A historical pragmatic analysis of Marie de Nassau's French-language correspondence with her father, 1573-1577

Joshua Bengough-Smith

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of Languages and Cultures, The University of Sheffield

April 2023

Abstract

Personal correspondence provides valuable insight into the lives of early modern young women and their expected roles and responsibilities. The daughter-father relationship is of particular interest - there are relatively few examples of French-language daughter-father correspondence in existing historical pragmatic and sociolinguistic studies of early modern women's lives when compared with other languages. Informed by research on early modern women's correspondence, the family, and historical pragmatic methods, this study focuses on 22 French-language letters (around 16000 words) sent by Marie de Nassau (1556-1616) to her father Guillaume d'Orange (1533-1584) during her later adolescence, 1573-1577. Her correspondence is analysed in conjunction with examples from sixteenth century French-language letter-writing manuals, revealing her behaviours through three key pragmatic features: formulaic sequences, politeness strategies, and speech acts.

Qualitative analysis of Marie's correspondence shows that speech acts and politeness strategies work to maintain the daughter-father relationship during periods of absence, with formulaic sequences providing structure. Broadly speaking, Marie employs commissive speech acts, negative politeness, text-constitutive formulae, and Christian-ritual formulae to emphasise deference to her father. Conversely, expressive speech acts, positive politeness, and intersubjective formulae highlight their kinship. Her use of formulaic sequences not found in manuals suggests that function was more important than form; her politeness strategies characterise the daughter-father relationship, made evident through formal address terms and markers of deference and kinship; and her speech acts show the potential effects at different functional levels of the text, discursive practice, and social practice. This study contributes a detailed example of French-language correspondence to the fields of historical sociolinguistics and pragmatics, crucially prioritising the daughter's voice. Additionally, it demonstrates the complex roles played by early modern young women as they were socialised into their adult lives, with Marie holding greater responsibility for the household, family, and her father's affairs than one might expect of the 'dutiful daughter'.

Keywords:

Historical sociolinguistics, Historical pragmatics, French studies, Women's letters, Early modern correspondence, Early modern daughters.

<u>Acknowledgements</u>

Firstly I would like to thank my supervisors, Professor Kristine Horner and Dr Graham Williams, for their continual support, knowledge and guidance over the years, as well as their encouragement to strike a healthy balance between my research and personal interests. I must also thank Professor Penny Simons for her instruction in Old and Middle French palaeography, and for helping me identify that part time attendance was a good idea. Thanks also to Dr Catharina Peersman, whose undergraduate teaching inspired me to investigate French historical sociolinguistics in the first place.

This project was made possible with the financial support of an Arts and Humanities Research Council competition studentship, awarded by the White Rose College of the Arts and Humanities (WRoCAH). I am particularly grateful to Caryn Douglas and Clare Meadley from the WRoCAH Office for their support in the early stages of the project and for providing avenues for professional development, including the unique opportunity to work with York Minster Collections.

I would also like to thank my personal tutors for their pastoral care, specifically Dr Audrey Small for making my problems seem smaller after a coffee and a chat, and more recently Professor Jan Windebank for her encouragement in the final few months before submission. I would also like to thank the School of Languages and Cultures support staff, particularly Claire Leavitt who has helpfully clarified many administrative processes and offered friendly conversation over the years.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends, family, and colleagues for their continued interest in (and patience with) the progress of this project. Most notable of these are Isabel Richardson and Diego Palombi, with whom I found many shared passions in addition to our overlapping research interests, as well as Philip Hatton for his general support over the past few years. I have enjoyed the metaphorical company of Marie de Nassau whilst writing this thesis, and am grateful that her letters were preserved, offering a window into the past and allowing a glimpse of an important phase of her life.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

'monsr crayndant vous donner facherie auecque plus longue letter fairay la fin priant dieu le createur vous donner monsr mon bien ayme pere sante heureuse vie et longue auecque accomplicement de tous vous bons desirs et a moy la grace de vous demeurer touiour humble et obeysante fille me recommandant treshumblement en vouster bonne grace'

'Monsieur, fearing that I inconvenience you with a longer letter I will finish it, praying that God the Creator grants you, Monsieur my most beloved father, a long, happy and healthy life, with accomplishment of all your best wishes, and [grant] to me the grace of always remaining your humble and obedient daughter, commending myself most humbly into your good graces' (Marie to Guillaume, 1573/12/05, my own translation)

The above quotation from the closing section of one of Marie de Nassau's letters to her father, Guillaume d'Orange, is somewhat typical of her correspondence with him during her adolescent years. Through the use of formulaic sequences, speech acts and politeness strategies, combined with her own voice, she is able to highlight the key aspects of her image that she wishes to portray to him through their correspondence whilst they are separated by geographical and temporal distance - namely that she continues to perform the role of his dutiful daughter. However, close analysis of her letters also reveals a number of ways in which she was able - and maybe even expected - to step beyond this humble role in order to best serve the family's interests at any given time.

Marie de Nassau (1556-1616) was the eldest daughter of Guillaume d'Orange (1533-1584) and his first of four wives, Anne d'Egmont (1533-1558). Guillaume, the Prince of Orange, is best known for leading the Dutch Revolt against the Spanish, and for being an ancestor of the Netherlands monarchy. Despite being the eldest living daughter of such a key figure in early modern Dutch and European history, Marie has received relatively little focus in the literature on this influential family. Historical accounts of her branch of the Nassau family focus on her father and brothers due to their roles in national politics, religion, and conflict. Indeed, even in a foundational historical account of her father's life, her birth is not acknowledged and the first mention of her is in conjunction with her elder brother Philip (Wedgwood 1944: 27). This account places her at the age of 28 in 1580 (Wedgwood 1944: 212), although she was only 24 at this time and has been mistaken for Guillaume's first daughter, also named Marie, who was born 4 years before Marie and died in infancy. More recent studies in fields like social history have begun to prioritise Nassau women's experiences rather than men's, particularly focused on Marie's younger half-sisters since

there is a great deal of their correspondence that survives. As such, these letters have been the subject of investigations into the social history of emotions, medicinal knowledge, and religion, as well as the management of the Nassau family as a unit, and specific relationships like stepmother-stepdaughter and sisterly bonds (see Broomhall 2005, 2009; Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a, 2009b, 2014; Broomhall & Spinks 2011; Campbell & Larsen 2009; Couchman 2005, 2018; Hodson 2007). On occasion, examples of Marie's correspondence have been included as part of wider investigations into the family (Broomhall and Spinks 2011, Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a), but there has not been as much focus on her individually when compared with studies on her younger sisters' letters.

The correspondence of early modern young women more generally has enjoyed increasing scholarly attention over recent decades. Despite this, some aspects of this field require further illumination, particularly regarding the experiences of young women as they navigated the transition into adulthood, the lived experience of daughters in relation to their fathers, and French language correspondence more broadly. Closer attention has been paid to the adolescent transition into adulthood when it comes to boys rather than girls (e.g. Hunt 1970), and when daughters have been the focus of studies they typically are in relation to mothers rather than fathers (e.g. Moran 2015). Both of these areas relate closely to the image of a 'dutiful daughter' that was expected of young women in this time period, since early modern young women 'owed dutiful respect to fathers' (Daybell 2006: 176), at least in theory. This thesis therefore aims to build upon the growing body of literature on early modern women's lives by foregrounding Marie de Nassau's voice, how she dealt with her progression into adult life, and how she navigated her relationship with her father through her correspondence, with the 'dutiful daughter' image being of particular interest. Much of the discussion of early modern young women's correspondence is also based on English language sources (e.g. Daybell 2006), so this thesis also aims to contribute additional knowledge on early modern young women's correspondence by foregrounding French language examples to assess the universal applicability of models derived from English language studies, providing parallels to studies of early English correspondence (e.g. Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 1995) and applying models derived from other contexts to the case of French-language correspondence (e.g. Brown & Levinson 1987). At this point it is also worth noting that French used in the early modern period between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries is classified as 'Middle French' as it was still undergoing transition from Old French and codification into what would later become standardised Modern French, but will be referred to as 'French' for simplicity throughout this thesis.

In order to investigate these aspects of Marie de Nassau's experience, it is important to select the right tools. The investigation aims to reveal her experience as a daughter and as a young woman by uncovering some of the social meanings that were inscribed through the

words of her correspondence, which places it within the disciplines of historical sociolinguistics and historical pragmatics. The decision to use pragmatic methods in this thesis is due to the focus on investigating the daughter-father relationship and the experience of early modern young women. In its broadest sense, pragmatics is concerned with 'the general conditions of the communicative use of language', with socio-pragmatics allowing for more local conditions to be accounted for (Jucker 1995: 10). Therefore, pragmatic methods are a useful tool for interrogating historical texts as they help to contextualise individual acts of communication. They highlight the range of functions that individual linguistic forms can perform, and by extension some of the potential social meanings that these utterances can convey to their target audience. It is important to remember that these texts were produced in a particular historical context that is separated from the researcher by several centuries, and so the surrounding social and discursive practices that influenced the production of these texts must also be established. As such, the researcher must be aware of the conventions and expectations of early modern young women's letter-writing, in order to not grant greater importance to certain aspects that seem unusual from a modern perspective but were merely conventional forms in the past. With this in mind, other contemporaneous texts, such as letter-writing manuals and model letter books, must be consulted as points of reference, in order to establish a set of expectations regarding the forms and functions of early modern young women's letters. Marie's particular case is therefore approached with these conventions in mind, and then further interrogated to help deepen understanding of early modern correspondence practices and early modern young women's roles and responsibilities.

Pragmatic methods are particularly suited to the analysis of historical correspondence. Analysing historical correspondence through the lens of pragmatic methods helps to show how particular linguistic forms may have produced certain functions when framed within their sociocultural context. Indeed, historical pragmatics is primarily concerned with 'any interaction between specific aspects of social context and particular historical language use that leads to pragmatic meanings' (Culpeper 2009: 182). The analysis of Marie de Nassau's correspondence can reveal some of her lived experience as a young woman and daughter in the early modern period, and it can also suggest some ways in which she could use correspondence as a means of maintaining and influencing the dynamics of her parental relationship during her father's absence from the family estate. Moreover, the analysis of her personal correspondence allows for the practice of early modern correspondence to be examined in its social context, in turn revealing how the genre itself may have influenced Marie's ability to communicate her own needs and desires effectively to her father whilst still maintaining a 'dutiful daughter' image. The selection of specific pragmatic features deserving of investigation is largely influenced by the nature of the source materials being studied. The

typically formulaic nature of early modern correspondence justifies an analysis of formulaic sequences, revealing how closely Marie followed conventional elements of the genre and grounding her writing within the specific social context of sixteenth-century letter-writing practices; the analysis of speech acts demonstrates the ways in which Marie was able to pass on information, express her desires, and make requests of her father through her correspondence, indicating matters that were important to her; and analysing politeness strategies shows how she was able to frame these desires and requests in a manner that would appeal to her father's face wants whilst also maintaining her strong 'dutiful daughter' image. These three pragmatic features comprise the analysis section of this thesis. By extension, the analysis also has implications for the pragmatic concepts that are investigated, for example demonstrating that formulaic sequences, politeness strategies and speech acts are not always neatly subdivided into discrete units, and could be employed quite flexibly to portray subtle differences through the medium of correspondence.

Although there has been increasing interest in early modern correspondence in the fields of historical pragmatics and sociolinguistics, it must be noted that French-language letters have received relatively little attention, at least in comparison to other languages such as Italian, Latin, English, German and Dutch. Existing historical pragmatic and sociolinguistic studies of French-language examples have often focused on the diachronic change in meanings and usage of particular parts of speech (e.g. Mosegaard Hansen 2005), the application of pragmatic models to historical French-language examples in order to question their universality (e.g. Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2011), and using existing pragmatic models to help explain some of the influences in language change over time (e.g. Beeching 2007). With regard to correspondence in particular, Dossena and Del Lungo Camiciotti's (2012) edited volume *'Letter Writing in Late Modern Europe'* gathers several articles on later modern European correspondence from historical pragmatic and sociolinguistic perspectives, drawing upon examples from Dutch, Finnish, Portuguese, German, Italian and English. Despite a lack of early modern French-language examples, this volume does highlight that many of the principles of correspondence were shared across these European languages, and so may also apply to French-language cases a little further back in time. The absence of French examples from this collection is not unusual, especially with regards to sixteenth century letters: *'Au seizième siècle la publication de lettres missives rédigées en français est un phénomène assez rare.'* ('In the sixteenth century, the publication of missive letters written in French is a relatively rare phenomenon', Altman 1990: 108, my own translation). This is confirmed by a more recent encyclopaedic collection of epistolaries, letter-writing manuals and model letter books from sixteenth century Western Europe by Erdmann, Govi & Govi (2014), which contains a handful of French language examples alongside the vast majority of Italian and Latin. This perhaps explains some of the reasons why there are fewer

studies on French language correspondence in historical pragmatic and sociolinguistic research, but this seems unusual given the historical importance of French as a language of power and diplomacy throughout the Middle Ages and into the early modern period. Indeed, Marie de Nassau was likely to have spoken German or Dutch given her upbringing and where she was located in the world, but the fact that her letters to her father are written in French suggests that there was a preference or prestige associated with using French to address her father.

Frijhoff (2015) offers insight into the important role that French played in the Dutch Republic in the seventeenth century, but the presence of French in what would become the Netherlands can be traced back to the Burgundian era of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Noting the importance of the French language in the multilingual landscape of the early modern Netherlands, he states that 'Ever since the Middle Ages French had been the language of diplomacy and of international trade, an important part of which was carried out with France. During the Burgundian era [...] it was also the language in which the Low Countries were governed from Brussels.' (Frijhoff 2015: 116). Although much of this relates to early seventeenth century Dutch high society, the fact that French enjoyed international prestige since the Middle Ages indicates that this was likely the case during the sixteenth century as well. He continues by noting that there was social prestige to using French: 'the pronounced international orientation of the stadholder's [the Dutch territories leader's] court meant that French continued to be spoken there, and as the attraction of this court increased, the social prestige of French rose as well' (Frijhoff 2015: 116). This suggests that French was valued as a prestige language associated with high status throughout this time period. Frijhoff also recognises a gendered aspect to language use, observing that 'only modern languages were viewed as a[n intellectual] field open to women, and French first of all. It has even been claimed that French initially played the same role for women that Latin did for men.' (Frijhoff 2015: 120). This comparison is based on the idea that in later medieval Europe, Latin had become associated with written expression of knowledge and the sacred, domains that were typically male dominated, whilst vernacular languages were favoured for oral expression, everyday records, poetry and fiction by people more generally (Lusignan 1986: 9), and indicates why French may have been the appropriate linguistic choice for Marie's correspondence. This gendered distinction between different forms of language use continued into the early modern period, and is particularly evident in the correspondence of the Salis family living in a multilingual Switzerland in the sixteenth century. The members of this family had multiple languages to choose from when writing, but the sons would routinely write to their father in Latin, the most formal option which would have been learned through schooling and so sons likely felt obliged to demonstrate their education and progression into adult life by corresponding with their father in Latin (Head 1995: 582). Conversely, the

women in this family were not educated in Latin and the lower prestige of the vernacular Romansh meant that they were more likely to write in Italian or German instead, as these languages might help their claims be taken more seriously given they were more 'learned' and prestigious for this family and their wider network in this particular time (Head 1995: 584, 586, 591). This demonstrates that different languages had different levels of prestige, even if the exact parameters changed across the different territories of Europe. Returning then to the Dutch aristocracy, French came to be perceived as a language of power (Frijhoff 2015: 128) due to its association with the court and international diplomacy, but was also a language that women were encouraged to learn. As a result 'For the elite, French thus became the second mother tongue, that of the supranational mother country which took shape along French lines in aristocratic networks and international court culture.' (Frijhoff 2015: 129). Whilst Frijhoff's claims relate more specifically to the seventeenth century, cases like Marie's correspondence with her father suggest that the prestige of French at court and for women may have already been growing in the sixteenth century.

Marie de Nassau's use of French in her correspondence with her father is interesting, given that she was a young woman living in Germany writing to her multilingual father and as such may have had a range of languages to choose from to communicate in. It is evident that she was proficient in at least three languages, French, German and Dutch, as in her later life she also wrote to her uncle and other relatives in German, and received some letters from her father in German and Dutch too (see Appendix 1 for a summary of her correspondence). Given that Marie had spent some time at court in Brussels, she would have been versed in French as the language of the court and may have wished to demonstrate her proficiency to her father, especially when it was deemed more suitable for women to be proficient in French than Latin, the religious and legal language that was the hallmark of young men's education. In addition, Guillaume was likely proficient in French, German, Dutch and Latin, which surely helped with securing political alliances through his marriages to women from different European backgrounds, but it is said that due to his lifetime at court he preferred to communicate in French. As such, Marie's use of French may have simultaneously demonstrated her good education and competencies acquired at court, but also recognition of her father's linguistic preference which shows familial intimacy and warmth. Her choice of language may also correlate with the intended purpose of the letter (Head 1995: 592), perhaps indicating a more familiar and diplomatic text than one written in another language. It is also worth noting that as a result of Guillaume's marriages across political borders to secure alliances, the Orange-Nassau family contained members speaking variously French, German, and Dutch, with education in Latin and undoubtedly other European languages, and so the entire family was likely multilingual. It is beyond the scope of the current study to investigate this, but it would be of interest to other scholars

interested in language contact, multilingualism and code-switching, especially within the early modern multilingual family.

The fact that Marie de Nassau's letters to her father are written in French is one of the key features that makes them of interest to study. French language correspondence, particularly that from the early modern period, is relatively underrepresented in the literature of historical pragmatics and historical sociolinguistics. Personal correspondence written in other early modern European languages has received more attention in these fields, particularly English-language correspondence, most notably thanks to the work of scholars at the University of Helsinki on the Corpus of Early English Correspondence (CEEC) from the early 1990s, which has made English language correspondence from the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries much easier to access and interrogate for various projects. This is likely due to a greater volume of data being available and accessible in these languages. However, given the historical importance of French as an emergent language of power and diplomacy in the later Middle Ages and into the early modern period, one would expect this language to have received a little more attention.

Marie's correspondence is of special interest for a number of other reasons than simply the language in which it is written. Her circumstances provided an opportunity for her to maintain a correspondence with her father that allows a rare insight into a number of intersecting features. The primary insight is into family life and the experiences of early modern young women, specifically relating to their roles and responsibilities as daughters during their adolescent years. Whilst there have been studies on the parent-child relationship, the focus has typically been on the parental experience and actions rather than that of the offspring (see chapter 2). There has been a little more research in recent years on the mother-daughter relationship, but by comparison the daughter-father relationship has still received relatively little attention. Therefore the letters from Marie to Guillaume demonstrate an example of the daughter-father relationship as it was experienced by the daughter herself, foregrounding her voice rather than that of her parent(s). It is also noteworthy that Marie writes these letters during the stage in her life when she had passed out of childhood but was still transitioning into adulthood with all the roles and responsibilities that entailed, whilst remaining unmarried despite being of marriageable age. With marriage symbolically marking the moment of transition into female adulthood, these letters provide an insight into just how much young women's adult status was marked by the roles they fulfilled as wives and mothers, as opposed to being a matter of socialisation into adult life based on factors such as her age and the ever-changing needs of her family.

It is worth noting at this point some key features of the early modern aristocratic family and household. Much like today, the exact makeup of individual households in early modern Europe was quite diverse, but typically power and responsibility lay with the father or

father-figure, at least nominally, and passed down to the first male heir. Despite being led by this patriarchal figurehead, gender was not necessarily a defining feature of the roles that individual family members played within the household structure, primarily because the overall status and aims of the family unit as a whole was more important in determining the division of responsibilities and the trajectory of certain decisions than any individual family member's desires. Therefore every family member had their own role to play in furthering their family's aims, and since every household was different this naturally looked different for every family. For the Orange-Nassau family, this often entailed the partnering of offspring with other families across political borders or of differing religious convictions, in order to secure alliances and territories. Indeed, familial needs and circumstances are likely to have influenced Marie's role within the family throughout her life. Being the eldest daughter of Guillaume's first marriage, and with her older brother being held in Spain as a political prisoner, she likely had to take charge of the family duties that would otherwise have fallen to her brother. This is compounded by the fact that their mother had died, and Guillaume had separated from his second wife and not remarried for the majority of the time period which Marie's letters cover, meaning that Marie may well have been the most senior woman of this branch of the family at this point in time. Despite these factors suggesting her important family status, Marie's correspondence has received relatively little attention in the scholarly literature on the Orange-Nassau family, particularly when compared with her younger siblings' or male family members' letters. This thesis contributes a new angle to the discussion of Orange-Nassau correspondence by foregrounding Marie's own voice and experience as witnessed through her letters to her father, rather than dealing primarily with the impact that her father, uncle, and brothers had on the dynastic fortunes. Adopting a historical pragmatic approach helps illuminate some of the expectations placed upon early modern young women, and daughters in particular. The use of pragmatic methods to interrogate these letters also has the benefit of allowing detailed qualitative interpretation of the findings. If the corpus were larger or contained multiple correspondents then a comparative quantitative analysis would supplement the qualitative interpretations. This is beyond the scope of the current study as the focus here is primarily on drawing out the pragmatic meanings from Marie's letters to her father, but additional comparative cases would certainly be of value in a future related project.

The central part of this thesis revolves around the analysis of the particular case study of Marie de Nassau's personal correspondence with her father. This consists of 22 individual letters, which appear to have been written in her own hand and were addressed directly to her father. They were written between 18 June 1573 and 20 September 1577, when Marie was aged between 17 and 21. She remained unmarried throughout this time period, and for the most part she was living with her aunt, grandmother and younger siblings at the family

estate in Dillenburg, Germany. The need for correspondence with her father arose from his absence, fighting the Spanish in the Netherlands and attending to his duties as the Prince of Orange. This case study totals around 16000 words across the 22 letters, which is small enough to allow for in-depth close reading of the texts without being unwieldy, yet large enough to demonstrate Marie's own style of self-presentation and any ways in which it varied from the conventional forms of the genre. In order to allow for easy searching of these letters with digital corpus tools like AntConc, I transcribed scans of the original letters into digital text documents, with minimal editing (such as retaining the original spelling rather than modernising or standardising it) to ensure that the transcriptions remain as faithful to the original manuscripts as possible and preserve the voice of the correspondent, though of course some elements are lost in the process as no transcription is completely neutral (brief summaries of each letter are found in Appendix 2, and a sample transcription in Appendix 3). In this format, keyword occurrences across the full case study can be searched, and English translations provided throughout the analyses (all translations are my own, and all dated quotations come from Marie's letters to Guillaume unless otherwise stated). Each transcription summary also contains metadata on features such as the layout and negative space of each manuscript, allowing for some of the material aspects of each letter to be commented on if relevant. This allows features that are evident in the manuscript to remain visible in the transcription, such as examples where a post-script seems to have been added to an already finished letter just prior to its sending. In addition, a small corpus of sixteenth-century French-language letter-writing manuals and letter-books is curated (outlined in detail in chapter 4) in order to elicit key points of comparison regarding some of the common conventions of the genre at the time.

To help contextualise these letters, a little more biographical history is required. After her mother's death and her father's second marriage to Anne de Saxe (1544-1577), Marie was sent to court in Brussels in 1565 to live as lady-in-waiting to the Regent Margaret, whilst her elder brother Philippe-Guillaume went to the University of Louvain, as Guillaume did not trust his second wife to care for them (Wedgwood 1944: 66). In April 1567, Marie returned to the family estate in Dillenburg, Germany, with Guillaume, her stepmother Anne, and her new half sister, also called Anne (Wedgwood 1944: 95). At this time, the household was ruled by Marie's paternal grandmother, Julienne (1506-1580), who features in most of her letters as *'madame ma gran mere'* ('Madame my grandmother'). The household functioned as a school for the nobility, with children's voices heard throughout the grounds. This was also the base for the Count of Nassau, Jean (1536-1606), his wife Elisabeth (1537-1579) and their children who welcomed the two *'Mesdemoiselles d'Orange'* ('young Orange ladies') into their new school routine (Wedgwood 1944: 97). Guillaume soon returned to his political engagements, as a key figure in the Dutch Revolt against the Spanish in the Netherlands. It

seems that Marie remained based at Dillenburg for the remainder of her adolescent years, since the majority of her letters during this time period were composed here, until she most likely travelled to Antwerp with other family members where her father set up a new home in October 1577 (Wedgwood 1944: 181). During this time, Guillaume and Anne had two more children before their marriage was annulled in 1571. Guillaume later married Charlotte de Bourbon (1546-1582) in 1575, and the couple were visited at Geertruidenberg by Marie and her two half siblings Anne and Maurice in 1577, the first time Guillaume had seen them in five years, with Marie and Charlotte striking a special friendship instead of confining themselves to the typical mother-daughter dynamic (Wedgwood 1944: 175), perhaps due to their age gap of only ten years and Marie's maturity and experience during her father's absence from the household (Appendix 4 contains more detailed timelines of key moments in Marie's and Guillaume's lives during the time of their correspondence). It is at this point that the case study draws to a close, as there are no further letters since they presumably live in the same household once again.

In order to investigate the primary data, it is necessary to narrow down the focus to a few core research questions. These are framed around the key areas of knowledge to which this study is expected to contribute: early modern daughters, young women's correspondence, and historical pragmatics. More specifically, the core research questions for this study are as follows:

> *RQ1. To what extent did Marie de Nassau's personal correspondence with her father follow known conventions and expectations for early modern young women's letters?*

> *RQ2. How did Marie de Nassau use different pragmatic features in her personal correspondence with her father to help navigate the dynamics of the daughter-father relationship? More specifically, how do the pragmatic features of formulaic sequences, speech acts and politeness strategies function in her letters?*

> *RQ3. What does the pragmatic analysis of Marie de Nassau's personal correspondence with her father reveal about her roles and responsibilities as a 'dutiful' daughter?*

These three research questions are essential for investigating the case study of Marie de Nassau and how she both fulfilled and stepped outside of her dutiful daughterly role. RQ1 is necessary as it is important to establish the prescribed conventions of letter-writing between daughters and fathers in order to figure out whether Marie was influenced by these prescribed conventions or was more free with her expressions. Once this has been established, it is possible to make more confident assertions about her use of different pragmatic features and the likely effects they had. RQ2 narrows the focus onto the

daughter-father relationship and the practicalities of early modern correspondence. The choice of analysing formulaic sequences, politeness strategies and speech acts helps to highlight the ways in which correspondence in particular was a useful means of navigating this relationship during her father's absence. These different pragmatic features are dealt with separately in the analysis chapters for the sake of clarity, but overlap and interact with one another. Finally, RQ3 allows for reflection on the more sociohistorical elements that derive from the pragmatic analysis, with particular focus on the roles and responsibilities of the 'dutiful daughter', and indeed any ways in which Marie may have stepped beyond this role when the needs of her family demanded it of her. This also allows for some speculation about how Marie's case may have applied more widely to early modern young women in similar circumstances, the types of subject matter that were important to them, and the role that correspondence played in their experience as daughters.

The remainder of this thesis proceeds as follows. Chapters 2 and 3 focus on framing the context of Marie's letters, the fields in which this thesis is situated, and outlining some of the wider literature that is useful to know when examining early modern young women's letters like Marie's, which will lay the groundwork for answering the core research questions in the course of the analysis chapters. Chapter 2 focuses primarily on the sociohistorical context of early modern daughters, detailing existing studies on early modern women, early modern family structure, and early modern youth, which helps frame the social context in which the conventions and expectations of RQ1 are uncovered as well as outlining some of the daughterly role relevant to RQ3. Chapter 3 focuses more on the theoretical grounding and practicalities of letter-writing, outlining historical pragmatic approaches to correspondence, framing letter-writing as a social practice, and then discussing the particulars of early modern family correspondence practices, more closely addressing RQ2 and RQ3. Following on from these contextual framing chapters, chapters 4 through 6 present the specific pragmatic analyses that provide deeper insights into the meanings contained within Marie's letters. Chapter 4 investigates the primary sources of letter-writing manuals and model letters, drawing upon studies of formulaic sequences in order to establish the conventions and expectations of early modern young women's correspondence with their fathers, and to see how Marie may or may not have strayed from these prescriptions, primarily addressing RQ1 and setting a baseline for addressing RQ2 and RQ3. Chapter 5 investigates the conventions of politeness, and how Marie used varying politeness strategies and face work in order to manage her relationship with her father through her correspondence whilst they were living separately, primarily addressing RQ2 and RQ3. Chapter 6 then takes speech acts as its focus, and similarly analyses Marie's letters for the types of utterances she uses in order to make certain points and express herself outside of the formulaic sections of her letters, also addressing RQ2 and RQ3, with a brief summary towards the end of the chapter that

attempts to combine the core findings from the preceding analyses. All three analysis chapters contain detailed discussion of the relevant pragmatic theories in relation to the case study of Marie's letters. Following on from this, chapter 7 concludes the thesis by synthesising the findings of the analyses (which is particularly useful for discussing RQ3), addressing the answers to the core research questions, and exploring potential for future research into the experience of early modern 'dutiful daughters'.

2. Early modern daughters

In order to gain most from the analysis of Marie de Nassau's correspondence with her father, it is important to build an understanding of the social and historical context in which they were situated. One of the most salient features of her letters is based upon the relationship between the correspondents as daughter and father, and how this may have looked during the early modern period. As such, the focus of this chapter is to explore the existing knowledge on the lived experience of young women, specifically as daughters, during the early modern period. The lives of early modern young women have become increasingly visible through scholarly research, such that 'No longer can any scholar bemoan the lack of records on early modern women, assert that women did not write, or complain that any group of women was invisible either in their own time or to historians' (Poska, Couchman & McIver 2013: 18). Despite this improvement in the depth of knowledge about early modern women's lives, there remain areas which would benefit from further investigation. In particular, there is relatively little known about young adolescent and unmarried women and the nature of their family relationships, specifically with their father, as they matured into adulthood. In order to better understand these particular aspects of early modern women's lives, it is necessary to review the literature in a few key areas of knowledge. These include research on early modern women and gender, family history (especially child-parent dynamics), and even childhood and adolescence more broadly. In this chapter, the relevant literature in these areas is outlined, starting with early modern women and gender (section 2.1), the early modern family (section 2.2), and childhood and adolescence (section 2.3). These are followed by a summary discussion (section 2.4), incorporating motivations for this study and reasons why an analysis of Marie de Nassau's letters can help address important gaps in the knowledge. In addition to these social contexts, it is also important to explore the practicalities of sending correspondence in the early modern period and the methods that can best help the researcher elicit information from these texts about the nature of these personal relationships in order to fully contextualise Marie's letters and the roles and responsibilities she adopted as a daughter. These matters relating to texts and methods more specifically will be addressed in the following chapter (chapter 3).

2.1 Early modern women and gender

In recent years, a number of edited collections have been published focusing on various aspects of women's lives in the past. Munns & Richards (eds) (2003) compiled an edited collection on *'Gender, Power, and Privilege in Early Modern Europe'*, which includes chapters that highlight the important roles that women played at this time, at least in the

upper levels of early modern society. In their introduction, they note how previous studies have shown that gender identities and sexual orientation did not operate in terms of binary oppositions between men and women in the early modern period, and that other factors such as status and activities in different social and cultural contexts must be taken into account when attempting to understand the gendered experiences of early modern women (Munns & Richards 2003: 2). In her own chapter within this volume, Richards argues against the idea of a 'traditional female role', stating that 'the notion that women either fulfil traditional female roles or are monstrous, does not accord with contemporary actuality at either the highest levels, where women had to function in the public and political realms, or at lower levels where women toiled alongside men.' (Richards 2003: 160). This chapter draws upon the case of the early sixteenth century Guise family, an aristocratic family whose women played essential and active roles in supporting the rest of their family members during war. Alongside their expected duties of looking after the family estates and upholding the patrimony, the Guise women were also active politically, with Richards arguing that 'domestic and public, familial and political did not represent very different spheres for the male and female members of elite families' (Richards 2003: 165). This suggests that at least in aristocratic families gender played less of a role in determining a woman's life experience than her status within the family and the responsibilities that entailed.

Muravyeva & Toivo (eds) (2012) further explore how gender may have applied in the past in their collection *'Gender in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe'*, once again challenging the idea of a strict and distinctly defined male-female dichotomy or hierarchy and the notion of patriarchal power. In particular, Dialeti's (2012) chapter laments that the focus of previous decades' research on early modern women's lives has assumed absolute male authority and female subordination, with women seeking but unable to attain true agency within that system or subvert the patriarchy, but this implicit assumption of absolute patriarchy ignores the elements of early modern male-female relationships that were more equal in power, and completely overlooks the power relations among women by assuming that power can only be attributed to men (Dialeti 2012: 20-21). This once again highlights the importance of paying attention to the context in which different women found themselves when trying to understand how gender played a role in the lives of early modern women.

One collection that is exemplary in offering insight into the lives of many different types of early modern women at different stages of their lives is *'The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe'* by Poska, Couchman & McIver (eds) (2013). This collection includes contributions that give a range of examples of women's experiences as mothers, wives, older women, members of religious orders both within and beyond the convent, producers of culture like art and literature, and as women of marginalised groups. Given the broad range of examples covered in this volume's chapters,

the editors are certainly right to claim that no group of women should be considered invisible or lacking in records in the past. However, this collection is not exhaustive and it lacks a chapter that explores early modern daughters and younger, unmarried women who did not enter the convent, which would help provide a perspective on women's experiences over the course of their lifetime and not just in adulthood.

2.1.1 Patriarchal authority

One common thread in much of the literature on early modern women is the idea that women's lives were constricted by a patriarchal system, both within the family and more broadly. '[T]he term 'patriarchy' has traditionally been used to denote the absolute authority of the male head of the household (*pater familias*) over his wife, children, servants, and other male and female dependents […]' (Dialeti 2012: 20, their italics). Any discussion of female agency is therefore typically represented as acting in opposition to patriarchal power: 'patriarchal structures are often implied as the background against which women's action took place, either as a dynamic resistance or most often in a negotiation process.' (Dialeti 2012: 22). Other authors have noted this trend in the literature too, with Flather (2013) suggesting a more quotidian nature of women's opposition to patriarchal power: 'It has been argued that this [early modern women's] agency can best be seen in the continual negotiation of everyday interactions rather than in occasional acts of resistance.' (Flather 2013: 347). In Moran & Pipkin's (eds) (2019) collection *'Women and Gender in the Early Modern Low Countries'*, which focuses on women from the low countries and their cultural production or representation within literary and artistic works, Howell (2019) also acknowledges the ways in which women countered the patriarchal regime in a more subtle way than simply direct opposition: 'for the most part we read not of women who overturned the patriarchal regime but of those who "negotiated the system" to protect their interests, who "worked around" the constraints of law to achieve a goal not intended by the law, or who "strategically positioned themselves" in ways that benefitted them, all suggesting that agency was achieved by circumventing rather than confronting or altering conventional norms.' (Howell 2019: 24). However, the idea that patriarchal power needed to be opposed rests on the assumption that 'there were two basic groups of historical actors, men and women [...] accompanied by the assumption that women in the past were invariably oppressed, excluded and marginalized' (Dolan 2003: 8), which over-generalises and does not account for specificity and unique circumstances in women's experiences that may have affected their roles. By assuming that this binary patriarchal system applied unproblematically in the past, it also downplays the positive aspects of early modern male-female relationships that undoubtedly existed: 'the notion of patriarchy, by highlighting the repressive side of male power, cannot interpret aspects of male-female relationships that include feelings of love,

friendship, and mutual support' and also ignores female-female relations (Dialeti 2012: 21). It cannot simply be considered as 'a universal system of male domination and privilege on the one side and female subjugation and victimhood on the other side' (Dialeti 2012: 29), because such a viewpoint gives an overly simplistic view of a situation where multiple factors were at play, and did not even apply in the same way from one person to the next: 'patriarchy was not equally oppressive for all women: class, marital status, occupation, regional, or even age-related factors intersected with gender to form a more complex image of power relations than that depicted by the radical feminist notion of patriarchy' (Dialeti 2012: 31). Although gender undoubtedly played its part in shaping the experiences of early modern women, other factors must be taken into account and a widely applicable system of patriarchal domination and female subordination should not be assumed as the starting point.

Whilst it is problematic to assume a system of patriarchal domination, it does not mean that gender was simply not a factor in early modern life, for clearly it was: 'historians have long been familiar with the paradox of early modern society: women, ostensibly socialized to be demure, compliant and submissive, proved in practice to be successful managers of estates, efficient organizers of popular protest, active participants in business, as well as being in the forefront of religious dissent.' (Pollock 1989: 231). Therefore, whilst it does seem evident that gender was certainly relevant in shaping women's lives in the early modern period, other factors were more important in determining their degree of agency and influence in their family and wider network, and this was particularly true of aristocratic families where status took precedence over gender concerns. Life cycle role, more so than gender, was the predominant factor in determining a young person's experience (Pollock 1989: 248). It has also been noted that assuming a dominant patriarchal system limits understanding of early modern women's lives, since it over-generalises and does not take individual circumstances into account, such as a woman's relative status within her family which may have modulated the degrees of power that she could have both within her own family and the wider social network. However, it is also clear that gender was still a factor that influenced some aspects of early modern life at least, and so it must be considered when attempting to understand early modern women's lives in more detail. One common model which focuses on the early modern woman's life cycle roles presents a linear progression from daughter to wife to widow.

2.1.2 Life cycle roles

Whilst a dominant patriarchal system may not have applied equally forcefully to the dynamics of every early modern family, the common model for women's lives defines women's identities around the particular life cycle role she played, which themselves were

based upon her relation to the most important male figure in her life at a given point in time. Women's identities were therefore typically framed around their familial relations: '[a] woman's experience, more so than a man's, was circumscribed by her family role, either as daughter, wife, mother, or widow' (Staples 2011: 1), whilst men's identities revolved more around their role in wider society. This results in the traditional description of early modern women's lives as progressing through three distinct stages: daughter-wife-widow. Within this model, motherhood is implied as part of the wifely role, but so too is the responsibility of being mistress of her husband's household in his absence. It is interesting to note that with each of these family roles, women are described in relation to a male figure or their position in a hierarchy: as a *daughter*, she is defined by being subordinate to her mother and father; as a *wife* she is defined by her husband, with her related role as mother defining her in relation to her children (and implicitly her husband), and as mistress of the household in relation to the household staff (and again implicitly her husband); and as *widow* she remains defined by her husband even after his passing, as well as any children and household staff she may remain responsible for, but may also have experienced greater independence at this stage in her life. Although defining women's roles in relation to the men in their lives paints a bleak picture of early modern women's agency, this does not mean they had no agency, especially within the family context. Richards takes the example of the Guise women who were just as active in the political affairs of the time as their male family members: 'They were active and militant participants in their families' ambitious and violent activities. They were as engaged in defeat as in victory, and as essential to the cohesion of their faction and survival of their family interests in their middle and later years as in their youth. Indeed, it was their positions as mothers, wives and widows, daughters and sisters that gave them motivation and authority.' (Richards 2003: 169). This highlights the importance of remembering that early modern women took on multiple roles and responsibilities within the key social structure of the early modern family. Within this unit, their roles could take on many different forms: 'while women in their capacities as daughters and wives owed dutiful respect to fathers and husbands, as mothers they commanded filial obedience from sons, and acting as mistresses of households they were empowered to instruct male servants' (Daybell 2006: 176). As such, early modern women's life cycle roles should be considered as more complex than the daughter-wife-widow model implies.

The daughter-wife-widow model suggests a linear progression through each of these life cycle stages, with daughters passing immediately from youth into adulthood at the point of marriage as they are passed from the hands of their father into the hands of their husband. Childbearing and household management were assumed as part of this adult married role, before they potentially passed into a more independent adult stage at the moment of their husband's death. This final stage of widowhood has received much attention in the literature

that attempts to foreground early modern women's voices, because it was 'a life stage in which women could exercise more public or visible forms of power than during other periods of their lives' (Broomhall & Spinks 2011: 75), and so there are often more surviving records from this stage in their lives. Similarly, 'very little is known about women's activities and influence during (or before) their marriage' (Marini 2010: 6). However, there is some evidence of the responsibilities that early modern women took on in their married lives: 'It seems that early modern Belgian aristocrats relied heavily on their wives' managerial skills. [...] The examples of women taking up the position of head of house in times of crisis, might even be the result of noblewomen's upbringing [...]' (Marini 2010: 19). This suggests that although women's power is most visible when they reached widowhood in later life, there are certainly less visible power dynamics to be uncovered at earlier stages in their lives, even during their upbringing.

Individual circumstances also meant that a linear progression from one discrete role to the next was not always the reality of early modern women's lives. As such, 'it is important to consider the array of factors that complicated people's personal relationships, few of which were mutually exclusive' (Poska 2013: 204), because early modern women were more than just their prescribed life cycle role - they were members of family structures and social networks that were vastly different from one to the next. The reality is that early modern women's roles and responsibilities were much more flexible than this model suggests because every woman's circumstances were different. This means that '[a] woman's place in the family, in the economy and before the law was determined by a variety of factors including her age, her role as mother and her marital status. Class also figured prominently in women's access to economic resources and political participation.' (Poska, Couchman & McIver 2013: 20). Adult women needed to be able to switch roles as their family circumstances required, and so were brought up with this in mind: 'The upbringing of girls was intended to ensure adult women were deferential to men, but not to preclude the possibility of independent thought or action. Thus, women as adults switched between roles, choosing according to the circumstances to utilize what were conventionally held to be masculine skills or feminine qualities.' (Pollock 1989: 250). However, 'the difficulty lay in ensuring they would revert to secondary status whenever it was enjoined and hence not threaten the ruling supremacy of their husbands' (Pollock 1989: 237). It seems that early modern women therefore had to be quite flexible in their roles, even if they could be loosely categorised as 'daughter-wife-widow'. It is therefore vital to consider early modern young women's lives as more complex than these discrete life cycle stages, with daughters adopting some of the responsibilities that were traditionally associated with their roles as wives, mothers, mistresses of the household, or even widows, if their particular family circumstances called for it.

2.2 The early modern family

A second area of research that the present study draws upon and attempts to contribute to is that of the early modern family. Hunt (1970) provides a detailed discussion of family life in early modern France, building upon the 1960 work of Philippe Ariès in *'L'enfant et la vie familiale sous l'ancien régime'* by incorporating historical and psychological considerations. His review of previous work on the early modern family suggests a tendency towards the theory of decline, 'that the family is no longer what it used to be' (Hunt 1970: 29). This implies a simplistic and teleological idea that does not necessarily reflect the complexities of family bonds in the early modern period. The family was an important social unit during the early modern period, particularly for the aristocracy, and likely had a greater impact on the lives of early modern women than gender alone. Indeed, gender and familial structure cannot be easily separated in the early modern period, since '[m]any scholars have agreed that women - widows, wives, and daughters - lost relative power and influence by the late Middle Ages due to changes in family structure and inheritance patterns, as families shifted to a patrilineal family arrangement and to placing emphasis on the first male heir' (Staples 2011: 7). Scholars have also suggested that this 'patrilineal family arrangement' was used as a model for structuring the hierarchy of society more broadly, since 'the family was not only the fundamental economic unit of society; it also provided the basis for political and social order,' (Amussen 1988: 1), for example serving as a metaphor for the state with King as the father of his subjects in early modern England, and perhaps more widely across Europe.

Although certain household tasks often ended up being divided along gender lines, early modern family roles were not distinctly defined according to gender. Where one might assume a 'strict division of work and space between men and productive work outside the house, on the one hand, and women and reproduction and consumption inside the house, on the other' (Flather 2013: 344), the distinction of labour among the women and men of the early modern household was necessarily diverse. This 'diversity of household structures that existed in the early modern period suggests that Europeans had complex understandings of the definition of family and were exposed to many different models of familial authority' (Poska 2013: 200), which implies that whilst gender may have initially informed family members' roles and responsibilities within the household, the ever-changing circumstances of family life may have shifted the power dynamics, and indeed redistributed responsibilities, among its members. As such, whilst it may have been the case that in general overt power lay with the father or father-figure and passed to his first male heir, it cannot be assumed that this patriarchal model meant all female family members were subservient and powerless. In fact, women played vital roles in promoting their families interests, for 'a high-born lady did not merely pass her time in domesticity and leisure but as part of the collaborative entity -

the great family […]' (Munns & Richards 2003: 5). This echoes what was seen in the previous section, that gender often was not the primary factor in determining the power and responsibilities that a particular person was given. Richards notes how '[w]omen as well as men were deployed to serve family interests - through marriage, warfare and public protest, as well as through the skills of the courtier - tact, charm, the giving of tasteful gifts and dispensation of favours - to secure patronage and extend the family's power.' (Richards 2003: 160). Similarly, Poska notes how the familial context and working towards the family's group aims was more important than individual concerns, especially when distributing power among siblings: 'When siblings lived together, brothers and sisters acted out gender tensions in the context of an array of other complications, including birth order, intra-familial alliances and internecine conflicts. As a result, in many cases, sisters, by virtue of their age or wealth, exerted significant influence over their brothers and younger sisters.' (Poska 2013: 200). Poska continues this recognition of the complexities of life in the early modern family, in some cases leading to women and children having greater influence over family decisions than the 'patriarchal' figures: 'Familial affection also tempered male authority and provided a mechanism for women and children to influence family decisions. [...] Most families successfully negotiated the tensions between the cultural expectations of male authority in the family and the complicated realities of family life.' (Poska 2013: 202). The important point to note here is that family concerns came before individual preferences and conventional life roles. Lanza points out that every family member had a contribution to make to their family's economic and social advancement (Lanza 2013: 281), continuing to mention that despite certain restrictions placed on them, women could find ways around them in order to benefit their family's interests: 'Although women had to work against certain contractions of their economic rights, they generally found ways to work around restrictions in order to address their and their families' economic interests.' (Lanza 2013: 287). It seems likely therefore that early modern women were highly active in progressing the interests of their family, often ahead of their own desires, perhaps taking on responsibilities that would have typically fallen to other family members, based upon whatever individual circumstances the family found itself in, and ensuring that the family concerns were prioritised.

Some key points that emerge from the literature on the early modern family that bear most significance for the present study include the fact that the family unit was seen as the basis for society and as such preserving the family image and furthering its interests were crucial aspects for every family member to consider. Within such a context, it becomes clear that any work and activities women took on in their daily lives were primarily for the benefit of the family. There is little evidence that household division of labour was strictly defined by gender roles, due to the fact that every family had different needs and circumstances that required its members to adopt different responsibilities, meaning that the early modern family

and household cannot be easily described to fit one model, but was rather diverse in its structure and daily functioning. With this considered, as suggested by the research on early modern women more generally, the idea of an all-pervasive patriarchal authority in the family seems less likely, given that women undoubtedly played crucial roles in decision making for the family unit. It must be noted that this discussion largely refers to aristocratic families rather than the merchant and lower strata of early modern society, and so may not be widely applicable since they were likely the exception and not the rule. Having briefly explored the nature of the early modern family, a more in depth look at specific relationships within the family unit is required, that of the parent-child relationship and more specifically the father-daughter relationship.

2.2.1 Parent-child relationships (especially daughterhood)

The nature of early modern parent-child relationships has already received a fair amount of interest from scholars. However, much of the literature on these relationships focuses on the parents' roles and experience of parenthood, rather than foregrounding the viewpoint of their offspring. Interestingly, despite the earlier assertion that early modern women's lives are typically defined in relation to men, much of the focus of investigations into the early modern family has been female-only relationships, such as mother-daughter or sister-sister. This leaves other family relationships where the power dynamics may have been dramatically different open for investigation, particularly when it comes to daughter-father relationships. In this section, some of the existing research on early modern parent-child relationships is discussed, with particular interest in daughters' parental relationships, whilst the following section turns the focus more specifically on the experience of early modern children and adolescents.

On the general dynamic of parents and children, Ben-Amos (2000) in 'Reciprocal Bonding' counters the idea of a distinct divide between parents and children and the dynamic of either parental dominance or affection by focusing on the degree of reciprocity that was present in these family relationships, whilst still acknowledging that parents should expect to give more to their children than they would get back in return, but the sense of duty went in both directions. They note that, at least for studies on early modern English families, research considers 'parent-child relations in terms of domination or affection. There are those who focus on parental authority over the offspring and those who emphasise parental devotion, concern, and love.' (Ben-Amos 2000: 291). They continue that this is not the full picture, and that '[a] different approach to family life involves the view of reciprocity: parents give, but they also receive something in return' (Ben-Amos 2000: 291). This was expressed in a few key ways, primarily the notion of filial obligation: 'As in many other societies, in early modern England strong norms governed parental and filial obligations, but these were not

articulated in terms of reciprocal exchange and individual merit but rather in terms of duties to rank, position in the family hierarchy, and to God.' (Ben-Amos 2000: 292). Other scholars have also noted the important role that every family member had to play in upholding their family's status and continuation. Referring to children in the Low Countries in the late Middle Ages and early modern period, 'Both sons and daughters were equally used by parents to safeguard the family patrimony' (Boone, De Hemptinne & Prevenier 2003: 25), suggesting that every family member had something to contribute, even if it may not appear to be a balanced exchange. Whilst parents provided bountifully for their offspring, they were offered duty and familial loyalty in return.

The mother-daughter relationship has received some interest in the literature on early modern family relationships. For example, in 'Like Mother, Like Daughter?', Tancke (2011) focuses on the mother's role in educating her daughter(s) to be able to succeed within a patriarchal framework, by being well educated but also demonstrating virtuous qualities. This is based on evidence presented in mothers' advice books, with the focus on what mothers were able to pass on to their daughters, rather than the experience that daughters had with using these advice books. The role of the mother is similarly highlighted in 'Motherhood and the Politics of Family Decisions in Early Modern Italy', where Moran (2015) explains the importance of a strong family dynamic, and mentions how daughters could try to shape their own futures through the connections and relationships they had within their family network, but the focus is really on how mothers negotiated these ties rather than foregrounding the daughters' voices. Despite this example focusing on the role of mothers in an early modern Italian family that was not part of the nobility, there may be some similarities in the dynamics present. For example, Moran notes the importance of networks to these women, since 'Mothers drew upon a wide range of relatives to create social networks of support in order to implement their plans' and 'At the same time, daughters used their mothers and other relatives to shape their own futures' (Moran 2015: 352). They also note the importance of recognising motherhood not simply as a biological definition, but more so a social construct that was flexible, and 'subject to negotiation and manipulation' (Moran 2015: 264), and it is likely that the same can be said of other familial roles such as fatherhood and daughterhood.

The mother-daughter relationship has also been studied in relation to other members of the Orange-Nassau family, though these too focus on the mother rather than the daughter. In 'Letters Make the Family', Broomhall (2009) shows how after the death of Guillaume in 1584, his widow Louise de Coligny was able to negotiate a cohesive family unit and identity to ensure the dynasty continued, particularly through her correspondence with her youngest stepdaughters, drawing similar conclusions to Hodson's (2007) earlier study 'The Power of Female Dynastic Networks'. The role of mothers in advancing the prospects of their daughters and family unit more generally is explored in detail in 'Dynastic Colonialism' by

Broomhall and Van Gent (2016), with more of a focus on how the dynastic identity was solidified during the seventeenth century. This echoes Moran's (2015) Italian study outlined above, with the focus being on advancing dynastic interests more so than the lived experience of their relationships that might foreground the daughterly voice.

Although the relationships between early modern mothers and daughters have been well studied, the relationship between father and daughter has received less attention. For example, Cavallo (2012) explores the Renaissance and early modern family in Italy from the perspective of fatherhood. This article focuses primarily on the strength of father-son relationships in early modern Italy, based on the idea that households were 'organized along both hierarchical and gender lines, with stronger and more enduring relationships between parents and children of the same sex' (Cavallo 2012: 311). This gendered parental bond may well account for the greater volume of surviving examples of son-father and daughter-mother correspondence when compared with son-mother and especially daughter-father correspondence. The focus of this article then turns to the inherent fragility of paternal authority despite this strong hierarchical family unit - that is to say that whilst the family patriarch nominally controlled the actions of their children, in practice this supposed authority was regularly challenged by children who wished to take different courses of action (see Cavallo 2012: 313-315). Moss (2009) also highlights how there is relatively little research on the father-daughter relationship, partly through a lack of research on fathers in general, but also the greater emphasis on women's relationships: 'Much work on daughters, for instance, is by scholars in women's studies, so there has been a greater interest in the relationship between women - particularly mothers and daughters - than between fathers and daughters, particularly when the critical opinion has largely been of the consensus that fathers were withdrawn from their children in general and from their daughters in particular' (Moss 2009: 118). Moss also finds examples of the fragility of patriarchal authority in late medieval literature involving daughter-father relationships, arguing that these stories reflect a societal anxiety about the underlying tension between a father's authority over his family and his weakness of dependence on them, including the fragile hold a father may have had over his household and particularly over his daughter(s). These two studies on fatherhood are useful to mention in order to highlight a gap in the field - existing research focuses on father-son relationships, literary examples, or the medieval rather than early modern period. They also highlight that a patriarchal system encompassed many forms of authority, and so it is possible to look for signs of power play at various levels within this social hierarchy, such as through daughters' letters. In order to investigate how this operated, it is important to analyse the texts that early modern daughters had a hand in creating.

One key point that arises from the literature on early modern parent-child relationships is that the discussion of father-daughter relationships, particularly from the perspective of the

daughter, requires more input from scholars wherever possible. It was also suggested that there is a lack of evidence that parent-child relationships were in any sense affective or emotional, and purely maintained for family politics and social obligation, but that ignores the humanity of the early modern family - just because there is little evidence of affective filial relations in the written record does not mean that there was a lack of emotional bonding between parents and children. When reading children's correspondence with their parents the lack of affective language may not indicate a general lack of affection in the relationship, but perhaps demonstrates a convention of the genre instead. Whilst childhood and adolescence may not be well-represented in historical sources and scholarly literature, it does not mean that it was a stage of life that went unrecognised in the past. Furthermore, it is also worth noting the perceived power differential between fathers and daughters, where the disparity is greater than for other family relationships. Whilst parent-child relationships, particularly those between father and daughter may well have been unequal in power, this does not mean that they were devoid of reciprocity. Parents did not simply provide for their children and expect nothing in return - rather children were expected to provide for their parents, through upholding the family name, offering service, assisting with the running of the household, and maybe even sending them regular correspondence, or with the assumption that care would be given later in life. Since the studies outlined here have focused more on the role of the parent than the child, the following section will outline what other studies have discovered about the experience of early modern childhood and adolescence in particular, as this will also help illuminate some of the circumstances that Marie de Nassau found herself in at the time she was corresponding with her father.

2.3 Childhood and adolescence

The nature of childhood and adolescence, particularly for daughters and young women in the early modern period, is one area in which research is limited. Children have been neglected in much scholarly research since 'adults tend not to discuss children seriously and instead elaborate on adult affairs in public' in contemporary accounts, and in addition 'we as adult scholars tend to be primarily interested in adult concerns, and so children figure only secondarily in medieval studies' (Classen 2005: 21), and this appears to be the case in early modern studies too. These stages of life should merit interest because 'Childhood and adolescence are biological phases in life that people go through in every place in the world and during every era in time. Nonetheless, these natural processes are mediated through culturally determined customs and thoughts can be fundamentally different from place to place.' (Buttigieg 2008: 139), and as such these should form interesting avenues of research, particularly for those studying the practices of these groups in other societies or at other points in history. Buttigieg continues to lament the fact that children and adolescents

must have made up a significant portion of the population and yet rarely appear in historical records, in the sense that youths are 'mentioned in passing' but rarely the object of investigation, resulting in a sort of 'pseudo-exclusion' (Buttigieg 2008: 142). The main stumbling block for investigating the lives of youths in the past is methodological, in that finding primary source materials created by children and adolescents is particularly difficult, since '[c]hildren themselves leave few records' (Buttigieg 2008: 143), and typically more emphasis is placed on adults, and so adolescents are more difficult to find in historical records. Furthermore, these earlier stages in life are the foundation upon which adult life is built, since 'Childhood was not only a time to lay the foundation for a moral future, it was also the proper, indeed only, time for acquiring the essential skills of adult life' (Pollock 1989: 235-236). Therefore it may be possible to learn a great deal about social elements of adulthood by exploring the socialisation of young daughters into adulthood.

The starting point for some studies in early modern childhood is usually the work of Philippe Ariès, *'L'Enfant et la vie familiale sous l'ancien régime'*, published in 1960. This work presents a view of childhood in medieval and early modern Europe as something very different from that of today, downplaying the possibility of affective bonds at that time due to the lack of evidence. As briefly noted above, Hunt (1970) builds on the work of Ariès by incorporating more of the psychological side of family life in early modern France, but still there is a limited view of the experience of childhood in this study - he notes how the age of seven marked a turning point in the conception of the (male) child, but that they still had years ahead of them in order to develop into their adulthood and were not yet 'fully people': 'Sources in the early modern period often single out the age of seven as a special turning point in a child's life. […] his status was qualitatively changing.' (Hunt 1970: 180). It is worth noting that the implied focus is the male child in early modern sources on childhood, and not the female child. Indeed, '[a]ll of the signs of growing up were epitomized by the graduation "out of the hands of women" and "into the hands of men".' (Hunt 1970: 183), which also describes the male child's progression into adulthood. Although the age of seven was considered the end of childhood, this does not mean that boys were considered to be adults from this early age. Hunt fails to elaborate in any great detail on this point, and so the transition period between childhood and adulthood remains somewhat mysterious, especially for those interested in the experience of the female child.

Whilst many aspects of childhood in the past may have been similar to today, Adams argues that 'Medieval childhood was nothing like its modern counterpart. Children […] regularly shouldered familial responsibilities unthinkable today. Still, as Ariès undoubtedly recognized, children were not simply small adults. Their limitations were acknowledged - their childhood was seen as a period of training for what lay ahead.' (Adams 2005: 288). This view of childhood and adolescence as a time for training for adult life in the medieval

period seems to have prevailed into the early modern period as well, as Pollock notes: 'The stage of childhood to the early modern mind was a period offering rich opportunities for improvement; here was the raw material from which the perfect adult could be constructed. [...] socialization in childhood was not confined to one sex - the adult male was as much a cultural creation as his female counterpart. [...] Instead, the process, in theory at least, was oriented towards the most suitable preparation for the life ahead' (Pollock 1989: 235). During their childhood this socialisation for adult life may not have been particularly gendered, since 'Up to the ages of twelve to fourteen, girls' education was treated in exactly the same way as that of their brothers' (Boone, De Hemptinne & Prevenier 2003: 24). Much of this is likely to have revolved around gaining proficiency in estate management, of which 'both women and men must have picked up a working knowledge' (Pollock 1989: 237) through advice, observation, shadowing, or book-learning, and if the usual method was shadowing parents around the estate, then women likely had more opportunities than men to pick up this skill, especially if their father was away from the estate as was often the case. Much in the way that mothers would attempt to secure their daughters' dynastic interests as seen briefly in the previous section, 'The main motive for giving a high quality education to both sexes lay in the hope that it would assure a safe financial and economic future' (Boone, De Hemptinne & Prevenier 2003: 25). Childhood thus seems to have been primarily about orientation for a secure future. After the age of twelve, it is possible that education became more divergent according to gender, with young men pursuing academic and military knowledge and young women gaining knowledge in estate management: 'Childhood education for girls was not generally intended to prepare them for a lifetime of academic pursuit, but the roles of wife, mother, and social participant required a certain degree of training. [...] The education of girls and young women therefore included something of a balancing act. Encouraging an excess of confident 'masculine reason' in women could contravene a social code of modest femininity, but a complete lack of understanding made for dull wives, inadequate mothers, irreligious citizens and unbearable guests.' (Hannan 2016: 37). This adolescent period in early modern people's lives therefore seems to be a critical time for preparing and gaining an understanding of how their future adult lives were expected to operate.

It is also relevant to note that the typical household and family structure was different in the past than it is today. Children and adolescents often lived in different households than their parents in order to gain education or broaden their experience: 'Most children continued to live at some distance from their parents rather than sharing a roof with them.' (Ben-Amos 2000: 299). In many cases these were extended family members, which means that children may have had several parental figures. Additionally, the male parental figures were often absent due to other affairs, as Buttigieg finds in a study of early modern Malta, resulting in households that are typically gendered and matriarchal for a lot of the time that children were

living there and growing up: 'The picture that emerges here [in early modern Malta] is one of young boys and girls inhabiting a world that was quite matriarchal in composition. […] the primary nurturer tended to be the mother, assisted by other women: grandmothers, aunts, female neighbours, female healers […] wet nurses. […] many men […] spent extensive periods of time away from their families.' (Buttigieg 2008: 148). This highlights the complexities of early modern families and households that will have influenced the experience of childhood and adolescence for everyone.

If children and adolescents are largely missing from the historical records, then it is important to find ways of accessing and prioritising their voices where they do still remain in order to better understand their experiences. This is made possible by 'focusing on children as producers of culture and taking their texts as sources for both the experience and construction of childhood' (Chedgzoy 2013: 262), since source texts written by children and adolescents do exist. 'Primary sources that enable us to consider the experience and construction of childhood from the child's point of view as subject of his or her own life take two principal forms: writings produced by children themselves and those in which adults recollect their earlier childhoods' (Chedgzoy 2013: 263). With this in mind, the personal correspondence of youths can be a key source for gaining insight into their experience. In turn this allows for a deeper understanding of early modern life: 'By being alert to the younger element of the life course spectrum in history, a richer and more varied narrative of past societies can be drawn up. This is done by integrating children and adolescents into the wider analysis and allowing for their voices to be heard.' (Buttigieg 2008: 151). One of the most evident means of doing this is through the analysis of surviving personal correspondence from early modern young people.

Although there is a limited volume of literature on childhood and adolescence in the early modern period, and in the past more generally, there are still ways of accessing their voices. The present study aims to add to this body of knowledge through the analysis of Marie de Nassau's correspondence during her adolescent years. Her case study provides a useful source of information for a number of reasons that address some of the gaps in existing research as outlined in this section. There is the hidden assumption that the 'child' or 'youth' in historical research is male, and so this study adds a female voice to help nuance understanding of the experience. There is also a gap in the research for the experience of adolescents between the age of seven and adulthood. This is especially true for female adolescents where even less is known about this kind of transitional stage of life, particularly given that their life roles were identified in relation to other men, yet they were growing up in households that largely consisted of women. This study helps add to this knowledge, at least for the experience of young noblewomen in their later adolescence. It was also noted how crucial it is for researchers to examine sources that children and adolescents in the past had

a hand in creating, so that their own perspectives may be better prioritised. These could be literary, artistic, or more quotidian in nature that were created by those investigated, which makes the correspondence composed by Marie de Nassau particularly suited to such an investigation. Her letters also give crucial insight into the early modern daughter-father relationship.

2.4 Summary

Having reviewed a selection of the most relevant literature on early modern daughters with specific reference to the concepts of the early modern family, household, parent-child relationships, and childhood and adolescence, some of the potential contributions of the present study have become more evident. Of these, perhaps the area that stands to benefit most from additional knowledge is the early modern family, in particular the father-daughter relationship. As noted above, this has rarely been discussed outside of literary examples, with other family relationships taking precedence in the research. There is a wealth of literature on early modern women more generally, but the experiences of women in younger (unmarried) life and their specific role and responsibilities as daughters require further exploration - the research on mother-daughter relationships typically focuses on the mother's actions, and the research on father-daughter relationships is framed within a literary rather than real-world context. The father-daughter relationship is perhaps the most interesting family dynamic to explore given the relative disparity in age, gender and power or status within the family hierarchy. This underlines a need for additional research into the 'typical' nature of early modern daughter-father relationships through the study of real examples, ideally created by the daughters in question. As will become evident in chapter 3, early modern correspondence is particularly suited to such an investigation.

This study also contributes some data to gender studies, through an exploration of the roles and responsibilities that early modern women took on during the course of their lifetime. This is often conceived of as a linear progression from daughter to wife (and mother) to widow, with existing studies largely focusing on women's role as wife or widow, and by extension mother, with less consideration of the experience of women as daughters. In a similar vein, young women's experiences are less visible in the literature, especially if they remained unmarried during their adolescent years, where they would be categorised as daughters but of an age where they may be expected to transition into the next phase of their life as wives. This justifies additional research on early modern young women's experiences in particular, ideally from their own point of view which again can be best accessed through texts that were composed by these women themselves such as surviving personal correspondence. Of course, this will vary greatly from one individual's experience to another's due to the complexities of the diverse circumstances of their family lives and

household dynamics, and so it is unlikely that all young women would have fit neatly into the 'daughter-wife-widow' model, but any investigation into this sector of early modern society will be beneficial in increasing understanding of their lives.

By studying the case of Marie de Nassau's correspondence with her father, the present study attempts to contribute to these gaps within the research fields. Her correspondence provides a unique perspective into the types of roles and responsibilities that adolescent unmarried daughters of the early modern noble classes may have adopted or been expected to understand by this point in their lives. The analysis of her letters therefore has the potential to contribute to knowledge not only on the nature of early modern daughter-father relationships, but also their place in the early modern family and household more broadly, specifically as they transitioned from childhood to young adult life. In the following chapter, the important role that early modern women's correspondence has to play in contributing to knowledge in these fields is explored in greater detail, before continuing with the analysis of Marie de Nassau's correspondence (chapters 4-6).

3. Methods and texts: Early modern daughters' correspondence

In the previous chapter, the broad social and historical context relating to early modern daughters was outlined in order to help contextualise the analysis of Marie de Nassau's correspondence with her father within the framework of early modern understandings of gender, the family, and specifically daughter-father relationships, highlighting the rationale for studying the lives of early modern young women like Marie. In that chapter, it was suggested that personal correspondence was a particularly rich source material for understanding the experiences of young adolescents and children, since these texts are ones which these underrepresented people had a hand in creating, and so their voice is likely to be more evident. The present chapter turns its attention to these texts and the methods used to interrogate them, focusing on the rationale for using correspondence to investigate the lives of early modern young women, specifically as daughters, as well as the pragmatic methods that can be applied to these historical texts in order to elicit some of the potential social meanings from them. This in turn can inform understanding of the broader roles and experiences of early modern daughters. This chapter is therefore framed around the methodological background that is required in order to analyse Marie de Nassau's correspondence with her father in a way that will best answer the three main research questions. This starts with an outline of pragmatic approaches to correspondence and how historical pragmatics is particularly suited to uncovering meaning about early modern family relationships and individual experiences through historical texts (section 3.1), followed by a deeper dive into the act of letter-writing not as a genre but as a social practice (section 3.2). After this, attention turns to existing studies on early modern family correspondence (section 3.3), with a specific focus on daughters' correspondence (subsection 3.3.1) and the letters of the Orange-Nassau women (subsection 3.3.2) in order to position the analysis of Marie de Nassau's correspondence within the context of existing research on her family's letters specifically and on daughterly writing more generally. This contextualisation of the methods and texts used in this study will provide a solid foundation for the following pragmatic analyses of Marie's daughterly correspondence (in chapters 4, 5 and 6).

3.1 Historical pragmatic approaches to correspondence

The use of linguistic utterances (a broad term that refers to any unit of language that is uttered in speech or writing and can therefore be analysed and interpreted) in different contexts can result in different meanings that a particular utterance holds for the participants involved in the interaction. The pragmatic analysis of utterances, whether written or spoken, aims to elicit these underlying social meanings by taking account of the contextual information, since it is through the use of language in a particular social context that an

utterance derives its meaning. This understanding of pragmatics resembles what Culpeper calls 'sociopragmatics', which 'concerns itself with any interaction between specific aspects of social context and particular language use that leads to pragmatic meanings' (Culpeper 2010: 76). Therefore examining specific instances of language use within the context of their creation allows for more than just literal interpretation. Through this lens, it is possible to investigate the language of a particular text to uncover more abstracted meanings, allowing information to be gleaned about the roles and responsibilities of the people involved in the interaction, how they related to each other, how they employed different strategies to negotiate the relationship dynamics (for example through politeness or affective language), and eliciting the speaker's (or writer's) attitudes and opinions regarding certain issues as well (Culpeper 2009: 181). This in turn can help build a picture of how broader concepts may have influenced the production of a text (such as gender, power and material practices), and how people could create multiple different meanings for seemingly similar utterances. Pragmatics 'is not simply concerned with mapping regular patterns of usage in interaction [...] but with understanding how those regular patterns are used and exploited in particular interactions' (Culpeper 2009: 180-181), and so it is not only useful for investigating the conventions and expectations of a particular communicative context (as is the aim of RQ1), but also helps demonstrate how these conventions can be adapted to achieve different results. The principles of pragmatics, whilst developed on contemporary language use, have been demonstrated to apply to historical cases as well, resulting in historical pragmatics as 'a branch focusing on language use in past contexts and examining how meaning is made' (Palander-Collin 2010: 651). This is possible due to the 'uniformitarian principle', which proposes that language use in the present, where data is more readily available, can be used to inform our understanding of language use in the past, where data is less readily available, based on the assumption that languages have always operated on very similar fundamental principles (Lodge 2004: 27), and so the pragmatic features selected for study can also be assumed to apply in a similar manner to historical cases.

Within the field of pragmatics, and historical pragmatics by extension, there are many different approaches, and there is a great deal of overlap with related fields like sociolinguistics and critical discourse analysis. Some scholars may approach pragmatic analysis beginning with a linguistic feature or system and be interested in deviations from the norm, while others may approach it with knowledge of sociological, historical and discursive practices to which linguistic practices can be related (Culpeper 2010: 79-80). Pragmatic studies can therefore start with the linguistic elements or the sociocultural elements as the point of departure, though naturally one entails discussion of the other at some point in the analysis. Within this broad spectrum, 'various frameworks [...] focus on different but complementary levels in their analysis of the interplay of the individual, language and

society' (Palander-Collin 2010: 651), highlighting how the linguistic, social, and pragmatic meanings are all interrelated no matter which part of the field a particular scholar might position their work. Pragmatic analysis therefore deals with elements of linguistic, social and cultural practice in order to fully explore the context of a particular text or set of texts (see Culpeper 2010: 74-76). The present study aims to explore the layers of pragmatic meaning at the levels of individual, language and society that Palander-Collin describes, through the analysis of a case study of early modern correspondence.

Existing historical pragmatic studies of letter-writing have focused on the linguistic element in particular. When grouped with other autobiographical writing under the broad category of 'ego-documents', correspondence is often viewed as a way of accessing language that is close to speech in historical texts, and it offers an additional non-teleological perspective 'from below' that is not based on the literary and formal texts that form the dominant narrative 'from above' about the history of a particular language (Van der Wal & Rutten 2013: 1). The concept of 'language history from below' has been common in historical sociolinguistic and pragmatic studies, and relies on the idea that the language closest to everyday speech should be studied in order to complement existing knowledge of traditional language histories that focus on the standardisation process and language of official texts, resulting in a better understanding of the language as a whole. Personal correspondence is considered to be valuable in such studies since '[p]rivate family letters are the best documents for historical sociolinguistics because they are the closest written documents to *language of immediacy*' (Martineau 2013: 133, their emphasis). This 'language of immediacy' refers to conceptually oral or informal texts such as private letters and intimate conversations, in contrast to 'language of distance' which includes conceptually literate or formal texts such as legislative documents or academic talks (Elspaß 2015: 38). Research that positions itself on this sociolinguistic side of the field typically argues for the use of a large corpus of personal correspondence drawn from multiple strata of society in order to access the 'language of immediacy' of the past to draw a picture of the extent of linguistic variation 'from below'. For research that is positioned more towards the critical discourse analysis part of the field, 'close textual analysis should be undertaken with reference to the discursive practices and the social practices of the communities in which the text is produced and consumed' (Wood 2007: 51), which includes piecing together multiple layers of meaning. This is a good justification for investigating smaller case studies like that of Marie de Nassau's letters to her father, since it is possible to build up a more detailed picture of the daily linguistic and social realities of an individual and their immediate network in this way. In either context, the work of the historical pragmatics researcher is therefore '[u]ncovering the temporally distant meanings of the letters, which may also have been ambiguous to the correspondents, involves interpretation on several embedded contextual layers. [...]

discursive cotext of the letter [...] situational context [...] [and] the broader historical context in which the correspondence is embedded' (Palander-Collin 2010: 665), which creates a more detailed account of people's roles and responsibilities in the past and how these were expressed through their linguistic choices.

Other accounts of the early modern art of letter writing focus on the rhetoric, charting the development of the genre from its Classical origins. In such studies, the letter is described as going from a purely practical 'giving of information to persons who are absent about matters of interest to them' in the Classical period (Bolgar 1983: 245), or from a beautiful form with 'expressions of affection and courtesy', to something much more utilitarian in the Medieval period and beyond, as increased business activity required more written communication (Bolgar 1983: 246). The art of letter writing soon became codified with set rules and prescriptions on usage, such that particular subtypes of letters could be easily distinguished, but due to the flexibility of the form each letter is its own special case and therefore always breaks one 'rule' or another, for '[l]etters varied as much as the people who wrote and received them' (Bolgar 1983: 253). Despite this variety, this does not mean that the 'rules' of letter writing should be ignored completely. In fact it is these codified features that allow letters to be identified as a distinct genre: 'Correspondence in general is a highly codified and conventional type of writing that applies and adapts socio-culturally defined formulae' and also 'typically consist of several formulaic parts that easily identify them as letters' (Laitinen & Nordlund 2012: 68). Palander-Collin also notes that '[t]here are letter manuals that provide the norm of writing, and letters contain opening and closing formulae indicating the relationship between the letter-writers in conventional ways, as well as the epistolary structure. Moreover, formulae and conventions seem to be very similar in different European languages [...]' (Palander-Collin 2010: 660). These formulae and conventions allow for correspondence to be identified and studied for its inherent meaning-making, since it is through understanding which parts of a letter are conventional and which parts are not that allow the correspondent's own voice, character and creativity to become apparent: 'We can consequently ask to what extent letter-writers merely conform to conventional patterns, repeat fixed phrases and follow the prescriptive instructions of writing manuals, and to what extent they show free agency' (Palander-Collin 2010: 660). Any study of correspondence must therefore at least identify the formulaic parts in order to better understand the writer's own linguistic choices. It is also worth noting that 'the use of pre-planned or learnt phraseology was not necessarily viewed as a barrier to expressive letter-writing' (Hannan 2016: 106), since the specific choice of formulaic sequences to use in and of themselves can indicate something about the writer's own repertoire. It is for these reasons that one of the core research questions of this study aims to identify some of the conventions and expectations that were likely to be present for Marie de Nassau when she was composing

her letters to her father (RQ1, which is primarily addressed in chapter 4). Her letters also provide an insight into French-language correspondence in particular.

The relational nature of personal correspondence is important and evident since it is essentially 'a message written by one individual to another individual who is far away' (Bossis & McPherson 1986: 63). As such it has frequently been used in both pragmatic and social historical studies. This is because it is 'a valuable primary source of information for reconstituting the nature of exchanges and the language used in former times', and the analysis of personal correspondence has made useful contributions to studies in the humanities and social sciences, especially social history (Martineau 2013: 132), particularly for the glimpses it gives into the quotidian nature of life in the past since it was 'above all an extension of daily life' (Bossis & McPherson 1986: 64). The insights it gives into social history allow it to stand out as a key primary source for investigating the nature of interpersonal relationships in the past (which is crucial to both RQ2 and RQ3). However, this also needs to be framed within the early modern context, since there were often multiple participants involved in the production, distribution and reception of letters at this time. 'Private' letters could be passed around multiple family members and friends, read aloud to gatherings of people, or even edited for publication, with potentially larger audiences than 'public' or 'official' letters, and as such the term 'personal correspondence' is preferred since it allows the individual correspondents to be identified without assuming that it was strictly 'private' (Palander-Collin 2010: 652-653). Indeed, early modern letters were more collaborative or 'public' than we might assume today, transitioning from 'self-conscious, quasi public literary documents' in the Middle Ages through the early modern period towards the 'intimacy, spontaneity, and privacy' that the genre enjoys in the modern day (Dossena & Del Lungo Camiciotti 2012: 5). It is important to remember these additional social aspects when analysing the text as they may have influenced what was possible to write in early modern correspondence as the writer considered their potential audience that could have been wider than just the named recipient. There are of course more social aspects of letter writing, which are outlined in greater detail in the following section.

3.2 Letter writing as a social practice

By its very nature, letter writing is a social practice. It involves at least two participants and draws upon a history of social, cultural and discursive practices that inscribe it with multiple layers of meaning: 'Since letters consist of written communication typically addressed to one or more named recipients, it is also a social practice' (Dossena & Del Lungo Camiciotti 2012: 5). Correspondents rely on a shared knowledge about one another and their multifaceted roles and personal histories, but also a shared expectation about the conventions that are appropriate to communication via the medium of correspondence.

There is also the implication of distance with letters, meaning that 'Relationships were forged and fostered through letter-writing and, thus, correspondence played a critical role in the continuation of significant friendships' (Hannan 2016: 153), and by extension other close relationships. Due to this, letters can offer an insight into the social environment of all individuals involved: 'The letter is an ego-document par excellence, written largely in the first person and allowing us to contextualise not only the writer and his/her social environment but also the recipient in a similar manner.' (Nurmi 2013: 166). Any close analysis of a small set of letters such as those sent from Marie de Nassau to her father therefore allows for a reasonable assessment of some of the intricacies of the everyday lives of both sender and recipient.

Correspondence derives some of its value as a social practice due to its necessity for connecting participants when they are separated - it can be thought of as a dialogue between two or more participants who are separated geographically and temporally. The composition of a letter allows the writer 'to overcome the distance or the absence which was separating two individuals [or groups of individuals] in order to reestablish an exchange' and elicit a response from the recipient(s) (Bossis & McPherson 1986: 64). Such a dialogue implies reciprocal exchange to metaphorically bridge the distance that separates them: 'Letter narrative depends on reciprocity between writers and addressees [...] It is a language of gap-closing, of speaking to the addressee as if he/she were present.' (Dossena & Del Lungo Camiciotti 2012: 5). However, due to the immediate absence of the other participants, some have argued that correspondence resembles more of a monologue than a dialogue because the addressee cannot intervene in the conversation: *'l'épistolaire est réduit* de facto *au monologue'* ('the letter is reduced *de facto* to a monologue', Reid 1990: 24, their emphasis, my own translation). Although the presence of an addressee is certainly not a necessary prerequisite for letter-writing (particularly in the case of letters that were fabricated for publication in model letter books), the act of letter-writing in most cases implies a dialogue or at least an expectation that a reply will be received eventually, and therefore this social element is still implicit. It is this very interpersonal element that grants letter-writing its social value: 'meaning is structured by interpersonal bonds [...] the *I/You* relationship that governs epistolary discourse is both a form of self-(re)presentation and of dialogic interaction.' (Dossena & Del Lungo Camiciotti 2012: 4, their emphasis). For this reason, the intended recipient(s) also has an impact on the letter, and so some information can be learned about both sides of the relationship even if examples only survive from one side, and thus can still be considered as dialogic despite the absence of replies.

Although correspondence can be considered dialogic, this does not mean that it is directly comparable to, or a substitute for, conversational dialogue. It is dialogic in the sense that there are two or more participants involved in an exchange, and responses are possible, but

distinct from dialogue as there is no requirement for turn-taking. To put it another way, from a modern teleological perspective examples of early modern correspondence can indeed appear to constitute a single stream of narrative back-and-forth between two or more participants, but closer inspection reveals a more muddled practice due to the temporal displacement between a letter being sent and received. Letters therefore always lagged behind life events, 'as epistolary discourse is governed by its moment of enunciation. Both past and future are always relative to the discursive present of epistolary communication.' (Dossena & Del Lungo Camiciotti 2012: 5). The impact of this means that individual letters were not always received in a timely manner or even in the order that they were sent, necessitating 'intertextual links' that reference other letters in a sort of 'epistolary chain', helping the recipient to navigate where a particular letter was located in time within this series of linked texts between the correspondents. This was especially useful if one participant wrote and sent multiple letters before receiving any replies, as it would explain why responses to letters were seemingly missed - the reply had simply not yet been received. By making references to prior texts, both written and spoken, individual letters are also intertextual (Wood 2007: 49). These intertextual references include acknowledgement of receipt of other letters, references to previously sent letters, or even separate communication from mutual correspondents, and may not always be other letters. It is likely that these feature prominently in early modern letters because letters were expected with regular frequency and yet could easily become lost or delayed en route, so these intertextual references were a courtesy that offered reassurance that letters had been received or were still on their way: 'between close correspondents, who expected to receive letters regularly, the content of a letter may have been secondary to its function as a simple reassurance of such epistolary regularity' (Tanskanen 2007: 85). It is important to remember these kinds of practicalities when examining letters from the past.

Whilst correspondents were geographically and temporally distanced from one another, their letters allowed them a space to 'meet' in the 'epistolary world'. This idea of entering and exiting the epistolary world helps to conceptualise the function of correspondence, since a letter creates a unique space that bridges the temporal, spatial and even social distance between the participants, typically achieving this through conventional opening and closing lines (Dossena 2012: 28; Laitinen & Nordlund 2012: 69-70). For many, correspondence was the only way of ensuring that a relationship was maintained during certain phases of life: 'Letter-writing represented the most accessible form of written expression available to individuals during this period. Correspondence also provided crucial links between people who only met rarely in person.' (Hannan 2016: 97). For whatever reason, be it political or business related, 'many correspondents had no other choice but to write, as meeting in person might be a rare event. In these circumstances openness was often encouraged on

the page, as the participants attempted to recreate the intimacy of first-person contact on paper.' (Hannan 2016: 110). This was particularly true for family members, since letters provided them with a space where they could more easily maintain a degree of emotional closeness despite being separated by geographical distance. Indeed, over time the letter itself could become symbolic of sentimental attachment even if the words it contained were not overtly so, with examples of brother-sister correspondence acting 'as a token of mutual affection [which] often becomes the subject of the letter itself' (Chiavetta 2012: 92). This implies that the act of sending a letter to family members in itself can be seen as an expression of intimacy or at the very least familial obligation, suggesting that the very act of sending correspondence has its own pragmatic function, regardless of its content.

Within the epistolary world, letter-writers had the opportunity to engage in forms of 'self-(re)presentation', choosing a certain self-image to portray to their intended recipients which could potentially impact how they were perceived. This image could remain stable or be more flexible as different matters became important to the writer that they wished to highlight. As Boutcher puts it, '[l]etters were used to document, yes, but also actively to shape a sense of the role of individuals, their inter-relationships and their reputations not just in the development of new thought and the spread of ideas but in the management of social and political life' (Boutcher 2002: 163). Correspondence was highly relational and so images, roles and responsibilities could be negotiated through the words on the page, depending on the writer's self-(re)presentation: 'correspondence - with its promise of a reader and the possibility of exchange - was an identity-forming experience. An individual's identity was, of course, highly relational and early modern letter-writers negotiated their roles and relationships within complex frameworks of belief, experience and interaction.' (Hannan 2016: 64). This complex negotiation of image and face work through the epistolary world, implicitly without the immediate feedback from the interlocutor, is a key feature that allows some of the social dynamics to be uncovered through the analysis of correspondence. More specifically for early modern women, letter-writing provided a means of representing the elements of themselves that they wished to showcase to their recipient, and '[f]or women in particular, while mobility and opportunities for social engagement were often limited, letters offered a way not just of being in contact with people, but of determining how to represent themselves while doing so' (Caine 2015: 483). This idea of presenting a certain image in correspondence is closely related to notions of face work and politeness strategies (addressing RQ2 and RQ3), which are pragmatic concepts that can help to draw out some of the relational aspects implied in linguistic utterances (and as such are focused on in detail in the analysis in chapter 5). It must also be noted that the writer may have intentionally manipulated or hidden certain information from their recipient whilst in the process of creating a certain self-image, so it is not possible to be completely certain of their 'true'

character and intentions behind their letters (Bossis & McPherson 1986: 68-70), but since these letters are often the only way of accessing the people involved it must be assumed that the contents are relatively truthful or accurate, at least for the purposes of analysis.

Additional clues to the social practice of letter-writing come from accounting for non-linguistic contextual information as well as the linguistic forms on the page. Of course much of the non-linguistic content of historical correspondence is lost to the researcher, and so these must be reconstructed from other contextual clues, since they would have undoubtedly have formed part of the communicative content of such letters. On a practical level, this means having an understanding of the practicalities of sending and receiving correspondence in the early modern period, some of which have already been alluded to. The early modern letter typically comprised both written and spoken elements, sometimes with additional unwritten information passed on by the letter-bearer, and often not just to the named addressee but to the whole family present (Kádár & Haugh 2013: 174-175). An understanding of practices like this allows for better inferences to be made about the full communicative content of a particular utterance. This can include things such as the hurried composition of a letter due to the unexpected availability of a suitable letter-bearer who was soon departing in the direction of the intended addressee, and the omission of more sensitive information from writing that would be hinted at through the text and passed on by the letter-bearer instead:

> 'A letter's deliverer (bearer) might act as a supplement to the letter's text, becoming a corporeal extension on the letter; meaning was therefore generated orally as well as textually; the sudden departure of a chance bearer could encourage an urgent immediacy among letter-writers (distanced from the careful crafting described by some historians) and become a rhetorical trope framing the occasion of a letter; letters were frequently sent unsealed, passed among family members to read aloud to assembled company.' (Daybell 2015: 509).

This is reflective of early modern correspondence practices among elite families, such as the Orange-Nassau family, as 'letter-writing was often a very public affair, accessible to secretaries and a network of friends, sometimes even enemies' (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a: 147). Additionally, early modern letters may not necessarily have been read, but rather heard, and could be composed by and received by multiple people. Indeed during the early modern period there was typically a section of correspondence that was conveyed purely by mouth: 'Since a letter may fall into the wrong hands, sensitive messages were conveyed orally by trusted carriers, which means that the entire message is not always contained in the text available to the researcher' (Wood 2007: 69). The presence of multiple people in the entire process of letter-writing from composition to reception must not be

forgotten, as this may be indicative of some of the things that remained unwritten in the correspondence that survives.

An understanding of the range of practices of sending correspondence, including the conventions and expectations of the genre and how they functioned, is crucial for contextualising the analysis of letters in the early modern period, since 'what is said in a given context, at a certain time, does not have the same significance in a different context, at another time' (Bossis & McPherson 1986: 67). This context includes considering letters as part of a longer chain of communication, even if only one side of the story survives for analysis: *'une correspondance ne peut être comprise qu'à l'intérieur des séries textuelles dans lesquelles elle s'insère'* ('correspondence can only be understood as incorporated into a series of texts to which it belongs', Le Guillou 1990: 100, my own translation). The analyst must account for this 'bad data problem' and acknowledge that the passage of history, archival practices, and luck may have resulted in only one side or fragments of one side of the correspondence being preserved, with many examples likely to have been lost or removed from archives over the years, either by curation or accident. Similarly, letters from offspring typically only survive from their adult years and not their earlier childhood years, suggesting that children's letters were either less frequent or simply not deemed worthy of preserving, not even for sentimental reasons (Daybell 2015: 508). The letters that do survive from offspring are often one sided, from a small cluster of years or even months, and therefore in such cases it must be remembered that they only offer a snapshot of the correspondent's lives and relationships, and despite the temptation to view them as static, their lives and relationships were just as complex in the past and constantly evolving as they are today (Daybell 2015: 508). This appears to be the case for Marie de Nassau's letters to her father, for which only her adolescent and adult letters are accessible and there are no direct responses from her father yet uncovered during the time period studied. As such the present study must piece together the context from other sources and from Marie's own words in order to develop a detailed picture of her family life, relationships, roles and responsibilities at this time.

The material letter itself also contributes information about the social elements and practices of early modern correspondence. Indeed, '[t]he production, distribution and consumption of letters entail many physical aspects resulting from the fact that letters are communication at geographical and temporal distance' (Palander-Collin 2010: 656) - early modern writers found multiple ways to convey meaning in more than just words. Material constraints include the fact that letters were typically confined to one manuscript page, but if they ran onto multiple pages then it is possible that sentimental reasons were more important in the writing, and typically they contained various passages on different matters indicating individual letters had multiple functions (see Daybell 2015: 515). 'Even the layout

of text on the page might be indicative of relationships and forms of emotional expression' (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a: 148), showing that meaning can be derived from the object itself and not just the words on the page. Elements such as size of paper, negative space, positioning of the body text on the page, and whose handwriting was used were all indicative of the correspondents' relationship and needed to be considered when composing a letter (Palander-Collin 2010: 656). This concept of 'social materiality' is important, for not only did letters among close family members act as symbols of filial obedience, but also 'functioned as gifts, conveying commendations, remembrances and family news, which obligated reciprocal and timely exchange, an exchange imbued with social protocols that made demands on both receiver and recipient.' (Daybell 2015: 515). It is important to be conversant with the conventions of early modern correspondence and how they differed from modern day correspondence. This includes both stock phrases indicative of the genre and deferential space that indicated the nature of correspondents' relationship and relative power: 'Social relationships could also be conveyed by means of spacing', with more space showing greater deference toward the recipient (Dossena 2012: 22). A familiarity with these material conventions allows for some assumptions to be made about the relationship between correspondents, and any deviations from these expectations become worthy of discussion. Material considerations such as these are clearly present in Marie de Nassau's letters, for instance all except the earliest four letters studied exhibit the observance of deference through use of negative space in the margins, along with the placement of the common subscription *'vouster treshumble et tresobeysante fille jusques a la mort'* ('your most humble and most obedient daughter until death') and signature in the bottom right hand corner of the majority of her letters. Since her use of these features is somewhat uniform, and given that the focus of this study is primarily on the pragmatic effects of her utterances, these material aspects are less important to the discussion in this thesis, but are mentioned when they are relevant to the findings of the analysis.

Correspondence has been used here as a generic term, but in reality it encompasses a wide variety of forms, and so there is a great deal of variability in the functions a letter can have and therefore how they look and the topics they cover (see Bergs 2007: 30). Despite this variability within the genre, letters of a certain type typically have conventional formulaic sections that are common. Formulae, or 'formulaic sequences' (Wray 2002: 9) are prefabricated units that are inserted into speech or writing but which do not necessarily get processed in the same way as regular language - the words say one thing in a literal sense, but combined in a particular context have a conventional meaning that may differ from the literal interpretation. Formulaic sequences are a feature of correspondence that closely address RQ1 regarding the conventions and expectations of the genre (and is discussed in detail in chapter 4). There is of course much to be said for studying non-formulaic parts of a

text for the variety and potential novelty it conveys, but formulaic sequences are also worthy of attention. Formulaic sequences are saturated with potential hidden information about the speaker (or writer) and their own desires and motivations and relationship with their interlocutor, since formulaic sequences are one of many linguistic devices that can be used to promote one's own interests and are necessary for mitigating any temporary problems regarding, for example, face threats (see Wray 2002: 95-96). This is interesting from a social perspective since the speaker must anticipate how their hearer will respond, and choose the appropriate formulaic sequence accordingly in order to be best understood, taken seriously, or some other personal motivation (see Wray 2002: 97-99).

Rutten & Van der Wal (2012) build on Wray's (2002) work by focusing their attention on the 'Functions of epistolary formulae in Dutch letters from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries'. They point out that in their own corpus 'some letters may even seem to consist of very little other than formulae' (Rutten & Van der Wal 2012: 174). This article goes on to describe different types of formulaic sequences that typically appear in their corpus, and argue against the idea that using formulaic sequences correlated with lack of experience writing. This article forms the starting point for the analysis chapter on formulaic sequences and manuals, and will be returned to in more detail there (chapter 4). However, one key point they raise that is worth mentioning at the outset is that use of formulaic sequences was inversely correlated with levels of writing experience. This is based on the notion that using such sequences reduces the amount of cognitive effort required when writing, and so less experienced writers are more likely to use them whilst more experienced writers will be more innovative in their writing (Rutten & Van der Wal 2012: 188). The authors of this study found in their own analysis that the presence of formulaic sequences - health formulae in particular - simply indicate the text type, rather than the writer's level of experience (Rutten & Van der Wal 2012: 189), and even showed signs of gender and social variation more so than degrees of literacy (Rutten & Van der Wal 2012: 193). Therefore, if one wishes to understand more about letter-writing and how early modern writers used correspondence to navigate their personal relationships when living at a distance from one another, a vital component of the research must involve examining the use of such formulaic features.

Indeed, the conventional parts of correspondence must not be overlooked, for there is an element of choice even in these parts that convey social meaning: 'the conventional and recurrent parts of these letters cannot be seen as empty envelopes, but as meaningful elements with textual functions of their own' (Laitinen & Nordlund 2012: 66). In their study of Finnish emigrant letters, Laitinen & Nordlund found that social meaning could be read into the seemingly conventional parts of the letters in their study, arguing that whilst they 'carry the flavour of those contexts in which they had previously been used', the exact meaning of a particular formulaic section of a letter could be negotiated depending on the context (who

the interactants involved were, their relative status, and so forth) (Laitinen & Nordlund 2012: 83). Even something seemingly as small as the choice of address terms, although conventional, can still convey a wealth of information about the social relationship of the correspondents. When considered alongside politeness strategies for example and other linguistic forms, the selection of an appropriate, if formulaic, address term can reveal much about the power dynamics between the correspondents, indicating the specific roles and responsibilities that they took on at a given time and how that interacted with their position in the social hierarchy (Palander-Collin 2010: 655). Considering letter-writing as a social practice also allows for connections to be made with other social domains such as gender, religion, social hierarchy, literacy, and power (Palander-Collin 2010: 653-655). By closely examining the linguistic forms and pragmatic functions of early modern correspondence, it is therefore possible to reveal some of the complexities of the lives, relationships, roles and responsibilities of the correspondents.

3.3 Early modern family correspondence

Having explored the role of correspondence in historical pragmatic studies and as a social practice in a broad sense in the first two sections of this chapter, this section examines existing studies on correspondence of the early modern family, in particular that of daughters and the Orange-Nassau family, in order to help position the analysis of Marie de Nassau's correspondence within the field. Correspondence provides a unique lens through which to view the early modern family. Letters 'have always been an important historical source, and correspondence among family members has more recently been recognized as providing valuable insights into the social history of the family, as well' (Head 1995: 577). In more recent studies, the family has been viewed as a microcosm of the wider social and political landscape, since '[f]amily was critical to political structures in early modern Europe' (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a: 145), and indeed throughout history. As such, the dynamics of family relationships can inform understanding of wider social and political dynamics at play. Correspondence in the early modern family context allowed them to coordinate as a cohesive social unit, despite living in diverse locations: 'Epistolary networks served many purposes during the early modern period. A primary purpose, of course, was as a basic means for communication for far-flung correspondents. [...] epistolary networks were important in sustaining and creating family connections.' (Campbell & Larsen 2009: 11). This family cohesion could also be achieved through correspondence despite more abstracted diversity among members of the family, such as religious and political beliefs: 'the early modern European nobility employed paper communication [including correspondence, pamphlets, chronicles] to reproduce its social status across the existing political, linguistic, geographical, and religious borders within society' (Verhaegen 2012: 36). Family

correspondence therefore offers valuable pragmatic insights, since they 'carry many other kinds of information, such as patterns of communication and deference within the family, clues to educational backgrounds and rhetorical strategies, and [...] the use of different languages' (Head 1995: 577), hinting at the dynamics of everyday life for the early modern family.

The family letters of women in particular are also vital for investigating the early modern family as they showcase the varied roles that early modern women took on as part of everyday family life in the early modern period: 'Letters written by women touch on their everyday lives, shedding light on the nature of family and other social relationships, and the complex position of women within a socially and gendered hierarchical society, where codes of female obedience and authority were set in constant tension to one another' (Daybell 2006: 176). The family was a domain where women could exercise their power more easily, and this is made visible in their correspondence: 'Family as a principle and correspondence as a practice were instrumental to the political structures of early modern Europe, as well as important vehicles through which women could operate politically' (Broomhall 2009: 27). This demonstrates (as suggested in chapter 2) that despite having seemingly less power than the men in the family, women were able to exercise their own power within this system in order to promote the interests of the family. Indeed, early modern women adopted important roles within the family unit, as Moran remarks in her study of family memory in early modern Italy: 'women's letters serve as an untapped resource for understanding female conceptions of family memory that demonstrate the centrality of women in family life' (Moran 2011: 196). She continues to note that '[t]heir writings reveal that men particularly relied on the observations and testimonies by female relatives (wives, daughters, and mothers) about events they missed when travelling for business or political assignments [...]' (Moran 2011: 197), which demonstrates the importance of the act of letter-writing at this time as well. Letters could also be used to demonstrate familial bonds and good behaviour, particularly when sent from children to parents: 'Letters could thus serve as both a vehicle for expression of love and pride between family members but also, importantly, as the means by which behaviour would be demonstrated by the girls, and observed by their relatives.' (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a: 148). The letters of daughters are of special interest to the present study so the next few paragraphs will focus on daughterly correspondence in particular, followed by a section on the Nassau women's family letters.

3.3.1 Early modern daughters' correspondence

Although many historical studies of letter-writing have focused primarily on men's letters (see for example Van Houdt, Papy, Tournoy & Matheeussen (eds) 2002), women's letters have not been neglected. Rather, 'letters [...] have now achieved the status of an

indispensable source for research on the history of women' (Ottaviani 2013: 1000). Indeed a substantial volume of work has been conducted on the letters of aristocratic women in sixteenth and seventeenth century England by leading scholar James Daybell. Although his studies focus on English in the early modern period, it is likely that parallels can be drawn that can inform study of Marie de Nassau's sixteenth-century correspondence with her father. In fact, Daybell goes into detail about various social relationships inscribed in early modern correspondence including examples of daughter-father correspondence. He writes: 'Daughters' letters to fathers illustrate the range of relations possible within this dynamic in sixteenth-century England, from seemingly authoritarian relationships at one extreme to relatively more open and relaxed at the other extreme. Numerous examples exist of overtly deferential letters to fathers, especially from young girls.' (Daybell 2006: 176), continuing to note that '[t]he very act of composing letters to parents was viewed as a mark of filial respect; written humbly, one of the main purposes of corresponding to fathers was to offer commendations and remembrances' (Daybell 2006: 177), and that '[l]etters of this nature, which at least overtly contained no request, were a performance of daughterly duty' (Daybell 2006: 177). This suggests that a common expectation for daughters was to present a 'dutiful daughter' image, even though they may have had varying degrees of authority and responsibility in the family. However, this performance of daughterly duty may have been limited to the formulaic sections - Daybell highlights one example where Mary Kitson writes to her father Sir Thomas Kitson, and '[a]fter the conventional epistolary platitudes, the letter becomes more critical' (Daybell 2006: 178). This implies that portraying the image of a 'dutiful daughter' may have been an expected and necessary part of early modern daughter-father correspondence, even if the remainder of the letter contained critical or harsh words, perhaps helping to mitigate any potential offence caused. An understanding of the conventions and expectations of daughter-father correspondence (addressing RQ1) is therefore useful for identifying where they were adhered to and where they were deviated from, which in turn can be analysed through the lens of pragmatic features that help uncover more of the social context in which those letters were composed (addressing RQ2 & RQ3).

The typical conventions and expectations of early modern women's letters can be elicited from sources such as letter-writing manuals which 'upheld social and gender hierarchies, demanding a certain level of formality and deference in letters dispatched to those of superior status. Daughters in particular were enjoined to display filial obedience in writing to parents' (Daybell 2015: 510). Additionally, in this later study of letters between mothers and daughters, Daybell found examples from daughters to mothers more numerous than those from mothers to daughters, suggesting that this highlights either the 'daughterly duty to keep in touch' or hints that daughters were more likely to write to parents for advice and assistance given their higher position in society (Daybell 2015: 508). However, the

conventions were not necessarily always strictly obeyed. Rather than distinct types of letters as recommended by models and manuals, women's letters often comprised a mix of functions: 'In many cases, women's letter-writing represented a complex mix of delivering news, requesting goods, discussing matters of household business, sending respects to relations, persuading others of their views and writing about ideas' (Hannan 2016: 111). This is reflective of the many and varied roles and responsibilities that early modern women had to adopt, countering the idea of distinct 'daughter-wife-widow' stages throughout their life (as suggested in chapter 2). In order to best contextualise Marie de Nassau's correspondence it will be important to build a repertory of conventions and expectations for early modern daughters, through comparisons with letter writing manuals and models (chapter 4) and by eliciting the roles she performed in her letters throughout the analyses.

For those who would be expected to use it in later life, letter-writing was a milestone in the education and upbringing of children: 'Children were expected to write often and their letters represented a hybrid: partly educational exercise in the adult skill of correspondence and partly genuine communiqué' (Hannan 2016: 98). In such a manner, correspondence may have been 'an explicitly educational exercise for girls and young women, and one that paved the way to adult competence in social life' (Hannan 2016: 102). Once the art of letter-writing had been learned in childhood, as adults '[w]hat generally pushed women, or some women, to write letters was the need for advice, the request for a piece of information lacking due to distance or worse the neglect of mothers or husbands or children, but here is also an explicit concern related to duties of a public sort [...] in the absence of their husbands' (Ottaviani 2013: 1001). This echoes what was mentioned in chapter 2 regarding how early modern women are typically perceived in relation to the significant men in their lives, but it does at least demonstrate how they were able to work within this patriarchal system and use correspondence to exercise their own authority. Indeed, 'sixteenth-century women's correspondence reveals in practice a striking degree of female independence, confidence, and forcefulness; women operated within the confines of male authority, and simultaneously transgressed restrictive codes of female submission, testing and flexing the parameters of their subordination' (Daybell 2006: 199), resulting in highly individual examples of letter-writing.

3.3.2 Nassau women's family correspondence

The focus of the present study is on the letters of Marie de Nassau, eldest daughter of Guillaume d'Orange. The Orange-Nassau family has garnered much attention in recent years, in particular the immediate family of Guillaume d'Orange and their correspondence. Nassau family letters 'have received increasing attention in analyses focused on their literary style, emotional expression, and political networking, as well as for what they reveal about

women's reproductive knowledge, female reading practices, and dynastic strategy' (Broomhall & Spinks 2011: 74). The Nassau family is well known for maintaining a united family identity even though its constituent parts were spread out across many countries of Europe and they married across these political and linguistic borders (Campbell & Larsen 2009: 3). Particularly after the assassination of the patriarch, Guillaume d'Orange, in 1584, epistolary networks were vital in maintaining the family image and identity. 'The women of the Nassau family used their letters in two dominant ways, to sustain the family relationships and to create ideas about how the family should maintain its dynastic identity' given that its members were spread across Europe at this point (Campbell & Larsen 2009: 12). Nassau family letters were practical in this sense, but could also function more relationally, since 'letters were a critical resource for this family, as both an expression and practice of sentiment' (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a: 147). They also fulfilled a multitude of functions, including practical negotiations that may have muted the sentimentality. That being said, the act of writing a letter itself shows a degree of emotional connection, even if it is couched in terms of filial duty: 'In many ways, letters fulfilled a similar function to gifts by creating both social obligations and emotional closeness.' (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a: 147).

Broomhall and colleagues have studied the Nassau family extensively, focusing particularly on sibling correspondence and letters with their stepmother after their father Guillaume was assassinated in 1584. After this event, the Nassau family 'attempted to recover its identity as a family community, one with shared needs, and interests, and a common identity. The experiences of the Nassau family offer a chance to see how letters supported and created ideas about family, as well as how notions about these relationships could be expressed through correspondence.' (Broomhall 2009: 25). It was important for early modern families seeking to maintain or improve their standing to place family needs first, for '[t]he Orange-Nassaus, like other European aristocratic families, were aware of a collective image and identity of the house' (Verhaegen 2012: 37). Correspondence also played a practical role in Nassau family politics: 'Because of the vast distances separating the siblings and their relatives, many of these relationships were sustained and created through correspondence. This was particularly so for the female members of the family, who did not travel as frequently as their brothers, especially after their marriages. Letter-writing and letter-exchange were important mechanisms by which women could continue to participate in the interests and concerns of their natal family. Letters were not only exchanged between participants but also circulated within the extended family.' (Broomhall 2009: 28). This is especially true for the women in the family, since their 'letters often took the place of physical presence in the lives of their sisters and brothers' (Broomhall 2009: 31). In this section, some of the key studies of Nassau women's family correspondence are

outlined as a means of framing and justifying the study of Marie de Nassau's correspondence with her father.

In their article 'Corresponding Affections', Broomhall & Van Gent (2009a) explore the relationship between a few Nassau siblings, including an example of Marie's writing. This article focuses on the nature of sibling relationships after Guillaume's death in 1584, rather than the daughter-father relationship, but the exploration of these letters shows how correspondence was an important tool that the Nassau family used to navigate their lives and familial concerns whilst being widely dispersed across Europe. The authors highlight why Nassau correspondence specifically offers a rich source of information on the nature of the early modern family:

> 'The Nassau siblings' rich extant correspondence can shed light on the experience and perception of gender and power within these familial relationships. As sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, the siblings had different opportunities to advance familial politics, or indeed to determine and debate it, and these were in part shaped by collective and individual understandings of men and women's roles, and their ability to express themselves to other family members.' (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a: 145).

This observation foregrounds the priority that the family unit took over individual concerns, but also the important role that individual family members played in shaping their own roles within the family. The authors then continue to remark on the inherent instability of early modern networks and how unexpected events could dramatically alter the dynamics between family members adapting to a new situation: 'events could trigger shifts in power relations and realignment of networks within the family, as with William's [Guillaume's] premature death from which his brother, Jan van Nassau [Jean de Nassau] and William's second son, Maurits [Maurice], emerged as competing patriarchs' (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a: 145). This serves as a reminder that individual family members' roles and responsibilities may have shifted substantially over the course of their lives, even from one year to the next, as different things became important to the family. Broomhall and Van Gent's justification for studying siblings in their (2009) study is based on the fact that '[m]uch of the analysis of early modern families focuses on parent-child relations, or the marital couple' and that '[c]hildren, especially girls, as individuals with their own emotional lives have rarely been given voice in the historical sources' (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a: 146). However, the parent-child relationships that are studied are often mother-daughter or father-son, and typically focus more on the parent's experience than the child's (as noted in chapter 2). The current study aims to add more on the daughter-father relationship whilst prioritising the daughter's voice.

Broomhall & Spinks (2011) also study the Nassau family correspondence, once more focused on the concept of family identity after the patriarch, Guillaume d'Orange, was assassinated in 1584. In a chapter on grief and family and national identities, they examine the communication strategies of Guillaume's widow, Louise de Coligny, and how she played a pivotal role in securing the status of the Orange-Nassau family, writing to her brother-in-law Jean de Nassau to ensure his support as potential new patriarch, and by implying that her own grief was one that the nation shared. Correspondence was the means through which Louise was able to create a form of public memory to Guillaume, 'and thereby to secure her position and that of her children' (Broomhall & Spinks 2011: 83). Alongside memorialising her deceased husband, Louise's correspondence to Jean also 'were intended to reiterate their connection and also to emphasize his superior position and his duty to support her' (Broomhall & Spinks 2011: 77) as the power dynamics within the family were still shifting and in negotiation.

The religious aspect of Nassau family life has also been examined through their correspondence. As a dynasty that was spread across Europe with children married to gain particular political favours, family members had to navigate multiple identities that may have conflicted with one another on a religious aspect even though they still shared familial affection and respect for one another despite opposing beliefs. The role of correspondence in this family's life again cannot be overstated: 'Letters were critical to the making and shaping of Nassau dynastic identity and in managing its collective reputation. So too was correspondence a vital tool that [religious] converts employed to articulate an intellectual, theological and affective position, to engage, suspend, delay and cease discussions with family, to foster certain relationships and break away from others, and to exchange information directly and indirectly.' (Broomhall & Van Gent 2014: 648). Although religious conversion could be motivated by individual beliefs or more pressing political concerns, it could still cause much tension within the family. Letters, gifts, and offers of service could help to smooth over these tensions in the name of maintaining a strong dynastic identity. Letters also had the advantage of being a space that allowed for a more balanced renegotiation of family relationships than heated face to face encounters would have allowed (Broomhall & Van Gent 2014: 663). The authors give the example of Flandrine (one of Guillaume's daughters from his third marriage to Charlotte de Bourbon) who tried to convert her sisters to Catholicism and expressed her hurt and anger when they did not respond in the manner in which she had hoped they would, but that she recognised her need to remain connected to her family network for practical and financial support, and so she still used affectionate language in her letters despite her convictions (see Broomhall & Van Gent 2014: 653). Although Marie and Guillaume appear to have shared religious convictions at the time of

their correspondence, this acts as a useful reminder that religion played a prominent role in the lives of this family, but also that family came first.

In 2016 a symposium was held on the correspondence of seventeenth century Nassau women, specifically the wives of stadtholders between 1605 and 1725. In a brief report of this conference, Buning notes how the conference attempted to address the fact that women have long been excluded from historiography but were beginning to receive more attention. They state: 'Letters written by women were often ignored or even destroyed, but the rise of women's history as a field of study is now also reflected in a growing interest in female correspondence.' and continues to note Akkerman's contribution to the conference that 'although women were usually kept from political power - unless they were widowed - they often actively sought to manipulate power through letters sent to legitimate political players in the early modern Dutch Republic.' (Buning 2016: 177). This demonstrates that there is still a need for the voices of younger, unmarried Nassau women to be represented.

A more recent study by Couchman (2018) is key to informing this study, since it focuses on some of the aspects of early modern women's lives that the present study aims to illuminate. Their study looks at the letters of three Nassau women during their later adolescent years, revealing how their sense of self (as conveyed through their correspondence) transitioned from a state of girlhood to adulthood during the early days of their respective marriages and first pregnancies. Couchman notes that although 'marriage and motherhood were acknowledged as official markers of the transition from childhood to adulthood for early modern women, many did not experience these events as definitive' (Couchman 2018: 196). She proceeds to examine the letters of Elisabeth de Nassau, her younger sister Charlotte-Brabantine de Nassau, and her daughter Marie de la Tour d'Auvergne during the first years of their marriages. Each of these women married at the age of 18, and had their first child by the time they were 19 years old. Couchman's analysis of the correspondence between these three women reveals that rather than switching between the three distinct 'ages of women' (virgin-mother-crone or daughter-wife-widow as seen in chapter 2), these women gradually created and transitioned into their adult roles, and 'they did not immediately become, or feel themselves to be, mature women when they married and bore their first children' (Couchman 2018: 212). Her means of assessing this seems to be the gradual change over time from 'somewhat self-centred uncertainty to confident, outward-looking maturity after their marriages and the births of their first children' (Couchman 2018: 196-197). This seems a sensible conclusion to make, since it would have taken some time for these women to adjust to their new lives as wives and mothers, but it implies that marriage and childbirth acted as a catalyst for their 'becoming' adult women. It may also be the case that this sense of adulthood arose at around this age for early modern women, regardless of their marital or maternal status. Instead, daughters may have actively

learned the roles and responsibilities of adult life from their elders during their formative years, and for some this may have informed their sense of adult self more so than marital or maternal status. Marie de Nassau provides a perfect counterexample to this study, since she remained unmarried and childless into her late thirties, but as will become apparent from the analysis her letters demonstrate some signs of a sense of adult self between the ages of 17 and 21 - roughly the same point in her life as her three younger relatives studied by Couchman.

Some examples of the correspondence of Marie de Nassau have been studied, although not to the same extent as the letters of some of her relatives. As detailed above, she is specifically mentioned in Broomhall and Van Gent (2009a) in relation to her uncle Jean de Nassau through one or two letters she sent to him complaining that he wasn't adopting the role of patriarch as she expected him to after her father's death, which is also touched upon in Broomhall and Spinks (2011) where Marie is shown to act as an intermediary for Guillaume's widow Louise who was unable to write due to grief (Broomhall and Spinks 2011: 78). It appears that more is known about Marie's later life - Broomhall and Van Gent (2009a) go into more detail about her relationship with her uncle, life after her father's death, and the struggles that she had with her younger brother and eventual family patriarch Maurice regarding her and her elder brother's rightful inheritance. Even as an unmarried woman in her early twenties, she seems to have been a responsible character, in a position to support her close and wider family both financially and morally - in a letter she wrote to her uncle Jean de Nassau in 1578, she informs him that the patriarch Guillaume approved of his nephew Wilhelm-Ludwig's [Guillaume-Louis's] desire to accompany Count Havere on a trip to England, including some of her own money to fund his trip (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009a: 150). The authors argue that this allowed Marie to foster a good relationship with a potential male ally in the family that she could rely on for mutual aid in the future should she need it, given that her brother, Filips Willem [Philippe-Guillaume] was still being held captive in Spain with no sign of being released soon, and relations with her younger half brother Maurits [Maurice] were often fraught. Whilst this may well have factored into her reasoning, this example also demonstrates that she was a young woman who was well connected with her wider family network who seemingly valued her input on their affairs, but also someone who had a good degree of control over her own assets and who would likely be able to confidently manage administrative and household matters in her future married life. This confidence suggests that she was afforded a greater deal of independence and authority than one might expect an unmarried young woman to have at this time, perhaps due to her status as the eldest daughter, and signs of this emerging during her adolescent years will be a key focus of the analysis of her letters to her father in the following chapters of this study.

3.4 Summary

In this chapter, a selection of the existing literature regarding the methods and texts appropriate to the present study have been explored. After outlining the background of historical pragmatic studies of correspondence, it is clear that the present study is well positioned within this field, using the close analysis of a small sample of texts and maintaining a focus on the sociocultural value that their words hold. This led to considerations of early modern letter writing as a social practice, for it is necessary to understand the ways in which it operated in a particular setting in the past in order to confidently comment on the effects it was likely to have had in a particular case study. These were followed up with brief surveys of the relevant literature in relation to early modern family correspondence, with a focus on early modern daughters' letters and the Orange-Nassau family letters. This highlighted the fact that an analysis of Marie de Nassau's correspondence is well-positioned to contribute more knowledge not only to Orange-Nassau family research but also regarding early modern daughter-father correspondence more broadly.

In the following three chapters, the letters of Marie de Nassau are analysed through the lens of different pragmatic features that help to uncover social meanings contained within her words, in order to address the three main research questions of this study. These pragmatic features are: formulaic sequences (chapter 4), politeness strategies (chapter 5), and speech acts (chapter 6). These features were chosen since they help to address the main research questions of this study, and will be explained in greater detail in their respective analysis chapters. The study of formulaic sequences is particularly useful for revealing any known conventions and expectations of letter-writing (RQ1), providing a baseline for additional commentary on the pragmatic and social aspects of linguistic utterances in Marie de Nassau's letters (relating to RQ2 and RQ3). Politeness theory can also contribute to the first research question, since in practice it relies on some shared understanding of expectations between the participants, but it is more revealing of the nature of interpersonal relationships, personal image, face work, and how these dynamics could be managed at a distance through correspondence (more closely addressing RQ2). Similarly, speech acts can be examined for their conventional usage but help to reveal some of the functional differences that the choice of linguistic utterances could produce in context (addressing RQ2). All three pragmatic features help to demonstrate the linguistic techniques that Marie de Nassau uses to navigate the dynamics of her daughter-father relationship during times of separation (RQ2), and the close analysis of these particular features also incidentally highlights the various roles and responsibilities that could be adopted by 'dutiful' daughters (RQ3). Whilst each of these features is treated separately within its own chapter, they are always operating in tandem, providing different yet interconnected layers of

meaning that help to build up the overall picture of how early modern correspondence could be used in this relational way from daughters to fathers during times of separation. By conducting these analyses, it is possible to uncover some of Marie de Nassau's own experiences, making visible the roles and responsibilities that she took on as Guillaume's eldest daughter at this point in her life, and how her correspondence was a crucial tool in navigating this family relationship. In turn this can help to elucidate more of early modern young women's lives by providing a detailed case study of a young woman whose life circumstances were of course unique to her but unlikely to be out of the ordinary for others in similar positions to her.

4. Manuals and formulae

Early modern letter-writing manuals are a useful resource to consult when analysing personal correspondence in the sixteenth century. They provided their target readers with prescriptions and models to employ when writing their own correspondence to various people ranging from workers to the Pope, offering examples of formulaic sequences that could be used to ensure that the appropriate forms were used throughout the correspondence. What was considered 'appropriate' for writing to people of equivalent or different status relationships was codified in these manuals, which detailed some of the options available to writers depending upon the relative status of whom they were writing to and the existing relationship they shared. In addition to manuals, collections of model letters also show examples of common conventions of letter-writing by presenting them in a naturalistic manner. By comparing the suggestions from manuals and examples from model letters with the real-life case study of Marie de Nassau's correspondence, inferences can be made about the reach of these manuals and their application at the level of individual writers, hinting at the social expectations that constrained the letter-writing process.

One pragmatic feature of particular interest that can help with investigating this is formulaic sequences, due to their conventional nature. The pragmatic model of epistolary formulae used in this study is that outlined by Rutten & Van der Wal (2013), which was based on a larger corpus of Dutch-language personal correspondence written in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and so this analysis also assesses how well this applies to early modern French-language familial correspondence. Analysis of letter-writing manuals and model letters through the lens of formulaic sequences provides a repertoire of typical constructions that can be used as points of comparison for the case study of Marie de Nassau's correspondence to assess the degree to which she imitated these forms, innovated by ignoring convention, or something in-between marrying innovative forms with conventional functions. In this chapter, a selection of French-language letter-writing manuals and model letters from the sixteenth century are analysed in comparison with the letters of Marie de Nassau, with particular focus on formulaic sequences, in order to ascertain the extent to which her letters conformed to these prescriptions.

For the purpose of this analysis, a small corpus of letter-writing manuals and model letters was compiled. Although letter-writing manuals were published frequently throughout Europe in the sixteenth century, only a handful of French language examples appear in a recent catalogue by Erdmann, Govi & Govi (2014) of epistolaries, letter-writing manuals and model letter books published in sixteenth-century Western Europe. This catalogue shows a preponderance of Italian and Latin texts, with only 2 key French-language single-author anthologies outlined in any detail, and 27 letter collections plus 21 letter-writing manuals

listed in the catalogue. Of these 50 texts, a list of 22 were drawn up, based primarily on accessibility (see Appendix 5 for a list of sixteenth-century French manuals and models considered for this study). Thanks to the faithful digitisation of early-modern publications by the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, only 7 of these 22 texts were not easily accessible and thus discounted from the list. A total of 7 texts were selected based on their date of publication relative to Marie de Nassau's letters. Any texts published in the ten years prior to Marie's first letter (1573) were included in the corpus, of which there are four. In addition to these, two earlier manuals on rhetoric and letters were included to gain a sense of whether the tradition had evolved much since the early half of the century. One more recent manual was included more intuitively since it had French and Flemish model letters in parallel, which was considered noteworthy given the Dutch connections of the Orange-Nassau family, although this manual was published after Marie wrote the letters that are analysed in this study. The resulting corpus of 7 texts therefore includes:

- *'Le grant et vray art de pleine rhetorique'*, 1521, by Pierre Fabri;

- *'Le Stile et Maniere de composer, dicter et escrire toute sorte d'epistres ou lettres missives […]'*, 1553, which is variously attributed to Pierre Durand, Jean de la Moyne, or Etienne Dolet, and is one of the more well-known French-language manuals from this time;

- *'Stile et maniere de composer lettres missives avec plusieurs reigles et argumens […]'*, 1566, by Jean Bourlier;

- *'Le stile de composer et dicter toutes sortes de lettres missives'*, 1571, by Pierre Habert;

- *'Finances et thresor de la plume françoise'*, 1572, by Etienne du Tronchet;

- *'Formulaire de lettres morales moult propres pour l'usage des jeunes filles […]'*, 1573, by Gabriel Meurier, and of particular interest given the intended audience was young women such as Marie;

- *'Lettres communes et familieres pour marchants et autres […]'*, 1586, a letter collection by Jean Bourlier, containing Flemish translations in parallel.

With the exception of the 1586 text, all these examples consist of a formulary of prescriptions or commentary on the art of letter-writing, followed by examples or model letters, suggesting that these were used as educational resources for those mastering the genre.

Using this selection of texts assumes that some of the common conventions and expectations are reflected in their pages. It is not known whether Marie would have had access to these specific manuals, but given that she was from a relatively wealthy and educated family it is possible that she would have had access to some sort of letter-writing

manual. It is also worth noting at this point that the two earliest manuals from 1521 and 1553 share a great deal of similarities, even quoted verbatim in many instances, which demonstrates that many of the ideas about the 'correct' way to write letters were shared and copied from one guide to the next at this time. By contrast the later two guides from 1573 and 1586 use model letters rather than formularies as their means of instruction. This sample in itself suggests a trend from a rhetorical, prescriptive focus at the start of the century to a more usage-based, model letter focus as the century progressed, which may be an artefact of the sample but may also suggest that there was a trend away from rhetoric in correspondence at this time, which may be evident in the analysis of Marie's letters.

This chapter is divided into four main sections. Firstly, the core prescriptions of letter-writing manuals are outlined (section 4.1), followed by some common features of the model letters (section 4.2). In both of these sections, Marie's adherence to these conventions is assessed. After this, a pragmatic approach is adopted as attention turns to the formulaic sequences found across the manuals, model letters and Marie's correspondence (section 4.3), which highlights some of the pragmatic functions of the formulaic parts of Marie's letters. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the analysis (section 4.4), linking the findings of this analysis back to the main research questions of this thesis.

4.1 Letter-writing manual features

Early modern letter-writing manuals are a valuable primary source for revealing common features and prescriptions of the genre, as they represent a codified record of what can be assumed to be some of the important features of the genre at that time. When reading through the letter-writing manuals selected for the current analysis, three broad groups of features are identifiable, pertaining to *typology*, *structure*, and *interaction* respectively. Typological features can be considered as ways of subcategorising different types of letters, based on matters such as whether the letter is seeking or responding to information, and the general subject matter it contains. Structural features are another key element, and these manuals divide individual letters into the main functions of individual parts such as the opening and closing sequences, detailing typical constructions that may be found within them. Finally, interactional features deal with the consideration of the intended recipient(s) of an individual letter, and as such the appropriate forms to use in these interactions. These broad categories of features are all commented on explicitly in the formularies - the parts of the manuals where these conventions of the genre are prescribed - and can also be gleaned from the model letters that appear as examples in these manuals. They also help to address RQ1 in particular, and a little of RQ2. In this section of the chapter, these three broad

categories of typology (subsection 4.1.1), structure (subsection 4.1.2), and interaction (subsection 4.1.3) are studied.

4.1.1 Typology

The categorisation of different types of letters was seemingly an important consideration in the early modern period, at least for the writers of the earliest letter-writing manuals founded on classical rhetorical principles. The two earliest manuals in this set (*'Le grant et vray art de pleine rhetorique'* (1521) & *'Le Stile et Maniere de composer, dicter et escrire toute sorte d'epistres ou lettres missives'* (1553)) concern themselves with types of letter. In *'Le grant et vray art'*, two main types are distinguished - active and responsive - and all subtypes of letters can be classed under one of these two categories:

> *'tout se peult reduire en deux manieres de lettres missiues les vnes missiues actiues: Les aultres missiues responsiues. Les missiues actiues sappellent celles qui sont narratiues et petitores et comminatiues. Les missiues responsiues sappellent les celles qui doibuent response en acordant: excusant: congratulant &c.'*

> ('all this can be reduced to two types of missives: one active, the other responsive. Active letters are those of narration, petition, and threat. Responsive letters are those which respond to or elicit a response by agreement, excuse, or congratulation.', *Le grant et vray art* 1521: lxviii recto)

In addition to these two broad types, the manual later defines three categories based on content and tone:

> *'Toute epistre ou elle est de doctrine ou de ieu: ou de grauite. Epistre de doctrine est celle qui de toutes choses enseigne les absens. Epistre de ieu q[ue] par ioyeux lo[n]g et familier la[n]gaige len rescript des choses familieres et domestiq[ue]s aux abse[n]s Epistre de grauite cest qua[n]t de graue et pesante matiere ta[n]t morale que ciuile len rescript aux absens.'*

> ('All letters are of doctrine, joy, or gravity. Letters of doctrine above all give information to those who are absent. Letters of familiarity use long, joyful, and familiar language to inform those absent of family and domestic affairs. Letters of gravity inform those absent of grave and serious matters both moral and civil.', *Le grant et vray art* 1521: lxiii recto)

The manual elaborates that letters of doctrine aim for profit and utility, letters of joy aim for recreation and joy, and letters of gravity aim for honour. Of these different categories, one might expect Marie to write to her father using 'long, joyful and familiar language', and therefore the *'epistre de ieu'* or familiar/domestic letter is likely the category most relevant to this analysis. However, when evaluating her letters for the different typological features

outlined, it becomes apparent that not all of her letters neatly fall into one specific category, as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 - Features of Marie de Nassau's letters by type and content

Letter type: *Actiue* = letters of narration, petition or threat. *Responsiue* = letters of agreement, excuse, or congratulation.

Content: *Doctrine* = informative, aiming for profit and utility. *Ieu* = joy, establishing rapport aiming for recreation and joy. *Grauite* = serious or moral, aiming for honour.

'+' indicates presence of this typological feature, '-' indicates a lack of it.

	Letter type		Content		
Letter	*actiue*	*responsiue*	*doctrine*	*ieu*	*grauite*
1573/06/18	+	+	+	+	-
1573/08/18	+	+	+	+	+
1573/09/23	+	+	+	+	+
1573/10/15	+	-	+	-	+
1573/11/25	-	+	-	+	+
1573/12/05	+	+	+	-	+
1573/12/25	+	-	+	-	-
1574/02/21	+	+	-	+	+
1574/03/16	+	-	-	-	+
1574/05/15	-	+	-	-	+
1574/06/01	+	-	+	-	+
1574/06/22	+	+	+	-	-
1575/03/02	-	+	+	+	+
1576/05/01	-	+	+	+	+
1576/10/15	+	+	+	+	-
1577/01/26	+	-	+	+	+
1577/03/19	+	+	+	-	-
1577/04/04	-	+	+	+	-
1577/05/06	-	+	+	-	-
1577/05/25	+	-	+	-	+
1577/05/26	-	+	+	+	-
1577/09/20	+	-	+	-	+

Whilst manuals prescribe discrete types of correspondence, the evaluation of Marie's letters shows that in practice her letters fell under multiple categories. It is true that her letters which deal with family affairs fall into the category of *'epistre de ieu'*, but she also discusses other matters of *'doctrine'* or *'grauite'* or all three in these letters, resulting in mixed content for most of her letters. Similarly, the distinction between *'actiue'* and *'responsiue'* letters is also not always clear since many of her letters deal with multiple issues that can be interpreted in both ways. Of course this could be an artefact of the researcher's own understanding of the categories and the content in Marie's letters, but it does indicate that the discrete units prescribed in letter-writing manuals were not necessarily adhered to by young women writers like Marie in the later half of the sixteenth century. This implies that the expectation was for distinct issues to be dealt with in separate letters, but in reality the convention was that writers would include a mix of topics in their personal correspondence, perhaps by way of conserving resources like writing materials and time, because they did not perceive the categories as distinctly as they are laid out in the manuals, or even because these manuals were not necessarily targeted at young women writers like Marie who may have written to different expectations.

Although formally Marie's letters demonstrate a mixed style, further reading of the manuals does indicate some features that may classify many of her letters as *'epistre de ieu'*. According to *'Le Stile et Maniere'* (1553), such letters are of vital importance:

> *'elles sont de leur nature tresnecessaires, pour a noz amys faire scauoir de nostre estat, & de noz negoces, soit de la santé, prosperité, maladie, aduersité, ou autres choses domestiques & familieres.'*
>
> ('they are by their nature most necessary, to let our friends know of our state, and of our negotiations, be they health, prosperity, illness, adversity, or other domestic and familiar affairs', *Le Stile et Maniere* 1553: 107)

The manual states that these letters should be divided into three parts: the first must include the health formula '*Si vales bene est ego quidem valeo*' ('If you are well so am I'). The second part must include the salutation and recounting of good or bad health and fortune, and how this came to be, making sure to give thanks to God. The third part includes a statement that there is nothing more to communicate other than offering a blessing to the recipient(s) (*Le Stile et Maniere* 1553: 107-108). Marie commonly opens her letters in a similar manner, for example:

> *'nous sommes encore en bonne sante dieu mercy esperant denstender le mesme de vous ce que de tout mon ceur je desire car nay eu en longtamps ce bien dauoir de vous nouuelles sy esse que je espere que nous en arons bien to'*
>
> ('we are still in good health, thanks be to God, wishing to hear the same of you, which I desire with all my heart since I have not had for a long time this

delight of having news from you, and if it were as I wish we would have this soon', 1573/09/23)

Whilst this is not separated into three parts, it includes all three features that the manual outlines for this type of letter. The 1572 *'Finances et thresor de la plume françoise'* further outlines the expectations of language usage in domestic and familiar letters:

'ceste maniere d'escrire familiere ne doit nullement esloigner le moyen ordinaire que nous vsons de parler ensemble, obseruant tant que faire se peut la curiosité de bien dire, par langage commun, priué, pur, & intelligible'

('this manner of writing familiar [letters] should not stray from what is ordinarily used, noting the curiosity of speaking well by means of language that is common to both, private, pure and intelligible',(*Finances et thresor* 1572: ij recto)

The manual continues prescribing an avoidance of excessive figurative language and metaphors, circumlocutions and periphrases, since the familiar letter should be easy to read, free from ornamentation, and clear in its purpose (*Finances et thresor* 1572: ij recto-verso). In terms of the appropriate topics to be addressed in such a letter, ordinary, household, and family affairs are most appropriate, but also letters between master and servant, husband and wife, parent and child (*Finances et thresor* 1572: iiij recto-verso). Reading through any of Marie's letters to her father shows adherence to these prescriptions, since in general she makes use of familiar language, avoids elaborate linguistic constructions, and deals primarily with familiar and domestic affairs, although other matters do arise.

In terms of typological features, Marie's letters tend to blur the boundaries between 'active' and 'responsive' letters, and content that is 'informational', 'joyful' or 'serious'. This suggests that letter type may not have been of particular concern to early modern young women when writing personal correspondence, instead favouring a mixed approach based on whatever needed communicating at a given time. However, it must be noted that these manuals were not specifically targeted at young women writers, and so the lack of adherence to the prescriptions does not necessarily mean that they were encouraged to be innovative writers, but rather there may have been other conventions at play, or other elements that were considered more important.

4.1.2 Structure

Another key prescription that is covered in letter-writing manuals is the internal structuring of the personal letter. The 1521 *'Le grant et vray art'* again has specific prescriptions on this matter, namely a letter can be divided into six parts: first the salutation, also called the exorde or proem, which opens the letter; second the narration; third the division or partition by subject matter, with as many sections as there are topics; fourth the confirmation, which functions to demonstrate arguments for claims made earlier in the letter; fifth the confutation,

which provides rebuttal; and finally the conclusion (*Le grant et vray art* 1521: xi verso). In Bourlier's 1566 *Stile et maniere de composer lettres missives*, the letter is divided into five parts based on the classical and medieval heritage of the *ars dictaminis*, the rhetorical art of correspondence: these are the *salutatio*, *benevolentia*, *narratio*, *petitio*, and *conclusio* (*Stile et maniere de composer lettres missives* 1566: 7). The *salutatio* addresses the reader; the *benevolentia* outlines the reasons for writing; the *narratio* gives the main issue about which is being written; the *petitio* raises the demands the writer wishes to make of their reader; and the *conclusio* finishes the letter with gratuities, graces and formalities appropriate to the form. These divisions are used in this analysis.

When examining Marie de Nassau's letters based on these five divisions, it is apparent that she generally conforms to this sort of structure, as shown in Table 4.2. This table shows that Marie generally adheres to the structural components of the letter as outlined in the 1566 manual. In many cases there seems to be a lack of a clear *petitio* section to her letters, and this is not necessarily because she does not make any sort of request or petition, but rather that she includes this with the *narratio* in most cases, rather than splitting it out into a separate section. This is possibly because when she does have requests there are multiple ones she wishes to make, and so it is perhaps easier for her or for Guillaume to process them when they are included next to the narrative that explains why she needs to make those requests. Similarly, though both *salutatio* and *benevolentia* are always present in her letters, the content is often blurred and makes it difficult to distinguish these as two clear sections, and perhaps can be better conceptualised as an 'opening sequence' of sorts. In a general sense, from a structural perspective, Marie's letters conform to the prescriptions of letter-writing manuals by including all key sections, but go against these conventions by blurring the boundaries.

Aside from these five core sections, the manuals prescribe an additional closing sequence which follows the *conclusio*:

> *'Ainsi faisons fin de nostre lettre auec gratuités, action de graces & presentation de nostre seruice, y aioutant an & jour de la missiue escrite, si la datte n'est mise au dessus.'*
>
> ('Thus we make the end of our letter with gratuities, graces, and presentation of our service, adding the year and day on which the missive was written, if the date has not been placed above.', *Stile et maniere de composer lettres missives* 1566: 7)

This prescription outlines a standard format for closing a letter after the *conclusio*, highlighting the fact that presentation of one's service was a conventional part of the genre, along with the date, although no mention is made of the leave-taking 'subscription'.

	Structural component				
Letter	*salutatio*	*benevolentia*	*narratio*	*petitio*	*conclusio*
1573/06/18	+	+	+	+	+
1573/08/18	+	+	+	+	+
1573/09/23	+	+	+	+	+
1573/10/15	+	+	+	-	+
1573/11/25	+	+	+	-	+
1573/12/05	+	+	+	-	+
1573/12/25	+	+	+	+	+
1574/02/21	+	+	+	+	+
1574/03/16	+	+	+	+	+
1574/05/15	+	+	-	-	+
1574/06/01	+	+	+	+	+
1574/06/22	+	+	+	-	+
1575/03/02	+	+	+	-	+
1576/05/01	+	+	+	+	+
1576/10/15	+	+	+	-	+
1577/01/26	+	+	+	-	+
1577/03/19	+	+	+	+	+
1577/04/04	+	+	+	-	+
1577/05/06	+	+	-	-	+
1577/05/25	+	+	-	-	+
1577/05/26	+	+	+	-	+
1577/09/20	+	+	+	-	+

Table 4.2 - Marie's letters by structural component

Structural component: *Salutatio* = addresses the reader. *Benevolentia* = outlines the reasons for writing. *Narratio* = describes the main issue. *Petitio* = makes demands of the reader. *Conclusio* = finishes the letter with gratuities, graces and formalities.

'+' indicates presence of this structural component as defined in Bourlier's 1566 *'Stile et maniere'* as a distinct section of the letter, '-' indicates a lack of it as a distinct section (although it could be part of another section, as in many cases the *narratio* and *petitio* are intermixed and difficult to distinguish).

Adherence to this prescription can be seen in Marie's correspondence:

> *'priant dieu le createur vous donner mons[ieu]r mon bien bon pere sante*
> *heureuse vie et longue auecque accomplicement de tous vous bons desirs et a*
> *moy touiour ce bien dauoier part en vouster bonne grace en laquelle*
> *treshumblement me recommande ce faict de dillenbourch ce 18 de juwin en lan*
> *1573 en fort gran hate'*

> ('praying God the Creator grant you, Monsieur my well beloved father, health,
> happiness and a long life, with accomplishment of all your good desires, and
> [grant] me this boon of having part of your good grace into which I most humbly
> commend myself; this [letter] written in Dillenburg this 18th of June in the year
> 1573 in great haste', 1573/06/18)

This is perhaps a typical example of Marie's closing phrases in her letters to Guillaume, which adheres to the advice of the 1566 guide by commending herself into her father's graces (and implied service), as well as dating the letter. However in most of her letters she additionally passes on more commendations from other family members, before the subscription and signature, as the above example continues:

> *'Monsr mon bien bon pere madame de nassaw la junne ma commande vous*
> *faire ce bien humbles recommandacions en vouster bonne grace*
>
> > *Vouster treshumble et tresobeysante fille*
> > *jusques a la mort Marie de Nassaw'*

> ('Monsieur my well beloved father, Madame de Nassau the younger asked me
> to pass on her most humble commendations into your good grace. // Your most
> humble and most obedient daughter until death, Marie de Nassau', 1573/06/18)

In this final section of her letters, Marie signals her relationship with Guillaume as his humble and obedient daughter, as well as passing on any final messages and commendations from other family members present at the time of composition. In some examples she also adds a postscript, going beyond what is prescribed in the manuals.

Other structural components of the letter are also covered in the manuals, such as the superscription. The superscription is an important component of the early modern letter, written on the external visible part of the letter after it has been folded and sealed. The 1553 manual *'Le Stile et Maniere'* is categorically asserts that the addressee's title, kinship, and status must be included in the superscription: *'En toutes superscriptions lon doit metre les dignitez permanentes les premieres, puis la consanguinité, & apres la dignité muable'* ('In all superscriptions one must place the permanent titles first, then kinship, and changeable status after', *Le Stile et manière* 1553: 9). In the examples where superscriptions are present, Marie almost invariably writes *'A Monsieur, Monsieur le Prince Dorange'* ('To Monsieur, Monsieur the Prince of Orange') on this external part of her letters to Guillaume,

and once simply *'A Mons[ieu]r mon Pere'* ('To Monsieur my father'). Marie typically addresses Guillaume with his title *'monsieur'* and status *'le Prince d'Orange'*, but in all but one example fails to make explicit their kinship by using *'mon pere'*. There could be any number of reasons for Marie to not adhere to this convention. It is possible that a more neutral superscription was preferred since many of these letters were sent during times of conflict, and family correspondence was likely to contain more compromising information about, for example, family members' locations. The obvious external identification of kinship letters in the superscription highlighted letters of this type, leaving them more vulnerable to be intercepted before reaching the addressee. Indeed, some of Guillaume's letters to his brothers were known to have been intercepted, such as that of 7 May 1574 which contained his typical superscription identifying kinship: *'A monsieur, monsieur le conte Jéhan de Nassau, mon bien bon frere'* ('To Monsieur, Monsieur the Count Jean de Nassau, my dear brother', Groen van Prinsterer 1837: 385-398). It is unclear why Marie chose not to identify kinship explicitly on the superscription of her letters to Guillaume, but risk of interception may have been a factor.

4.1.3 Interaction

Perhaps the most crucial aspect of letter-writing is the presence of at least one other participant. Indeed, *'toute epistre ou lettre missiue nest aultre chose que aux absens parler'* ('all epistles or missals are nothing other than speaking to those who are absent', *Le grant et vray art* 1521: lxviii recto). There are a number of features that the letter-writing manuals highlight as important in this respect, including use of an appropriate register, the correct salutation, relevant pronouns, and even material considerations of layout and presentation. Many of the manuals advise that one should consider the addressee before even picking up the quill. The 1521 *'Le grant et vray art'* advises considering the condition and standing of the addressee as well as what length and register of letter they would prefer to receive:

> *'Mais est assauoir q[ue] aua[n]t q[ue] le[n] prenne la plume pour escripre: le[n] doibt co[n]siderer la p[er]so[n]ne a q[ui] le[n] rescript: & pri[n]cipallement sa co[n]ditio[n] & sa dignite: […] il est plusieurs gens qui de leur co[n]ditio[n] nen prenne[n]t a plaisir chose que le[n] leur rescripue tant soit ioyeuse : et a ceulx la sommairement & brief len doibt rescripre. Les aultres sont ioyeuses de lire lettres & a ceulx la len doibt rescripre elegantement et tres aorneement'*

> ('But it is to be known that before picking up the quill to write, one must consider the person to whom one writes, and foremost their condition and standing […] there are many people whose condition means they only take pleasure when they have joyful things written to them, and to them one must

write summarily and briefly. Others are happy to read letters and to them one must write elegantly and elaborately', *Le grant et vray art* 1521: lxx verso)

Similarly, the 1553 *'Le Stile et maniere de composer'* advises:

> *'Auant que pre[n]dre les instrumens materielz pour escrire Epistre ou lettre missiue, sont a considerer ces poinctz qui s'ensuiue[n]t : c'est asçauoir, la condition, dignité ou qualité de celuy au quel lon escrit : sil est personne publicque, priuée, riche poure, amy, ennemy : aussi s'il est bien congneu ou peu.'*

> ('Before taking up the material instruments for writing an epistle or missal, the following points must be considered: the condition, standing or quality of the addressee; whether they are someone public, private, rich, poor, friend, [or] enemy; also if they are well known or not.', *Le Stile et maniere de composer* 1553: 21-22)

The 1571 *'Le stile de composer'* puts it more succinctly, advising on the best usage:

> *'Ceux qui desirent acquerir l'vsage de bien coucher par escrit, doiuent soigneusement garder ce moyen: A sçauoir, de considerer diligemment la qualité de celuy, ou ceux ausquels ils veulent escrire.'*

> ('Those who desire to acquire the usage of tact in writing must carefully follow this method: that is to diligently consider the quality of the one or those ones to whom one wishes to write.', *Le stile de composer* 1571: 3)

This particular manual continues to advise that the most appropriate register to use when addressing friends, relatives and servants is one that is more familiar and emphasises the relationship, as opposed to when addressing, for example, a Lord or Lady which requires language of humility and reverence. When considering Marie's letters to her father with these prescriptions in mind, it is apparent that she carefully considers her addressee by the recognition of the status of their relationship as father and daughter, but she also clearly marks her deference towards him. This shows a careful consideration of both their familial relationship and their relative status in the hierarchy.

Considering what is most appropriate for the addressee is a crucial part of the letter-writing process ('appropriateness' being a concept that is explored more closely in reference to politeness theory in chapter 5). One part of the letter where it is of most importance is the salutation, for it opens up the epistolary space where the correspondents are able to interact, and as such sets up the specific relationship between the correspondents in this epistolary act. Bourlier's 1566 *'Stile et Maniere de composer'* presents various formulaic sequences for use by different correspondents and in different situations. Of these, the suggested salutations for children to use when addressing their parents are the most relevant to the present study and include *'Obedience volontaire, & amour puerile, auec constant & incorruptible fidelité je vous presente tres-chers Parens. &c.'*

('My dear parents, I present you voluntary obedience and filial love with constant and incorruptible fidelity') and *'Tres-chers & bien aimez Pere & Mere, si vous & toute vostre famille estes en bonne santé, ce me sera vn grand plaisir, sçachez que je suis en fort bon point, graces à Dieu.'* ('Dear and most beloved father and mother, if you and all your family are in good health, that will be a great pleasure to me, [and] know that I am in good health, thanks be to God', *Stile et Maniere de composer* 1566: 8). Both of these examples signal the relationship of deference that was expected for children to demonstrate to their parents in their correspondence. The second example also echoes the expected usage of the health formula from earlier Latin rhetoric, *'Si vales bene est ego quidem valeo'*, as discussed in the typology subsection above. Marie's letters often follow this pattern, but not always so explicitly. Her opening address term is either simply *'Monsieur'* or the more elaborate *'Monsieur mon bien bon/ayme pere'* ('Monsieur my most beloved father'), highlighting their kinship from the outset. The utterances that follow the greeting vary from letter to letter, occasionally highlighting her obedience as in *'jay nay poient voulu falier au deuoir dobeisante fille de vous faire sete'* ('I did not wish to fail my duty as [your] obedient daughter to write you this [letter]', 1573/08/18). More frequently she makes reference to the process of letter-writing itself, be it acknowledging receipt of letters and thanking Guillaume for writing to her, or giving reasons for her having not been able to write sooner, rather than the health-based salutation that the manual advises is appropriate. Whilst this suggests that Marie does not follow the prescriptions of the manuals closely in the salutation, her usage is not unexpected, and she invariably makes reference to health at other points in her letters. This demonstrates that strictly adhering to the prescriptions of letter-writing manuals was not something that Marie found necessary to do when writing her own correspondence, favouring a strategy of entering into the epistolary world in the salutation and leaving matters of health until later. She was most certainly concerned with hearing of and passing on news of correspondents' health, but this was not restricted to a prescribed location in her letters.

Another means by which early modern letter writers could signal their consideration of the addressee(s) was through material characteristics. The layout of the writing on the page conveys meaning that links to social standing, which is further reinforced by the register and vocabulary used in key parts of the text. As with other features of letter-writing, the manuals have their own prescriptions, offering guidelines for presentation considering people in different levels of the social hierarchy. The earlier guides both give similar advice, distinguishing between letters addressed to a superior, an equal, or an inferior. The 1553 *'Le Stile et Maniere'* outlines that when addressing or talking about a superior, the tone should be one of honour, humility and reverence, using no more than three superlative and comparative terms, such as *'treshaut, trespuissant, treshonnoré, tresredouté, meilleur, plus loyal, plus digne'* ('most high, most powerful, most honourable, most renowned, best, most

loyal, most dignified', *Le Stile et Maniere* 1553: 6). The subscription should be placed in the bottom right hand corner, including the terms appropriate to the relationship, such as *'Par vostre treshumble, & tresobeissant filz, seruiteur, &c.'* ('From your most humble and most obedient son, servant, etc.', *Le Stile et Manière* 1553: 6). The manual continues to offer guidelines for writing to those of equal or inferior status. To an equal, the tone should be familiar, addressing them directly with positive terms and few superlatives, such as *'sage, prudent, ho[n]norable, discret, puissant, redouté'* ('wise, prudent, honourable, discrete, powerful, renowned', *Le Stile et Maniere* 1553: 7). The subscription should be placed centrally at the base of the letter, including the terms appropriate to their relationship, such as *'par le tout vostre compere, & amy a iamais'* ('all from your companion and forever friend', *Le Stile et Maniere* 1553: 6). To an inferior, the tone should be one of honest authority, addressing them as *'nostre amé'* ('our friend', *Le Stile et Maniere* 1553: 8), and placing the subscription on the left hand side of the letter with the terms *'par le tout vostre, &c'* ('yours, etc.', *Le Stile et Maniere* 1553: 6). Of these three categories of potential addressees, Marie's letters to her father naturally resemble the guidelines for letters written to a superior. She addresses him with a respectful *'mon bien ayme pere'* ('my most beloved father'), and refers to herself and their relationship appropriately deferentially in the subscription as *'vouster treshumble et tresobeisante fille jusques a la mort'* ('your most humble and most obedient daughter until death'), which is placed in the bottom right hand corner of the letter in all but one example. This shows that both layout and register were important features for conveying the social meaning of their father-daughter relationship, since Marie's adherence to these prescriptions would have demonstrated her deference towards him from the moment he unfolded the letter or had it read aloud to him.

In this section of the chapter, three key features of early modern correspondence as prescribed by letter-writing manuals have been outlined: typology, structure, and interaction. When comparing these prescriptions with Marie de Nassau's letters to her father, one common pattern emerged: whilst Marie follows the prescriptions of these manuals in broad terms, she does not do so exactly. Instead of following strict guidelines and dividing her letters into discrete sections, the functions of her writing are blurred. She checks off every expected feature of the letter, but not necessarily in the prescribed place. This could indicate a number of different things. Firstly, it is possible that she did not learn the rules of letter-writing from manuals, and so these prescriptions would not have been at the forefront of her mind. It could also be that she had learnt these prescriptions during her childhood but had become increasingly adept at writing and therefore was able to be a little more flexible and creative. It is also possible that the letter-writing manuals lagged behind actual writing trends, or were too specific and did not apply well to early modern daughter-father

correspondence. Whatever the reasons, it is evident that there were indeed some general principles that Marie adhered to in her letters to her father which indicate that she typically wrote in a manner expected of and appropriate to someone in her situation - an obedient daughter who keeps her father informed of the household affairs whilst he is away.

4.2 Model letters

Whilst letter-writing manuals provide prescriptions on formal features of correspondence, model letters give examples of how these operate in practice. Alongside the formulary, many manuals contained a section of model letters for different recipients, and indeed some books contained only model letters. Of the early modern French-language correspondence manuals and letter books selected for the analysis, there is a conspicuous lack of model letters from daughters to fathers, not even in Meurier's 1573 '*Formulaire de lettres moult propres pour l'usage des jeunes filles*' ('Formulary of letters most proper for usage by young women'). This lack of examples is informative in itself, since it indicates the expected audience and also the shortcomings of manuals published in the sixteenth century. If manuals and letter books were meant to be a reflection of the actual practices of correspondence, then the exclusion of daughter-father letters indicates that they did not reflect the full range of correspondence being written at that time, and therefore do not reflect everyday practices since we know that such letters were written. This also suggests that, with the exception of Meurier's 1573 formulary, the assumed audience of these texts was not young women, and so it is likely that multiple different correspondence practices coexisted even if not all of them were codified into letter books. This lack of young women's voices in the prescriptive records of the time justifies the study of real examples like the correspondence of Marie de Nassau. However, since there are no model letters which are directly comparable to the letters Marie de Nassau sent to her father, other points of comparison must be found in these texts in order to proceed with a meaningful analysis. Perhaps the closest models to daughter-father correspondence are those which reflect similar hierarchical family power dynamics. The texts include models from sons to fathers (6 examples), daughters to mothers (5 examples), and sons to mothers (1 example), all of which demonstrate the child-parent dynamic to a similar extent. For this analysis, the greeting, the opening topic of the salutation, and the subscription will be the focal points, since they are sections of the letters that highlight the interactional elements clearly.

The greetings in the model letters all form similar patterns. The models from sons to fathers all open with either *'(mon) trescher pere'* ('(my) dearest father') or *'monsieur & pere'* ('Monsieur and father'). The models from daughters to mothers are lengthier, starting with *'ma (tres chere et) treshonorée mere'* ('my (dearest and) most honorable mother'), followed by either *'mes humbles premises à vostre dilection et bonté maternelle'* (my humble

greetings for your affection and maternal goodwill'), *'mes treshumbles premises à vostre bonne grace'* ('my most humble greetings for your good grace'), *'mes humbles premises à vostre reuerence & bonté maternelle'* ('my humble greetings for your reverence and maternal goodwill'), or *'je me recommande tres humblement à vostre grace, pareillement à celle de mon tres honnoré pere'* ('I commend myself most humbly into your grace and that of my most honorable father'). The model letter from son to mother simply greets her as *'madame & mere'* ('Madame and mother'). Marie's typical greeting *'monsieur mon bien bon/ayme pere'* ('monsieur my dearest/beloved father') does not precisely match any of the models, but rather shows more similarity to the forms that her other family members used - such as her father addressing his own brother as *'monsieur mon bien bon frere'* ('monsieur my dearest brother'). This strongly suggests that Marie learned much of her epistolary skill from imitating family letters rather than models.

The opening topic of the salutation is typically more varied. In the models from sons to fathers, the topic is either passing on commendations such as *'mes bien humbles recommandations presentées à vostre bonne grace'* ('my most humble commendations presented to your good grace'), acknowledging affective aspects of the relationship such as *'ie cognois apertement l'amour paternel qu'il vous plaist me porter'* ('I clearly know the paternal love that it pleases you to have for me'), intertextual reference to a previous letter *'i'ay esté auisé par vostre triste letter […]'* ('I was informed by your sad letter […]'), or moves directly onto the main narration of the text. Similarly, the models from daughters to mothers make intertextual reference to previous letters such as *'pour vos lettres dernieres briefues […]'* ('for your recent brief letters […]'), sometimes commenting on the lack of replies *'vous advisant que suis Dieu mercy encore haitée, mais par ce que vous ay par plusieursfois escrit, &; n'ay receue ne moins veue aucune response […]'* ('informing you that I am, thanks be to God, still happy and well, but since I have written to you many times and have neither received nor seen any response […]'), and in one case showcasing new skills that have been learned *'il vous plaira entendre que m'employe à faire mon plein deuoir d'apprendre à coudre […]'* ('it will please you to hear that I have tasked myself with all my duty to learning to sew […]'). The model from son to mother refers to the process by acknowledging the letter bearer by saying *'i'ay esté grandement ioyeux de voir nostre cousin present porteur, encores plus d'auoir receu vos lettres'* ('I was very happy to see our cousin, the current letter-bearer, and even more so to have received your letters').

By comparison, the opening salutation of Marie's letters typically address the following themes, from most to least frequent:

- Acknowledging receipt of correspondence from Guillaume:

'jay rechu vouster letter quil vous a plut mescrirpe et vous remercie treshumblement de lonneur que me fettes de vous sou[venir] tant

continuellement a moy' ('I received your letter which it pleased you to write me and I thank you most humbly for the honour you do me in continually remembering me') x5;

'jay nay poient voulu falier au deuoir dobeisante fille de vous faire sete et serat pour vous auertir que jay rechu le [date] de ce mois vouster letter' ('I did not wish to fail my duty of obedient daughter to write you this [letter] and it will inform you that I received the [date] of this month your letter') x2;

'cete seruirat pour vous auertir que jay rechu le [date] de ce mois vouster letter' ('this will serve to inform you that I received the [date] of this month your letter') x3.

- Referencing her current act of writing, be it at her own convenience or on behalf of another:

'ayant trouue sy bonne commodite a vous addresser ma letter jay nay poient voulu falir au deuoir' ('having found a good opportunity to write this letter you you I did not wish to fail my duty') x4;

'comme jay suys este requis de par [person] de vous escripre en sa faueur' ('since I was requested by [person] to write to you in their favour') x2.

- Giving reasons for not having written sooner or for writing very little, either by lack of letter-bearer or not having much to add due to having recently written:

'comme le porteur de cete a este retune plus longtamps' ('as the bearer of this stayed a long time') x3;

'encore que pour le present je nay gran chose a vous escripre a cause que depuis peu de tamps je vous ay escript' ('for now I have no more to write since it is only a short time since I last wrote to you') x1.

- Expressing concerns that her letters would cause an imposition:

'encore que pour le present je ne vous importune poient voulontir auecque me letters a cause que je say bien que aues pour leur beaucoup daulters enpechemens' ('for now I do not wish to inconvenience you with my letters for I know you have many other affairs') x1.

- Providing additional information to continue a previous letter:

'comme je vous avois escript' ('as I have already written to you') x1.

Whilst these categorisations are somewhat open to interpretation, as each utterance could belong to multiple categories (including others not listed here), they do give a useful indication of the typical topics that Marie employs in her opening salutations. Marie's letters share similarities with some of the model letter examples, since she opens every one of her letters with some sort of reference to the process of writing, sending, and receiving

correspondence, which has the effect of constructing the communicative setting that frames this individual letter as part of a series of correspondence with her father. This type of reference to the genre is likely to have been a common occurrence across Europe at this time, since it has been found in research by other scholars such as Tanskanen (2007) who examined the intertextual nature of Lady Katherine Paston's English correspondence from around the same period, resulting in seven explicit ways in which her letters were presented as part of an intertextual string of letters (see Tanskanen 2007: 77 onwards). It also backs up the idea that letter-writers create a virtual epistolary world into which they insert themselves and their correspondents at the start of the letter and then remove themselves from at the end of it, which has been observed in other studies (notably Fitzmaurice 2002: 38; see also Chiavetta 2012). This is explained by the idea that 'the construction of the epistolary world is very important in letter writing because the writer manipulates the deictic organisation to create an illusion of face-to-face interaction. The writers […] create the communicative situation concretely; they begin their letters by entering the epistolary world and end them by exiting it.' (Laitinen & Nordlund 2012: 69). Marie achieves this aim of entering the epistolary world through the combination of her greeting and the topic of the opening salutation. By using greetings like *'Monsieur mon bien ayme pere'* which closely resembles other family letters and model letter greetings and is therefore an index of the genre, Marie opens up the epistolary world. This is then followed by an acknowledgement of the fact she is writing a letter, be it through placing it in the temporal context of other letters she has just received from her father or stating the reason she has found time to write to him (both of which she does frequently), and so Marie enters the epistolary world through these contextualising clues, allowing her to move on to the main topics of the letter after this point. Having set this up, she later extracts herself from the epistolary world in the closing subscription.

The closing subscriptions of the model letters are another place where the models demonstrate the interactional qualities of correspondence, and like the salutation can also be grouped thematically. In models from sons to fathers, typical themes include commendation *'Pour la fin à vous deux la teste inclinée humblement me recommandant […]'* ('to conclude I humbly commend myself to you two with a bow of my head […]'), pleading *'Ie vous prie que je ne soye frustré de mon esperance […]'* ('I pray that you are not annoyed by my wish […]'), or highlighting obedience and servitude *'Esperant si bien faire mon deuoir en tout, que vou aurez iuste occasion de vous contenter de ma diligence & obeissance'* ('hoping to have fulfilled all my duties, so that you will have reason to content yourself with my diligence and obedience'). They usually conclude with some version of *'vostre humble et obedient filz'* ('your humble and obedient son'), a commendation to God, and the date and place. The themes in models from daughters to mothers also include commendation *'au surplus vous plaira tant humilier de presenter mes humbles recommandations […]'* ('furthermore it will

please you to have me humbly present my commendations […]'), may also be rather abrupt such as *'non autre, vous m'entendez bien'* ('nothing more, you understand me well'), can appeal with affective language *'de rechef et de rechef supplie vostre bonté et affection maternelle me vouloir interiner ma rogue et requeste […]'* ('again and again [I] pray your maternal good will and affection [that you] wish to fulfil my question and request […]'), or commend God (*'a tant ma tres-honorée & bien bonne mere, prieray le Seigneur Dieu vous donner en santé, sa grace, & à moy continuation de la vostre'* ('so my most honored and good mother, I pray the Lord God grant you health, his grace, and to me the continuation of yours [grace]')). They usually conclude with a form of *'vostre treshumble fille en toute obedience & reverence'* ('your most humble daughter in all obedience and reverence'), commendations, including commendation to God, and the date and place of writing. In the model from son to mother, he commends her into God's protection and then commends himself into her graces: *'Lequel [Dieu], Madame ma mere, ie vay humblement supplier vous preseruer souz sa saincte protection en treslongue & bonne vie: Apres auoir presenté mes tres-humbles recommandations à vos bonnes graces.'* ('Whom, Madame my mother, I will humbly pray [He] keep you under His sacred protection with a long and happy life: after having presented my most humble commendations into your good graces').

Marie's concluding utterances share some similarities with the child-parent models. She typically invokes God and passes on her commendations, before closing with her standard subscription *'Vouster treshumble et tresobeisante fille jusques a la mort Marie de Nassaw'* ('Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death, Marie de Nassau'). The common ways in which she begins to conclude her letters include:

- Clear demarcation:

'a tant fairay la fin' ('so I will conclude') x10.

- Fearing causing an inconvenience:

'monsr […] crayndant de vous donner facherie a lire ma letter ne faray cete plus longue' ('Monsieur […] fearing giving you the inconvenience of reading my letter I will not make this any longer') x8.

- A combination of the two, passing on extra information with the letter bearer:

'entenderes le tout plus amplement par luy car ne vous veux poient [im]portuner auecque longue letter [greetings from other family members] a tant fairay la fin' ('you will hear everything more fully from him [the letter bearer] since I do not wish to inconvenience you with a long letter [greetings from other family members] so I will conclude') x2.

- Declaring that there is nothing else to mention:

'comme je nay say aulter matire quy merite a vous escripre je finneray sete'
('since I have no other matter that merits writing to you I will finish this') x1.

- Reemphasising the commendation of a previous recent letter:

'a tant vous recommande encore en la garde de se bon dieu' ('so I commend you once more into the protection of our good God') x1.

These closing subscriptions of Marie's letters mimic some of the model letters. For instance the clear demarcation between the main body of the text and the closing section with *'a tant fairy la fin'* ('so I will conclude') resembles the abrupt *'non autre, vous m'entendez bien'* ('nothing more, you understand me well') of the daughter-mother model, whilst her fears of causing an inconvenience *'monsr […] crayndant de vous donner facherie a lire ma letter ne faray cete plus longue'* ('Monsieur […] fearing giving you the inconvenience of reading my letter I will not make this any longer') resembles the son-father model's *'le vous prie que je ne soye frustré de mon esperance'* ('I pray that you are not annoyed by my wish'). Just from these two examples, it is evident that the exact form of Marie's utterances do not directly match those found in the models, although they do appear to perform similar functions. This supports the idea that Marie did not use model letters and manuals to inform her own writing, but was likely mimicking other letters that she or her close family members had received, or indeed that she had internalised the conventions of correspondence at this point and was able to be more creative with her writing. The function of these sections of her letters was undoubtedly more important than the exact form her words took. In addition, much like her opening salutation indexed the act of writing correspondence that was being opened, these closing subscriptions also make it explicit that her correspondence is reaching its conclusion through referring to the act of writing. This has the effect of indicating that she is ready to exit the epistolary world, by once again highlighting the practice of letter-writing and then signalling its conclusion.

In these first two sections of the chapter examining the prescriptions and models provided in a sample of sixteenth-century French language letter-writing manuals and letter books, it has become clear that Marie de Nassau followed some prescriptions but not others. In the first section it was shown that her writing tends to diverge from the prescriptions in formal features of typology and structure of her letters, since her writing tends to blur the boundaries between the categorisations provided in the manuals. She tends to follow more of the interactional prescriptions of the manuals, particularly in terms of selecting the terminology and physical layout most appropriate for someone writing to a superior in her social hierarchy. In this second section, Marie demonstrates a similar mix of adherence to some elements of model letters but not others, typically with the form diverging from the models whilst still functioning in a similar manner. This may be due to the fact that the

models used do not include directly comparable examples of daughter-father letters, but the similarities to both son-father and daughter-mother models suggests that the relative social hierarchy was an important factor. Other potential reasons for this lack of strict adherence to the prescriptions could indicate that Marie did not use manuals - at least not the ones surveyed in this study. She may have been more familiar with Germanic language manuals given her geographical location at this time, but she had spent her earlier years in Brussels at a French-speaking court so this seems unlikely, especially since the tradition of letter-writing manuals in languages across Europe was largely based on Classical Latin oratory and so they shared similar prescriptions.

Another possibility is that the manuals and models reflected an idealised image of language usage that was not representative of everyday correspondence in circulation at the time. However, the fact that Marie's own usage does correlate with many of the prescriptions, particularly in terms of interactional and functional elements, suggests that they were representative of common practice but did not contain the full range of expression that was possible. Perhaps the most likely explanation for this partial similarity and partial difference between Marie's letters and the manuals and models is that she learned the art of letter-writing through mimicking examples that she or her other family and household members had sent and received, imitating a convention for her family network which included some prescribed constructions and some novel expression that still functioned conventionally. Indeed, although letter-writing manuals and model letter books were published at this time, it does not mean that they were used routinely by those learning to write letters. There is also the possibility that Marie was inspired by the contents of letters she and her close family received from other family members rather than having recourse to any sort of manual, as evidenced by the few examples of secretary copies of letters that Guillaume himself sent to Marie. For example, he opens his letter of February 1573 with a reference to his last sent letter *'Ma fille, depuis que je vous ay escript ce xiiie jour du mois passe [...] mest icy venue bonne vre lre & une & du xxie'* ('My daughter, since I wrote to you on the 13th day of last month [...] I received your letter and another from the 21st', Guillaume to Marie 1573/02/05). In addition, he signs off his letter to her in August 1574 with *'a dieu je luy supplieray oussy vous donner ma fille de sante heureuse et longue vie escript a Rotterdam le xiiie daougst 1574'* ('to God whom I pray also give you, my daughter, a happy, healthy and long life. Written in Rotterdam on the 14th of August 1574', Guillaume to Marie 1574/08/14), making use of health and Christian-ritual formulae in almost an identical manner to Marie (these types of epistolary formulae are outlined in the following section 4.3). This demonstrates that these types of formulaic sequences were at the very least used in correspondence between Marie and Guillaume, and likely throughout their family network

too. Indeed, in a later letter that her stepmother Louise de Coligny writes to Marie, these opening and closing formulaic sequences are employed, for example:

> *'Mademoiselle ma fille, je ne vous puis dire le contentement extrême que ce me fut, il y a quelques jours, de recevoir de vos lettres pour avoir appris par icelles que vous êtes, grâce à Dieu, en meilleur état que vous n'avez été'*

> ('Mademoiselle my daughter, I cannot tell you the extreme happiness that it gave me a few days ago to receive your letters and to have learned from these that you are, thanks be to God, in better health than you were', Louise de Coligny to Marie 1590/06/02; from Marchegay 1887: 51, my own translation).

In another example she writes *'[je] vous baise humblement et prie Dieu, Mademoiselle ma fille, vous donner heureuse et longue vie.'* ('[I] humbly kiss you and pray that God gives you a happy and long life, my daughter', Louise de Coligny to Marie, 1590/06/02; from Marchegay 1887: 52, my own translation). These few examples show that some of the formulaic sequences that Marie uses were also used by her wider family network, and thus it lends some support to the idea that these were learned through imitation of family letters. It is also possible that by this stage in her life she had developed her own set of preferred utterances that she used when composing her correspondence, some based on family letters and others from elsewhere. Marie obeys many of the conventions associated with the form whilst still incorporating elements of her own style. It must also be mentioned that Marie's particular situation may also have resulted in more divergence from the child-parent models as she was forced to take on additional roles and responsibilities (as will be discussed in more detail in subsection 4.4.1). Whilst the exact form of Marie's utterances may not have directly copied the model letters, she still had a set of stock phrases that she frequently used in her letters to her father, which functioned in the same way - such as her opening greetings which resemble those in the manuals but not precisely. This type of construction using repetitive or formulaic sequences is an integral part of the genre of correspondence, and forms the focus of the third main section of this analysis chapter.

4.3 Epistolary formulaic sequences

Whilst the comparison of letter-writing manuals and model letters to the correspondence of Marie de Nassau is useful for identifying how closely she adhered to the conventions of letter-writing at the time, the examination of common formulaic sequences found in both manuals and Marie's de Nassau's correspondence is a useful task to undertake, since it has the potential to reveal some of the multiple functions and expected effects that these parts of the letters could have. In their study of seventeenth and eighteenth century Dutch language correspondence, Rutten & Van der Wal (2013: 52) outline a schema of epistolary formulae based on those present in their letter corpus. Although their study is based on letters from a

later time period in a different European language, their model likely still applies relatively well to the case of early modern French language correspondence since there was 'a pervasive pan-European tradition of letter writing dating back to the late medieval *ars dictaminis* and the Renaissance rhetorical art of letter writing' (Rutten & Van der Wal 2013: 52, their emphasis). They divide epistolary formulae into three functional categories: text-constitutive, intersubjective, and Christian-ritual. 'Text-constitutive' formulae are crucial to identifying the genre, and can be divided into 'text-type' including features such as salutation, opening sentence, closing formulae, address, date, and signature, as well as 'text-structural' including transitions and conjunctions. 'Intersubjective' formulae facilitate the relational component, i.e. the fact that a letter is written between at least two people, and typically deals with health, greetings, and contact formulae. The 'Christian-ritual' formula includes any invocation of God into the correspondence, most commonly in the form of commendation. Whilst their schema by necessity divides epistolary formulae into these distinct functional categories, in practice formulaic sequences could perform multiple functions at once.

In this section, Marie de Nassau's letters are analysed with reference to each of the functional categories of epistolary formulae in turn, starting with text-constitutive formulae (subsection 4.3.1), through intersubjective formulae (subsection 4.3.2) to Christian-ritual formulae (subsection 4.3.3). There are other utterances which emerge from the texts which do not necessarily fit neatly into this schema but which occur repeatedly in the same section of the text or are repeated multiple times. It will become clear that many of these formulaic sequences have already been briefly addressed earlier in this chapter, highlighting the integral part that formulae played in the genre. Indeed, Rutten & Van der Wal's (2013) functional categories parallel the prescriptions of manuals from earlier in the chapter: the 'text-constitutive' formulae subtypes of 'text-type' and 'text-structural' formulae correspond closely with the prescriptions of 'typology' and 'structure', whilst the 'intersubjective' formula corresponds with the 'interaction' prescription. Some of the models also featured invocations of God, which may link to the 'Christian-ritual' formula. Approaching the manuals and letter corpus from this theoretical schematic standpoint helps to demonstrate which elements of the letter are reproduced formulaic sequences and therefore the extent to which writers were more innovative as they gained more experience with the genre. It also shows how certain formulaic functions could still be uttered in a novel way, and how Marie was able to present a certain image to Guillaume thanks to this.

4.3.1 Text-constitutive formulae

Text-constitutive formulae consist of two main categories: *text-type* and *text-structural*. Text-type formulae include the salutation, opening sentence, closing formulae, address,

date, and signature. Text-structural formulae include transitions and conjunctions, and these can overlap with the text-type formulae. Starting with text-type formulae, the salutation and opening sentence are variable in form but typically limited to a few main themes. The manuals (as outlined in subsection 4.1.3) provided examples of intertextual references such as acknowledging receipt of previous letters, and interpersonal concerns such as passing on commendations. Marie's own letters also echo these references and concerns, with the effect of inserting herself and her reader(s) into the epistolary world. The closing formulae similarly reference intertextual and interpersonal features, such as marking the end of the narrative and informing the recipient(s) of one's health, in both the manuals and Marie's letters, along with invocations of God and passing on commendations.

The closing formulae are then typically followed by the address, date, and signature. In the manuals these are tacked on at the end of the letter, and the relationship between the correspondents is emphasised in the subscription. The 1573 *'Formulaire de lettres morales'* gives many examples in this respect, with young women signing off their letters with sequences like *'Vostre tres-humble fille en toute obedience & reuerence'* ('Your most humble daughter in complete obedience and reverence'), *'Tres-obeissante fille & ancelle à iamais'* (Most obedient daughter and servant forever'), and *'Vostre tres-humble & tres-obeissante fille'* ('Your most humble and most obedient daughter'). The latter of these is particularly reminiscent of the form that Marie uses in her letters to Guillaume, indicating that this part of the letter at least was likely remembered by Marie as a fixed sequence to be recopied as needed. These closing sequences, including Marie's preferred *'Vouster treshumble et tresobeisante fille jusques a la mort'* ('Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death'), have two main effects. Firstly, they highlight the writer's desire (or at least a social obligation to express a desire) to be seen as a humble and obedient servant of the socially-superior recipient, bolstering the 'dutiful daughter' image. Secondly, they are phrased in a way that offers a means of removing oneself from the epistolary world by virtue of switching from first to third person reference. For example, throughout Marie's letters from the salutation to the closing formulae she refers to herself with first person pronouns *'monsr mon bien bon pere'* ('monsieur <u>my</u> beloved father'), *'a moy touiour se bien dauoir part en vouster bonne grace'* ('to <u>me</u> always this boon of having part of your good grace'), yet in the subscription she stops using first person pronouns, instead referring to herself as Guillaume's daughter *'vouster […] fille'* ('<u>your</u> […] daughter'). This switch from the first person reflexive is a feature that is found in the closing sequence of letters in other European languages at around this time, as it indicates a withdrawal from the interaction (Laitinen & Nordlund 2012: 70). The use of predictable formulae along with this change in self-reference is useful for the recipient since 'part of the reason for using them is to signal the discourse structure to the hearer' (Wray 2002: 87), meaning that they can anticipate the

next section of the letter or in this case the fact that it is drawing to a close. Although this may already be evident to the reader as they will see that they are reaching the end of the text, it must be remembered that early modern correspondence was commonly read aloud to the recipient(s) by a letter-bearer and so this structural marker may have played an important role in cases where the message was heard rather than read. The subscription closes with the signature, which Marie places at the bottom right hand side of the page, and which she signs slightly larger than the rest of the text but is clearly in the same hand.

Dates are another important feature of Marie's letters. She adds it to the subscription in all but a couple of her letters, occasionally informs Guillaume of the date she received his letters, and sometimes includes the dates of previous letters she has sent. She uses specific dates to distinguish between two different letters she received, for example two letters she received in December 1573 dated 13 and 22 November. The examples where she mentions dates do not link directly to any specific events, but the delight she expresses at hearing of Guillaume's prosperity suggests that she may have waited longer than usual for this news, or that there were particular topics in those letters that were urgent or pleasing for her to hear. Also given the time-consuming process of writing and sending letters, keeping track of dates could help alleviate the anxieties of not knowing whether a loved one was safe and well due to the long periods of silence between letters received (Chiavetta 2012: 95-96). Given that her father was away on political business during a time of conflict with the Spanish in the Netherlands, this concern would not be unfounded and so using dates may have been important for Marie.

In addition to these expected formulaic sequences, Marie adds other notable features to the subscription which are not present in the manuals yet could be considered to function like text-type formulae. For example, on a number of occasions after the date and location she adds the sequence *'en fort gran hate'* ('in great haste'). This is indicative of a self-reflexive thought about the manner in which she has written the letter, suggesting that she believes it is not up to her father's expected standards for her as his 'dutiful daughter'. The words imply that she was unable to find enough time to devote to composing the letter for whatever reasons, which she sometimes makes explicit, for example by mentioning that the letter-bearer was leaving urgently or that the household was busy entertaining guests. Whilst this may have been the truth on many occasions, Marie could also use it to excuse poor execution by implying that she had to rush it due to an external factor (this has the result of saving face - a concept that is analysed in greater detail in chapter 5). However, this utterance appears in both her shorter and longer-length letters, and looking at the manuscripts there is no obvious deterioration in her handwriting that might be expected if the composition was being rushed, which suggests that this was a turn of phrase she liked to employ to cover all eventualities. Indeed in later letters to her uncle Jean de Nassau, written

in German, she consistently dates and signs off her letter with the similar utterance *'in ser grosser eil'* (Groen van Prinsterer 1839: 297, 303, 310, 330, 424), which roughly translates to 'in great haste', suggesting that this was an utterance that she regularly used in closing her letters.

Marie also regularly adds what might be best termed a 'postscript' to her letters. This is a feature that is not identified in Rutten & Van der Wal's (2013) schema or the manuals examined, but which is arguably a recognisable feature of the correspondence text-type, albeit an optional one. The postscript is formulaic in its presentation, although the content varies. It is separated from the main body of the text and occupies the left hand side of the manuscript so that it does not interfere with the placement of the subscription and signature in the bottom right hand corner, a placement prescribed by the manuals. The placement on the page may indicate that it was added to the letter sometime after the initial composition process, and at the very least after the subscription was written. Indeed, in her letter dated 15 October 1576, the postscript wraps around the subscription and signature, both above and below, indicating that in this instance at least it was added after the letter was finished and signed. The content, whilst not formulaic in nature, is typically an additional note that elaborates on a topic not sufficiently covered in the main body of the text, or in some cases reaffirms something that has been previously stated. However, the postscript is consistently introduced with a formulaic sequence that is seen at the start of the letter – the direct address term *'mons[ieu]r (mon bien bon pere)'* ('Monsieur (my beloved father)'). This similarity to the start of her letters also suggests that some time may have passed between writing the letter initially and adding the postscript, as those words are the first ones she would write when picking up the quill to compose her letters to him. It could also be seen as a text-structuring device, using this address term to attract his attention and signal a change of topic as she does elsewhere in her letters. Therefore, apart from its physical positioning on the page, its brevity, and its introduction with a direct address term, Marie's postscripts are not formulaic sequences in their own right but simply provide additional content that emphasises or clarifies a key point.

The postscript could also be used as the place to pass on commendations from other family members. Indeed, in her letter dated 15 May 1574, Marie passes the quill to her aunt Juliana who adds a postscript in her own hand. This has potential implications for understanding the common practices and timescale of the letter-writing process, at least within Marie's family at this point in time. Throughout her letters to Guillaume, it is suggested that her other siblings and relatives were expected to write to him regularly, but for whatever reasons they are not always able and so it fell to Marie to pass on their regards and apologies to him. The fact that Juliana adds her own postscript to one of Marie's letters also suggests that a great value was placed in receiving letters written in one's own hand, even if

it was just one sentence tacked on to the end of another person's letter. When taken with the idea that she added the postscript some time after the initial writing of the letter, in cases where she passes on commendations from others it may be that initially she thought they would write to him but as time has passed it has become clear they will not have the opportunity to do so, and so she passes on their wishes. Similarly she can use the postscript to update Guillaume on how matters have progressed in the short space of time between initially writing the main letter and writing the postscript. Therefore in letters where she laments that she still has not received the money he has promised her in the body of her text, then seems to reiterate this in the postscript, it may not be an attempt by her to drive home the point that she is running out of funds, but rather that she is doing her best daughterly duty of keeping him up to date with the latest information, added a few days after the main body was written and providing a crucial update just before the letter bearer departed from her household.

Turning the focus to text-structural formulae, certain functional roles emerge from Marie's letters, even if the exact wording differs from those found in manuals. These may be divided into subtypes which perform different but potentially overlapping functions. The functions of text-structural formulae found in manuals include conjunctions *'aussy'*, *'mais'*, *'sur ce'*, and *'comme'* ('also', 'but', 'upon which', and 'likewise' respectively) and the transitions *'ie vous prie que'*, *'apres avoir presenté'*, *'en outre'*, and *'au surplus'* ('I pray you', 'after having presented', 'furthermore', and 'in addition'). These terms, particularly the transitions, read like argumentation and rhetoric rather than personal correspondence, which is hardly surprising given the provenance of letter writing manuals, including the 1521 manual '*Le grant et vray art de pleine rhetorique'*. Marie's text-structural formulae seem to show a little more nuance. She too makes frequent use of conjunctions like *'pareillement'* ('likewise') and *'semblablement'* ('similarly') and transitions such as *'quant a'*, ('as for') and *'pour changer de propos'* ('to change topic'), but there are other structural devices that do not seem to fit these categories. These include responses *'vous me mandes ousy'* ('you also asked me'), affective utterances *'je suis fort aise denstender'* ('I am relieved to hear'), and various epistolary practice references such as *'ce seruirat sete a aulter effect sinon pour vous auertir'* ('this [letter] serves no other purpose than to inform you'), *'vous entenderes par icelle'* ('you will hear by this [letter-bearer]'), *'je nay peus ousy laiser de vous escripre'* ('I cannot leave writing to you [about …]', and *'comme je vous auois escript'* ('like I wrote to you'). As mentioned above, another interesting device Marie uses with text-structuring effect is the address term *'mons[ieu]r'*, which she frequently places at the start of an utterance dealing with a new topic, with the dual effect of marking a transition in the narrative and also drawing Guillaume's attention to a key point (address terms are returned to and considered in relation to facework and politeness theory in chapter 5). These observations of the

text-structural formulae in the manuals and Marie's letters show that the manuals tend to adopt a more argumentative structure, whereas Marie's letters also include affective language and provide structure not only to the narrative within a single letter but also to the narrative that is ongoing in an intertextual chain of correspondence, with responses and multiple references to the process of writing itself. This goes beyond the simple categories of conjunction and transition that are suggested in Rutten & Van der Wal's (2013) schema, demonstrating that text-structural formulae functioned in a more complex way than simple narrative devices.

To summarise the text-constitutive formulae found in Marie's letters, her use of text-type formulae in the opening and closing parts of her letters is relatively consistent with those found in the manuals. Text-type formulae signal the epistolary world, but work in conjunction with text-structural formulae that mark transitional points in the letter. Although her use of text-type formulae shows similarities to the examples in models (such as signing off as a humble and obedient daughter), she also adds her own flourishes to some of these formulae (like indicating that she is writing in great haste) which suggests that the function of her utterances was more important than the exact form, with other considerations like politeness (dealt with in chapter 5) potentially influencing how she could express herself. She shows more variety in her text-structural formulae, since the choice of transitions and conjunctions she uses varies from the examples in the manuals - where the manuals provide these elements for structuring the letter like an argument or piece of rhetorical writing, Marie brings in more interpersonal elements, affective language, and references to the practice of letter-writing itself. In addition, Marie includes a postscript in a number of her letters, which differs from the prescriptions and which are not included in the functional categories of formulaic sequences. Whilst the exact wording of this postscript is not the same, its position within the text and the way it is introduced in a similar manner to the opening sequence of the main body of the text, as well as its role to reiterate or clarify matters already discussed, suggests that it should be considered a formulaic part of the genre. This can be added to Rutten & Van der Wal's schema as an optional text-type formula. This example also highlights that the functional aspect of an utterance is more important than the form it takes, since the specific phrasing changes from one to the next and yet it still follows a pattern. This lends weight to the idea that young women like Marie were not limited to a set of stock utterances that could only be used in circumscribed situations, but could choose a turn of phrase that added some character and variety to their letters whilst still performing the same sort of function.

4.3.2 Intersubjective formulae

The second main category in Rutten & Van der Wal's (2013) schema is intersubjective formulae. These formulaic sequences 'foreground the interactional aspect of the pragmatic situation' (Rutten & Van der Wal 2013: 52) and thus deal with the relationships between correspondents. Based on their study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Dutch letters, Rutten & Van der Wal subdivide this category into *health formulae* which deal with health statements and wishes, *greeting formulae* which are directed towards the addressee or towards a third party via the addressee, and *contact formulae* which express wishes for maintenance of correspondence in the future (Rutten & Van der Wal 2012: 180-181). In this subsection, examples of each of these subcategories are elicited from Marie de Nassau's correspondence, along with additional examples that function in this intersubjective manner but which do not fall distinctly under one of these subcategories. Comparison with select examples from manuals suggest how closely Marie followed conventions but also reveal evidence of the practicalities of sending early modern correspondence.

Health formulae have long been recognised as a feature of early modern correspondence. Davis notes how 'Fifteenth-century letters in English of a formal, respectful kind very often open with a long sequence of conventional phrases' (Davis 1965: 236). He elaborates that these sequences are typically expressed fully in child-parent letters, and include 'an expression of desire to hear of the recipient's welfare', a desire 'for the continuation and increase of this welfare', an expression of the writer's own welfare and a report of their own good health, followed by giving thanks to God, which is collectively termed as the 'health' formula (Davis 1965: 236). Whilst health formulae do not occur in every manual, the few examples include *'Scachez tres-cher Pere, que je me porte bien, & suis en bonne santé graces à Dieu'* ('Know, dearest father, that I am well and in good health thanks to God') and *'Ce scait Dieu le createur lequel je prie vous donner en santé bonne & longue vie'* ('As God the creator knows, whom I pray will give you good health and a long life'), both of which are typically placed in the closing sequence. All of Marie's letters contain some form of health formula, such as *'nous sommes ousy encore en bonne sante dieu mercy lequel je prie de vouloier donner la grace quil pieuse longtamps continuer'* ('we are also still in good health, thanks be to God, whom I pray wishes to grant the grace that it may last a long time'), and *'priant dieu le createur vous donner monsr mon bien bon pere sante heureuse vie et longue auecque accomplicement de tous vous bons desirs'* ('praying God the creator grants you, monsieur my beloved father, a long, happy and healthy life with accomplishment of all your good desires'), also typically falling in the closing lines of her letters and demonstrating close adherence to the prescriptions of the manuals. In addition, she regularly comments on health news received in previous letters, such as *'je suis ousy este fort aise denstender que vous estes encore en bonne sante decoy je remercie dieu'* ('I

was also greatly relieved to hear that you are still in good health, for which I thank God'). The similarity between the wording of examples from manuals and Marie's usage, along with their positioning towards the end of the letter, suggests that this was indeed a formulaic part of the letter-writing process. This is not to say that Marie did not care about her father's health and was merely wishing him good health out of obligation, but convention meant that matters of health were typically placed in a prescribed segment of the letter - even if she did also raise the matter elsewhere in the body of the text. It is also notable that *'sante'* ('health') and *'dieu'* ('God') occur alongside one another in all these utterances, indicating that there was a perceived link between good health and having God's blessing. This suggests that at the level of social practice, health and religious devotion were topics that were intertwined and important to include in correspondence. Indeed, religion was evidently an important matter to many of the Nassau family, who despite having individuals converting between Catholicism and Calvinism for various reasons were still able to reconcile their differences in convictions in order to maintain a functional and unified family dynamic (see Broomhall & Van Gent 2014). The Christian worldview widespread at this time may also explain why the health formula contains thanksgiving to God, since it would be assumed that God was the agent responsible for granting a blessing of health to faithful servants and taking it away from those who did not deserve it - indeed this is hinted at in Marie's words *'il le fault prender en patience et remester le tout enter se mayns car lon ne peut conter sa voulonte'* ('we must be patient and leave it in His [God's] hands because we cannot counter His will', 1574/06/22), where she makes it clear that their fate (in this case waiting to hear about the wellbeing of some family friends who have fallen silent during a conflict) is dependent upon the will of God.

Moving on to intersubjective greeting formulae, these consist of wishes and commendations that are passed on through the letter. These appear with regular frequency in both the manuals and Marie's correspondence, suggesting that this type of formula found in Rutten & Van der Wal's (2013) study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century correspondence was already a key part of the genre in the sixteenth century. In the manuals, examples include those directed at the addressee alone *'Ma tres-honorée Mere, mes treshumbles premises à vostre bonne grace'* ('my most honourable mother, my most humble address to your good grace'), towards the addressee and additional parties *'Tres-cher Pere, mes bien humbles recommandations presentées à vostre bonne graçe, à celle de ma mere, de ma seur Marie, de mes deux freres, & de toute vostre famille.'* ('Dearest father, my most humble commendations presented to your good grace, to that of my mother, of my sister Marie, of my two brothers, and all of your family'), or in other cases the writer acts as the intermediary *'nostre Regente vous salue par moy'* ('our regent greets you through me'). Examples of the first type highlight the bond shared by both participants in the

correspondence, whilst examples of the second and third types bring in additional parties, suggesting a more collaborative approach to letter-writing than one might expect in written communication today. In the majority of cases in the manuals, these intersubjective greeting formulae occur in the opening utterances and are typically directed towards the addressee and third parties. Compared with Marie's letters, a familiar pattern emerges - she follows some prescriptions but also demonstrates more variety than the manuals. Like the models, Marie's letters include many examples of greeting formulae directed at the addressee, but these often occur in the closing utterances - for example the deferential 'kissing of the hands' motif *'a moy touiour se bien de vous besser bien humblement le mains'* ('to me always the boon of humbly kissing your hands'). In contrast to the models, Marie consistently performs the intermediary role passing on commendations to Guillaume more often than directing her greetings to third parties via her addressee. These typically come from close family members *'madame ma gran mere et madame ma tante de nassaw mont commande vous faire leur bien affectueuse recommandacions en vouster bonne grace'* ('madame my grandmother and madame my aunt of Nassau asked me to pass on their affectionate commendations into your good grace'), especially if they found themselves unable to write: *'ma seur se recommande ousy treshumblement en vouster bonne grace et vous supplie de luy vouloir pardoner quelle ne vous escript poient setefois a la premire commodite ne faulderat a faire son deuoir'* ('my sister commends herself most humbly into your good grace and prays that you will forgive her for not writing to you this time, at the first opportunity she will not fail her duty [and write to you]'). On a few occasions she writes on someone else's behalf to gain Guillaume's favour: *'je suys este requis de Jan Vadelfe cannon ny porteur de cete pour vous escripre en sa faueur'* ('I was asked by Jean Vadelfe, canon and bearer of this [letter], to write to you in his favour'). It is interesting to note that she tends to pass on other family commendations towards the end of her letters, but when another person is seeking Guillaume's favour then it is one of the first utterances that she makes. The fact that Marie takes on this intermediary role suggests that she was likely well-connected even at this adolescent stage of her life. It is possible that Marie's unique position of being the eldest daughter of Guillaume's first marriage led her to forging more connections or taking on more duties, and it is likely that she was in a better position than other family members to pass on these messages either directly in her own letters or indirectly via other connections. Other family members would likely also act as intermediaries in different circumstances, depending on the needs at the time. It is possible that acting as an intermediary is something that was expected as part of her daughterly duties due to her socially inferior status, but the lack of daughter-father models makes this difficult to verify. Indeed it is possible that this was something that occurred more frequently in daughter-father letters than daughter-mother or son-parent letters for which there are more models. These intersubjective greeting formulae

form a crucial part of Marie's letters, highlighting that at least during this stage in her life it formed part of her daughterly duties to maintain these important connections through her correspondence.

The third category of intersubjective contact formulae deals with expressing the wish that the relationship between correspondents shall be maintained either by future visits or further correspondence. The request for further correspondence offers the opportunity to continue their relationship within the epistolary world at some future date, overlapping with the prescription of interaction as seen in the model letters (section 4.2) and text-constitutive formulae (subsection 4.3.1). The manuals contain very few examples of this type, the closest match being *'Par ce supplie vostre bonté maternelle plaise me faire aduertir par le porteur de ceste […] de vostre estat, et par le mesme m'enuoyer vne couple d'escus […]'* ('by this I pray your maternal goodwill shall be pleased to advise me by the bearer of this […] of your health, and by the same to send me a couple of écus […]'), which more precisely deals with sending money (écus) than sending letters, and only hints at a desire for a reply. The model letters show acknowledgement of receipt rather than requesting further contact. This suggests that replies were simply expected by virtue of the genre without needing to be explicitly requested, or that it was potentially seen as poor form to explicitly ask for a response when writing to a social superior, at least in the prescribed situations of the models. In contrast, Marie regularly encourages Guillaume for a response with utterances like *'nous tertous nous sommes encore en bonne sante dieu mercy esperant denstender le mesme de vous ce que de tout mon ceur je desire car nay eu en longtamps ce bien dauoir de vous nouuelles sy esse que je espere que nous en arons bien to'* ('all of us are still in good health, thanks be to God, hoping to hear the same of you, which I desire with all my heart because I have not had this goodness of having news from you for a long time and I hope that we will have some soon'), if only to hear of his good health and no more. Marie also makes intertextual references and wishes for future contact in different forms, including making it known that the letter bearer has additional spoken elements to the letter *'comme le dict mesagir vous dirat bien'* ('as the said messenger will surely tell you'), referring to previous letters sent *'comme vous auoys faict mention en ma letter du […]'* ('since I mentioned to you in my letter of […]'), previous letters received, such as *'jay rechu vouster letter quil vous a pleut mescripre'* ('I received your letter which it pleased you to write me') and *'jentens par vouster letter que'* ('I hear from your letter that'), or received news recounted by bearers *'je suis ousy fort rejouwy denstender par se porteur vouster bonne sante'* ('I was also so happy to hear by this letter bearer of your good health'). These intersubjective contact formulae help to contextualise her letters in relation to other texts that had been sent and received at the time of composition, for it could not be guaranteed that every letter arrived in the right order or even at all, but also give insight into the complex

practicalities of early modern letter-writing containing a mix of spoken and written elements conveyed by letter bearers. It is also notable that Marie raises the topic of health when she uses contact formulae, demonstrating that despite this being an expected formulaic topic it was also a key reason for her to maintain correspondence with her father during this period in their lives, showing that she expected to send and receive news of hers and others' health with some degree of frequency. The intersubjective contact formula is where there is the greatest contrast between the letter-writing manuals, which contain hardly any examples of this type, and Marie's letters, where she consistently asks for replies and opens up the opportunity to maintain the chain of correspondence. This discrepancy could be an artefact of the lack of direct daughter-father models to use for comparison, but could be indicative that she considered regular communication to be particularly important at this stage in their lives, a time when Guillaume was in conflict with the Spanish in the Netherlands, and so she wanted to reiterate her desire for future contact to be made known of his circumstances and health.

In addition to the subcategories of health, greetings and contact formulae from Rutten & Van der Wal's (2013) study, it is possible that additional subcategories of intersubjective formulae may have also been present in earlier letters which were not as prevalent in the letters they studied. This is perhaps due to the sixteenth century marking a transition period from the tradition of letters as rhetoric to what would more closely resemble personal correspondence as we recognise it today. Some examples of these are evident in Marie's letters as utterances that she repeats in predictable ways but which cannot be said to fit easily with 'health', 'greetings' or 'contact'. These include markers of deference and servitude, like *'je vous supplie bien humblement'* ('I pray you most humbly'), and *'a vous render heumble seruise'* ('to render you humble service'). These two may have been specific to daughter-father letters, as they reinforce an image of the humble and obedient daughter, the former functioning to help secure an action from her father when making a request, and the latter promising her own future action of serving her father. There are also repeated utterances where Marie downplays her own desire for a response, such as *'vous aues tant des aulter affaires et rompement de teste que nares le tamps de me pouuoir recripre'* ('you have such other affairs and worries that you do not have the time to be able to reply to me'), which are not always worded in the same way but which function to bolster the existing status of their relationship, by highlighting Marie's deference towards Guillaume as her social superior. There is perhaps scope to add a fourth subcategory of intersubjective formula based on this observation, named 'status' or 'relationship' as these type of utterances foreground the relative status and therefore relationship that the correspondents have or aspire to have. This additional subcategory merits discussion since it encompasses examples that codify the relational structure between participants in interaction in a way that

differs from the selection of the appropriate subscription for the addressee as seen above (subsection 4.3.1), which in turn highlights that these categories of formulae overlap rather than being mutually exclusive.

To summarise, the comparison of sixteenth-century letter-writing models and Marie de Nassau's correspondence through the lens of intersubjective formulae shows a relative degree of adherence to conventions but also some divergence. Her use of health formulae occurs in prescribed places in her letters but she also raises the topic in other places, showing that this was not simply a matter of conventionality. Marie uses greeting formulae in a similar manner to those found in the manuals, but she also uses them in the closing sequence of her letters. She adopts an intermediary role more than the manuals would predict, suggesting that it was important for her to remain connected to her father and others, which in turn indicates that she played an active role in the wider social circle and took on some extra responsibilities as eldest daughter whilst Guillaume remained unmarried. Similarly with the contact formulae, Marie produces utterances that conform with the models but she goes beyond simply acknowledging receipt of Guillaume's letters and asks for replies more frequently than such examples appear in the models. This shows a desire to remain in contact, reinforces that her concern for news of her father's health was not simply out of obligation to the form of the genre, and additionally helps to place her letters within a chain of communication that could have arrived late or in the wrong order due to the practicalities of sending early modern letters. In addition, it was noted that other examples of repeated utterances could be considered as a fourth subcategory of intersubjective formulae, ones which function to highlight the status differences and equalities in the relationship between the participants.

4.3.3 Christian-ritual formulae

The third main category of epistolary formulae identified in Rutten & Van der Wal's (2013) schema is the *Christian-ritual formula*. This is a smaller category than the previous two, dealing with any invocation of the divine into the epistolary world. In the model letters these typically occur near the start and end of the letter and can be grouped into thanksgiving *'graces à Dieu'* ('thanks to God'), obedience *'pour obeyr à Diev & à vous'* ('to obey God and you'), commendation into His care *'vous recommander à la grace de Dieu'* ('to commend you into God's grace'), acknowledging His omniscience *'ce scait Dieu le createur'* ('as God the creator knows'), and performative prayer *'prieray Dieu vous octroyer en son Eternelle faueur'* ('I pray God admits you into His eternal favour'). Combinations of these types of Christian-ritual formulae from the model letters are also found in Marie's letters. She frequently concludes her letters with a combined performative prayer and commendation of the addressee into God's care, such as *'priant dieu le createur vous donner monsr mon bien*

bon pere sante heureuse vie et longue auecque accomplicement de tous vous bons desirs' ('praying God the creator grants you, monsieur my beloved father, a long, happy and healthy life with accomplishment of all your good desires'). A similar version of this can appear in the body of the letter *'[…] dester auerty de vouster bonne prosperite et prie a ce bon dieu de vous y vouloier longtamps maintenir'* ('[…] to be advised of your good prosperity and [I] pray to this good God to wish to keep you this way for a long time'), and can also be directed towards a third party *'jespere que dieu laiderat hors de mayns de ces enemis'* ('I hope that God will help [him] from the hands of these enemies'). She also gives thanks *'je remercie dieu'* ('I thank God'), and performative prayers like *'je prie a dieu'* ('I pray to God') or *'louer se bon dieu'* ('praise this good God') throughout her letters using similar terms to the manuals, but additionally expresses hope for His blessing which could also be considered recognition of His omnipotence, for example *'jespere auecque la grace de dieu'* ('I hope that with the grace of God') and *'remester enter le mains de dieu'* ('place it back in the hands of God'), resulting in these utterances functioning as intercessory prayers calling on God to intercede in the matter at hand.

By bringing the divine into her everyday personal correspondence, Marie acknowledges her blessings and shows humility in accepting the hand that she has been dealt. She calls upon God to ensure that these blessings persist, but concedes that this will only happen if it is His will. The inclusion of this divine element also bolsters Marie's self-image as a dutiful daughter, not only fulfilling her material duties to her father but also the spiritual duties she owes to her Heavenly Father as well. The use of formulaic prayers are of particular interest since they have a performative quality, that is they function as both an utterance describing her prayer and the action of praying itself (this performative nature is discussed in the speech acts analysis chapter subsection 6.1.2). It is important that she uses these performative prayers in her letters to Guillaume so that he is aware she is fulfilling her Christian daughterly duties by asking God to intercede in their lives. It is also interesting that the Christian-ritual formulae co-occur with intersubjective health formulae, as noted above, since it suggests that the two matters were conceptually linked. That is to say that Marie (and others at this time) would have likely attributed her good fortune in matters of health to being blessed by God, which highlights the prominent role that religion played on her (and others') mind in daily life. When comparing the form of Marie's Christian-ritual formulae to those found in the manuals, there is a relatively close resemblance, more so than for the preceding categories but still with some variety in the specific wording. This resemblance between the manual prescriptions and Marie's actual usage demonstrates that this type of formulaic sequence was likely considered an important feature of the genre at this time, especially given that they occur frequently throughout.

4.4 Discussion

In this final section of the chapter, a few additional comparisons and observations are made. Firstly, it is beneficial to include an additional point of comparison between Marie's correspondence and some other model letters, since it has become evident from this analysis alone that she performs more duties than simply that of the 'dutiful daughter'. This additional point of comparison deals with the additional roles and responsibilities that she adopted at this point in time (subsection 4.4.1), followed by concluding remarks that reflect on what has been addressed in relation to the core research questions and early modern French-language correspondence (subsection 4.4.2).

4.4.1 Additional roles and responsibilities

Whilst Marie signed off letters to her father with *'vouster treshumble et tresobeysante fille'* ('your most humble and most obedient daughter') or similar variations, it has become clear that she was performing more roles than simply that of the 'dutiful daughter', at least during this stage of her life. Indeed, the fact that these letters were composed in the first place suggests that there was a particular set of circumstances that meant Marie needed to correspond with her father regularly during this time period. Around half the letters were written in 1573 and 1574, a time when Guillaume was busy fighting the Spanish in the Netherlands, notably unsuccessfully defending the town of Haarlem throughout 1573 (Harrison 1907: 137; Wedgwood 1944: 133). During this time Guillaume remained unmarried, his first wife Anne d'Egmont having passed away and his second marriage to Anne de Saxe being annulled, until his marriage to Charlotte de Bourbon (Montpensier) in June 1575. As the eldest surviving daughter, with her elder brother out of the picture as a prisoner of war in Spain, and with no other maternal figure at the head of this branch of the family, it is likely that much of the management of the household, which would have conventionally passed to the wife of the head of the family, fell to Marie in her father's absence. As such, it can be argued that in addition to her daughterly role, Marie also performed some of the duties of a wife or mother figure during this time period.

There is good reason to believe that Marie took on the responsibilities that typically fell to wives or mothers during this stage in her life. Firstly, this conforms to the common model of early modern women's lives as a linear progression through the three stages of 'daughter-wife-widow' (as previously outlined in chapter 2). However, rather than switching from one role to the next at the point of marriage or widowing, it is much more likely that early modern young women transitioned through each stage in a more gradual way. It is also likely that children and adolescents were socialised into their adult roles through shadowing or mimicking their parents or other senior figures at earlier stages in their lives (Pollock 1989: 237), and in the case of young women this would allow them to gain practical experience of

managing a household in preparation for their future married lives where they would be expected to do so in their husband's absence. In Marie's case, where it is known that she was living with her grandmother and aunt at this stage in her life, it seems likely that her particular life circumstances provided her with the perfect opportunity to practise performing her future 'wifely' role. Additionally, this may even be interpreted as part of her daughterly duty since there was no other maternal figure to take on these responsibilities at the time, and as the most senior woman in the hierarchy of that particular branch of the family at this point it would have likely become expected of her - albeit with the probable assistance of her elder female relatives.

Evidence that Marie adopted this wifely role in addition to her daughterly duties can be found when making comparisons with contemporaneous manuals and formularies. There are two good examples in the models, one from the 1553 manual and the other from the 1571 manual. The first is a model letter from wife to husband. Unusually, it does not open with any address terms, but this particular letter-writing manual includes a list of the appropriate opening salutations depending upon relationship in the first few pages of the formulary, so it may be that these were assumed unnecessary to include in every model letter. Instead this opens with the first topic of the letter: *'Depuis que vous partistes, Dieu scait en quantes pensées ay vescu & certes en toutes mes tribulations pour vostre absence nulle peine ie sens plus grande qu'en vn an entier a grande peine receuoir deux seules briefues lettres.'* ('Since you left, God knows how many thoughts I have endured and certainly in all my worries in your absence [there is] no pain I feel greater than to have hardly received only two brief letters [from you] in an entire year', *Stile et maniere* 1553: 174). This example is followed by some potential explanations for why it may be the case that her husband has not written to her, suggesting that he is busy and that is understandable, which saves her own face having just made a complaint (see chapter 5 for more on face work). This is very similar to some utterances that Marie produces, for example *'je suys fort desirante de auoir eung petit mot de letter vennant de vous mains car de longtamps nay eu se bien den auoir'* ('I greatly desire to have just one small word of a letter coming from your hand since it has been such a long time since I have had the pleasure', 1573/10/15). This similarity suggests that there was an expectation for regular correspondence between husband and wife (or indeed wifely figurehead in Marie's case) and that a degree of criticism was tolerated in the case where the husband did not send enough letters in his absence. In this example the wife also passes on brief news from other family members, notably their children, and in a similar manner Marie regularly informs her father of wider family news including that of her siblings. This short model letter concludes with a request for the husband's presence: *'do[n]cques vous supply & requiers vo[us] vouloir d'icy approcher, car nous auons grand besoing de vous & non de deniers: ou en grand desir nous vous*

attendons.' ('so I pray you and request that you wish to approach her, since we have great need of you and not money; where in great desire we await you', *Stile et maniere* 1553: 175). This shows similarities and differences to Marie's letters to her father - where the model states that they do not care about money but would prefer a visit from the husband himself, Marie regularly updates her father on the lack of money: *'Monsr mon bien bon pere touchant de ce docteur et ses aulters marchans ~~de~~ qui me deuerinte liuerer cet argent comme maues escript aultrefois je nen ay encore nulle nouuelles'* ('Monsieur my most beloved father, concerning this doctor and other merchants who should be bringing me this money like you have written to [tell] me [about] before, I have not yet had any news', 1573/10/15). She does also express a desire to see him in person: *'je voulderoys auoir se bien de vous pouuoir voir et ester aupres de vous'* ('I would like to have the boon of being able to see you and be near to you', 1574/05/15). These similar features between the wife-husband model letter and Marie's letters to her father suggest that she was able to adopt some of the responsibilities that would typically fall to the wife instead of the daughter - notably her concern for financial matters suggesting that she was responsible for maintaining the household in this regard.

The second model letter (Habert 1571) is an example from a wife writing to her husband to give him her disapproving opinion on his recent actions. It opens with the address term *'Monsieur'* much like Marie does in most of her letters, followed by *'ie vous prie ne trouuer estrange, si moy qui ne suis qu'vne femme, ose m'enhardir de conseiller vn sage & prudent homme tel que vous'* ('I pray that you do not find it strange, that I who am only a wife, dare to have the courage to advise a wise and prudent man such as yourself', Habert 1571: 28) before continuing to state that she only mentions this out of love for him and that his wellbeing is of her utmost concern. This line shows similarities to Marie's use of the verb *'prier'* acting as a transition into a request whilst also demonstrating her own deference (which incidentally functions as a form of politeness, with similar examples examined in chapter 6). This construction parallels one that Marie uses, such as *'je vous prie de me pardonner que je vous inportune tant mais le grant desir que jay touiour dauoier de vous nouelles me contraynt de ce faire'* ('I pray that you excuse me if I inconvenience you so, but the great desire that I always have to receive news from you compels me to do so', 1574/01/21), where she makes a request, excuses herself which has the effect of highlighting their status differential, before supplying a reason why she must make her request. In a similar example, the model letter states *'Et pour ce, Monsieur, ie vous supply de quitter la partie'* ('And for this, Monsieur, I pray that you withdraw from the group', Habert 1571: 29), offering the wife's advice to her husband that withdrawing from the situation may be the best course of action, which can be offered through the use of *'supplier'* again suggesting a level of deference like the verb *'prier'* in the previous example, and the

punctuative use of *'Monsieur'* which draws the attention of the husband to this important point, a technique that Marie also uses (a feature which is discussed in more detail in chapter 5). One final key similarity between this model letter and Marie's is the closing sequence or subscription *'Ie supply Ie Createur vous donner, Monsieur, tres-heureuse & longue vie'* ('I pray the Creator grant you, Monsieur, a very happy and long life', Habert 1571: 30). In most of Marie's letters, there is a variation on this construction, for example *'priant dieu le createur vous donner monsr mon bien ayme pere sante heureuse vie et longue auecque accomplicement de tous vous bons desirs'* ('praying that God the Creator grants you, Monsieur my most beloved father, a long, happy and healthy life, with accomplishment of all your best wishes', 1573/12/05) before elaborating further that she wishes to stay in his good grace. Although this is not an exact replication of the model letter, the key functions remain intact and the form is at least similar. The similarities with examples from this model letter support the idea that Marie adopted some elements of the wifely role at this point in her life.

The presence of a few key similarities between the model letters from wives to husbands and the language found in Marie's letters to her father at this particular juncture in their lives raises some interesting discussion points. Firstly, the similarities in form and function of some of the utterances suggest that Marie did indeed adopt some of the responsibilities that would conventionally have fallen to the wife or matriarchal figure in the patriarch's absence from the household - passing on news and wishes from other family members, giving advice on current affairs, managing household staff and finances, and requesting his presence or at least more frequent updates. The addition of wife-husband model letters to this analysis also raises questions about the lack of daughter-father models. The existence of models for almost every other conceivable family relationship implies that daughters were not expected to write to their fathers, and yet clearly some of them did. This in turn implies that daughters were in fact expected to correspond with their fathers when they were separated geographically, but for whatever reason models were not available for this purpose. It is possible that daughter-father models did exist but that there are no surviving examples in the formularies that are available today. Conversely, the lack of models implies that daughters were not expected to write to their fathers in their absence, yet examples of these letters do exist (for example Daybell 2006: 176-179). This lends some credence to the idea that daughters were socialised into their adult roles through shadowing their female elders as they managed the household, which may well have included mimicry of examples of wife-husband correspondence which they would be expected to write in later life. It may well be the case that Marie found herself in a unique set of circumstances that led her to taking on the responsibilities that closely resembled that which a wife or mother would take on, in addition to her usual daughterly role. She demonstrates responsibility for household staff,

some financial and administrative duties, provides for her siblings, comments on her father's political engagements, and acts as an intermediary between her father and others, all of which correspond more closely with the roles of adult married women.

4.4.2 Concluding remarks

To return focus to the core research questions addressed in this chapter, a few answers have already become clear. With reference to RQ1, the analysis of manuals and formulae has helped to determine the importance of prescribed conventions in Marie's correspondence with her father. The analysis has shown that whilst Marie often made utterances that functioned in the expected manner of particular formulaic sequences, their form was not necessarily fixed to the exact prescriptions found in model letters. This combined with the lack of specific examples of daughter-father model letters suggests that it was unusual for letters to be sent between people in this relationship, which in turn highlights the importance of studying these types of examples when they do appear. The lack of clear models to imitate coupled with the similarities to the examples of child-parent and wife-husband models suggests that whilst there may have been prescribed conventions for daughters to follow when writing correspondence to their fathers, there may have been a few possible reasons for this lack of models. This includes the possibility that it was rare for daughters to need to write to their fathers, as other family members would be expected to do so on their behalf; that daughters were expected to write to their fathers but the models were followed through imitation of other family letters and so models were deemed unnecessary; or perhaps the most likely that daughters were expected to write to their fathers but only in certain circumstances. The lack of distinct models for daughter-father letters also explains and allows for the types of merging that appears in Marie's correspondence, since she uses forms that are typical of daughter-mother or son-father letters but additionally produces utterances that are similar to wife-husband model letters and indicative of the mixed social roles that she must have been playing at this point in her life.

When addressing RQ2, the analysis of contemporaneous letter-writing manuals and formulaic sequences in relation to Marie's correspondence has revealed a little about the dynamics of the father-daughter relationship, and about the pragmatic functions of the formulaic sequences she used. The analysis of formal features prescribed in the letter-writing manuals highlighted that Marie did not strictly adhere to these conventions - instead of writing distinct types of letters and following a strict sequence of sections, she often merged personal and informational messages into one missive, dealing with multiple topics and blending her petitions into the narrative body of her letters. Despite not conforming strictly to the formal features of early modern correspondence, Marie did typically include all these features at some point in her letters, showing that pragmatically they

functioned in an expected manner even if the exact composition was not completely conventional. This may be explained by the foundation of letter-writing manuals in Classical rhetoric and argumentation rather than personal correspondence. There is also a little to be said about the dynamics of daughter-father relationships through correspondence, primarily that the key elements of child-parent letters more generally present but that Marie also seemed to have additional responsibilities evident in the language of her letters, which can only be inferred from the manuals due to the lack of daughter-father models. This research question will be more directly addressed by the following two chapters on politeness (chapter 5) and speech acts (chapter 6), due to their focus on utterances that foreground the relationship between correspondents.

The lack of daughter-father model letters also feeds into the exploration of RQ3, since there is no clear model for the 'dutiful daughter' within the manuals, however the comparison with wife-husband model letters provides some evidence for the idea that part of this 'daughterly duty' role involved taking on additional responsibilities for the family as and when required. However, this must also be mentioned in conjunction with the fact that Marie found herself in a particular set of circumstances at this time which could have contributed to her taking on these additional responsibilities: she was Guillaume's eldest living daughter, her elder brother was out of the picture being held by the Spanish as a prisoner of war, there was no other clear maternal figure within Guillaume's branch of the Orange family to take on these duties, and Guillaume himself was away from the family estate on wartime business. These factors likely all contributed to Marie being the ideal choice to take on the household responsibilities in the absence of her father. Although this set of circumstances was specific to Marie during this time period, and likely a motivating factor in why she chose or was obliged to correspond directly with her father, it is unlikely that this was an isolated event. Early modern young women would have been expected to manage their husbands' affairs in their absence from the household in adult married life, and so young women would have been socialised into these roles through shadowing, imitating, or being instructed by their female elders. Therefore rather than being an isolated example, it is likely that Marie's correspondence with her father demonstrates the complex and multiple roles that early modern young women had to adopt during their formative and early adult years, dependent upon their relative status within their family hierarchy and where centres of power lay.

In addition to the research questions, it is also important to note that the analysis has also been useful in evaluating the pragmatic model of formulae that Rutten & Van der Wal (2013) used and relatedly Wray's (2002) conception of formulaic sequences. For the most part their models can be said to have applied to Marie's French language correspondence even though they were based upon more recent texts in other languages. This helps to confirm that the principles may have applied somewhat universally to the genre, but the evidence

from Marie's correspondence also highlighted that an utterance does not always have to be expressed in a strict conventional manner in order to function in the same way as a particular formulaic sequence. In addition, Rutten & van der Wal's (2013) model would benefit from the addition of some optional formulaic sequences which do not appear in every letter but which do follow a formulaic structure when they are included in a letter - most notably the 'postscript' which followed a conventional pattern in Marie's correspondence and is undoubtedly a well-recognised structural feature of letters more generally.

To summarise, in this analysis some of the key formal features of early modern French language correspondence have been explored. It has been noted that whilst Marie de Nassau typically adhered to these conventions of form, she often blurred the boundaries between different types of letter and did not always use the exact forms that would be expected, even though her utterances did perform the same functions as these more formulaic sequences found in letter-writing manuals. This blurring of boundaries is likely to have been due both to the fact that there was little in the way of formal models for daughter-father correspondence, but also due to the fact that Marie herself was performing multiple roles as part of her branch of the Orange family. As part of her duty as Guillaume's eldest daughter, and whilst he remained unmarried and absent from the family estate, Marie appears to have adopted a number of responsibilities that would have fallen to the wife or matriarch. This is partly reflected in the language she uses in her correspondence as well as the types of subject matter she raises, which reflects the content found in model letters not only for child-parent letters (son-father, daughter-mother, son-mother) but also wife-husband models. Whilst it has been useful to explore these conventions and expectations of early modern young women's correspondence through the examination of letter-writing manuals, model letters and the use of formulaic sequences, there is still more to uncover regarding the more interactional aspects of this correspondence and by extension the nature of early modern daughter-father relationships as managed through this medium. The following two analysis chapters explore this interactional element more deeply, starting with politeness theory and face work (chapter 5) and continuing with speech act theory (chapter 6).

5. Politeness

Politeness theory is a key concept in studies of pragmatics. Alongside other pragmatic elements like speech act theory (which is explored thoroughly in the following analysis chapter), it can foreground some of the interactional and relational aspects of language and uncover additional layers of social meaning not immediately obvious from the text. At its core, politeness theory helps uncover 'the social dynamics of human interaction', with particular attention to how certain aspects of participants' identities, feelings and self-image can be enhanced, aggravated, manipulated and negotiated during the course of their interactions (Kádár & Culpeper 2010: 9). As an inherently relational concept, concerning the procedures and behaviours that are employed by participants as a means of managing their relationship (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2011: 134), the analysis of politeness strategies found in language can help elicit the underlying social dynamics and behaviours of the participants. As a result, the analysis of texts through the lens of politeness theory can be indicative of expected conventions of behaviour among participants or a community of practice, as well as revealing the relative hierarchies and power dynamics within participants' relationships, and shows how they may use their language and in particular their politeness strategies to maintain or upset the balance of power. Whilst politeness theory is often studied in relation to contemporary spoken interactions, it can also be applied to historical written texts that have an interactional nature, such as the correspondence sent from Marie de Nassau to her father. In this chapter, the core basis of politeness theory is outlined (section 5.1), including key concepts like facework, face-threatening acts, and politeness strategies that form the theoretical grounding for the analysis. This is followed by a detailed analysis of some of the face-threatening acts and politeness strategies that are found in Marie's correspondence (section 5.2), which culminates in a fine-grained analysis of her use of address terms. Following on from this, the key patterns emerging from her letters are discussed at length (section 5.3).

5.1 Politeness Theory

In order to conduct the analysis, first the theoretical background must be outlined. In general terms, 'politeness' relates to ideas of good manners, but specifically as a concept in pragmatics it relates to the seemingly universal phenomenon of human interaction that consists of linguistic strategies that aim to maintain harmony or at least stability in interpersonal relationships (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2002: 1). This pragmatic theory relies on another notion called 'face', which in essence is a person's public self-image that can be threatened under certain circumstances. These key concepts, including a brief outline of the predominant theory of politeness based primarily upon Brown and Levinson's (1987 [1978])

work, dealing with face threatening acts and politeness strategies, are outlined first (subsection 5.1.1), followed by some evaluation of the key strengths and notable criticisms of this theoretical model (subsection 5.1.2). Although this theory forms the basis of the analysis, a few additions are made, notably the ideas of self-politeness (Chen 2001) and politeness as a continuum (Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 1995), so those are also outlined briefly here. This is followed by a brief delimitation of aspects of politeness that will not be analysed but must be acknowledged (subsection 5.1.3). This section of the chapter then concludes with an outline of the specific case study of address terms and how they are valuable in politeness research like the current study (subsection 5.1.4).

5.1.1 Key concepts

There are two main orders of definition of 'politeness': *first order* politeness has the general sense of 'good manners', whereas *second order* politeness refers to the theoretical concept used in pragmatic analysis. First order politeness therefore has a 'fuzzy and slippery' definition (Jucker 2012: 423), often encompassing ideas of good manners and social convention in everyday expression. Whilst second order politeness also deals with these sorts of expected behaviours, it is a concept that is constructed within a theoretical framework (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2006: 82), and therefore it is necessarily more precise in its definition in order that it remains useful as an analytical tool (Jucker 2012: 423). More precisely, second order politeness relates to the ways in which a particular utterance can influence a person's 'face', and the strategies used to threaten or flatter someone's 'face wants', resulting in 'face-work' being required.

This 'face-work' arises from Goffman's (1967) notion of 'face'. Face is thought to be 'one of the central factors governing the pragmatic choice in general' (Nevala 2010: 170), and it is argued that the structure of interactions is largely determined by considerations of face and the need to perform face-work in order to preserve interactional harmony (Alberdi Urquizu 2007-08: 16). Goffman describes face as 'the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular context' (Goffman 1967 [2003]: 7). In other words, 'face' can be thought of as a person's public self-image as presented through their words and behaviours. Brown & Levinson (1987 [1978]) divide this in two: 'negative face' values territory and personal independence of action, whereas 'positive face' values interpersonal connection with others (Brown & Levinson 1987: 61; Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 544). This duality also implies two related yet opposing 'face-wants': 'the desire to be unimpeded in one's actions (negative face), and the desire to be approved of (positive face)' (Kádár & Haugh 2013: 18). During the course of an interaction, written or spoken, these face-wants are appealed to or impinged upon as different desires are expressed. Since 'the majority of acts that we have to

accomplish daily are potentially "threatening" for the other's [negative or positive face]' (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2011: 134), participants routinely run the risk of committing a 'face threatening act' (or 'FTA') towards their interlocutor's, or even their own, face.

A particular utterance can be classed as a face threatening act by imposing upon the interlocutor's freedom of action and independence, thus threatening negative face, or conversely by demonstrating a lack of cooperation and empathy with the interlocutor, thus threatening positive face; in addition the utterance has the potential to threaten the face of the person who produces it, by conceding some power or autonomy to the interlocutor they threaten their own negative face, and by claiming a greater stake in the relationship or ownership over the other person they threaten their own positive face (Brown & Levinson 1987: 65-68; Chen's (2001) model of 'self-politeness' is outlined below). This theory highlights the vulnerability of face, and so it is assumed that participants will generally try to cooperate in maintaining each other's face, in order for functional relationships and successful communication to continue (Brown & Levinson 1987: 61). Some examples of the types of utterance that are commonly considered to be FTAs include: putting pressure on the interlocutor to perform a future action (threatens negative face), expressing disapproval of their actions (threatens positive face), giving excuses for one's own actions (threatens self-negative face), and apologising (threatens self-positive face) (see Appendix 6 for a full list of these 'intrinsic FTAs').

In order to maintain the other person's face, someone producing a FTA has recourse to various politeness strategies that aim to mitigate the potential damaging effects, in other words to redress or 'save' face. Brown & Levinson list five super-strategies for producing a FTA: 'bald on record', where the participant utters the FTA without any redress to save face (such as the imperatives 'watch out!' or 'sit down'); 'positive politeness', where they utter the FTA with redressive action towards positive face threats; 'negative politeness', where they utter the FTA with redressive action towards negative face threats; 'off-record', where they utter the FTA without redressive action, but the threat is masked through indirectness; or finally 'withhold the FTA', or avoiding uttering the FTA altogether (Brown & Levinson 1987: 68-71). In order to decide which strategy to take, the person making the FTA must consider the benefits to the situation and their own face relative to the severity of the threat posed to their interlocutor's face, and therefore how it may tip the balance of power in the relationship. Since these politeness strategies are simultaneously self-oriented and other-oriented, they can be considered useful tools for negotiation (Bax 2010: 67), and the results of that negotiation can be inferred by the researcher through analysis of the politeness strategies used. Brown & Levinson number their strategies according to the relative 'weightiness' of the face threat they attempt to redress, based on the participants' own knowledge of the social distance between them, their relative power differentials, and the relative imposition a

particular utterance can cause in their own situation (Brown & Levinson 1987: 74-76). In general, a higher numbered strategy would redress a greater face threat (Brown & Levinson 1987: 83). For the purposes of this analysis, the types of politeness strategies being used are of more interest than their relative 'weightiness', but it is still useful to use their numeration to help identify specific strategies - for example positive politeness strategy 4 'Use in-group identity markers', or negative politeness strategy 5 'Give deference' (a full numerated list of these strategies is also included in Appendix 6).

Face threats can also be self-oriented, that is to say directed towards the person producing the utterance. Brown & Levinson (1987: 67-68) outline some 'intrinsic' FTAs that orient to the speaker's own face. Negative self-FTAs include expressing thanks and making excuses, as they imply a lack of independence of action, opposing their face want for autonomy. Positive self-FTAs include apologies, self-contradiction, or admitting responsibility, which highlight the speaker's shortcomings as a member of the social group, threatening their face want for group membership. Although mentioned by Brown & Levinson, they offer little in the way of self-politeness strategies for redressing FTAs directed at one's own face (Chen 2001: 91). As such, Chen (2001: 99-100) proposes that this 'self-politeness' should also be considered because the face of the person producing an utterance is equally as vulnerable to change during the course of an interaction as the face of the intended recipient (Chen 2001: 89). Chen suggests four super-strategies for producing Self-Face Threatening Acts (SFTAs), which directly parallel Brown & Levinson's (1987) model of politeness strategies, except for merging positive and negative politeness into one 'with redress' category, and which come into play when 'the need to protect and enhance one's own face influences what one says and the way she says it' (Chen 2001: 88). These 'self-politeness' super-strategies for producing a SFTA are: 'baldly', when the risk of self-face loss is minimal; 'with redress', including specific strategies such as justification, contradiction, humour, modesty, and attaching conditions; 'off-record', which may involve indirectness, implication, or withholding certain information to mitigate the threat, by violating maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner; and 'withhold the SFTA', often through careful use of silence which usually has the effect of making it obvious that a SFTA has been avoided (see Chen 2001: 98-103). Therefore, when analysing face threats and politeness strategies it is important to remember that specific utterances can threaten the face of both the other and the self, and equally that certain politeness strategies may be used to redress those threats. Chen also numbers self-politeness strategies in a similar manner to Brown & Levinson, such as self-politeness (with redress) strategy 1 'justify', and so this numeration will also be used for specificity in the current analysis (a full list is also included in Appendix 6). However, it must be noted that although both of these systems prescribe a fixed number of strategies, it

is possible that other strategies may exist or that their relative politeness value and interpretation may differ in different situations.

Whilst Brown & Levinson's politeness theory implies a binary distinction between positive and negative politeness or face threats, scholars such as Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg have highlighted the utility of conceptualising politeness and face threats on a continuum between negative and positive. Since many interactions will likely contain a mix of positive, negative, and off-record politeness strategies, the relative politeness 'value' of a given utterance will likely fall somewhere in between the two extremes. By conceptualising politeness strategies and face threats on this 'continuum on a sliding scale of values' model, utterances that prioritise independence will fall towards the negative end of the scale, whilst those that emphasise propinquity and connection will fall towards the positive end of the scale, and those that do something in between will fall somewhere in the middle (Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 557). The exact placement of a given utterance along this continuum will depend heavily upon the context in which it is uttered. In a similar manner, it may also be beneficial to conceptualise the distinction between self-politeness and other-politeness in this scalar way, since a given politeness strategy or face threat may often impact both the person making the utterance and the recipient of it and the distinction between the two may not always be clear (Chen 2001: 104). Therefore it will be beneficial to think of the categorisations in this analysis not as discrete units that cannot overlap, but as a scalar and flexible means of assessing the general value and impact that a given utterance may have.

5.1.2 Evaluation of methodology

As has already been seen from the modifications proposed by Chen (2001) and Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg (1995), Brown & Levinson's (1987) model is not without its criticisms and therefore requires some modifications and evaluation of its efficacy before applying it to new cases. Chen (2001) helps to address the criticism that Brown & Levinson's model lacks a complete set of politeness strategies for instances where face-threats are self-oriented by adding a full set of self-politeness strategies to parallel other-oriented politeness strategies, and noting that sometimes the distinction between self- and other-oriented face threats and politeness strategies is not always clear cut. A related criticism of the model is that it tends to distinguish somewhat arbitrarily between positive and negative politeness strategies, which Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg (1995) address by conceptualising both face-threats and politeness strategies as a continuum with negative on one end and positive on the other, allowing for the interpretation of FTAs and politeness strategies to be placed at different points along this continuum depending on the relative effect on the participants' face wants. These two key modifications allow the model to remain

productive for analyses despite its age. Indeed, one of the model's many virtues is that it is one of the best known and most productive theories of politeness that is able to predict and explain patterns in multiple language studies, and as a theory of second order politeness it sits comfortably alongside the first order definition which means it is intuitively understandable (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2002: 3; 2006: 82). However, some dispute its claims at universal applicability (across languages, times, and cultures) and its pessimistic outlook on human social interactions.

The universal applicability of Brown & Levinson's model has come into question because if different communities have different conventions about politeness and resort to different strategies with different frequencies, then it is logical to assert that some communities must be inherently more or less polite than others (Alberdi Urquizu 2009: 121). If instead the 'universality' of this model just refers to the principles of maintaining harmony in interactions through face work, rather than the specific strategies themselves, then the politeness strategies listed by Brown & Levinson (1987) are not in fact an exhaustive list of all possibilities, but common ones used in the examples they based their model on, with the specific strategies available differing according to the specific language or culture. In other words, the theory can be seen as a universal model of social behaviour, but the specific politeness strategies available for use must be relativised to each situation (Alberdi Urquizu 2009: 122). By this logic, it can also be asserted that 'face-want is universally shared even if it is modulated differently from one society to another' (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2011: 152), and the expression of politeness and face can also change during the course of a person's life, 'subtly adapting, and adapting to, generally held views in their own communities' (Beeching 2006: 143) as different circumstances affect the power dynamics of their relationships. During the analysis therefore it will be important to remember that politeness theory provides tools that may apply universally but that are flexible enough to be configured in different ways relative to a given situation without disproving the model as a whole. For this reason, the specific 'weightiness' of each politeness strategy is considered of less importance than the type of strategy itself.

In terms of the theory's applicability to different contexts, especially historical and cross-linguistic cases, the main criticism is that the modern concept of politeness (in both its first and second order definitions) does not necessarily translate exactly into historical and cross-cultural cases, and may not even relate to an equivalent practice at all in some circumstances (Kádár & Culpeper 2010: 23; Kádár & Haugh 2013: 160). Indeed, the equivalent term *politesse'* ('politeness') is only first attested in 1578 in French etymology ('Politesse' [n.d.] entry 1), later than the majority of texts analysed in this study. Politeness is also not easily translated across cultures due to examples of 'ostensibly extremely polite uses of language that, on closer examination, merely amount to presentation rituals - in

other words, unmarked politic behaviour, mandatory face-work' (Bax 2010: 75). Despite the lack of an exact like-for-like mapping, similar concepts and practices have been demonstrated to exist in historical and cross-cultural contexts. In the case of the French language, there have been various manuals and treatises on topics that can be approximated with the modern term 'politeness': '*dite étiquette, savoir-vivre, civilité, tact … la politesse a fait l'objet, tout au long des siècles, de manuels et de traités* [...]*'* ('called etiquette, social skills, civility, tactfulness … politeness has been the subject of manuals and treatises throughout the centuries [...]', Alberdi Urquizu 2009: 119). This supports the idea that some universal principles of politeness may apply to historical cases, even if the specific configuration is different. In addition, it may be difficult for the researcher to reconstruct the specific configuration in historical studies because some of the relevant contextual information surrounding the production of a text will be at least unfamiliar or in some cases unknown to them. As such, complications arise when distinguishing between what would have been considered as strategic politeness in that context as opposed to conventional behaviour (Bax 2010: 49). Indeed, some utterances can be interpreted simultaneously as strategic politeness and conventional behaviour (Jucker 2011: 187). Despite the universality, not all aspects of politeness theory can be translated directly into past cultures. For example, Kohnen's (2008) study of address terms in Old English demonstrates that facework was not a sufficient enough explanation for the choices of address terms used. It is possible that for this particular community of practice, strategic politeness provides less explanatory power than conventional behaviour in maintaining harmonious interactions. Since there is no direct evidence or list of all the politeness behaviours and expectations in place for a given society in history, second hand inferences must be made in order to make the best possible of the limited data there is (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2011: 138), whilst also remembering that 'all linguistic forms have the potential to index a range of different social meanings' (Pizziconi & Christie 2017: 151). Such inferences can be made from the source texts, comparisons with other letters from the time, and other source materials that describe common practices such as letter-writing manuals (as already explored in chapter 4).

The application of politeness theory to historical correspondence requires consideration of how face operated in the past. For example, Bax notes that '[t]he current preoccupation with other-face differs materially from historically earlier conceptions [of politeness]' and that in the early modern period for Dutch language correspondence politeness was 'primarily a device for self-presentation and self assertion' rather than other-focused, and 'minding one's manners was also generally motivated by 'selfish' reasons' (Bax 2010: 67). However, this does not mean that the other person would be completely ignored in considerations of politeness in this early modern case. The writer still had to take the face wants of others into consideration (Nevala 2010: 147), even if ultimately the writer's main motivations were

'selfish'. This gives additional weight to the notion that Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness can indeed be applied universally if it is flexible enough to take into account that different situations will require facework and politeness strategies to be modulated to account for different functional properties. It also confirms that politeness and facework necessarily involve both participants in the interaction, justifying the need for Chen's (2001) self-politeness strategies.

Some scholars also criticise politeness theory for its assumption that certain utterances are intrinsically face-threatening. However, utterances can only gain meaning from the particular interaction in which they are used. Instead the 'moral order', which is essentially the background information and shared expectations that participants 'take for granted' in a given interaction, must be taken into account in order to give an utterance its meaning (Kádár & Haugh 2013: 67). By this logic, no utterance can be intrinsically polite or face-threatening, but rather its interpretation is based on the interactional situation and so '[politeness] can be identified only by reference to the prevailing norms and no utterance is *intrinsically* polite or impolite' (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2006: 99; their emphasis). That being said, it is possible that so-called 'intrinsic FTAs' are largely similar across different languages even if not realised in the same manner. Indeed, several studies have applied politeness theory in different linguistic contexts without issue. These include examples of modern French written texts (Manno 1999, who analysed the language of rejection letters sent to job applicants for speech acts and politeness markers), modern French spoken texts (Beeching 2006, who studied politeness markers in French tourist office interactions; Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2006, who emphasises the importance of the politeness ritual in small shop interactions in France), or historical English correspondence (Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 1995, and later Nevala 2004, who analysed forms of address in early English correspondence; Kohnen 2008, who questioned the applicability of politeness in Anglo-Saxon English communicative contexts; Nevala 2010, who investigated how face considerations govern the choice of reference form for interactants; Jucker 2012, who highlights how expectations of politeness and politic behaviour have changed over time in the history of English from discernment and deference in early modern English to face-threat mitigation in modern English), and early modern Dutch correspondence (Bax 2010, who demonstrates a tendency towards negative facework alongside politic behaviour in early modern Dutch correspondence). The application to these other contexts suggests that politeness can also be applied easily to learn from examples of early modern French language correspondence.

Finally, some scholars criticise Brown & Levinson's model for being pessimistic. The model envisions the process of interaction as navigating a minefield of face threatening acts, with interactants who are obsessed with threats to their own face and territory, and under this conceptualisation it ignores the possibility that there can be more positive motivations for

the performance of politeness strategies (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2002: 3-4). As opposed to FTAs, anti-threats valorise face wants rather than posing a threat to them, and thus form an additional type of politeness strategy than simply face saving, and to mirror Brown and Levinson's terminology may be called 'face-flattering acts' (FFAs) (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2002: 4). Where FTAs invoke politeness strategies that convey the sense of 'I wish you no harm', FFAs instead invoke politeness strategies that convey the sense of 'I wish you some good'. Much as FTAs are usually softened with a politeness strategy, FFAs are usually reinforced (Alberdi Urquizu 2009: 121). The addition of FFAs to the model allows for two types of politeness strategy to be distinguished in a way that is more intuitive to the connotations of 'positive' and 'negative': 'negative politeness' would thus link to face threats and 'positive politeness' would thus link to face enhancement. Kerbrat-Orecchioni asserts that thanks to the addition of face-flattering acts to the theory as a counterpart to face-threatening acts, along with the reframing of negative politeness to refer to potential harm and positive politeness to refer to potential boosts to participants' territory and face, the model become far more powerful, coherent and logical, thus more systematically applicable and able to account for a greater range of language data (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2002: 4). The addition of this more optimistic reasoning behind certain polite utterances does help to counteract the perception of inherent pessimism in Brown and Levinson's model, and may well help to account for more instances of politeness in the language data that are not explained easily by the model - for example direct address terms do not in most cases attempt to redress a threat to face, but still contain some facework and thus the choice of address terms can be seen as a politeness strategy that can enhance or threaten face. However, the reframing of negative and positive politeness strategies based around the distinction between FTAs and FFAs is not necessarily a helpful distinction to make. For one, many utterances contain a mix of strategies that both threaten and enhance face, so it is difficult to distinguish them categorically. Secondly, since the majority of scholarship uses Brown and Levinson's definitions of these types of politeness strategies, and they are thus widespread in use, to employ different definitions would only complicate understanding. Furthermore, it is difficult to see exactly how FFAs differ from face-saving politeness strategies which automatically consider the face wants of the other participant in the interaction, and so this extra distinction is ultimately not useful. However, it is useful to raise the issue of pessimism, for it highlights the fact that politeness strategies are not always employed for selfish reasons but ultimately are enacted to ensure that *both* parties' face wants are adequately met during the course of their interaction.

In this subsection, a number of criticisms of Brown and Levinson's model of politeness have been discussed. These include its lack of clear strategies for self-politeness, its

somewhat arbitrary distinction between positive and negative politeness strategies, questions about its universal applicability (particularly historically), its assertion that certain utterances intrinsically threaten face no matter what context they are in, and its broadly pessimistic nature. This section has outlined some of the discussion regarding these criticisms and with some minor adjustments the model remains robust and applicable for use in explaining some of the relational work that happens in early modern personal correspondence. The first key thing to note is the recognition that both participants in the interaction have face wants that must be addressed, resulting in the addition of a set of self-politeness strategies to complement other-oriented politeness. Secondly, it is important to remember that utterances can perform multiple functions, and tend to both positive and negative face wants at the same time, so conceptualising politeness on a continuum between negative and positive is perhaps more productive. Similarly, certain utterances could also be interpreted as both strategic politeness or conventional practice, or even somewhere between the two. In addition, the criticisms regarding the model's pessimism may be downplayed by accepting that politeness strategies that enhance face do not necessarily need to be employed in response to a potential face threatening act, but can still tend to positive or negative face wants. Finally, the fact that multiple studies of correspondence in other European languages from the early modern period have been conducted using the model suggests that with these small modifications, politeness theory is still a productive tool for explaining interactions in cases such as the French-language correspondence sent by Marie de Nassau to her father in the late sixteenth century.

5.1.3 Impoliteness and non-politeness

Although politeness and face-work may be crucial to many interactions, not every utterance will have recourse to politeness and therefore only those which involve face-work are useful to the politeness researcher (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2002: 8). Politeness strategies may account for a number of linguistic behaviours that aim at maintaining interactional harmony between participants, but it is one part of a broader system of strategies that may have different aims. One assumption of Brown & Levinson's politeness theory is that participants aim to maintain interactional harmony and so all utterances that are potentially face-threatening acts must be avoided or mitigated through face-work (Jobert 2010: 8). However, the opposite may also be true - participants may aim to disrupt harmony through the deliberate use of face-threatening acts and avoidance of politeness strategies, being impolite. The contrast between politeness and impoliteness can be summarised as follows: 'polite (language) behaviour *goes beyond* what the interaction order requires in terms of mutual face-protection and face-saving, whereas impolite (language) behaviour involves *doing less* than what is required qua face-management by the interaction order' (Bax 2010:

41; their emphasis). Although impoliteness theory can be described as the 'opposite' of politeness theory in that it explains attempts to attack or ignore the interlocutor's face want rather than appeal to them, it has its own pragmatic models which parallel - but are distinct from - Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies, most notably Culpeper's (1996) framework. In addition, the sample of letters investigated in this study contain plenty of examples of politeness, with few clear examples of impoliteness. As such, impoliteness is excluded from the current study, although it may well be an interesting topic to investigate in other early modern young women's letters by way of comparison with politeness.

The other related concept that must be mentioned is the case of utterances that have no markedly polite or impolite aims. Some obvious examples include purely informational utterances where politeness does not factor (Alberdi Urquizu 2009: 123), as well as many of the formulaic sequences already examined in the previous chapter, but there are other utterances which at a surface level appear to involve politeness techniques when in fact they are devoid of any such strategic behaviour - rather these can be a consideration of appropriateness (Locher 2006: 255). The language of politeness can be employed strategically as Brown & Levinson's model demonstrates, but also conventionally in context-appropriate usage known as 'politic behaviour'. Watts (2003) defines this as 'that behaviour, linguistic and non-linguistic, which the participants construct as being appropriate to the ongoing social interaction' (Watts 2003: 21) and is therefore the neutral and unmarked form due to its conventionality, or indeed appropriateness, in a given situation (Jobert 2010: 9). Appropriate 'politic' behaviour involves an acknowledgement of one's relative position within a social group and acting according to the norms of that social group and particular type of interaction (Culpeper 2011: 23). The similarities between politeness and politic behaviour are due to different interpretations of the same linguistic forms based on context. For example, given the choice of the two utterances 'Could you lend me your pen?' and 'Lend me your pen.', the former is more likely to be interpreted as polite as it suggests a degree of respect for the other person's own freedom of action, but it may simply be appropriate to the context if for example the interactants did not know each other very well; equally the latter may be more appropriate to a situation where directness is required, such as someone rushing to note down a telephone number and not being able to find a pen (example from Pizziconi & Christie 2017: 154). The former example could be interpreted as 'off-record' politeness as the FTA is expressed indirectly as a question rather than an instruction, but it could be merely conventional in an interaction where the participants did not know each other well. Equally, some formulaic sequences found in correspondence may appear to be examples of politeness, but can be considered as politic behaviour due to their conventionality. This distinction between the conventionality and expectation of politic

behaviour and the deliberate strategy of politeness are useful to be aware of during this analysis since there is often an overlap between the two.

5.2 Analysis

This section contains an in-depth analysis of examples of face threats and politeness strategies found in Marie de Nassau's correspondence with her father. This is divided into three main subsections: the first focuses on her own conception of first-order politeness, or perhaps a better synonym would be 'courtesy', by reviewing what she has to say about polite and courteous behaviour in her letters (subsection 5.2.1). This is followed by a detailed analysis of her second-order politeness behaviours, referring to examples of face threats and politeness strategies that occur frequently in her letters (subsection 5.2.2). After this, the specific case of terms of address becomes the focus, including direct address terms for her father, terms of reference for herself, and those for third parties, with much focus placed on their appearance in the ritualistic opening and closing portions of her letters (subsection 5.2.3), before a summary discussion in the final part of this chapter.

5.2.1 First Order Politeness

Examining the evidence for Marie's own conceptualisation of 'politeness' is a useful way of assessing how this may have functioned at a conscious level for her and others at the time. Although the French equivalent term *'politesse'* was not widely used at the end of the sixteenth century, that does not mean that the concept did not exist. Other synonyms related to courtly and proper behaviours (or indeed the lack thereof) can be used to uncover Marie's conception of first order politeness. There are only a handful of these examples to be found in her letters to her father, through terms such as *'courtoysement'* ('courteously'), *'idonne'* ('appropriate') and *'conuenir'* ('to suit (someone)' or 'to be appropriate for (someone)'). Of these, perhaps only the first is closely linked with modern ideas of 'politeness', with the other examples referring to expected behaviours, but they all build a sense of the 'appropriate' behaviour that would have been salient for Marie and others at the time. It should be noted that in this instance the sense of 'appropriateness' relates to Marie's own conception of the behaviours that are expected of her and others, and the examples in this section are distinct from the strategic nature of second order politeness.

The word *'courtoysement'* roughly translates to 'courteously', but also has a sense of 'courtly' or 'politely'. This only occurs once in Marie's correspondence, in a letter dated 5 December 1573, but it is an interesting example. She writes:

> *'monsr mon bien ayme pere comme vous mescriues ousy que les ennemis*
> *sont tout alentour de vous et quil vous commencette a escripre courtoysement si*

ne se sont poient feintise seroyt pour auoir espoir quil y poroyt auenir et bonne et ferme paix'

('Monsieur, my well beloved father, as you have also written to me that the enemies are all around you and that they have begun to write courteously to you, then if they are not merely deception, you can have hope that it will come to a good and strong peace', 1573/12/05)

In this example, Marie refers to negotiations that are ongoing between her father and the enemies that surround him, who are likely to have been Spanish envoys in the Netherlands during the Wars of Religion. It is apparent that Guillaume has previously written to her about these negotiations, either directly copying or at least describing their tone, which has evidently become more amenable. Marie responds with measured reasoning, suggesting that the courteous manner of the enemy's correspondence may well indicate the end of their conflict and that they might soon put aside their differences in favour of a peaceful future. This logic indicates that at least in Marie's own understanding, correspondence which contained courteous - or 'polite' in the first order sense - language was a good indicator of a positive outcome or strong relationship. This also demonstrates her knowledge of correspondence being used for courteous means, and her belief that courteous language should be evaluated positively even when coming from enemies. By extension, it could be argued that she would also wish to express courteous language in her own correspondence with those she held in high esteem, including her father. However, she also offers a caveat that the enemy may be capable of trickery with the utterance *'si ne se sont poient feintise'* ('if they are not merely deception'), and as such they may be using courteous language in their correspondence in order to deceive her father. This demonstrates Marie's knowledge that courteous language can in fact be insincere and used in order to conceal some other truth from the recipient. These remarks confirm Marie's own keen awareness of the pitfalls of written communication, the social expectations regarding courteous - or indeed polite - language, and how individual circumstances and characteristics of the correspondents could affect the interpretation of their words.

Regarding social expectations, Marie also comments on appropriate behaviour in her correspondence. There are three comparable occasions where she uses the adjective *'idonne'* ('appropriate') to qualify a particular course of action. In September 1573, she requests that her father take a mayor's son into his service in the manner he deems appropriate:

'le mayer de linbourh mat prie que je vous voulderoys escripre a la faueur de son fis pieus quil lat sy grant desir de vous fair[e] seruise que le veules auoir pour recommande en ce quil semblerat a monsr ester idonne'

('the mayor of Linburg asked that I might wish to write you with favour of his son who has great desire to serve you and that you might want to take him under your wing in whatever capacity that seems to be appropriate to you, Monsieur', 1573/09/23)'

Similarly in May 1577, she requests that he sends her someone appropriate (mostly likely in the sense of being respected and trusted by the family, as well as possessing the practical skills required) to the task at hand:

'je vousderois bien sil seroit pousibele et que le trouueris bon que enuoyeris deuant mon partement eung [[unclear]] *qui vous sembleroit ester idonn[e] et quil demureroit eung 8 ou 9 jour a dillenbourg pour coppier se letriage'*

('I wish that this will be possible and that you will find it good to send to me before I leave [someone] who seems to be appropriate to you and who will stay for 8 or 9 days at Dillenburg to copy these letters', 1577/05/06)

Later that month, she reinforces this request by asking that he send her someone who is better suited than she to the task (which appears to be the duplication of many letters to send on to other family members, but also could be the task of finding a suitable messenger who can be trusted with transmitting the information from these letters):

'je ne say comment que je le porey faire coppier a cause quil nen y at [que] eungne grande cartile et que sela ne se laiseroit poient bien fiare en eung mois ou deux par ou je vous ay bien voulu auertir sy dauenture monsr y vouldera[t] donner quelque order de enuoier quelqun icy qui seroit idonne a tel affaire comme je vous auois ousy escript par sy deuant'

('I do not know how I might be able to copy it [previous letter] because there is [only] one large letter and that has been waiting to be done for one or two months during which I have wanted to inform you of them, if it happens, Monsieur, that you want to give the order to send someone here who will be appropriate to the task like I have also written to you about before', 1577/05/25)

In addition to these three examples of *'idonne'*, Marie also uses the verb *'conuenir'* ('to suit (someone)' or 'to be appropriate for (someone)') to request that Guillaume sends a letter of commendation to the people of Buyl promising them his support in their plight:

'je suys este requis de se pouuer gens de buyl quelque vilage qui est de soubz le peys de craninck et dendofen de vous escripre en leur faueur […] faire sete faueur de leur donner eungne letter de recommandacions […] si esse que vous pores faire en secy comme il vous semblerat conuenir'

('I am required by these poor people of Buyl, some village which is in the territory of Craninck and Dendofen, to write to you in their favour […] do this

favour of sending them a letter of commendations […] if it is that you can do this as it seems appropriate to you', 1577/09/20)

Marie's use of *'idonne'* and *'conuenir'* in these examples demonstrate her consideration of appropriate behaviour, but they are also quite specific cases - they are all requests she makes of her father for him to take action on a particular matter. By modulating these requests with acknowledgements of 'appropriateness', not only is her first order politeness conception made evident, but she engages in second order politeness strategies, since requests typically threaten the interlocutor's negative face. This is discussed in detail in the following section, but put simply in all these requests she risks threatening her father's negative face, but minimises the imposition this may cause to him by saying he should only act if it is appropriate, which tends to his negative face wants. Requests can also be categorised as directive performative speech acts, which adds another layer of pragmatic meaning to these examples (speech acts being the focus of the analysis in chapter 6).

Although these keywords are few in number, they allow speculation that Marie's understanding of (first order) politeness is based on socially appropriate behaviour, including the use of courteous language which she evaluates positively. She does not remark on it directly in her own letters but demonstrates awareness that courteous language is conventional and relational, in that it implies a desire for cooperation between parties. Her concerns about courteous language used to deceive also demonstrates an awareness of the powerful variability of language used in different situations. As seen in the analysis of her use of formulaic sequences, she is also clearly aware of the social expectations of daughterly correspondence with their father, and her knowledge of 'courteous' language use is another facet of this. Indeed, her awareness of the social expectations regarding her correspondence and position in society were likely to factor into her use of (second order) politeness strategies. The terms *'idonne'*, *'conuenir'*, and *'courtoysement'* may only hint at Marie's understanding of politeness as it applied in her situation, and perhaps link more closely to the notions of politic behaviour mentioned earlier, but they do show an awareness of using language strategically to present a certain image of oneself - in Marie's case arguably the 'dutiful daughter' - which links more closely to second order politeness.

5.2.2 Second Order Politeness - FTAs and Strategies

Whilst analysing first order politeness hints at how politeness, or 'courtesy', was understood in Marie's time, the analysis of second order politeness - particularly face threatening acts and politeness strategies - demonstrates how it was put into practice. The analysis helps uncover the self-image she presented to her father through their correspondence during his absence, as well as how their daughter-father relationship was negotiated and maintained at a distance during this time in their lives. In this subsection, a

sample of Marie's utterances is examined in relation to the types 'intrinsic FTAs' they perform, along with the strategies she uses to mitigate these threats. In this analysis, Brown & Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies (and Chen's 2001 self-politeness strategies) are numbered and given in square brackets. Each utterance has the potential to threaten both the negative and positive faces of both Marie and her father. To help structure the discussion, these are analysed separately, with threats to Guillaume's face first followed by self-face threats, but it must be remembered that they are different points on a continuum rather than discrete units.

Marie's utterances potentially pose a threat to Guillaume's negative face on occasions when she puts pressure on him to perform an action, typically by making requests of him or promising some future service to him (implying a request for him to accept her service). Some common terms used to make these requests include the verbs *'prier'* ('to pray') and *'supplier'* ('to beg'). Marie's use of the verb *'prier'* ('to pray') is typically used with reference to God, as in her common closing utterance *'fayray la fin priant dieu le createur vous donner [...] sante heureuse vie et longue'* ('I will end [this letter] here, praying that God the Creator grants you [...] health and an long and happy life'), but also has a sense similar to modern French, as a means of requesting a favour from someone. For example, Marie requests to receive more correspondence from Guillaume:

> *'vous prie ousy treshumblement sil et pousibele de nous vouloir faire part de vous nouuelles'*
>
> ('[I] also pray you most humbly that if it be possible you might wish to share your news with us', 1573/09/23)

In this example, the request performs a negative face threatening act, but she mitigates this with negative politeness strategies: the word *'treshumblement'* ('most humbly') gives deference [negative strategy 5], and *'sil et pousibele'* ('that if it be possible') acts as a hedge [negative strategy 2]. These combine to imply that she does not wish to coerce Guillaume into doing something unwillingly, which prioritises his negative face wants for independence of action, thus saving face and being considered as negative politeness.

In a later letter, she requests more correspondence with this verb again, but uses different politeness strategies:

> *'je vous prie de me pardonner que je vous inportune tant mais le grant desir que jay touiour dauoier de vous nouelles me contraynt de ce faire'*
>
> ('I pray you to forgive me if I inconvenience you so but the great desire that I always have to receive news from you compels me to do so', 1574/01/21)

Having mentioned that she would like to receive more letters from Guillaume, her request *'je vous prie'* is modulated by the apology *'de me pardonner'* [negative strategy 6], but she

then states the FTA as a rule [negative strategy 8] by saying that she does not wish to impose upon Guillaume but that her desire to hear from him has forced her hand. This communicates her desire for him to perform this favour, but still allows him freedom of action. This example can also be interpreted as her giving reasons [positive strategy 13] for performing the FTA, as well as assuming reciprocity [positive strategy 14], which means that this utterance can also be seen to tend to his positive face wants by emphasising their kinship and assumed cooperation, placing this utterance somewhere between negative and positive politeness.

Marie also uses *'supplier'* ('to beg') to request that Guillaume send more letters to her. On one occasion her usage is a little different, since she apologises for her own behaviour rather than requesting:

> *'monsr je vou[s] supplie ousy bien humblement me pardonner que jay escript de sy mauuaise grace locasion at este que nay eu gere de tamps a cause de la compayn[ie] parquoy jespere que me tinderes pour excuse je lamenderay eung aultrefois'*

> ('Monsieur, I also most humbly beg you to forgive me for writing with such poor graciousness, the reason is that I hardly had any time due to having company, for which I hope that you will excuse me and I will make up for it another time', 1576/03/02)

In this example, she gives deference [negative strategy 5], but also gives reasons for her writing not being as 'gracious' as it usually is [positive strategy 13], adding that she will make up for it in the future - in other words incurring a debt towards him [negative strategy 10]. As in the previous example, this utterance tends towards negative politeness but does contain elements of positive politeness that allows it to tend to both Guillaume's positive and negative face wants. This example also demonstrates how self-oriented politeness cannot be easily untangled from other-oriented politeness. Marie's acknowledgement of her 'poor graciousness' threatens her self-image as a dutiful daughter, and so to redress that threat she justifies herself [self-politeness strategy 1] with an explanation for why her writing was rushed. This demonstrates a desire to co-operate and appeals to positive face wants by aiming for harmony to be maintained. It is also implied that had external factors not influenced her, she would not have needed to rush the letter. This has the effect of impersonalisation [self-politeness strategy 4], allowing Marie to distance herself from the misdemeanour of writing such a rushed letter, which helps mitigate the threat to her own self-image.

Turning to look at positive FTAs, there are very few explicit examples in Marie's writing. Instead they are hinted at through implied disapproval of her father's lack of action. One

occasion where this is most evident in her letters is after she has asked for his advice but not received anything from him:

> *'je suys este fort enmerueille que monsr ne mat poient donne eung seul mot de response sur ma letter que vous auois escript car je ne say comment que je me dois maintenant rigeler'*

> ('I am quite surprised that Monsieur has not given me a single word of response to my letter that I wrote to you because I do not know how I am supposed to act now', 1577/03/19)

Marie's disapproval at a lack of any response from her father is an implicit positive FTA. The implication is that she assumes a degree of reciprocity in their relationship [positive strategy 14], which suggests a positive politeness strategy. However, it is heavily implied rather than explicitly stated, so she has to follow up with a longer utterance a few lines later to ensure that the face threat is properly mitigated:

> *'mais sy esse que jespere je pense bien que les grande negosses que aues journelement vous ont enpeche a me render response mais jespere que auecque le tamps me manderes toute resolucion'*

> ('But if it is as I hope I think that you must have important negotiations to make daily which have prevented you from composing a response, but I hope that with time you will advise me of all decisions', 1577/03/19)

Having likely foreseen a negative reaction on Guillaume's part to her disapproval, Marie adds these positive politeness strategies to smooth things over. Here she suggests a possible reason why he may not have been able to reply to her [positive strategy 13], and attending to his needs [positive strategy 1] by recognising that he is most likely busy with his current negotiations. She then masks another threat to his negative face (a request for him to inform her of the appropriate decisions to make) in a way that assumes future cooperation and reciprocity [positive strategy 14], with politeness strategies that tend towards the positive side of the scale, even though it is redressing a negative face threat in the latter case.

In general, Marie's letters tend to contain far fewer positive politeness strategies than negative ones when it comes to mitigating the threat to Guillaume's face. It can be stated that in general then her politeness strategies whilst being mixed are somewhere in the middle of the scale but fall a little more on the negative side. This suggests that, at least for Marie and Guillaume's situation, the expected pattern of politeness behaviour in correspondence was for daughters to use strategies that were largely on the negative side of the continuum by emphasising the distance between them as superior and inferior in the social hierarchy. Of course there was also a place for more positive politeness strategies to be used when their close family ties were more important to emphasise, for instance

following deaths and miscarriages in the family Marie may have wanted to emphasise their bonds more strongly in order to appeal to their shared heritage and emotional ties.

One possible reason for the politeness strategies falling somewhere in the middle of the continuum between negative and positive politeness is due to the way in which Marie was communicating with her father. Since there is no immediate feedback when writing to a person, as compared with talking to them face-to-face, Marie has to anticipate her father's reaction to her utterances. As such, she must make appropriate adjustments to them and perform the most appropriate politeness strategies to mitigate any potential face threats she might cause, regardless of whether or not those face threats actually occur upon Guillaume reading them. As a result, if she wanted to hedge her bets between tending to his negative face wants for independence and his positive face wants for kinship, it is likely that her politeness strategies would fall somewhere in the middle of the scale rather than being at the extremes.

Looking more closely at some of the self-oriented face threats found in Marie's letters allows the opportunity to uncover the image that she wished to maintain in her father's eyes, and also tests the applicability of Chen's (2001) model to a historical case. For example, Marie most commonly threatens her own face on occasions when she implies that she has not been able to fulfil her daughterly duties:

> *'ne mat poient este pousibele de le recripre par ou jespere que me tinderes*
> *pour excuse eung aultrefois sy plaist a dieu je lamenderay'*
>
> ('[It] has not been possible to rewrite them for which I hope that you will excuse me and if it pleases God I will make amends for this another time', 1576/10/15)

In this example, Marie has not lived up to the 'obedient daughter' image, for she has not been able to fulfil a duty of copying out letters to send on to her father. In presenting her excuses, she threatens her own negative face by recognising that she has not been able to act independently in this matter. However, she redresses some of this face threat by justifying [self-politeness strategy 1] that it was not possible to perform this task, and then shows she is confident [self-politeness strategy 6] that she will make amends for this in the future, thus restoring the order and maintaining her image.

On other occasions, Marie admits guilt about her poor performance of daughterly duties through self-critical comments. For example:

> *'Monsieur il me desplait bien fort que vous ay peu enuoier le litriages par*
> *monsr de taffin dont il men a faict mention de vouster part mais comme je ne*
> *suys este a dillenbourg je ne lay seu faire'*

('Monsieur, it greatly displeases me that I have sent you so few letters by Monsieur de Taffin who made mention of this on your behalf but since I have not been at Dillenburg I have not been able to do so', 1577/01/26)

In this example, Marie threatens her own positive face with self-criticism, which she redresses with a justification [self-politeness strategy 1]. However in providing a reason for the poor performance of her duties, she also inadvertently threatens her own negative face since this can also be read as an excuse. This has the effect of maintaining a deferential tone, which highlights the imbalanced nature of their relationship within a hierarchical social system whilst also attempting to maintain it in its current state.

Marie also asks for forgiveness about the requests she makes of her father to reply to her on many occasions, such as:

'vous prian[t] ousy de me vouloier pardonner que je vous inportune tant mais jespere monsr que ne le prenderes poient de mauuaise part'

('also praying that you wish to forgive me that I inconvenience you so, but I hope, Monsieur, that you will not take it the wrong way', 1573/06/18)

Whilst Marie admits responsibility for imposing on her father and expecting a response, threatening both his negative face and her own positive face, she attempts to save her own face by attaching the condition [self-politeness strategy 9] that he must not take it the wrong way as it is well-meaning.

This example also highlights some of the complex facework patterns that typically occur in Marie's letters to her father. By stating her initial insecurity *'que je vous inportune tant'* ('that I inconvenience you so'), Marie recognises that she could impose on Guillaume's independence, thus threatening his negative face. To modulate this, she adds *'de me vouloier pardonner'* ('that you wish to forgive me'), asking him to forgive her for the imposition, which expresses solidarity and saves his positive face, but also creates a new imposition by making this request of him to forgive her, thus threatening his negative face again. Adding *'vous prian[t] ousy'* ('also praying you'), Marie demonstrates confidence in the nature of their relationship, thus enhancing positive face again, but also shows her deference that is part of this relationship, which helps enhance negative face too. Finally, by adding the modifier *'mais jespere que ne le prenderes poient de mauuaise part'* ('but I hope that you will not take it the wrong way'), Marie makes it clear that she never intended her words to be taken in a threatening way, and thus tries to restore ritual balance by saving all threats to negative face, including her own. This relatively simple example shows the great deal of work that goes into maintaining balance within a relationship when communicating via the medium of correspondence, including the amount of double-think that writers would have to work through in order to help ensure that their messages were clearly understood in the intended manner.

This brief analysis of some of the typical 'intrinsic FTAs' in Marie's letters has highlighted a couple of interesting points. Firstly on a methodological level, whilst it is clear that Brown & Levinson's model can be readily applied to this historical case of French language correspondence, it requires modification in the form of conceptualising positive and negative politeness and face as scalar rather than binary, as well as needing a more detailed system of self-politeness such as that proposed by Chen (2001) in order to account for the full range of politeness strategies that were used. In Marie's specific case, the tendency for her to threaten her father's negative face and use typically negative politeness strategies had the result of threatening her own positive face which she could then redress through justification or other strategies. These examples not only show that self- and other-oriented politeness are difficult to separate since one can affect the other, but they have also shown that Marie was likely aware of the different ways in which her words may be interpreted by her father, and the potential threats any misinterpretations may cause. As a result, there appears to be much facework that appeals simultaneously to both positive and negative face wants, although falling largely on the negative side of neutral, which has the effect of emphasising the expected deferential nature of their daughter-father relationship. This preference for negative politeness suggests that relative social status was also a particular concern when writing correspondence at this time, taking precedence over positive politeness that would suggest greater importance placed on kinship ties. This may partly be constrained by the genre itself, and is equally apparent when examining a key component of the genre in the next subsection - address terms.

5.2.3 Key case study: terms of address

Terms of address are a useful unit for interrogating the interactional aspects of personal correspondence, since they are inherently relational. In formal terms they are typically pronouns or short nominal phrases used to refer to the self, directly to the addressee, or another party. In the target language of this study, middle French, possible direct address second person pronouns included *'tu'* and *'vous'*, and possible noun phrases included names, titles (like *'monsieur'* or *'madame'*) and terms of endearment (like *'ma mignonne'* ('my little one')). In Marie's letters to her father, she exclusively uses the *vous* form to address him directly, as would be expected for a young woman addressing her father and social superior, and so nominal phrases that she used as address terms are likely to provide greater insight into their relationship and how politeness worked in this case. When it comes to their politeness value, address terms may not specifically redress FTAs, but they do tend to face wants, which in turn can reveal a great deal about the relationship between the interactants.

Terms of address can be particularly useful for revealing the interpersonal dynamics of relationships, and have been a focus of research in historical pragmatics since they are 'one of the loci of language use in which interactive dynamics emerges most clearly' (Mazzon 2010: 351). Generally speaking, terms of address are a variable set of nouns or noun phrases, which tend to occur as vocatives but not always (Mazzon 2010: 363-364), for example 'Sir' or 'My dear father'. It is through address terms that 'politeness is manifested in speech and writing' (Nevala 2004: 2129). This is because these terms tend to have both social and pragmatic content - social elements like titles and kinship terms can be used, but also pragmatic ones like terms of endearment or insults (Mazzon 2010: 364). In general, terms that convey in-group ties demonstrate positive politeness, whilst terms that convey power and authority demonstrate negative politeness (Kohnen 2008: 140-141). However, it is important to retain a degree of flexibility when employing this type of system - since address terms are changeable in nature, in that the way in which they are employed may be different in different situations and may even change over the course of an interaction, any analysis of their pragmatic politeness content must take into account this flexibility (Mazzon 2010: 367), for example by adopting a continuum model of politeness strategies as proposed above. Therefore in some cases kinship terms may not indicate closeness and titles may not indicate deference, but rather each case may in fact be perceived as more neutral, conventional or 'politic'.

One benefit of studying address terms to investigate manifestations of politeness in historical correspondence in particular is the fact that '[f]orms of address reveal a carefully graduated scale of social hierarchy, thus reflecting the power relations' of a given society (Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 547). Based on this premise, historical correspondence becomes a useful tool not only for understanding an individual's patterns of politeness behaviour, but also how this fits within the contexts of both their relationship with their correspondent(s) and also with general patterns in their wider social circle. From a practical perspective too, terms of address in correspondence are readily accessible and easy to identify, at least for direct reference, because 'the form of address in the salutation is an integral part of the personal letter' (Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 542). This means that the majority of direct address terms can be found in the opening sections of a letter, and then repeated utterances can be found throughout the body of the letter. Of course, it is not only direct terms of address that are used in correspondence. There are also references made to the self, and references made to other third parties - the former is most readily identifiable in the closing sequence of the letter, and both are to be found throughout the body of the text. Since the investigation of (second order) politeness entails an exploration of relationships, the relational nature of terms of address makes them ideal candidates for study. Direct terms of address for the recipient and for the self are of most

interest, as they are integral parts of correspondence, but terms of address for third parties are also worth investigation as they can also be indicative of the nature of such relationships.

Relational terms are not limited to direct address between correspondents. Marie also uses terms of address to refer to other people within or outside of the family. These include *'madame'*, with associated forms *'madame ma gran mere'* ('Madame my grandmother') and *'madame ma tante'* ('Madame my aunt', often complemented with specification of which particular relative, such as *'de nassaw'*, *'de schwartzbourch'*, or *'juliana'*, for example). Although these may appear to be a combination of a negatively polite title with a positively polite kinship term, they are primarily informational. Although these cases may help present Marie as a young woman who was obedient to all her elders and relatives, it is likely that the terms of address used for these third parties were a means of helping her father navigate the contents of Marie's letters by giving precision about which person she is referring to in a given utterance. As such, the terms of address used to refer to third parties in Marie's correspondence are regarded as informational here and not considered in the investigation of politeness and how they tend to face wants.

The most common term used by Marie to address her father is *'monsieur'* and its abbreviated form *'monsr'*. A search of Marie's letters for these terms reveals 285 occurrences (with 53 written in full and 232 abbreviations), either on its own or modified with adjectives as noun phrases. In order of most common occurrence in her 22 letters, the following noun phrases appear with some frequency: *'mons(ieu)r'* on its own (194), *'mons(ieu)r mon bien ayme pere'* (38), *'mons(ieu)r mon bien bon pere'* (25), *'monsr mon oncle'* (25), *'monsr mon bien bon ayme pere'* (2), and *'monsr mon pere'* (1). It must be noted however that not all 194 occurrences of *'mons(ieu)r'* are direct address terms that Marie uses to address her father, but they refer to some other gentleman she mentions in the body of her letter, and of course the 25 occurrences of *'monsr mon oncle'* do not refer directly to him either but to her uncle Jean de Nassau-Dillenbourg. The general usage patterns and deduced politeness value of these noun phrases will now be examined, first in the case of *'mons(ieu)r'* alone and then in the longer phrases *'mons(ieu)r mon bien (bon) (ayme) pere'*.

In Middle French, the term *'monsieur'* had the sense of an honorific title, used to designate a person of high status, or an address term conveying respect ('Monsieur' [n.d.]). In sum, it was used as a term of respect to refer to the addressee or to address them directly. As such, it can be placed on the scale of politeness strategies somewhere near the central neutral point, as a conventionalised term of respect. However, due to this inherent comment on the addressee's social superiority, it can be argued that it falls just on the negative politeness side of the scale, since it marks deference and social distance between the two participants involved in the interaction.

Marie's use of the word *'mons(ieu)r'* largely functions as a direct term of address for her father in the opening sequence of her correspondence:

> *'Monsr comme jay seu que se porteur est arire alle vers vous jay nay poient*
> *voulu falir a mon deuoir de vous faire sete'*

> ('Monsieur, since I knew that a letter bearer has arrived and is heading to you,
> I did not wish to fail my duty of writing you this [letter]', 1577/03/19)

She also uses it in the body of her letters to address him directly by his title rather than his name or with *'vous'*, meaning it fulfils the function of a second person pronoun in these cases:

> *'je ne sarois jamais ases humblemen[t] remercier monsr du continuel soing*
> *que portes de moy'*

> ('I never know how to thank [you] Monsieur so humbly for the continual aid
> that you bring me', 1576/03/02)

This use of *'monsr'* instead of *'vous'* has the effect of maintaining a degree of deference, and could be a means of saving her own face.

Marie also uses *'mons(ieu)r'* as a means of punctuating her utterances, indicating a change of topic and may also draw his attention to key points:

> *'je luy escript tout affaires monsr il fault que je vous ~~fashe~~ fasge encore de*
> *quelque chosse'*

> ('I wrote everything down for him [to pass on], and also Monsieur, it is
> necessary that I do something else for you', 1573/12/25)

Since there was no regularised punctuation marks in written correspondence at this point in time, it is possible that Marie used address terms as an utterance boundary, marking the change from one topic to the next and signalling to the recipient that they should pay attention to the new key point that was about to be made.

It is also notable that Marie is consistent with her direct address for Guillaume on the publicly visible parts of her letters. Almost invariably, Marie writes the superscription:

> *'A Monsieur*
> *Monsieur le Prince Dorange'*
> ('To Monsieur
> Monsieur the Prince of Orange')

Addressing Guillaume in this manner on the external part of the folded manuscript serves two functions. Practically, it ensures that the letter reaches its intended recipient. Socially, it respects the conventions of personal correspondence at the time, as well as signalling the specific type of letter Guillaume may expect to find inside, and if he were to read it himself (rather than having it read to him), Marie's own handwriting would have also signalled this as personal correspondence.

At this point, it is worth noting that Marie also uses *'mons(ieu)r'* to refer to third parties in her letters, in reference to her uncle and other gentlemen. These occurrences seem to indicate similar levels of respect for the social hierarchy, such as one example referring to her uncle Jean:

> *'je ne peus laisser de vous mander comment que monsr mon oncle et arire ariue icy pase 4 ou 5 jour'*
>
> ('I cannot refrain from informing you how Monsieur my uncle has been here for the past four or five days, 1577/05/25)

This is also true for other gentlemen outside of the family:

> *'touchant de mon frere morits monsr de taffin vous en ferat tout raport ensemble de tout aulter chosse que se passe par icy parquoy je remet le tout a luy'*
>
> ('as for my brother Maurice, Monsieur de Taffin will give you a report on him and all the other things that are happening here because I have recounted everything to him', 1577/01/26)

This consistent use of the address term *'mons(ieu)r'* for different gentlemen is an indicator that social status, whilst linked to the family hierarchy, took precedence over familial or friendship ties. In the case of *'monsr mon oncle'* ('Monsieur my uncle') and similar examples, the use of *'monsr'* indicates respect for their status whilst *'mon oncle'* helps with identifying the specific referent, without any real focus on their familial bond. However, this does not mean that kinship could not also be expressed through other terms of address.

One of the occurrences of *'monsieur'* is also written by Marie's aunt Juliana at the end of one of her letters, and she also employs this title in much the same manner as a term of direct address:

> *'Monsieur trouuant Madamoiselle ma nipse qui vous escripuoit je nay peu lesser vous presenter mes treshumble recomandations'*
>
> ('Monsieur, finding Mademoiselle [Marie] my niece writing to you, I could not refrain from presenting you my most humble commendations', (1574/05/15, in Juliana's hand)

Although this example comes from Guillaume's sister, she addresses him with similar deference to his daughter, implying that the family social hierarchy was an important consideration in composing correspondence, even if it was just a brief addition to someone else's letter.

In addition to the majority of occasions where Marie uses *'mons(ieu)r'* alone to address her father, she also embellishes this term of address with additional terms that highlight their kinship. The examination of these longer address terms reveal more interesting politeness work at play. The most elaborate example is perhaps *'monsieur mon bien bon ayme pere'*,

which is best understood when divided into its component parts. The simple address term *'monsieur'* falls just on the negative side of neutral on a scalar politeness model, since it acknowledges some degree of social distance between the interactants. Marie specifies this by adding the kinship term *'mon pere'* ('my father'), occasionally with other adjectives. As a kinship term, this indicates a level of social proximity as family members, and is thus on the positive side of the politeness scale. Addressing Guillaume as *'monsieur mon pere'* thus incorporates two address terms with different social distance values - one emphasising distance, the other proximity. As such, this particular utterance is likely to be perceived as relatively neutral, in that it tends to both slightly positive and slightly negative face. In utterances such as *'monsieur mon bien bon pere'* ('Monsieur my very good father'), the modifiers *'bien'* and *'bon'* ('well' and 'good') primarily act as intensifiers. The term *'bon'* has one sense of moral goodness and a second sense of fulfilling one's nature, so it could be perceived as a reference to Guillaume's ample fulfilment of his fatherly duties towards Marie. If this is the case, utterances such as *'monsieur mon bien bon pere'* lend greater emphasis to the proximity of their relationship as kin, and thus the occasions where this utterance occurs are more in a context of moderately positive politeness. However, the most frequent way in which Marie modifies her direct address terms to Guillaume is with the adjective *'ayme'* ('beloved'). At first glance, this suggests that her frequent address of *'monsieur mon bien (bon) ayme pere'* is indicative of a strong positive politeness strategy that emphasises their proximity as family members. However *'ayme'*, the past participle of the verb *'aimer'*, when employed adjectivally can also function as a mark of fealty and deference to a social superior, or when intensified with *'bien'* takes on the sense of 'respected' or 'appreciated' ('Aimer' 2015), which would place this utterance firmly in the negative politeness end of the politeness strategy scale. Conversely, the phrase *'bien aime'* conveyed a sense of being loved completely ('Bien-aimé' 2007), which supports the idea of positive politeness instead. Given this double interpretation, address terms like *'monsieur mon bien ayme pere'* may have had a dual meaning, appealing to both positive and negative face wants, with a sense of 'Monsieur my dear and respected father'. With this combination of positive and negative politeness strategies involved in one address term, it simultaneously indexes both social proximity and social distance between Marie and Guillaume, which perhaps depending upon the tone of the rest of the interaction could then be interpreted in one direction or another. It is also possible that Marie was well aware of this double meaning and that she deliberately used this construction as a means of demonstrating both her affection and family bonds to him, but also importantly still conveys her deference towards him as her social superior.

The ways in which Marie uses address terms in reference to herself are also indicative of the self-image she wished to present to her father and anyone else who read her letters. The

terms she chooses to use are relatively predictable. In all but two letters, she signs off with her name *'Marie de Nassaw'* preceded by *'vouster fille'* ('your daughter'), an address term that emphasises the daughterly bond she has to her addressee Guillaume. A search of her letters for *'fille'* returns 39 occurrences of this word, two of which refer to other daughters, with the remaining 37 occurring in utterances that emphasise Marie's own self-image as an obedient daughter.

The two instances which refer to other daughters are essentially informational, but one is interesting in that it highlights Marie's expectations that her younger sister will also mature into an obedient daughter to Guillaume:

> *'ma seur deuint fort grande selon son eage il sen fault gere quelle est sy haulte que moy et sy elle continue de croister aynsin elle me paserat de beaucop et jespere quelle vous serat ousy touiour obeisante fille'*

> ('My sister is getting so tall for her age that she is almost as tall as me, and if she continues to grow at such a rate she will greatly outgrow me, and I hope that she will also always be an obedient daughter to you', 1576/05/01)

This occurrence in particular highlights the societal expectation that daughters would grow up to be obedient to their parents, and this also seems to be the image that Marie wishes to portray when referring to herself in her own correspondence with Guillaume.

When Marie uses *'fille'* to refer to herself, she highlights her obedience to her father in three similar and predictable ways: simply as *'(vouster) obeisante fille'* (10), elaborated as *'(vouster) humble et obeisante fille'* (7), and intensified as *'(vouster) treshumble et tresobeisante fille jusques a la mort'* (20). The use of *'vouster fille'* ('your daughter') on its own, being both informational and indicating Marie's kinship ties to Guillaume, would place these utterances slightly on the positive side of the scale due to the idea of familial proximity. By adding the term *'obeisante'* ('obedient'), Marie indicates her deference towards her father and so utterances like *'vouster obeisante fille'* ('your obedient daughter') are perhaps more neutral or tend to negative face. At this point it must be noted that the formulaic sequence *'vostre obeissant serviteur/sujet'* ('your obedient servant/subject') was used in correspondence at this time ('Obéir' [n.d.]; 'Obéissant' [n.d.]), and so occurrences of this utterance in the closing sequence of Marie's letters are likely conventional and therefore politic behaviour rather than appealing to face wants.

That being said, Marie does refer to herself as *'obeisante fille'* ('obedient daughter') in a couple of different constructions within the main body of her letters: *'jay nay poient voulu falir au deuoir dobeisante fille'* ('I did not wish to fail my duty as obedient daughter') and *'obeisante fille en tout ce quil vous plairat'* ('obedient daughter in all that pleases you'). Despite similar appearances, there are subtle differences that modulate the placement of these utterances on the politeness scale. Taking the first example:

> *'jay nay poient voulu falir au deuoir dobeisante fille de vous faire cete pour me remente uoir treshumblement en vouster bonne grace'*
>
> ('I did not wish to fail my duty as [your] obedient daughter so I wrote you this [letter] to be remembered most humbly into your good grace', 1573/12/25)

In this case, Marie employs a largely negative politeness strategy. Her emphasis is on duty, obedience and humility, all of which are indicative of the negative politeness strategy of giving deference, and by associating these conditions with her being a good daughter she mitigates any potential threat caused to her own self-image. In the second example however frames her obedient daughterly duties within a different politeness strategy:

> *'je vous en remercie treshumblement et vous seray toute ma vie plus que obeisante fille en tout ce quil vous plairat me commander'*
>
> ('I thank you most humbly and for all my life I will be more than an obedient daughter to you in all that it pleases you to ask of me', 1573/11/25)

In this case, there remains the emphasis on obedience and humility, but she chooses to highlight the relationship ties. By promising Guillaume her obedience in doing whatever favour he asks of her, she does indeed demonstrate a degree of deference towards him, but in addition she conveys the fact that she views them as cooperators, highlighting their proximity and therefore this particular utterance falls more towards the positive side of the scale than the first example (though still relatively close to the centre due to the deferential language).

Humility and obedience are concepts that are closely linked, and in most cases when Marie describes herself as an obedient daughter, she also mentions her humility:

> *'vous priant bien humblement monsr me tenir touiour pour vouster humble et obeisante fille laquelle je desire de demure tant que je uiue'*
>
> ('Humbly praying you, Monsieur, to keep me forever as your humble and obedient daughte', 1577/04/04)

Similarly to the previous example, this utterance is indicative of a mixed politeness strategy. By emphasising her humility and obedience, Marie shows deference towards her father and thus this part of the utterance tends to negative face, but by remarking on her desire for the longevity of their relationship she once again implies that she expects at least some reciprocity and so this part tends to positive face. Overall this could be said to be on the negative side of the politeness scale, but not too far from the centre.

The most common and most elaborate way in which Marie refers to herself is in the closing formulae. Typically she signs off with:

> *'Vouster treshumble et tresobeisante fille jusques a la mort / Marie de Nassaw'*
>
> ('Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death / Marie de Nassau')

Since this occurs in the closing salutations, it is likely formulaic and cannot be considered in terms of politeness, but instead is reflective of the typical construction found in Middle French correspondence sent to a social superior ('Obéissant' [n.d.]). The addition of *'jusques a la mort'* could be Marie's own flair in an attempt to highlight the longevity of their relationship, which would simultaneously emphasise their proximity but also her continued deference, although equally it could be seen as attaching conditions which is typically a negative self-politeness strategy. However, given its resemblance to formulaic sequences it likely has little politeness value attached to it.

In summary, Marie's terms of reference for herself tend towards the negative end of the politeness scale. Although she does often mix in positive politeness strategies in these examples, Marie typically gives deference towards Guillaume when she refers to herself. This suggests that the image of herself that she possesses, or wishes to portray, is that of the obedient child. This implies that she values and respects her father's face want for independence of action more than her own face want of being connected (though she does raise this issue elsewhere in her letters when there has been a significant passing of time without response from him), but her representation of herself as an obedient daughter has the self-polite effect of redressing any damage that might be caused to her own face by projecting this largely positive self-image. In comparison to her typical strategies for addressing Guillaume directly, Marie's self-politeness strategy presents a subtly different self-image. Her direct address to her father tends to involve mixed strategies, with utterances that often emphasise their closeness whilst simultaneously conveying a sense of deference towards her social superior. As a result, the self-image that Marie seems to present is also one of an obedient daughter, but the emphasis is more on the daughterly aspects. Therefore Marie's address terms can be said to convey just enough of a sense of familiarity with Guillaume as her father, whilst maintaining her respect for him as her social superior. Of course, much of this will have been prescribed by conventions of personal correspondence at the time, especially in the closing sequences which are likely to contain more formulaic utterances.

5.3 Discussion

In this chapter, the broad patterns of facework and politeness strategies found in Marie's correspondence with her father have been outlined. Some interesting observations have been made regarding the self-image that Marie attempts to present in her letters, as well as the complexities involved in pre-empting potential misinterpretations and the FTAs that could result from her utterances. The applicability of politeness theory to this historical case of middle French language correspondence has also been assessed. In this final part of the chapter, the key observations from Marie's letters are reiterated (subsection 5.3.1), followed

by some concluding remarks which relate back to the core research questions of this study (subsection 5.3.2).

5.3.1 Observations

Taking Marie's first order politeness as a starting point, it is evident from her writing that there was certainly a concept that resembles 'politeness' in the modern common usage sense, even if *'politesse'* was not widely used in sixteenth century French contexts. The main features of this first order politeness were an awareness of social expectations and appropriateness of particular actions, and including appropriate language. This suggests that in Marie's circles it was important to be seen to be acting appropriately, and presenting the right sort of self-image to others. She also noted that different linguistic forms may be appropriate for different settings, and enemies can use language to deceive.

Marie's second order politeness and facework was shown to tend to the negative-to-mixed segment of the politeness continuum, with recourse to positive facework as the need arose. This confirms that social distance was an important factor for the choice of terms used in personal correspondence, even in cases where emphasising kinship was desired. Marie used a mixed strategy of positively polite kinship terms combined with negatively polite titles, demonstrating the importance of both kinship and social hierarchy. This suggests some similarities with facework used across the Channel in the history of English, where in earlier times Anglo-Saxon kinship society had placed emphasis on both kin loyalty and recognition of one's place in society (Jucker 2011: 180), and so remnants of this are evidently still in operation in early modern Europe. In addition, contemporaneous studies of English correspondence in the fifteenth- to seventeenth- centuries note that 'the addressee's social superiority takes precedence over kinship, manifesting itself in the selection of status nouns' (Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 572). In a related manner, Marie tends to portray a self-image in her correspondence with Guillaume which would match this social hierarchical expectation. Her use of generally negative-to-mixed politeness strategies has the effect of creating and presenting a self-image of a humble, obedient, and ultimately deferential daughter - that is, one who is seen to do the right thing and behaves appropriately in any given situation.

With face threatening acts in particular, the tendency is towards the negative side of the spectrum. Analysis of the 'intrinsic FTAs' in Marie's letters revealed many potential threats to Guillaume's negative face but only a handful to his positive face, which demonstrates that Marie most likely valued their connection but would end up imposing on his independence, usually by making requests that he write to her more frequently. Even when she does threaten his positive face, she falls into her habit of negative politeness by emphasising her role as being his obedient daughter. This suggests that she wanted to maintain the balance

in their relationship by reinforcing her existing role as obedient daughter. However, this role is most often emphasised in the formulaic sections of her letters, suggesting conventionality but also feeding back into that idea of her behaving appropriately and presenting a positive self-image.

Additionally, there are a number of occasions when Marie produces utterances that can be interpreted in a few different ways, or which simultaneously contain positive and negative facework. Such an ambiguous strategy could be advantageous when sending correspondence due to the genre's lack of immediacy. Since there would be quite a delay between messages, and unlike with face-to-face interaction no chance for immediate redress if something is misinterpreted, letter writers must have had to engage in some degree of doublethink, predicting the likely ways in which their words could be interpreted. By employing both positive and negative politeness strategies in one utterance, Marie essentially hedges her bets in the case that she causes some offence to Guillaume that she has not foreseen when writing her letter. Such examples also demonstrate the fact that facework is a complicated issue that requires constant attention in order to maintain harmony, especially when conducted through the written medium of correspondence.

In addition to these observations, some evaluative commentary can be made about the models applied in this chapter. Brown & Levinson's (1987) model benefits from the addition of self-politeness strategies (Chen 2001) and framing as a continuum rather than a binary (Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 1995). Terms of address provided a useful lens for analysing both conventionality and strategic politeness, highlighting that utterances can be said to appeal to certain face wants but without necessarily redressing a specific face-threatening act. This analysis also highlighted the fact that even one term of address can perform multiple different functions within the same letter, and it may not always be easy for the researcher to tease apart which functions apply. Marie's use of *'monsieur'* as a way of punctuating her utterances is a good example of this - this address term could simultaneously demarcate different topics in her letters whilst also highlighting the nature of the relationship between her and her father and appealing to his face wants. Additionally, although 'politic' behaviour was not foregrounded in this analysis, some knowledge of these conventional behaviours is important in order to understand which examples are strategic politeness and which are conventional, or indeed if they function in both ways.

5.3.2 Concluding remarks

The analysis of facework and politeness strategies in Marie de Nassau's personal correspondence to her father has been beneficial for a number of reasons. It has confirmed the productivity of politeness theory at describing some of the functions that language can perform to negotiate interpersonal relationships and individual desires, helping to explain the

functions of certain utterances in Marie's letters which generally conform to patterns predicted by the model. More specifically, it has helped to answer each of the core research questions of the current study, and additionally it has highlighted some elements that the theory overlooks and potential modifications which may be useful for future research.

Many of the conventions and expectations of early modern young women's correspondence (addressing RQ1) were uncovered through the analysis of formulaic sequences and comparisons with manuals in the previous chapter (chapter 4), but the analysis of facework and politeness strategies also contributes a little to this knowledge. The analysis of Marie's first order politeness highlights a theme of 'appropriateness', in other words what was recognised as being acceptable and expected behaviour. This is not just in terms of the language of correspondence, but rather a broader social expectation that people should behave in an appropriate manner, or that the appropriate person should be available to complete a task. 'Appropriateness' is therefore a useful way of distinguishing first order politeness from the more strategic second order politeness. The close analysis of address terms helped reveal some of the conventionality of this second order politeness - it was expected and conventional for daughters to address their fathers as *'monsieur',* but this very conventionality likely also diluted the meaning of this address term and as such it was unlikely to achieve its full effect of establishing social distance between Marie and her father. Other features of Marie's second order politeness also hint at the conventions of early modern daughters' correspondence. For example, the use of conventional address terms alongside generally negative or mixed politeness strategies were necessary in order for Marie to maintain the expected image of an obedient and deferential daughter, even if they did not redress any specific face threats due to their conventionality. Considering the maintenance of this image as an expectation of the genre, Marie's facework and politeness strategies are largely predicted by the model, with prevalent negative politeness strategies directed towards her social superior, alongside positive politeness strategies on occasions when their familial kinship was more important to highlight.

Politeness strategies and facework offer a good insight into how Marie was able to navigate the dynamics of the daughter-father relationship (addressing RQ2), since they are inherently relational. Here again the close analysis of address terms helped to uncover some of this relational value. Marie's tendency to use mixed but mostly negative politeness strategies suggests that maintaining the status of their relative social hierarchy was of primary importance, but this also had to be mediated with some positive facework in order to emphasise their kinship bonds as well. Indeed, finding a balance between expressing relative social standing and familial kinship seems to have been crucial for maintaining the status of their relationship via correspondence during times of absence. The close analysis of terms of address in particular highlighted this balancing act, with Marie often mixing terms

expressing social distance (*'monsieur'*) with those expressing social proximity (*'mon pere'*), which implicitly appeal to both negative and positive face wants. Although kinship was evidently important for Marie to express, respecting her father's status and their relationship took precedence. As such, whenever the balance was potentially upset by a face threatening act, Marie often directs the attention towards her own obedience and humility, promoting her self-image as one of a 'dutiful daughter' above all else.

This 'dutiful daughter' image is something that was clearly important to express, and Marie's correspondence allows for some insight into the nature of this daughterly role (addressing RQ3). The most obvious place where Marie signals this daughterly role is when she signs off her letters as *'vouster treshumble et tresobeisante fille'* ('your most humble and most obedient daughter'). There are also expectations linked with this daughterly role, as made evident when Marie remarks that she has failed to meet the expectations of her being an 'obedient daughter' and then promises to continue performing her duties, saving her own face in the process. The most evident of these duties was maintaining a regular correspondence with her father; an exchange that was reciprocal due to their kinship ties, meaning that fathers had responsibility to their daughters just as daughters did to their fathers. This responsibility for regular correspondence is likely to have been part of the role of the 'dutiful daughter', since regular correspondence would have demonstrated a shared kinship bond that she wished to maintain, but as was suggested in the previous chapter the content of Marie's letters suggests that she took on a little more responsibility than was expected of daughters. Her regular correspondence also hints at the wifely or motherly responsibilities she adopted, since it includes passing on news and wishes from the household and other acquaintances, as well as reports on household administration and financial matters, and comments on Guillaume's political endeavours. The analysis of politeness strategies hints at these additional responsibilities which young women like Marie de Nassau may have needed to adopt should the need arise. These responsibilities become more evident through the analysis of speech acts (chapter 6), which provide a related but different angle of insight into the pragmatic functions of Marie's correspondence.

6. Speech Acts

Having highlighted some of the key formulaic elements of Marie's letters, and looked closely at the politeness strategies used, many utterances can still be analysed in terms of their functional content and how they impact the nature of the correspondence and the relationship between Marie and her father. The close analysis of smaller linguistic units in particular can help to demonstrate the different ways in which language can be used. Wood (2009) uses tools from the field of critical discourse analysis to create a three-dimensional model of analysing the functions and meanings of language in historical discourse, which is then applied more specifically to a set of early modern English language correspondence. This three-dimensional model helps tease out different layers of meaning from historical texts, starting with features from the text itself at the micro level, which can be seen as part of a wider set of discursive practices at the meso level, which can in turn be seen as part of a host of broader social practices at the macro level of analysis. Starting with the micro level of the text itself, individual features can be isolated in order to focus the analysis. These features can include 'vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, text structure, speech acts, intertextuality, [and] coherence' (Wood 2009: 192). Of these features, the speech act, or 'illocutionary act' as it is sometimes called, is the primary 'unit of analysis' for categorising the ways in which language can be used to different effects (Searle 1979: vii-viii). As such, it is an appropriate text-level feature to interrogate in Marie's letters to Guillaume, since it allows her utterances to be analysed for their pragmatic content, that is to say the real-world implications of her language and how she used it to communicate different facts, feelings, desires, and expectations to her father. Although the name 'speech acts' implies that it only relates to spoken language, the same principles can be applied to written language. The text level analysis can then inform the discursive practice level, which deals with matters of production, distribution, and consumption of the primary texts (Wood 2009: 192). This includes consideration of any contextual and material practicalities of sending early modern correspondence, which can be inferred from the speech acts within her letters and backed up by historical accounts. These can then inform analysis at the level of social practice, which can be split into any number of different domains depending on the source text itself. Wood highlights 'social status, religion, and gender' as being the most significant social practice domains relevant to the fifteenth-century letters analysed in their article (Wood 2009: 192). In the case of Marie's letters, the social domains of most interest are the family and household, with a focus on daughter-father relationships and responsibilities, though social status, religion and gender do have their part to play as well.

The three-dimensional model of historical discourse analysis informs the structure of the first part of this chapter, starting from the micro level of the text (section 6.1), moving to the

meso level of discursive practice (section 6.2), and working out to the macro level of social practice (section 6.3). Despite this distinct division however it is important to remember that levels are interconnected frames, and so each level informs the others reciprocally - social and discursive practice levels will have their impact upon the text level unit of speech acts, and text and discursive practice levels will have their impact upon the social practice domains as well. This distinction into separate layers merely helps to articulate the multiple layers of meaning that are present in examples of early modern correspondence such as that sent by Marie to her father, each offering different yet interrelated perspectives on the same text. Marie's correspondence with her father provides a snapshot of how she experienced this relationship, and analysis can help to reveal the 'structures of expectations', to employ Wood's (2009: 195) terms. By analysing Marie's use of speech acts using this three-dimensional model, it should become clearer how her linguistic choices both directly influenced and were influenced by her relationship with her father, her role within the family and household, and the expectations placed on her as a young woman in the early modern period. In addition to this layered analysis, a few examples are considered in combination - not only across these three layers of analysis but also drawing upon the findings of the preceding analyses of formulaic sequences, politeness strategies and speech acts (section 6.4), before some concluding remarks are made on the analysis as a whole (section 6.5).

6.1 Text-level analysis - speech acts

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, text-level analysis can focus on any of a number of core linguistic features, including speech acts. Speech acts have been a staple of philosophy of language and pragmatic analysis for decades, and for the purposes of the current study the formal categorisation of speech acts by Searle (1979) is adopted. Searle (1979) reworks a classification system of speech acts originally proposed by Austin (1962), presenting a taxonomy of 'illocutionary acts' based upon their different formal properties. The main properties include the illocutionary force of an utterance, the direction of fit between words and world, and the expressed psychological state, along with other minor factors. For the current study, the most relevant property is the illocutionary force of the utterance, which in essence can be defined as the likely intended meaning of a utterance (as opposed to its literal meaning). There are five types of illocutionary act based on their formal properties: *assertives*, *directives*, *commissives*, *expressives*, and *declaratives*. Put simply, assertives represent a truth about the world, directives aim to compel someone else to take action, commissives oblige the person performing the utterance to take action, expressives demonstrate feelings and attitudes to the matter being discussed, and declaratives aim to bring about change (Searle 1979: 29). Individual utterances may fall into one or more of these categories, since they may have multiple functions, and so they are not distinct

categories as such. Due to this ambiguity present in much of linguistic communication, it is possible that an utterance may appear to have one function at face value, but a different indirect function or meaning that is implied through convention, and is based on the individual context of that utterance (Searle 1979: 30). In the remainder of this section, Searle's categorisation of illocutionary acts is explored in relation to Marie's correspondence with her father. The verbs used in illocutionary acts often correlate closely with the type of speech act being uttered, and so likely examples were searched for in the corpus of Marie's letters using keywords common to each type of speech act, as detailed in each subsection below.

6.1.1 Assertives

Assertives, also known as representatives, demonstrate the speaker's (or in this case the writer's) belief about the truth value of a proposition, although the degree of certainty about that belief can vary (Searle 1979: 12-13). Prominent examples of assertive speech act verbs that appear in Marie's letters include '*croire*' ('to believe') and '*penser*' ('to think'). These can range from straightforward examples, such as '*je ne say poient encore pour asseure quant il se doiuent partir mais sy esse que je croy que se serat bien apres la pentecoute*' ('I do not yet know for certain when they must leave but if it is as I believe it will be just after Pentecost', 1577/05/06), where Marie asserts her belief about a future event taking place which she thinks is relevant for Guillaume to know - in this case the gentry leaving Heidelberg for Geneva some time after Pentecost. Similarly with the verb *penser* she also writes: '*je pense que monsr mon oncle et madame se partiront ousy arire dicy dedens 3 ou 4 jour vers la maison mais je ne say poient bien sy nous y trouuerons encore*' ('I think that Monsieur my uncle and Madame [my aunt] also left from here about three or four days ago heading for the house, but I do not know if they have arrived there yet', 1576/10/15), where again she states the fact that her aunt and uncle left recently and she believes they will arrive soon. In other examples, there are indirect functions which are masked by the overtly expressed assertive speech act. One such example is the following assertive speech act: '*je pense bien que monsr mon oncle desirerat dauoir vouster conseil et que je croy que par sela il vous auertirat de tout*' ('I truly think that Monsieur my uncle would desire to have your advice and I believe that because of this he will inform you of everything', 1577/03/19), where overtly Marie is asserting her belief that it will be beneficial for her father and uncle to communicate about a certain issue. Indirectly though, this utterance also functions as a directive speech act (discussed in more detail below) by making the suggestion that her father should take action and offer his advice to her uncle. Since letters were commonly circulated around family members in the early modern period, it is also possible that her uncle Jean would have seen this letter at some point and also felt encouraged to

communicate with his brother Guillaume, especially since at this time she was living in the same household at Dillenburg (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009b: 1134). Given that Jean seems to have been away from the estate at this time, Marie may well have sent a similar missive to him, asserting her belief that he should contact Guillaume directly. These examples are typical of the assertives that appear in Marie's letters to her father, and perhaps less frequent than other types of speech act.

6.1.2 Directives

Directives are used as an attempt to convince the intended recipient or hearer of an utterance to perform a certain action, which implicitly hints at the sender or speaker's desires too (Searle 1979: 13-14). The most overt examples of directive speech act verbs in Marie's letters to Guillaume include '*desirer'* ('to want'), '*prier'* ('to pray'), and '*supplier'* ('to supplicate/pray'), which she employs to make certain requests of her father. On a number of occasions, she desires a written response to her letters, ideally in his own hand rather than a secretary's, for example '*[je] desire ousy fort dauoier de vous nouuelles*' ('[I] also greatly desire to have news from you', 1573/06/18), and '*Monsr mon bien ayme pere je vous supplie treshumblement que je pieuse bien to rauoir de vous nouuelles sil est pousibele*' ('Monsieur my beloved father, I so humbly ask that I might receive news back from you soon if it is possible', 1573/11/25). In other cases, she uses directives to request that her father keeps her in his good favour, such as '*en vouster bonne grace et souuenance en laquelle vous prie mauoir touiour*' ('I pray you to always keep me in your good grace and memory' 1573/09/23), and also to request forgiveness for her insistent nature if it annoys him '*je vous prie de me pardonner que je vous inportune tant*' ('I ask you to forgive me if I inconvenience you so [with my insistent letters and requests]' 1574/01/21). These examples show that directives can entail requests that require varying degrees of action from the recipient. In the examples above, Marie requests the physical and time-consuming written response, as well as more general remembrance by her father. It is also of note that these particular speech acts are performative, in that the act of uttering her request is itself the act or requesting - Marie desires, asks or prays in the same instant that she writes those words. Performative speech acts are always self-referential in this way, in that the utterance itself is the action.

Marie also makes use of directive speech acts in an indirect manner. Common speech act verbs used in such cases to introduce speech acts with a directive function include *auertir* (to inform), *escripre* (to write), *esperer* (to hope), *enstender* (to hear), and occasionally *deuoir* (should), and also utterances which contain the nominal form *desir* (desire). One example of an indirect directive speech act includes:

> '*Monsieur mon bien ayme pere cete seruirat pour vous auertir que jay rechu le*
>
> *20 de ce mois vouster letter quil vous a pleut mescripre et vous remercie*

treshumblement de lonneur et faueur que me fettes de me fere part de vous nouuelles'

    ('Monsieur my dear father, this letter will serve to inform you that I received on the twentieth of this month your letter which it pleased you to write to me and I so humbly thank you for the honour and favour that you do by sharing your news with me', 1574/01/21).

In this example, Marie ostensibly informs her father that she has received his letter and then goes on to thank him and express how much this meant to her (which is itself an expressive speech act, discussed below). However it can be argued that by continuing to elaborate on her emotional state how much it meant to her to receive this letter that she is also implicitly requesting that he continues to send letters regularly in the future, and her apparent delight at receiving news from him also implicitly obliges him to continue writing to her in order that he might make her feel this way again. She also implicitly creates a reciprocal obligation by stating that his letter had arrived safely, implying that once he receives the letter she is currently writing that he should also let her know of its safe arrival in kind.

Other examples of indirect directive speech acts include occasions when she seeks advice on a particular course of action but without asking him outright, as in '*je ne say comment que je me dois maintenant rigeler*' ('I do not know how I should act now', 1577/03/19). Here, she is clearly asking her father to write back to her by providing a reason for him to do so, and this also plays into the 'dutiful daughter' image since it demonstrates her deference towards him as a social superior, as has been seen in the preceding analyses. By highlighting a different aspect than the request, such as the positive emotions she experiences when receiving correspondence from him, or the reverence she has for this advice and opinions of certain issues, she reinforces her dutiful daughter image which in turn may make her request be more likely to be fulfilled. She may also use indirectness as a politeness strategy, or because she genuinely feels as though her requests may inconvenience Guillaume, like when she apologises '*que je vous inportune tant*' ('that I inconvenience you so') - if this is the case, the indirect posing of requests alongside justifications for him to contact her may be a way for Marie to feel like she is making less of an imposition on him.

With these examples, it is clear that Marie often uses directive speech acts in her correspondence with her father Guillaume to focus on securing a physical, written response that comes directly from him within a relatively short time period, even if she does not always make this request explicitly. This feeds into the cooperative principle as proposed by Grice: 'Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose of the talk exchange in which you are engaged' (Grice 1975: 47). Applying the

cooperative principle to the case of correspondence, since letter writing can be defined as a written conversation, in order for the conversation to function successfully, both parties must co-operate in the communicative act by following an agreed set of principles or expectations established by the medium of correspondence. In order for successful communication to occur in such a situation, both parties must cooperate by responding to one another: '[t]he expectation is that the letter, however long it may take to arrive, will eventually be answered' (Wood 2009: 197). This expectation is something that Marie continues in her use of commissives.

6.1.3 Commissives

In contrast to directives, commissive speech acts commit the sender or speaker of an utterance to perform a certain action (whether fully or partially), and by extension demonstrates their intentions (Searle 1979: 14). Examples can be found in Marie's correspondence when searching for the noun form of '*deuoir*' ('duty') and its related construction '*falir au deuoir*' ('to fail one's duty'), as well as the verb '*encherger*' ('to be entrusted with'). Marie uses the lexical item '*deuoir*' to convey a sense of duty, be it her own or someone else's. It is most often found as part of the construction '*fali[e]r au deuoir*', as in the examples: *'jay nay poient voulu falir au deuoir dobeysante fille de vous faire cete'* ('I did not wish to fail my duty of obedient daughter by writing this [letter]', 1574/05/15); *'jay nay poient voulu falir a mon deuoir de vous faire sete'* ('I did not want to fail my duty of making you this [letter]' 1577/03/19); and *'se pendant ne faulderay a mon deuoir de continuer a luy prier quil vous veule donner force'* ('however I will not fail my duty of continuing to pray to Him that He give you strength' 1573/12/05). In all of these examples, Marie indicates her intention to continue writing to Guillaume or praying to God, by emphasising how she must not fail to perform these actions, and simultaneously maintaining expected characteristics in the eyes of both her earthly father and her Heavenly Father. This construction has the effect of reinforcing her promise to perform these future actions. In the case where she commits herself to writing letters to her father, the utterance is itself the action and therefore is also a performative speech act. This is also the case for examples of *'encherger'* ('to be charged with [a task]') used as part of a commissive illocutionary act. In such examples, Marie highlights the fact that she has already made and fulfilled her promise - *'madame ma gran mere madame ma tante de nassaw mont encherge vous faire leur bien affectueuse recommandacion en vouster bonne grace'* ('Madame my grandmother and Madame my aunt of Nassau have entrusted me with passing you their most affectionate commendations into your good grace', 1573/11/25). The form of Marie's commissive speech acts tend to follow these patterns, and feature regularly throughout her letters. This suggests that making promises and then being obliged to keep her word were important elements for her to

highlight through speech acts in her letters, likely to bolster her image. The fact that she also uses these speech acts in a performative manner to demonstrate that she has already fulfilled her obligations is a useful strategy for her to indicate that she will likely continue to keep her word in the future, behaving as the dutiful daughter she is expected to be.

6.1.4 Expressives

Expressive speech acts primarily convey the sender or speaker's psychological state about the subject matter they are discussing in an utterance (Searle 1979: 15-16). As such, 'the expression is essentially subjective and tells us nothing about the world' (Mey 2001: 121), but they do demonstrate a great deal about the person performing the utterance and how they position themself in relation to the matter they are discussing. Unsurprisingly, these types of illocutionary act are the most numerous and varied in Marie's personal correspondence with her father, and express various states including gratitude, hopefulness or expectancy, uncertainty, concern for the welfare of others, and delight. Some expressive speech act verbs in Marie's letters include *'esperer'* ('to hope'), *'laisser'* (to allow), and *'louwer'* (to praise), although other verbs are often found in expressive speech act constructions such as *'auertir'* (to warn), *'deuoir'* (to be ought to), '*enstender'* (to hear), *'escripre'* (to write), *'inportuner'* (to inconvenience), *'remercier'* (to thank), and more indirectly the verbs *'prier'* (to pray) and *'supplier'* (to pray/supplicate).

There are many clear examples of Marie expressing her gratitude, such as *'je ne faulderay de luy remercier de tout mon ceur et luy prier ousy journelement'* ('I will not fail to thank Him with all my heart and also pray to Him daily', 1574/01/21), and *'suys este fort rejouy denstender par se porteur que estes encore en bonne sante decoy je loue mon dieu'* ('I was delighted to hear from this bearer that you are still in good health, for which I praise my God', 1577/03/19). In the first example her gratitude is obvious due to the use of the speech act verb *'remercier'* ('to thank'), whereas in the second example it is expressed implicitly with a vocabulary of happiness rather than overt gratitude. Interestingly both examples include gratitude alongside an invocation of God, which helps foster an image of Marie as a good Christian daughter who ascribes her good fortune (and more specifically news of her father's good health) to God.

Similarly, the psychological state of hopefulness is also found in conjunction with references to the divine, such as *'jespere auecque la grace de dieu que lennemy ny ganerat reyn'* ('I hope that with the grace of God the enemy shall gain no ground', 1573/06/18), and *'jespere que dieu laiderat hors de mayns de ces enemis'* ('I hope that God will help deliver them from the hands of these enemies', 1573/12/05). This invocation of the divine lends these utterances a prayer-like quality, which can be argued to function as directive speech acts that request the assistance of God. In another example, *'nous sommes encore en*

bonne sante dieu mercy esperant denstender le mesme de vous' ('we are all in good health, thanks be to God, hoping to hear the same of you', 1573/09/23), Marie expresses both gratitude and hopefulness, but this can also be interpreted as a formulaic sequence (as discussed in chapter 4, this example can be seen as an intersubjective and Christian-ritual formula).

Marie also expresses negative psychological states such as anxiousness or concern in her correspondence, although these states are usually implicit. For example, when Marie writes *'je ne say comment que je me dois tenir en sela'* ('I do not know how I should conduct myself in this [matter]', 1573/09/23), she expresses her uncertainty about her own ability to devise the best course of action to take in this utterance and so follows this up with a request of advice from her father. She also frequently shows disquiet about potentially crossing the boundaries of her status in relation to Guillaume, as evidenced by utterances such as *'crayndant vous donner facherie auecque plus longue letter chachant bien que estes inportun[e] auecque beaucops des aulters affaires fayray la fin'* ('fearing causing you an inconvenience with a longer letter, knowing full well that you are encumbered with many other affairs, I will finish', 1574/06/22). This demonstrates a sense of status and daughterly duty by writing to him, but also not wishing to overstep her mark, or metaphorically overstay her welcome, by making too many demands or writing a letter so long that it will delay him from his other duties.

Marie also uses the modifier *'treshumblement'* ('most humbly') in some of her expressive speech acts to help express her deference towards her father, although this may well be a conventional form. Specific examples include *'je vous remercie treshumblement de lonneur quil vous a pleut me faire'* ('I most humbly thank you for the honour that it pleased you to write to me', 1573/08/18), a performative expressive speech act where the modifier adds significance to Marie's expression of gratitude by highlighting her humble and deferential image. It also bolsters these features in other types of performative speech act, such as the directive *'je vous supplie treshumblemen[t] monsr'* ('I most humbly pray of you Monsieur', 1573/06/18),

Marie's apparent concern about her relationship with her correspondent and father also extends to general concern for the welfare of members of their family and social network, but again this concern is typically concealed within other constructions. For example, Marie appears to state the fact *'je ne peus laisser de vous auertir comme le porteur de sete ariue icy il na poient trouue monsr mon oncle Jan'* ('I cannot fail to inform you that the bearer of this [letter] arrived without having found Monsieur my uncle Jean', 1574/05/15), and whilst the literal interpretation of the utterance, or locutionary act, states the fact that the letter-bearer had not found uncle Jean as was presumably intended, the illocutionary act

implies a degree of concern about why this might not have happened and therefore the welfare of this family member.

At this point it is worth outlining the concept of implicature. A simple implication establishes a logical link between two propositions, usually with the causal relationship 'if… then…' (Mey 2001: 46). Conversational implicature on the other hand requires an additional layer of interpretation than simply a logical causal relationship (Mey 2001: 47), one which is dependent upon the context of language use. This is the type of implicature that Marie employs in the above example, for she does not explicitly mention her concern for her uncle's welfare, but makes the suggestion that the course of action her father might have expected to have happened after he sent his original correspondence with the letter bearer (that the letter bearer would find Jean and then travel on to Marie before returning to Guillaume) has not in fact come to pass. In this context of correspondence travelling between participants with a letter bearer, any suggestion that the expected course of action has failed automatically implies a degree of care and concern by the person who mentions this fact.

Concern for the welfare of other family members is also occasionally expressed in prayer-like utterances involving the verb '*prier*' ('to pray'), for example *'je prie a dieu de la vouloir aider plus auant et luy donner forse et b[ien] to bonne sante'* ('I pray that God might wish to help her even more than before and give her strength and soon good health', 1577/05/25), in a letter informing Guillaume of the health of Marie's pregnant aunt. Marie's concern for other family members' health is often paired with a clear expression of delight at hearing of their good health: *'suys este fort rejouwy denstender que estes encore en bonne sante'* ('I was so delighted to hear that you are still in good health', 1573/12/05). In cases like this, the expressive speech act also functions indirectly as a directive speech act, since the fact that she has had such a positive reaction to receiving news from her father that she chooses to inform him of this delight may serve to condition him into sending her more news of his good health in the future.

6.1.5 Declaratives

The final type of speech act in the typology used for this study is the declarative. These illocutionary acts bring about a certain state of affairs, declaring a proposition to be truthful or representing factual information through the very act of its utterance (Searle 1979: 16-17). These are also performative speech acts, due to the fact that their very utterance brings about the change in the world as they are performed, be it spoken or written. In other words, performative utterances 'do not merely describe things which may be proved true or false and are not 'just saying something'; they constitute, at least in part, the actual 'doing' of a socially recognized act' (Williams 2013: 113-114). There are several examples of these in

Marie's letters to her father, including many that have already been encountered, such as *'madame ma gran mere madame ma tante de nassaw mont encherge vous faire leur bien affectueuse recommandacion'* ('Madame my grandmother and Madame my aunt of Nassau have entrusted me with passing you their most affectionate commendations', 1573/11/25). In this case, aside from it being a commissive speech act demonstrating that she has made a promise to pass on her relatives' regards to her father, Marie fulfils this promise in the process of writing this letter and that particular utterance. As a declarative, or performative, speech act, the act of writing this utterance brings about a new state of affairs, one in which a promise has been simultaneously made and fulfilled, and the truth of the proposition has then been conveyed to the recipient.

Other performative utterances feature prominently in Marie's correspondence, for example in the opening sequence of one of her earlier letters she writes: *'jay nay poient voulu falir au deuoir dobeisante fille de vous faire cete pour me remente uoir treshumblement en vouster bonne grace'* ('I did not wish to fail my duty as [your] obedient daughter so I wrote you this [letter] to be remembered most humbly into your good grace', 1573/12/25). In this example, Marie makes a clear performance of her daughterly duty by expressing her desire that she be remembered in her father's good grace, if this was not evident from the act of correspondence itself and her repeated references to herself as his obedient daughter. Indeed this parallels findings from studies of English-language correspondence at a similar time period, where 'love and duty were things to be *remembered* in letters, particularly in those sent to one's superiors, and expressive performatives typically occur within the opening or closing of a letter' (Williams 2013: 129, their emphasis). This implies that this type of performative utterance was a conventional feature of early modern correspondence, helping to demonstrate a sense of duty and obedience through the act of letter-writing, in turn reinforcing a particular self-image. Although these directive or performative speech acts were likely common or indeed expected features of early modern correspondence, a great deal can be learned from the analysis of speech acts more generally across different spheres of influence, rather than focusing on how they brought about new realities at the moment of their utterance.

6.1.6 Text-level analysis summary

This preliminary analysis of the speech acts in Marie's letters to her father demonstrates a number of functions they served, often simultaneously. These included her assertions about likely courses of action that she believes will be of interest to her father, her requests to remain in his affections and to receive replies from him with news or advice, her promises of being an obedient daughter, her expressions of gratitude and hopefulness but also anxiety and concern, and her bringing about a state of affairs through the very act of writing itself.

These functions are employed in both direct and indirect manners, often with requests for action being implied rather than explicitly asked, which perhaps says more about Marie's use of politeness strategies or could have been conventional - demonstrating the interrelation between the different pragmatic elements isolated for interrogation in the current study. In a similar manner, expressions of negative emotions are typically masked by more neutral informative language. Through her use of expressive speech acts, Marie is able to show a great deal of concern about the wellbeing of her family members, and the fact that she frequently pairs her expressives with comments about receiving correspondence from her father suggests that for Marie the receipt of letters was intimately tied to her emotions, and that she did use them as a means of self-expression. This reinforcing expression of positive emotion upon receipt of a letter from her father in turn may have acted as a directive speech act requesting further responses. Her use of directives more generally suggests that she used correspondence as a means to navigate some of the dynamics in her relationship with her father. It is these wider spheres of influence that Marie's use of speech acts imply for both the practice of correspondence and also the nature of early modern daughter-father relationships that form the basis of the following sections, as the lens of focus broadens to the discursive practice and social practice levels, before tying it all together in the final two sections of the chapter.

6.2 Discursive practice level analysis

Whilst examining Marie's use of speech acts at the level of the text allows the identification of the different functions these utterances could potentially perform, it is important to expand the lens and analyse them within the context of wider discursive practices regarding early modern young women's personal correspondence, and even broader social practices regarding the role of young women in early modern society (which will be discussed in section 6.3). At the discursive practice level, material and practical considerations surrounding early modern letter-writing come into play, since as noted earlier '[t]he production, distribution and consumption of letters entail many physical aspects resulting from the fact that letters are communication at a geographical and temporal distance' (Palander-Collin 2010: 656). As with any communication, '[l]etter writing activity is a specific kind of social interaction in which particular behaviour is expected' (Wood 2009: 199), and so certain constraints of the form will need to be considered in order to better understand Marie's use of speech acts. Recursively, the analysis of Marie's personal correspondence can also provide insight into the process of letter-writing itself, since common practices and expectations can be inferred from her utterances. In this section, Marie's use of speech acts in her letters are considered in relation to some of the practicalities of early modern correspondence.

One salient feature of early modern correspondence is the presence of a *'porteur'*, or letter-bearer, as part of the communicative act. Without this means of transporting the message from one correspondent to another, the process would not have been possible. These letter-bearers were often private and trusted messengers, such as family, friends, or household staff, since letters were liable to be intercepted en route (Palander-Collin 2010: 656). The availability of a suitable letter-bearer was evidently a key constraint on Marie's ability to communicate with her father, since at times their availability could be limited. This is shown in one example, where she uses an assertive speech act to excuse herself for not having written in some time: *'Il nat jamais manque a ma bonne voulonte mais locasion at este que nay seu porteur allant vers vous'* ('It was never my intention [to leave it so long without writing] but chance had it that I knew of no letter-bearer headed your way', 1573/08/18). At this point it has likely been around six weeks since her last letter, and this assertive shows that she is not responsible for this delay and therefore had not shirked her daughterly responsibility of regular correspondence. On other occasions letter-bearers would be readily available, only for a short window of opportunity for a letter to be written. This has been shown in early modern England where it is known that 'the sudden arrival and departure of a bearer, could encourage an urgent immediacy among letter-writers' (Daybell 2009: 184). This is evidenced in a few of Marie's letters, with declarative speech acts such as *'je ne vous fayray sete plus longue a cause que je ne say quant se porteur se doit partir vers vous'* ('I will not write any more since I do not know when the letter-bearer needs to leave to reach you', 1574/06/01). Similarly, if she knows that a letter-bearer will soon be heading for her father, she makes this apparent with an assertive speech act that highlights how she is fulfilling her duty: *'Monsr comme jay seu que se porteur est arire alle vers vous jay nay poient voulu falir a mon deuoir de vous faire sete'* ('Monsieur, when I knew that this letter-bearer was ready to travel in your direction I did not want to fail my duty of writing you this [letter]', 1577/03/19). This demonstrates how letter-writing was expected regularly, and was a time-sensitive task primarily reliant on the availability of the letter-bearer and prompted by their presence or imminent departure.

Letter bearers were not only entrusted with the transmission of the material object of the letter from the sender to the intended recipient(s), but they would often be tasked with relaying an additional message orally as well, and may even have read the physical letter aloud to those present too. Marie makes several references to such occasions, with assertive speech acts that indirectly function as directives, such as *'comme le porteur de cete vous dirat bien'* ('as the bearer of this [letter] will surely tell you', 1573/09/23), *'quant aus aulter nouuelles vous entenderes le tout par le porteur de cete'* ('as for the other news, you will hear it all from the bearer of this [letter]', 1573/10/15), and *'monsr entenderat bien par se porteur comment que toute les affaire pardesa se portent'* ('Monsieur, you will surely hear

from this letter-bearer how all the other affairs are progressing', 1577/04/04). In each of these cases Marie uses an assertive to state her belief that the message will be passed on, but there is an implied directive that is aimed at the letter-bearer, requesting that they pass on the unwritten content of the message, and also aims at her father, requesting that he ensures the letter-bearer informs him of that content. It could also be interpreted as a declarative, since she causes this action to be performed upon receipt of the letter. This evidently functioned both ways, since Marie expresses her gratitude by acknowledging receipt of messages from her father spoken by the letter-bearer, often informing her of his good health: *'je suys ousy et fort rejouwy denstender par se porteur vouster bonne sante'* ('I am also delighted to hear of your good health from this letter-bearer', 1574/05/15). This highlights the apparent importance of health as a topic in Marie's letters, a daughterly concern that one might expect but may also have been an expected topic for a young woman to cover in her correspondence with parents (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009b: 1140).

Letter-bearers were not the only additional agents to be involved in the act of early modern correspondence. These could sometimes involve scribes and other staff, although Marie appears to have written the letters examined in the current study in her own hand. Instead, it was often other family members who wished to add their piece to Marie's writing. In the majority of her letters, Marie has been charged with passing on the regards from other family members who are with her at the time of writing, usually following a form like: *'madame mat commande vous faire se bien humbles recommandacions en vouster bonne grace'* ('Madame asked me to pass on her truly humble commendations into your good grace', 1577/05/06) - a commissive and declarative speech act as already outlined above. She will often pass on apologies for those who are otherwise indisposed and cannot write, for example: *'elle vous euse voulontir escript mesme mais elle est sy grosse quelle ne se sait casy apesser'* ('she would gladly have written to you herself but she is so heavily pregnant that she cannot settle down', 1577/05/06). This is indicative of a wider social expectation for family members to be in regular contact with their patriarchal figurehead, Guillaume, but in practice often only one person in the household was able to sit down and write a letter so the others would use them as an intermediary to pass on their regards. However, as has already been partially examined, one of Marie's letters contains an addition from another relative - Marie's aunt, and Guillaume's sister, Juliana de Nassau, adds this postscript in her own hand:

> *'Monsieur trouuant Madamoiselle ma nipse qui vous escripuoit je nay peu*
> *lesser vous presenter mes treshumble recomandations auecque offre de tout*
> *obeisanse et seruise de fidelle seruante*
> *Vre treshumble seruante*
> *Juliana de Nassaw'*

('Monsieur, finding Mademoiselle my niece writing to you, I could not neglect presenting you my truly humble commendations with offer of all the obedience and service of a faithful servant. Your truly humble servant, Juliana de Nassau', 1574/05/15, in Juliana's hand)

This example highlights the collaborative nature that early modern correspondence had, much more so than modern day private missives. This addition by Juliana in her own hand shows how it was good practice for those who could write to do so when possible, even if it was just a few lines in someone else's letter. Her utterances also highlight the social dynamics between siblings of differing status within the family, with a similar level of deference to that presented by Marie, though this is constrained somewhat by the formulaic nature of passing on commendations.

There is also evidence that Marie acted as an intermediary for other social relations, not just between Guillaume and the household at Dillenburg. For example, with an assertive speech act she explains to her father that *'le porteur de sete ariue icy il na poient trouue monsr mon oncle Jan ~~icy~~ car il sestoyt party dicy passe quelque Jour'* ('the bearer of this [letter] arrived without having found Monsieur my uncle Jean ~~here~~ because he left here a few days ago', 1574/05/15). On occasion she also took on the responsibility of passing on messages from other workers and friends of the family. For example, she writes: *'le mayer de linbourh mat prie que je vous voulderoys escripre a la faueur de son fis pieus quil lat sy grant desir de vous fair[e] seruise [...] le pere men at tant prie que je le vous voulderois escripre que je ne luy ay seu refuser'* ('the mayor of Linburg asked that I might wish to write you with favour of his son who has great desire to serve you [...] the father was so insistent on asking me to write to you that I did not know how to refuse him', 1573/09/23) and later *'je suys este requis de Jan Vadelfe cannon ny porteur de cete pour vous escripre en sa faueur lequel at este icy au seruise de monsr mon oncle lepase dung an ou plus'* ('I was asked by Jean Vadelfe canon and bearer of this [letter] to write you in his favour since he has been here in the service of my uncle for the last year or more', 1574/06/01). In both of these examples, Marie indirectly uses declarative commissive speech acts that pass on the commendations and desires of other people who wish to be in good favour with Guillaume. Her reaction of 'not knowing how to refuse' the mayor of Linburg's request demonstrates the sense of obedience and a daughterly duty to pass on these messages and requests, with the assumption that Guillaume will accept. She may have been chosen by these other people as the most likely candidate to put in a good word to her father, since daughters were expected to write regularly to their parents. These examples also show that Marie has been granted the ability to commend others into her father's service, such as the mayor's son and the bearer of the letter from June 1574, which in itself demonstrates a degree of agency and responsibility within the family and the wider social network. Therefore it is likely that as

Guillaume's eldest daughter living in the family estate, she acted on his behalf when he was away, since she was a representative of this branch of the family. This also ties in with the idea that early modern women were brought up to be able to step into whichever role was required of them during their adult life: 'women as adults switched between roles, choosing according to the circumstances to utilize what were conventionally held to be masculine skills or feminine qualities' (Pollock 1989: 250). Her correspondence with her father was a good domain to practise different roles and responsibilities whilst keeping Guillaume informed of everything he needed to know.

Another aspect of the material practice of letter writing made evident by Marie's use of speech acts is the expectation for regular correspondence. This is apparent from her use of expressive speech acts that betray her anxiety about either disappointing her father by not having written in a timely manner, or conversely her disapproval about not having heard from him. She makes explicit the expectation of regular correspondence in one case (assertive rather than expressive) where a letter-bearer had been repeatedly delayed in leaving and so Marie had kept on writing extra letters for them to take: *'Monsr mon bien bon pere comme le porteur de cete a este retune plus longtamps [...] je luy auois donne quelque letters pour vous deliueres lequelle seront bien vielles [...] de ce faire a tout heur que poroys trouuer la commo[dite]'* ('Monsieur my dear father, since the bearer of this letter has been away a while [...] I have given him several letters for you, many of which are very old [...] [but I] do this at my earliest opportunity', 1573/10/15). She specifically refers to a letter she had written two weeks prior that is included with the current letter, so it is possible that fortnightly correspondence was the frequency with which she was expected to provide her father with updates at this point in their lives, and this may well have been common practice for young adult daughters writing to their parents outside of the Nassau family too. Similarly, Marie also appreciates regular responses from Guillaume: *'sommes este eung espase de tamps que nay auons eu se bien dauoier de vous letter'* ('it has been a great deal of time since we have had this honour of receiving a letter from you', 1573/08/18), which indicates that there is a certain amount of reciprocity in the relationship. This is another assertive speech act but within this utterance there is an implicit sense of delight at receiving a letter or even a sense of disappointment at the lack of communication.

The analysis of speech acts at this medial level of discursive practice has helped to illuminate a little more about the practice of sending and receiving correspondence in the early modern period, at least for the Nassau family if not others. The practicalities of letter-writing meant that personal correspondence with family was not a one-to-one private medium but rather a collaboration between multiple family members and staff, mediated through letter-bearers who would often confer additional information to the intended recipient(s). It is also apparent that regular correspondence was expected between

daughters and fathers. In Marie's case, it is also evident that she was taking on a number of responsibilities during this period of her adolescence that would set her up well for her future married adult life.

6.3 Social practice level analysis

At the macro level of analysis, speech acts can be used to make comments on the broader social practices regarding early modern correspondence and the relationship between daughter and father as mediated through the letter, as well as hinting at the roles and responsibilities taken on by young women. At this level of analysis, broad social identities and concepts become relevant: 'The social aspects of letter-writing most clearly include macro-societal issues like the distribution of literacy and power, relevant social distinctions like social hierarchies and gender, and dominant ideologies like religion' (Palander-Collin 2010: 653). In Marie's case specifically, these 'macro-societal issues' include concepts like the daughter-father relationship, early modern young women's duties, the early modern household, and religious matters..

The importance of regular correspondence between parent and child is made apparent in an example from Marie's letters, hinting at her social role within the family at this point in time. She writes:

> *'je vous enuoie encore eungne letter que jay escript en auguste affin que voies que en nulle sorte du monde je ne veulx faire a vous escripre et il me desplait bien que je nay peus auoir se bien de vous escripre sy souuent que voulderois bien jauois touiour espere quil y feusse alle quelqun vers vous pour vous enuoier ma letter mais comme jay nay seu person[ne] je le vous enuoie auecque se porteur esperant quelle vous ferat fort bien adres[se]'*

> ('I also send you another letter that I wrote in August so that you may see in no circumstance did I not wish to write to you, and it displeases me that I cannot have the benefit of writing to you as often as I would like, I have always hoped that there may be someone heading towards you who could send on my letter, but since I knew of nobody, I send it to you with this bearer, hoping that it will find you well', 1573/09/23)

In this example, a series of assertive and expressive speech acts, which also function as declaratives, highlight the importance of regular parent-child correspondence, as has been seen elsewhere. However, the emphasis on its importance may well have been amplified by the fact that Marie was the eldest daughter and seemingly had extra responsibilities within the household - one of which could have been keeping Guillaume updated with affairs. Within the wartime context as well, this example also shows how Marie was aware of the possibility of her letters falling into the wrong hands should they be given to an unsuitable

letter-bearer. She also notes in other examples how she has deliberately avoided writing certain sensitive pieces of information in her letters, lest they fall into the wrong hands, which betrays an anxiety regarding the possibility of compromising her father's position in his military operations that were ongoing at points during this time period.

Marie's use of speech acts can help to reveal a fair amount about the family and household, and by extension the expected social roles of young women in a similar position to Marie at this time. Her letters contain many utterances which emphasise her social standing as a dutiful daughter and obedient servant. For example, the commissive *'pour vous pouoir render treshumble seruise et consolation en tout ce quil me seroyt pousibele'* ('so that I might render you most humble service and consolation in all that is possible for me to do', 1573/11/25) commits her into her father's service, emphasising her comparatively low status. The directive request *'je vous supplie bien humblement que la longue absence ne soyt ocasion de me mester en obly'* ('I so humbly ask that this long absence will not cause you to forget about me', 1574/06/22) also reinforces the social hierarchy by a display of deference towards him. She also combines a commissive and directive in a formulaic closing sequence *'tant feray la fin vous priant bien humblement monsr me tenir touiour pour vouster humble et obeisante fille'* ('so I will draw to a close here, humbly praying you, Monsieur, to keep me forever as your humble and obedient daughter', 1577/04/04), here making the father-daughter relationship obvious. This notion of obedience and deference is indicative of the expectations placed upon daughters even into adulthood - whether or not she truly desired to serve him, or it was simply her obligation, at the very least this adherence to expectations functions as a sign of respect and familial duty.

The performance of daughterly duty is something that occurs throughout Marie's letters, and was encouraged in other parts of Europe during the early modern period: 'Daughters in particular were enjoined to display filial obedience in writing to parents' (Daybell 2015: 510). Marie emphasises her daughterly duty to Guillaume with commissives such as *'tant que je uiueray je vous demureray obeisante fille en tout se quil vous plairat me commander'* ('as long as I live I will remain your obedient daughter in anything that it pleases you to ask of me', 1576/03/02*), 'je nay voulu falir au deuoir dobeisante fille de vous faire cete'* ('I did not wish to fail my daughterly duty in writing you this', 1577/01/26)*, and 'je desire de vous render touiour obeisance en tout se quil me serat pousibele'* ('I desire to always render you obedience in all that is possible', 1577/05/25). It is interesting to note the vocabulary she uses to convey her sense of duty is one of willingness rather than obligation - she *desires*, *wishes* and *wills* to be an obedient daughter, rather than feeling that she *should*, *must* or *is obliged to* behave in such a way in order to please her father, at least in the letters analysed. Even if it was somewhat conventional and expected, it potentially had the added benefit of keeping her father's good favour should she ever need to request something in the future. It

is also worth noting here that daughters, especially unmarried ones, were unable to offer future service to their fathers (unlike sons might be able to promise future service), and so the only currency with which they could negotiate with their fathers was their emotional loyalty and sense of duty to the father and the family (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009b: 1143).

Marie's deference toward her father is also indicated in material ways in her letters to her father. She follows the conventions of placing her closing salutation and signature in the bottom right hand corner of the paper she is writing on. In some cases she will also leave a margin of negative space, another index of her lower relational status to her correspondent, but this is not always the case. This link between negative space and social standing in relation to the correspondent is commonly found in the early modern period and can be generalised under the following rule: 'the requirement that socially superior addressees be honoured with as much blank paper as possible' (Gibson 1997: 2). Another feature of filial obedience found in the materiality of Marie's letters include the blank space left after her closing salutation with the signature in the bottom right hand corner. This honorific blank space and signature placement was a marked visual sign of obedience in early modern women's letters (Daybell 2015: 67). On the occasions where only a small amount of negative space is left, it could be indicative of a sense of familiarity and intimacy - after all they are close family members - which might result in the letter being read more favourably than if a more formal layout and tone were to be used. Marie does leave more space in her later letters, and some of these contain more direct requests for action on her father's part, so there could be a weak correlation between these factors as Marie became more familiar with the customary expectations of letter-writing over the years.

However, being an obedient daughter did not mean that Marie lacked freedom of expression. Indeed early modern women were brought up to show deference to men 'but not to preclude the possibility of independent thought or action' (Pollock 1989: 250). This ties in with politeness theory as outlined in the previous chapter, for when attempting to challenge the confines of her position, Marie risks threatening the face of both herself and her father. By making requests of her father, she steps outside of her usual image of the obedient daughter and therefore risks threatening both his and her face by asking too much of Guillaume and causing him offence as a result. In order to mitigate this potential offence, a degree of cooperative face-work, or a politeness strategy, must be used so that Guillaume does not take offence and that Marie maintains her image of the obedient daughter.

In a similar manner, she was also able to make requests of her father when the need arose and trusted that he would be willing and able to provide. This is most evident when it comes to financial concerns. In the first letter of the selection, she comments to her father with an assertive speech act that *je nay encore rin entendu [...] de cet argent'* ('I have heard nothing yet [...] about this money', 1573/06/18). In the next few letters her concern about this

matter becomes more pressing, as she uses an expressive speech act which functions indirectly as a directive request: *'je desire fort denstender [...] toute nouuelles des affaire de cet argent'* ('I greatly desire to hear [...] any news of this money', 1573/08/18). This becomes more insistent as she later repeats: *'vous entenderes par icelle toute nouuelles de cet argent que je dois encore receuoir de vouster part mais monsr comme je vous auois escript que je nauois encore rins entendu de ce marchans qui me deuerinte liuere ce 3000 flurins'* ('you will hear from this [bearer] all news of the money that I am still waiting to receive from you but Monsieur as I have already written to you I have as yet heard nothing of this trader who ought to deliver me these 3000 florins', 1573/09/23). This once again functions as an indirect directive that requests Guillaume follow up this missing money. By mid-October of that year, at least four months after the money was promised, she follows up the main body of her letter with a footnote about the ongoing issue: *'qui me deuerinte liuerer cet argent comme maues escript aultrefois je nen ay encore nulle nouuelles comme entenderes bien par mes aulters letters'* ('[as for those people] who should be bringing me this money like you have written to [tell] me [about] before, I have not yet had any news, as you shall well hear from my other letters', 1573/10/15). The inclusion of this topic in the closing lines of this last letter is possibly an indication of her exasperation that such a long time has passed between the promise of money and her still not receiving it, almost an afterthought after having been persistent in her previous letters. It could also be a technique of getting her father to take action on the matter, since it will be one of the last things he reads from her, it might stand a better chance of being remembered and acted upon. Whatever effect this may or may not have had upon Guillaume's actions regarding this monetary exchange, the matter seems to have resolved itself by the end of the following month, since there is no mention of the missing sum of money again after her letter of 25 November 1573.

When not preoccupied with monetary concerns, a more usual request for Marie to make of her father is simply that of receiving a reply. In cases such as the following she conveys her directives in the guise of expressives, once again through the technique of self-denial accompanied by indulging her father: *'ne vous veux poient [im]portuner auecque longue letter chachant bin que aues des aulter enpechemens asses monsr je suys fort desirante de auoir eung petit mot de letter vennant de vous mains car de longtamps nay eu se bien den auoir'* ('I do not wish to inconvenience you with a long letter, knowing full well that you have many other engagements, Monsieur, I greatly desire to have just one small word of a letter coming from your hand since it has been such a long time since I have had the pleasure', 1573/10/15). In this example, she shows her own sense of deference toward him by noting that she does not wish to take up too much of his time with the reading of her letter. She continues to make her request of receiving a reply from him, but mitigates any sense of obligation caused by this directive utterance by acknowledging that he has many other

affairs to attend to, but then she goes on to politely reinforce her request by saying it has been such a long time since she has had the pleasure of receiving a letter from him - implicitly suggesting that although she knows her father has plenty of other pressing matters to be attending to, she feels that she should still be one of his priorities and receive regular updates about his wellbeing.

Along with obligations to her family, Marie also demonstrates religious obligations in her use of speech acts, for there are a number of occasions when she invokes the presence of the Christian God in her letters, such as the commissive *'je ne faulderay de luy remercier de tout mon ceur et luy prier ousy journelement'* ('I will not fail to thank Him with all my heart and also pray to Him daily', 1574/01/21). These cases can indicate her devotion to God, not only as a dutiful daughter but also a dutiful Christian daughter, but they could equally be interpreted as conventional parts of the letter, as the analysis of formulaic sequences (see chapter 4) highlighted. Indeed it is possible that both are true. In either case, this was clearly an important aspect of the Nassau social life which was crucial to represent within their correspondence.

There are a few instances that could be interpreted as Marie presenting her identity as a good Christian woman when invoking God. In such cases, she usually refers to Him directly as *'dieu'* ('God'), *'le tout puisant'* ('the Almighty') or *'noster siengneur'* ('our Lord'), occurring frequently with expressive speech act verb *'esperer'* ('to hope'), or unsurprisingly the performative speech act verb *'prier'* ('to pray'). She makes prayer-like utterances within her letters to her father, such as *'jespere que dieu laiderat hors de mayns de ces enemis'* ('I hope that God will help deliver them from the hands of these enemies', 1573/12/05), or *'jespere que noster siengneur donnerat la grace qui ne paruinderont poient a leur intension et que le nosters aront victore'* ('I hope that our Lord will give us the grace that they [the enemy] will not achieve their goal but that our side shall be victorious', 1573/12/05). Similarly, she prays for her aunt's health during pregnancy: *'je prie a dieu de la vouloir aider plus auant et luy donner forse et b[ien] to bonne sante'* ('I pray that God might wish to help her even more than before and give her strength and soon good health', 1577/05/25). These utterances bring her father into the prayer with her, as perhaps she considered the best way she can help her father (or aunt in the last example) is through prayer and for God to intervene. They also outline some of Marie's anxieties about the circumstances of society in which her family members found themselves at the time - be they perils of war or the dangers of childbirth - an anxiety not aided by the geographical and temporal distance that separated her from her correspondent. The other instances of Marie invoking God in her letters are perhaps best categorised as Christian-ritual formulae, which have already been analysed. These cases, such as *'le tout puisant lequel je prie vous donner monsr en parfaite sante heureuse vie et longue'* ('the Almighty whom I pray will keep you, Monsieur, in perfect

health with a long and happy life', 1577/09/20), whilst largely conventional and formulaic still demonstrate an obligation for Marie to present a good image.

The presence of religious language in Marie's letters to her father, though formulaic in many cases, is indicative of the period of reform they were living through. Members of the Nassau family did not all share the same version of the Christian faith (although these differences did not detract from their ability to prioritise dynastic concerns), and indeed by 1574 Guillaume would convert from Catholicism to Calvinism. This faith was shared by Marie, so the presence of her commissive and directive speech acts along the lines of 'we have many reasons to thank God' may have helped to reinforce the spiritual bond that they shared. During 1574 in particular, it is possible that Marie was particularly reliant on her faith and concerned for her father's welfare since mortality would have been on her mind. At this point her father was still leading the war effort against the Spanish in the Netherlands, likely based at Leiden, and her uncles, Guillaume's younger brothers Louis and Henry, had both died in the Battle of Mookerheyde in April of that year. As such it is likely that Marie's letters around this time may have focused more than usual on health, commendation into God's care, with an increased importance on communicating family news.

The analysis of Marie's correspondence with her father at the social-practice level has highlighted a few key aspects of Marie's life. In the first instance, the role of correspondence in reinforcing the relationship between father and daughter during periods of absence as hinted in the discursive-practice level is re-emphasised. This can also be conceptualised as part of her responsibilities within the family and household context, and it is likely that her status as eldest daughter contributed to making the sending of regular updates to her father one of her core duties. The idea of a dutiful daughter is something that has been seen elsewhere, and whilst this analysis does show Marie presenting this image on many occasions, there are other moments when she does not strictly adhere to it - her presentation as a dutiful daughter does not limit her freedom of expression. Some of the topics that come up a few times in her letters include monetary concerns, implying that she took on responsibility for these matters potentially as eldest daughter and due to her being responsible for her younger siblings. Health and religion are also dominant topics in her letters, which makes sense given the context in which they were written and especially her familial circumstances. One confounding factor is that these topics are also examples of formulaic sequences that were expected in correspondence at the time, as seen earlier in this thesis. This indicates that it was also an expectation of the dutiful daughter to include these matters in their regular correspondence, and reiterates the findings of the meso-level discursive practice analysis.

6.4 Combined analysis

Having analysed the function of speech acts at three distinct levels of discourse, from text level, through discursive-practice level, and to social-practice level, it has become clear that whilst this layered analysis can help isolate specific forms and functions of speech acts in Marie of Nassau's correspondence with her father, they also all combine together in order to produce certain effects in her writing. The specific instances of speech acts she employed in her letters had effects at each of these different levels, and in turn can inform our understanding not only of Marie's own letter-writing practices, but more broadly of the nature of early modern young women's correspondence and even some of the social conventions that were in play at the time and how they were expressed through personal correspondence. These different levels clearly work together to produce certain effects, whether intentional or conventional. In a similar manner, the preceding analyses of the pragmatic features of formulaic sequences and politeness strategies, followed by the current analysis of speech acts, have all been considered as separate units. However, they all coexist in the writings of Marie to her father, and so they must also be considered for the effects they likely produce when combined in the context of one another and the wider text. Therefore in this section, a few key examples from Marie's letters are considered, not only in relation to how she uses speech acts to produce different effects at the three levels of discourse, but also with regard to what has already been seen from the analysis of formulaic sequences and politeness strategies in the two preceding chapters. These examples also bridge the levels of text, discursive-practice and social practice, highlighting the role of pragmatic features in matters such as early modern young women's responsibilities, their socialisation into adulthood, the expectations of father-daughter relationships and their expression through correspondence, and some of the practical aspects of early modern family correspondence. This combined analysis helps clarify some of the additional roles and responsibilities that Marie appears to have adopted during this time as well.

One clear example of Marie's additional responsibilities during her father's absence relates to her decisions about household staff. In the specific example of her granting leave to a member of household staff called Steynhuys, she appears to have some insecurity about holding this responsibility and potentially coming to decisions that her father may not agree with, which therefore might threaten their connection. In this example, she moves on from the previous subject of her letter with an address term that functions as a transition formula: *'monsr mon bien ayme pere pour changer de propos se serat pour vous auertir'* ('Monsieur my dear father, to change the subject, this is to inform you', 1574/06/22). She continues by informing him of a decision she has been required to make for a member of household staff - allowing him to take leave to visit his stepmother after the death of his

father and showing apparent concern for the welfare of the stepmother. After outlining the details of this situation, Marie explains to her father how she has made this difficult decision:

> *'aynsin at telle desire dauoir son conge decoy je suys este bien mary sy esse que jay luy ay donne car jay nay lay point veule retenir a cause que je crayndons[1] que a mon ocasion elle euse peu auoir quelque domage ou perte a son bien ce que je nusse poient voulontir eu et espere que monsr nen serat poient mal content'*

> ('so he has such desire to take leave, which I am perturbed by if I grant it to him, for I don't want to keep him [here] since I fear that for my actions she may suffer damage or loss of her goods, which I do not wish to have [happen], and I hope that Monsieur will not be displeased', 1574/06/22)

In this example, Marie uses an assertive speech act to outline the situation, but follows it up with an expressive that shows her emotional state of feeling conflicted about the decision she has had to make. This expression of negative emotion threatens her own positive face, but her emphasis on showing compassion for Steynhuys and his stepmother also helps demonstrate that she fostered a sense of kinship with the wider household and upholds her moral duties towards them, which may well have been considered part of her daughterly duties in her father's absence, and which may have mitigated the potential threat to her own face. She also expresses hope that her father will not be displeased with her actions, threatening his negative face, but her explanation about why she has come to this decision helps mitigate this face threat too.

This example also makes it clear that Marie was tasked with a number of responsibilities and also played a crucial role in the household at certain points during her young adolescent years. By granting Steynhuys leave, it is clear that Marie was responsible for at least part of the management of the family estate at Dillenburg at this point in time, and more than just an intermediary between Guillaume and the rest of the family. The timing of this letter is also worth considering for the contextual information that it provides about why Marie may have found herself in this position of responsibility. She was the eldest daughter of Guillaume by his first marriage to Anna of Egmond, who had died when Marie was young, and although she had an elder brother, Philip William (Filips Willem), he was being held in Spain as a prisoner of war and thus was out of the picture. At the time of writing this letter in 1574, Marie was living at the family estate in Dillenburg with her younger siblings Anna, Maurice, and Emilia, all from Guillaume's second marriage to Anna of Saxony - a marriage which had been annulled in 1571 and Guillaume was yet to remarry. Along with her siblings, Marie also

---

[1] This is an interesting example of the first person plural ending being used with a first person singular construction. This was common in some varieties of middle French, but since it is only one example it is difficult to say anything about Marie's own French variety, and variation is not the core focus of this study, but it is interesting to note.

lived with her paternal grandmother and at least one of her aunts, plus uncles and other family members when they were not assisting directly in the war efforts. As a result of this combination of factors, Marie would have been a likely candidate for managing the household affairs in the absence of another suitable matriarchal figure that may have traditionally been expected to take on this responsibility. That being said, it is also the case that her grandmother and aunt would have helped her navigate her duties, as they would have passed on their experience to her in order to socialise her into adult life and prepare her for what would be expected of her in the future should she marry. This supports the work of Linda Pollock (1989), who outlines a convincing argument that young women were taught many of the same skills as their male counterparts, but also socialised to show obedience and defer these duties to their future husbands or other patriarchal figures when required. In other letters, Marie shows that she seeks her other family members' advice when making decisions about household management, showing this socialisation in action. Despite being entrusted with these responsibilities, this does not eliminate the potential for Marie to occasionally feel unsure of her decisions regarding Guillaume's household, which would account for her seeking his approval through her correspondence. Even if she was confident in her decisions, by showing that she was open to feedback from her father, it ensures that she continues to display deference towards him and therefore would step back into a subordinate role upon her father's return or should he prefer to take a different course of action. This may appear to contradict the 'dutiful daughter' image she so often presents, but when considering that in her future married life she would be expected to know how to make these household decisions on her own when her future husband was away from the household and then defer to his authority upon his return, it suggests that this was a key 'rehearsal' and part of her socialisation into her future roles in adult life.

A further example of Marie's socialisation into her adult responsibilities is evident in the frequent updates she gives and requests regarding financial matters, even from the earliest of the letters examined in this study. For example, she introduces the topic with a commissive speech act that functions as a transition formula *'je ne pieus laise[r] de vous mander'* ('I cannot neglect to tell you', 1573/09/23), then informs her father that she is still waiting for a merchant to bring her a sum of money from him, but that the merchant has been in contact with her and she hopes that he will visit her after a fair in Frankfurt which seems to be the reason for his delay. She continues: *'sy to que je arrey rechu largent je nay faulderay a mon deuo[ir] de le vous mander'* ('as soon as I have received the money I will not fail my duty of informing you', 1573/09/23), making her daughterly duties explicit as she performs a commissive speech act that shows deference to her father. She proceeds to state that she has not heard anything of the doctor and whether to give anything

(presumably whether to give the doctor some of the money that she is waiting to receive), so she requests advice from Guillaume with a directive speech act:

> *'mais quant au docteur je nen oys nulle nouuelles sy feult donner quelque chosse ou poient que je ne say comment que je me dois tenir en sela sy vous plait monsr vous me pores mander par le premir vouster bon auis'*

> ('yet as for the doctor I have heard no news if it is necessary to give something or not I do not know what I am supposed to do about it please Monsieur if you could give me your advice at your earliest convenience', 1573/09/23).

This directive speech act also threatens Guillaume's negative face by imposing upon him, but appeals to his positive face by recognising their mutual connection, and appealing to his negative face by highlighting her deference towards him - a typical mixed strategy that maintains the status quo. This example also hints that the expectation for regular correspondence went both ways, not just from daughters to fathers but reciprocally too.

Although Marie presents this dutiful daughter image much of the time, this does not preclude her stepping outside of the boundaries of this image and expressing herself more freely, even with disapproval. In an example from her letter of 19 March 1577 (which was examined in relation to positive FTAs in chapter 5), the opening sequence is followed by an unusually direct complaint at her father's lack of response:

> *'je suys este fort enmerueille que monsr ne mat poient donne eung seul mot de response sur ma letter que vous auois escript car je ne say comment que je me dois maintenant rigeler et se que jay de faire aucque se letriage que monsr at desire dauoir par sa derniere'*

> ('I was greatly surprised that Monsieur did not give me one single word of response to my letter which I wrote you, because I do not know how I am supposed to act and what I should do with the letter that Monsieur wanted to have in his last [letter]', 1577/03/19).

In this utterance, Marie complains that she has not received the response that she requested from Guillaume, at least not in a timely manner. The lack of transition formula to mitigate any face threat makes this utterance seem very direct compared to Marie's usual transitions from one section of the letter to the next, suggesting that she may have wanted to draw attention to this section, or that her household responsibilities granted her some freedom of expression. The expressive speech act functions as a positive face threat, by describing her disapproval at Guillaume's lack of response to a matter that had clearly been of great importance to Marie and weighing on her mind. Some of this threat is mitigated by her immediately giving reasons for her feeling this way, which acts as a positive politeness strategy as it highlights her connection with her father and the fact that she wanted to include

him in her decision. This example suggests that she is responsible for certain household duties, but does not feel completely comfortable with decisions she makes that may fall under her father's remit. She continues to express her disapproval at her father's lack of response, which threatens both his and her face wants, but then suggests possible reasons why he has not been able to do so, which redresses some of this potential face threat:

> *'car je ne poient la de et auois escript a monsr de me lenuoyer affin que jusse peu satifere a vouster commandemen[t] me sela ne se faict parquoy jen suys en painne mais sy esse que je pense bien que les grande negosses que aues journelement vous ont enpeche a me render response'*

> ('because I cannot know this [what Guillaume wants to happen] and I wrote to Monsieur to send it to me so that I may satisfy your orders but that did not happen which is why I am laboured with it, but if it is as I think, then the great negotiations that you have daily have stopped you from giving me a response', 1577/03/19).

This example demonstrates some of the complexities of composing letters during the early modern period. Due to the nature of early modern correspondence, there could be a significant delay between individual episodes of communication. It is implied in this case that a response has taken much longer than usual, but because Marie could not be certain of the reasons for this delay, nor could she be certain how her writing would be interpreted by her father, she is forced to consider potential causes for his delayed response in order to avoid appearing like she is criticising him. As such, she hedges and makes it explicit that she assumes there has been no change in their relationship dynamic, but simply that Guillaume has wanted to respond but not had the chance due to other affairs, leaving it open to him to explain should he feel the need to in his next letter. To ensure that this does not upset the balance of their relationship, but that she also gets the response she initially desires, she follows this hedged criticism with an expressive speech act that functions as a directive, stating that she hopes her father will be in touch with her as soon as he is able: *'mais jespere que auecque le tamps me manderes toute resolucion comment que je me dois rigeler auecque le tout'* ('but I hope that with time you will give me all resolution about how I should act with it all', 1577/03/19). This example also demonstrates that whilst daughters were expected to be deferential to their fathers, there was still a reciprocal expectation that fathers provide guidance and regular communication with their daughters.

In the same letter, despite her insistence that she will wait patiently for a reply, Marie continues to emphasise her desire for communication with Guillaume, suggesting a course of action that will force him to respond in one way or another. She proposes that she visit him before her heavily pregnant stepmother gives birth, but lists the complications that will ensue by her leaving the household, which at this point in time is based in Siegen:

'et sy dauenture il plairoit a monsr que je vinse vers luy auant laccousement de madame je vous voulderois bien supplier quil vous plairoit me faire se bien de me conseiller et mander se quil vous sembles que porois donner a madame ma gran mere et madame ma tante et a monsr mon oncle et au desmoiselles et offisirs de la maison car sy je me partiroit pour tout dicy je voulderois bien prender eung honete conge auecque tout puis que je connois qui me sont touiour este sy affectione a faire tout plesir et amity et sy en cas que monsr me seroit retourner en quelque tamps icy il ne seroit poient de besoing de tant donner'

('and if by chance it pleases Monsieur that I come to him before Madame gives birth, I wish to pray you, that [if] it pleases you to do this good of advising and telling me what it seems to you that I could give to Madame my grandmother and Madame my aunt and Monsieur my uncle and to the demoiselles and officers of the household, for if I were to leave all that is here I would like to take an honest leave of everything, because I know that they have always been so close to me in all satisfaction and amicability, and if in the case that Monsieur will return here in some time there will be no need to give such [advice]', 1577/03/19).

Although she frames this as wanting to perform her daughterly duties to the household but also visit her father, this entire passage acts as a directive speech act that will force her father to reply in some form whether or not she should visit, and hopefully this will also mean he responds to the previous matter she wanted his advice on as well. In case this request was not clear, she makes it explicit: *'par ou je vous supplie me mander par le premir vouster intension et selon sela je me porey rigeler car je remet le tout en la bonne voulonte et discresion de monsr'* ('about which I pray you to inform me of your intention at the earliest, and according to that I will be able to act, for I place all of this back into the good will and discretion of Monsieur', 1577/03/19). This has the effect of reinforcing her dutiful daughter image, but also reminds her father of his duties to the family and household even during periods of absence. In this letter she also makes requests of her father, but fearing causing threats she redresses them: *'je vous supplie bien humblement de ne prender de mauuaise part que je vous suys sy inportung auecque telle chosse mais se que je faict est par affection'* ('I pray you most humbly to not take this badly that I inconvenience you so with such things but that I do it out of affection', 1577/03/19). Having requested that Guillaume send gifts to her siblings, Marie emphasises that this does not come from some desire for control or greed but from her affection and the bonds that keep her family connected, which also demonstrates how Marie was acutely aware of what was expected of her.

When taking the broader perspective to analyse the various ways in which different pragmatic features interact in Marie's letters, some generalisations can be made. Her use of speech acts and politeness strategies often overlap, with formulaic sequences framing and

structuring her letters. When emphasising her dutifulness and displaying deference she often employs commissive speech acts (obliging her to take future action), negative self-face threatening acts (downplaying her own independence), negative politeness strategies (demonstrating respect for her father's independence), text-constitutive formulae (conforming with the expectations of the genre), and Christian-ritual formulae (highlighting her obedience to the other authority in her life). On the other hand when emphasising kinship and her status as daughter, she uses expressive speech acts (emphasising their emotional connection as family members), positive self-face threatening acts (betraying her reliance on her father's input), positive politeness strategies (reinforcing their connection), and intersubjective formulae (making the relational element of correspondence explicit, typically including other family and friends as part of the group). For most of her letters, her use of speech acts and politeness strategies combine and complement each other, resulting in maintaining the balance of the relationship, and when she is concerned that she may have stepped out of line she makes attempts to redress it, with formulaic sequences helping to structure her correspondence. Although these are rather broad generalisations, they do give some indication of how Marie was able to combine these pragmatic features in her letters to help portray the image of herself that she wanted or needed her father to see, something which would not have been so evident from separate analyses alone.

6.5 Discussion

In a similar manner to formulaic sequences and politeness strategies, speech acts function in a number of both distinct and overlapping ways in Marie of Nassau's personal correspondence with her father. The modular analysis presented in this chapter also reveals how they function at different levels of impact, and thus can be used to reveal more about not only Marie's letter-writing practices alone but also the practice of early modern letter-writing more generally, and some of the existing social structures, and related social expectations, that were prevalent at the time, at least within the Nassau family circles.

At the level of the text, her use of different types of speech acts follow some general patterns or common themes: she uses assertives to suggest courses of action she believes to be optimal for herself, her father, or the family more generally; she uses directives to request that Guillaume keeps her in his affections and replies to her with advice on various matters, or to request other people involved in the process of correspondence continue to do their part; she uses commissives to promise her daughterly obedience and to perform promises she has made to others by passing on their requests to him in her letters; she uses expressives for a mixture of positive emotions such as gratitude and hopefulness, as well as more negative emotions like anxiety, concern and disapproval; and some of these also function as declaratives, where Marie performs the action she describes through the very act

of writing it down or passing the letter to a bearer to pass on. Whilst all of these types of speech act are made both directly and indirectly, her directive requests of Guillaume and her expression of negative emotions through expressives are often implied rather than explicitly stated, which hints at conventionality and politeness. Her use of positive emotions through expressive speech acts could help bolster the appeal of a directive request for a quick response from Guillaume. It is clear that her use of speech acts at least had the potential to influence her father's responses, even though his replies have not survived which would allow us to see directly how he responded to these requests, but this does suggest that at least in principle Marie could attempt to use speech acts to navigate the social dynamics between her and her father (and by extension others too), as would become apparent from the broader discursive- and social-practice level analyses.

The analysis of speech acts at the discursive-practice level reveals more about the practicalities of sending and receiving correspondence as it was lived by Marie at this time. Several declarative speech acts highlight the fact that she was writing a letter due to the presence of a suitable letter-bearer, or passing on news from other family members and friends. This confirms that at this time correspondence between two individual named correspondents was still a collaborative act that involved many agents, and multiple people could be involved in the process. It also became apparent from some of the utterances in Marie's letters that regular correspondence was expected between daughters and fathers, and this expectation went both ways. It was also shown that everyone in the household was expected to maintain regular communication with the patriarch, even if that was simple passing on regards via another person who had more to write about, but that a letter in their own hand would always be preferred - indeed Marie's aunt added a small note in her own hand to one of Marie's letters when she knew that her brother Guillaume was the intended recipient. It is difficult to say for certain whether Marie's unique position in the family as an unmarried adolescent of marriageable age, and as Guillaume's eldest daughter from his first marriage with no obvious mother figure to take on responsibilities in his place, meant that she had greater responsibilities and expectations placed upon her for ensuring that he was kept updated regularly, but it is clear from her letters that this was one of the many responsibilities she shouldered during this period of her adolescence that would likely set her up well for future married adult life.

At the level of social-practice, analysis reveals how Marie's use of speech acts highlights her performance of daughterly duties, noting her responsibilities to write frequently, but also recognition of her position in relation to her father, the rest of her family and wider circle, and even her relationship with God. The themes of religion and health are particularly evident in her correspondence at this social-practice level, and it is unsurprising given that her father had converted to Calvinism, and was away at war with the Spanish, and during this time

period they had lost family members to this combat, pushing these topics to the forefront of her mind, at least for some of her letters. Financial concerns, and relatedly management of the household, were also topics of some concern for Marie at points during their correspondence, highlighting once more the fact that she took on a number of duties at this time which typically would have fallen to the mother figure in the absence of her father.

Whilst the analysis of Marie's correspondence through these three levels has been a useful tool for structuring the discussion, it should also be clear from the analysis (and indeed from Wood's (2009) original model) that these levels overlap and inform one another. The text-level analysis can reveal the specific functions that many of Marie's speech acts perform, but these must be considered in relation to the discursive practice of early modern correspondence and the expectations that this particular form of communication imposed upon her writing, which in turn are informed by the wider social expectations that were placed upon young women in circumstances similar to Marie during this period of European history and would limit what she could write. Taken together, the multi-level analysis of speech acts provides an additional layer of insight into the core research questions. Some of the conventions and expectations (RQ1) of early modern daughters' correspondence are most evident through the discursive-practice level where the everyday practical constraints become clearer. The nature of the daughter-father relationship (RQ2) is most evident at the text level, where the effects of specific utterances are made clear by the function(s) that they perform, but also at the social-practice level where it is possible to draw upon more of the contextual cues that will have informed Marie's writing, as well as at the discursive-practice level which imposed certain obligations on her. The close analysis of speech acts also reveals some of the responsibilities that Marie took on as part of and in additional to her 'dutiful daughter' role (RQ3), particularly through the social-practice level which made the family circumstances more evident and therefore provides some explanatory power for the additional responsibilities that Marie appears to have taken on during this time in her life.

Reflecting on the analytical model, the analysis of this sample of letters helps to confirm the utility of multi-dimensional models of discourse analysis such as that proposed by Wood (2009) to other similar cases of early modern correspondence in languages other than English as used in her study. Such a model is useful at extrapolating different layers of meaning and impact from individual utterances, allowing different elements of the broader contexts in which they are produced to be considered more effectively. Speech acts, as a long-established text-level feature, are a useful avenue of investigation for the analysis of Marie's correspondence in order to help answer questions about both the experience of the practice of letter writing for her and others like her at this point in history, but also for exploring the expression and performance of her roles and responsibilities as a dutiful daughter, and by extension the nature of the relationship she had with her father.

When considering the combination of multiple pragmatic features - formulaic sequences, politeness strategies, and speech acts - the analysis of a few key interesting examples of Marie's letters helped clarify some discursive- and social-practice level implications. This includes illuminating the fact that she took on certain responsibilities for the household during her father's absence, the expectation not just for daughters to write regularly to their fathers but also for this exchange to be reciprocal, and the fact that she did not always maintain a 'dutiful daughter' image when she needed to be more expressive or display her increasing independence of thought and action as she transitioned into adulthood.

Some common patterns of usage that map the different pragmatic features onto one another were also observed during the analyses (a sample analysis showing how individual utterances can have multiple pragmatic functions is included in Appendix 7). Certain types of speech act often correlate closely with a particular politeness strategy or face threat, and can also be matched with certain formulaic functions on occasion too. For example, Marie's commissive speech acts typically threaten her own negative face, since they oblige her to perform some future action which impinges on her own face want for independence. Similarly, her directive speech acts typically threaten her father's negative face, by imposing upon his independence. These examples of directive speech acts may not easily map onto formulaic functions, but in some cases they could - for example an intersubjective contact formula requesting a reply, or a Christian-ritual formula instructing the recipient to pray regularly. Relatedly, two apparently similar formulaic sequences may differ in their politeness and speech act functions - an intersubjective greeting formula where the writer passes on wishes from another person to the recipient may function as an assertive speech act with no obvious facework involved, and yet another intersubjective greeting formula used to commend another person into the recipient's service would implicitly function as a directive speech act and threaten the recipient's positive face by assuming that they will accept this commendation. Of course it must also be remembered that these categorisations are not mutually exclusive and are open to interpretation, but the fact that these different pragmatic features can be loosely mapped onto one another is a useful contribution to the field of pragmatics. The fact that these features combine in such ways also highlights the complexities involved in early modern young women's letter-writing practices, where language could be used in different ways to balance deference and kinship, demonstrate independence but also obedience to superiors, and crucially to maintain balance or negotiate new dynamics within family relationships when the participants were separated by distance. In combination with other pragmatic features such as formulaic sequences and politeness strategies, speech acts give a useful understanding of early modern life for young women as expressed through their correspondence. The analysis of these features has also confirmed the numerous roles and responsibilities that Marie de Nassau adopted during

times of her father's absence from the household (and potentially at other times too), as part of her socialisation into adulthood.

<u>**7. Conclusion**</u>

Over the course of the preceding three chapters, the analysis of Marie de Nassau's French-language correspondence with her father, Guillaume d'Orange, between the years of 1573 and 1577, through the three different but interrelated pragmatic lenses of formulaic sequences, politeness strategies, and speech act theory, has helped to uncover some intriguing features of life for young women like Marie in the early modern Europe, and has produced some interesting answers to the three core research questions of this study. In this concluding chapter, these findings are summarised and discussed in depth with particular attention to addressing the core research questions. As has been seen in the preceding chapters, a lot can be learned about the conventions and expectations of early modern young women's correspondence, as well as some of the key pragmatic features. Since these have already been commented on in detail, the key findings are summarised rather than providing additional analytical commentary, allowing the discussion to focus on the interpretation of Marie de Nassau's letters as part of their broader sociohistorical context, using the research questions to guide this discussion, highlighting the key contributions that this study has made to the existing body of knowledge and suggesting future avenues of inquiry. It is assumed that the observations made on the specific case study of Marie de Nassau's French-language correspondence with her father can be extrapolated to give a deeper understanding of the lives of early modern young women and their social relationships (primarily with their fathers), their roles and responsibilities within their family and household, and provide some additional commentary on how this type of text may have been used by young women on a wider scale than simply within the Orange-Nassau family. Of course Marie's circumstances were unique, and so the fact that she adopted responsibilities more typical for a wife or mother figure during this time period (such as household administration and acting as an intermediary) may not be as widely applicable to other young unmarried daughters whose family setup was different, but it does demonstrate some of the varied roles that young women in the early modern period may have been expected to adopt should the need arise within their family. This chapter is therefore structured around the research questions initially, followed by more evaluative and concluding remarks. The three core research questions are addressed sequentially in the first part of this chapter (section 7.1), with particular attention given to the third of these research questions (in subsection 7.1.3) as it allows for a much broader and speculative approach to discussing what the analysis may suggest about the lives of early modern young women on a sociohistorical level. Following on from this, it is important to outline some matters arising from this study, primarily additional points that could not be addressed in this thesis but which may benefit from further investigation (section 7.2). Finally, some

concluding remarks are made about the potential impacts of this piece of research and restatement of the key findings (section 7.3).

7.1 Answering core research questions

In this section, the core research questions of this study are restated and answered based on the findings of the preceding analyses. It is important to note that although these three questions are addressed in three distinct subsections, the findings do interrelate, much in the same way that although the three pragmatic tools were separated into distinct chapters they also overlap a great deal. By drawing upon the findings of these separate analyses, it is hoped that the research questions can tie together these strands for a more rounded understanding of each aspect of Marie's correspondence under investigation. This section is divided into three subsections. The first relates to Marie's adherence to conventions and expectations of the genre of correspondence (RQ1 - subsection 7.1.1), the second focuses more on the specific pragmatic features that she used in her letters to navigate the complexities of early modern daughter-father relationships (RQ2 - subsection 7.1.2), and the third relates to the roles and responsibilities of young women in the early modern period, with particular attention to its expression via correspondence (RQ3 - subsection 7.1.3).

7.1.1 Conventions and expectations

RQ1. To what extent did Marie de Nassau's personal correspondence with her father follow known conventions and expectations for early modern young women's letters?

In order to investigate the extent to which any young woman in the early modern period followed the conventions and expectations of her with regard to French-language correspondence, as well as comment on any strategies she may have employed in her writing and what social effect that may or may not have had, it is necessary to know what the conventions and expectations were likely to have been at the time. As such, the first core research question (RQ1) aims to address this. It is for the same reason that the exploration of sixteenth-century French-language letter-writing manuals and model letters was important to include in the first analysis (chapter 4), as it allows a baseline to be drawn from which any deviations from expected constructions can be assumed to be deliberate choices by the writer or the result of some other factor that impacted their writing choices. The prescriptions made in contemporaneous letter-writing manuals and the exemplars found in model letter books provide a sample of possible utterances that were likely to have been used frequently at the time, including specific linguistic constructions but also the social considerations that played a role in the choice of specific vocabulary and other features like page layout.

Although they do not represent the full range of possibilities available to writers at this time, they do provide a list of the most salient features of correspondence for different purposes. In addition, the use of certain formulaic sequences (chapter 4) and even certain politeness strategies (chapter 5), within both the model letters and Marie's letters, also indicate some other expectations for early modern young women's French-language correspondence. These features allow for more nuance to appear in the letters, as considerations of social hierarchy, deference and kinship come into play (merging somewhat with the other two research questions). This subsection summarises the key findings of the analysis of conventions and expectations of early modern young women's French-language correspondence, starting with manuals and model letters, moving on to politeness theory, concluding with some commentary on possible links to the sociohistorical context.

As outlined in chapter 4, only one surviving French-language letter-writing manual from the sixteenth century appears to be targeted towards an audience of young female correspondents like Marie de Nassau, that being the '*Formulaire de lettres morales moult propres pour l'usage des jeunes filles*', published in 1573 by Gabriel Meurier. The existence of this title alone indicates that there was a gendered aspect to letter-writing, at least in certain circumstances, and the model letters included in its pages highlight the importance of relative social status when writing to others. However, neither this nor any of the other manuals consulted include any models of daughter-father correspondence, despite containing multiple examples of other social and familial relationships. This specific lack of daughter-father models is conspicuous, but could have a few explanations. It is possible that early modern young women were not expected to write letters to their fathers and so did not need model letters, perhaps because other family members like her mother or husband would pass on news of her health in their own letters. Another option is that young women did not use manuals but rather learned the conventions of personal letters through imitation of correspondence that they or other family members received. If this were common practice, there would be little reason to include model letters from daughters to fathers in an instructional manual, since it would be assumed that young women would already be familiar with the appropriate forms and expectations of this type of personal correspondence, having been taught the basics by their elders. However, the existence of other child-parent model letters suggests that even if this was the common practice, some daughter-father letters should at least have been codified in the same way. It seems most probable that daughter-father letters were not as common as the other child-parent letters, and so this would account for the lack of representation in both surviving correspondence and model letter collections. It also must be noted that the passage of time may also have had its effect on the amount of surviving evidence of daughter-father letters, which may have been more common than the records suggest but have been lost over time.

Since there were no examples of prescriptions for daughter-father letters found in the French-language formularies and model letter collections, comparative examples had to be elicited from other child-parent models, based on the assumption that these would share similar features due to similar degrees of social distance between correspondents in these relationships. Indeed Marie's correspondence shows use of formulaic sequences that function consistently with those found in the child-parent models, but she also demonstrates more variability than these models would predict. Whilst this may be unique to Marie or an artefact of the lack of daughter-father specific models, it seems more likely that the use of both conventional forms and free personal expression were not mutually exclusive in early modern young women's correspondence. There is also prominent use of health formulae and Christian-ritual formulae in her letters, the frequency of occurrence suggesting that these matters were more than simply formulaic expectations of the genre, but also matters of particular concern to Marie. One possible explanation for these small differences between Marie's correspondence and the child-parent models is due to the origins of the manuals and formularies - the model letters from the earlier part of the sixteenth century appear to rely on the rhetoric and formal structure of the tradition of *ars dictaminis* with a little more flexibility as the century progresses (see chapter 4), whilst Marie's letters move more freely between topics, which are often familiar in nature. It is of course possible that young women were not expected to strictly conform to these prescriptions, which in itself lends support to the idea that early modern young women learned the art of correspondence not from instruction through manuals and formularies, but rather through the imitation of family letters sent and received by their elders.

Whilst the letter-writing manuals and model letter collections lay out the explicit expectations for children writing to their parents, the analysis of features such as politeness strategies and face threats reveals the more implicit expectations of interpersonal communication at the time. By investigating Marie's (second order) politeness strategies, it was possible to uncover some of the underlying patterns in her writing that had the potential to influence the nature of her relationship with her father, which in turn helped to build up a more detailed picture of how early modern daughter-father relationships may have looked. Specifically, Marie demonstrates a pattern of neutral-to-negative politeness, indicating a desire to maintain some social distance by respecting their relative positions in the family and social hierarchy, but she also frequently uses positive politeness strategies, and kinship terms in particular, which indicate a desire to maintain social proximity with her father by emphasising their emotional bonds and familial relationship. This suggests that a combination of deference and kinship were likely to have been expressed conventionally in correspondence between family members, with recognition of the social hierarchy taking precedence over family ties (even though the social hierarchy was also inherently linked to

their relative family ties). This echoes findings from studies of correspondence in other languages in the early modern period, notably English language correspondence (Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 1995; Nevala 2004; Kohnen 2008; Mazzon 2010 - all looked at the politeness values for address terms in historical varieties of English, as outlined in chapter 5), and adds further data to the limited existing studies on historical French language politeness (such as Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2011).

As observed throughout the analyses, expressions of deference and kinship combined in young women's correspondence to present a 'dutiful daughter' image. This self-presentation through letters allowed young women to demonstrate deference for their elders, and it is likely that adopting a 'dutiful daughter' image was a conventional element of early modern young women's correspondence practices. It was evidently important for this positive self-image to be maintained in writing, and this is potentially due to the semi-public nature of correspondence at the time. In many cases, the letter was read by people other than the named recipient and so keeping a consistent self-image would maintain face with the group. The letter can therefore also be seen as a performative space or world that the correspondents could enter and exit in order to perform and portray particular versions of themselves, which had the potential to influence the nature of their relationship with one another depending on the image they adopted in this epistolary world.

In summary, there is limited evidence available from letter-writing manuals and model letters about the prescriptions placed on early modern young women's French-language correspondence in the sixteenth century. Indeed, the evidence for these prescriptions comes from manuals that are grounded in rhetorical principles rather than personal correspondence, and the model letters used as points of reference only came from other child-parent relationships rather than any daughter-father models. Whilst there is some similarity to these model letters, the variation in Marie's correspondence shows a combination of both conventional and innovative elements in her writing. Although the conventional and formulaic elements found in Marie's correspondence often perform the same functions as those found in the model letters for children-parents, in most cases their linguistic form differs. This indicates that rather than learning the conventional formulae from prescriptive manuals and model letters, early modern young women like Marie were more likely to have learned the art of correspondence from imitation and practice, as part of their socialisation from children into adults. The lack of daughter-father model letters suggests that this particular type of correspondence was not widely expected at the time, especially given that there are examples of all other child-parent model letters, and yet daughter-father correspondence does exist from this time period, although in smaller numbers. It is possible that other factors may have contributed to Marie's need to write to her father in the first place.

7.1.2 Pragmatic features and the daughter-father relationship

RQ2. How did Marie de Nassau use different pragmatic features in her personal correspondence with her father to help navigate the dynamics of the daughter-father relationship? More specifically, how do the pragmatic features of formulaic sequences, speech acts and politeness strategies function in her letters?

Having established some of the conventions and expectations of early modern young women's French-language correspondence through answering RQ1, it is now possible to determine some of the pragmatic functions of Marie de Nassau's letters to her father, with a greater understanding of which constructions may have been intentional choices on her part and which may have simply been prescribed by the genre. Whilst the analysis of the selected pragmatic features of formulaic sequences, politeness strategies, and speech acts in Marie's correspondence were dealt with separately in the preceding analyses (chapters 4-6), the combination of these three pragmatic elements is likely to have compounded to produce additional effects (as synthesised in section 6.4 of the previous chapter). Taken separately, these pragmatic features have different but interrelated effects on the daughter-father relationship dynamic. The use of formulaic sequences not only functions to structure Marie's letters, but can also help Marie portray herself in a certain light when addressing her father, such as making known her deference and servitude or her concern to hear of his health and welfare. The use of politeness strategies that vary from negative to positive sides of the scale allow Marie to play with the expectations of their relationship and push her father and social superior to take action, whilst maintaining enough respect for his higher social status, with her letters becoming a space to demonstrate deference and acknowledge kinship. The analysis of speech acts also shows how individual utterances can reveal multiple layers of interpretation from the text level through to practices of the genre and up to wider social issues of the time, with Marie's use of predominantly expressive, commissive and directive speech acts highlighting the balance of emotional and deferential bonding through correspondence alongside the implied expectation of reciprocal exchange. When viewed collectively, it is possible to examine how Marie combines certain speech acts with formulaic sequences to produce nuanced politeness strategies that likely affected the dynamics of her relationship with her father whilst he was away from the family estate. In this subsection, some of the key findings in relation to RQ2 are outlined.

At a structural level, Marie's letters are composed in a generally conventional manner and therefore are functionally as expected. She consistently uses address terms to open the letter with a salutation that functions as a greeting formula, typically along the lines of '*Monsr mon bien bon pere*' ('Monsieur my dear father'). Whilst this is structurally conventional given

its position at the start of her letters, it also contains some value for politeness and facework, by combining terms that emphasise both deference (*'monsr'*) and kinship (*'mon pere'*) with qualifying adjectives *'bien bon'* that can express both 'morally good' and 'dearly respected' depending on context. This choice of address term sets the tone of the letter to follow, allowing Marie to frame herself as a dutiful and deferential daughter from the outset, appealing to her father's expectations of her whether or not she may go on to step outside of this 'dutiful daughter' image in the course of their correspondence.

Following on from the greeting, the opening sequence also proceeds in a predictable manner on many occasions, in a way that speaks to the practices of early modern correspondence through the use of self-referential contact formulae. Marie acknowledges receipt of specific letters that have prompted her response, alternatively offering an explanation for why she is writing in cases where duty or circumstance have prompted her to write instead of receiving a letter - such as the availability of a letter-bearer, additional news update to pass on, or simply that an appropriate amount of time has passed between missives that she feels obliged to write again. These references to the epistolary world are a vital component of early modern correspondence. The acknowledgement of receipt of other letters helps with the identification of individual letters as part of the longer chain of epistolary communication, allowing correspondents to more precisely identify the timing to avoid confusion if some letters were delayed or lost, which may have been particularly useful at times when situations developed quickly and may have changed from one letter to the next. The practicalities of early modern correspondence are made apparent on occasions where the availability of a suitable letter-bearer prompted Marie to write, since it demonstrates a sense of obligation for her to write to her father when the opportunity presented itself, no matter how recently she had last done so, but also reminds the modern reader that it was not a simple matter of putting a letter in a post box and trusting that it would arrive at its destination in a few days. The availability of a suitable messenger, be they a member of household staff, a family friend, or a visiting relative, was not guaranteed on any regular schedule. This explains the sense of urgency created in many of Marie's letters, for the presence of a letter-bearer gave an opportunity for communication that may otherwise have been delayed. Indeed, there are occasions when she composed regular letters every few weeks, only to have them delayed and sent together due to letter-bearers being unavailable. Marie's use of these structural elements to perform the function of contact formulae demonstrate not only some of the practical considerations of sending early modern correspondence, but also some of the expected dynamic of the daughter-father relationship.

The analysis also highlighted some common thematic formulae that are present in Marie's letters. The opening sequence frequently includes a commendation into her father's remembrance and good grace, followed by health formulae either welcoming news of his

health or passing on news of others' health to him, alongside a Christian-ritual formula ranging from simple thanks to lengthier praise. Indeed, throughout Marie's letters the themes of health and religion co-occur with regularity, particularly in the formulaic opening and closing sequences. Whilst their co-occurrence in these formulaic sections suggests that they were prescribed by the genre, they may have additional layers of meaning. The prevalence of health and religious themes in these letters may indicate that these were important matters to discuss in correspondence at the time, not least because this was an era of conflict and religious reform in which the Orange-Nassau family played an important role. Marie's father Guillaume was a crucial figure in reclaiming and unifying the Dutch provinces from the Spanish during the short time period studied here. Notably the Act of Federation passed in April 1576 granted him interim powers over Holland and Zealand, whilst also guaranteeing religious freedom to their inhabitants - provided the religion practised was gospel-based (Wedgwood 1944: 161-162). As such, it is likely that matters of health and religion were in the forefront of people's minds at this time, and especially so for this particular family, justifying its prominence in Marie's correspondence.

Similarly to the opening sequences, there is a common pattern to the closing sequences in Marie's letters. She usually makes it explicit that she intends to exit the epistolary world, by making a comment on the letter she is writing and recognising that her letters must cause an inconvenience to her father. After announcing that she will finish the letter she proceeds to commend him into God's care by wishing him a long, happy and healthy life (demonstrating the co-occurrence of health and religious formulae once more), and in turn commends herself into his grace and remembrance again. As with the opening sequence, the exact phrasing of the closing sequence differs from letter to letter, but the formulaic function signalling the end of the act of correspondence remains. At this point, she moves into text-type formulae that are distinctive of correspondence: giving the date and location of her letter, followed by a subscription about her being his humble and obedient daughter, followed by her signature. This subscription and signature typically are placed carefully at the bottom right corner of her letter with use of deferential terms like *'vouster treshumble et tresobeisante fille'* ('your most humble and obedient daughter'), in line with expectations for writing to a superior, although there are examples where she is more relaxed with the layout. Occasionally, she adds a postscript here too.

The pragmatic analysis has highlighted a few key components of early modern young women's correspondence practices through structural and formulaic features alone. In many cases the formulae act as signals of the genre, as mechanisms the writer could use to indicate certain changes in topic or highlighting key points they wished to emphasise, or as markers for the recipient to help navigate the text around these key points. They also show that matters of health, religion, and regular contact were also crucial elements of

letter-writing at the time (mirroring what Rutten & Van der Wal have demonstrated in their 2012 study of Dutch letters from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries), which is understandable given the geographical and temporal distance typically separating correspondents at this time, which was also rife with conflict and at a crucial moment in terms of religious reform from Catholicism to Calvinism. The pattern of general conformity to the models, with a little flexibility, is perhaps somewhat expected given that child-parent letters followed similar patterns in other European languages during the sixteenth century. For example, Daybell notes in his work on Tudor women's letters that 'Daughters letters to fathers illustrate the range of relations possible within this dynamic in sixteenth century England, from seemingly authoritarian relationships at one extreme to relatively more open and relaxed at the other extreme' (Daybell 2006: 176). Along this scale, Marie's letters may justifiably be placed somewhere in the middle, since she expresses deference to her father whilst also demonstrating independence and taking responsibility for family decisions at times. Marie's confidence with discussing matters of household administration and familial political news is comparable with examples of sixteenth-century English women's letters, notably Anne Broughton's correspondence to her father after she married, who similarly signed off her letters as 'obedient' daughter, but also 'mixed details of household provisioning, family news, and business arrangements with the minutia of everyday life', indicating a less unequal social relationship than one might expect for daughters and fathers at this time (Daybell 2006: 178-179). Whilst Daybell notes that this is likely due to marriage improving a woman's social standing, it is evident from Marie's letters to her father that marriage was not the only way in which this was possible, providing an interesting counterexample of an unmarried daughter taking on a similar role. Additionally, the pragmatic methods used in this study were also initially developed based on modern English language examples, as noted in the previous chapters, with both Rutten & Van der Wal and this thesis demonstrating that historical texts in other languages can be successfully analysed through the lens of these different pragmatic tools.

Turning now to the second half of RQ2, the specific combination of formulae, politeness and speech acts is also worthy of discussion, since they do not occur in isolation but rather combine within certain utterances to perform multiple functions that may have the potential to influence the recipient's actions. It is possible to map these various pragmatic functions onto individual utterances and highlight some similarities between them. It is relatively easy to match up speech acts and politeness strategies as there is a fair amount of crossover between them. For example, a commissive speech act will often also function as a negative self face threatening act, since it obligates the writer to perform some action in the future and thus restricts their independence. A directive speech act often implies a threat to the recipient's negative face by making a request of them, and in some cases can also imply a

sense of reciprocity and connection which appeals to their positive face. Expressive speech acts could map onto different face threats depending on the degree of emotional expression expected in a relationship - too much emotion threatens both the writer's and the recipient's positive faces, as it reflects negatively on their relationship dynamic, but a balanced amount of emotional expression actually works to redress these threats or flatter their positive faces, provided there is no pressure to act on these emotions, as it reinforces their connection. Assertive and declarative speech acts largely deal with factual information and so are less likely to pose threats to the writer's or recipient's faces. However, it is more difficult to neatly map formulaic functions onto those of speech acts and facework/politeness strategies. For example, whilst a directive speech act may also function as a negative face threatening act, it could correlate to a few different types of formulaic sequences - this includes an intersubjective contact formula requesting a reply, or a Christian-ritual formula that instructs the recipient to pray regularly, or indeed it could be non-formulaic. In a similar manner, an intersubjective greeting formula where the writer passes on wishes from other people to the recipient may function as an assertive speech act without any facework, whilst an intersubjective greeting formula used to commend someone into the recipient's service would implicitly function as a directive speech act and thus threaten the recipient's positive face by assuming that this commendation would be accepted. As such each case must be considered in the context of the general shape that the individual act of correspondence takes and how that is likely to affect the relationship between correspondents. In the case of Marie's letters, there is a strong reliance on formulaic sequences (in part due to the restrictions of the genre), and her politeness strategies and speech acts tend to reflect the father-daughter relationship generally as expected,maintaining the status quo by balancing deference and kinship.

7.1.3 Sociohistorical implications & considerations

RQ3. What does the pragmatic analysis of Marie de Nassau's personal correspondence with her father reveal about her roles and responsibilities as a 'dutiful' daughter?

Whilst the first two research questions are primarily concerned with the pragmatic content of Marie's correspondence, this third main research question builds upon these pragmatic features and turns the focus towards the social implications of her utterances. This relates particularly to the roles and responsibilities of the 'dutiful daughter', as well as what this may suggest about early modern young women's French-language correspondence more widely. In this subsection, links between Marie de Nassau's particular case and the wider social context of the time are made, with specific interest in the matters of early modern women's lives, the early modern family, and early modern daughters (three key areas that were

initially outlined in chapter 2 as requiring further input, particularly using French-language sources). Although the evidence only comes from one specific case, it is assumed that Marie's circumstances, whilst particular to her, were not unique, and therefore the findings from this study are likely to be applicable to other young aristocratic women who found themselves required to take on additional duties in the absence of other senior figures, or at least who took on these responsibilities in preparation for their expected future married life whilst under the supervision of another maternal figure. This of course may only represent a small percentage of early modern young women's cases, but is likely to be indicative of some of the processes involved in the socialisation of young women into their adult lives.

Although Marie presents a strong 'dutiful daughter' image in her correspondence with her father, it is also clear from her writing that she took on additional responsibilities that would be considered to fall outside the remit of this role, at least during this stage in her life. This seems to have been brought about by necessity due to the particular circumstances of Nassau family life during the time period studied, with Marie adopting some of the administrative duties that would have normally fallen to the matriarch in the absence of the family patriarch. Comparison with wife-husband model letters demonstrated a number of key similarities in the types of responsibilities that Marie took on. These were shown to have included managing household staff (such as granting compassionate leave for someone whose father had died), controlling some financial matters and particularly those related to providing for her younger siblings (such as sending money to her younger brother's schoolmaster to cover any costs incurred, or allocating funds to buy fabrics for making clothes for her younger sisters), in addition to providing her opinions on her father's political engagements (in the case where she advises that the enemy may be deceiving her father but is hopeful that they are in fact seeking to make peace), and acting as an intermediary for others who wished to seek her father's favour (as in the case where the people of Buyl asked her to request his assistance, presumably against the Spanish forces). In 1573 (and perhaps even earlier), the absence of both patriarch (due to wartime affairs) and matriarch (due to an annulled marriage) from the Nassau household is likely what led Marie, as eldest unmarried daughter still remaining at Dillenburg, to take on these additional responsibilities that would later fall to her stepmother, Charlotte de Bourbon, once Guillaume remarried in 1575 (and later to his fourth wife Louise de Coligny who is known for promoting the dynastic interests of her adopted offspring - as discussed in, for example, Broomhall 2009; Broomhall & Spinks 2011; Verhaegen 2012). Marie's adoption of some of these more typically maternal roles grants a confidence that allows her to address her father as if he is her social equal rather than superior at certain times - although she always modulates these instances to demonstrate that she will still respect his wishes first. Indeed, it was seen in chapter 2 that early modern women's lives are considered to have progressed conventionally through a

linear model of 'daughter-wife-widow' - three distinct lifetime roles all defining women's identities in relation to a significant male figure. Poska, Couchman & McIver (2013: 20) noted how a woman's roles and responsibilities depended on factors such as her age, motherly duties, and marital status. However, this does not exclude the possibility that individual circumstances may lead daughters to take on roles that traditionally fell to wives, mothers, or widows, and Marie certainly seems to have adopted more responsibilities than one might expect of an unmarried adolescent daughter. Her age is also not irrelevant, being 17 at the start of the time period covered in this study and as Guillaume's eldest daughter, she would most likely have been expected to know how to perform these additional duties as part of her role as 'wife' were she to have been married. As such, it could well be argued that these additional responsibilities were a natural extension of the typical 'daughterly duties' that they would be expected to learn and practise as they were socialised into their adult lives, and so Marie's correspondence shows evidence of this socialisation being put into practice.

The idea that young women, specifically in the Nassau family, were expected to know how to perform these duties during their adolescence is partially supported by evidence from a study by Couchman (2018) which was first outlined in chapter 3. In this study, Couchman examined the letters of three Nassau women in their adolescence, analysing how their self-representation transitioned from girlhood to adulthood as a result of marriage and pregnancy. The conclusion seemed to suggest that these three women's sense of self gradually transitioned into adulthood after they were married and had given birth (in all three cases they were wives by age 18 and mothers by age 19). Whilst it is logical that anyone would have needed some time to adjust to their new roles in life after significant life events, it implies that marriage and childbirth acted as a catalyst for 'becoming' adult women. This does not seem to have been the case for Marie de Nassau, who shows evidence of a similar coming of age (through adopting more adult-like duties) between the ages of 17 and 21, despite remaining unmarried and childless at the time. The fact that Marie appears to have adopted some of the responsibilities usually reserved for adult married life suggests that this sense of adulthood was likely to be developing anyway for this age group, implying that marital and maternal status were not the only important factors in determining the transition from adolescence to adulthood. These life events can perhaps be seen as symbolic markers of this transition, whilst still allowing for young women to adapt their roles based on the ever-changing needs of their family circumstances. The fact that Marie and these other Nassau women were of similar ages when taking on these roles, but had different circumstances, also helps support the idea that it may have been common among young adolescent women in the early modern period to begin adopting these more adult roles in spite of their specific marital or maternal status.

It is also important to remember that as a fundamental social unit during the early modern period, the family and its ever-changing needs would often take precedence over the desires of individual family members. This is certainly true of the Nassau family in the later part of the sixteenth century, when after the death of Guillaume his fourth wife and widow, Louise de Coligny, sought out diplomatic and political links - especially through fruitful marital pairings for her stepdaughters - in order to maintain a secure position for the family's future (see Broomhall & Spinks 2011). With this in mind, Marie and other young women may well have promoted family interests over their own desires. In her correspondence with her father, Marie does not show concerns about finding a husband, but rather focuses on family matters. Indeed, in one of the few references to Marie in historical accounts of her father's life, this is the conclusion that is drawn about her still remaining unmarried in 1580: 'Marie, 'Mademoiselle d'Orange', at twenty-eight [she was actually 24-25 at this time, the author likely confused her with her sister of the same name who had died in infancy] was still unmarried; both leisure to conduct negotiations, and the necessary marriage portion had been continually sacrificed to the immediate needs of the Netherlands. Marie, her father's daughter, was content they should be.' (Wedgwood 1944: 212). This may account for why Marie remained unmarried until her late thirties, as concerns that affected the family as a whole may have taken precedence: this could have included raising her younger siblings, prioritising securing her father's political position through conflicts and remarriage, and after her father's death navigating disagreements with her younger brother led to difficulties in securing her and her elder brother's full inheritance (although it is also said that her eventual marriage to Philip of Hohenlohe was a love match so her personal preference may have been considered alongside the needs of the family).

If family interests were more important than personal ones, it follows that family roles and household management strategies varied depending on the family circumstances - indeed '[h]ousehold work strategies, out of necessity, were diverse' (Flather 2013: 344). Marie's varied responsibilities may also be considered a part of her duty to the family. It is also worth remembering the examples where Marie runs her ideas past her father for his feedback before taking action herself, or where she makes a decision and then checks in with him after the fact (such as when granting leave to household staff). When Marie runs these decisions past her elders it may indicate a sense of insecurity about her own decision-making abilities, but more likely shows that she recognised the societal expectation that women be capable of these duties but versatile enough to step aside when necessary, switching roles easily as required: 'The upbringing of girls was intended to ensure adult women were deferential to men, but not to preclude the possibility of independent thought or action. Thus, women as adults switched between roles, choosing according to the circumstances to utilize what were conventionally held to be masculine skills or feminine

qualities.' (Pollock 1989: 250). The evidence from Marie's correspondence certainly corroborates this assertion.

Turning the focus to early modern child-parent dynamics more generally, the literature outlined in chapter 2 suggested that parents gave lots to their offspring and expected to receive little in return, but there is more reciprocity in these relationships than first meets the eye (Ben-Amos 2000: 291). The close analysis of pragmatic functions in Marie's correspondence has helped to uncover more of the broader social expectations and common practices in early modern child-parent communication, and confirms that there is an expectation of reciprocal exchange between children and parents, even if that differs in material terms. Her father's contribution is naturally significant but relatively invisible in the record - granting her status and inheritance through the family name, providing for her and her siblings as they grew up including sending Marie to be lady-in-waiting to Regent Margaret in Brussels in 1565 (Wedgwood 1944: 66). Marie also acknowledges receipt of tangible gifts like funds (1577/03/19) and wine (1577/05/26), but also requests more abstract and affective gifts like news of health and advice (1573/09/23), or a letter in his own hand (1573/10/15). In return, she offers him her humility and obedience at the end of every letter, as was conventional, but also provides him with news of the family's health, household administration, passing on messages and requests from others, and of course the physical gift of the letter itself. Her words imply that she sent more letters than she received, demonstrating her duty to him, but also showing that the child-parent bond did indeed involve reciprocal exchange, with parents offering material and emotional support whilst children offered service and immaterial support, an exchange which would likely be expected to continue into later life.

The current study has built upon previous work on early modern child-parent relationships in a couple of key ways - firstly by highlighting the voice of the offspring rather than the parent, and secondly by providing a rare case study of daughter-father correspondence in particular. To address the first of these, many previous studies (as outlined in chapter 2) have focused on the mother in mother-child relationships, for example showing how mothers were able to negotiate diplomatic marriages for their daughters (Moran 2015), educating them to fit in with societal expectations (Tancke 2011), and in the case of the Nassau family in particular ensuring that the dynastic interests were prioritised especially after Guillaume's death (Hodson 2007; Broomhall 2009; Broomhall & Van Gent 2016). However, the current study shows that these types of discussions and negotiations were not necessarily limited to maternal figures, since Marie does show signs of managing network relationships, even if it is not to the same degree as arranging marriages like her future stepmother Louise de Coligny would do for Marie's younger sisters. Instead she acts as an intermediary for others wishing to be commended into her father's service, passing on their requests and vouching

for their good character, such as on behalf of Jan de Viellemont (1574/03/16). Whilst Marie was not necessarily leading this negotiation of powerful networks, it shows that she at least had involvement in the process, and likely provided good practice for the types of negotiations she may have been expected to conduct in later married life. To address the second, examples of daughter-father relationships in particular are few and far between, and largely come from literary sources. Moss claims that early modern fatherhood was a contradictory concept: 'firstly that paternal authority is inviolate and permanent, and secondly that paternal authority must be reinforced […]' (Moss 2009: 164). The current study lends some support to this claim, as evidenced by the complexities of politeness strategies used to maintain the balance of their relationship, for example by making requests of her father that would threaten his face but then using face-saving strategies to reinforce his paternal authority and maintain the status quo. The very act of using deferential terms and negative politeness strategies shows that paternal authority was both an expected consideration for daughters to uphold in their correspondence, but also something which was fragile enough to need reinforcing with every act of correspondence, often multiple times within the same letter. This amount of deference combined with the fact that few parent-child correspondence examples survive may lead some to believe that early modern parent-child relationships were void of emotion and affect because their emotions weren't readily expressed through affective language in the examples that do survive. However there are a few examples of affective language in Marie's letters, such as when she states how she hopes to hear of his good health: *'ce que de tout mon ceur je desire'* ('which I desire with all my heart', 1574/03/16), suggesting that these examples do exist but are not as common. Indeed, there is a lack of records of childhood and adolescence in the past more generally - after the age of seven, for girls especially, there are few records of the transition into adulthood. Marie's example therefore adds a vital data point to this lacuna, albeit at the upper end of the age group in question. The evidence from her letters suggests that her childhood and adolescence were a time period in which she was trained for the expectations of adult married life, and the fact that she remained unmarried but under the watchful eye of her aunt and grandmother during this time meant that she was able to practise her future duties whilst still being under supervision.

Finally, and more conceptually, the close analysis of Marie's correspondence through the lens of pragmatic functions helped to identify the fact that she was taking on multiple responsibilities beyond the 'dutiful daughter' role, as her linguistic behaviour does not exactly match what one might expect to find. The close analysis of key moments in her correspondence helped to reveal how she was able to manage these additional duties whilst still performing her expected societal role and maintaining the status of her relationship with her father in his absence all through her correspondence. This is a key benefit of using

pragmatic tools to investigate socio-historical matters, since they help to focus on the micro-level linguistic features that give hints, once contextualised, about the specific relationship dynamics and constraints placed upon the participants. There is a certain reciprocity between pragmatic analysis and socio-historical research, for without the close analysis of letters like Marie's, there would be less understanding of the multiple roles and responsibilities that were possible for early modern young women to take on, and equally without existing socio-historical research it would be difficult to adequately contextualise the pragmatic functions of early modern young women's correspondence. This study draws upon and contributes to both these fields in order to improve understanding of the nuances of early modern young women's lives through the surviving evidence in their correspondence.

7.2 Additional points for further investigation

Over the course of the close analysis of Marie's letters, some observations have been made about additional areas of potential for further investigation. These other matters, whilst seemingly unusual or interesting, were beyond the scope of this particular study, since they involved other features such as materiality, or required additional comparisons with a larger dataset, which would have drawn the focus away from the core research questions and investigation into Marie's experiences had they been investigated in this particular study. In this section of the chapter, a few of these potential directions for future research are outlined.

The first potential avenue of further inquiry involves the physical features of Marie's letters that could not be investigated in the study of her linguistic behaviour. The materiality of Marie's correspondence contains additional social information, since even seemingly banal details like the size of manuscript, significant negative space, positioning of the different sections on the page, handwriting, folding of the manuscript and even the seal used, all conveyed social meaning that correlates with the correspondents' relationship and thus were actively choices that were made when composing a letter (Palander-Collin 2010: 656). Of these elements, the use of deferential negative space in Marie's letters is perhaps deserving of more attention. In the majority of cases (16 out of 22 letters), there is blank space in the top and left hand margins - a feature that indicates deference toward the recipient since more blank space can be 'afforded' to 'waste' when writing to a social superior (Dossena 2012: 22). One example had these margins intact but were later filled, and one was a smaller scrap that was used to add a note to a letter from the previous day. The four remaining letters have no margins and fill the page. It is interesting to note that these four are also the first four letters from this study sent in 1573 when Marie was 17 years old, after which the margins are used. It is possible that this change in behaviour is indicative of the changing priorities between adolescence and adulthood, perhaps that prior to a certain age

the daughter-father relationship is more intimate but then after a certain age this becomes more formal as the child is socialised into adulthood, since the four full page letters suggest a more intimate relationship that one might expect a child to show to her father, whereas the inclusion of deferential negative space in the later letters may suggest an increased awareness of the social hierarchy in which Marie played a part, and an awareness that her letters may be seen by others en route to her father so she should present an image of a good daughter. These observations could be developed into a comparative investigation into the use of significant space by other young women, perhaps analysing their letters to parents over time to see if there is a similar pattern that indicates a development from intimate parent-child dynamic indicated by a lack of negative space, turning towards a more deferential relationship indicated by presence of negative space, which would also highlight the point at which these features of the genre were learned and internalised as they were socialised into their adult lives.

Close analysis of Marie's letters also highlighted the important practical considerations that went into early modern correspondence which can be easily overlooked. These include: the availability of a suitable letter-bearer; the expectation to write with a certain degree of frequency; the fact that multiple letters could stack up waiting for a letter-bearer due to these two preceding factors; the fact that letters between correspondents took several days, typically weeks or even months to arrive, and that they could pass one another with simultaneous correspondence; the fact that letters were often passed around family members and not just to the named addressee, including the use of scribes on certain occasions, particularly if copies of certain letters or other documents needed to be made; the fact that multiple people had input on a letter, either adding a bit in their own hand or simply passing on their greetings; and the importance of receiving letters in one's own hand and not that of a scribe. All these matters are alluded to or explicitly mentioned in Marie's letters, and echo similar practices across Europe in languages other than French, suggesting a common feature of the genre. These material aspects were not the focus of this study, but would provide a rich vein for future researchers to tap into, perhaps with a cross-linguistic comparison.

Another investigation that may prove fruitful would be to compare the letters studied here with other examples of Marie's writing to different family members. An analysis of her German-language letters to her uncle Jean de Nassau, who is said to have acted as a secondary fatherly figure to Marie, may prove beneficial. This analysis would not only help to assess whether Marie's apparent preference for certain formulaic sequences and structures was based purely on her social standing within the family, but also whether the choice of language she wrote in had any bearing on the form her correspondence took. Further comparisons could then be made with parent-child correspondence within the

Orange-Nassau family, such as the letters exchanged between Louise de Coligny and her stepdaughters from Guillaume's previous marriage to Charlotte de Bourbon, which have already been interrogated for their historical value and perspectives on motherhood by scholars such as Couchman (2005) and Hodson (2007). More generally, but still within the family, other comparisons could be made between the correspondence of Marie and that of her younger half-sisters from Guillaume's marriage to Charlotte de Bourbon, since these particular letters from Louise-Julienne, Elisabeth, Charlotte-Brabantine and Amelia-Antwerpiane have already been studied from a social historical perspective by scholars such as Broomhall (2002, 2005, 2009) and Broomhall & Van Gent (2009a). Similarly, it would be interesting to examine the letters from young Orange-Nassau women to other superiors in their family hierarchy (mothers, grandparents, aunts and uncles, younger brothers with more power than them), as well as to their social inferiors (typically younger family members or those with less responsibility than them) to assess whether the 'dutiful daughter' image translates into a more general pattern of female deference in multiple relationships or whether that was something particular to the daughter-father dynamic. Unfortunately for the current study, the analysis of this dynamic has been one-sided since the only examples of Guillaume's letters to Marie were outside of the time frame studied, so it would be beneficial to analyse any examples of letters exchanged in both directions as direct replies. That being said, this study has the advantage of presenting a rather unique daughterly perspective.

Given enough resources, it is also possible for a large-scale analysis of the Orange-Nassau correspondence to be conducted. The Orange-Nassau family provides a rich vein of correspondence in both French and German (and occasionally other languages including Latin and English) that can be mined. Many examples have been preserved in edited collections such as the *'Archives ou correspondance inédite de la famille Orange-Nassau'* by Groen van Prinsterer published from the early nineteenth century onwards. Additionally, Jean-Luc Tulot (2016) has compiled, transcribed, and granted access to many of the Orange-Nassau family and wider network's French-language correspondence, with minimal editing, some historical context and organised by primary correspondent. Combining these resources with any other examples that may yet be uncovered, it would become possible to interrogate a large database of the family's letters using quantitative linguistic techniques in order to ascertain general patterns of language that were in use at the time, which could then be cross-referenced with features such as age, gender, marital status, birth order, and hierarchical differentials between correspondents to establish any clear patterns of sociolinguistic variation. Such a study would help to feed into the trend in historical sociolinguistics for 'big data', contributing additional data points for a large corpus of early modern French-language texts - the likes of

which does not appear to exist, at least not on the scale and accessibility level of English-language correspondence corpora like the Early Modern Letters Online corpus (Hotson & Lewis (eds)) - and would very likely add data points to German and Dutch language corpora from the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries as well. Although the number of letters from women within the Nassau family is limited, they would be able to contribute to a French-language equivalent of the Women's Early Modern Letters Online corpus as well. Any of these types of comparative studies, whether on the scale of the Orange-Nassau family alone or more broadly using some form of early modern French language correspondence corpora, would allow for confirmation of the more tentative findings of the current study. Such a database would also benefit from including a more diverse range of informants, such as any surviving letters from women of lower social ranks (see Lodge 2013). In addition, cross-linguistic comparisons could be made with a larger dataset - Marie wrote to her father in French but to her uncle Jean in German, and her siblings and wider network undoubtedly were familiar with both these languages, Latin and potentially other European varieties too. Such comparisons may reveal whether the 'innovative' formulae used by Marie were in fact literal translations of German phrases she was more familiar with and therefore not as creative as they first appear. A large-scale study would also open up the possibility of exploring the wider network of communication, which has already been hinted at throughout Marie's correspondence where she acted as an important intermediary node in the family network, since she regularly passes on messages, requests and health news from family and non-family members alike.

7.3 Concluding remarks

By way of conclusion, in this final section I highlight the broad areas of contribution of this study as well as reiterating the more specific findings as they relate to Marie de Nassau's correspondence. One key way in which this study contributes to the fields of historical sociolinguistics and early modern young women's correspondence is by providing an in-depth case study of correspondence written in French. As noted throughout this thesis regarding existing literature on pragmatics and early modern correspondence, the majority of research has been conducted using English language correspondence or using pragmatic methods on English language texts, with relatively few examples of French language correspondence being studied. Whilst of course there are extant studies of French language correspondence, within the field of historical sociolinguistics there has been a greater focus on other languages like English and Dutch, particularly from the later modern period. This is understandable given the likelihood of a greater number of letters surviving in these languages from more recent history than in French from the early modern period, not least letters from daughters to fathers which are even rarer than letters of other family

relationships. Whilst this thesis only contributes one case study, it does help demonstrate that the findings from these other languages using pragmatic methods in their sociolinguistic analyses can also be applied with relatively few problems to early modern French language cases. In terms of pragmatic methods used, the combination of speech acts and politeness theory with the formulaic sequences and prescriptions found in manuals were shown to overlap with each other and elicit similar narratives from the texts even though the nuances were different in each case. This lends support to any research involving multiple pragmatic methods to gain a more detailed understanding of a particular set of texts, as they each help to bolster the findings elicited from each framework.

Another important area of contribution is knowledge on the nature of daughter-father relationships in the early modern period. As noted above there is little representation of daughter-father correspondence in existing manuals from the time period (at least not in the French language examples that are accessible), and other studies of daughter-parent letters have often focused on the mother-daughter relationship, regularly with more focus on the experience from the mother's perspective than from the daughter's. This study provides a greater insight into this side of the relationship by foregrounding Marie's daughterly voice, and whilst it would be even more useful to have the response letters from Guillaume with which to compare the outcomes of her letters, it still provides a useful lens through which to see the nature of daughterhood as a lived experience in the early modern period. This is another bonus of this study, for it foregrounds the voice of the younger and socially inferior participant in the parent-child relationship, where other researchers have focused on the role of the parent in this dynamic. This study also calls for a richer understanding of the flexibility and variability to be found within the early modern family and household, in particular when it comes to the roles and responsibilities of the young women in the family. If Marie's example is one that can be extrapolated to other similar aristocratic families across early modern Europe, it shows that adolescent daughters, whether married or not, were actively trained in taking on adult responsibilities so that they could confidently step in to take over more typically motherly or wifely duties in times of need, as well as being asked for their political advice regarding ongoing situations. From this case alone it is apparent that Marie took on household responsibilities in the absence of her father - under careful supervision of her aunt and grandmother at Dillenburg - most likely in the hope that it would provide her with a solid foundation for future married life that would stand her family in good stead. Her particular circumstances at this time may have forced her to take on more responsibilities than one might typically expect, but this one example hints at the flexible nature of the early modern family, and the fact that being a 'dutiful daughter' often entailed a lot more work behind the scenes than simply doing what was expected of her to maintain that public image.

Despite initial appearances as a 'dutiful daughter', the close analysis of Marie de Nassau's letters has revealed that she played a much more significant role in the management of the Nassau household during periods of both paternal and maternal absence than one might typically expect for an adolescent woman at the time. Her letters demonstrate that young women in the early modern period were expected to be capable of adapting to their particular circumstances and more importantly the needs of their family, whether they were married or not. The content of Marie's letters during this period in her life demonstrates a level of independence and responsibility that would have prepared her well for adult life. On a linguistic level, her competencies with the pragmatic features of formulaic sequences, politeness strategies and speech acts allowed her to balance multiple social demands placed on her - she expresses herself clearly and makes demands of her father, whilst simultaneously maintaining a strong social image of a dutiful daughter in an attempt to keep the status of their relationship balanced. By mixing conventional forms with some novel expressions, Marie's own voice emerges from the page and demonstrates her progression from adolescence into adulthood. Other young women's voices are likely to be similarly evident in their correspondence with their fathers, as they navigated their transition from adolescence into adulthood and fulfilled the particular needs of their families during this stage in their lives. The 'dutiful daughter' appears to have been an adaptable role, flexible enough to be whatever her family circumstances required of her at any given moment, ultimately preparing her for success in adult life.

8. Bibliography

Primary sources:

Correspondence of Marie de Nassau and Guillaume d'Orange, Koninklijk Huisarchief (KHA), The Hague:

Maria van Oranje-Nassau to Willem van Oranje, 1573/07/18, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5515, A 11/XIV A/4-1.

—, 1573/08/18, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5516, A 11/XIV A/4-2.

—, 1573/09/23, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5517, A 11/XIV A/4-3.

—, 1573/10/15, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5518, A 11/XIV A/4-4.

—, 1573/11/25, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5519, A 11/XIV A/4-5.

—, 1573/12/05, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5520, A 11/XIV A/4-6.

—, 1573/12/25, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5521, A 11/XIV A/4-7.

—, 1574/02/21, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5522, A 11/XIV A/4-8.

—, 1574/03/16, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5523, A 11/XIV A/4-9.

—, 1574/05/15, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5524, A 11/XIV A/4-10.

—, 1574/06/01, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5525, A 11/XIV A/4-11.

—, 1574/06/22, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5526, A 11/XIV A/4-12.

—, 1576/03/02, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5527, A 11/XIV A/4-13.

—, 1576/05/01, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5528, A 11/XIV A/4-14.

—, 1576/10/15, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5529, A 11/XIV A/4-15.

—, 1577/01/26, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5530, A 11/XIV A/4-16.

—, 1577/03/19, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5531, A 11/XIV A/4-17.

—, 1577/04/04, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5532, A 11/XIV A/4-18.

—, 1577/05/06, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5533, A 11/XIV A/4-19.

—, 1577/05/25, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5534, A 11/XIV A/4-20.

—, 1577/05/26, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5535, A 11/XIV A/4-21.

—, 1577/09/20, De correspondentie van Willem van Oranje nr. 5536, A 11/XIV A/4-22.

Manuals and other letters:

Bourlier, Jean 1566. *Stile et maniere de composer lettres missives avec plusieurs reigles & argumens [...]*. Jean Waesberghe (Anvers/Brussels).

Bourlier, Jean 1586. *Lettres communes et familieres pour marchants et autres*. Jean Waesbergue (Rotterdam).

Durand, Pierre, Jean de la Moyne, & Etienne Dolet 1553. *'Le Stile et Maniere de composer, dicter et escrire toute sorte d'epistres, ou lettres missiues, tant par response que autrement. Avec epitome de la poinctuation, et accentz de la langue françoise. Liure tresvtile et proufitable'* (attributed variously to these three authors). Maurice Menier (Paris).

Du Tronchet 1572. *Finances et thresor de la plume françoise*. Nicolas du Chemin (Paris).

Fabri, Pierre 1521. *Le grant et vray art de pleine rhetorique*. Slatkine Reprints (Geneva, 1972).

Groen van Prinsterer, G., *Archives ou correspondance inédite de la famille Orange-Nassau* (Series 1: Tome V), S. & J. Luchtmans (Leiden), 1838.

Groen van Prinsterer, G., *Archives ou correspondance inédite de la famille Orange-Nassau* (Series 1: Tome VI), S. & J. Luchtmans (Leiden), 1839.

Habert, Pierre 1571. *Le stile de composer et dicter toutes sortes de lettres missives*. In: *Le miroir de vertu*. Antoine Bourriquant (Paris).

Hotson, Howard and Miranda Lewis, eds, *Early Modern Letters Online*. Available at: <http://emlo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>.

Marchegay, Paul 1970 [1887]. *'Correspondance de Louise de Coligny, Princesse d'Orange'*. Slatkine Reprints (Geneva).

Meurier, Gabriel 1573. *Formulaire de lettres morales moult propres pour l'usage des jeunes filles és escoles françoises*. Jean Waesberghe (Anvers).

Tulot, Jean-Luc 2016. *Le Monde des La Tremoille au XVIIe siecle*. Available at: <http://jeanluc.tulot.pagesperso-orange.fr/01LMDLT.htm>.

Dictionary entries:

'Aimer' 2015, in *Dictionnaire du Moyen Français*. Cromer, Pierre (ed.). Available at: <http://www.cnrtl.fr/definition/dmf/aimer> [Accessed 9 January 2019].

'Bien-aimé' 2007, in *Dictionnaire du Moyen Français*. Martin, Robert (ed.). In: Available at: <http://www.cnrtl.fr/definition/dmf/bien-aimé> [Accessed 9 January 2019].

'Monsieur' [n.d.], in *Dictionnaire du Moyen Français*. Martin, Robert (ed.). Available at: <http://cnrtl.fr/definition/dmf/monsieur> [Accessed 8 January 2019].

'Obéir' [n.d.], in *Dictionnaire du Moyen Français*. Martin, Robert (ed.). Available at: <http://www.cnrtl.fr/definition/dmf/ob%C3%A9ir> [Accessed 5 February 2019].

'Obéissant' [n.d.], in *Dictionnaire du Moyen Français*. Martin, Robert (ed.). Available at: <http://www.cnrtl.fr/definition/dmf/ob%C3%A9issant> [Accessed 9 January 2019].

'Politesse' [n.d.], in *Trésor de la Langue Française informatisé*. CNRTL (Centre National de Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales). Available at: <https://www.cnrtl.fr/etymologie/politesse> [accessed 18 May 2022].

Secondary sources:

Adams, Tracy 2005. 'Medieval Mothers and their Children: The Case of Isabeau of Bavaria in Light of Medieval Conduct Books', in Classen (ed.) *Childhood in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. De Gruyter (Berlin, Boston), pp265-289.

Aijmer, Karin & Gisle Andersen (eds) 2011. *Sociopragmatics*. Vol. 5 of Handbooks of Pragmatics series edited by Wolfram Bublitz, Andreas H. Jucker and Klaus P. Schneider. Mouton de Gruyter (Berlin).

Alberdi Urquizu, Carmen 2007-08. 'Politesse et structure de l'interaction', *Pragmalingüística*, 15-16, pp7-32.

Alberdi Urquizu, Carmen 2009. '*Politesse, savoir-vivre: modernité d'un concept bien classique'*, *Synergies Espagne*, 2(2), pp117-128.

Altman, J G 1990. 'Pour une histoire culturelle de la lettre: l'epistolier et l'état sous l'Ancien Régime', in Bossis & Porter (eds) *L'epistolarité à travers les siècles. Geste de communication et/ou écriture*. Franz Steiner Verlag (Stuttgart), pp106-115.

Amussen, Susan Dwyer 1993 [1988]. *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England*. Columbia University Press (New York, Oxford).

Auer, Anita, Daniel Schreier & Richard J. Watts (eds.) 2015. *Letter Writing and Language Change*, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge).

Austin, John L. 1962. *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford University Press (Oxford).

Bax, Marcel 2010. 'Epistolary Presentation Rituals: Face-work, Politeness and Ritual Display in Early Modern Dutch Letter-Writing', in Culpeper & Kadar (eds) *Historical (im)politeness*. Peter Lang (Bern, Oxford), pp37-85.

Beeching, Kate 2006. 'Politeness Markers in French: Post-Posed quoi in the Tourist Office', *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behavior, Culture*, 2(1), pp.143-67.

Beeching, Kate 2007. 'A politeness-theoretic approach to pragmatico-semantic change', *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 8(1), pp69-108.

Ben-Amos, Ilana Krausman 2000. 'Reciprocal Bonding: Parents and their Offspring in Early Modern England', *Journal of Family History*, 25(3), pp291-312.

Bergs, Alexander 2007. 'Letters: A new approach to text typology', in Nevalainen & Tanskanen (eds) *Letter writing*. John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp27-46.

Bolgar, R R 1983. 'The teaching of letter-writing in the sixteenth century', *History of Education*. 12(4), pp245-253.

Boone, Marc, Thérèse de Hemptinne & Walter Prevenier 2003. 'Gender and early emancipation in the Low Countries in the late Middle Ages and early modern period', Munns & Richards (eds) *Gender, Power and Privilege in Early Modern Europe*. Routledge (London), pp21-39.

Bossis, Mireille & Charles A. Porter (eds) 1990. *L'Epistolarité a Travers les Siècles: Geste de communication et/ou d'écriture: Colloque sous la direction de Mireille Bossis et de Charles A. Porter.* Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur, Beihefte, Neue Folge Heft 18. Centre Culturel International de Cerisy la Salle, France. Franz Steiner Verlag (Stuttgart).

Bossis, Mireille & Karen McPherson 1986. 'Methodological Journeys Through Correspondences', *Yale French Studies*, 71, pp. 63–75. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/2930022

Boutcher, Warren 2002. 'Literature, Thought or Fact? Past and Present Directions in the Study of the Early Modern Letter', in Van Houdt, Papy, Tournoy & Matheeussen (eds) *Self-presentation and social identification: the rhetoric and pragmatics of letter writing in early modern times*. Leuven University Press (Leuven), pp137-163.

Broomhall, Susan & Jennifer Spinks 2011. *Early modern women in the low countries: feminizing sources and interpretations of the past*. Ashgate (Farnham, Burlington). Available at: <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/sheffield/reader.action?docID=665342> [accessed 26/02/2019].

Broomhall, Susan & Jacqueline van Gent 2009. 'Corresponding Affections: Emotional Exchange Among Siblings in the Nassau Family', *Journal of Family History*, 34(2), pp143-165.

Broomhall, Susan & Jacqueline van Gent 2009. 'In the Name of the Father: Conceptualizing Pater Familias in the Letters of William the Silent's Children', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 62(4), pp1130-1166.

Broomhall, Susan & Jacqueline van Gent 2014. 'Converted Relationships: Re-negotiating Family Status after Religious Conversion in the Nassau Dynasty', *Journal of Social History*, 47(3), pp647-672.

Broomhall, Susan & Jacqueline van Gent 2016. *Dynastic Colonialism: Gender, materiality and the early modern house of Orange-Nassau*. Routledge (Abingdon, New York).

Broomhall, Susan 2002. 'Womens Little Secrets: Defining the Boundaries of Reproductive Knowledge in Sixteenth-Century France', *Social History of Medicine*, 15(1), 1-15.

Broomhall, Susan 2005. 'Lettres de Louise-Julienne, d'Élisabeth et d'Amélie de Nassau à Charlotte-Brabantine de Nassau (1595-1601)', in Goldsmith & Winn (eds.) *Lettres de femmes: Textes inédits et oubliés du XVIe au XVIIIe siècle*. Honoré Champion (Paris), pp135-177.

Broomhall, Susan 2009. 'Letters Make the Family: Nassau Family Correspondence at the Turn of the Seventeenth Century', in Campbell & Larsen (eds) *Early Modern Women and Transnational Communities of Letters*, Ashgate (Farnham, Burlington), pp. 25-44.

Brown, Penelope & Stephen Levinson C. 1987 [1978]. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge).

Buning, Robin 2016. 'Digital Correspondence of the Nassau Women', *The Court Historian*, 21(2), pp176-177.

Buttigieg, Emanuel 2008. 'Childhood and adolescence in early modern Malta (1565-1632)', *Journal of Family History*, 33(2), pp139-155.

Caine, Barbara 2015. 'Letters between Mothers and Daughters', *Women's History Review*, 24(4), pp483-489. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09612025.2015.1015326> [accessed 30 May 2019].

Campbell, Julie D. & Anne R. Larsen (eds) 2009. *Early Modern Women and Transnational Communities of Letters*. Ashgate (Farnham, Burlington).

Campbell, Julie D. & Anne R. Larsen 2009. 'Introduction', in Campbell & Larsen (eds) *Early Modern Women and Transnational Communities of Letters*. Ashgate (Farnham, Burlington), pp1-21.

Cavallo, Sandra 2012. 'Fatherhood and the non-propertied classes in Renaissance and early modern Italian towns', *The History of the Family*, 17(3), pp309-325.

Chedgzoy, Kate 2013. 'Did Children Have a Renaissance?', *Early Modern Women: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 8, pp261-273.

Chen, Rong 2001. 'Self-politeness: A proposal', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, pp87-106.

Chiavetta, Eleonora 2012. 'Fanny to William: A Critical Discourse Analysis approach to the letters of Frances Leonora Macleay', in Dossena & Del Lungo Camiciotti (eds) *Letter writing in late modern Europe*. John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp89-103.

Classen, Albrecht (ed.) 2005. *Childhood in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: The Results of a Paradigm Shift in the History of Mentality*. Walter de Gruyter (Berlin, New York). Available at:
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/sheffield/detail.action?docID=3041871>.

Classen, Albrecht 2005. 'Philippe Ariès and the Consequences: History of Childhood, Family Relations, and Personal Emotions: Where do we stand today?', in Classen (ed.) *Childhood in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Walter de Gruyter (Berlin, New York), pp1-65.

Cohen, Elizabeth S. & Margaret Reeves (eds.) 2018. *The Youth of Early Modern Women*. Amsterdam University Press (Amsterdam). Available at:
<http://www.oapen.org/search?identifier=1004126> [accessed 21/02/2019].

Cole, Peter & Jerry Morgan (eds) 1975. *Syntax and Semantics. Vol 3: Speech Acts.* Academic Press (New York).

Couchman, Jane 2005, 'Lettres de Louise de Coligny, princesse d'Orange, aux membres de sa famille aux Pays-Bas et en France', in Goldsmith & Winn (eds) *Lettres de femmes: Textes inédits et oubliés du XVIe au XVIIIe siècle*. Honoré Champion (Paris), pp89-133.

Couchman, Jane 2018. ''Is it possible that my sister [...] has had a baby?': The Early Years of Marriage as a Transition from Girlhood to Womanhood in the Letters of Three Generations of Orange-Nassau Women', in Cohen & Reeves (eds.) *The Youth of Early Modern Women*. Amsterdam University Press (Amsterdam), pp195-214.

Culpeper, Jonathan & Daniel Z. Kadar (eds) 2010. *Historical (im)politeness*. Peter Lang (Bern, Oxford).

Culpeper, Jonathan 1996. 'Towards an anatomy of impoliteness', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), pp349-367.

Culpeper, Jonathan 2009. 'Historical sociopragmatics: An introduction', *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 10(2), pp179-186.

Culpeper, Jonathan 2010. 'Historical sociopragmatics', in Jucker & Taavitsainen (eds) *Historical Pragmatics*. De Gruyter Mouton (Berlin, New York), pp69-94.

Culpeper, Jonathan 2011. 'Politeness and Impoliteness', in Aijmer & Andersen (eds) *Sociopragmatics*. Mouton de Gruyter (Berlin). pp39-436. Available at:
<eprints.lancs.ac.uk/64460/1/Culpeper_HOP_Politeness_longoverviewfinal.pdf> [accessed 09/05/2019].

Culpeper, Jonathan, Michael Haugh & Dániel Z. Kádár (eds) 2017. *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*. Palgrave Macmillan (London). doi: https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-37508-7

Davis, Norman 1965. 'The Litera Troili and English Letters', *The Review of English Studies*, 16(63), pp233-244.

Daybell, James 2006. *Women Letter-Writers in Tudor England*. Oxford University Press (Oxford). Available at: <https://www.dawsonera.com/abstract/9780191531897> [accessed 25/02/2019].

Daybell, James 2009. 'Letters', in Knoppers (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, New York), pp181-193.

Daybell, James 2015. 'Social Negotiations in Correspondence between Mothers and Daughters in Tudor and Early Stuart England', *Women's History Review*, 24(4), pp502-527.

Dialeti, Androniki 2012. 'From Women's Oppression to Male Anxiety: The Concept of 'Patriarchy' in the Historiography of Early Modern Europe', in Muravyeva & Toivo (eds) *Gender in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Routledge (New York, Abingdon), pp19-36.

Dolan, Frances E. 2003. 'Gender and sexuality in early modern England', in Munns & Richards (eds) *Gender, Power and Privilege in Early Modern Europe*. Routledge (Abingdon, New York), pp7-20.

Dossena, Marina & Gabriella Del Lungo Camiciotti (eds) 2012. *Letter writing in late modern Europe*. John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadelphia). Available at: <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/sheffield/detail.action?docID=882554>.

Dossena, Marina & Gabriella Del Lungo Camiciotti 2012. 'Introduction', in Dossena, & Del Lungo Camiciotti (eds) *Letter writing in late modern Europe*. John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp1-12.

Dossena, Marina 2012. 'The study of correspondence: Theoretical and methodological issues', in Dossena & Del Lungo Camiciotti (eds) *Letter writing in late modern Europe*. John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp13-29.

Elspaß, Stefan 2015. 'Private letters as a source for an alternative history of Middle New High German', in Auer, Schreier & Watts (eds) *Letter Writing and Language Change*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge), pp35-52.

Erdmann, Axel, Alberto Govi, & Fabrizio Govi 2014. *Ars Epistolica: Communication in Sixteenth Century Western Europe: Epistolaries, Letter-Writing Manuals and Model Letter Books 1501-1600. With an introduction by Judith Rice Henderson*. Gilhofer and Ranschburg (Luzern).

Fitzmaurice, Susan M. 2002. *The Familiar Letter in Early Modern English: A Pragmatic Approach.* John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadelphia).

Flather, Amanda J. 2013. 'Space, Place, and Gender: The Sexual and Spatial Division of Labor in the Early Modern Household', *History and Theory,* 52(3), pp344-360.

Frijhoff, Willem 2015. 'Multilingualism and the challenge of frenchification in the early modern Dutch Republic', in Peersman, Rutten & Vosters (eds) *Past, Present and Future of a Language Border: Germanic-Romance Encounters in the Low Countries*. De Gruyter Mouton (Berlin, Boston), pp115-140.

Gibson, Jonathan 1997. 'Significant Space in Manuscript Letters', *The Seventeenth Century*, 12(1), pp1-10.

Goffman, Erving 2003 [1967]. 'On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction', *Reflections*, 4(3), pp7-13.

Goldsmith, Elizabeth C. & Colette H. Winn (eds.) 2005. *Lettres de femmes: Textes inédits et oubliés du XVIe au XVIIIe siècle*. Honoré Champion (Paris).

Grice, H. Paul 1975. 'Logic and conversation', in Cole & Morgan (eds) *Syntax and Semantics. Vol 3: Speech Acts*. Academic Press (New York), pp41-58.

Hannan, Leonie 2016. *Women of letters: gender, writing and the life of the mind in early modern England*. Manchester University Press (Manchester).

Harrison, Frederic 1907. *William the Silent*. Macmillan (London).

Head, R. (1995). 'A Plurilingual Family in the Sixteenth Century: Language Use and Linguistic Consciousness in the Salis Family Correspondence, 1580-1610', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 26(3), pp577-593. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/2543140

Hodson, Simon 2007. 'The Power of Female Dynastic Networks: a brief study of Louise de Coligny, princess of Orange, and her stepdaughters', *Women's History Review*, 16(3), pp335-351.

Howell, Martha 2019. 'The Problem of Women's Agency in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe', in Moran & Pipkin (eds) *Women and Gender in the Early Modern Low Countries*. Brill (Leiden, Boston), pp21-31.

Hunt, David 1970. *Parents and children in history: the psychology of family life in early modern France*. Hachette.

Jobert, Manuel 2010. 'L'impolitesse linguistique: vers un nouveau paradigme de recherche?', *Lexis*, HS 2. doi: https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.777

Jucker, Andreas H. (ed.) 1995. *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*. John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadelphia).

Jucker, Andreas H. & Irma Taavitsainen (eds) 2010. *Historical Pragmatics*. De Gruyter Mouton (Berlin, New York).

Jucker, Andreas H. 2011. 'Positive and negative face as descriptive categories in the history of English', *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 12 (1-2), pp178-197.

Jucker, Andreas H. 2012. 'Changes in Politeness Culture', in Nevalainen & Traugott (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English*. Oxford University Press (Oxford), pp422-433.

Kádár, Dániel Z. & Jonathan Culpeper 2010. 'Historical (Im)politeness: An Introduction', in Culpeper & Kadar (eds) *Historical (im)politeness*. Peter Lang (Bern, Oxford), pp9-36.

Kádár, Dániel Z. & Michael Haugh 2013. *Understanding Politeness*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge).

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine 2002. 'Politesse en deçà des Pyrénées, impolitesse au delà : retour sur la question de l'universalité de la (théorie de la) politesse', *Marges Linguistiques*. Available at:
<http://icar.univ-lyon2.fr/Equipe1/documents/MargesKerbrat.pdf>.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine 2006. 'Politeness in small shops in France', *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 2(1), pp79-103.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine 2011. 'From Good Manners to Facework: Politeness Variations and Constants in France, from the Classic Age to Today', *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 12(1-2), pp.133-155.

Knoppers, Laura Lunger 2009. *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge).

Kohnen, Thomas 2008. *Linguistic politeness in Anglo-Saxon England? A study of Old English address terms*. In: *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 9:1 (2008). (John Benjamins). pp140-158.

Laitinen, Lea and Nordlund, Taru. 2012. 'Performing Identities and Interaction Through Epistolary Formulae', in Dossena & Del Lungo Camiciotti (eds) *Letter Writing in Late Modern Europe*. John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadephia), pp65-88.

Lanza, Janine M. 2013. 'Women and Work', in Poska, Couchman & McIver (eds) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*. Routledge (Abingdon, New York), pp276-293.

Le Guillou, Louis 1990. 'Epistolarité et Histoire littéraire', in Bossis & Porter (eds) *L'Epistolarité a Travers les Siècles: Geste de communication et/ou d'écriture*. Franz Steiner Verlag (Stuttgart), pp99-105.

Locher, Miriam A. 2006. 'Polite behaviour within relational work: The discursive approach to politeness', *Multilingua*, 25, pp249-267.

Lodge, R. Anthony 2004. *A sociolinguistic history of Parisian French*, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge).

Lodge, Anthony 2013. 'A lady-in-waiting's begging letter to her former employer (Paris, mid-sixteenth century)', in Van der Wal & Rutten (eds) *Touching the Past: Studies in the historical sociolinguistics of ego-documents*. John Benjamins Publishing Company (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp19-43.

Manno, Giuseppe 1999. 'La Spécificité du travail de figuration dans la communication écrite', *Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur*, 109(3), pp256-76.

Marini, Mirella. 'Female authority in the pietas nobilita: Habsburg allegiance during the Dutch revolt', *Dutch crossing*, 34(1), pp5-24. doi: https://doi.org/10.1179/030965610X12634710163060 [accessed 30/05/2019]

Martineau, France 2013. 'Written documents: What they tell us about linguistic usage', in Van der Wal & Rutten (eds) *Touching the Past: Studies in the historical sociolinguistics of ego-documents*. John Benjamins Publishing Company (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp129-147.

Mazzon, Gabriella 2010. 'Terms of address', in Jucker & Taavitsainen (eds) *Historical Pragmatics*. De Gruyter Mouton (Berlin, New York), pp351-376.

Mey, Jacob L. 2001. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Second Edition. Blackwell Publishing (Malden, Oxford, Victoria).

Moncrief, Kathryn M. & Kathryn R. McPherson (eds) 2011. *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England: Gender, Instruction, and Performance*. Routledge (London, New York).

Moran, Megan 2011. 'Female Letter Writing and the Preservation of Family Memory in Early Modern Italy', *Early Modern Women*, 6, pp195-201.

Moran, Megan 2015. 'Motherhood and the Politics of Family Decisions in Early Modern Italy', *Journal of Family History*, 40(3), pp351-372.

Moran, Sarah Joan & Amanda Pipkin (eds) 2019. *Women and Gender in the Early Modern Low Countries*. Brill (Leiden, Boston).

Mosegaard Hansen, Maj-Britt 2005. 'From prepositional phrase to hesitation marker: The semantic and pragmatic evolution of French enfin', *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 6(1), pp37-68.

Moss, Rachel E. 2009. *Fictions of Fatherhood: Fatherhood in Late Medieval English Gentry and Mercantile Letters and Romances*. Thesis.

Munns, Jessica & Penny Richards (eds) 2003. *Gender, Power and Privilege in Early Modern Europe*. Routledge (Abingdon, New York).

Munns, Jessica & Penny Richards 2003. 'Introduction', in Munns & Richards (eds) *Gender, Power and Privilege in Early Modern Europe*. Routledge (Abingdon, New York), pp1-6.

Muravyeva, Marianna & Raisa Maria Toivo (eds) 2012. *Gender in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Routledge (New York, Abingdon).

Nevala, Minna 2004. 'Accessing politeness axes: forms of address and terms of reference in early English correspondence', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, pp2125-2160.

Nevala, Minna 2010. 'Keeping Up Appearances: Facework in Self- and Addressee-Oriented Person Reference', in Culpeper & Kadar (eds) *Historical (im)politeness*. Peter Lang (Bern, Oxford), pp147-173.

Nevalainen, Terttu & Helena Raumolin-Brunberg 1995. 'Constraints on Politeness: The Pragmatics of Address Formulae in Early English Corresponence', in Jucker (ed.) 1995. *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*. John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp541-601.

Nevalainen, Terttu and Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen (eds) 2007. *Letter writing*. John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadelphia).

Nevalainen, Terttu & Elizabeth Closs Traugott (eds) 2012. *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English*. Oxford University Press (Oxford).

Nurmi, Arja 2013. ''All the Rest Ye Must Lade Yourself': Deontic Modality in Sixteenth-Century English Merchant Letters', in Van der Wal & Rutten (eds) *Touching the Past: Studies in the historical sociolinguistics of ego-documents*. John Benjamins Publishing Company (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp165-182.

Ottaviani, Mgn 2013. 'The power of words in the letters of some women of power (late middle ages and early modern era)', *Nuova Rivista Storica*, 97(3), pp991-1008.

Palander-Collin, Minna 2010. 'Correspondence', in Jucker & Taavitsainen (eds) *Historical Pragmatics*. De Gruyter Mouton (Berlin, New York), pp651-677.

Peersman, Catharina, Gijsbert Rutten & Rik Vosters (eds) 2015. *Past, Present and Future of a Language Border: Germanic-Romance Encounters in the Low Countries*. De Gruyter Mouton (Berlin, Boston). <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/sheffield/detail.action?docID=1727131> [accessed 26/02/2019].

Pizziconi, Barbara & Chris Christie 2017. 'Indexicality and (Im)politeness', in Culpeper, Haugh & Kádár (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*. Palgrave Macmillan (London), pp143-170.

Pollock, Linda 1989. ''Teach her to live under obedience': the making of women in the upper ranks of early modern England', *Continuity and Change*, 4(2), pp231-258.

Poska, Allyson M. 2013. 'Upending Patriarchy: Rethinking Marriage and Family in Early Modern Europe', in Poska, Couchman & McIver (eds) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*. Routledge (Abingdon, New York), pp198-214.

Poska, Allyson M., Jane Couchman & Katherine A. McIver (eds) 2013. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*. Routledge (Abingdon, New York).

Poska, Allyson M., Jane Couchman & Katherine A. McIver 2013. 'Introduction', in Poska, Couchman & McIver (eds) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*. Routledge (Abingdon, New York), pp17-26.

Reid, Martine 1990. 'Ecriture intime et destinataire', in Bossis & Porter (eds) *L'Epistolarité a Travers les Siècles: Geste de communication et/ou d'écriture*. Franz Steiner Verlag (Stuttgart), pp20-26.

Richards, Penny 2003. 'The Guise women: Politics, war and peace', in Munns & Richards (eds) *Gender, Power and Privilege in Early Modern Europe*. Routledge (Abingdon, New York), pp159-170.

Rutten, Gijsbert & Marijke van der Wal 2012. 'Functions of epistolary formulae in Dutch letters from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries', *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 13(2), pp173-201.

Rutten, Gijsbert & Marijke van der Wal 2013. 'Epistolary formulae and writing experience in Dutch letters from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries', in Van der Wal & Rutten (eds) *Touching the Past: Studies in the historical sociolinguistics of ego-documents*. John Benjamins Publishing Company (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp45-65.

Searle, John R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, New York, Melbourne).

Staples, Kate Kelsey 2011. *Daughters of London: Inheriting Opportunity in the Late Middle Ages*. Brill (Leiden).

Tancke, Ulrike 2011. 'Like Mother, Like Daughter? Women Teaching Girls in Early Modern England', in Moncrief & McPherson (eds) *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England: Gender, Instruction, and Performance*. Routledge (London, New York), pp147-158.

Tanskanen, Sanna-Kaisa 2007. 'Intertextual networks in the correspondence of Lady Katherine Paston', in Nevalainen & Tanskanen (eds) *Letter writing*. John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp73-87.

Van der Wal, Marijke J. & Gijsbert Rutten (eds.) 2013. *Touching the Past: Studies in the historical sociolinguistics of ego-documents* (Advances in Historical Sociolinguistics 1). John Benjamins Publishing Company (Amsterdam, Philadelphia).

Van der Wal & Rutten 2013. 'Ego-documents in a historical-sociolinguistic perspective', in Van der Wal & Rutten (eds) *Touching the Past: Studies in the historical sociolinguistics of ego-documents*. John Benjamins Publishing Company (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp1-17.

Van Houdt, Toon, Jan Papy, Gilbert Tournoy & Constant Matheeussen (eds) 2002. *Self-presentation and social identification: the rhetoric and pragmatics of letter writing in early modern times*. Leuven University Press (Leuven).

Verhaegen, Sarah 2012. 'Early Modern Noblemen and the Use of Paper Communication Media: The Media-Politics of the 'Lesser' Nassau (c. 1570–1620)', *Dutch Crossing*, 36(1), pp35-49. doi: https://doi.org/10.1179/0309656411Z.0000000003

Watts, Richard J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge).

Wedgwood, C. V. 1944. *William the Silent*. Meuthen (London).

Williams, Graham T. 2013. *Women's Epistolary Utterance: A study of the letters of Joan and Maria Thynne, 1575-1611*. John Benjamins Publishing Company (Amsterdam, Philadelphia).

Wood, Johanna L. 2007. 'Text in context: A critical discourse analysis approach to Margaret Paston', in Nevalainen & Tanskanen (eds) *Letter writing*. John Benjamins (Amsterdam, Philadelphia), pp47-72.

Wood, Johanna L. 2009. 'Structures and Expectations: A systematic analysis of Margaret Paston's formulaic and expressive language', *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 10(2), pp187-214.

Wray, Alison. 2002. *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge).

9. Appendices

Appendix 1 - Letter-sending summary

Appendix 2 - Summaries of Marie's letters

Appendix 3 - Sample transcription 1574/06/22

Appendix 4 - Marie and Guillaume's timelines

Appendix 5 - Sixteenth-century French letter-writing manuals survey

Appendix 6 - Face threats and politeness strategies reference

Appendix 7 - Sample utterance analysis 1574/06/22

Appendix 1 - Letter sending summary

Date	Sender	Sender likely location	Recipient	Recipient likely location	Relationship	Archive number or reference	Notes	Language	Part of study
1567/04/21	Guillaume d'Orange	?Delft	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter	#12566	Also to Filips Willem, in Dutch	Dutch	N
1573/01/13	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter				N
1573/02/05	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter	#2945		French	N
1573/04/09	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter	#2972		French	N
Before 1573/06/18	Guillaume d'Orange	Leyden	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter				N
1573/06/18	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	Leyden	Daughter to Father	#5515		French	Y
About 1573/07/01	Guillaume d'Orange	Leyden	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter				N
Before 1573/08/17	Guillaume d'Orange	Dordrecht	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter				N
1573/08/18	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	Dordrecht	Daughter to Father	#5516	Likely sent with #5517	French	Y
1573/09/23	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	Dordrecht	Daughter to Father	#5517	Likely sent with #5516	French	Y
1573/10/02	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Daughter to Father				N
1573/10/15	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Daughter to Father	#5518		French	Y
1573/10/01	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter		Received before #5519		N

Date	Sender	Sender likely location	Recipient	Recipient likely location	Relationship	Archive number or reference	Notes	Language	Part of study
1573/10/16	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter		Received before #5519		N
Before 1573/11/18	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter				N
1573/11/25	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Daughter to Father	#5519	Sent later with #5520	French	Y
1573/11/13	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter		Received with 22/11/1573 on 03/12/1573		N
1573/11/22	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter		Received with 13/11/1573 on 03/12/1573		N
1573/12/05	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Daughter to Father	#5520		French	Y
1573/12/25	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Daughter to Father	#5521		French	Y
About 1574/02/01	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	?Vlessingue	Daughter to Father				N
Before 1574/02/20	Guillaume d'Orange	?Vlessingue	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter				N
1574/02/21	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	?Dordrecht	Daughter to Father	#5522		French	Y
1574/03/16	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	?Dordrecht	Daughter to Father	#5523		French	Y
1574/05/15	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	?Gorichum	Daughter to Father	#5524		French	Y
1574/05/23	Guillaume d'Orange	Gorrichum	Jean & Louis de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Brother to Brothers	Groen van Prinsterer 1:5 p6	Of interest due to being in French	French	N
1574/06/01	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	Rotterdam	Daughter to Father	#5525		French	Y

Date	Sender	Sender likely location	Recipient	Recipient likely location	Relationship	Archive number or reference	Notes	Language	Part of study
Before 1574/06/16	Guillaume d'Orange	Rotterdam	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter				N
1574/06/22	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	Rotterdam	Daughter to Father	#5526		French	Y
1574/08/24	Guillaume d'Orange	?Rotterdam	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter	#3189		French	N
1576/02/02	Guillaume d'Orange	Rotterdam	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter		Received 01/03/1576		N
1576/03/02	Marie de Nassau	Rudolstadt	Guillaume d'Orange	?Rotterdam	Daughter to Father	#5527		French	Y
1576/04/05	Guillaume d'Orange	Delft	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter		Received 18/04/1576		N
1576/05/01	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Daughter to Father	#5528		French	Y
Before 1576/10/12	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Marie de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Father to Daughter				N
1576/10/15	Marie de Nassau	Ottweiler	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Daughter to Father	#5529; Groen van Prinsterer 1:5 p428		French	Y
Dec 1576/ Jan 1577	Marie de Nassau	?Siegen	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Daughter to Father				N
Dec 1576/ Jan 1577	Marie de Nassau	?Siegen	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Daughter to Father				N
Dec 1576/ Jan 1577	Marie de Nassau	?Siegen	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Daughter to Father				N
1577/01/26	Marie de Nassau	Siegen	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Daughter to Father	#5530		French	Y
1577/03/19	Marie de Nassau	Siegen	Guillaume d'Orange	Middelbourg	Daughter to Father	#5531; Groen van Prinsterer 1:6 p15		French	Y

Date	Sender	Sender likely location	Recipient	Recipient likely location	Relationship	Archive number or reference	Notes	Language	Part of study
1577/04/04	Marie de Nassau	Siegen	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Daughter to Father	#5532		French	Y
Before 1577/05/05	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Marie de Nassau	?Siegen	Father to Daughter				N
1577/05/06	Marie de Nassau	Siegen	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Daughter to Father	#5533	Sent with #5534 and #5535	French	Y
1577/05/25	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Daughter to Father	#5534	Sent with #5533 and #5535	French	Y
1577/05/26	Marie de Nassau	Dillenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Daughter to Father	#5535	Sent with #5533 and #5534	French	Y
1577/09/20	Marie de Nassau	Geertruidenburg	Guillaume d'Orange	?Middelbourg	Daughter to Father	#5536		French	Y
1578/02/10	Marie de Nassau	Antdorff	Jean de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Niece to Uncle	Groen van Prinsterer 1:6 p292		German	N
1578/03/08	Marie de Nassau	Antdorff	Jean de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Niece to Uncle	Groen van Prinsterer 1:6 p301		German	N
1578/03/13	Marie de Nassau	?Antdorff	Jean de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Niece to Uncle	Groen van Prinsterer 1:6 p309		German	N
1578/03/19	Marie de Nassau	Antdorff	Jean de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Niece to Uncle	Groen van Prinsterer 1:6 p329		German	N
1578/07/24	Marie de Nassau	Antdorff	Jean de Nassau	?Dillenburg	Niece to Uncle	Groen van Prinsterer 1:6 p423		German	N
1590/06/02	Louise de Coligny	Middelbourg	Marie de Nassau		Stepmother to stepdaughter	Marchegay 1970: p51-52		French	N

Appendix 2 - Summaries of Marie's letters

Letter: 1573/07/18 (#5515).

Short summary: Marie thanks Guillaume for the money he's sending to Mademoiselle d'Alendorff - she asks that he does this quickly. She lets him know that she still hasn't heard from Jacob Joostens but will tell him when she does. She thanks him for the money he sent for her to spend on herself, her sisters and her brother Maurice. She is pleased to hear his good news but displeased that Haarlem is still besieged and prays that this will change. She passes on wishes from a letter from her aunt, Madame de Schwartzbourg. She tells him her grandma was also pleased to hear from him. She also passes on wishes from Madame de Nassau junior.

Detailed summary: Marie thanks Guillaume for being remembered, that he is in good health, and that she knows of nothing better than receiving news of his good health. She lets him know that she and her grandmother are still in good health. She thanks Guillaume for letting her know he will send Madamoiselle d'Alendorff 700 hallers by Corneles his bursar because she [Alendorff] is in such pain that it will be a pleasure for her, and she notes that he has told her how he will send the rest and she begs that it does not get forgotten and can be sent a soon as possible. She performs a politeness formula to downplay this request. She informs him that she still hasn't heard from Jacob Joostens, brother of the bursar/bearer of this money that he should receive from Jacop Matten and the doctor, but that she hopes to have news of this soon and that she will pass this on to Guillaume when she has it. She informs him that as for the money he sent her to spend on herself, her sisters and her brother Maurice that she has done what he asked and it was well received by them so she thanks him. She says she doesn't know how she deserves the good things he does for her but that she pledges her obedience as his daughter. She notes how she was pleased to hear that things were still going well in their domain, but as for the town of Haarlem she is unhappy that it is still besieged/surrounded and she hopes that the enemy will gain no ground - as for her she will continue to pray that god deliver Haarlem from the enemies and that a good resolution will result. She tells him that she received a letter from her aunt Madame de Schwartzbourgh, who asked her to pass on her humble commendations to him and wished him much happiness ('heur et felicite') and wishes to hear from him. She also notes how her grandmother was so happy to receive news from him, and she hopes that this will continue to be a possibility because god knows they yearn to hear from him. She closes with a politeness formula of not wishing to cause nuisance ('donner facherie'), wishing him a long, happy and healthy life with accomplishment of all his wishes. From Dillenburg on 18 June 1573. She adds that Madame de Nassau la jeune asked her to pass on her humble commendations too. From your most humble and most obedient daughter until death. Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: 1 side plus seal, page filled to every edge no margins, signature to bottom right with little closing statement to bottom left.

_____

Letter: 1573/08/18 (#5516).

Short summary: Marie acknowledges receipt of letter on 17th. She was pleased to hear things are going well in their domain. She lets him know that her grandmother and everyone are all in good health. She admits to his remark that she did not write to him for six weeks but explains this is because she had no letter bearer available. She will ask her uncles to write as often as possible too. She notes how her letters sent by bearers Bartolomeaus Momber, Mons de Helinge and Jacop Joosten are unlikely to have arrived with Guillaume yet. She asks for Guillaume's advice as soon as possible regarding all three items of correspondence. She notes her grandmother and aunt's happiness at hearing his good health and passes on their wishes and offers of service.

Detailed summary: Marie informs Guillaume that on the 17th she received his letter for which she thanks him and says she is the happiest person in the world when she receives such news from him of his good health, especially since it has been a long time since she has received a letter from him, which displeases her because she fears the worst in such cases and so from now on she wishes to hear from him more often. She was pleased to hear outside of his letter that things are going reasonably well in their domain and that the towns are relatively free now and she thanks God and prays that things improve and end well. She says she wishes to have the joy of being near him but knows she must be patient. She begs to be remembered always as one of his obedient daughters. She informs him how her grandmother and everyone there are all in good health and she prays this may continue. She acknowledges his comment that she had not written to him for six weeks, but she says she often thought about it and really wanted to write but couldn't because she did not know of anyone who could bear letters that was headed his way but she never wishes to fail her duty and he should know that it was with good reason and not negligence because she always wants to send him letters if she can and she will try to write more frequently in the future. She also says how she will remind her uncles to write to him as often as they can like he asked her to tell them. She notes how she wrote to him by Bartolomeaus Momber a month ago and that she imagines he has not yet arrived at Guillaume's location but she hopes that he soon will because she strongly desires to hear news of the money he wrote to her via him that she should receive from Coligny because it seems to her that he has no intention of giving her anything and she does not know how she should act in such a case so she wants his advice. She also notes how she wrote to him via Mons de Helinge and that she hopes this letter arrives soon. She also thinks that Jacop Joosten, brother of the bursar will soon be with him and will tell him how things are going with the doctor because she no longer knows what to do in this case and wants his advice. She desires a response to her letters but acknowledges he has many other urgent matters that limits the time he has to write to her. She uses a prayer formula. She notes how her grandmother and aunt de Nassau are happy to hear of his good health and pass on their wishes, and everyone there passes on their wishes too with offer of service. Closing formula of 'facherie' and prayer. Written Dillenburg 18 august 1573. From your most humble and most obedient daughter til death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: Two sides including seal on second page, minimal left margin no top margin, signature at bottom right of prose with a little space but not all the way at the bottom because the seal is on the bottom half!

_____

Letter: 1573/09/23 (#5517)

Short summary: Marie notes how she has found an opportunity to write to Guillaume. She informs him of her grandmother's and everyone's health. She passes on the commendation into service of the son of the Mayor of Linburg. She notes how her August letter accompanies this one as proof she wants to write regularly but that there is a lack of letter bearers available. She informs him that she still hasn't received the money but hopes to after the Fair in Frankfurt. She has also not heard from the doctor and wants Guillaume's advice on what to do next. She hopes Mons de Helinge will soon arrive with her letter. She passes on wishes from her aunts Madame de Schwartzbourg and Juliana. Her uncles and Madame de Nassau are at the Fair in Frankfurt.

Detailed summary: Marie states that she has found an opportunity to write and wishes to be remembered. She writes how her grandmother and everyone there is in good health and she hopes to hear the same from Guillaume. She hopes to hear from him soon because it causes her anguish so she wishes him good fortune. She tells him that the Mayor of Linburg has asked her to write to him on behalf of his son because he wishes to render Guillaume service in whatever way seems appropriate. She says how the father beseeched her to write and she didn't know how to refuse but she assures him that he is truly moved to serve him. She also notes how she sends him another letter that she wrote in August [presumably the previous letter in this set] so he can see that she does want to write to him regularly, but she is displeased that she is unable to do so because there is hardly ever anyone available going in his direction to bear her letters. She sends these letters with this letter bearer hoping that it reaches the right address and he will hear by this bearer any news of the money that she is still owed since she has already written to him to say that she has heard nothing of the merchants who should deliver the 3000 flurins. She says how they have written to her since to say it will be immediately after the Fair in Frankfurt and she wants to know if this is actually happening or not. As soon as she has received the money though she will do her duty and let Guillaume know. As for the doctor she has still heard no news if she should give something or not so she doesn't know what to do and would like Guillaume to give his advice as soon as possible. She prays that she might hear his news soon because her grandmother and everyone there want it and if he sent her news it would make her happy and more obedient to him. She hopes that Mons de Helinge will arrive soon with him and he will hear all the news. Also her aunts Madame de Schwartzbourg and Juliana wrote to her to pass on their wishes to him. She informs him that her uncles and Madame de Nassau are not currently there because they are at the Fair in Frankfurt as the bearer of this letter will tell him. Closing formula of not wishing to cause 'facherie' with a long letter. Written Dillenburg 23 September 1573. Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: 2 sides including seal, no margins, signature in bottom right but apparently she realised the seal needed to be there too so it is below the seam, which is written upside down.

_____

Letter: 1573/10/15 (#5518)

Short summary: Marie explains the letter bearer will pass on news and some letters. She informs Guillaume that since her last letter she has received 2500 allers from the collector and that Jan de Villemont has furnished 3281 1/4 hallers. She asks Guillaume for a letter in his own hand. She passes on news and wishes of the grandmother and aunt de Nassau. Madame de Nassau is now heavily pregnant. The letter bearer will pass on other news. She still hasn't received anything from the doctor and other merchants so now requests Guillaume's advice.

Detailed summary: Marie explains that the letter bearer has been so delayed that she just told him news to pass on to Guillaume and she gave him some letters to pass on that are quite old now but written as and when she had the chance, and this letter is only to let him know that since the letter she wrote on the 2nd of this month she has received the 2500 allers that the bursar wrote to her about and with that also Jan de Villemont furnished the sum of 3281 1/4 hallers following the bill of exchange that the collector/bursar sent and Guillaume will hear all of this from him because she doesn't want to inconvenience him with a long letter since she knows he has other matters to attend to. However she does wish to have a letter from him in his own hand as it has been a while since he has done so. Her grandmother and aunt de Nassau asked her to pass on their wishes. They are also well. Madame de Nassau is now heavily pregnant and she prays that God give her all she needs. The letter bearer will pass on all other news. God health formula. Written in Dillenburg 15 October 1573 in haste. She says that as for the doctor and other merchants who should deliver her money as promised she has still heard nothing since her previous letters and wants to know what she should do now, but in any case she will let Guillaume know as soon as she hears anything. Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: 1 side, page filled with minimal borders.

———

Letter: 1573/11/25 (#5519)

Short summary: Marie lets Guillaume know she received his letter on the 18th of this month, and she was happy to receive this. She lets him know her grandmother and everyone is in good health. Marie is sad that Guillaume has lost one of his faithful servants but tells him he must be patient and trust in God. She wishes to be closer but knows this isn't possible so she prays for God's protection. She lets him know she received his letters dated 1 October and 16 October and has sent replies. Her grandmother and aunt de Nassau pass on their wishes, as do Mademoiselle van Royen la Derenbege and company. She adds that she wants a quick response from him.

Detailed summary: Marie tells Guillaume she received on the 18th his last letter and thanks him for this. She was glad to hear that he is in good health and can think of no news that would make her happier than to hear this. She prays that this may continue and that God grants him everything he needs. As for her grandmother and everyone there they are all in good health, God willing this will last. Marie tells Guillaume her heart aches because she has

heard that he lost one of his most faithful servants and he has lost a lot and had bad luck in receiving help, but since it is the will of God then he must be patient and hopefully He will provide a new servant, we must have confidence in Him and she prays for this. She changes the subject and lets Guillaume know that she heard in his letter he had good intentions to help her in any way he could, for which she thanks God for all the good that Guillaume gives her and she thanks him too, pledging obedience. She wishes to be close to him to render service and consolation but since she can't she prays for Guillaume's protection so that his affairs can end well and peacefully. She knows that there are many afflicted so they must humble themselves and repent of their sins. She lets him know that she has received his letters dated 1 October and 16 October and already sent replies to these which he hasn't mentioned receiving so she hopes he will receive them soon. Her grandmother and aunt de Nassau charged her with passing on their wishes and wanted to write to him but knowing that he has other affairs to deal with they didn't want to disturb him but wish him well. She also passes on wishes from Mademoiselle van Royen la Derenbege and company there. She continually prays for his health and wants to avoid nuisance by making this a long letter so she ends it there, with god formula, written Dillenburg 25 November 1573. She adds that she wishes to have a quick response from him for she is restless without news from him, but she apologises if she asks too much it's just that she really desires this. Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: 2 sides plus seal, left and top margins, closing section separate and central, signature bottom right.

———

Letter: 1573/12/05 (#5520)

Short summary: Marie remarks on her duty to write to Guillaume on this occasion. She received his letters dated 13 November and 22 November. She is happy to hear he is in good health. She lets him know her grandmother and everyone are healthy. She is pleased to hear that Monsieur de Sainte Aldegonde is alive and hopes that he will be delivered from the hands of the enemy. She is saddened that Guillaume still has little support but prays it will come. She also prays that their country be liberated. She talks about how Guillaume's enemies are writing courteously and that could be a good sign. She says she hopes the ships that have set sail from Anvers have a successful mission. She asks him to send news because she doesn't trust what she hears from other people. She lets him know her uncles are away near Heidelberg. They took messenger Peter with them who also has some letters from Marie. She also kept messenger Jacop back so that he can be sent to Guillaume when they hear from the uncles. She passes on wishes from her grandmother and aunt de Nassau.

Detailed summary: Marie states how she didn't want to fail her duty so she has written to Guillaume. She received on the 3rd of this month two letters from him dated 13 November and 22 November, for which she is thankful because she is always happy to hear from him. She was happy to hear he is still in good health. Her grandmother and everyone there are all in good health. She was pleased to hear from his letters that Monsieur de Sainte Aldegonde is still alive and that he is hopeful God will grant him release from prison. Everyone there had assumed him dead and been saddened by this and the assistance that they would need to

provide for his wife and children who would have lost so much, but since he is still alive she hopes that God will lead him from the hands of his enemies and be able to render service once more. She notes how they provided him with much support and so she is saddened that he has no assistance but it is the will of God and they must be patient and once day assistance will come. She will keep praying that one day their poor country may be freed and things will end well. She responds to Guillaume telling her he is surrounded by enemies but that they have started writing courteously by saying that as long as it isn't dissimulation then there is hope that things will end well and peacefully and they are also probably tired of this miserable situation. As for the boats which left Anvers she hopes that God grants them grace and victory. She asks for him to send news if he is able as they always want to know how things are going, since they do not believe what the common people say as there are lots of (false) rumours/lies everywhere. She informs him that neither of her uncles have been there for 10 to 12 days since they are on their way to Heidelberg or thereabouts to stay there and she sends them his letters. They took Peter the messenger with them so that he might tell you where they are and also what they will do from there. Marie has nothing else to add for herself, since she also wrote some letters which Peter will pass on hopefully soon. They have also held back Jacop the messenger until her uncle's return and she hopes that this will be soon so that she can tell him everything through him. Her grandmother and aunt de Nassau asked her to pass on their commendations and good wishes. Fearing causing nuisance ('facherie') with longer letter she ends it here, wishing him health etc. always your humble and obedient daughter commended into your good grace at Dillenburg 5 December 1573. Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death. [No signature]

Physical features: two sides plus seal, left and top margins, closing right no signature.

_____

Letter: 1573/12/25 (#5521)

Short summary: Marie explains she is writing because a messenger was headed his way. She informs him that her aunt de Nassau gave birth to a son [Ernst Casimir] on 22 December and is doing well. She passes on news of her grandmother's and everyone's good health. She informs him that she has received the 3000 florins from Jacop Wils as expected but that 600 was taken from this sum to give to Alendorff. She asks him to write and send aid to Madame de Horne because she has been hassling Marie, having tried writing to Guillaume and getting no response. She explains she has nothing else to write about given how recently she wrote on 25 November and 5 December. She notes that the messenger will not yet have reached her uncles as she had hoped in the previous letter. She passes on wishes from her grandmother and aunt.

Detailed summary: Marie explains that she is writing to Guillaume because a messenger is headed his way. She informs him that her aunt de Nassau gave birth to a son [Ernst Casimir] on the 22nd of the month. She prays that God give him virtues. The mother is doing well considering her condition, and the date of the baptism is not yet decided nor the godparents. She informs him that her grandmother and everyone are all well and god willing shall remain so for a long time, and she hopes to hear the same from him soon as nothing makes her happier than to receive news from him of his good health [formulaic]. She prays that God allows his affairs to finish well and peacefully. To change subject she informs him that she

received in the past 4 or 5 days the 3000 florins from Jacop Wils like he had written about to her many times by the collector/bursar who should deliver as sees fit so he took 600 florins from that sum which he will give to Alendorff as the bursar instructed him to do as the aforementioned Jacop told her to lend(?) by the bursar all because she told him everything. She is obliged to do another thing regarding Madame de Horne which she cannot do freely/easily/voluntarily because she knows that he has many other pressing issues but since she insisted so much that she was obliged to write to him that she beseeched her to write to him that she begs him to send her a little money to help her in Holland - she wrote to her because she had written to him many times but got no response and she complained a lot because she is in great need, and Marie believes this to be the case but doesn't have the means to be able to help her, so she asks Guillaume if there is any way he can help with anything for her like she said and to help her and to write her a small word of response so that she can see Marie did her duty of writing to Guillaume otherwise she won't hear the last of it from her because she is so insistent that she write to him that she hopes he can help her. She doesn't know what else merits writing about since she already wrote him a letter on 25 November and another on 5 December which she hopes he has already received except the messenger for the 25th was delayed so much that he probably hasn't arrived with her uncles like she suggested in her letter from the 5th, and also this messenger will tell him. She passes on wishes from her grandmother and aunt, praying to god for his health, kissing his hands, written Dillenburg in haste 25 December 1573. Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: two pages plus seal, left and top margins, signature bottom right.

———

Letter: 1574/02/21 (#5522)

Short summary: Marie informs Guillaume that she received his letter on the 20 February. She was glad to hear of his victory. She prays for continued good fortune. She notes how her uncles aren't with her at the moment. She complains it is too dangerous for her to say any more. She notes how messenger Jacop was sent a few days prior with her letters. She passes on wishes from her aunt de Nassau.

Detailed summary: Marie informs Guillaume that she received his letter on the 20th of the month. She was glad to receive it and hear outside of his letter that he is still in good health and that God has seen fit to give him victory over their enemies. She knows nothing better than to hear news of his prosperity and so God must be praised, and Marie will continue to pray that things keep improving and that Guillaume might be guided by His Spirit and that a good and peaceful end will come and that God will not abandon them but continue to support them, provided that they maintain faith in and pray to Him. She informs him that neither of her uncles are there but she thinks that they will inform him themselves of where they are and she prays that this will end well. She says how she wants to say much more than that but there is danger in writing it down so she dare not, but she begs that even though they are not there he should not forget to write to her too because she is always happy to receive them and does not know how to relax without them, so she beseeches him to do this for her and to forgive her if she is too insistent but her desire forces her to ask. She notes how she wrote by Jacop the messenger a few days back and hopes he received the

letters. She passes on wishes from her aunt de Nassau and the fact she was happy to hear of his victory. She ends the letter not wishing it to be too long, praying to god for his health and commending her into his service. Dillenburg 21 February 1574.

Physical features: two sides plus seal, left and top margins, signature bottom right. second page looks different but could just be the scan quality.

_____

Letter: 1574/03/16 (#5523)

Short summary: Marie tells Guillaume she was requested to write in Jean de Villemont's favour so that Guillaume might help him. She assures him that he seems worthy of assistance. She notes how happy she was to hear that he secured Middelberg and Armuen and hopes that the war will end. She tells him of his grandmother's and everyone's good health. She notes that she wrote to him twice in early February and again on the 22nd and hopes that he has received them and will soon reply. She passes on wishes from her grandmother and aunt.

Detailed summary: Marie tells Guillaume she was requested by Jean de Villemont, townsperson of Middelberg, to write in his favour for some house and goods he says to have in Middelberg, as Guillaume will hear by his report or request that he will send to him, but she did not want to leave this opportunity to ask him if he might take him as 'commended' and to help him with what he asks if possible because she found him to be a good and impassioned man to render him service and on this occasion she was obliged to write to him. However, she knows she is too insistent for now due to his current affairs but he begged her so much and lamented the loss he had suffered so much that she didn't know how to refuse and also he has such devotion to Guillaume that he will never desert him and will help him and she thinks that this would be possible. She hopes that her request does not tire Guillaume and changes the subject to say she was so happy to hear that God let him secure the town of Middelberg and Armuen for which she praises God and hopes that He will aid them more and that it will end peacefully and end the misery and calamity of war. She informs him that her grandmother and everyone are all in good health hoping to hear the same from him because it has been a long time since she has had this honour. She says that she wrote to him twice at the start of February and again on the 22nd and hopes he has received them, and she anguishes about this because then she will be able to hear about his health which is news she strongly desires and she hopes he finds the means to share his news with her. She passes on wishes from her grandmother and aunt. She closes the letter wishing him good health and having her commendation. Dillenburg 16 March 1574. Your most humble and obedient daughter until death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: one page plus seal, left and top margins, signature bottom right.

_____

Letter: 1574/05/15 (#5524)

Short summary: Marie informs Guillaume that she is writing due to an available messenger. She is happy to hear from the messenger that he is well. She lets him know her grandmother and aunt are well considering but fatigued by some misfortune that has come their way, which Guillaume will hear more about [probably by the messenger] because she doesn't want to write a long letter and she doesn't know the full details. She notes they must be patient now. She prays God keeps helping their cause and that she will be able to see Guillaume again one day. She advises that the letter bearer has not found uncle Jean de Nassau because he has gone away and they do not know when he will return. They held the messenger back by a few days in case he returned, and have sent him via Coligny to pick up any letters that Jean may have sent for Guillaume that way. She passes on wishes from her aunt. Her aunt Juliana de Nassau adds in greetings in her own hand too.

Detailed summary: Marie informs Guillaume that she is writing because there is a messenger headed for him and she doesn't wish to shirk her daughterly duty. She commends herself into his grace etc. She tells him she was happy to hear by this messenger that he is well and she hopes god lets this continue. She lets him know the her grandmother and aunt are well given the current situation/season but they are certainly tired of the (mis)fortune that has come their way and she guesses that Guillaume will be more amply informed of this [likely by the messenger] since she does not wish to write a long letter and she does not know for certain yet whether what she has heard is truthful, but she hopes that with God's help they will have good news soon. She says she never wished for things to turn out as they have but against the will of God and there is no remedy other than to be patient which she doesn't doubt Guillaume is doing anyway. She prays that God continue to protect/keep them as He has done so far for he has not deserted them of friends or assistance but helped them in everything they have needed, so she will continue to pray to him that He regards in his eye with pity and misericord and that things might come to a good finish so that Guillaume might be delivered from his unending labour, which gives Marie much regret/negative-emotion when she thinks that he has no respite. She wishes to be able to see and be near to him again so that she might render him service and she hopes that God will one day give her this opportunity. She advises him that the bearer of this letter had not yet found her uncle Jean because he has been away for the past few days but they have sent Guillaume's letter on to him immediately and held the messenger back 3 or 4 days thinking that her uncle might return or send a response, which he hasn't yet done, so they let the messenger return to Guillaume because they do not know when her uncle might return but she hopes it is soon. She thinks that her uncle may also have sent some letters to Coligny with responses to Guillaume and so she hopes that the messenger will be able to find them and bring them to him too. Her aunt asked her to pass on her wishes. She doesn't want to make the letter too long so she ends it there wishing him well and kissing his hands. Dillenburg 15 May 1574. Julienne de Nassau adds in her own hand that she saw her niece writing and she wanted to present her own wishes, your humble servant Juliana de Nassau. // Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: two sides plus seal, top and left margins, bottom right signature, different hand for message from Juliana his sister.

_____

Letter: 1574/06/01 (#5525)

Short summary: Marie commends Jean Vadelfe into Guillaume's service. She explains how he has been loyal to her uncle Jean and demonstrated many virtues in that time. She ends the letter because she does not know when the bearer must leave as he has other affairs to attend to in Frankfurt on the way. She passes on wishes from her grandmother and aunt.

Detailed summary: Marie advises Guillaume that she was requested by Jean Vadelfe canon [the canon of Delft?] and bearer of this letter to write to you in his favour since he has been here in the service of her uncle for the past year or more, but since her uncle has now separated from some of his people there are a number of them leaving and he has the intention of coming to find Guillaume to render him service if possible. He asked her to write this letter and she did so willingly because he is a valiant man and he has demonstrated many other virtues in his time here. She begs him to take him as 'commended' because she hopes he will find him faithful with anything he entrusts to him and he is passionate about rendering him service. She ends the letter now because she is not sure when the bearer needs to leave for Guillaume because he mentioned needing to address matters in Frankfurt. She passes on wishes from her grandmother and aunt, and her own. Dillenburg 1 June 1574. Your most humble and most obedient servant until death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: one side plus seal, left and top margins, signature bottom right.

_____

Letter: 1574/06/22 (#5526)

Detailed summary: Marie informs Guillaume that she received his letter on the 16th of the month. She was pleased to hear of his health and victory over the enemy. She says how she will continue praying for things to improve and that God will never desert them as long as they are faithful to Him. She says she was unhappy to hear that he still doesn't know how things are with their good friends. She wants to tell him more but cannot because she is not sure what she has heard is true. It is strange because it has been a long time and they still know nothing and her grandmother and everyone desire to know this as they should. Despite this they must be patient and put everything in God's hands and act accordingly. She informs him that Steynhuys who is there with her has asked for leave because his father has died and his stepmother has written to him many times so that they might be together and put things in order. It seemed to Marie that his mother wouldn't have these means for much longer and she has nobody there to help not even her relatives, Marie was saddened to hear this and granted him leave because she feared that his mother might lose her means and she couldn't willingly let this happen, and she hopes Guillaume is not upset [by her taking this decision]. She informs him that she received the deniers that Gillebert wrote to her about recently which she won't talk mush more about because he has other affairs and also she wrote amply to Gillebert anyway who will report back to Guillaume, even though Marie wishes to see Guillaume so that she can render him service and because she has lots to tell him which she cannot write since she cannot do this she must be patient. She prays

that this long absence doesn't mean he forgets about her but that he can share his news with her because she is always yearning for news from him. She prays he keeps her in his service as his humble and obedient daughter always. She tells him she received a letter that he wrote to Madame de Schwartzbourg her aunt which she will send on as soon as she can because she left 5 or 6 days ago towards Arnstadt, and if Count Guntert isn't there she will come back soon but she will be glad to hear Guillaume's news. Her aunt de Nassau passes on her humble commendations and wishes. Marie doesn't want to bore him with a longer letter so ends there etc. Dillenburg 22 June 1574. Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death. Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: three sides plus seal, left and top margins, signature bottom right.

Comments: one of the first letters where she takes a decision on her own due to need for urgency and tells guillaume what she's done after the fact rather than seeking his advice first

———

Letter: 1576/03/02 (#5527)

Detailed summary: Marie informs Guillaume that she received on the 1 March the letter he sent on 2 February which was most welcome. She was pleased to hear that he and Madame [possibly his new wife, Marie's new stepmother Charlotte] are in good health for which she is thankful and praises God and prays He keep them that way. She explains she was saddened by the other news he told her that he is experiencing more attacks daily from the enemy but which haven't succeeded yet. She hasn't told Madame [likely her grandmother or aunt] yet due to her condition, but if it will give her relief to tell her then she will and Madame supports it all with patience and grace of god. She prays that God strengthen Madame and keep her in this patience and she hopes that things will continue to improve for both Monsr and Madame. She informs him that her grandmother and Madame de Nassau and everyone are in Rudolstadt having led her aunt to the house and everything went well, they only wish he was there and they could see him but she must be patient until God decides this can happen and she will be joyful in his presence. She has nothing else to say about the wellbeing of her grandmother and everyone except that they're in good health praise be to God that He protected her during the journey here for it was a long and tortuous ride for such an old lady and besides she has hardly had respite for 3 or 4 weeks since we left Dillenburg for Hanne [Hanau?] and have been for 8 days [in early February] at Hanne for the marriage of her cousin de Hanne where there has been good company of the Count [Philip Ludwig I, Count of Hanau-Munzenberg] and Countess [Magdalena of Waldeck] and little rest, otherwise it was good and then they left for Arnstadt where they also stayed for 8 days and then to here where they have only just arrived but she thinks that they will soon leave for Dillenburg. She prays that their journey back will be without misfortune. She notes how she is becoming aggravated by the company of her aunt Juliana but that there is nothing she can do about it so she must just try and be happy. She was pleased that he received the copies of the letters that she sent him and that everything was to his pleasing because she only wants to be obedient to him. As for the money that he wrote to say he was sending for dressing her sister she will do her best to send it to the place where Gilbert assigned her so that she can collect it for the Fair in Frankfurt so that she can go there and buy everything she needs to dress her. She will do her duty by going to the best market as possible, and if

there is still a good sum that he also wrote to her about because at the moment everything is expensive. She also received in the past 4 or 5 weeks the 1200 florins that he had written about many times. She was also pleased to hear by his letter that he had been able to make her chain(?) which she likes better than money and she doesn't know how to thank him for the continual aid he brings her. She hopes to always be his obedient daughter. She also heard from his letter that he had sieged 3 fortresses and also recovered the town of Zierikzee which she was pleased to hear and prays that it ends well which she has no doubt will happen if they pray with good heart. She passes on commendations from Count Albert of Schwartzburg and his wife with their excuses that they cannot write this time because of the company with them they don't have the free time but will write at their earliest convenience. The same from the Count Courat [Conrad?] of Solms and his wife, the Count Wolf of Heisenberg and the Count Henry of Essenburg, the Count Herman de Widt and the Countess Elisabeth of Schwartzburg and the Countess Orsel of Solms and finally all the good company passes on their wishes to him. She apologises for writing with such poor grace because she has so little time due to being with company but she will make it up in the future. Typical ending of good wishes and remaining in his memory. Ronderstat 2 March in great haste 1576. Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: four sides, left margin and minimal top margin, signature crammed in bottom right.

—————

Letter: 1576/05/01 (#5528)

Detailed summary: Marie informs Guillaume that she received on 18 April his letter dated 5 April which was most welcome. She was pleased to hear of his good health and praises God for it. Her grandmother and everyone are still well too and she prays this will last. She says she never knows how to write of the joy that she gets to hear that Madame [Charlotte de Bourbon] was delivered of a girl [Louise-Julienne] and that they both are well, praise be to god, since he had written to her whilst she was pregnant to say there were many assaults by the enemy which must have caused Madame much fear and worry but since things have turned out ok they should be grateful. Also now that Monsieur has three strongholds(?) she hopes that the enemy won't bother them any more. As for Zierikzee she hopes that their Lord will replenish which she will pray for along with a good way out of these affairs so that a good peace can come of it and so that she might be able to be in his presence. She informs him that she received the 1800 florins that he wrote to her about and bought some silk fabric to dress her sister Anne following his commandment. She took some violet velvet and wadded black velvet(?) and damask and satin and white 'toubinne' [possibly a fabric like cashmere?] and still more fabrics for daily wear that she has to start with 5 or 6 robes and also more little 'menules' [odds and ends?] like some 'pasement' [trimming?] of gold and silver for edging the robes and other necessary things both for her sister and for Maurice and for her sister Emily and for herself. Everything altogether was very expensive that she spent around 4 or 500 hallers as she wanted to get everything when she could but she is unhappy because she still needs to get some more. She hopes that she doesn't have to spend so much again. If it pleases Monsr she will make chains(?) [possibly decoration to edge the fabric] because that would be suitable and if he wants to let her buy at another fair a little

more fabric for dresses or bonnets or other things that seem to him to be necessary it seems to her that would be best and provided with everything she needs then it won't feel like such a large sum at once, and besides Monsr commanded her to do all this and she is always ready to obey. Her sister is becoming big for her age, so much so that she is almost as tall as Marie and will soon pass her by much if she continues growing at this rate, and she hopes that she will also become as obedient a daughter to Guillaume as she is. Her brother Maurice is well and is currently in Heidelberg and has started learning well. If Monsr thinks they should give some gift to the Mester d'Hotel and the Mesters d'Ecole and also to Stilla. She asks him what action to take, but she will in any case send the master of the household some money, probably 20 hallers or more, to cover the cost of little things Maurice might need. She informs him that Countess Elisabeth of Schwartzburg has married Count Jean of Aldenburg and the marriage celebration will be after Pentecost when the Count Herman de Widt will marry Countess Wallper de Benteng, though the day hasn't been set yet but she imagines it won't be long to wait. She prays god send them all happiness. That's all the news she has for him and since she knows of nothing else she ends the letter, praying god keep him and commending herself to him. Her sister apologises for not writing to him this time but she will at the next opportunity, where she will show him she has learned to write German. Dillenburg 1 May 1576. Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: four sides of same folded folio, Left and top margins observed, signature very bottom right corner.

———

Letter: 1576/10/15 (#5529)

Detailed summary: Marie informs Guillaume that she received on 12 October his letter which pleased her greatly to hear of his news and good health and that of madame [likely Charlotte de Bourbon] and she can't think of anything better to hear and she hopes it will continue. She doesn't know what to tell him about her uncle and madame [probably her aunt] other than they are in good health. They are there with Count Albert on the hunt(?) where they took perhaps some deer(?). She hopes that she can wish monsieur to have some recreation time soon because she knows he has hardly any, but much debate and headaches, which bothers her greatly when she thinks about it, but she hopes that he will soon be delivered of it. She was glad to hear from his letter that things are going well in Brabant she hopes they will continue better and peacefully so that she might see her father and madame [Bourbon?] again. As for the master of the household and others who are looking after her brother Maurice who Guillaume tells her to recompense as she sees fit, but she doesn't know how she can do this because she worries she might give them too much or too little, she wants him to tell her how much to give, but since she can't do that she will ask her uncle how much and she will do what he says and won't give too much money, because she is sure the master of the household is looking after Maurice well and she hopes that this continues. As for that he asked about her sister's accoutrements and 'chains' it seems that Guillaume is content so she will make her some because she [sister] needs them but Marie will need 300 or 400 florins for this which she wants to warn Guillaume about because she has been spending so much lately which displeases her, but hopefully they will only need one more large sum. As for her grandmother she hasn't written much because around 7 or 8 weeks

ago they left from Widt [presumably after the marriage] and then they were here for some time with Constain near to monsieur her brother but she thinks that now she will be returning to Dillenburg and will let him know how she is. She thinks that her uncle and madame [her aunt] will also soon leave here in 3 or 4 days for the house but she doesn't know if they will find her grandmother or not because she intends to part from Brif towards the land of Duringe near to Madame her aunt juliana countess of schwartzburg who is pregnant and will likely give birth in 5 or 6 weeks. She prays for a good delivery. Madame de Nassau [probably 'la jeune' the younger] and Count Albert and her aunt/his wife pass on their wishes. She asks for forgiveness if she wrote with poor grace but she had to rush but they need to go to the Schage of Sengely which she hasn't been able to rewrite yet but she will have to do it another time. She commends herself and wishes him well. Otweiller in Westerick 15 October 1576 in great haste. Her sister Anne also asked to pass on her commendations and wishes, she wanted to write to him but it wasn't possible because she had a headache and she will write another time. Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: 3 sides plus seal, left and top margins, end of line flourishes, close wraps around signature which is in bottom right

Comments: appears to be a mistake at the start of line 3 where she added in je vous asseure to cover it up? or an example of an unusual construction that was possible.

—————

Letter: 1577/01/26 (#5530)

Detailed summary: Marie tells Guillaume she has little to write because it has been so little time since she wrote 3 times to him already but since Monseiur de Taffin is available she wanted to write as is her duty. She informs him that her uncle and madame [aunt] are all there in good health hoping to hear the same of him, because she always like to hear of his good health. Her grandmother has not yet returned but they are waiting for her every day and hope that she will arrive in the next 4 or 5 days as they will be very happy to have her there again. She is unhappy that he has sent her so few letters with Mr Taffin, he said greetings on his behalf but since she is not at Dillenburg she didn't know what to do as she didn't want to inconvenience anyone. However for 15 days there have been no deaths and they hope this continues and that the misfortune will cease. She won't fail to pass on the letter that Taffin gave her but she hopes that he will send it as soon as possible. She is upset that she cannot go to Dillenburg so that Taffin might help her but that can't happen. As for her brother Maurice, Taffin will inform him of everything and other things she has entrusted to him to pass on so she won't make this any longer, praying to god and wishing him well and kissing his hands. Siegen 26 January 1577. [Left margin:] Her aunt de Nassau asked to pass on her commendations, she is heavily pregnant and will likely give birth at the end of May praying for a good delivery. Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death Marie de Nassau.

Physical features: one side plus seal, top and left margins but left filled with end salutation and signature (rotated anticlockwise 90 degrees).

_____

Letter: 1577/03/19 (#5531)

Short summary: Marie lets Guillaume know she is writing because the bearer is available and heading his way. She lets him know her grandmother and everyone are well. She is surprised that he has not sent a single reply to her previous letters as she still doesn't know what action to take. She wrote to him because she wanted to obey his commandment but she cannot do this. She acknowledges he has other matters to attend to but insists she still wants a reply. She suggests that if he wants she will come visit him before madame [possibly Charlotte de Bourbon, possibly her aunt] gives birth, and to tell her what to give to her grandmother, aunt, uncle, demoiselles and officers of the household because if she needs to leave where she is she wants to make sure things are settled first, and if he is going to return soon then there is no need for her to do this, but she insists that either way her let her know his intention. As for the Mester d'Hotel and the Jeunes Seigneurs she gave them on his behalf 200 Philippus Allers of silver/money that Jacques Charles brought her because her uncle and madame [aunt] said that would be enough and she delivered it herself. She wanted to give them other things but the bearer thought it was without merit so she didn't [she then adds something about listening to someone's advice and serving them and hoping they would too(?)]. She thinks that her uncle also wants Guillaume's advice. Since she only gave the Mester d'Hotel 200 allers she has kept back 100 in case she needs to give it to the mesters d'ecole or others who are responsible for Maurice. Madame her grandmother and Madame de Nassau and Madame her aunt of Weilbourg are there at the moment and pass on their wishes. She hopes that she doesn't tire him because what she says is meant with affection. She closes the letter. [Siegen 19 March 1577]

Physical features: 3 sides plus seal, left and top margins, signature bottom right but not the very corner.

_____

Letter: 1577/04/04 (#5532)

Short summary: Marie notes how she wrote 14 or 15 days prior but the messenger was delayed and this bearer is headed his way so she wanted to write again. She still desires to know what action he wants her to take even if it's just by letting the bearer know and not writing a letter. She was pleased to hear from Madame's [Charlotte de Bourbon's?] letter of 23 February that they are both well. The provision that he sent to her via her uncle arrived in the past few days but it wasn't as much as madame had said it would be in her letter. She doesn't want to write too long a letter so passes on news of her grandmother and aunt's health. Madame becomes heavy with child and she prays for a good delivery. The letter bearer will pass on other news. She ends the letter apologising for her haste. [Siegen 4 April 1577]

Physical features: 2 sides plus seal, left and top margins and slim bottom margin too, signature bottom right but not very corner.

_____

Letter: 1577/05/06 (#5533)

Short summary: Marie informs Guillaume she received his letter on 5 March. She thanks him and notes how happy she was to hear of the birth of her sister but saddened that they are unwell since then. She notes how she wants to see them again but will settle for seeing Bruninck or others he sends to her. She says she will return to Dillenburg but must stay because madame will give birth in 4 to 5 weeks and she wants to see how things go. She has asked her uncle and aunt for their advice but her grandmother isn't there so hopefully he hears from her. [... she talks about how he can send things if he wants to via Bruninck or anyone…]. She notes if the young lords ('jeunes seigneurs') must soon part from Heidelberg to Geneva then they want to take Maurice too and this will probably happen after Pentecost - her uncle wants to bring back Maurice and Philippe and the Jeune de Vandenberg, so he might leave them at Heidelberg. She thinks they will leave for Dillenberg tomorrow so she will keep the letters she wants or needs to send on and take them with her. When she gets a chance she will copy the ones that madame wanted but there is only one 'copiste' [scribe?] here who writes French and who has little free time so it will take a while, but if he wants to send her someone appropriate to the task then she will keep them at Dillenburg for 8 or 9 days to make the copies and satisfy madame's request. She passes on commendations from Madame as well as thanks for the vin Jucker and other items he sent for the baptism. She describes that madame [likely her aunt] is so large now she will have to write another time. Madame de Mandersiheit is there with them and her grandmother and they pass on their wishes. She passes on her wishes as do Anne and Emily. She apologises for her haste. [Siegen 6 May 1577]

Physical features: 3 sides plus seal, left margin with smaller top margin, close to bottom left and signature to bottom right.

—————

Letter: 1577/05/25 (#5534)

Short summary: Marie notes it has been 19 or 20 days since she wrote via this bearer thinking he was ready to leave but he has been delayed until now. She informs him that on the 16th madame gave birth to a stillborn son so they are all worried because madame is now in danger, but thanks God that the mother is still holding on. Her grandmother is aggrieved too and she worries this won't do her any good because she is old and fragile and worrying for madame's health cannot do her any good. Her uncle arrived about 4 or 5 days ago and she asked his advice about her travel movements and he agreed with Guillaume. She intends to attach the letters of donation of Vianne to this letter. As for the letters that madame wants she wants to send them but doesn't know how she can begin to copy them because there are so many it would take her a month or two so it would be best if he sent her someone to do it. As for Maurice she says to refer to her letter from 6 May and also her uncle will update him. Madame her grandmother, and madame, and madame her aunt of Solms are there and pass on their wishes. She passes on her wishes, closing the letter. [Dillenburg 25 May 1577]

Physical features: 3 sides plus seal, left margin and smaller top margin, signature bottom right but slightly higher as page three only filled part way, usual end of line flourishes and on ys etc.

—————

Letter: 1577/05/26 (#5535)

Short summary: Marie notes how she was going to send the letters of donation of Vianne but her uncle didn't think this was a good idea as they might get lost so she is going to copy them and send the copies which her uncle will get the bursar to sign so that they have credence. If he needs the original he should let her know but her uncle also wants a copy so she hopes this is ok with him. She lets him know that the wine and other goods arrived and she gave them to her grandmother and madame and they were very happy. The grandmother wanted to write to thank in person but because of her age and current condition it is difficult for her to write so she apologises and will do it another time. Madame her aunt de Wit and [uncle herman maybe?] also arrived and pass on their wishes [26 May 1577]

Physical features: 2 sides, seemingly smaller paper and written in landscape rather than portrait, left margin wide but minimal top margin, no signature - presumably enclosed with letter #5534 which was dated the previous day.

—————

Letter: 1577/09/20 (#5536)

Short summary: Marie notes how she doesn't want to inconvenience Guillaume. She was requested by the poor people of Buyl in the land of Craninck [Kruiningen?] and Dendofen [Eindhoven?] to write in their favour. They want his assistance because there are some hundred horsemen of Lord Crunige surrounding them. She notes how he will hear more about this in the letter from madame [her aunt?] so she will keep it brief but wants to pass on her commendation for supporting these people. She desires to be near him again and to hear his news. She passes on her commendations as does Anne. [Saint Gertrudenberg 20 September 1577]

Physical features: two sides plus seal, left and top margins, bottom right signature.

Monsr mon bien ayme pere sete me seruirat sulement
pour vous auertir que jay rechu le 16 de ce moys vouster
letter quil vous a pleut mescripre et vous remercie bien
humblement de lonneur et faueur que me fettes de vous
souuenir tant continuelement de moy es suys este
fort rejouwy denstender que estes encore en bonne
sante et ousy de la bonne victoire quil a pleut a ce
bon dieu de vous donner conter vous ennemis de
coy auons bien matire a louer se bon dieu du bien
quil nous faict . quant a moy je ne faulderay jamais
a mon deuoir de continuer a luy prier quil vous
veulle donner la grace quil puisse venir touleiour de
mieulx en mieulx et que le tout puisse ester a sa
gloire et au salut de noster ame jespere que se bon dieu ne
nous delayserat poient mais quil nous ayderat en tout ce que arons
de besoing moyenant que nous nous fions en luy et le prions
de bon ceur car sans luy rien ne se peult faire . monsr mon
bien ayme pere je ne vous aroys ousy jamais escripre que
grant regret que se mat este denstender que ne saues
poient encore comment que set auecque nous bons amis
je touiour eu espoir que monsr en euse seu a parler mais
puis que sela nest jay crayns serte quil ne serat poient bon
car quant a nous nous ne sauons poient encore ousy a la
verite ce qui nen et car lon nen parle fort diuercement ce
bien enug etrange chosse quil y at sy longtamps et que
ne pouons sauoir comment que set set eungne pietuse
chosse et vous promais monsr que madame ma gran mere
et nous tertous en sommes fort enwie comme de rayson
mais soiet comme se soict puis que set ^^aynsin^^ la voulonte de dieu
il le fault prender en patience et remester le tout enter
se mayns car lon ne peut conter sa voulonte il se fault rigeler
//
selon sla monsr mon bien ayme pere pour changer
de propos se serat pour vous auertir que steynhuys qui
et aupres de moy me at demande son conge a locasion que
--il-- son pere et mort et que sa belle mere luy at escript
pluseurefois quelle ne leseroyt poient de venir affin qui porin
partir par encemble de leur bien et y mester quelque order
car il me semble que sa belle mere ne veult poient ^^auoir^^ plus
longtamps son ^^bien^^ enter se mains et comme elle nat eu personne
de mester en sa plase car comme il me semble se parens ne
font poient beaucop pour elle aynsin at telle desire dauoir son
conge decoy je suys este bien mary sy esse que jay luy ay donne
car jay nay lay point veule retenir a cause que je crayndons
que a mon ocasion elle euse peu auoir quelque domage ou perte
a son bien ce que je nusse poient voulontir eu et espere que

monsr nen serat poient mal content . je ne puis ousy laiser
de vous auertir que jay rechu se denirs dont gillebert mauoit
escript passe quelque tamps decoy ne vous fayray long discous
sachant bien que estes enpeche auecque aulter affaires et ousy
je escript le tout amplement au dit gillebert lequel vous
ferat bien le raport se qui nen et je voulderoys que je
poroys auoir se bien et set heur que dester aupres de vous
affin que vous poroys render quelque seruise et ousy vous
aroys bien beaucop a dire qui ne se laisse poient aynsin escripr[e]
or bien puis qui ne peult ester il men fault prender la
patience et atender le tamps jusques a ce quil plerat a ce
bon dieu quil auinse en se pendant je vous supplie bien
humblement que la longue absence ne soyt ocasion de me
mester en obly et quant monsr trouuerat le moyen de me
faire aucunefois part de vous nouelles se que met eung gran
contentement quant se bien me peult afenir car je suys
touiour langisant den auoir je vous prie ousy monsr que
//
me vouler touiour tenir pour vouster humble et obeysante
fille car jespere qu ne me t[r]ouueres jamais aulter. jay rechu
ousy eungne letter que aues escript a madame ma tante de
schwartzbourch laquelle je luy enuoyeray sy [t]o que pores [[tear in paper]]
trouuer la comodite elle set party dicy pase [5] ou 6 [[tear in paper]]
jour --de-- arire vers arnestat sy esse que le conte
guntert ne poient encore la mais je pence quil
reuinderat bien to je say quelle serat fort rejouwy
dauoir de vous nouelles . --et-- monsr mon bien ayme
pere madame ma tante de nassaw mat commande
vous faire se bien humble recommandacions en
vouster bonne grace en vous souheydant tout
heur et prosperite et at este fort rejouwy de la
bonne victore quil at pleut a ce bon dieu vous
donner . crayndant vous donner facherie auecque
plus longue letter chachant bien que estes inportun[e]
auecque beaucops des aulters affaires fayray la fin
priant se bon dieu vous donner monsr mon
bien ayme pere sante heureuse vie et longue
auecque accomplisement de touts vous bons desirs
et a moy se bien dauoir touiour vouster bonne
grace en laquelle treshumblement me recomma
nde se faict de dillenbourch se 22 de juwin 1.5.7.4

                         Vouster treshumble et tresobey
                         sante fille jusques a la mort
                         Marie de Nassaw

//
A Monsieur
Monsieur le prince Dorange

—-

*Transcriptions keep line and page formatting where possible, and aim to preserve the
original spelling as closely as possible. The following symbols are also used:*

[[transcriber comments]]
--deletion–
^^insertion^^
// new page/side

Appendix 4 - Marie and Guillaume's timelines

Marie's timeline:

1556 Feb 07. Born to William [Guillaume] and Anna of Egmond (Buren).
1558 Mar 24. Mother dies.
1565. William sends Marie to be lady-in-waiting to Regent Margaret, whilst her brother goes to University of Louvain, because his second wife Anna he did not trust to care for them (Wedgwood 1944: 66).
1566. Anna attempts to collect Marie from the Regent's household and bring her to Antwerp, but William sends her back (Wedgwood 1944: 86).
1567. Marie rejoins William from Regent's household (Wedgwood 1944: 93) at Breda.
1567 Apr 22. Marie, Anna, her daughter [also called Anna] and William leave Breda for Germany (Dillenburg probably), passing through Louvain to see Philip-William on the way (Wedgwood 1944: 95-6).
1567. (Probably around Apr 25). Arrival at Dillenburg. Juliana still rules the roost, school was attended by nobles, and children's voices heard throughout the courtyard. John (and presumably Elizabeth) there with their children, who welcomed the two little 'Mesdemoiselles d'Orange', who settled into school routine which was a change from Marie's life at the Regent's household in Brussels (Wedgwood 1944: 97) [This source also says she's 13 at this time when in fact she's 11 - probably confused with their first born child Marie, who died aged two the year before our Marie was born].

1576. Charlotte de Bourbon (William's third wife) gives birth to Louise-Julienne.
1577. Charlotte de Bourbon gives birth to Elisabeth.
1577 Sep. Marie, Anna and Maurice en route with uncle Jean to see William (Amelie stayed at Dillenburg), at Gertrudenberg. He hadn't seen the children in five years at this point, and soon had to leave them anyway (Wedgwood 1944: 175).
1577. Charlotte and Marie become special friends rather than mother and daughter (they only have ten years between them), so Charlotte's letters to William often mention of doings of 'Mademoiselle d'Orange et moi' (Wedgwood 1944: 175).
1577 Oct 23. Charlotte and the children travel to Antwerp via Middelburg and Breda to be reunited with William (Wedgwood 1944: 181).

1578. Charlotte and the children mostly at Breda (Wedgwood 1944: 191).

Guillaume's biography 1573-1577:

1572 Dec 10 - 1573 Jul 12. Siege on Haarlem endures (Harrison 1907: 137).

1573 Jul 09. Force relieving Haarlem(?) annihilated (Wedgwood 1944: 133).

1573 Jul 12. Haarlem falls to the Spanish (Wedgwood 1944: 133).

1573. William [Guillaume] tours the loyal cities of Holland to reassure his people (Wedgwood 1944: 134).

1573 Oct 12. Alkmaar saved from the Spanish; the tides begin to turn (Wedgwood 1944: 134-135).

1573 Oct. Sea Beggars outmanoeuvre the Spanish fleet off Enckhuysen (Wedgwood 1944: 135).

1573. Philip William is a prisoner of war by this stage, and sends William a letter with scant detail (Wedgwood 1944: 136).

1574 Feb 18. Middelburg capitulates to William (Wedgwood 1944: 137).

1574 Apr 14. Battle at Mook Heide; William's brother Louis presumed dead (Wedgwood 1944: 138; Harrison 1907: 152).

1574 May end. Leyden cut off by Spanish and soon to fall (Wedgwood 1944: 141).

1574 Jun 05. William wants to relieve Leyden, but he cannot suffer another defeat after Haarlem (Wedgwood 1944: 141).

1574 Aug. William very ill (Wedgwood 1944: 144).

1575 Jan 01. William sees in New Year at Middelburg (Wedgwood 1944: 151).

1575 Jun 12. Marriage to Charlotte de Bourbon (Wedgwood 1944: 155).

1575. Charlotte tries to piece together a home for her husband and adopted children (Wedgwood 1944: 156).

1575. William arranges Charlotte to stay in Dordrecht where he hopes to return to her over summer, but he is needed at Zierickzee on 17 Jun to inspect the fortifications, then goes to Rotterdam to the fleet, and so on (Wedgwood 1944: 157).

1575 - 1576. Siege of Zierickzee.

1576 Mar 05. Philip of Spain dies of Typhus, giving William/Holland chance to take back control (Wedgwood 1944: 160, 161).

1576. Charlotte gives birth to a daughter (Louise-Julienne?).

1576 Apr. Union of Delft/Act of Federation passed, granting the Prince of Orange interim powers over Holland and Zealand, whilst guaranteeing religious freedom as long as it was gospel-based (Wedgwood 1944: 161-162).

1576 summer. Charlotte likely making arrangements to unite the children with her and their father, since William was too busy with his own political affairs (Wedgwood 1944: 162).

1576 Nov 08. Spanish sack Antwerp (Wedgwood 1944: 166).

1576. Pacification of Ghent.

1577 Jan 09. Union of Brussels, confirming Pacification of Ghent (Wedgwood 1944: 168).

1577 Feb 17. Perpetual Edict, seen as an infringement of the Pacification of Ghent sparks protest letters throughout spring (Wedgwood 1944: 170).

1577 Apr. William installs a garrison at Gertrudenburg (Wedgwood 1944: 170).

1577 May 20. Six delegates from each side meet at Gertrudenburg to discuss the breach of Pacification of Ghent (Wedgwood 1944: 170, 171).

1577 May 30. Baptism of Elizabeth, Charlotte's second child born at Middelburg (Wedgwood 1944: 173).

1577 Jul. Don John seizes Namur (Wedgwood 1944: 174).

1577. His brother John en route from Dillenburg to visit him (Wedgwood 1944: 174-175).

1577 Aug. Toured cities of Holland and Zealand settling outstanding problems, including visiting Utrecht with Charlotte (Wedgwood 1944: 175).

1577 Sep mid. Greets his brother and children at Gertrudenburg, presents the children to their stepmother and two little sisters, then leaves them for the south (Wedgwood 1944: 175).

1577. William plans to reunite his family after Breda has been given back to him, suggesting they should return there (Wedgwood 1944: 176).

1577 Oct 23. William receives Charlotte and the children at Antwerp (Wedgwood 1944: 181).

1578. Charlotte and the kids are mostly at Breda, presumably with William (Wedgwood 1944: 191).

Appendix 5 - Sixteenth century letter-writing manuals

Title	Author where known	Date(s) of publication	Type	Original retrieval source:	Comments	Part of study	Reason
Le Grand Stille et prothocolle de la Chancellerie de France, nouvellement corrigé [...]		1508/1515		https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b86185053/f11.image	http://bp16.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb41875901g/	N	
Le Prothocolle Des Notaires [...] avec le guydon des secretaires [...]		1518		https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=iX9kAAAAcAAJ&hl=en_GB&pg=GBS.PT6		N	
Le grant et vray art de pleine rhetorique	Pierre Fabri	1521	Formulary	TUoS Library Hard Copy: WBL B 445(F)	A good early C16th guide. Mostly based on the art of rhetoric and elegant composition (for writing but also speech). It subdivides the letter into its various types and parts, and then gives some examples of particular situations and how these would be written in the number of parts specified by the model. It is perhaps both too specific and not specific enough - these subdivisions go into a great deal of detail, but all in all there are not many examples of the types of letter that are of use in this study (familiar letters). This perhaps indicates that familiar domestic letters were not so common in the early part of the sixteenth century, or at least that there was not a perceived need for commentary and direction on these types of letters at this time if they were indeed abundant	Y	Available, provides useful context
Le Prothocol des Secretaires et aultres gens desirancs scavoir l'arte et la maniere [...]		1534?		https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=vCxNAAAAcAAJ&hl=en_GB&pg=GBS.PP5		N	

Title	Author where known	Date(s) of publication	Type	Original retrieval source:	Comments	Part of study	Reason
Une nouvelle maniere de escrire par response	Quinerit de Mousne	1544				N	No readily accessible version found
La diversité des epistres familieres, et oratoires	Bathélemy Aneau	1552				N	No readily accessible version found
Le Stile et Maniere de composer, dicter et escrire toute sorte d'epistres ou lettres missives [...]	Durand/de la Moyne/Dolet	1553	Formulary with letters	https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b86120310/f5.image	This has clearly borrowed (almost word-for-word in some cases!) much of the information in the Pleine Rhetorique, but has expanded on it. There are plenty of instructions on how to write letters with different subsections that are important. Crucially this is followed by a selection of example letters which make it clear how the relationship is important, as that is what is highlighted in the title of each letter (e.g. 'Vn Gentilhomme à vn autre.' followed immediately by 'Response d'vn gentilhomme a l''autre.'). A few examples of letters written to women and some of their responses, but still largely male focus and not many domestic examples as such. Models also often refer to classical references which is absent largely in the letters I've seen. 1556 printing: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k71733j.image	Y	Available, published close to time of Marie's letters
L'instruction de bien et parfaictement escrire	Jean le Moyne	1556		https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=pOBmAAAAcAAJ&hl=en_GB&pg=GBS.PP1		N	
Formulaire de missives, obligations, quitances, lettres de change, d'asseurances	Gabriel Meurier	1558				N	No readily accessible version found

Title	Author where known	Date(s) of publication	Type	Original retrieval source:	Comments	Part of study	Reason
Le Tresor des Amadis [...]		1559	Letter collection	https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k54553x/f2.image		N	
La maniere de dicter et composer toutes sortes de lettres missives [...]	Etienne de Lugré	1563				N	No readily accessible version found
Stile et maniere de composer lettres missives avec plusieurs reigles et argumens [...]	Jean Bourlier	1566	Formulary with letters	https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=SiNnAAAAcAAJ&hl=en_GB&pg=GBS.PP3	A really good formulary for looking up individual parts of a letter and knowing a few different ways of writing what is needed. Doesn't overcomplicate, but does subdivide into a number of sections depending on the tone of the message being conveyed, or relationship between correspondents. Also includes a number of sample letters.	Y	Available, published close to time of Marie's letters
Le stile de composer et dicter toutes sortes de lettres missives	Pierre Habert	1571	Formulary with letters	https://bildsuche.digitale-sammlungen.de/index.html?c=viewer&lv=1&bandnummer=bsb00002861&pimage=00001&suchbegriff=&l=fr	Mostly a book of example letters with some notes on style. More familiar letters than elsewhere, but again could be more comprehensive.	Y	Available, published close to time of Marie's letters
Finances et thresor de la plume françoise	Etienne du Tronchet	1572	Formulary with letters	https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k717299/	Has a nice simple overview of the three main types of letters: familiar, sovereign, and compliment, followed by many examples of letters. However, none are of much relevance to my current study, i.e. don't deal with family relationships or female authors so much. Also deals with a form of poetic letter. Most model letters not of use, but info about letters quite useful.	Y	Available, published close to time of Marie's letters

Title	Author where known	Date(s) of publication	Type	Original retrieval source:	Comments	Part of study	Reason
Formulaire de lettres morales moult propres pour l'usage des jeunes filles [...]	Gabriel Meurier	1573	Formulary with letters	https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=FWqmtBKLo8EC&hl=en_GB&pg=GBS.PT4	A very good formulary which is primarily a collection of women's letters. Very relevant to current study as they are specifically letters for young women to write and involve letters sent to and received by this demographic. Still lacking some specific relations such as daughter to father, but plenty of similar status based relations which can be referred to. Subject matter can be very 'domestic' in parts.	Y	Available, published close to time of Marie's letters
La fleur de lis, contenant certaines petit missives alphabetiques et familieres	Gabriel Meurier	1580				N	No readily accessible version found
Nouveau Stile et maniere de composer, dicter et escrire [...] Plus les lettres amoureuses [...]		1584				N	No readily accessible version found
Lettres communes et familieres pour marchants et autres [...]	Jean Bourlier	1586?	Letter collection	https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=pRBNAAAAcAAJ&hl=en_GB&pg=GBS.PA1	A letter collection which is partly useful. It is of particular note because it has both French and Dutch parallel texts, which suggests that a need for bilingual texts was common enough at this time - which makes sense given the fact it is targeted at merchants primarily. Contains some letters useful to current study from son to father, but would ideally have more family examples than just this relation.] NB Has Dutch versions in parallel; some examples of son-father and father-son letters, possibly intended for merchants and a more dutch-based audience given bilingual text and content of some letters	Y	Available, provides useful context
Les lettres	Etienne Pasquier	1586	Letter collection	https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=dWATAAAAQAAJ&hl=en_GB&pg=GBS.PP11		N	

Title	Author where known	Date(s) of publication	Type	Original retrieval source:	Comments	Part of study	Reason
L'art des secretaires/Le Secrettaire	Chappuys/Sansovino	1588				N	No readily accessible version found
Lettres missives et familieres	Etienne du Tronchet	1596	Letter collection	https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k65440638.texteImage		N	
Le Thresor des Secretaires, auquel est compris la maniere de composer et escrire [...]		1598?	Formulary	https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=ME5nAAAAcAAJ&hl=en_GB&pg=GBS.PP1		N	

Appendix 6 - Face threats and Politeness strategies

Intrinsic FTAs (based on Brown & Levinson 1987: 65-68)

- Threats to H's negative face:

(i) Put pressure on H to do act A:

    orders & requests;

    suggestions, advice;

    remindings;

    threats, warnings, dares.

(ii) Put pressure on H to accept/reject a future positive act A by S:

    offers;

    promises.

(iii) Put pressure on H to protect and object of S's desire or give it to S:

    compliments, expressions of envy or admiration;

    expression of strong (negative) emotions towards H.

- Threats to H's positive face:

(i) Show S has negative evaluation of some aspect of H's positive face:

    expressions of disapproval, criticism, contempt or ridicule, complaints &

   reprimands, accusations, insults;

    contradictions or disagreements, challenges.

(ii) Show S doesn't care about H's positive face:

    expressions of violent (out-of-control) emotions;

    irreverence, mention of taboo topics, including those inappropriate in the context;

    bringing of bad news about H, or good news (boasting) about S;

    raising of dangerously emotional or divisive topics, e.g. politics, race, religion,

   women's liberation;

    blatant non-cooperation in an activity;

    use of address terms and other status-marked identifications in initial encounters.

- Threats to S's negative face:

    expressing thanks;

    acceptance of H's thanks or H's apology;

    excuses;

    acceptance of offers;

responses to H's *faux pas*;

unwilling promises & offers.

- Threats to S's positive face:

    apologies;

    acceptance of a compliment;

    breakdown of physical control over body, bodily leakage, stumbling or falling down, etc.;

    cowering, acting stupid, self-contradicting;

    confessions, admissions of guilt or responsibility;

    emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears.

<u>*Politeness strategies (based on Brown & Levinson 1987: 68-71, 101-227)*</u>

Brown & Levinson numerate their politeness strategies as follows, with 'S' referring to the speaker or person making the utterance, and 'H' referring to the hearer or person whom the utterance is directed towards (these are not an exhaustive list of strategies):

1. Bald-on-record:

    Whenever S wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency *more than* he wants to satisfy H's face.

2. Positive politeness strategies:

- Claim common ground:

    1. Notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods)

    2. Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)

    3. Intensify interest to H

    4. Use in-group identity markers

    5. Seek agreement

    6. Avoid disagreement

    7. Presuppose/raise/assert common ground

    8. Joke

- Convey S and H are cooperators:

    9. Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants

    10. Offer, promise

    11. Be optimistic

    12. Include both S and H in the activity

    13. Give (or ask for) reasons

    14. Assume or assert reciprocity

- Fulfil H's wants:

    15. Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

3. Negative politeness strategies:

- Be direct:

    1. Be conventionally indirect

- Don't presume/assume:

    2. Question, hedge

- Don't coerce H:

    3. Be pessimistic

4. Minimise the imposition

5. Give deference

- Communicate S's wants to not impinge on H:

6. Apologise

7. Impersonalise S and H

8. State the FTA as a general rule

9. Nominalise

- Redress other wants of H's:

10. Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H

4. Off record politeness:

- Invite conversational implicatures, and violate maxim of Relevance:

1. Give hints

2. Give association clues

3. Presuppose

- Invite conversational implicatures, and violate maxim of Quantity:

4. Understate

5. Overstate

6. Use tautologies

- Invite conversational implicatures, and violate maxim of Quality:

7. Use contradictions

8. Be ironic

9. Use metaphors

10. Use rhetorical questions

- Be vague, and violate maxim of Manner:

11. Be ambiguous

12. Be vague

13. Over-generalise

14. Displace H

15. Be incomplete, use ellipsis

5. Don't do the FTA

Self-politeness strategies (based on Chen 2001: 98-103)

1. Baldly

   The estimate of self-face loss is low

2. With redress (both positive and negative)
   1. Justify
   2. Contradict
   3. Hedge
   4. Impersonalise
   5. Use humour
   6. Be confident
   7. Be modest
   8. Hesitate
   9. Attach conditions

3. Off record
   1. Violate the Maxim of Quantity (say too much/too little)
   2. Violate the Maxim of Quality (metaphor, irony, white lie, exaggeration)
   3. Violate the Maxim of Relation (avoid the question)
   4. Violate the Maxim of Manner (ambiguity, vagueness, intentional obscurity)

4. Withhold the SFTA

   Make it obvious

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences					Christian-ritual	Other functions
							Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective				
		Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Face Threat	Politeness	Face Threat	Politeness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
Monsr mon bien ayme pere	Monsieur my dear father							+/-			Salutation and address term			Greetings			
sete me seruirat sulement pour vous auertir que jay rechu le 16 de ce moys vouster letter quil vous a pleut mescripre	this [letter] only serves me to inform you that I received on the sixteenth of this month your letter which it pleased you to write me	+									Opening sentence				Contact		
et vous remercie bien humblement de lonneur et faueur que me fettes de vous souuenir tant continuelement de moy	and I thank you most humbly for the honour and favour that you do me of continually remembering me so		(+)		+		-		-		Opening sentence						Commendation and thanks
es [et] suys este fort rejouwy denstender que estes encore en bonne sante	and I was so happy to hear that you are still in good health				+						Opening sentence		Recognition of health				

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences						
		Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective			Christian-ritual	Other functions
							Face Threat	Politeness	Face Threat	Politeness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
et ousy de la bonne victoire quil a pleut a ce bon dieu de vous donner conter vous ennemis	**and also of the good victory that it pleased our good God to grant you against your enemies**	+									Opening sentence					Thanking god	
de coy auons bien matire a louer se bon dieu du bien quil nous faict .	**which we have great reason to praise the good Good for this good He has granted us.**		+	+	(+)		-		-		Opening sentence					Prayer	
quant a moy je ne faulderay jamais a mon deuoir de continuer a luy prier	**As for me I will never fail my duty of continuing to pray to Him**			+					+/-			Transition				Prayer	Duty
quil vous veulle donner la grace quil puisse venir touleiour de mieulx en mieulx	**that He may wish to give you the grace of things improving every day**	+														Prayer	
et que le tout puisse ester a sa gloire et au salut de noster ame	**and that everything may be in His glory and the salvation of our spirits**	+														Prayer	
jespere que se bon dieu ne nous delayserat poient mais quil nous ayderat en tout ce que arons de besoing	**I hope that the good God will not desert us but that He may aid us in all that we need**				+											Prayer	

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences					Christian-ritual	Other functions
		Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective				
							Face Threat	Politeness	Face Threat	Politeness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
moyenant que nous nous fions en luy et le prions de bon ceur	**provided that we have faith in Him and praise Him with a good heart**	+	(+)	(+)												Prayer	
car sans luy rien ne se peult faire .	**for without Him nothing can happen.**	+														Prayer	
monsr mon bien ayme pere	**Monsieur my dear father**							+/-			Address term	Transition					
je ne vous aroys ousy jamais escripre que grant regret que se mat este denstender	**I also have never written to you of the great displeasure that it was for me to hear**				+		?		+?						?		
que ne saues poient encore comment que set auecque nous bons amis	**that you do not yet know how it is with our good friends**	+															
je touiour eu espoir que monsr en euse seu a parler	**I always had hope that Monsieur had been able to speak to them**				+												
mais puis que sela nest jay crayns serte quil ne serat poient bon	**but since that is not the case I fear for sure that it will not be good**				+				+?								

234

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences						
		Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective			Christian-ritual	Other functions
							Face Threat	Politeness	Face Threat	Politeness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
car quant a nous nous ne sauons poient encore ousy a la verite ce qui nen et	**since as for us we also do not yet know the truth whatever it is**	+															
car lon nen parle fort diuercement	**because conversely we do not speak much about it**	+															
ce bien enug etrange chosse quil y at sy longtamps	**it has truly been strange thing for such a long time**	+															
et que ne pouons sauoir comment que set	**and that we cannot know how it is**	+															
set eungne pietuse chosse	**that is a piteous thing**				+				+								
et vous promais	**and I promise you**			+			-										
monsr	**Monsieur**							+/-			Address term						
que madame ma gran mere et nous tertous en sommes fort enwie comme de rayson	**that Madame my grandmother and all of us reasonably have great desire [to know]**	(+)	(+)		+				+						?		
mais soiet comme se soict puis que set ^^aynsin^^ la voulonte de dieu	**but whatever will be will be since it is the will of God**	+								?						God	

235

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences					Christian-ritual	Other functions
		Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective				
							Face Threat	Politeness	Face Threat	Politeness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
il le fault prender en patience	one must be patient	+	(+)	(+)						?							
et remester le tout enter se mayns	and place everything into His hands	+								?						God	
car lon ne peut conter sa voulonte	for we cannot go against His will	+														God	
il se fault rigeler // selon sla	one must conduct oneself according to that	+	(+)	(+)						?							
monsr mon bien ayme pere	Monsieur my dear father							+/-			Address term	Transition					
pour changer de propos	to change the subject				+							Transition					
se serat pour vous auertir	this is to inform you				+							Transition					
que steynhuys qui et aupres de moy me at demande son conge	that Steinhuis who is with me as asked for leave	+															
a locasion que --il-- son pere et mort et que sa belle mere luy at escript pluseurefois quelle ne leseroyt poient de venir	due to the death of his father and that his stepmother wrote to him many times that she would not be able to come [here]	+															

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences						
							Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective			Christian-ritual	Other functions
		Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Face Threat	Politeness	Face Threat	Politeness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
affin qui porin partir par encemble de leur bien et y mester quelque order	for they would be separated from their goods and place them in order [?]	+															
car il me semble que sa belle mere ne veult poient ^^auoir^^ plus longtamps son ^^bien^^ enter se mains et comme elle nat eu personne de mester en sa plase car comme il me semble se parens ne font poient beaucop pour elle	for it seems to me that his stepmother will not have her goods in her hands for much longer and since there is nobody to take her place for it seems to me that her relatives do very little for her	+															
aynsin at telle desire dauoir son conge	so he has such desire to take leave	+															
decoy je suys este bien mary sy esse que jay luy ay donne	which I am perturbed by if I grant it to him				+				+								

237

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences						
		Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective			Christian-ritual	Other functions
							Face Threat	Politeness	Face Threat	Politeness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
car jay nay lay point veule retenir	**for I don't want to keep him [here]**				+												
a cause que je crayndons que a mon ocasion elle euse peu auoir quelque domage ou perte a son bien	**since I fear that for my actions she may suffer damage or loss of her goods**				+				+								
ce que je nusse poient voulontir eu	**which I do not wish to have [happen]**				+												
et espere que monsr nen serat poient mal content .	**and I hope that Monsieur will not be displeased.**		(+)		+		-		+								
je ne puis ousy laiser de vous auertir	**I also cannot neglect to inform you**			(+)		+						Transition			Contact		
que jay rechu se denirs dont gillebert mauoit escript passe quelque tamps	**that I received the deniers which Gillebert wrote to me about a while ago**	+															

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences					Christian-ritual	Other functions
		Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective				
							Face Threat	Politeness	Face Threat	Politeness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
decoy ne vous fayray long discou[r]s sachant bien que estes enpeche auecque aulter affaires	about which I will not say much knowing that you are encumbered with other affairs	+				+	-		+								Process
et ousy je escript le tout amplement au dit gillebert	and also I wrote amply about everything to Gillebert	+													Other contact		Process
lequel vous ferat bien le raport se qui nen	who will surely relate all of this to you	+															Process
et je voulderoys que je poroys auoir se bien et set heur que dester aupres de vous affin que vous poroys render quelque seruise	and I wish that I might have the benefit and fortune of being close to you so that I might render you some service				+		-		+								Daughterly duty and affection
et ousy vous aroys bien beaucop a dire qui ne se laisse poient aynsin escripr[e] or bien puis qui ne peult ester	and also [because] I have much to say to you which cannot be written or rather which should not be	+													Future contact		Process

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences					Christian-ritual	Other functions
		Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective				
							Face Threat	Politeness	Face Threat	Politeness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
il men fault prender la patience et atender le tamps jusques a ce quil plerat a ce bon dieu quil auinse	I must be patient and wait for the time when it pleases God for this to happen			+												God	
en se pendant je vous supplie bien humblement que la longue absence ne soyt ocasion de me mester en obly	and however I humbly pray you that this long absence will not be occasion to forget me		+		+	+	-										Request
et quant monsr trouuerat le moyen de me faire aucunefois part de vous nouelles	and when Monsieur finds the means to make me some part of your news		+				-	+?									Request
se que met eung gran contentement quant se bien me peult afenir	that will be a great comfort to me when this benefit may come to me				+				+								Affective
car je suys touiour langisant den auoir	for I am always yearning to have it				+				+	+							

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences						
		Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective			Christian-ritual	Other functions
							Face Threat	Politeness	Face Threat	Politeness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
je vous prie ousy monsr que *//* *me vouler touiour tenir pour vouster humble et obeysante* *fille car jespere qu ne me t[r]ouueres jamais aulter.*	**I also pray you Monsieur that you will always wish to keep me as your humble and obedient daughter because I hope that you will never find me otherwise.**		+			+	-	-	+								Commendation
jay rechu *ousy eungne letter que aues escript a madame ma tante de schwartzbourch*	**I also received a letter that you wrote to Madame my aunt of Schwartzbourg**	+													Other contact		
laquelle je luy enuoyeray sy [t]o que pores [[tear in paper]] trouuer la comodite	**which I will send to her as soon as I have the opportunity**		+												Other contact		
elle set party dicy pase [5] ou 6 [[tear in paper]] jour --de-- arire vers arnestat	**she left here [5] or 6 days ago headed for Arnestadt**	+															
sy esse que le conte guntert ne poient encore la mais je pence quil reuinderat bien to	**if it is the case that Count Guntert is no longer there however I think he will return soon**	+															

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA — Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed — Other-oriented Face Threat	Other-oriented Politeness	Self-oriented Face Threat	Self-oriented Politeness	Formulaic Sequences — Text-constitutive Text-type	Text-structural	Intersubjective Health	Greeting	Contact	Christian-ritual	Other functions
je say quelle serat fort rejouwy dauoir de vous nouelles .	I know that she will be very happy to have news from you.	+															
--et-- monsr mon bien ayme pere	Monsieur my dear father							+/−			Address term	Transition					
madame ma tante de nassaw mat commande vous faire se bien humble recommandacions en vouster bonne grace en vous souheydant tout heur et prosperite	Madame my aunt of Nassau asked me to pass on her most humble commendations into your good grace in wishing you fortune and prosperity	+				(+)			-	+			Passing on health wishes	Passing on greetings			
et at este fort rejouwy de la bonne victore quil at pleut a ce bon dieu vous donner .	and she was delighted with the good victory which it pleased God to grant you.	+											Passing on greetings			God	
crayndant vous donner facherie auecque plus longue letter	fearing inconveniencing you with a longer letter				+		-		-		Closing formula						

242

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences						
		Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive	Declarative	Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective			Christian-ritual	Other functions
							Face Threat	Politeness	Face Threat	Politeness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
chachant bien que estes inportun[e] auecque beaucops des aulters affaires	knowing that you are busy with many other affairs	+						-			Closing formula						Deference
fayray la fin	I will finish				+						Closing formula						
priant se bon dieu vous donner monsr mon bien ayme pere sante heureuse vie et longue auecque accomplisement de touts vous bons desirs	praying the good God grant you Monsieur my dear father a long happy and healthy life with accomplishment of all your good desires	+	(+)		(+)						Closing formula		Health wishes				Commendation
et a moy se bien dauoir touiour vouster bonne grace	and to me the benefit of always having your good grace	+	(+)		+				+		Closing formula						Commendation
en laquelle treshumblement me recommande	into which I most humbly commend myself				+	+		+/-	-		Closing formula						Commendation
se faict de dillenbourch se 22 de juwin 1.5.7.4	written at Dillenburg this 22 of June 1574	+				(+)					Closing formula, date and address						

Utterance	Approximate translation	Speech Acts + = present (+) = indirect SA					Politeness Strategies/FTAs + = Positive, - = Negative, +/- = Mixed				Formulaic Sequences						
		Asserti ve	Dire ctiv e	Co mm issi ve	Exp res sive	Dec lara tive	Other-oriented		Self-oriented		Text-constitutive		Intersubjective			Christian-ritual	Other functions
							Face Threat	Polite ness	Face Threat	Polite ness	Text-type	Text-structural	Health	Greeting	Contact		
Vouster treshumble et tresobey sante fille jusques a la mort Marie de Nassaw	**Your most humble and most obedient daughter until death Marie of Nassau**			(+)	+			-	+	+	Closing formula, subscriptio n and signature						Commendation
// A Monsieur Monsieur le prince Dorange	**To Monsieur Monsieur the Prince of Orange**							+/-			Superscrip tion						