CHAPTER IX

CLASSES OF SENTENCES

18. Sentences are divided according to their structure into three classes — simple, compound, and complex. A simple sentence contains but one independent proposition. A compound sentence contains two or more independent propositions. A complex sentence contains one independent proposition and one or more subordinate clauses. As the simple sentence has already been discussed there remain only the compound and the complex sentences to be treated.
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19. The compound sentence consists of different independent propositions or members. These members may be two or more simple sentences, or one member may be a simple sentence and the others complex sentences, or there may be any combination of simple and complex sentences. These members are usually connected in the following ways:

1. Coördinating Conjunctions. The members are connected by coördinating conjunctions. The commonest are and, or, but, for: 'John is in the garden working and Mary is sitting at the window reading.' The members of a compound sentence, however, are not always thus complete, each with subject and finite verb, for a natural feeling for the economy of time and effort prompts us, wherever it is possible, to contract by employing a common verb for all members, so that the conjunctions connect only parts of like rank: not 'John is writing and Mary is writing,' but 'John and Mary are writing,' or 'John and Mary are both writing,'
or ‘Both John and Mary are writing.’ ‘I bought paper, pen, and ink.’ ‘John writes fast but neatly.’ Care must be taken in contracting when one subject is used with two different verbs each of which stands in a different compound tense: ‘All the debts have been or will be paid,’ or ‘All the debts have been paid or will be,’ but not ‘All the debts have or will be paid.’ Sentences containing these conjunctions, however, are often not an abridgment of two or more sentences, but a simple sentence with elements of equal rank, connected by a conjunction: ‘The King and Queen are an amiable pair.’ ‘She mixed wine and oil together.’

Coördinating conjunctions also link together subordinate clauses of like rank: ‘The judge said that the case was a difficult one and that he would reconsider his decision.’

Besides the pure connectives mentioned in 1, p. 161, there are many adverbs which perform not only the function of an adverb but also that of a conjunction. Coördinating conjunctions and conjunctive adverbs may be divided into the following classes:

a. Copulative, connecting two members and their meanings, the second member indicating an addition of equal importance, or, on the other hand, an advance in time and space, or an intensification, often coming in pairs, then called correlative: and; both — and; equally — and; alike — and; at once — and; not — nor (or neither, or and neither); not (or never) — not (or nor) . . . either (or in older English, and still in popular speech, neither); a positive or negative proposition — and nobody (or not, or nor) or in older English, ne instead of nor) . . . either (or in older English, and still in popular speech, neither, or both words may be suppressed); in elliptical sentences where the subject or finite verb is expressed in only one member and understood elsewhere no (or not, or never) — or (or often nor when it is desired to call separate attention to what follows and thus emphasize); not — no more, employed when it is desired to repeat a preceding sentence with a new subject, usually with inverted word-order and a stressed subject after no more, but with normal word-order and a stressed verb when it is merely desired to corroborate a preceding negative statement; neither — nor (now replaced after a negative by either — or, but a little earlier in the period also found after a negative), but in elliptical sentences where the subject or finite verb is expressed in only one member and understood elsewhere we sometimes still, as in older English, employ here neither — or, especially where there is no emphasis or contrast involved; instead of neither — nor sometimes in poetry a positive first member followed by a second introduced by nor, which imparts its negative force to the first member; neither — nor — nor
(with three or more members instead of two); in older English
no(u)ther — nor instead of neither — nor; nor — nor in poetic or
older English, now usually neither — nor; neither — neither, in
poetic or older English, now usually neither — nor; ne — ne, in
older English, now neither — nor; not only — but (or more com-
monly but also or but . . . too); too; as well as or and — as well;
also, and also, in older English also eke; moreover, and moreover;
and withal (= and moreover); as also or simple as (= moreover,
and likewise), especially in older English; again; later; further,
furthermore; besides; likewise, and likewise; even; indeed; let
alone, to say nothing of, not to say anything of, not to mention;
still more; still less (in older English also simple less) or much less;
in the first place; first, firstly, secondly, etc.; finally; then (27 3,
last par.); first — then; now — now; sometimes — sometimes; at
times — at times; partly — partly; what with — and what with
somewhat (i.e., in part) on account of — and somewhat (i.e., in
part) on account of, often with elliptical form, what with — and,
or instead of this elliptical form others, often what between —
and (a loose colloquial and popular blending of what with — and
and between — and) and sometimes what of — and; on the one
hand — on the other (hand); at least, etc.

Examples:

He can both sing and dance.

He can sing and dance both.

This he published in 1779, a performance in one so young equally sur-
prising and admirable.

He went to sleep alike thankless and remorseless.

The book is alike agreeable and instructive.

The Prime Minister was at once detested and despised.

I am not obliged to tell everybody, nor (or neither) am I obliged to
keep it a secret.

John was not there; nor was James (or neither was James, or and
neither was James, or and James was not either).

'I am not fond of parties.' — 'I am not fond of them either' (or Nor I
either).

CLAUD. — I did never think that lady would have loved any man.
LEON. — No, nor I neither (Shakespeare, Much Ado About Nothing, II, iii,
98) (now nor I either).

You see the little beggar's never been to church before. I don't go in
town neither (now usually either), but I think it's right in the country to
give a good example (Thackeray, Pendennis, I, Ch. XXII).

I am going and nobody can prevent it either (or nor can anybody prevent
it).

At least, and at last, I was off the sea, nor had I returned thence
empty handed (Stevenson, Treasure Island, VIII).
It hasn’t done me much good, nor anyone else either.

I don’t deny it was a good lay and I’ll not deny neither (popular language for either) but what, etc. (Stevenson, Treasure Island, XX).

Then shall Cadwallin die; and then the raine (reign) Of Britons eke with him attonce shall dye; Ne shall the good Cadwallader, with paine or powre, be hable it to remedy (Spenser, The Faerie Queene, III, III, XL).

I can get no rest by night or (or nor) by day.

He is not brilliant or (or nor) attractive.

There was not a cat or (or nor) a dog in town that night that was not given a warm shelter.

I want no promises, nor notes (more emphatic than or notes); I want money.

I will not do it, nor consider it (more emphatic than or consider it).

I have never spoken or (or more emphatically nor) written to him.

‘I can’t make out how it came about.’ — ‘No more can I’ (Mrs. Gaskell, Wives) (or more commonly Nor can I).

‘Harriet, my dear, you’ve gone too far — we had no right to pry into Mr. Preston’s private affairs.’ — ‘No more I had’ (ib.) (or more commonly I know I hadn’t).

Neither she nor I saw him.

Some evils which neither he or (now nor) she foresaw (Sterne, Tristram Shandy, III, VII).

I am suffering neither from one or (now more commonly nor) from the other (Trollope, The Duke’s Children, 2, 140).

Great brother, thou (usually neither thou) nor I have made the world (Tennyson, Idylls of the King, The Last Tournament, l. 203).

Neither duty, nor honor, nor gratitude has any possible claim on him.

Thou hast neither heat, affection, limb, nor beauty (Shakespeare, Measure for Measure, III, i, 27).

There was no respite neither (now either) by day nor (now or) night for this devoted city (Southey, Peninsular War, II, 131, A.D. 1827).

Nobody knows either him or his family.

Nor sun nor wind will ever strive to kiss you (Shakespeare).

It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come (Matthew, XII, 32).

Ne is thy fate, ne is thy fortune ill (Spenser, The Faerie Queene, III, iii, xxiv).

At fifteen he was not only fit for the university, but carried thither a classical taste and a stock of learning which would have done honor to a Master of Arts (Lord Macaulay).

Not only the mother but also the children are sick.

‘There is not only concision in these lines but also elegance’ (or ‘but elegance too’) or ‘There is not only concision in these lines, there is also elegance’ (or ‘there is elegance, too’).

I have promised to go. I am going to do it, too.

It will be my endeavor to relate the history of the people, as well as the history of the government.
‘He must irrevocably lose her as well as the inheritance,’ or ‘He must irrevocably lose her and the inheritance as well.’

Some books are still written in Latin, and some scholars speak it. It is also used in our time as the language of the Roman Catholic Church (West, *A Latin Grammar*, p. 4).

Take this, and my very best thanks also.

The wolf is hardy and strong, and withal one of the cleverest of animals (or and one of the cleverest of animals withal).

Wherefore, that I might show them what kindness I could, as also that I might have a full opportunity to observe the extraordinary circumstances of the Children, and that I might be furnished with Evidence and Argument as a Critical Eye-Witness, I took the eldest of them home to my House (Cotton Mather, *Memorable Providences*, The First Exemple, Sect. XVII).

We must abide our opportunity, And practise what is fit, as what is needful (Ben Jonson, *Sejanus*, I, ii, 172, A.D. 1603).

Again (often, as here, at the beginning of a paragraph, continuing the discussion), man is greater by leaning on the greatest (Emerson, *Trust*).

‘The attorney general further holds that,’ etc. (Chicago Tribune, March 26, 1925), or with greater emphasis, ‘Further (or furthermore), the attorney general holds that,’ etc.

John dislikes me; he even told me so.

The birds here are very numerous. Indeed, they often rise in a dense cloud that hides the sun.

Not even dogs were unkind to him, let alone human beings.

The house is uninhabitable in summer, let alone in winter. And the scare (of cholera) has produced a rigid quarantine that has upset all commercial relations, to say nothing of (or not to say anything of, or not to mention) the serious interruptions of passenger traffic (Bret Harte, *Letter to His Wife*, Sept. 17, 1892).

It is scarcely imaginable how great a force is required to stretch, still more break, this ligament.

I do not even suggest that he is negligent, still less (or much less) that he is dishonest (Oxford Dictionary).

You never fought with any, lesse (now still less, or much less) slew any (Ben Jonson, *Magnetic Lady*, III, iii, A.D. 1632).

We played a little while longer; then we went home. First think, then act.

What with his drinking and what with his jealousy (or what with his drinking and his jealousy), he wore himself out.

‘What between the trenches and alarms we never have a moment to ourselves.’ The what should be suppressed here.


My interests at present are twofold: on the one hand my flowers claim me early in the morning, on the other (hand) I am absorbed in language studies the rest of the day.
He is very poor, at least he has not the wherewithal to buy proper clothes for his wife and family.

b. DISJUNCTIVE, connecting two members but disconnecting their meaning, the meaning in the second member excluding that in the first: or, in older English also either or outher (= or) and in questions whether — or with the force of simple or; or . . . either; either — or; either — or — or (with three or more members instead of two); or — or, in older English and still in poetry, in older English also other — or; other — other, outher — or, outher — outher else, either — either; the disjunctive adverbs else, otherwise, or or, or or else, in older English outher else.

The employment of whether here as a conjunction in older English is explained by its original use as an interrogative pronoun with the force of which of the two: 'Whether is greater, the gold or the temple that sanctifieth the gold?' (Matthew, XXIII, 17). Examples of its later use as a conjunction are given among the examples below.

Examples:

Is he guilty or innocent?
Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either (now or) a vine, figs? (James, III, 12).

Pray, Sir, whether (now suppressed) do you reckon Derrick or Smart the better poet? (Boswell, Life of Johnson, IV, 159).

Whether then (both words now suppressed or replaced by Say), Master Tommy, do you reckon it more honest to use your own faculties or those of others? (Punch, 1872, Vol. I, III).

If John said so or William either, I could believe it.

Either he or I must go.

A narrative has to do with a narration of events, either past, present, or to come.

At different times the American government has been carried on without the coöperation of the Vice-President. Either he has resigned through ill-health, or has died while in office, or has succeeded to the presidency.

Alike or when or where they shone or shine, or on the Rubicon or on the Rhine (Pope, Essay on Man, IV, 245–246).

This idle sort . . . which hitherto other (now either) poverty hath caused to be thieves, or else now be other (now either) vagabonds or idle serving men and shortly will be thieves (Sir Thomas More, Utopia, 58).

No, no, Eubulus, but I will yield to more than either I am bound to grant, either (now or) thou able to prove (John Lyly, Euphues, 193).

He cannot be in his right senses, else (or otherwise, or or, or or else) he would not make such wild statements. Compare 31 1 d dd.

Seize the chance, else (or otherwise, or or, or or else) you will regret it. Compare 31 1 d bb.
Either—or often has the force of both—and: ‘John is as steady as either Henry or William.’

c. **Adversative**, connecting two members, but contrasting their meaning: *but, but then, only (= but, but then, it must however be added that), still, yet, and yet, however* (in older English *however*, surviving in dialect as *howsumever, howsomdever*), on the other hand, again, on the contrary, conversely, rather, notwithstanding, nevertheless (replacing older *nath(e)less*), none the less (replacing older *not the less*), all the same, though, after all, for all that, at the same time; and withal, yet withal, or but withal (= at this same time, for all that, notwithstanding); in the meantime, meanwhile, etc.; in older English *howbeit* (= *yet*; see Mark, V, 19).

**Examples:**

He is small *but* strong.
The commander-in-chief has not been quite successful, *but then* he has essayed a difficult task.
He wanted to take precedence of all the Lowland gentlemen then present, *only* my father would not suffer it (Scott, Waverley, Ch. XV).
He makes good resolutions, *only* he never keeps them.
She is devilish like Miss Cutler that I used to meet at Dundum, *only* fairer (Vanity Fair, I, Ch. IV).
She has wronged me, *and yet* I wish to do her justice.
‘I want to go very much; *still* (conjunction) I do not care to go through the rain’; but *still* is an adverb in ‘It is raining *still*.’
‘I miss him, *yet* I am glad he went’; but *yet* is an adverb in ‘It hasn’t quit raining *yet*.’
‘The studio contained some armor and pottery of no special value. There was, *however*, a fine old cabinet at the end of the room’ (or ‘There was a fine old cabinet at the end of the room, *however*,’ or ‘*However*, there was a fine old cabinet at the end of the room’).
Miss Raeburn’s dress was a cheerful red, verging on crimson. Lady Winterbourne, *on the other hand*, was dressed in severe black.
Charles is usually cheerful; sometimes, *again*, he is very despondent.
I have not nearly done. *On the contrary*, I have only just begun.
Very free word-order is possible only in inflected languages. *Conversely*, absolute fixed order occurs only in languages devoid of inflection.
The old man is no coward; *rather*, he is a man of high spirit.
I denied myself everything. *Notwithstanding*, the old skinflint complained without ceasing.
He is always chin-deep in debt. *Nevertheless* (or *none the less*), he is always jolly.
The expression is ungrammatical; *all the same* it is a part of the common tongue.
‘The sheep which we saw behind the house were small and lean; in the next field *though* (coördinating conjunction) there were some fine
cows'; but though is a subordinating conjunction in 'Though it never put a cent of money into my pocket, I believe it did me good.'

In coming home we got caught in the rain and became wet through and through. After all I don't mind it, as we had a fine time.

He often loses his temper and can become unreasonable. For all that we like him, as he has some fine traits.

These persons are a moving mass of scarfs and furs and overcoats, and shivering withal.

It (book) is very stimulating and sound to the core — yet difficult reading withal (James Gibbons Huneker, Letter, Aug. 23, 1900).

'He confessed that his master was rather severe, but withal a good man' (or 'but a good man withal').

He was now undergoing many hardships. His brother in the meantime was having an easy time.

d. Causal, adding an independent proposition explaining the preceding statement, represented only by the single conjunction for: 'The brook was very high, for a great deal of rain had fallen over night.' Compare 30 a (next to last par.).

Although the independent causal proposition usually has declarative form, it sometimes has the form of a direct question: 'I had no twinge of compunction, for was this not fulfilment?' (Ray Stannard Baker, Adventures in Contentment, Ch. V).

e. Illative, introducing an inference, conclusion, consequence, result, namely, therefore (originally the same word as therefor, but since A.D. 1800 differentiated from it in spelling and stress in accordance with meaning), on that account, consequently, accordingly, for that reason, so, then, hence, thence (= hence, but not so common), etc.

Examples:

No man will take counsel, but everybody will take money; therefore money is better than counsel (Swift).

The factory was burned down last night; on that account (or consequently) many workmen are thrown out of employment.

The thing had to be done. Accordingly we did it.

There was no one there, so I went away.

'I am here, you see, young and sound and hearty; then, don't let us despair!' (or 'don't let us despair, then!).

When the blood becomes viscous, it is difficult for the heart to pump it through the capillaries. Hence the blood pressure increases.

A vast and lofty hall was the great audience-chamber of the Moslem monarch, thence called the Hall of the Embassadors (Washington Irving).

f. Explanatory, connecting words, phrases, or sentences and introducing an explanation or a particularization: namely, to wit, viz. (short for Latin videlicet, the z indicating a contraction, as in
oz. for ounce), that is (when it precedes, often written i.e., for Latin id est), that is to say, or, such as, as, like, for example (often written e.g., which is for Latin exempli gratia), for instance, say, let us say.

Examples:

There were only two girls there, namely, Mary and Ann.
Among the building stones in New England three kinds are of especial value, namely, granite, marble, and slate.
There is but one way of solving the difficulty — namely, to publish both articles.
'He has an enemy — to wit, his own brother' (or much more commonly 'namely, his own brother').
There is now ample accommodation for them here, no less than five hospital ships being available, viz. (or namely), Maine, Spartan, Nubia, Lismore, and Avoca.
The play was flung on 'cold' — that is, without an out-of-town try-out.
A great deal of the forest of the West is on government land, and to prevent it from being wasted, our government has set apart what are called 'forest preserves.' That is, the forest is kept, or reserved, by the government, so that no one can cut down the trees without permission.
My wife suggested my going alone, i.e., with you and without her.
The Navy is the first line of defence; that is to say, it is not till the Navy has been beaten that the shores of England can be invaded.
I passed some time in Poet's Corner, which occupies an end of one of the transepts, or cross aisles, of the Abbey.
She possessed certain definite beauties, such as (or simple as, or like) her hair.
The mistletoe grows on various trees, such as oaks, poplars, birches.
Michael, who all the time was dreading many unfortunate events, as for the cabman to get down from his box and quarrel about the fare, or for the train to be full, or for Stella to be sick during the journey (Mackenzie, Youth's Encounter, Ch. V).
The drama of literary moralizing is growing increasingly, as witness the plays by Mr. Shaw, Mr. Barker, Mr. Galsworthy (Bookman).
She gave me a good deal of miscellaneous information, as that William's real name was Mr. Hicking (J. M. Barrie, The Little White Bird, Ch. VIII).
We designate odors by the objects from which they come, e.g., violet, orange, etc.
Such changes in the level of the land are even now in progress in many places, though the process is so slow that usually years, and even centuries, must pass before the changes become evident. For instance (or for example), the land along the coast of New Jersey is sinking at the rate of about two feet a century, while that around Hudson Bay is rising.
I have often heard this pronunciation, for instance in New York.
Take a few of them, say a dozen or so.
Any country, let us say Sweden, might do the same.
2. Pronouns and Adverbs as Conjunctions. The connection between the members may be made by placing at the beginning of the sentence a stressed personal pronoun, possessive adjective, or demonstrative pronoun or adverb referring back to the preceding proposition: 'In this crisis I have often thought of the old home, of Father, of Mother. That was a good place to start out in life from. Their life has always been an inspiration to me, their example a sure guide. There at least in memory I shall still often tarry. Them I shall often consult.' Demonstrative adverbs are very frequent here. Examples of then so used are given in 1 a, p. 165.

3. Parataxis. Sometimes there is no formal link binding the members together since the logical connection forms a sufficient tie. Upon close investigation, however, it will become clear that such apparently independent propositions are not absolutely independent. One of the propositions often stands in some grammatical relation to the other, such as that of subject or object, or in an adverbial relation, such as that of cause, purpose, result, concession, condition: 'The best way is you ask the man himself' (subject clause). "'I am not sure of it' (object clause), he replied.' 'Hurry up; it is getting late' (cause). 'They gave him a large sum of money; he was to keep still, you know' (purpose). 'The crops were very poor this year; the prices of food are high' (pure result). 'I could have poisoned him (modal result) I was so mad to think I had hired such a turnip' (Mark Twain, Letter to His Daughter Clara, Sept. 29, 1891). 'Let him talk (concession), it'll do no harm.' 'Do it (condition), you'll never regret it.'

Such sentences represent an older order of things which was once more general than now. In the earliest stage of the parent tongue from which the various Indo-European languages have come, there were no subordinating conjunctions as now, i.e., no formal expression had as yet been found for the idea of subordination of one proposition to another. This placing of a subordinate proposition alongside of a principal proposition without a formal sign of subordination is called parataxis. The development of a distinctive formal sign of subordination in the form of conjunctions and relative pronouns — hypotaxis, as it is called — is characteristic of a later stage of language and belongs to the individual life of the different languages after the migration of the different peoples from their original home. It has required many centuries to develop the present hypotactic forms, but actual subordination, although without a formal expression, was present at a very early stage of language growth, as can still be seen in the old verbless type of sentence preserved in old saws:
Out of sight out of mind = ‘If something is out of sight, it soon passes out of mind.’

An early stage of formal hypotaxis, asyndetic hypotaxis, i.e., hypotaxis clearly marked in thought and form but not yet indicated by a separate word such as a conjunction or a relative, is still quite common in English in relative clauses that do not have a relative pronoun: ‘The book I hold [it] here in my hand is an English grammar.’ In this old construction, of the two originally independent sentences one of them, lying alongside of the other in close relation to it, often even as in this example literally embedded in it, is so markedly dependent logically and also formally dependent by reason of its peculiarly abridged and close-linked form that it is no longer felt as an independent sentence but as a relative clause. Compare 23 II. An imperative sentence that precedes another sentence is often logically subordinate to it. It often has the force of a conditional clause: ‘Do it, you will never regret it.’ The imperative sentence often has the force of a concessive clause: ‘Let him be the greatest villain in the world, I shall never cease to have an interest in him.’ Likewise a question is often degraded to a subordinate conditional clause: ‘Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms’ (James, V, 13). Now usually without the question mark: ‘Had I the time, I would go.’

In general, the formal hypotactic stage was preceded by coordination, the connection of sentences by pronouns, adverbs, and coördinating conjunctions, as described in 1 a, b, c, d, e, 2, pp. 162–170. Coördination often indicates a close relation between two words or two propositions, the context frequently showing clearly that one of these is subordinate to the other: nice and warm = nicely warm. ‘A little farther, and (= when they had gone a little farther, a clause of time) they turned off to the left in the direction of an olive orchard’ (Wallace, Ben Hur, VIII, Ch. VIII). ‘Give him an inch, and (= if you give him an inch, a clause of condition) he’ll take a mile.’ ‘You should try and be reasonable’ (= to be reasonable, an abridged infinitive clause in the object relation). ‘You will come and see us, won’t you?’ (= to see us, an abridged adverbial infinitive clause of purpose). ‘Go and fetch them for me’ = ‘Go fetch me them’ (Genesis, XXVII, 13), an adverbial infinitive clause of purpose containing an old simple infinitive, once more common here. ‘You have been and moved my papers!’ (Concise Oxford Dictionary) = ‘You have been to move my papers,’ the old infinitive of purpose construction described in 7 D 3 = ‘You have been moving my papers!’ ‘Can you touch pitch and not be defiled?’ (= without being defiled, a gerundial clause of result).
Instead of an infinitive clause of result (38 2 b ee, 4th par.), as in ‘If you are not more careful, you are going to lose your knife,’ we often employ a coördinated proposition: ‘Why did I have to go and lose my rifle?’ (Victor Appleton, Don Sturdy among the Gorillas, Ch. XIX). ‘I cannot keep these plants alive and I have watered them well, too’ (= although I have watered them well, an adverbial concessive clause). In older literary English, an independent proposition which is coördinated by and to a preceding independent proposition is often used instead of a dependent relative clause: ‘A good man was ther of religioun, And was a poure persoun of a town’ (Chaucer, Canterbury Tales, Prologue, 477) (= who was a poor parson of a town). Coördination instead of a dependent relative clause is still widely used in Irish English dialect, as illustrated below.

As can be seen by the above examples, coördination with and, though a very old construction, is still in colloquial and popular speech often more common than the hypotactic form of statement, which in general is now more common in accurate literary language. In popular Irish English every possible kind of subordination is expressed by connecting two propositions by and. That the proposition following and is now felt as subordinate is frequently shown by putting it in the old appositional type (6 B a) without a finite verb, the regular form in Irish English for every subordinate clause: ‘What way wouldn’t it be warm, and it (i.e., the sun) getting high up in the South?’ (J. M. Synge, The Well of the Saints, p. 1) (causal clause). ‘I’m told it’s a great sight to see a man hanging by his neck; but what joy would that be to ourselves, and we (an old blind couple) not seeing it at all’ (ib., p. 10) (conditional clause). ‘Is it a niggard you are grown to be, McDonough, and you with riches in your hand?’ (Lady Gregory, McDonough’s Wife) (concessive clause). ‘Ah, what sort at all are the people of the fair, to be doing their bargaining and she being stark (i.e., lying dead) and quiet!’ (ib.) (temporal clause). ‘Did you not hear his reverence, and he speaking to you now?’ (J. M. Synge, The Well of the Saints, p. 79) (relative clause). This appositional type of clause after and was a common construction in Gaelic. Hence it became thoroughly established in early Irish English, for Irish expression was influenced here not only by Gaelic but also by literary English, which at this time had the same construction: ‘What mortall fools durst raise thee to this daring, and I alive!’ (Beaumont and Fletcher, The Maids Tragedie, IV, i, 70, A.D. 1622) (= while I am alive). ‘Because we could not free Captain Hawkins and other voluntaries of what they had done, we were to send a small present to Monsieur
D'Aulnay in satisfaction of that, and so all injuries and demands to be remitted and so a final peace to be concluded' (Winthrop, Journal, Sept. 20, 1646) (= that thus all injuries and demands might be remitted and a final peace be concluded, purpose clause). It occurs sometimes still in literary English: 'If it is miserable to bear when she is here, what would it be, and she away?' (Dickens, David Copperfield, Ch. XVI) (= if she were away). 'Think, while we sit In gorgeous pomp and state, gaunt poverty Creeps through their sunless lanes, and with sharp knives Cuts the warm throats of children stealthily And no word said' (Oscar Wilde, The Duchess of Padua, Act II) (= without a word being said, a gerundial clause of result).

The older construction of coordination cannot as accurately as hypotaxis give expression to many fine shades of meaning required in exact thinking, but it is by reason of its simple directness often more forceful than the younger, more exact construction of hypotaxis, and consequently is still, even in the literary language, widely used in lively style. An illustration of this is given in 2, p. 170. Likewise the oldest construction here, parataxis, still has its distinct advantage in lively style with quick movement, as in old saws, imperative sentences, and questions as illustrated by the examples given on opposite page. In lively description, although the sentences are as elsewhere more or less connected logically, hypotaxis plays an inconspicuous rôle. On the one hand, parataxis is the favorite where the movement is rapid, as in I came, I saw, I conquered. On the other hand, coordination is in place where different objects are presented for the sake of making the picture more impressive, or different activities are described separately in their natural sequence in order to depict the march of events in a stately or impressive way: 'We have ships, and men, and money, and stores' (Webster). 'And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell; and great was the fall of it' (Matthew, VII, 27). Again, coordination is much more expressive when there is feeling to be conveyed: 'Three thousand years and the world so little changed!' (Thoreau, Journal, I, p. 31); more expressive than hypotactic: 'Although three thousand years have passed since Homer's times, the world has changed very little.'

On the other hand, parataxis is often loose and clumsy and for a long time has been yielding to hypotaxis, which expresses our thought more compactly and conveniently. In 26 in the description of the development of the clause of place introduced by the conjunction where we have an apt illustration of the compactness of hypotaxis as against the looseness of parataxis.
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20 1. Complex Sentence, Function, and Form of Subordinate Clauses. The complex sentence consists of a principal clause and one or more subordinate clauses. This is true, however, in only a general sense. In an exact sense there is often no principal clause at all: 'Whoever comes will be welcome.' Here one of the essential elements of the sentence, the subject, has the full form of a subordinate clause, but there is no principal clause in the sentence distinct from the subordinate clause. The so-called principal clause is merely the predicate. Not only an essential element but also a subordinate element can have the form of a clause: 'I have heard that he has come.' Here the object has the form of a clause, an object clause. The subordinate clause may also be merely a modification of some word within one of the component elements of the sentence: 'The book which I hold in my hand is an English grammar.' Here the clause is not the subject but only a modifier of it, hence is an adjective clause.

According to their grammatical function, subordinate clauses are divided into subject, predicate, adjective, object, adverbial clauses. These clauses may be reduced to three if we divide them according to the part of speech which they represent: (1) substantive clauses, i.e., clauses with the functions of a substantive,
including subject, predicate, object clauses, and such adjective clauses as represent a noun in the attributive relation of appositive, genitive, or prepositional phrase, as described in 23 I; (2) adjective clauses; (3) adverbial clauses.

A subordinate clause is usually employed to indicate dependency of thought. It completes the meaning of the principal proposition, or it modifies it or some word in it. Formally it is distinguished by a distinctive conjunction or connective, such as that, when, while, where, who, which, etc., or, where there is no conjunction or connective, by the slightness of the pause before it and by the quicker enunciation, as in ‘He told me he saw you do it’ and ‘Give me the book you hold in your hand.’ Often, however, the thought in the subordinate clause is as independent as in the principal proposition. Subordinate clause form here is sometimes employed to indicate a close association with the act of the principal proposition: ‘I had scarcely stepped out of the house when (indicating a closer association of the two acts than then) I heard a shot within.’ Sometimes it expresses a contrast: ‘She is diligent, while (or whereas) he is lazy.’ Frequently it is employed merely as a convenient means of joining one independent statement to another: ‘I handed it to John, who (= and he) passed it on to James.’ ‘One lost a leg, another an arm, while (= and) a third was killed outright.’ While with the force of and has become a marked feature in recent journalistic language, but has not yet become established in choice expression.

2. Position of Subordinate Clauses. As each subordinate clause which is not merely a modifier of some word within one of the component elements of the sentence has a definite function as if it were a simple word, its position in the sentence is regulated by the same principle that determines the position of a simple word with the same function and logical force. For instance, just as an emphatic noun subject stands at the end of the sentence, as explained on page 4, an emphatic clause subject assumes the end position: ‘The best way is you ask the man himself.’ A subordinate clause may follow or precede the principal proposition: ‘He stole my watch while I was asleep’ or ‘While I was asleep he stole my watch.’

A subordinate clause often modifies, not the principal proposition, but a preceding subordinate clause or some element in it, the two subordinate clauses forming a complex subordinate clause. ‘Late one afternoon when I was in the garden near the end of the vineyard, where there was a bird box, I suddenly heard the loud, emphatic note of a bluebird.’ In complex subordinate clauses there is not always a succession of subordinate clauses as here.
but often one of the subordinate clauses is embedded in the other, as illustrated in 21 (last par.), 23 II 6 a, 24 III (last par.).

3. Abridged Clauses. The various kinds of subordinate clauses are the result of a long development, and represent the active efforts of the English mind in its countless practical struggles for fuller expression to adapt from emergency to emergency the available historical materials of the language to the more accurate processes of thought that became necessary in its growing intellectual life. Alongside of these involved structures are simpler forms of expressions which in their first beginnings belong to the earliest stage of language growth. There is still preserved in old saws a very primitive type of complex sentence which is verbless and conjunctionless and yet as complete in its expression as a modern complex sentence with its highly developed hypothetic form: 'Right or wrong — my country' = 'Whether the cause be right or wrong, I shall stand by my country.' 'Better dead!' (Galsworthy, The First and the Last, Scene III) = 'It would be better if he were dead!' 'Out of sight, out of mind' = 'If something is out of sight, it soon passes out of mind.' These sentences are forms of the old appositional type of expression described in 6 B a. Today there is usually a finite verb in every principal proposition and in every subordinate clause, and the latter is introduced by a conjunction, but in these old sentences there is no finite verb and no conjunction. The grammatical relations are made clear by simply placing one part of the sentence alongside of the other.

The particular forms of the old appositional type given above are not now common, but other forms of the old type of predication without a finite verb have become general favorites in the subordinate clause in the style of everyday practical life, where their vigor and simplicity have a strong appeal. Their great practical value was discovered centuries ago, so that now for a long time they have been developing into convenient terser types of easy expression alongside of the more intricate clause formations which we employ in more formal and exact language. While these simpler constructions are, in general, characteristic of colloquial speech, they are not at all confined to it. Their good qualities are appreciated in every style. A few of these constructions, as indicated on page 177, are more common in literary than in colloquial style, for their compact form often becomes desirable there in concise language. These simpler types of expression are treated in the following articles alongside of the fuller and more precise clause formations. They are given under the caption of abridgment in the various kinds of clauses treated below and are often
elsewhere spoken of as ‘abridged’ or ‘contracted’ forms. Although these abridged clauses are in their original form older than the fuller clause structures and hence in a historical sense cannot be said to be abridged from them, the terms ‘abridged’ or ‘contracted’ are not inappropriate, for the more compact structures have long been intimately associated with the fuller, more involved structures, and in contrast to their fuller form are now felt as abridgments or contractions.

English has gone much farther than the other Germanic languages in preserving these old forms and developing them into types of expression capable of wide use. Particularly terse is the predicate appositive participial construction, where the participle and its modifiers form an abridged clause in which the participle is the logical predicate, and the subject of the principal proposition is the logical subject, the clause as a whole indicating some adverbial relation, as time, cause, manner, etc., which can be determined only from the connection, since this relation is not formally expressed in the clause itself: ‘Going down town (= when I was going down town), I met an old friend.’ ‘Having finished my work (= after I had finished my work), I went to bed.’ ‘Being sick (= as I was sick), I stayed at home.’ This is the old appositional type of clause described in 6 B a. The thought is not expressed accurately by means of intricate grammatical form, but is merely suggested by associating the participle with the subject of the principal proposition. Compare 48 2 (5th par.).

Two or more participial clauses can be coördinated, linked by coördinating conjunctions or unlinked, but one of them cannot now, as sometimes in older English, be replaced by a clause with a finite verb: ‘I haue reade of Themistocles, which (now who) hauing offended Philip, the king of Macedonia, and could no way (now being in no way able to) appease his anger, meeting his young sonne Alexander, tooke him in his armes’ (John Lyly, Euphues and Atheos, Works, I, p. 303, A.D. 1580).

Sometimes the conjunction employed in the full subordinate clause is used also in the abridged participial clause to indicate more clearly the different adverbial relations, such as time, place, cause, concession, condition, restriction — an improvement introduced in the sixteenth century: (concession) ‘For lovers’ hours are long, though seeming short’ (Shakespeare, Venus and Adonis, 842). (concession) ‘One hears now and then of a serious-minded Eastern girl who, though having grown up in the Eastern tradition, distrusts the preponderantly feminine atmosphere of the woman’s college that has been chosen for her’ (Olivia Howard Dunbar in
A more accurate form of the old appositional type of clause is the gerundial construction. Often a preceding preposition indicates clearly the relation to the principal proposition: 'I am opposed to John's going to their house.' 'I was mortified by her (or Mary's) treating him so unkindly.' The predicate of the clause is the verbal noun, the gerund. The gerund without verbal endings of any kind becomes a full verbal predicate, though in fact a noun, by merely being placed as a noun alongside of its dependent possessive adjective, or its dependent noun in the genitive, or now often, as explained in 50 3, a dependent noun in the accusative, which serves as its logical subject. The preposition which precedes the abridged clause is the sign of subordination to the principal proposition. If the subject of the gerund is the same as that of the principal verb it is not expressed: 'I am fond of doing this.' Likewise if the subject is general or indefinite: 'There is a strong feeling in the ward against making him alderman again.' In older English, the subject of the gerund was often expressed even though it was the same as that of the principal verb: 'Since her (now suppressed) being at Lambton, she had heard that Miss Darcy was exceedingly proud' (Jane Austen, Pride and Prejudice, III, Ch. II). Also elsewhere the gerundial construction is a clear, accurate type of expression. As subject the gerundial clause precedes the principal verb; as object it follows the verb, so that the grammatical relations are always easily discernible. The gerund, as we use it today, is one of the tersest and most convenient constructions in the language and little by little has come into wide use. An outline of its present extensive functions is given in 50 3.

Verbal nouns often form with the genitive a clause of the appositional type: 'After the king's death (= after the king died) many changes were made in the government.' 'You can easily observe the decline of his mental power' (= that his mental power
is declining). Here the genitive is the subject of the clause, and the verbal noun is the predicate. The subject of the clause is often implied in a noun or pronoun in the principal proposition: ‘After the loss of his fortune (= after he lost his fortune) he had to change his manner of living.’ This type is chiefly literary.

Abstract nouns often form with a genitive a clause of the appositional type: ‘I recognize the man’s ability’ (= that the man is able). ‘I question the truth of the statement’ (= whether the statement is true). Here the genitive is the subject of the clause, and the abstract noun is the predicate with the force of a predicate adjective. Chiefly literary.

A widely used appositional type of clause is the infinitive construction. The infinitive without verbal endings of any kind becomes a full verbal predicate, though originally a noun, by merely being associated with some noun or pronoun near it: ‘I hope to finish the work this evening’ = ‘I hope that I may finish the work this evening.’ The subject of the infinitive to finish is implied in I, the subject of the principal proposition. A brief history of the development of the infinitive construction into a convenient new type of subordinate clause is given in 49 2 a. Also the form of the subject of the infinitive is discussed there. An outline of the present extensive use of the infinitive is given in 49 4.

Another form of the appositional type of clause is the absolute nominative construction described in 17 3 A, B, C, D.

Not unlike the preceding forms of the appositional type of clause is the use of a prepositional phrase as a clause: ‘He put on his socks with the wrong side out’ (= so that the wrong side was out). ‘Even with conditions unfavorable (= even though the conditions were unfavorable) he would succeed.’ ‘He said it with tears in his eyes’ (= at the same time that tears were in his eyes). The first noun in each prepositional phrase is the subject of the abridged clause; the adverb, adjective, or prepositional phrase after the subject is the predicate; and the introductory preposition is the sign of subordination to the principal verb.

The old objective predicate construction described in 15 III 2 and 15 III 2 A is still a widely used form of the appositional type of clause: ‘He got the machine to running.’ = ‘He got the machine so that it ran.’ ‘She boiled the egg hard.’ = ‘She boiled the egg that it became hard.’ ‘The President made him a general.’ = ‘The President disposed so that he became a general.’ Here the object of the principal verb serves also as the subject of the subordinate clause. The predicate of the clause is a prepositional phrase, an adjective, a participle, or a noun. Compare 28 5 d.
ELLiptical clauses are elliptical clauses, which have the same structure as full clauses, only that the finite verb is suppressed: 'She is regarded more highly than he [is regarded].’ In an abridged clause there is nothing suppressed that belongs to its structure.
21. **Conjunctions.** The subject clause is usually introduced by: *that*, in popular speech often replaced by *as* (27 2, 2nd par.); sometimes *because* or in older English *for that* instead of *that* when the subject clause contains a reason for an act or a state of things; *lest*, after nouns expressing fear, sometimes still as in older English used instead of *that*; after verbs of saying, telling, relating sometimes *how* instead of *that*; *but*, *but that*, or in colloquial speech *but what*, instead of the more common *that* after *not improbable, not impossible, cannot be doubted*; in older English *but, but that* after *it is odds (= the chances are)*, now usually *that*; *since, before, till*, see p. 190; the indefinite relative (23 II 1, 2, 3) pronouns *who* (in older English also *who that*), *that, as* (= *who*), *who(so)ever, whoso* (in older English), *what* (in older English also *what that*), *what(so)ever, whatso* (in older English), *which, whichever*; the indefinite relative adjectives *which, what, whichever, whatever*; the indefinite relative adverbs *where, when, whither* (in a choice literary style, usually replaced by *where*, or often, especially in England, the more accurate *where . . . to*), *whence* (in a choice literary style, usually replaced by *where . . . from, from where*, or sometimes *from whence*), *why* (in older English also *why that*), *how* (in older English also *how that*), *whether* (originally a pronoun meaning *which of the two*) or *if; whether — or whether; whether — or*, used when the second member has its subject, or its verb, or both, suppressed; in indirect questions introduced by interrogative pronouns, adjectives, and adverbs, *who, which, what, where, when, whither, whence, why, how*; in indirect exclamations introduced by *what a, how*.

In substantive clauses — subject, object, and attributive substantive clauses (23 I) — indirect questions are a common feature.
Attention is called here to the examples of indirect questions given below and in 23 I and 24 III, since their true nature has often been misunderstood and false impressions have been spread by the common definition that 'an indirect question is a substantive clause introduced by an interrogative word.' By 'interrogative word' most grammarians mean the who, which, what, where, when, why, how, or whether which stands in a substantive clause. These words are a very old class of indefinites which have come down to our time with their original force unimpaired in principal propositions and substantive clauses. As pure indefinites they are still widely used to introduce a substantive clause: 'It is not known who did it, when he did it, how he did it.' They are here called indefinite relative (i.e., conjunctive) pronouns or adverbs. They are interrogatives only when they call for an answer directly or indirectly. Direct question: 'Who did it?' An indirect question is an indirect way of asking a question, as in 'Tell me who did it,' or an indirect report of a question, as in 'I asked who did it.' These forms never cease being indefinites. Their use as interrogatives in direct and indirect questions is only a special function which they often perform. In countless expressions, however, these words, who, what, when, etc., are not interrogatives and have not developed out of interrogatives, as is so often claimed. For instance, in a sentence like 'I saw plainly who struck him' who indicates that the identity of the person doing the striking was known to the speaker but unknown to the hearer, so that it contains an element of indefiniteness and is properly called an indefinite. It is surely not an interrogative, as so often claimed, for there isn't here the slightest suggestion of an interrogation. Similarly, the conjunctions whether and if, often used to introduce an indirect question, are also frequently employed merely to indicate indefiniteness, doubt, uncertainty as to the occurrence of an act: Indirect question: 'I asked him whether (or if) he had seen it.' Mere indefiniteness, uncertainty: 'I do not know whether (or if) he has seen it.' 'He has not yet said whether (or if) he will do it.' 'I'll go see whether (or if) he has returned.' Compare 23 I.

The idea of indefiniteness is also closely associated with interrogative form of any kind and is often the chief element in it, so that we often in deliberative and speculative (23 II 1, last par.) questions employ interrogative form merely to express indefiniteness, doubt, without any thought of eliciting an answer: 'Have I a right to do this?' (deliberative question). 'Is he lying or telling the truth?' (speculative question). Hence, instead of the usual form of a substantive clause introduced by an indefinite we often employ interrogative form: 'The thing I want to know is what
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(relative) I can do to improve my health,' or more graphically in the form of a deliberative question, What can I do to improve my condition? or more simply in the form of a noun, a means of improving my health. 'The thing I want to know is what (relative) the cause of the disturbance really is;' or more graphically in the form of a speculative question, What is really the cause of the disturbance? Similarly, instead of a clause introduced by the indefinite whether or if we sometimes employ interrogative form: 'She cast about among her little ornaments to see could she sell any to procure the desired novelties;' instead of whether (or if) she could sell any, etc. Often in popular Irish English: 'I stood outside, wondering would I have a right to walk in and see you, Pegeen Mike' (J. M. Synge, The Playboy of the Western World, Act I), instead of whether (or if) I had a right, etc. 'Leave your hand off me and open the room door, and you will see am I telling you any lie' (Lady Gregory, McDonough's Wife), instead of whether (or if) I am telling you any lie. Compare 24 III c. We often speak the clause introduced by the indefinite if or whether with rising intonation, thus combining the indefinite with question form to emphasize the idea of indefiniteness: 'He says I secretly do believe, but that I am perverse and fight against my convictions. I wonder if I do?' (Robert Hichens, Mrs. Marden, Ch. V).

In substantive clauses indefinites and interrogatives both have relative (i.e., conjunctive) force, serving as indefinite relatives and interrogative relatives, but for convenience the two groups are here distinguished as relatives and interrogatives. Relatives: 'It is not known who did it, when he did it, how he did it, whether (or if) he did it.' Interrogatives: 'I asked him who did it, when he did it, how he did it, whether (or if) he did it.' The interrogatives introduce indirect questions.

The subject clause usually has declarative form, but sometimes it appears in the form of a command or a question: 'Our thought has been "Let every man look out for himself"' (Woodrow Wilson, March 4, 1913). Examples of question form are given above and on page 185.

Examples of Subject Clauses:

'It is best that he go' (or more commonly that he should go), but originally 'The best (predicate) is that: he should go,' where that is subject, a determinative (56 A) pointing to the following explanatory appositional clause.

It would seem — to look at the man as he sat there — that he had grown old before his time (Mrs. Wood, East Lynne, I, Ch. I).

That he was in error will scarcely be disputed by his warmest friends.
It's only natural as (popular form for that) I shudn't git things clear at fust, seeing as you've kept me in the dark this two month (Sheila Kaye-Smith, *Green Apple Harvest*, p. 49).

The occasion (of his discontent) was, because he had bound himself for divers years and saw that, if he had been at liberty, he might have had greater wages (Winthrop, *Journal*, Aug. 6, 1633).

The deputy would not suffer them to come, neither did [he] acquaint the governor with the cause, which was, for that Salem and Sagus had not brought in money for their parts (ib., Nov., 1633).

The reason why I was alone in the mountains on this occasion was because, for the only time in all my experience, I had a difficulty with my guide (Theodore Roosevelt, *An Autobiography*, Ch. II).

My only terror was lest my father should follow me (George Eliot, *Daniel Deronda*, I, III, Ch. XX).

'Tis told how (= that) the good squire gives never less than gold.

It is not impossible that (or now less commonly but, but that, or but what) I may alter the complexion of my play.

It could not be doubted that (or now less commonly but, but that, or but what) his life would be aimed at.

It is odds when he spits but that (now usually simple that) all his teeth flie in thy face (John Lyly, *Midas*, III, II, 70, A.D. 1592).

It is odds but (now usually that) you touch somebody or other's sore place (Chesterfield, *Letters*, II, CLVII, 116, A.D. 1748).

'Tis is odds that he will do it' (Oxford Pocket Dictionary), now usually 'The odds are that he will do it.'

As in the last seven examples, it often points forward to the following subject clause in both declarative and interrogative sentences, but in questions which of the two, or in older English whether (as in Matthew, IX, 5), points forward if the reference is to two clauses: 'Which of the two is more probable, that he will come himself, or that he will send a substitute?'

Although that, or its substitutes how, or but, or but that are the most common conjunctions, the other connectives are not infrequent: *Who* (relative pronoun) goes light travels fast' (proverb).

*Who* (or now more commonly he who, or in colloquial speech still more commonly a man, fellow, woman who) does a thing like that cannot be trusted.

Is there who (more commonly any one who) 'mid these awful wilds has . . . heard . . . Soft music? etc. (Wordsworth, *Descriptive Sketches*, 340).

'Whom' (now more commonly those) the gods love die young,' and in older English after this model 'When him (instead of he whom) we serve's away' (Shakespeare).

It is he that (or who) did it.

It is he that I am so anxious about (or about whom I am so anxious).

'Handsome is that (= he who; see 23 II 10 a, last par.) handsome does' (proverb), or sometimes here the relative pronoun as instead of that: 'Handsome is as handsome does' (De Morgan, *Somehow Good*, Ch. VI).
There are *that* (now *those that*, or *those who*) dare (Shakespeare, *Henry the Eighth*, V, i, 40).

‘The question I want to ask is, *Who* (interrogative) *is he?*’ (direct question), or in the form of an indirect question *who he is*.

‘The great mystery now is, *who* (relative) *is he,*’ or more graphically in the form of a speculative question, *Who is he?*

It is not known *who* (relative) *he is*.  
*Whoever* (relative) calls must be admitted.  
It is not yet known *what* (relative) *they did.*  
It has often been asked *what* (interrogative) *I meant* (indirect question).

*What* (plural relative) *have often been censured as Shakespeare’s conceits* are completely justifiable (Coleridge).

*What he says* goes.  
*Whatever* (relative) *he talks on will prove interesting.*

‘*Which course we are to take* will be announced soon,’ but where the thought is more indefinite we say ‘*What (or whatever) changes we make in our plans will be announced later,*’ or a little more definitely, ‘*Which ever of these three plans he approves will be the one we adopt*’ (relatives).

‘It is not yet known *which*, or *what* (relatives), *road he took,*’ or ‘*which (relative) of the roads he took.*’ ‘*It has often been asked which, or what (interrogatives), road he took,*’ or ‘*which (interrogative) of the roads he took.*’

*Where* (relative adverb) *he is weakest is in his facts* (Concise Oxford Dictionary).

‘*It is immaterial where or when* (relatives) *he goes,*’ but when the relative adverb becomes quite emphatic, the subject clause comes to the front, so that the relative adverb may stand at the beginning of the sentence, and the anticipatory *it,* of course, drops out: ‘*Well, where that rolling-pin’s got to is a mystery*’ (Compton Mackenzie, *The Altar Steps*, Ch. III).

*It has often been asked where and when (interrogatives) he went.*

‘*The most important question (or thing that concerns us) now is when (relative) he will return,*’ or more graphically in the form of a speculative question (23 II 1, last par.), *When will he return?*

*It was a bond of union when I learned that he was friendless as I* (Doyle, *The Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes*, p. 156).

*It is not known where (relative) he came from.*

*It has often been asked where (interrogative) he came from.*

*It is immaterial why (relative) he did it.*

*It has often been asked why (interrogative) he did it.*

*It could easily be seen how (relative) he did it.*

*Is that how (relative) you look at it?*

*It has often been asked how (interrogative) he did it.*

*It is doubtful whether, or if (relatives), he is coming.*

The first question I put to him was *whether, or if (interrogatives), he would do it* (indirect question).

*It is immaterial whether (relative) he comes himself, or whether he sends a substitute (or whether he comes himself or sends a substitute).*
It has often been asked whether (interrogative) he will come himself, or whether he will send a substitute.

It is not known whether (relative) he did it or not.

It occurred to me what a nice stroke of business it would be to offer my services to them (Cassel's Magazine, May, 1894, p. 425).

How strong is the hold which universities and public schools together have upon the English mind, to what an extent their influences dominate the men who in turn are entrusted with the administration of the country, may be judged by the following estimate (Escott, England).

The subject clause is sometimes complex, i.e., consists of a principal and a subordinate clause, the one being embedded in the other: 'What the South wants above all things is just what General Grant says let us have, and that is peace' (Henry Watterson, Editorial, Nov. 9, 1868). Here the principal clause of the subject clause, General Grant says, is embedded in the subordinate clause.

a. OMISSION OF 'THAT.' As in the original paratactic (193) construction, that is still often omitted: 'It was natural they should like each other.' 'There are, it seems, few people present who are interested in this subject.' 'It is to be hoped nothing serious has happened.' The omission of that always takes place when the principal clause is embedded in the subject clause, as in the second example. Elsewhere, however, the that should not be omitted if it is needed to keep the thought clear, i.e., to indicate the oneness of the words in the subject clause and to maintain the integrity of the group as a distinct grammatical element in contradistinction to other elements in the sentence. It is especially needed when the clause stands in the first place, but it is also often useful elsewhere.

b. POSITION AND STRESS. If a predicate noun or adjective is emphatic it is often placed near the beginning of the sentence after anticipatory it, is stressed, and pronounced with falling intonation — here indicated by a period — while the subject clause stands at the end: ‘It is at least a probability., or probable., that he will come tomorrow.’ If the subject clause is emphatic it stands at the end, while the predicate — word or clause — is in the first place, is unstressed, and is followed by the verb, which is spoken with rising intonation — here indicated by a raised period: ‘The probability is that he will come tomorrow.’ ‘The fact is he has already come.’ ‘As she sat down she took up her yarn and needles. It was a sweater, I think. What matters is that her hands moved swiftly and deftly’ (Meredith Nicholson, Lady Larkspur, Ch. II, p. 56. The emphasis upon the subject clause — the full or the abridged clause — is in writing often indicated by setting the clause
off by a comma or a colon: 'It seems to me the idea of our civilization, underlying all American life, is, _that men do not need any guardian_ '(Wendell Phillips, _Harper's Ferry_ ). 'Something must be done to relieve congestion. That something is: _widening the gates_ ' (Editorial in _Chicago Tribune_, Feb. 27, 1925).

The unemphatic predicate here is often situation _it_ (7 C, last par.): 'The queer part of it was that Miss Waters didn't seem to be really mean. _It_ (= the cause of her trouble-making) was just that she couldn't mind her own business' (Fannie Kilbourne in _American Magazine_, Sept., 1925). 'He used to grumble at his ill-luck and his small bag. _It_ (= the cause of his ill-luck) was not that he lacked skill with his gun. He was a good shot, but he absolutely disregarded caution in stalking' (Ernest Brooks in _McClure's Magazine_, Sept., 1925).

There is often an anticipatory _this_, which is spoken with rising intonation, thus pointing forward to the following subject clause, which is then usually without a conjunction: 'But the purpose of this epistle is this': mother's having a few people in for dinner before we go over to Lovell's dance; will you come?' (Edwin Balmer, _The Breath of Scandal_, Ch. I, p. 6). 'Of course you can see something has happened. It's this' — Captain Orwyn has been killed in the war' (Robert Hichens, _Mrs. Marden_, Ch. IX).

**c. EMPHASIS AND ATTRACTION.** In accordance with the principle described in 4 II C, we can make any noun or pronoun in a sentence emphatic by making it formally the predicate of a sentence introduced by anticipatory _it_. Of course, also a subject can in this way be made emphatic: Instead of 'I am not marvelous. You are marvelous' we may say: 'It's not I that am (instead of the correct _is_ ) marvelous. It's you that are (instead of the correct _is_ ) marvelous' (Arnold Bennett, _Sacred and Profane Love_, Act I). The correct third person occurs sometimes: 'It is not I that does it' (Cameron Mackenzie, _Mr. and Mrs. Pierce_, Ch. III). 'Is it you that's going to be married, or is it Edith?' (Shaw, _The Doctor's Dilemma_, 229). '"Tisn't I that wants to spoil your home' (Galsworthy, quoted from Jespersen's _Modern English Grammar_, III, 90, where there are other examples). The correct third person was employed by Chaucer, and has long been in limited use: 'It am I that loveth so hote (hotly) Emelye the brighte' (_The Knightes Tale_, 878). As in the example from Bennett, a peculiar attraction now usually takes place when the subject or object of the subordinate clause represents the same person or thing as the predicate noun or pronoun of the principal proposition. The emphatic subject of the principal proposition here becomes formally an emphatic predicate, and the subordinate
clause, which is really a subject clause, is construed as an attributive relative clause, so that only such relative pronouns can be used here as are used in the attributive relative clause; and the verb, if the relative is subject, must agree in person and number with the false antecedent, the predicate of the principal proposition. Similarly, ‘It is his searching questions that (or which) confuse me,’ instead of the correct what confuse me. If there are a positive and a negative antecedent, the verb usually agrees with the positive form: ‘It is you, not I, who are afraid to pursue this subject further’ (Willa Cather, A Gold Slipper).

In questions, of course, the emphatic predicate here stands in the first place wherever it is an interrogative pronoun or adverb: ‘Whó is it that needs me?’ ‘Whén is it that you need me?’

In Old English, a determinative (56 A) often stood in such sentences before the subject clause, pointing to it: ‘Hwæt is se þe þe sloh?’ (Matthew, XXVI, 68, A.D. 1000); literally, ‘Who is that one there: [he] struck you?’ In the King James Version the English form of this passage is: ‘Who is he that smote you?’ Here he corresponds closely to Old English se. It is not a personal pronoun, but a determinative serving as an anticipatory subject, pointing to the following subject clause. This anticipatory subject indicates the sex. This type of expression is now little used where it is simply desired to identify. In Old English, there was another type of expression. The anticipatory subject was a neuter form, and the subject of the subject clause was suppressed: ‘Hwa is past þe slog?’ (Rushworth MS.) = ‘Who was that struck you?’ As can be seen by the translation, this old type of expression is still common in our colloquial language. We now use the old neuter that or the modern it in interrogative form, but regularly it in declarative form: ‘Who was that just came in?’ ‘What’s that you say?’ (Cameron Mackenzie, Mr. and Mrs. Pierce, Ch. VIII). ‘Who was it told you that?’ (A. Marshall, Watermeads, Ch. II). ‘What is it moves this body?’ (Alfred Noyes, The Torch-Bearers, p. 240). ‘It was this infernal fellow completely upset me’ (Meredith, Rhoda Fleming, Ch. XXI). ‘Prothero (name) had first set him doubting, but it was Benham’s own temperament took him on to denial’ (H. G. Wells, The Research Magnificent, Ch. III). ‘But that is not it (now it is not that) I intend to speak of here’ (Hobbes, Leviathan, II, XXVI, 137, A.D. 1651). When the predicate of the principal proposition is a pronoun in the first or second person, the verb of the subject clause is usually attracted into the person and the number of the predicate pronoun, as in the examples in the first paragraph, where the relative pronoun is expressed: ‘No, ’tis you dream’ (Dryden, All for Love, I, i, 335,
A.D. 1678). ‘Tis thou hast dragged My soul, just rising, down again to Earth’ (Thomas Godfrey, The Prince of Parthia, II, VI, A.D. 1675). The correct third person has long been in limited use: ‘Tis I, sir, needs a good one’ (Middleton-Rowley, The Spanish Gipsie, III, ii, 124, A.D. 1661). It has even become common in popular Irish English: ‘Is it yourself has brought the water?’ (Synge, The Well of the Saints, Act I). ‘Is it you is Mary Doul?’ (ib.). ‘Isn’t it yourself is after playing lies on me?’ (ib.).

In the literary language the subject of the subject clause is now usually expressed in this type: ‘Who was it just went out?’ or in literary form ‘Who was it that (or who) just went out?’ ‘What was it that caused the disturbance?’ ‘What was it which Wulf had recognized in Hypatia which had bowed the old warrior before her?’ (Kingsley, Hypatia, p. 193). ‘Assuredly it was a daring thing which she meant to do’ (Marion Crawford, Katherine Lauderdale, I, Ch. VI). ‘It was my two brothers that (or who) were hurt.’ We thus often use it even where we point to persons, provided the desire is to identify, as in the last example; but when the desire is to describe, we may say with Shakespeare ‘It is a good divine that follows his own instructions’ (Merchant of Venice, I, ii, 15); or more commonly we replace it here by a personal pronoun that indicates gender and number: ‘He is a good divine who follows his own instructions.’

The emphatic subject that has become a formal predicate for sake of emphasis is often modified by a relative clause, so that there are two relative clauses, the first a real relative clause, the second in reality a subject clause: ‘It is only women who live alone that can know what it is to yearn to have a man’s strong arm.’

The predicate noun may be made emphatic in the same way as the emphatic subject: ‘What you see yonder is my new house,’ or ‘It is my new house that you see yonder.’ Here, as in case of an emphatic subject, the subject clause assumes the form of a relative clause. Compare 4 II C and 22 a.

Also dative and prepositional objects and adverbial elements may be made emphatic in this way, but here the subject clause has the regular form of a subject clause introduced by the conjunction that, or without a conjunction: ‘It was to you that I gave it,’ not ‘It was to you to whom I gave it,’ as we sometimes hear and read; but where the predicate is a nominative ‘It was you that (relative pronoun) I gave it to’ (or to whom I gave it). ‘It is to you [that] he objects’ (Henry James, The Wings of the Dove, Book II, Ch. I). ‘It is upon you that I depend.’ ‘It was then that the unexpected turn in our affairs came,’ or to emphasize the subject of the
clause: ‘It was then [that] came the unexpected turn in our affairs.’ ‘Twas then [that] came horror, as to the House of Mirth, again’ (William E. Leonard, Two Lives, p. 32). ‘It wasn’t this morning, it was yesterday that I saw him.’ ‘It was with great difficulty that I got him to come along.’ ‘It was when I was a mere lad that I first met her.’ ‘Where is it [that] mothers learn their love?’ (John Keble). Instead of using that in the subject clause, as in these examples, we use since and before in sentences containing an adverbial element indicating duration of time: ‘It is (or has been) a long time since I have seen him’ = ‘I haven’t seen him for a long time.’ ‘It is (or has been) many months since I have seen him.’ ‘It will be weeks before his disappearance will attract attention’ = ‘His disappearance will not attract attention for weeks.’ That is often employed here instead of since, usually differentiated in meaning from it; the clause introduced by since indicating that the action is past, the clause introduced by that indicating that the action is still continuing: ‘It is now four years since I have studied this question,’ but ‘It is now four years that I have studied (or have been studying) this question.’ ‘It is now four years that I have meditated this work’ (Byron, Marino Faliero, Preface). In connection with ago, however, that indicates a point of time in the past: ‘It was four years ago that he died.’ ‘It is now four years since (simple since, not ago since, as is often spoken and written) he died’ calls attention to a period of time. In older English, the subject clause was sometimes introduced by till or until instead of before: ‘It was not long till (in England now usually before) he set about turning this new knowledge to account’ (Carlyle, Schiller). In the Oxford Dictionary this usage is represented as now confined, in England, to dialect, but to many Americans till is still a common form, often used alongside of before. Not only adverbs and adverbial phrases may thus be stressed but also adverbial clauses, as illustrated in 22 a.

d. Repeated Subject. Sometimes still, as in older usage, there stands in the principal proposition when it is preceded by the subject clause a personal pronoun, which points to the preceding subject clause and in a word sums up its contents, thus binding the two propositions more firmly together: ‘Whoever calls, he must be admitted.’ Today the subject clause by reason of its distinctive form is so clearly felt as such that it is usually not considered necessary to indicate this relation by the use of a personal pronoun in the nominative pointing back to it. Where, however, an emphatic compound subject, consisting of two or more full or abridged clauses, introduces the sentence, it is customary to place a that at the beginning of the principal proposition to point back
to the preceding compound subject: ‘To know how others stand, that we may know how we ourselves stand; to know how we ourselves stand, that we may correct our mistakes and achieve our deliverance — that is our problem’ (Matthew Arnold, The Modern Element).

e. ABRIDGMENT OF SUBJECT CLAUSE. This clause can be abridged to an infinitive clause with to when there is some word in the principal proposition which can serve as the subject of the infinitive or can indicate it: ‘It is stupid of you to say it.’ The subject is often implied in a preceding possessive adjective: ‘It is my earnest desire to do it.’ ‘My way is to act and let others do the talking.’ Provided the context makes the reference clear, the infinitive can be employed even though there is no word in the principal proposition that can serve as its subject: ‘The great difficulty [for us] now is how, or when, or where, to cross the river.’

The infinitive with to can be used also when the subject of the clause is general or indefinite, in which case the subject is usually understood: ‘It is wise to be cautious.’

When the infinitive has a subject of its own, we introduce the clause by for . . . to, putting the subject into the accusative and placing it between for and to: ‘For me to back out now would be to acknowledge that I am afraid.’ ‘All that I want is for somebody to be thinking about me’ (Arnold Bennett, The Glimpse). To emphasize the subject of the infinitive we often withhold it for a time, placing it after the infinitive and inserting a formal anticipatory subject, there (4 II C), after for: ‘It is impossible for there ever to be a conflict between our two countries.’

The to-infinitive is old, but it was long limited in its development since it could only be used when there was some word in the principal proposition which could serve as its subject, or when its subject was general or indefinite, as described above. Its compact convenient form, however, won it favor, so that in the fourteenth century there arose a desire to extend its boundaries, i.e., to use it with a subject of its own if there was no word in the principal proposition to serve as its subject: ‘It is no maystrye for a lord To dampne a man withoute answere or word’ (Chaucer, The Legend of Good Women, 400) = ‘It is no great feat for a lord to condemn a man without answer or word.’ The for + noun here represents an older simple dative of reference, which, as illustrated in 12 1 B a, is still sometimes used. This group of words with the force of the old simple dative of reference is still widely employed: ‘It was hard for me to understand him.’

Closely related to this dative is the dative of interest, which was likewise a simple form in Old English, and is even sometimes
still used in its simple form, as illustrated in 12 1 B b. In its modern form with for + accusative the dative of interest was common with Chaucer and is still much used: 'It is bet for me To sleen myself than been defouled thus' (The Frankelyns Tale, 693) = 'It is better for me to slay myself than to be violated thus.' Both the dative of reference and the dative of interest are sentence datives and modify the whole sentence, but there is always here a logical relation between the dative and the following infinitive, so that the dative is often felt as the subject of the infinitive. This led in Chaucer's time to the use of the modern dative, i.e., for + accusative, as the subject of the infinitive. The for + noun in the quotations from Chaucer is still near a real dative, but gradually the use of this form became freer, so that in time it became common to use for + noun or pronoun as the subject of an infinitive when there was no word in the principal proposition which could serve as its subject.

Alongside of the infinitive with for . . . to there thrived in this early period and for centuries afterwards a competing construction, the to-infinitive with an absolute accusative as subject: 'Thanne (then) schal y (I) haue al that [it] is necessarie me to knowe' (Pecock, The Donet, p. 93, A.D. 1449). This construction arose under Latin influence, and followed the Latin quite closely: 'Forsothe it is lister heuene and erthe to passe' (Luke, XVI, 17, Purvey's ed., A.D. 1388), corresponding to the Latin version, 'Facilius est autem coelum et terram praeterire,' later replaced by 'It is easier for heaven and earth to pass' (King James Version). This construction was used not only by scholars, but not infrequently also by literary men: 'It is a greet folye a womman to haue a fair array outward and in herself [been] foul inward' (Chaucer, The Persouns Tale, 935). The simple accusative here has disappeared from the literary language. An accusative is found here in popular speech, but it is of quite different origin, resulting from the popular tendency to employ the accusative instead of the nominative, which, as described in the next paragraph, was once common here: 'I felt as if it was a great compliment him (for he) to come in friendly like and take a chair and talk to you and me' (M. O. W. Oliphant, The Second Son).

As the absolute accusative that arose under Latin influence was foreign to native English expression, it was replaced in early Modern English by the more familiar absolute nominative (17 3 B): 'I to bear this is some burden' (Shakespeare, Timon of Athens, IV, iii, 266), now 'For me to bear this is some burden.' This construction has been supplanted in the literary language by the competing construction of the infinitive with for . . . to
described on page 191, but it survives in popular speech. It is especially common in popular Irish English: ‘[it is] A great wonder he not to have come and this the fair day of Galway’ (Lady Gregory, McDonough’s Wife). This construction was carried to Ireland by British colonists in the seventeenth century, where it easily became established in Irish English, as it corresponded closely to Gaelic expression.

There is another infinitive construction with for to of entirely different origin, which first appeared in Old English, as described in 33 2. The to of the infinitive originally indicated purpose or end. As in the course of time to had lost much of its original concrete force, for, with the same meaning, was placed before the to to bring out more clearly in purpose clauses the idea of purpose or end. But early in the thirteenth century the new double form for to met the fate of simple to, i.e., lost its concrete force, so that from this time on it was long used alongside of to without the slightest differentiation as a mere parallel form in all the categories in which simple to could be used, i.e., in subject clauses, object clauses, etc.: ‘And of swich thing were goodly for to telle’ (Chaucer, Prologue of The Nonne Preestes Tale, 13), now ‘It would be pleasant to telle such a thing.’ As this old use of for to instead of simple to had nothing whatever to recommend it and was even of positive harm since there was another for to with different function, as described on page 191, it gradually in course of centuries disappeared from the literary language. It lives on, however, in popular speech: ‘It’s not manners for t’help oursel’s’ (Mrs. Gaskell, Sylvia’s Lovers, Ch. XXVI).

The simple infinitive was often used here in older English. See 4 d, p. 5. This older literary usage is still common in Irish English: ‘It is best for you give in to their say’ (Lady Gregory, McDonough’s Wife). Often also in all parts of the English-speaking territory in colloquial speech: ‘All she has to do is come here’ (George Ade, Hand-Made Fables, p. 19). In many cases, however, the simple infinitive is retained, since it is felt and interpreted as an imperative. See 4 d, p. 5, for examples.

As in b (2nd par.) the sentence is sometimes introduced by an unemphatic predicate, situation it (7 C, last par.). The to of the infinitive is in colloquial speech usually suppressed: ‘I was no match for him, It (= the thing to do) was just dodge an’ run for me’ (Amy Lowell, Selected Poems, p. 180). This form is often felt as an imperative, as can be seen by the punctuation: ‘It’s tramp! tramp! tramp! I’ve covered more mileage than th’ mailman looking for the lady in black’ (Harold Teen Cartoon in Chicago Tribune, Feb. 19, 1929).
The infinitive construction is often replaced by the gerund: ‘To have done one’s duty (or Having done one’s duty) is a great consolation in misfortune.’ ‘To live near a large town (or Living near a large town) is an advantage for a farmer.’ The sentence here is often introduced by an anticipatory it, pointing forward to the real subject standing at or near the end, which by being withheld for a time, creating suspense, becomes emphatic: ‘It is dangerous to play with explosives’ (or playing with explosives). ‘It is no use, or of no use, or useless, to say anything, or for me, or for you, or for Father, to say anything, or my, or your, or Father’s saying anything.’ ‘What use (or of what use) is it to say anything?’ ‘It was very strange for me getting a letter from him dated Had­dington’ (Jane Welsh Carlyle, Letter to Jeanie Welsh, Sept. 12, 1843) (or more commonly for me to get). ‘My daughter’s staying so late worries me,’ or ‘The staying of my daughter so late worries me.’ The noun predicate in such sentences can become subject without a change of meaning: ‘There is no use (or no good) (subject of sentence) in saying (or to say) anything’ instead of ‘It is no use (or no good) (predicate of sentence) saying (or to say) (subject) anything.’ The it and there constructions are often blended: ‘There is no use saying (or to say) anything.’ Compare 4 II C.

The regular subject clause with a conjunction followed by a nominative subject and a finite verb is often replaced by the old appositional type of clause described in 17 3 B, which here consists of a subject in the absolute nominative followed by a predicate in the form of an appositional adjective or participle: ‘Things going right is to me real poetry’ (or is to me poetical). ‘It’s not a bit of use you talking, I shan’t wear it again’ (Arnold Bennett, Old Wives’ Tale, II, Ch. II). ‘It was no use men being angry with them for damaging the links’ (London Times, 1913). In the last two examples the subject clause stands at the end for emphasis. Other examples in 17 3 B.

To make room for an emphatic predicate adjective, noun, or pronoun near the head of the sentence, this subject clause is often put at the end with an anticipatory subject it at the beginning: ‘It is vilely unjust, men closing two-thirds of the respectable careers to women’ (Sir Harry Johnston, Mrs. Warren’s Daughter, Ch. III). Often the subject of the participle is not expressed but merely implied in the emphatic predicate of the principal proposition: ‘I do not say these things for a dollar, or to fill up the time while I wait for a boat: it is you talking (= who are talking) just as much as myself — I act as the tongue of you’ (Walt Whitman, Leaves of Grass, p. 89). ‘It was always you
teasing me' (= who teased me) (Eleanor Carroll Chilton, *Shadows Waiting*, p. 57).

As in c, a subject clause here, such as in the first example in the second paragraph on page 194, may be converted into an emphatic predicate after it is: 'It is things going right that is poetical' (Chesterton, *The Man Who Was Thursday*, Ch. I).

In the case of impersonal expression the subject clause here as elsewhere has no real subject, only a mere formal subject *it*: 'It being Sunday complicates matters,' or in gerundial form 'Its being Sunday complicates matters.'
22. Conjunctions. The predicate clause performs the function of a predicate noun or adjective: ‘Serious trials are to the soul what storms are to the atmosphere’ (= purifying agents).

The predicate clause is introduced by who (= the man or boy, woman, etc.), what, why, as, where (a), when (a), before (a), after (a), because (a), that.

Examples:

‘He was not who (now more commonly the man) he seemed to be,’ but regularly in the accusative relation He was not the man I took him to be.

Reputation is what we seem; character is what we are.

We are not what we ought to be.

They looked what they were — the sisters, the wives, the mothers of strong men (Vachell, Quinneys’, 42).

And this is why I sojourn here (Keats, La Belle Dame Sans Merci, XII).

Things are not always as they seem to be.

That was where he failed (Oxford Dictionary).

That is where he lives.

Now is when I need him most.

‘This (or that) is what he meant.’ ‘Is that what he meant?’

That is what we agreed on.

That sometimes introduces a predicate clause which explains a determinative so that stands in the principal proposition: ‘Yet so it is, that people can bear any quality in the world better than beauty’ (Steele, Spectator).

There is sometimes a that in the principal proposition, pointing back as a demonstrative to a what in the preceding predicate clause, a survival of older usage when the propositions had more independent force than today and needed to be more closely linked by demonstratives in order that the relation between the members might be pointed out. The poet is fond of these older
more concrete forms of expression: 'What the leaves are to the forest, That to the world are children' (Longfellow). Compare 26 (2nd par. under Examples).

In all the preceding examples the predicate clause is a nominative clause, predicated of a subject; but as it can be predicated of an accusative object, it can be also an accusative clause: 'I found it to be what I wanted.'

In 8 1 1 c it has been shown how difficult it often is to determine whether the noun before the copula is the subject or the predicate complement. It is also often difficult to determine whether the clause before the copula is a subject or a predicate clause. The general rule for determining the grammatical relations given in 8 1 1 c will prove useful also here: 'What he said (subject clause) was a blessing to us all.' 'It matters little how a man dies. What matters (predicate clause) is how he lives.'

a. Position and Stress. Just as any noun, adverb, or adverbal phrase may become an emphatic predicate by being stressed and put into the first part of the sentence after it is, so may any clause become an emphatic predicate clause by being placed at the beginning after it is, followed immediately by the subject in the form of a that-clause: 'It was where we now stand that we parted.' 'It was when I was a mere lad that I first met her.' 'It was before her mother died that I first met her.' 'It was after her mother died that I first met her.' 'It was before her mother died that I first met her.' 'It is only because I regard it as absolutely necessary that I take such harsh measures.'

After a causal clause employed as an emphatic predicate, we sometimes instead of a subject clause employ an independent statement introduced by adversative but, since we desire to palliate the deed: 'I know it's because one is bad — but the minute one has to be grateful one isn't' (De Morgan, Joseph Vance, Ch. X). Compare 4 II C (6th par.) and 21 c.

The principal verb is stressed by putting it in an unusual position, especially by forming a predicate clause in which what is subject and the emphatic verb is predicate, in accordance with a principle observable elsewhere that a verb inclines more to stress in a subordinate than a principal proposition: 'Manners are what (plural) vex or sóothe, corrúpt or purify, ezált or débásé, bárbarize or refine us' (Burke). 'Truth is what húrts.' 'The factories are what (plural) blácken up the city so.' This form is also used to emphasize the subject, since it is a convenient device to put the subject in an unusual position: 'That is what I think' instead of 'I think that.' If, however, the emphatic subject is a thought it can be put into a that-clause and placed at the end of the sentence while an unemphatic predicate what-clause in-
troduces the proposition, followed by the verb spoken with rising intonation, here indicated by a raised period: 'What I am glad to hear is that he is fond of music.'

b. Complex Predicate Clause. The predicate clause is often complex, i.e., consists of a principal proposition and a subordinate clause, the one being often embedded in the other: 'But that is not what I sent for you to tell you' (Robert Hichens, Mrs. Marden, Ch. XII). Here the principal proposition of the complex predicate clause, *I sent for you*, is embedded in the subordinate clause.

c. Abridgment of Predicate Clause. We often use the gerundial construction instead of a predicate clause with a finite verb: 'That is hitting the nail on the head.' Prepositional predicate clauses are common: 'He seems about taking the step.' See 7 F, 50 4 c dd.
CHAPTER XIII

ATTRIBUTIVE ADJECTIVE CLAUSES

23. There are two classes — the attributive substantive clause and the attributive relative clause.

ATTRIBUTIVE SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSE
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23 I. An understanding of the nature of a direct and an indirect question is necessary to appreciate the form and meaning of some of the examples of this clause given below. A general description of the nature of an indirect question is presented in 21 and 23 II 1 (last par.). This subject is discussed also in 24 III. The attributive substantive clause is often a direct or an indirect question: ‘We hope you will answer in your next letter our oft repeated question, How did you accomplish it? (direct question), or how you accomplished it (indirect question). The forms employed to introduce direct and indirect questions in attributive substantive clauses are also used to introduce other attributive substantive clauses, namely, indefinite relative clauses, where there is not the slightest reference to a question or an answer, as in ‘His explanation of how (indefinite relative adverb) he accomplished it (indefinite relative clause) is very interesting.’ There is, however, a close relation between these interrogative and indefinite relative (21, 4th par.) forms. Both groups were originally indefinites and still retain their original meaning. An interrogative is an indefinite that assumes the additional function of asking information concerning indefinite relations. The interrogative, however, never ceases to be an indefinite. Indeed, we
often, instead of employing an indefinite relative, use the form of a question, although we do not expect an answer. Deliberative question (23 II 1, last par.): ‘What shall I say to him when he comes?’ Speculative question (23 II 1, last par.): ‘What could he have meant?’ On the other hand, the question often loses every trace of a desire for an answer, also every trace of indefiniteness, doubt, and becomes declarative, expressing the idea of an emphatic contrary assertion—a rhetorical question: ‘What’s the use of trying?’ = ‘There is no use in trying.’ Some questions, such as ‘What is the meaning of life?’ are either speculative or rhetorical. All the above shades of meaning appear in the attributive substantive clause: ‘Next comes the question what you want it for’ (indirect question) or in direct form, What do you want it for? ‘The question often comes up in my mind what he wanted it for’ (indirect speculative question), or in direct form, What did he want it for? ‘The question often comes up in my mind what I shall say to him when he comes’ (indirect deliberative question), or in direct form, What shall I say to him when he comes? ‘The question often comes up in my mind what the use is of trying’ (indirect rhetorical question), or in direct form, What’s the use of trying?

For the most part, attributive substantive clauses are appositional or genitive clauses, but a large number are prepositional.

A noun that modifies another noun or a pronoun is usually in the genitive, but if the modifier is a full clause the most common construction is the appositional, the clause lying alongside of the governing noun or pronoun as an appositive: ‘The hope of his recovery is faint,’ but ‘The hope that he may recover is faint.’ The genitive clause, however, is often used when the clause is introduced by exclamatory what a or an indefinite relative pronoun, adjective, or adverb. Objective genitive: ‘He soon gave proof of what a wonderful leader he was.’ ‘One evening of each week was set aside for the reception of who(so)ever chose to visit him.’ ‘I shall make note of whom copies are to be sent to,’ or of to whom copies are to be sent. ‘I am in favor of the purchase of whatever books you may need.’ ‘We can count on Father’s sanction of whichever course (or whichever of these courses) we may choose.’ ‘His description of how he did it is interesting.’ Partitive genitive: ‘This gave us a taste of what was to follow.’ Possessive genitive: ‘The force and clearness of what was said depended so much on how it was said.’ Appositive genitive: ‘We are not investigating the question (= subject) of whether he is trustworthy,’ or in the form of simple apposition whether he is trustworthy.

The prepositional clause is sometimes introduced by the
conjunction that preceded by a preposition and anticipatory it as its object: ‘There was no doubt about it that he took the money.’ Usually, however, prepositional clauses are introduced by an indefinite relative pronoun, adjective, or adverb: ‘I haven’t the least interest in what he is doing, in what views he holds.’ ‘I have little insight into what he is doing, into what motives are swaying him.’ ‘We have no definite information yet as to which route (or which of these routes) he will take.’ ‘Can you give me any information as to whether he will come, as to when he will come?’

Compare 10 IV a. The preposition is often omitted: ‘She had no idea [as to] why she thought of him thus suddenly,’ or ‘[as to] Why she thought of him thus suddenly she had no idea’ (Galsworthy, Freeland, Ch. VIII). ‘I am in doubt [as to] whether I should buy or sell.’

The appositional clause is introduced by different conjunctions, or is sometimes without such introduction, and can, moreover, be introduced by both interrogatives and indefinite relatives: ‘The thought that we shall live on after death in another better world consoles many.’ ‘I’d a feeling as (popular for literary that) maybe you cud give me,’ etc. (Sheila Kaye-Smith, Green Apple Harvest, p. 35). ‘There can be no question (or doubt) that (or sometimes but, or but that) she was lovely,’ or in the form of a prepositional clause, ‘There can be no doubt about it that she was lovely.’ ‘We ought to discuss carefully the vital question (or problem) whether (relative) we can do it or not,’ or more graphically in the form of a deliberative question, Can we do it? or more simply in the form of the appositive genitive of a noun, of our ability to do it. ‘I have often asked myself the question whether (interrogative) I have the right to do it’ (indirect deliberative question), or in direct form, Have I the right to do it? ‘We now come to the two main questions (or problems), what (relative) the cause of the disturbance is, and who (relative) the proper person would be to remove it,’ or more graphically in the form of a deliberative question, What is the cause of the disturbance, and who would be the proper person to remove it?” ‘But tell me one thing now: What was that awful shadow I saw?’ (Mark Twain, Joan of Arc, I, Ch. VII) (direct question). ‘I now put the question to you plainly, Will you come or not?’ (direct question). ‘I insisted on an answer to my question whether he was coming or not’ (indirect question). ‘I should like to say to you one important thing, You should go slow in this matter’ (polite command), or in stronger language, Go very slow in this matter! ‘I should like to say to him one important thing, he should go very slow in this matter’ (indirect polite command), or in stronger language, let him go very slow in this matter.
Appositional clauses, as can be seen by the examples on page 201, are for the most part introduced by conjunctions, especially the following: *that*; after the noun *fear* sometimes still, as in older English, *lest* instead of *that*; after *no doubt* usually *that*, or now less commonly *but that*, *but that*, or *but what*; as, in popular speech often replacing *that*; *whether*, now a conjunction, but in older English a pronoun = *which of the two*, as in Matthew, IX, 5.

The use of *lest* after the noun *fear*, and the use of *that*, *but that*, or *but what* after the noun *doubt*, and as *if* after the noun *look*, shows that the noun is influenced by the corresponding verb, as also in the case of most of the other conjunctions employed here, so far as the nouns are derived from verbs: ‘I was in mortal *fear* lest (or more commonly *that*) he should see me.’ ‘The good people of the place had no doubt *that* (or *but*, or *but that*, or *but what*) the end had really come.’ ‘I never had a doubt *but what you would* [do it]’ (Winston Churchill, Coniston, Ch. VII). ‘There was in his eye a look as *if he would annihilate me*.’

The appositional clause, however, often follows the noun directly, as appositive clause without a connective: ‘His fear he might never accomplish anything is torturing him a good deal.’ Also appositional clauses in the form of direct or indirect questions or in the form of relative clauses introduced by relative pronouns, adjectives, or adverbs frequently occur; also appositional commands, as illustrated in the preceding paragraphs.

There often stands before the *that*-clause an explanatory coordinating conjunction, *as, such as, namely, to wit*, etc., thus indicating that an additional remark is about to be made, a remark not bearing upon the preceding statement as a whole but upon only a single noun in it, hence appearing in the form of an attributive appositional clause: ‘She gave me a good deal of miscellaneous information, *as that William’s real name was Mr. Hicking*’ (J. M. Barrie, The Little White Bird, Ch. VIII).

a. ABRIDGMENT OF ATTRIBUTIVE SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSE. The attributive substantive clause can often be abridged to an infinitive clause with *to* when its subject is general or indefinite, or is implied in some word in the principal proposition: ‘The time *to do something* has at last come.’ ‘Now arises the question of *how to do it*.’ ‘Then he went out to the sunshine of that morning with the whole world before him and his choice of *what to do with it*.’ ‘Your plan *to go yourself* doesn’t please me.’ ‘But one course was open to me — *to cut his acquaintance*’ (Thackeray, Snobs, Ch. I). Compare 50 4 d and 10 V 3. In colloquial speech the *to* of the infinitive is often omitted in the appositional relation: ‘There was only one thing for me to do — *regain hold of the reins of the government*’
(Chicago Tribune, Feb. 24, 1929). The absence of to here indicates in many cases, as in this example, that the form is felt as an imperative.

When there is no word in the principal proposition that can serve as the subject of the infinitive, it has a subject of its own introduced by for: ‘Your plan for me to go doesn’t please me.’ ‘The time had come for the parting words to be spoken over the dead’ (Oliver Wendell Holmes, Elsie Venner). Even when there is some word in the principal proposition that might serve as the subject of the infinitive, the infinitive often has a subject of its own to remove all ambiguity and make the thought perfectly clear: ‘I sent him the money in time for it to reach him on Monday.’ The origin of the for-construction is explained in 21 e. In the appositive relation the for . . . to clause, just as the full that-clause, is often introduced by an explanatory conjunction, as, such as, namely, etc.: ‘Michael, who all the time was dreading many unfortunate events, as for the cabman to get down from his box and quarrel about the fare, or for the train to be full, or for Stella to be sick during the journey’ (Mackenzie, Youth’s Encounter). Compare 50 4 d and 10 V 3.

The infinitive here, except in the cases stated in 50 4 d, can be replaced by the gerund. The gerund does not have an expressed subject if the subject of the principal proposition or some word in it can serve as its subject: ‘Your plan of going yourself doesn’t please me.’ If there is no word in the principal proposition that can serve as the subject of the gerund, it has a subject of its own, usually a genitive of a noun or a possessive adjective (originally a genitive of a personal pronoun), or now often also the accusative of a noun or pronoun, as described in 50 3: ‘The hope of John’s—or his, or John’s brother (acc.)—coming cheers us.’

The gerund is not only common as an attributive genitive, as in these examples, but also in an attributive prepositional phrase after most prepositions: ‘He is experiencing much joy on account of his sister’s—or her, or his sister’s son (acc.)—coming.’ For limitations to this usage see 50 4 d (last par.).

The gerundial clause is often used as an appositive: ‘That is just our way, always arriving too late,’ or always to arrive too late.

The appositive is sometimes an absolute nominative clause (17 3 D): ‘Well, that is just our way, exactly — one half of the administration always busy getting the family into trouble, the other half busy getting it out again’ (Mark Twain, Letter to Mrs. Grover Cleveland, Nov. 6, 1887).
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23 II. This clause was originally an appositional construction, as can still be seen by the form which it often has: ‘The book I hold [it] in my hand is an English grammar.’ ‘I want to show you my books, especially those I’ve recently acquired [them].’ Here the and those each point as a demonstrative, or more accurately a determinative (56 A), to a following explanatory appositional clause. Such a clause has the full force of a subordinate relative clause, but there is in it no relative pronoun. The preceding
determinative points to it and serves the same purpose as a relative; only it stands in the principal proposition and points to the following dependent clause, while a relative pronoun stands in the dependent clause and points back to the antecedent in the principal proposition. Such a clause without a relative pronoun is called an asyndetical (without a connective) relative clause. As can be seen by the forms in brackets, the pronoun that belongs to such a clause is a personal pronoun, not a relative. The suppression of the personal pronoun here leads us to look to what precedes for the connection. This suppression of the pronoun is the old primitive way of indicating that the clause is subordinated to what precedes. The asyndetic relative construction is found only rarely in Old English and Old German. The writers of this early period, accustomed to the Latin type of clause with an expressed relative pronoun, carefully avoided a relative clause without a relative pronoun. The construction has disappeared in Modern German, but it is widely used in present-day English. As it has long been used in Danish, it seems quite probable that in the older period the large Scandinavian population of Great Britain helped establish the construction in English. Its present wide use is described in 10, page 233.

In Old English, we often find a double determinative in accordance with older English fondness for double expression, as seen also in the use of two negatives instead of one and the use of double determinatives in the adverbial clause constructions described in 25, 26, 27 2. Double expression indicates a desire to make thought and feeling clearer. As, in oldest English, determinatives were only spoken gestures, they were often, like gestures in general, freely applied, as we shall see in the course of this discussion. The old double determinative form is still often employed, but we no longer feel it as such: 'I'll lend you the pen I write with [it],' or with double expression of the determinative 'I'll lend you the pen that I write with [it].' We do not now feel the and that as a double determinative, pointing as with two index fingers to the following explanatory clause, but construe that as a relative pronoun standing in the relative clause, pointing back to the antecedent pen in the principal proposition. As the old determinative that stood immediately before the explanatory remark it became closely associated with it, gradually forming with it a subordinate clause and serving as its connective, linking it to the principal proposition and thus developing into a relative pronoun. The form of the clause, however, is the old determinative, for the preposition with stands at the end of the clause with its pronominal object it suppressed. For the peculiar form that such prepositions
used to have see 62 4 (next to last par.). If the clause here were a real relative construction the preposition would stand before the relative pronoun, as in ‘I’ll lend you the pen with which I write.’

We now feel also as (from all so, i.e., quite so) as a relative pronoun, but it was originally a determinative, like that, with which it competed and still competes. Though now felt as a relative, it still always has the old determinative construction with the preposition at the end of the clause: ‘Let us discuss only such things as we can talk of freely.’ This is the old double determinative construction, the determinatives such and so originally pointing as with two index fingers to the following explanatory clause: ‘Let us discuss only such things, so (= of this character): we can talk of [them] freely.’ Also our two common relative pronouns who and which have developed out of a determinative construction, as will be described in detail in 1 and 3, pp. 208–212, 215–217. In choice language they now usually take the newer relative construction after prepositions, especially who, which already in early Middle English was here felt as a relative pronoun, but in colloquial speech they may still have here the old determinative form, especially which, which still as in older English is intimately associated with this form: ‘I should like to introduce to you the gentleman of whom I spoke’ (or sometimes whom I spoke of). ‘I’ll lend you the pen with which I write’ (or often which I write with). Farther on we shall see also other traces of the former determinative character of who and which.

In Old English, the personal pronoun in the subordinate clause was not always suppressed, as in the examples given above, for it was sometimes necessary to express it, especially when in the dative or genitive, to bring out the grammatical relations clearly: ‘bæt is se Abraham se him engla god naman niwan asceop’ (Exodus, 380), literally, ‘It was that Abraham, that one, the God of the angels gave him a new name.’ Here the determinative is an inflected form. After the uninflected determinative be the personal pronoun was employed still more freely, as it was often felt as helpful to make the grammatical relations clear: ‘bam witgum be God self þurh hi spec to hys folce’ = ‘to the prophets, those: God himself spoke through them to his people.’ Also bæt was often used as an uninflected determinative, and could be followed by a personal pronoun: ‘And þær is mid Estum an magþ bæt hi magon cyle gewyrcan’ (King Alfred, Orosius, 21, 13) = ‘There is among the Esthonians a tribe, that one (= such a one): they can create cold.’ In Middle English, invariable that superseded se and þe, but the old determinative construction remained intact throughout the period, and was still in literary use in Shake-
speare's time, especially in the genitive relation: 'Therynne wone\(\text{e}\) a wy\(\text{e}\)t that wrong is his name' (Piers Plowman, C, II, 59, about A.D. 1362–1395) = 'Therein lives a fellow, that one: Wrong is his name.' 'Name me a profest poet that his poetry did ever afford him so much as a competencie' (Ben Jonson, Poetaster, I, ii, 59, about 1601, ed. 1616). Also which was used here as a determinative: 'pe kynges dere sone, which alwey for to do wel is his wont' (Chaucer, Troilus, II, 318) = 'the King's dear son, that one (= such a one): always to act right is his wont,' now 'whose wont is always to act right.' This old genitive construction is preserved in popular speech, both with that and with which: 'There's two fellows that their dads are millionaires' (Sinclair Lewis, Babbitt, Ch, II, I). 'Mrs. Boffin, which her father's name is Henery' (Dickens, Our Mutual Friend, I, Ch. V). Also with who: 'The fellow who you don't know his name' (Sinclair Lewis, Babbitt, p. 122).

In Middle and early Modern English, however, the old determinative construction, with the personal pronoun in the subordinate clause expressed, was not confined to use in the genitive relation, but was sometimes employed also in the nominative and accusative relations, flowering especially in long descriptive clauses. The determinatives were at first that and which, later also who: 'A knight ther was and that a worthy man, That (= such a one), fro (= from) the tyme that he first bigan to ryden (= ride) out, he loved chivalrye' (Chaucer, Prologue, l. 43). 'bis is he which pat (= that one) myn vncle swereth he mot be ded' (id., Troilus, II, 654). 'Pyrithian of Thessayle was there among all other, the whiche (= that one) when he apperceeyuid that euerich (= everyone) hadde well eten and dronken raysonably, he stood up,' etc. (Caxton, History of Jason, p. 8, A.D. 1477). 'Anger is like A full hot horse, who (= such a one) being allow'd his way, Selfmettle tires him' (Shakespeare, Henry the Eighth, I, r, 133). 'It is a massy wheel . . . which (= such a one), when it falls, Each small annexment, petty consequence, Attends the boisterous ruin' (id., Hamlet, III, iii, 17). 'For charity is that fire from heaven, which (= namely such a one), unless it does enkindle the sacrifice, God will never accept it for atonement' (J. Taylor, Worthy Communicant, London, 1678, IV, I, 197).

In the literary language, this loose old determinative type of expression disappeared about the close of the eighteenth century, having been replaced by the compact relative construction with a relative pronoun pointing back to the antecedent in the principal proposition. In the transitional period from the old to the new, the new relative clauses were often construed in accordance with
Latin models and were often quite un-English. Since the old determinative was now, under the influence of Latin idiom, construed as a relative pronoun, the following personal pronoun or pronouns were felt as superfluous and were simply dropped without any attempt to recast the clause, resulting frequently, as in Latin, in bringing together in the same subordinate clause a relative pronoun and an adverbial conjunction or another relative pronoun, a construction still unknown in natural English, as it has always been, but in this earlier time in learned language under Latin influence quite common and in archaic style still lingering on: ‘And this man began to do tristily (boldly) in the synagogue, whom whanne Priscille and Aquila herden, they token hym’ (Acts, XVIII, 26, John Purvey’s edition, A.D. 1388). ‘And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue, whom when Aquila and Priscilla had heard, they took him unto them’ (King James Version), corresponding to the older type ‘who when Aquila and Priscilla had heard him, they took him unto them.’ ‘Captain Neal sent a packet of letters to the governor, which when the governor had opened [it] he found it came from Sir Ferdinando Georges’ (Winthrop, Journal, June 25, 1631). ‘And you are to know that in Hampshire they use to catch Trouts in the night by the light of a Torch or straw, which when they have discovered [them] they strike [them] with a Trout spear’ (Izaak Walton, Compleat Angler, p. 128, A.D. 1653). ‘To send for a Comission, which if [it] could or could not be Obtayned by a certain day, they would proceed Comission or no Comission’ (Thomas Mathew, Bacon's Rebellion, p. 7, July 13, 1705). ‘These were works which, though I often inspected [them], I did not accurately study [them]’ (H. F. Clinton, Literary Reminiscences, 24, A.D. 1818). ‘Now the third joy of making, the sweet flower Of blessed work, bloometh in godlike spirit; Which whoso plucketh [it] holdeth for an hour The shriveling vanity of mortal merit’ (Bridges, The Growth of Love, 26, a.d. 1913).

On the other hand, the old determinative construction survives in popular speech: ‘He’d been a-making a tremendous row the night afore a-drinking, and a-singing, and wanting to fight Tom and the post-boy; Which I’m thinking he’d have had the worst of it’ (Thackeray, Pendennis, Ch. V). ‘Brer Rabbit ’spond’ (responded) dat he smell sump’n’ which it don’t smell like ripe peaches’ (Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, p. 125). ‘The road from Nice to Monte Carlo is called the Grand Corniche, which I don’t know what it means’ (Ring Lardner, The Riviera).

1. Development of the Relative Pronoun ‘Who.’ Out of the double determinative construction with indefinite who, in its
original form *swa hwæ swa*, i.e., *so who so*, literally, *that somebody that one*, has developed our common relative pronoun *who*, which in accord with its original meaning refers only to persons: ‘*Swa hwæ ne swa ic cysse se hyt is*’ (*Matthew*, XXVI, 48, tenth century) = Modern English ‘It is he *whom* I kiss,’ but literally, in the spirit of the old determinative construction = ‘*That somebody that one* I kiss [him], he it is.’ The two determinatives point to the following explanatory clause ‘I kiss.’ The speaker here chooses for a relative the indefinite *so who so* since the person in question is as yet unknown to the men addressed, but the speaker has a definite person in mind, namely, Jesus, so that the sense is quite different from the vague general meaning usually found in *so who so*. The indefinite determinative *who*, which here replaces older definite *that*, suggests in a general indefinite way the idea of a person, but at the same time points to the following explanatory clause, so that in fact the reference becomes definite. This passing from the unknown to the known was a new means of expression here that soon found favor. Compare 26 (6th par.) and 27 1. The old indefinite form *so who so* was later reduced to *who so*. Alongside of *who so* with the determinative *so* there was another indefinite form in use, *who that* with the determinative *that*: ‘*A3aines kinde Gap hwa pat swuche kinsemon ne luueS*’ (*Old English Homilies*, p. 275) = ‘Who ever does not love such a kinsman goes against nature.’ Gradually the two forms became differentiated, so that *who so* was used for indefinite reference and *who that* for definite reference. In archaic language *whoso* is still used for indefinite reference. In normal speech it is now replaced here by *whoever*. Although *who that* was in early Modern English sometimes still used for indefinite reference, it was already in Middle English more commonly employed for definite reference, referring to a definite antecedent: ‘the sighte of hir *whom that* I serve’ (*Chaucer, The Knightes Tale*, 373). Here *who that* points to a definite person just as our modern *who*. *Who that* differs from *who* in the retention of the old determinative *that*. The retention of the determinative shows that there was still some feeling left for the old determinative construction. While, on the one hand, the relative *who* pointed backward to the antecedent, the determinative *that*, on the other hand, indicated that the relative was also associated with the following clause, linking it to the antecedent. But as *who* here soon developed more fully in the direction of a true relative pronoun, closely associated with both the antecedent and the following clause, linking the latter to the former, the *that*, no longer having a real function, disappeared. But even in Shakespeare’s day, *who* had not entirely lost its old determinative nature, as
clearly seen in the quotation from *Henry the Eighth*, I, 1, 133, given on page 207.

In Old English, alongside of the indefinite *so who so* was a simple indefinite *who* with the same meaning, which will be discussed below at more length. This simple indefinite *who*, in exactly the same manner as *so who so*, developed definite meaning, so that we find it in Middle English after a definite antecedent as a parallel form to the *who that* described in the preceding paragraph: 'He nadde (= ne hadde) bote an doxtor wo migt eir be' (Robert of Gloucester, *Chronicle*, Rolls, 1977, A.D. 1297), literally, 'He had but a daughter who could be his heir.' ‘My lady whom I love and serve’ (Chaucer, *The Knightes Tale*, 285). 'And thei camen, not oonli for Jhesu, but to se Lazarus, whom he hadde reisid fro deth' (John, XII, 9, John Purvey's ed., A.D. 1388). Our present relative pronoun *who* has come in part from this *who* and in part from *who that* by the suppression of that.

The definite relative *who* first appeared in the thirteenth century, but was comparatively little used before the sixteenth. Its use was at first largely confined to the objective form *whom*, as in all the examples given above, except in the one from Robert of Gloucester. It was not much used in the nominative relation, for in this earlier period indefinite *who* was here still quite common. The usual relatives were *that* and *which*; but after *who* had acquired definite force it rapidly came into favor, for it had a great advantage over its competitors — it referred only to persons — hence for reference to persons was a clearer form.

On the other hand, the old determinative construction *so who so*, out of which the relative *who* developed, did not disappear, but in modified form, now *whoso*, or more commonly *who(so)ever* instead of *so who so*, is still widely used, not like relative *who* pointing backward to an antecedent, but still a determinative pointing to the following explanatory remark, forming with it a substantive or a concessive clause (21, 32, 8th par.) and serving as its connective, binding it to the principal proposition, hence a real relative pronoun, though having no antecedent — an indefinite relative pronoun: ‘He welcomed whoever (with stronger indefinite force whosoever) came.’ ‘He stopped whom(so)ever he met.’ ‘Whosoever it is, I mean to have it.’ In older English, the determinative *that* is sometimes used here instead of *so*: ‘Play who that can that part’ (Sir Thomas Wyatt, *Poems*, 18 (3), sixteenth century). Compare first paragraph.

Alongside of this compound determinative there is the simple determinative *who*, which now, as in Old English, has the same indefinite force, only not so general and vague, often approaching
definiteness, but on the other hand with the same determinative force, pointing to the following explanatory remark, forming with it a substantive clause and serving as its connective, binding it to the principal proposition, hence a real relative pronoun, though having no antecedent — an indefinite relative pronoun: ‘Who (or more indefinitely whoever) goes light travels fast’; literally, ‘That somebody: [he] goes light travels fast.’ ‘I always felt that, talk with whom I would, I left something unsaid which was precisely what I most wished to say.’ ‘Really’ replied Mr. Povey with loftiness as who should say ‘What an extraordinary thing that a reasonable creature can have such fancies!’” (Arnold Bennett, Old Wives’ Tale, Ch. I). ‘It is not known who did it,’ i.e., the identity of the author of the act is not known. In ‘I saw whom he struck’ and ‘I saw who struck him’ the identity of the person struck and the person who did the striking is known to the speaker but not to his hearers. In the preceding examples the indefinite who stands within the relative clause, serving as its relative, i.e., conjunctive, pronoun, binding the subordinate clause to the principal proposition, but in the following example it stands in the principal proposition as an indefinite determinative with the force of that one only that the reference is indefinite: ‘Vengeance is his or whose he sole appoints’ (Milton, Paradise Lost, V, 808), now usually that one’s. Compare 56 A (3rd par.).

This indefinite who often has an indefinite antecedent: ‘He makes no friend who never made a foe’ (Tennyson). This usage occasionally occurs in older English: ‘A hwam mai he luue treweliche hwa ne luues his brother?’ (Old English Homilies of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, I, 274) = ‘Ah, whom can he truly love who does not love his brother?’ In older English, who that was often used instead of simple who: ‘Repreve he dredeht never a del Who that beset his wordis wel’ (Chaucer, The Romaunt of the Rose, 5261) = ‘He dreads not reproof at all who sets his words well.’ As can be seen by the translation of this example we now drop the determinative that here. In plain prose we today avoid the indefinite antecedents he, she, they. Thus instead of he who, she who, they who, we usually say in plain prose a man who, a boy who, a woman who, a girl who, those who. We especially avoid here she who. He who, she who, they who are still used in choice literary English. Compare 5, p. 220, Examples, 2nd par.

Closely related with this indefinite who and developed out of it is interrogative who. It was quite natural that in asking questions in primitive Germanic a word was employed which indicated that the relations of the person in question were indefinite, unknown to the speaker. Interrogatives, however, have
never ceased to be indefinites. These indefinites often assume the special function of calling for an answer in an indefinite situation: ‘Who did it?’ The interrogative is used also in indirect questions, i.e., to ask a question in an indirect way, as in ‘Tell me who did it,’ or to report a question indirectly, as in ‘He asked me who did it.’ Our grammarians, however, often regard as an indirect question the subordinate clause of such sentences as ‘I saw who did it’ and ‘We shall soon know who did it.’ In the former example who indicates that the identity of the person doing the act is known to the speaker but not to the hearer. In the latter example who indicates that the identity of the person doing the act is unknown to both the speaker and the hearer. In both examples there is in who an element of indefiniteness, but not the slightest suggestion of an interrogation. An interrogative is an intensive indefinite indicating that the indefiniteness has impressed the mind so strongly that an intellectual reaction has set in which has demanded an explanation. Interrogative form, however, is often employed not to elicit an answer but merely to express doubt — a deliberative or speculative question. Deliberative: ‘What shall I (or am I to) do?’ ‘To our son there are only two courses open, both connected with great difficulties. Which shall he take?’ (a question not calling for a categorical answer but introducing a deliberation). Speculative: ‘What can it mean?’ ‘Will he come?’ The question often loses every trace of a desire for an answer, also every trace of doubt, and becomes declarative, expressing the idea of an emphatic contrary assertion — a rhetorical question: ‘Who could have foreseen it?’ = ‘No one could have foreseen it.’ ‘When doctors disagree who shall decide?’ = ‘No one can decide.’ Rhetorical questions are often charged with different kinds of feeling. Disapproval: ‘Who told you to do that?’ Indignation aroused by inconsiderate treatment: ‘Who do you think I am?’ Compare 21 (2nd and 3rd parr.) and 23 I.

2. Development of the Relative Pronoun ‘What.’ In exactly the same way as the relative who developed out of the indefinite double determinative so who so, as described in 1 above, relative what has developed out of the double determinative construction with indefinite what, in its original form swa hvaet swa, i.e., so what so, literally, that something that. As in the case of so who so, described above, the determinatives so — so have disappeared: ‘Now this was not all what G. B. wanted’ (W. Black, *Sunrise*, I, 302). Also as in the case of the who-construction there are two types: the older one with a relative what pointing not backward to an antecedent but forward to a following explanatory clause; the younger
one with a relative what pointing backward to an antecedent, as in the example from Black just given. The older form is still a very common construction, now with -so or more commonly -(so)ever instead of older so — so, pointing to the following explanatory remark, forming with it a substantive clause (21, 24 III, IV) and serving as its connective, binding it to the principal proposition, hence a real relative pronoun, though having no antecedent — an indefinite relative pronoun: ‘His mother gives him whatever (or archaically whatso, or with stronger indefinite force whatsoever) he asks for.’ The accusative of this indefinite, like the accusative of other indefinites, as described in 16 4 a, is often used adverbially, with the force of at all: ‘There is no doubt whatever about it.’ ‘No one whatever would have anything to do with him.’ ‘I cannot see anyone whatever.’

What(so)ever is used also adjectively, standing before its governing noun and pointing as a determinative to the following explanatory remark, forming with it and its governing noun a substantive clause and serving as its connective, binding it to the principal proposition, hence a real relative, though having no antecedent — an indefinite relative adjective: ‘Even the fishermen armed themselves with whatever weapons they could procure.’

Whatever, whether pronoun or adjective, is very common in substantive clauses, but it is often used also in adverbial concessive clauses (32): ‘I am going to pursue this course, whatever it may cost, whatever sacrifice it may demand.’ It is sometimes employed also in adjective clauses. See 6 below, 5th and last parr.

Alongside of this compound determinative there is the simple determinative what, which now, as in Old English, has the same indefinite force, only not so general and vague, often approaching definiteness, but with the same determinative force, pointing to the following remark, forming with it a substantive clause and serving as its connective, binding it to the principal proposition, hence a real relative pronoun, though having no antecedent — an indefinite relative pronoun: ‘His mother gives him what (or more indefinitely whatever) he asks for.’ ‘I saw what (something seen by the speaker but as yet unknown to the persons addressed) he held in his hand.’ This what is often used elliptically: ‘Something is the matter, but I don’t know what [it is].’ ‘I’ll tell you what [the thing to do is]. We should take that fellow down a peg.’

What is widely used in substantive clauses, also as an indefinite adjective with the same determinative and relative force: ‘I gave him what money I had with me.’ ‘Come yourself and bring along with you what men you can induce to come.’ What, or what a, often expresses a high degree of some quality or a large
amount: ‘I want to tell you what a time we had.’ ‘We all know what a liar he is, what liars they are.’ ‘You can’t realize what trouble we have had.’ Whatever is more indefinite than what: ‘I’ll see to it that you get whatever money you may need.’ Adjective what was originally a pronoun. The noun following it was a genitive, so that the form was: ‘I gave him what of money I had with me.’ Since the genitive in older English was often an indistinctive simple form, the grammatical relations became obscured, so that the genitive was construed as the common case, and what was taken for an adjective.

The substantive (571) forms of the adjectives what, what a, and whatever are often used in substantive clauses as indefinite relative pronouns, always with a definite antecedent but with only an indefinite reference to it: ‘I have only a little money with me, but what I have is at your disposal.’ ‘I am short of them and what I have are bad.’ ‘He is always making costly blunders, but we cannot foresee just what ones he will make next.’ ‘Each time he makes a new excuse. It will be interesting to hear what one he will offer next.’ ‘We surely needed friends, and we now realize what a one we have found in Mr. Benton.’ ‘His mother has overlooked all the mistakes he has made in the past, and will probably overlook whatever ones he will make in the future.’ Whatever is used also in concessive clauses: ‘Whatever the defects of American universities may be, they disseminate no prejudices’ (American Notes, III, A.D. 1842).

What is used also in principal propositions as an interrogative or exclamatory pronoun or adjective: ‘What did he say?’ ‘What impression did he make?’ ‘What weather!’ ‘What a day!’ ‘Oh, what trouble we have had!’ Also what one(s) is used as an interrogative or exclamatory pronoun. ‘You have read many interesting German books. What ones would you recommend as the best twenty-five?’ ‘To be sure we have found a house for rent, but what a one!’ Also indirect questions are common: ‘I asked him what he was doing.’

Who and what were originally singulars, but who is now used in all its functions also as a plural: ‘Who were there?’ ‘I do not know who were there.’ Sometimes also what: ‘What have been censured as Shakespeare’s conceits are completely justifiable’ (Coleridge, Lectures on Shakespeare). ‘What appear, from the point of view expressed in these pages, to be its shortcomings are emphatically the shortcomings of its type’ (Olivia Howard Dunbar in Forum for Nov., 1923, p. 2049). ‘I outlined what seem to be the seven dominant fears that have inspired and have been inspired by this literature of despair’ (Glenn Frank in Cen-
tury, for Sept., 1925, p. 626). Less frequently whoever: ‘Whoever allow themselves much of that indulgence, incur the risk of something worse’ (J. S. Mill, On Liberty). Often, however, in the predicate: ‘I am not afraid of them, whoever they are.’

What in the old so what so construction had such pronounced determinative force, usually pointing forward to something following, that it did not develop relative force, pointing backward to an antecedent, as in the case of who. The same conditions, however, were present, as in the case of who, so that we have a few traces of a development in the direction of a pure relative pointing backward, both in the case of simple what and what accompanied by a determinative: ‘Til she had herd al what the frere sayde’ (Chaucer, The Somnours Tale, 493). ‘Every lover thoughte, That al was wel what so he seyde and wruoughte’ (id., Troilus and Criseyde, III, 1799). Later, the determinative so here was always dropped: ‘anything what (now that) thou wilt’ (Ben Jonson, Every Man out of His Humour, V, III, A.D. 1600).

‘That what (now usually which) we falsely call a religious cry is easily raised by men who have no religion’ (Dickens, Barnaby Rudge, Preface). ‘To peruse everything what went into the “Post”’ (H. Sydnor Harrison, Queed, Ch. VII). That which leads to the use of what here instead of which is a tendency to differentiate which and what by employing what when the reference is general or indefinite. This employment of indefinite what as a relative, pointing backward to an antecedent, though not widespread or common, is old, for it is found in late Old English; but its strong determinative force, its normal use to point forward to something following, prevented its common use and its final establishment in the language as a relative pointing backward to an antecedent. Thus while who is usually a relative pointing back to an antecedent, what is rarely so. It is usually a different kind of relative, a form pointing forward to something following and at the same time as a relative binding it to the principal proposition. In popular speech, however, what may point back to a definite antecedent, even to one representing a person or persons: ‘I can’t see that the man what’s willing to remain poor all his life has any pride at all’ (George Moore, Esther Waters, Ch. VI). ‘This is them two sisters what tied themselves together with a handkercher’ (Dickens, Our Mutual Friend, I, Ch. III).

3. Development of the Relative Pronoun ‘Which.’ In the same manner in which who developed out of the indefinite double construction with swa hwa swa, i.e., so who so, the relative which developed out of the indefinite double determinative construction with swa hwilk swa, i.e., so which so, the determinatives so — so
pointing, as the double determinatives described above, to the
following explanatory clause. Instead of the determinatives so —
so we often find others in older English, especially the and that,
as in the which, which that, the which that, the usual forms in Middle
English, referring to either persons or things. The which began
to appear in Old English: ‘an of þæm gebundennum, þone swæ
hwælcne hia gigiüdon’ (Mark, XV, 6, Lindisfarne MS.), literally,
‘one of the prisoners, that one, the one they desired.’ This is the
oldest example of the which. In this oldest form the so after which
has disappeared. This passage in the Corpus MS. reads: ‘ânne
gebundenne swa hwylcne swa hi bædon.’ In Middle English this
form appears as which that, where the first determinative so has
dropped out and the second has been replaced by the determina-
tive that. In both of these old examples there is an antecedent,
an indefinite one, but yet an antecedent, so that which, the which,
which that, standing as they do between antecedent and subordi-
nate clause, can now easily develop into a relative pronoun binding
the subordinate clause to the antecedent. As the meaning here
often became more definite these forms were later frequently used
with the force of our modern which or who: ‘this wyde world
which that men seye is round’ (Chaucer, The Frankelyns Tale,
500); ‘felawes the whiche that he had knowe in olde dawes’ (id.,
452) = ‘fellows whom he had known in former days.’ As which
from now on usually followed a noun or pronoun, it gradually
developed into a relative pronoun, pointing back to the preceding
noun or pronoun; hence the determinatives the and that used in
connection with which disappeared, since they lost their original
function and had thus become useless. Where the reference was
to definite persons which was gradually replaced by who or that.
In early Modern English which was still lingering on here.

The old indefinite force of which, however, survives in adjective
function in substantive clauses (21, 24 III, IV), where there is not
a reference to a definite antecedent but only a general or indefinite
reference: ‘I do not know which way he went.’ Whichever is still
more indefinite: ‘You may take whichever book you like.’ As in
the case of the adjectives what and whatever described in 2, p. 212,
the adjectives which and whichever, though referring to no definite
antecedent, have become true relative adjectives, binding the
clause in which they stand to the principal proposition. Which
and whichever differ from what and whatever only in indicating a
little less degree of indefiniteness. The indefiniteness of which is
also preserved in questions, direct and indirect: ‘Which book did
you take?’ ‘I asked him which book he took.’

The substantive (57 1) forms of the adjectives which and which-
ever are often used in substantive clauses (21, 24 III, IV) as indefinite relative pronouns, frequently with a definite antecedent but with only an indefinite reference to it: ‘As I have not read all the new books, I cannot tell which one (or which ones) I like best.’ ‘Here are some new books. You may have whichever one (or whichever ones) you choose.’ ‘Several Smiths live here. I don’t know which one you refer to.’ These forms often point forward to a following noun or pronoun: ‘I don’t know which of these books he would rather have.’ ‘You may have whichever of these books you choose.’ ‘I don’t know which one of them did it, but some one of them did it.’ Which and whichever are used also as interrogatives: ‘Which of you did it?’ ‘Which (or whichever) of these books is yours?’ ‘Which of these books are yours?’ Other examples in 57 3 (last par.). Indirect question: ‘I asked him which of the books he wanted.’ ‘I asked him which one of the men he meant.’ In all of these cases which may refer to persons or things. Originally, which could always refer to persons or things.

Indefinite relative whichever, whether pronoun or adjective, is used also in adverbial concessive clauses (32): ‘He will find difficulties, whichever way (or whichever of these ways) he may take.’ It is sometimes employed also in adjective clauses, as illustrated in 6 below, 5th and last parr.

While adjective which is, in general, indefinite and without an antecedent, it is sometimes definite, referring back to a definite antecedent, where it is a definite relative adjective: ‘We traveled together as far as Paris, at which place we parted company.’

4. Other Determinative Constructions. Out of the determinatives just described have developed not only our relative pronouns but also other connectives, among them the most common conjunctions, that, as, and what: ‘I know that he is faithful’; originally ‘I know that: he is faithful,’ the that pointing forward to the following explanatory appositional clause. In colloquial and popular speech, what with the same determinative force as that is often used instead of that after but: ‘Not a day passes but what (or in the literary language but that, or simple but) it rains.’ ‘I cannot say but what (or but that, or simple but) you may be right.’ In popular speech we often find as here instead of that, just as we often in popular speech find as instead of relative that: ‘He told us as (for that) “Gospel” meant “good news”’ (George Eliot, Adam Bede, Ch. II). Although this little word as is frequently used in popular speech where it is not employed in the literary language, its field in colloquial and literary English is an exceedingly wide one, altogether too wide, embracing so many meanings
that the thought is not always apparent at a glance. A bird's-eye view of its uses is given in 27 2. This wide range of meanings indicated by as is explained by its original determinative nature, which was simply to point, leaving it to the connection to make the thought clear. This is also true of the conjunction that, ex-determinative, like as. Just as the indefinite who, as described in 1, p. 208, developed into a determinative and then into a relative pronoun with the force of that, so the indefinite how — from the same stem as who — developed into a determinative and then into a conjunction with the force of that, attaining to its final stage of development very early, even in Old English, much earlier than who: 'I saw how (= that) he was falling behind in the race.'

In Middle English, the determinative that was so often associated with a preceding word, as in the who that, which that described above, linking this word to the following subordinate clause, that it was construed as a sign of subordination and was attached to other words which originally were not followed by a determinative, such as interrogatives: 'If men wolde axe (ask) me why that god suffred men to do yow (you) this vileinye' (Chaucer, Melibeus, 38).

5. List of Relative Pronouns Used in Attributive Relative Clauses: that for persons and things, except after that where we now usually say that which, thus avoiding the repetition of that, although that that was quite common a little earlier in the period; at, the worn-down form of that, once widely used in the literary language of Scotland and North England, still surviving in northern English dialect, where it is now often written at; who for persons; in older English sometimes the who (as in Shakespeare's Winter's Tale, IV, iv, 538) instead of simple who; which for things, referring to some definite thing or things, or to something indefinite; in older literary English and current popular speech also referring to persons; the which, once a common form competing with which without a difference of meaning, now only rarely used and then restricted largely to descriptive clauses, both when used as a relative pronoun and as a relative adjective; whichever (see 6 below, 5th and last parr.); what, earlier in the period sometimes referring to an indefinite pronoun, nothing, all, everything, that, etc., and sometimes still so used, but far less commonly than that and which, the latter the usual form after the indefinite pronoun that; what, widely used when the reference is to a following statement or the thought contained in a following adjective, as illustrated in 6 below; whatever (see 6 below, 5th and last parr.); but (or sometimes but he, but she, etc., instead of simple but) or in colloquial speech but what, both forms with the meaning of that not, which not, who not,
but usually only employed after a negative or a question in the subject relation, much less commonly in the object relation; as, in older English more widely used as a relative than now, still the regular form after such, although also that, which, and who are still, as in older English, used here occasionally; as, now the regular form after the same in elliptical clauses without a finite verb, in older English, however, also that, while in the full clause with finite verb we employ that, which, who, or much less commonly as; as, sometimes elsewhere in elliptical clauses; as, still much used in descriptive clauses where the reference is to the thought contained in some preceding or following proposition or word; as, still common in the predicate relation where the reference is to a preceding noun; moreover, a number of adverbs or conjunctions, where (in older English also there, there as, there that, where as, where that), whence, or sometimes from whence (both restricted to poetry and choice prose, elsewhere replaced by from which), thence that (in older English = whence), whither (in poetry and choice prose, elsewhere replaced by to which), when, while, why, also a large number of others, once common but now little used except in poetry or in exact, especially legal, language, such as whereby, wherein, whereof, etc. In popular speech as (27 2) or what often replace that or who: 'They've got a friend as (or what) will help 'em.' In older English, we find as here also in the literary language, after determinatives, not only after such and the same, as described above for present usage, but also after that, those, the: 'I have not from your eyes that gentleness And show of love as I was wont to have' (Shakespeare, Julius Cesar, I, ii, 33). 'Those as sleep and think not on their sins' (id., The Merry Wives, V, v, 57). 'I did not imagine these little coquetries could have the ill consequences as I find they have' (The Spectator, 87). Of all the above relatives only who is declined: nominative who, genitive whose, dative and accusative whom, the same form in each case serving as singular and plural.

But and but what originated in adverbial clauses of pure result (28 5, 28 5 b) in sentences where the meaning permitted the clause to be construed either as a clause of result or as a relative clause: 'Nobody knew him but (or but that, or but what) he loved him' (adverbial clause of pure result), or 'but (or but what, relative pronouns used as subject) loved him' (relative clause). 'Nobody read the book through but (or but that, or but what) it impressed him favorably' (adverbial clause of pure result), or 'but (or but what, relative pronouns used as object) it impressed favorably' (relative clause). The relative clause is now differentiated in form from the adverbial clause of result by the suppression of the personal
pronoun, he, she, it, the relative pronoun but or but what serving as subject or object. The differentiation of the two clauses was not so complete in older English as it is now.

Examples:

'The boy who is standing by the door'; 'a boy that will do such a thing'; 'the boy whose father died yesterday'; 'the two little boys whose parents are dead'; 'the boy with whom you play,' or 'the boy you play with'; 'a boy that you should play with,' or 'a boy you should play with'; 'the boy whom you struck,' or 'the boy you struck'; 'the man to whom you referred' (or whom you referred to, or that you referred to, or you referred to); 'the book that (or which) is lying on the table'; 'Dumas the Elder, than whom there never was a kinder heart,' where in harmony with fixed usage whom stands after than instead of the correct who, in accordance with a general tendency, not so firmly fixed in the literary language elsewhere, to employ the accusative of a pronoun instead of the nominative in clauses and phrases which do not contain a finite verb, as illustrated in 7 C a.

'You could scarcely have told from the peace that dwelt upon them which was she that (choice language) had sinned' (Bret Harte, The Outcasts of Poker Flat); likewise 'he that had sinned,' or in plainer language nearer colloquial speech 'he, or she, who had sinned,' but in colloquial speech for both he who and she who usually the one who, since there is a strong tendency here to avoid the use of he or she as a definite determinative: 'this gentleman and the one who is standing by the window'; 'this lady and the one who is standing by the window.' But we cannot use the one where there isn't a preceding noun to which it can refer. Here, in colloquial speech, we usually employ a noun preceded by the definite article, which together serve as a definite determinative instead of he or she: 'the gentleman, or lady, who is standing by the window.' Of course, we can freely use he or she before who when they are not determinatives: 'We were speaking last night of a man who has been asking for us here. His visits have alarmed the servants, but there is nothing to fear from him. You know it is rather he (not a determinative but a predicate pronoun) who seems to fear us' (subject clause). Where he (she, or they) is an indefinite determinative pointing forward to something following, we say in the singular, 'He who (she who, or in choice poetic language he that, she that, but in colloquial speech usually one who, a man who, a woman who, a fellow who, a girl who) would do such a thing would not deserve respect,' but in the plural we usually prefer 'Those who (now largely replacing in plain prose older, once common, those that, they that, such as) would do such a thing would not deserve respect,' although they who (now largely replacing older they that) still occasionally occurs, especially in choice, poetic language: 'They who had most admiringly begged Percy Bresnahan for his opinions were least interested in her facts' (Sinclair Lewis, Main Street, p. 448), but especially in beautiful language, as in 'Great souls are they who love the most, who breathe the deepest of heaven's air, and give of themselves most freely' (William Allen White, A Certain Rich Man, Ch. XXII). 'Those have most power to hurt us that (now usually
whom) we love’ (Beaumont and Fletcher, The Maids Tragedie, V, iii, 129, A.D. 1622). ‘They that (now those who or they who) seek immortality are not onely worthy of leave but of praise’ (Ben Jonson, Discoveries, p. 11, A.D. 1641). ‘Poetry in this latter age hath prov’d but a meane mistresse to such as (or those who) have wholly addicted themselves to her. They who (now more commonly those who) have but saluted her on the by, and now and then tendred their visits, she hath done much for’ (ib., p. 27). To express the idea of kind or quality we often employ the qualitative determinative such: ‘Let such teach others who (now usually as) themselves excel’ (Pope, Essay on Criticism, 15). When a restrictive clause follows such, as in this example, those is often used in colloquial speech as a qualitative determinative instead of such, since the restrictive clause is felt as indicating with sufficient clearness the idea of quality, and such is avoided as a literary word: ‘Mention especially the intelligent and those who (or in more exact formal language such as) want to study literature as an end, not a means’ (Sir Walter Raleigh, Letter to Percy Simpson, Dec. 13, 1913). The singular qualitative determinative such a one is common when there is a preceding noun to which it can refer: ‘I have had some good teachers but never such a one as [is] Professor Jones.’ When there is no such preceding noun to which it can refer, the qualitative determinative such a one is a literary form, replaced in simple prose by someone or a man (woman, boy, girl): ‘Associate with such a one as you can look up to,’ or ‘Associate with someone, or a man (woman, boy, girl), you can look up to.’

In every society, however seemingly corrupt, there are those (= some) who have not bowed the knee to Baal (Hughes, Tom Brown's School-Days, 193).

The book which I hold in my hand is an English grammar.
Our Father which art in heaven (Matthew, VI, 9).
(She) had been told it herself by Mrs. Mudberry, which kept a mangle (Dickens, Pickwick, Ch. XXXIV).
Uh man w’ich steal is uh man w’ich enter anodduh man’ house een de dead ub night (Gonzales, The Black Border, p. 72).
All that I have is at your disposal.
It was that (something definite, just referred to) which killed him.
He always does that (determinative) which the hour demands, not that which he would fain do.
There was that (= that indefinite something) about him that (now more commonly which) did not please her (Julia Kavanagh, Queen Mab, I, 105).
There was that in Lady Jane’s innocence which rendered light talking impertinence before her (Thackeray, Vanity Fair).
I fear nothing what (now usually that or which) can be said against me (Shakespeare, Henry the Eighth, V, i, 125).
Now this was not all what (usually that) G. B. wanted (W. Black, Sunrise, I, 302).
That what (usually which) we falsely call a religious cry is easily raised by men who have no religion (Dickens, Barnaby Rudge, Preface).
to peruse everything what (usually that or which) went into the 'Post' (H. Sydnor Harrison, Qued, Ch. VII).

No leader worthy of the name ever existed but (or but what) was an optimist.

There is almost no man but hee (old nominative of but, now more commonly simple but or but what) sees clearer (16 5 a) and sharper the vices in a speaker then (now than) the vertues (Ben Jonson, Discoveries, p. 19, A.D. 1641).

Not one great man of them, but he (old nominative form of but, but now more commonly simple but) will puzzle you, if you look close, to know what he means (Ruskin, Selections, I, 172).

There is not a touch of Vandyck's pencil but (used as relative pronoun in the object relation) he seems to have reveled on (ib., I, 261).

No ill luck stirring but what lights on my shoulders (Shakespeare, Merchant of Venice, III, I, 98).

Not that I think Mr. M. would ever marry anybody but what had some education (Jane Austen, Emma, 29).

Not a soul in the auditorium or on the stage but what lived consummately during those minutes (Arnold Bennett, Leonora, Ch. VI).

No words but what seemed to him violent and extreme would have fulfilled his conception of the danger he had escaped (Galsworthy, The Country House, 71).

I have not from your eyes that (now such) gentleness as I was wont to have (Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, I, i, 33).

I can't serve with that (now such) cheerfulness as formerly (Addison and Steele, Spectator, 366) (or the same cheerfulness as formerly).

Such books as (predicate) this [is], or such men as he, are rare.

I made such alterations as occurred to me.

Such only who (usually as) have been in parishes that have been for generations squireless and also in those where a resident family has been planted for centuries can appreciate the difference in general tone among the people (S. Baring-Gould, Old Country Life, Ch. I).

Only such intellectual pursuits which (or that, but usually as) are pleasant (Sarah Grand, Ideala, 229).

Tony turned his eager attention to such pleasures that (or more commonly as) could be obtained in that sociable place (A. Marshall, Anthony Dare, Ch. I).

The children get the same food as I [get].

I really couldn't put up with living in the same place as that fellow after what had happened.

Such was thy zeal to Israel then, the same that (now as) now to me (Milton, Paradise Regained, III, 413).

He sits in the same row that (or as) we do.

When we saw the engine enter the tunnel on the same track that (or as) we were on, we believed our last hour had come.

He is entangled in the same meshes that (or which) held me.

He is the same man that (or whom) we met yesterday.

His air as [was that] of not having to account for his own place in the
social scale was probably irritating to Urbain (Henry James, The American, Ch. XIII).

Between her eyes was a driven look as [was] of one who walks always a little ahead of herself in her haste (Edna Ferber, So Big, Ch. I).

He granted her wish, good fellow as (or that) he was.

The place where I saw him last; this delightful country whither (still a favorite in choice, poetic language, but in plain prose usually replaced by to which) we should like to make a tour; a corner whence (or from whence; in choice, poetic language, but in plain prose usually replaced by from which) there was no escape; the day when I was there; the pauses while we are thinking of the right word.

It is a gentil pasture ther (now where) thou goost (Chaucer, The Prologue of the Monkes Tale, 45).

. . . this Tartre king, this Cambinskan, Roos fro his bord, ther that (now simple where) he sat ful hye. Toforn  him gooth the loude minstralcye, Til he cam to his chambre of parements, There as (now simple where) they sownen diverse instruments (Chaucer, The Squires Tale, 258–262).

To Engelond been they come the righte wey, wher as (now simple where) they live in joye and in quiete (Chaucer, The Tale of the Man of Lawe, 1032).

I shall show you the chambre where as (now simple where) he slepeth (Lord Berners, Huon, I, p. 102, A.D. 1534).

'Tis his Highness' pleasure You do prepare to ride unto Saint Alban's, Where as (now simple where or at which place) the King and Queen do mean to hawk (Shakespeare, II Henry VI, I, ii, 56).

Y must [go back] to the erthe thennes that y come fro (Knight de La Tour, 36, A.D. 1450).

That is the reason why (or that) he cannot succeed.

Is there a certain test whereby words of native English origin can be known from others?

6. Descriptive and Restrictive Relative Clauses. There is a tendency in English at present to distinguish between descriptive relatives, introducing a descriptive, independent fact, and restrictive relatives, introducing a clause confining or limiting the application of the antecedent. Descriptive clauses stand in a loose relation to the antecedent and hence are separated by a pause, indicated in print by a comma, while restrictive clauses are quite closely linked to the antecedent in thought, so that they follow immediately without pause, and hence are not usually cut off by a comma: 'I like to chat with John, who is a clever fellow,' but 'What is the name of the boy that brought us the letter?' 'Next winter, which you will spend in town, you know, will give you a good opportunity to work in the library,' but 'The next winter that you spend in town will give you a good opportunity to work in the library.' There is often a double restriction, the second
relative clause restricting the antecedent as restricted by the first relative clause: 'How seldom do we find a man that has stirred up some vast commotion who does not himself perish, swept away in it' (Carlyle, Heroes and Hero-worship, 127). The descriptive relative clause is in a formal sense a dependent clause; but it does not in any way limit the application of the antecedent, so that it is logically an independent proposition. Compare 201 (3rd par.). In a descriptive relative clause the relative pronoun must be expressed, for its suppression might change the thought or obscure the expression: 'This fact, which you admit, condemns you,' not 'This fact, you admit, condemns you,' which is another thought.

Who, that, and which are all used in restrictive clauses; who with reference to persons, that with reference to persons and things, which now usually with reference to things. A number of grammarians, however, recommend here the exclusive use of that, both for persons and for things: 'Here is the boy that did it.' 'Here is the book that he lost.' But there is another tendency here, which has been growing for centuries and is now often stronger than the tendency to distinguish the restrictive relative clause by the use of that. It is the tendency to express the idea of personality by the use of who and the idea of lack of life or personality by the use of which. The tendency to express personality is now strong even in restrictive clauses: 'He was not a man who allowed his taste to be warped when he knew for solid reasons that it was sound' (Galsworthy, The Man of Property, p. 304). It was not possible in Old English, with all its wealth of form, to express this fine shade of meaning. The tendency in restrictive clauses to use which to express lack of life or personality is not so strong as the tendency to employ who to express personality, but it is growing: 'There is much which will be unpleasing to the English reader; much which the Indian will dislike; but there is nothing which can be seriously questioned' (Cambridge Review). On the other hand, the choice of pronoun here is often determined by formal considerations. After the interrogative who we always employ that on merely formal ground, to prevent the repetition of who: 'Who that has the spirit of a man would suffer himself to be thus degraded?' That being impossible, we must employ whom or which in prepositional constructions wherever the preposition is placed at the beginning of the clause: 'There is no man for whom I have sincerer respect.' 'He bitterly regretted that the little estate on which he had set his heart had slipped out of his hand.' That can also not be used in the genitive and must be replaced here by whose, the genitive of who. In popular speech, however, as a survival of older usage, explained on page 207, that and which
are used in the genitive relation by placing a possessive adjective after that or which, that or which together with the possessive adjective having the force of whose: ‘There's two fellows that their (= whose) dads are millionaires’ (Sinclair Lewis, Babbitt, Ch. II, I). ‘Mrs. Boffin, which her (= whose) father's name was Henery’ (Dickens, Our Mutual Friend, I, 75). In the literary language where the reference is to things, which is replaced in the genitive relation by whose, or we may employ the prepositional genitive, of which, as described in 7 (last par.) below.

Who, that, and which have until recently been used also in descriptive clauses, but at present there is a tendency, not yet fixed usage but a growing tendency, to replace that here by who for persons and by which for things: ‘He is with his youngest son, who is accompanying him on his walk.’ ‘This book, which only appeared about a year ago, has already gone through several editions.’ This new usage is much more common with reference to persons than to animals and things, where we still often find that: ‘For the first few weeks she spoke only to the goat, that was her chiefest friend on earth and lived in the back garden’ (Rudyard Kipling, The Light That Failed, Ch. I, 5). ‘Once he piped up a kind of country love-song, that he must have learned in his youth’ (Stevenson, Treasure Island, Ch. III, 28). Which is usually employed when an attributive relative adjective in connection with a governing noun is used instead of a relative pronoun: ‘We traveled together as far as Paris, at which place we parted company.’ We now only rarely use here the which, once, however, a common form, competing with which in all its uses: ‘He brought him unaccountable presents of knives, pencil-cases, gold-seals, the which tokens of homage George received graciously, as became his superior merit’ (Thackeray, Vanity Fair, I, Ch. V).

In early Modern English the who was sometimes used in descriptive clauses instead of simple who: ‘Where you may Enjoy your mistress, from the whom, I see, There's no disjunction to be made’ (Shakespeare, The Winter's Tale, IV, iv, 537).

In descriptive clauses where the reference is indefinite some indefinite relative pronoun in -ever must be used; whatever with vague indefinite force and whichever with much less indefinite meaning: ‘Someone in the crowd, whoever it was, demanded fair play.’ ‘I'll send you one of my boys, whichever of them (or whichever one) you prefer.’ ‘He stumbled over something, whatever it was, and fell.’ ‘You may use either of the expressions, whichever sounds best to you.’

In descriptive clauses that refer to a thought, an idea, whether
contained in a proposition, a group of words, or a single noun or adjective, which is used with reference to a preceding statement or a single noun or adjective, while with reference to a following statement or a single noun or adjective we now usually employ what, though in older English, and sometimes still, which occurs: ‘I am getting gray and wrinkled, which is not particularly cheering.’ Only rarely now with the which instead of simple which: ‘She said with thin lips, “Why, even all this time you have been deceiving me!” the which egged on, in that vile way in which exchanges of a quarrel are as knives sharpening one against the other, Keggo’s inflamed retort, “The more fool you! Little fool!”’ (A. S. M. Hutchinson, This Freedom, p. 167). ‘We talked a long while about our boyhood days, after which we had a good dinner.’ ‘My brother is a good business man, which I am not.’ ‘My brother is a millionaire, which I am not.’ ‘When overwrought, which he often was, he became acutely irritable’ (Charlotte Brontë, Villette, Ch. XXX). ‘I’ve seen their Capital, their Troops and Stores, Their Ships, their Magazines of Death and Vengeance, And, what is more, I’ve seen their potent King’ (Robert Rogers, Ponteach, III, III, a.d. 1766). ‘He praised the wine of the country and what was more to the purpose, gave us the opportunity of tasting it.’ ‘And, which (now usually what) is worse, all you have done Hath been but for a wayward son’ (Shakespeare). ‘I found also, which (now usually what) appeared to me to be an unlucky measure, that the former had issued his warrants against one Herman Husbands’ (George Washington, Diary, Oct. 20, 1794). ‘(I was) also abused, and taken amiss, and, which (now usually what) vexed me most of all, unknown’ (Blackmore, Lorna Doone, Ch. LXIV). Adjective which in connection with an appropriate governing noun can refer to the thought contained in a preceding proposition: ‘She had forgotten to wind it up, which omission indicated that the grocer had perturbed her more than she thought’ (Arnold Bennett, Old Wives’ Tale, II, 133).

On the other hand, that is the usual form in restrictive clauses where the reference is to the thought contained in a preceding adjective: ‘On that day she looked the happiest that I had ever seen her.’ The that may be suppressed: ‘Louise was sitting in a deep chair, looking the happiest [that] I had ever seen her’ (Mary Roberts Rinehart, The Circular Staircase, Ch. XXXIV).

The adverbs when, as (17 2), whereupon, and whereat are used as relative pronouns in descriptive clauses where the reference is to a preceding statement or the idea contained in a preceding word, the first two forms often, the other two not now so commonly as formerly, as also where the reference is to a following
statement: 'The whole nation was jubilant, when, like a bolt from the blue, news arrived of a serious reverse.' 'I met him a month ago, since when I haven't seen anything of him.' 'He was an Englishman, as (or which) they perceived by his accent.' 'You behave like a madman, as (or which) you are.' 'Nor was the testimony of Lord Justice Rigby less important, showing, as (in such a parenthetical remark more common than which) it did, that the officers of the army are not visionary philanthropists.' 'Robin Hood replied that he had some two or three hundred head of cattle, whereupon (or after which) the sheriff said that he should like to ride over and look at them.' 'The inventor . . . said that . . . he would demonstrate by his own model that some day navigation would be by steam: whereat (or at which) they all kindly laughed at him for a dreamer' (J. L. Allen, Choir Invisible, II).

When the reference in descriptive clauses is indefinite, whatever and whichever (less indefinite than whatever) must be used to refer to a thought contained in some preceding word or words: 'He is one of the moderns, whatever that may mean.' 'The leper looked or listened, whichever he was really doing, for some seconds.'

a. Complex Relative Clauses. Both restrictive and descriptive clauses may be complex, i.e., may consist of a principal proposition and a subordinate clause, the one sometimes being embedded in the other: 'It is a fine opportunity, which I would seize if I were not otherwise engaged.' 'Shakespeare's mind may be likened to that modern machine into which if a thousand voices speak it will treasure up and redeliver the words.' 'Samuel Dale was a typical farmer of that part of the country with his fifty or sixty acres of land, the capital to work which had come from fish' (Compton Mackenzie, The Altar Steps, Ch. VII). In this example the relative which stands as an object in the attributive infinitive clause that modifies capital, which is the subject of the principal proposition of the complex clause. The relative often stands in a substantive clause which is the subject, predicate, or object of the verb or predicate adjective in the principal proposition of the complex clause: 'I now desire to speak of Pericles, whose aim was, it has been said, "to realize in Athens the idea which he had conceived of human greatness."' 'That is a statement which I believe I can prove' (or which I am sure I can prove). In this sentence and many similar ones the clause is only in a formal sense complex, for we feel such expressions as I believe, I am sure as sentence adverbs, as explained in 16 2 a (p. 132).

b. Descriptive Relative Clause Introduced by 'As.' In older English, as with the force of as being often stood before the relative pronoun introducing a descriptive clause: 'That which is of itself is the thing which we call God, beyond whome nothing can bee imagined and by whome all things both are and have bene, as which (= as being things which)
could have no being of themselves’ (Sir Philip Sidney, *Trewnesse of the Christian Religion*, Ch. II, A.D. 1587). As *who* was similarly used.

c. ‘AND WHICH,’ ‘AND WHO,’ ‘BUT WHICH,’ ‘BUT WHO.’ These forms now usually follow only a noun modified by a relative clause, but sometimes, especially earlier in the present period, they follow a noun modified in other ways: ‘the sign of the Bell, an excellent house indeed, and which (now usually simple which) I do most seriously recommend’ (Swift). ‘A man well looking for his years, and *who* was neither much beloved, nor yet abhor’d’ (Byron, *Don Juan*, I, 65), now usually ‘a man who was well looking for his years, and was neither much beloved nor yet abhorred.’ ‘In the case of calls within the London area, *but which* require more than three pennies, the same procedure is followed’ (recent writer), now usually ‘In the case of calls which are within the London area but require more than three pennies, the same procedure is followed.’

7. Personality and Form. Current English stresses the idea of personality much more than older English. Even a little earlier in the period *who* was used of animals, while we today usually employ *that* or *which* here since we feel the absence of personality: ‘Though the weather is raw and wintry and the ground covered with snow, I noticed a solitary robin, *who* (now *that*) looked as if he needed to have his services to the Babes in the Woods speedily requited’ (Thoreau, *Journal*, I, p. 21). The relative is always near the antecedent, hence the incongruity of placing a personifying form alongside of a noun designating a being without personality is more keenly felt than in the case of personal pronouns, which stand farther away: ‘We have one cow *that* (or *which*) we highly prize. *She* is a Jersey.’ With children the idea of individuality increases with their age. We say ‘the last child *which* was born,’ but ‘our only child *who* is now at college.’

The idea of personality varies considerably in collective nouns denoting persons. We employ *which* here wherever the idea of oneness or a mass or masses is more prominent than that of a number of independent individuals: ‘The Garth family, *which* was a large one,’ etc. (George Eliot, *Middlemarch*, 217). ‘His mother had ten children, of *which* he was the oldest’ (*Scribner’s Magazine*, XXXV, 114), but ‘Every faction is attended by a crowd of camp-followers, an useless and heartless rabble *who* prowl round its line of march’ (Macaulay). ‘He instructed the crowds *which* surrounded him,’ but ‘People *who* have enjoyed good educational opportunities ought to show it in their conduct and language.’

In older English, after the names of cities, countries, and other organizations implying persons, *who* was often used as relative,
but it has been entirely replaced here by which, since the idea of organization is now uppermost in the mind: 'France, which is in alliance with England; that party in England which,' etc.

Similarly, we often employ which after a noun denoting a person where we desire to express the idea of estate, rank, dignity rather than to speak of a person: 'He is exactly the man which such an education was likely to form' (Trollope, The Warden, Ch. II). 'He was surprised to find that he had come out upon quite a different Clark from the one to which he had been accustomed' (Barry Pain, The Culminating Point). 'He did not understand, and could not without giving up his own idea of her, the May Gaston which, as she said, he had made for himself' (A. Hope). 'Most of the critics have been kind. I only saw one which was not' (Sir Henry Jones, Letter, May 29, 1919). Which is especially common here in the predicate relation: 'Like the clever girl which she undoubtedly was' (Benson, Relentless City, 84). 'He is not the man which his father wants him to be.' That might be used instead of which in all of these examples. Although which and that are both used here, which is the more distinctive form and is, in general, winning out, but in the predicate relation that and also as are still quite common: 'But Hilda, like the angel of mercy that she was, whispered,' etc. (Grant Allen, Hilda Wade, Ch. I, 19). 'I will do my best to stop you, madman as you are' (Thackeray, Newcomes, I, Ch. XXIX). We often omit the relative here where it would not impair the thought: 'It is a part of Torrence's business to counsel widows, which he does like the honorable man [that] he is' (Meredith Nicholson, Lady Larkspur, Ch. II, p. 69).

When the relative refers to both persons and things we cannot, of course, in one word indicate both personality and lack of it, hence we here choose the colorless that, which can refer both to living beings and lifeless things: 'He spoke largely of the men and the things that he had seen.' Of course we cannot use that after prepositions, where we must use which. See 8, p. 230.

In sharp contrast to the principle of indicating personality or the lack of it, which now prevails in the use of the nominative and objective cases of the relative, as described above, is the employment of the genitive whose for reference to persons, animals, and living and lifeless things: 'the man whose watch was stolen,' 'a dog whose name is Carlo,' 'the tree whose top was trimmed,' 'the house in whose shade (or in the shade of which) we sit.' Where the reference is to lifeless things, colloquial language prefers the new prepositional genitive of which, although the convenient old form whose is still not infrequent. In poetry and choice prose
the old form is still the favorite: 'a little white building whose small windows were overgrown with creepers' (Galsworthy, *The Patrician*, p. 40). The use of whose for persons and things is the survival of older usage, which knew nothing of the differentiation described above. In the genitive the convenient agreeable form has thus far proved stronger in our feeling than the logical distinctions which sway us in the nominative and objective relations. Even in choice language, however, the genitive is only in limited use, for it cannot be used at all in the relation of an objective genitive: 'In its sensuous purity this woman's face reminded him of Titian's "Heavenly Love," a reproduction of which (not whose reproduction) hung over the sideboard' (Galsworthy, *The Man of Property*, p. 301).

8. **Case of Relative and Its Agreement with Its Antecedent.**

The relative pronoun performs a double function: It is a pronoun in the clause in which it stands and is also a connective joining the clause in which it stands to the governing noun. As a pronoun it has the case required by its function in the relative clause, i.e., is subject, direct or indirect object, or a genitive limiting some noun in the clause: 'The man who (subject) was sick is now well.' 'The boy whom (object of the verb of the clause) I trusted has proved worthy of my confidence.' 'The boy of whom (object of the preposition of) I spoke yesterday will soon be here.' 'The boy whose (genitive limiting knife) knife was lost has bought another.' In loose colloquial speech we sometimes hear who as accusative instead of the correct whom. See 11 2 e.

As a connective or conjunctive pronoun the relative has relations to its antecedent, with which it agrees in gender, number, and person. Gender: 'The boy who is standing by the gate is my brother,' but 'The book which lies upon the table is a history.' For the use of whose with reference to both persons and things see 7 (last par.) above. *That* is the appropriate form where the reference is to two or more antecedents representing both persons and things: 'The cabmen and cabs that are found in London.' However, we use also which here and this form must be used where a preposition stands before the relative: 'The Company had indeed to procure in the main for themselves the money and the men by which India was conquered.'

As relative pronouns have the same form for both numbers and all three persons, their number and person can be gathered only from the number and the person of the antecedent. This becomes important wherever the relative is the subject of its clause, for it then controls the number and person of the verb: 'I, who am
your friend, tell you so,' where am is in the first person singular agreeing with its subject who, which agrees with its antecedent I. 'For help I look up to thee who art all-powerful and able to help.' 'The road that leads to the shore is sandy.' 'The roads that lead to the shore are sandy.' An antecedent which is in the vocative, i.e., in the case of direct address, is felt as being in the second person: 'Dark anthracite, that reddenedest on my hearth!'

The relative often in loose colloquial speech, sometimes even in the literary language, agrees incorrectly with some word closely connected with the antecedent instead of agreeing with the antecedent itself, since this word lies nearer the thought of the speaker or writer than the grammatical antecedent, with especial frequency in the case of a plural partitive genitive that is dependent upon the numeral one, which is erroneously felt as the antecedent: 'That is one of the most valuable books (true antecedent but here not felt as such) that has (instead of the correct have) appeared in recent years.' 'Tyranny is one of those evils which tends (instead of tend) to perpetuate itself' (instead of themselves) (Bryce, American Commonwealth, Second Edition, II, 344). The singular form of the verb here is quite old: 'Thauriso, bat is a full fair cytee and a gret and on (one) of the beste bat is in the world for marchandise' (Mandeville, Travels, Ch. XVII, fourteenth century, MS. Cotton, A.D. 1410-1420).

c. Antecedent Implied in a Possessive Adjective. The antecedent of the relative pronoun is usually a noun or a pronoun, but it is sometimes, especially in older English or in poetry, a person implied in a possessive adjective, which is explained by the fact that the possessive adjective was originally a personal pronoun in the genitive and still always represents a definite person: 'Would you have me . . . Put my sick cause into his hand that (now usually into the hand of him who) hates me?' (Shakespeare, Henry the Eighth, III, i, 115).

b. Verb in Agreement with Subject of Principal Proposition. Where the antecedent is a predicate noun in the principal proposition, the verb of the relative clause sometimes, especially in older English, agrees in person and number with the subject of the principal proposition if it be a personal pronoun: 'I am no orator, as Brutus is, But, as you know me all, a plain blunt man, That love my friend' (Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, III, ii, 221), now usually that loves his friend.

c. Verb in Third Person Without Regard to Antecedent. In older English, the verb of the relative clause was sometimes in the third person without regard to the antecedent of the relative: 'My Lord of Burgundy, We first address toward you, who with this king Hath (now have) rival'd for our daughter' (Shakespeare, King Lear, I, i, 192). This usage still lingers: 'To me, who knows the capacity of human muscle, these men are a miracle' (Norman Douglas, South Wind, Ch. X). 'Above
all, no compulsion is offered to yourself, dear Elizabeth, who rightly
resents anything of the sort' (Hugh Walpole, Wintersmoon, A.D. 1928).

d. False Attraction. Writers and speakers not infrequently place
the relative pronoun in the accusative under the false impression that it
is the object of the following verb, while in reality its grammatical function
demands the nominative form: 'Instinctively apprehensive of her father,
whom she supposed it was, she stopped in the dark' (Dickens). Here
whom is incorrectly used for who, the predicate of the relative clause
who it was, which is the object of the verb supposed. This incorrect
usage was very common in Shakespeare's time: 'Arthur, whom they say
is kill'd tonight On your suggestion' (King John, IV, ii, 165).

9. Position and Repetition of the Relative. To avoid ambiguity
the relative should be placed as near as possible to the antecedent:
'The figs which we ate were in wooden boxes,' not 'The figs were
in wooden boxes which we ate.' If this cannot be done, the sen-
tence must be altered so that the thought becomes clear: not
'Solomon, the son of David, who built the temple,' but 'David's
son Solomon, who built the temple.' In older English, an ante-
cedent in the genitive might precede its governing noun, but today
it follows the governing noun and stands immediately before the
relative: 'I shall not confine myself to any man's rules (now the
rules of any man) that ever lived' (Sterne, Tristram Shandy, I, p. 10).

Though in general the relative pronoun introduces the clause,
we sometimes for the sake of emphasis put some other word in
the first place: 'So we get this charming little book, the newest
thing about which is, perhaps, its method' (London Times, Literary
Supplement, 29/10, 1914). 'It amounts to this that they are
ready to undertake work the results of which they can visualize'
(ib., 19/10, 1916). 'A deeply interesting book is this ancestor of
the modern dictionary, to describe which adequately would take
far more time than the limits of this lecture afford' (Sir J. Murray,
Evolution of English Lexicography). If the relative is the object
of a preposition the latter frequently precedes: 'He is the man
upon whom I am depending.' The preposition often stands at
the end of the clause. See 62 4.

Where the construction in two or more successive relative
clauses is the same, and there is no particular reason to contrast
them or emphasize each statement, the relative pronoun need not
be repeated: 'John Jones, who was born and buried in London.'
In older English, the relative pronoun was often not repeated
even where the construction in the different relative clauses was
different: ' 'Tis like a Potion that a man should drinke, But turns
his stomacke with the sight of it' (Ben Jonson, Every Man out of
His Humour, I, 1, 9, A.D. 1600). The relative is now repeated when the case or government is changed: ‘Originality in politics, as in every field of art, consists in the use and application of the ideas which we get or which are given to us.’ ‘Nor do I, either in or out of Cambridge, know any one with whom I can converse more pleasantly, or whom I should prefer as my companion.’ As in these examples, we should always use the same relative when we repeat a relative. There is a natural hesitancy, however, to repeat restrictive that when widely separated from its antecedent, as it usually follows its antecedent immediately, not even separated by a pause, so that some prefer which where the pronoun is widely separated from its antecedent: ‘all the toys that infatuate men and which they play for’ (Emerson). We may avoid this difficulty by using which in both cases. On the other hand, if there are two relative clauses in the sentence and one of them is subordinate to the other, a change of relative is helpful to keep the grammatical relations clear: ‘He enjoyed a lucrative practise, which enabled him to educate his family with all the advantages that money can give.’

a. Personal Pronoun Instead of Relative. Sometimes, especially in older English, where the grammatical conscience was not so sensitive as today, we find in the second of two coordinated relative clauses a personal pronoun instead of a relative, usually, however, only where the construction in the two clauses is different, which clearly indicates that the personal pronoun has been chosen as a convenient means of avoiding the reconstruction of the second clause: ‘Fortune shall cull forth out of one side her happy minion, To whom in favour she shall give the day, And kiss him (instead of whom she shall kiss) with a glorious victory’ (Shakespeare, King John, II, 1, 391).

b. Independent Proposition Instead of Relative Clause. In older English, we often find a relative in one clause, but do not find in the following clause, which in a formal sense is coordinate with it, a relative expressed or understood: ‘At last they were forced into a harbor, where (= in which) lay a French man-of-war with his prize, and had surely made prize of them also, but that the providence of God,’ etc. (Winthrop, Journal, June 15, 1637). In such sentences the second subordinate clause has a subject in common with the first subordinate clause, but there is no relative pronoun that links it to the first subordinate clause, so that it appears to be an independent proposition. Instead of the conjunction and the relative pronoun which should have been used: ‘a man-of-war with his prize, which had,’ etc.

10. Asyndetic Relative Construction. There is in English fairly well preserved the most primitive type of relative construction, the asyndetic relative clause, i.e., a clause without a
connective, without a formal link joining the clause to the governing noun. In a strict sense this is not a relative clause since it does not contain a word which points back to an antecedent. It simply lies alongside of it as an appositive clause explaining it. The usual custom of saying that the relative is omitted suggests carelessness and has in fact brought the construction into bad repute with many who are wont to attach value to form. A careful study, however, of the true nature of this favorite old construction, as given at the beginning of II, p. 204, and also in 193, will show at once that it is a good natural English expression, not a mutilated grammatical member but perfect and neatly fitted into the structure of the sentence, performing its function tersely, yet clearly and forcefully, often even with elegant simplicity.

There are two groups:

a. HYPOTACTIC ASYNDETIC CLAUSE. In this, the more common of the two types, the clause is always restrictive, closely linked to its antecedent; in fact so closely that it is indispensable to the thought, hence though not connected with the antecedent by a formal link, it is yet bound to it by such a strong logical tie that the dependent relation is distinctly felt. In most cases there is in the governing proposition a formal indication of subordination, a demonstrative or, more accurately, an adjective or pronominal determinative (56 A), namely, the (definite article), that, the one, or some other word with determinative force, the indefinites a, any, etc., and the qualitative determinatives a, one, ones, like that, or in colloquial language simple like (56 A), pointing to the following asyndetic relative clause. The following groups of examples of this common construction are arranged upon the basis of the function that the relative pronoun would perform if it were expressed.

Direct object of the verb: 'the book I hold in my hand'; 'the books I am holding and those (or the ones) you gave me'; 'that lovely way Father has, that even course he always pursues'; 'a man we met yesterday'; 'any course you may pursue'; 'the need of a man we can trust'; 'not such a man, but one we can trust.' 'She makes pies like those Mother used to make,' or in loose colloquial speech like Mother used to make.

Instead of an indefinite determinative we often simply omit the determinative altogether, since the absence of an article or other determinative imparts indefinite force: 'certain books (or simply books) we should all read.'

Although the asyndetic relative clause is most common in the relation of direct object, as discussed above, it not infrequently occurs elsewhere: Cognate (112) accusative: 'He went back the
way he had come.' Accusative of length of time: 'The length of time Eskimo dogs can go without food seems beyond belief.' Indirect object: 'the man I wrote to,' 'the boy I gave the knife to.' Object of a preposition (62 4): 'the pen I write with,' 'the car I rode on,' 'the book I spoke of,' 'the table the ball rolled under,' 'the fence he jumped over'; 'the place I am going to,' or to which I am going, or whither (in a choice literary style) I am going, colloquially, where I am going, usually only in popular speech where I am going to, although outside of relative clauses this form is much more widely used; 'the place I came from,' or from which I came, or whence (in a choice literary style, or sometimes from whence) I came, usually only in popular speech where I came from, although outside of relative clauses this form is much more widely used. On (or in) which in expressions of time: 'the day he arrived,' 'the year you came back.' Every (or each) time that: 'every (or each) time he came.' While: 'all the time I was there.' Why: 'the reason I did it.' In which in expressions of manner: 'the way he does things.' Predicate: 'He is not the man he once was.' 'She is not the cheerful woman she used to be.'

Earlier in the period, this construction was not infrequent in the subject relation: 'I have a niece is a merchants wife' (Ben Jonson, Every Man out of His Humour, I, II, A.D. 1600). 'Truth is mans proper good and the onely immortal thing was given to our mortality to use' (id., Discoveries, p. 4, A.D. 1641). 'I bring him news will raise his drooping spirits' (Dryden, All for Love, I, 113, A.D. 1678). Though this construction is in general not now used so much in the subject relation as formerly, it is still quite common here in a large number of expressions: 'My children have had every complaint there is to be had.' 'There's nothing makes me so wild as that continual bawling.' 'Mrs. Jones came to borrow some butter and I gave her all there was (or the little there was) in the house.' 'I lent to Mrs. Jones all the butter (or the little butter) there was in the house.' 'You may keep the money there is left after buying your hat.' 'There isn't one of us really knows what she's doing it for' (W. D. Howells, A Hazard of New Fortunes, II, Ch. I). 'There's going to be several folks talk too much, shortly' (H. W. Morrow, Forever Free, Ch. XII). Still widely used in popular Irish English, which here, as often also elsewhere, preserves older English idiom: 'It's the like of that talk you'd hear from a man would be losing his mind' (J. M. Synge, The Well of the Saints, p. 55). Also still quite common in the language of educated Irishmen: 'There's no investment in the world would give you a return like that' (Lennox Robinson, Harvest, Act I). Also common in the mountain dialect of Kentucky:
'Any man can't fight for his friends [had] better be dead' (Lucy Furman, *Mothering on Perilous*, Ch. XV).

The old asyndetic clause is still not infrequent in subject clauses which are now felt and treated as relative clauses: 'Who was it told you that?' Other examples in 21 c.

The old asyndetic clause was once common after the determinative *that*, but as the form was early interpreted as a relative pronoun it was later replaced by *what* and *he who*, *those who*, the original construction now only lingering on, seldom recognized, in poetry or poetic prose or old saws: 'We speak *that* (now *what*) we do know and testify *that* (now *what*) we have seen' (John, III, 11). 'A man passes for *that* (now *what*) he is worth' (Emerson). 'Handsome is *that* handsome does,' now in plain modern form 'Handsome is *he who*,' etc. 'Of her ancestors there have been *that* (now *those who*) have exalted and pulled down Kings' (Digby, *Private Memoirs*, 272, A.D. 1665).

6. **Paratactic Clause.** Here the clause is descriptive, often quite loosely linked: 'There is a man at the door [, he] wants to see you.' 'Here is a little book [, it] will tell you how to raise roses.' 'I knew an Irish lady [, she] was married at fourteen' (Meredith, *Ordeal of Richard Feverel*, Ch. XXVIII, 226). 'I have discovered something [, it] Concerns you nearly' (Bridges, *Humour of the Court*, III, 2, 2583). In this old paratactic (19 3) type two sentences lie side by side, each with enough independence that it might stand alone, and yet the second is connected in thought with the first. In older English, when two such sentences came into relations with each other, there was often no personal pronoun in the second sentence referring to a noun in the first. The context made the thought clear. The suppression of the pronoun is a primitive means of suggesting subordination. In our present hypotactic (19 3) stage of development we prefer to indicate this subordination by a relative pronoun, hence this old type is now little used.

11. **Abridgment of Relative Clause.** The relative clause can often be abridged. Its contracted form is frequently that of an appositive noun, adjective, or participle, which, alone or modified, might theoretically be construed as an elliptical clause, as indicated by the square brackets, but in reality is an abridged clause (20 3), as often becomes evident in clauses containing a present participle which, as in the examples from Ben Jonson and Mark Twain, cannot be construed as standing in an elliptical clause. The subject of the abridged clause is usually some noun or pronoun in the principal proposition: 'The English, [who are] a practical and energetic people, have spread beyond their islands.
and now hold territory in all parts of the world.’ ‘His companions led Henry V to do many deeds [that were] quite unworthy of a prince.’ ‘Opinion is a light, vaine, crude, and imperfect thing, settled in the imagination, but never arriving (= which never arrives) at the understanding, there to attain the tincture of reason’ (Ben Jonson, Discoveries, p. 6, A.D. 1641). ‘It (i.e., the circus) was all one family — parents and five children — performing (= who performed) in the open air’ (Mark Twain, Letter to His Wife, Sept. 28, 1891). ‘Pride [which is] joined with many virtues chokes them all.’ ‘Geoffrey says his speech on the Poor Law was head and shoulders the best [that was] made’ (Galsworthy, The Patrician, p. 338). ‘Well, Father, there’s Rocket (name) [who has] come for you’ (Hugh Walpole, The Green Mirror, p. 29). ‘First (58, 6th par.) [who has] come, first [who will be] served.’ ‘First [who has] come, first [who will be let] in.’

There is also another kind of abridged relative clause which has come into wide use. Wherever there is a modal idea involved, a relative clause, in accordance with 7 D 2, can be abridged to an infinitive clause when the infinitive serves as the predicate and some noun or pronoun in the principal proposition as subject: ‘He is not a man to trifle with’ (= who is to be trifled with, can be trifled with). ‘That isn’t anything to censure’ (= that should be censured). ‘The sights to be seen (= which can be seen) are not impressive.’ As explained in 7 D 2, the infinitive here is often active in form but passive in meaning. In oldest English, active meaning was quite rare in this construction, but it is now quite common: ‘John is the boy to do it’ (= who should do it). ‘Did you ever see anything to beat it?’ (= that could beat it). ‘It is the glory of Trinity that she has an abundance of famous men from whom to select’ (= from whom she can select, or in simpler form to select from). ‘He is a poor old man soon to become (= who must soon become) a burden to his family.’ There is often here a future force in connection with the modal. See 7 D 2 (2nd par.).

When the reference is general or indefinite, the infinitive here has no subject: ‘It is not a night to turn a dog from the door’ (= in which one should turn a dog from the door). ‘He has no following to speak of.’ ‘What is there to do?’

Not infrequently, the subject is indicated by the context: ‘Clearly the minute had come at which to speak plainly’ (Basil King, The Side of the Angels, Ch. XIII) (or in simpler form to speak plainly = at which he should speak plainly).

Where the subject of the infinitive is not general or indefinite, or is not implied in some word in the principal proposition, or is not indicated by the context, the infinitive has a subject of its
own introduced by *for*, as explained in 21c: 'She wasn't terrible, she wasn't really anything except a kind of peg *for all sorts of traditions to hang on to*’ (Hugh Walpole, *The Duchess of Wrexæ*, Ch. XII). ‘The thing *for you to do* is to go to bed.’ ‘What is there *for us to do*?’
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24. Object clauses are divided into genitive, dative, accusative, and prepositional clauses. In the prepositional clause the preposition and the following clause form a unit called a prepositional clause, which as a whole serves as the object of some verb or adjective.

GENITIVE CLAUSE

24 I. A genitive clause performs the function of a noun in the genitive, used as the object of a verb or an adjective: 'I reminded him that he had promised it' (= of his promise). 'I am sure that he will support me' (= of his support).

The genitive clause is introduced by: *that; but, but that*, or in colloquial speech *but what*, after a negative proposition instead of *that not*; the indefinite relative (23 II 1, 2, 3) pronouns and adverbs *who, what, whether, how*, etc. The genitive clause does not usually have a distinctive form. We recognize it by the fact that a corresponding noun or pronoun object is in the genitive, as in the two examples given above. If, however, it is introduced by an indefinite relative other than *whether*, it has the genitive sign of: 'I reminded him of what he said.' 'Are you sure of what you say?' 'Are you sure of who he is?'
Examples:

I am not sure that he will come.
I am not sure that he may not decline (or but that, or but what, he may decline).
I cannot convince myself that she isn’t alive (or but that, or but what, she is still alive).
I cannot persuade myself that she does not still love me (or but that, or but what, she still loves me).
They robbed him of what he had on his person.
He was not sure whether he had left his umbrella at school or on the playgrounds.
He was mindful of how kindly they had treated him.

As many people feel the genitive clause now as a prepositional clause, these examples might all be classed under IV, p. 253.

a. Abridgment of Genitive Clause. A that-clause may sometimes be abridged to an infinitive clause, but it is much more freely abridged to a gerundial clause, since the gerund can naturally assume the genitive form: ‘He is worthy to receive such honor’ (or to be thus honored). ‘I reminded him of his having promised it.’ ‘I convinced him of his (or my) being able to do it.’ ‘He is not convinced of being defeated.’ ‘I am not quite sure of his having said it.’

DATIVE CLAUSE

24 II. The dative clause performs the function of a noun which is in the dative after a verb or an adjective:

He told the story to whoever would listen.
He told the story to whomever he met.
He was unkind to whoever opposed him.
This is like what we saw yesterday.
The explosion took place near where we stood.

The relative pronoun in the subject relation is sometimes incorrectly put into the dative after the dative sign to, the writer or speaker for the moment not noticing that the pronoun is subject of the dative clause: ‘The original papers . . . are in my posses­sion and shall be freely exhibited to whomsoever (instead of the correct whosoever) may desire a sight of them’ (Hawthorne, Scarlet Letter, The Custom House).

As like and near may be construed also as prepositions, the clause following them may be construed as the object of a preposition, preposition and clause together forming a prepositional clause: ‘This cloth does not wear like what we bought of him before.’
"The bridge crosses the river near where we live." Compare 50 4 c bb and 24 IV.

a. ABRIDGMENT OF DATIVE CLAUSE. This clause is sometimes replaced by a participle: 'He is unkind to all opposing him,' instead of to whoever opposes (sometimes oppose) him.

ACCUSATIVE CLAUSE, OBJECT OF A VERB

24 III. Conjunctions. This clause performs the function of a noun in the accusative used as the object of a verb: 'I saw what he did' (= his deed). There are sometimes two direct objects — one a noun or pronoun, the other a clause: 'I entreated him that he spare me this humiliation.' As the double accusative is not now a common construction, we prefer a prepositional object instead of the accusative of the noun or pronoun, wherever this is possible: 'Pas straight desired all the company they would beare witnes' (Sir Philip Sidney, Arcadia, Book III, p. 65, A.D. 1593), now usually of all the company. But the accusative of the noun or pronoun is the more common form when the clause is an infinitive clause: 'I desire all the company to bear witness.'

This clause is introduced by: that, in popular speech still often replaced by as (27 2, 2nd par.), as sometimes in older literary English; in older literary English sometimes as that instead of the usual that; lest, from older thy (old instrumental case of that) less the, literally, on that account that with the negative less (= not) inserted to indicate that the person in question wishes that the action may not take place; sometimes still, as in older English, used after verbs of fearing instead of that; but, but that, or in colloquial speech but what, often used instead of that not after a negative or interrogative proposition containing a verb of knowing, thinking, believing, expecting, fearing, or saying; an illogical but, but that, or in colloquial speech but what, sometimes used instead of the more common that after a negative or interrogative proposition containing a verb of doubting, wondering, earlier in the period also a verb of denying and gainsaying, in all four cases verbs which though positive in form are negative in meaning; an illogical but or but that instead of that after a negative or interrogative proposition containing a verb of hindering or preventing, verbs which though positive in form are negative in meaning, a construction once common but now replaced by a positive gerundial clause after the preposition from; in older English, an illogical that not instead of that after such verbs as to forbid, hinder, etc., which though positive in form are negative in meaning; after verbs of remembering, recalling, thinking, knowing, learning,
perceiving, hearing, and relating often how instead of that, or, especially earlier in the period, with double expression, how that, in popular speech often replaced by as how or that how; often introduced by the indefinite relative (23 II 1, 2, 3) pronouns who (in older English also who that), what (in older English also what that), that (in older English, now replaced by what), which, whichever, what(so)ever, whatso (in older English); the indefinite relative adjectives which, whichever, what (more indefinite than which), whatever; the indefinite relative adverbs where, when, whence (in a choice literary style, usually replaced by where— from, from where) or sometimes from whence, whither (in a choice literary style, usually replaced by where, or often in colloquial speech by the more accurate where — to), why (in older English also why that), how (in older English also how that), whether (originally a pronoun meaning which of the two) or if, or in older English sometimes and or an; whether — or whether, in older English also if — or, also if — or whether, also if — or whether that; whether — or, used when the second member has its subject, or verb, or both suppressed, but in older English we find here also whether — or whether; in indirect questions introduced by whether or if, or in older English sometimes and or an; whether — or whether, in older English also if — or whether, whether (or if) — or whether that; whether — or, in older English also if — or; in indirect questions also introduced by the interrogative adverbs why (in older English why that), how (in older English how that), whence, where — from, whither, when, where, etc., or the interrogative pronouns and adjectives, who, what, which, etc.; in indirect exclamations introduced by what a. Examples illustrating the use of these conjunctions are given below. One of these conjunctions — if — needs a historical explanation. In older English, it was used in both substantive and conditional clauses. Its original meaning of doubt or uncertainty was felt as appropriate for both categories. Today in the literary language we usually distinguish the two categories by a distinctive form, preferring whether to if in substantive clauses and reserving if for use in conditions. The old usage of employing if also in substantive clauses is still widespread in colloquial speech. But even here if is not used if the substantive clause precedes the principal proposition or if the substantive clause stands in the attributive relation, i.e., is an attributive substantive clause (23 I): ‘Whether (not if) he comes himself or sends a substitute is immaterial to me.’ ‘The question whether (not if) he should come himself or send a substitute must be decided soon.’

An understanding of the nature of a direct and an indirect
question is necessary to appreciate the form and meaning of some of the examples given below. The nature of an indirect question is discussed in 21 and 23 II 1 (last par.). The forms employed to introduce direct and indirect questions are used also to introduce other object clauses where there is not the slightest reference to a question or an answer, as in 'I told him how (relative adverb) he should do it.' There is, however, a close relation between these interrogative and indefinite relative forms. Both groups were originally indefinites and still retain their original meaning. An interrogative is an indefinite that assumes the additional function of asking information concerning indefinite relations. The interrogative, however, never ceases to be an indefinite. Compare c, p. 247, and 23 I and II 1 (last par.). For the use of the terms relative and interrogative see 21 (4th par.).

Although the accusative clause usually has declarative form, it sometimes has the form of a direct command or a direct question: 'And I say to mankind, Be not curious about God!' (Walt Whitman, Leaves of Grass, p. 90). For examples of interrogative form see c, p. 247.

Examples of Accusative Clauses after Verbs:

'I know that he has come,' originally 'I know that: he has come,' where the that is a determinative pronoun pointing to the following explanatory appositional sentence.

Is it sufferable that the Fop of whom I complain should say as (now that) he would rather have such-a-one without a Groat than me with the Indies? (Steele, Spectator, No. 508, p. 6, A.D. 1712).

Miss Ophelia. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. — Mr. St. Claire. I don't know as (now that) I am (Harriet Beecher Stowe, Uncle Tom's Cabin, Ch. XVIII).

I don't know as (now that) it would be proper for me to mention the grown-up people over the way (Louisa Alcott, Aunt Jo's Scrap-Bag, 197).

I don't know as (in popular speech replacing, as here, literary that) I should want you should marry for money (W. D. Howells, The Minister's Charge, Ch. XX).

Pray let her know as that (instead of the usual simple that) I will present her . . . my Lancashire Seat (Richardson, Clarissa, IV, 259, A.D. 1748).

I feared that it might anger him (or lest it should, or might, anger him).

I don't know but (or but that, or but what) it is all true (= that it isn't all true).

Who knows but (but that, or but what) it is all true? (= that it isn't all true?).

I could hardly believe but (but that, or but what) it was all real (= that it wasn't all real).

Take the money — there is no saying but (but that, or but what) you will need it.
That wouldn't say but what I'd be foolish (= that I shouldn't be foolish) to feel that way (Victor Appleton, Don Sturdy in Lion Land, Ch. IV).

Thus we lived several years in a state of much happiness; [I will] not [say] but that we sometimes had those little rubs which Providence sends to enhance the value of its favors.

Also, he did a big piece of work in his clean-up of camps all over California, and in awakening, through countless talks up and down the state, some understanding of the I. W. W. and his problem. (Not but what it seems now to have been almost forgotten.) (Cornelia Stratton Parker in Atlantic Monthly, April, 1919.)

Who doubts that (or now less commonly but, but that, or but what) he will win.

'I do not doubt that (or now less commonly but, or but that, or but what) the catastrophe is over,' but with the indefinite whether to bring out the idea of doubt, uncertainty: 'I doubt whether (or if) the catastrophe is over.'

'What hinders then but that thou find her out?' (Addison, Cato, III, vii, 18), now, 'What hinders you then from finding her out?'

He forbade that not (now simple that) anybody should use a silver drinking cup (W. Burton, Comment. Itin. Antonin., 121, A.D. 1658).

'I saw how (= that) he was gradually falling behind in the race,' quite different from 'I asked him how he did it' (indirect question).

Tell John what (relative adjective) things ye have seen and heard; how that (= simple how or that) the blind see, the lame walk (Luke, VII, 22).

Seeing as how (for literary that) the captain had been hauling him over the coals (Marryat, Peter Simple, XIII).

Miss Dorritt came here one afternoon with a bit of writing, telling that how (in popular speech for literary that) she wished for needle work (Dickens, Little Dorritt).

I should like to ask who (interrogative pronoun) did it (indirect question).
I told him who (relative pronoun) did it.
He told me whom (relative) he blamed for it.
I asked him whom (interrogative) he blamed for it (indirect question).
I asked him who (interrogative; see 11 2 e; better whom) he plays with (indirect question).

'I may neither choose who (now one whom) I would nor refuse who (now one whom) I dislike' (Shakespeare, The Merchant of Venice, I, ii, 24).

Today we avoid simple indefinite who where we desire to describe rather than to point out.

Give me what (relative) you have in your hand.
Tell me what (interrogative) you have in your hand.
That (relative; now what) thou dost, do quickly (John, XIII, 27).
Whatever he threatens he performs.

'I'll tell you soon which (relative) plan, or which (relative) of the plans, we finally settle on,' or where the thought is more indefinite 'I'll report to you later what (or whatever) changes we make in our plans,' or a little more definitely 'We are ready to adopt whichever of these plans you recommend.'

I asked him which (interrogative) plan he had settled on, or which (interrogative) of the plans he had settled on.
I told him why (relative) I did it.
I asked him why (interrogative) he did it.
I wonder why he doesn’t come! (indirect speculative question; see 21, 3rd par.).
I wonder what he is going to do now! (indirect speculative question).
I told him when (relative) I was going.
I asked him when (interrogative) he was going.
I have seen, When (now a case, or cases in which), after execution, judgement hath Repented o’er his doom (Shakespeare, Measure for Measure, II, ii, 10).
I see whither (relative; in poetry and choice prose not infrequent) your question tends (Concise Oxford Dictionary).
I told him where (relative; in poetry and choice prose whither) I was going.
I asked him where (interrogative; in poetry and choice prose whither) he was going.
I told her where (relative) I came from (or in poetry or choice prose whence I came).
‘Nobody knew where (relative) he came from,’ or to emphasize where by withholding it until the end: ‘He came from nobody knew whereabouts’ (George Eliot, Silas Marner, Ch. II).
‘I should like to know where (interrogative) she came from’ (or in poetry and choice prose whence she came), a polite indirect way of asking a question; but in a direct question we often for emphasis bring the interrogative, who, what, where, when — from, etc., forward from the subordinate clause and put it at the beginning of the sentence: ‘Who did she say wrote it?’, ‘Who do you think it is?’, ‘What do you think has happened?’, ‘Where did she say she put it?’, ‘Where did she say she came from?’; instead of: ‘Did she say who wrote it?’, ‘Do you think who it is?’, ‘Do you think what has happened?’, ‘Did she say where she put it?’, ‘Did she say where she came from?’
‘I have heard, Where (now conversations in which) many of the best respect (rank) in Rome, Have wish’d that noble Brutus had his eyes’ (Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, I, ii, 59). This old use of where with the force of a noun + in which is still heard in colloquial speech: ‘This morning I read in the Tribune where (in the literary language an account in which) a boy killed his father.’
Of many things that have been taken for granted men are beginning to ask, Are they true? (direct question), or whether they are true (indirect question).
He decided that he would go and see whether (relative) Rachel were in (Hugh Walpole, The Duchess of Wrexe, p. 261).
I asked him whether (or if; interrogatives) he was coming.
In ‘She found herself wondering at the breath she drew, doubting that another would follow’ (Meredith), the writer employs that to indicate that, though there was doubt in the mind of the person described, there is really no doubt about the fact in question; but it is more natural here to use whether (or if) to portray vividly the doubt in the mind of the person described.
"I doubt whether (or colloquially if) he was there," but 'I do not doubt that (or sometimes but, or but that, or colloquially but what) he was there' and 'Do you doubt that (or but, or but that, or but what) he was there?'

Good sirs, looke and (now whether or if; relative) the coast be cleere, I'ld faine be going (Ben Jonson, Every Man out of His Humour, V, iii, A.D. 1600).

Aske him an (now whether or if; interrogatives) he will clem (starve) me (Ben Jonson, Poetaster, I, ii, A.D. 1601).

I do not know whether (relative) he will come himself, or whether he will send a substitute (or whether he will come himself or send a substitute).

Know of the Duke if (now usually whether) his last purpose hold, Or whether since he is advis'd by aught To change the course (Shakespeare, King Lear, V, i, 1).

I do not know whether (relative) he is better or worse.

'We may choose whether we will take the hint or not' (or sometimes as in older English also no), or 'We may choose whether or not (or no) we will take the hint.'

'Confessing not to know whether there were gods, or whether not' (Milton, Areopagitica, 7), now simply or not.

Then while the king debated with himself If (now usually whether) Arthur were the child of shamefulness, Or born the son of Gorlois, etc. (Tennyson, Idyls of the King, 237).

I asked him whether (interrogative) he would come himself, or whether he would send a substitute (or whether he would come himself or send a substitute).

'And hark thee, villain, observe if his cheek loses color or his eye falters' (Scott, Talisman, Ch. XV). This if — or is still common in colloquial American English, but in the literary language whether — or is the usual form.

Then judge, great lords, if (now usually whether) I have done amiss, Or whether (relatives) that such cowards ought to wear this ornament of knighthood (Shakespeare, I Henry VI, IV, i, 27).

Every one knows what a scene takes place when a Ministry is defeated in the House of Commons.

Little did she foresee what a difference this would make.

The object clause is often complex, i.e., consists of a principal and a subordinate clause, the one being often embedded in the other: 'Let us now consider what we said was the supreme characteristic of a highly developed age — the manifestation of a critical spirit, the endeavor after a rational arrangement and appreciation of facts.' Here the principal proposition of the complex clause, we said, is embedded in the subordinate. The clause is often only in a formal sense complex since the principal proposition has the force of a sentence adverb, as described in 16 2 a (p. 132): 'I now desire to discuss what I feel is the main issue.'

a. Anticipatory Object or Object Pointing Back. There is often an anticipatory word such as this, it, one thing, etc., in the
principal proposition, pointing to the following object clause: 'I know this, one thing, that he will never do that again.'

If the principal proposition is placed at the end for emphasis, it often contains a pronominal object which points back to the object clause, which is the real object: 'Whom I honor, him I trust.' 'What the light of your mind pronounces incredible, that in God's name leave uncredited' (Carlyle).

b. Omission of 'That.' As in 21 a, that is often omitted: 'He always answers us he is well.' This always takes place when the principal proposition is embedded in the accusative clause: 'God himself, they devoutly trusted, would shelter his servants in the day of battle against the impious men who were less their enemies than his' (Gardiner). Sometimes the principal proposition follows the accusative clause, which has been placed first for emphasis: 'You've an appointment at the tailor's, remember' (Pinero, The Thunderbolt, Act I).

It is a characteristic of American popular and dialectic speech to employ a full clause after want (= desire), usually with suppressed that, while in the literary language the abridged form of the clause, according to d, p. 249, is always used: 'He wanted Luke should go with him' (Amy Lowell, East Wind, p. 110), but in the literary language always: 'He wanted Luke to go with him.'

c. Accusative Clause in the Form of a Question. In colloquial and popular speech it is common to employ here a blending of direct and indirect discourse — the form of a direct question instead of the usual literary accusative clause introduced by the interrogatory conjunction whether or if, with the important modification, however, that a present tense form under the influence of a past tense is changed to a past tense form: 'He spoke of Pen's triumphs as an orator at Oxbridge, and asked was he coming into Parliament' (Thackeray, Pendennis, p. 286). 'He had asked the boy Micky had any one gone to see them' (De Morgan, When Ghost Meets Ghost, Ch. XXIX). 'He wants to know is the newspaper man here' (George Bernard Shaw, The Doctor's Dilemma, Act IV). 'Mr. Man up'n ax' 'im is (= has) he got a bad cole' (Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, p. 125). This construction is spreading from popular speech. It is especially common in popular Irish English. It is used there even when the principal proposition is a question, so that both propositions have question form: 'Would you say would that lad grow too high in himself to go into the kitchen to oblige me?' (Lady Gregory, The Dragon, p. 91).

As explained in 21 (3rd par.), question form here sometimes denotes not a formal question but mere doubt, uncertainty: 'She
cast about among her little ornaments to see could she sell any to procure the desired novelties,' instead of the usual if (or whether) she could sell any, etc. Very often in popular Irish English: 'Mad, am I? Bit by a dog, am I? You'll see am I mad!' (Lady Gregory, The Full Moon), instead of the usual if (or whether) I am mad. In the literary language we often find here a question followed by the formal principal proposition I wonder, which in reality, however, is not the governing proposition but a sentence adverb (16 2 a, p. 132) which gives the sentence the coloring of uncertainty: 'Am I getting deaf, I wonder?' (Edith Wharton, The Glimpses of the Moon, Ch. XXI).

In all these cases there is sometimes not only a change of tense but also a change of person: (direct) 'Will you call again?' (indirect) 'Would I call again? she asked.' 'Ned put his flat and final question, would she marry him, then and there' (Hardy, Life's Little Ironies).

Similarly, after the interrogatives when, where, what, why, etc., we sometimes find here question form instead of the usual word-order of the accusative clause: 'Then he asked where was King Phillip' (M. H. Hewlett, Richard Yea-and-Nay, 228), instead of where King Phillip was. 'Dey ax' 'im, dey did, wharbouts wuz Brer Fox' (Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus). 'My sister asked me what was the matter' (Doyle, Sherlock Holmes). As above, question form here sometimes denotes not a formal question but mere doubt, uncertainty: 'I wonder what way did that lad make his way into this place' (Lady Gregory). 'He realized that it would be best to see what was the matter' (Robert Herrick, The Common Lot, Ch. XXVI) (or more commonly what the matter was). As above, we often find here in the literary language a question followed by the formal principal proposition I wonder, which in reality is not the governing proposition but a sentence adverb which gives the sentence the coloring of uncertainty: 'Why do you dislike having servants and being waited upon so much, I wonder' (Mrs. H. Ward, Lady Rose's Daughter, Ch. XII).

Furthermore, question form is often employed where there is no desire either to report indirectly actual questions or to express doubt, uncertainty. When a speaker or writer presents a topic for consideration, he frequently first puts it in the form of a question and then proceeds to discuss it: 'To come to closer quarters we may ask, What are the chief general characteristics of sixteenth-century English?' (H. C. Wyld, History of Modern Colloquial English, p. 100).

Of course, question form is used when a direct question is quoted: "Where are you going?" she asked."
d. ABRIDGMENT OF ACCUSATIVE CLAUSE. This accusative clause can be abridged to an infinitive clause when its subject is identical with the subject or an accusative, prepositional, or dative object in the principal proposition: 'I hope to see him today.' 'I don’t know how to do it'; but in older English sometimes without how: 'since I knew to love' (Thomas Godfrey, The Prince of Par-thia, I, III, A.D. 1765). 'I didn’t know whether to laugh or cry.' 'I beg you (acc.) to go.' 'I beg of you (prepositional object) to go at once.' 'I showed him (dat.) how to do it.' 'Tell him (dat.) to come at once.' 'I told him (dat.) where to find it.' 'I taught him (dat.) to swim' (or swimming, or how to swim). 'I have taught how to swim to many boys' (dat.). 'I taught him (dat.) what to say' (or what he should say). 'He allows (or permits) me (dat.) to do it.' 'That makes it hard for me (dat. of reference; see 12 1 B a) to do it.' As explained in 7 D 2 (3rd par.), the to-infinitive here often has modal force: 'I do not know what to do' (= I am to do, or I should do). 'I should be happy if I knew how to accomplish (= I might accomplish) this.'

Originally, the infinitive was only a modifier of the verb, but in course of time a close relation developed between it and the subject or the object of the principal verb, so that the infinitive and the subject or object of the principal proposition came to be felt as an abridged clause, in which the subject or object of the principal proposition was the logical subject and the infinitive the logical predicate. This construction has become thoroughly established where the subject of the infinitive is the subject of the principal proposition or the accusative, dative, or prepositional object of the principal verb; indeed in many cases it has spread beyond these early limits of the construction, for the infinitive is often used with an accusative subject after the verbs want, wish, desire, like, order, request, know, think, believe, suppose, take (= suppose), image, expect, report, represent, reveal, cause, enable, permit, grant, etc., where the accusative is felt as the subject of the infinitive rather than as the object of the principal verb: 'I want you to go away and stay away.' 'I want you to wait for me until six o'clock;' but with descriptive force, 'I want you to be waiting for me with the car when my train arrives.' 'I expect, desire him to go.' 'I desire the rubbish to be removed.' 'He ordered the house to be pulled down.' 'I know him to be an honest man.' 'I know it all to be true.' 'I thought, supposed him to be the owner of the house.' 'I thought, supposed it to be him' (7 A a (1)), or more commonly with a clause with a finite verb, 'I thought, supposed it was he,' or in loose colloquial speech him, as explained in 7 C a. 'He thought, supposed Richard to be me' (or that Richard
was I, or in loose colloquial speech me). 'I took him to be nearer sixty than fifty.' 'The big table enables maps and documents to be laid out with ease' (Strand Magazine, No. 325, 16a). 'He doesn't allow (or permit) the books to be taken out of the library.' In Middle English and early Modern English, the list of these verbs was longer, including to say, tell, allege, fear, promise, do, etc. This usage with the last of these verbs survives in archaic 'We do you to wit' (= know); i.e., 'We give you to understand, inform you.' In the passive form of statement, however, the old construction is generally preserved: 'Nobody could be said to understand the heath who had not been there at such a time' (Hardy, The Return of the Native, I, Ch. I). Though the old active form with say has gone out of use, the old passive form of the same construction survives. Compare 7 D 1 b.

Except with the list of verbs given above we now follow the simple rule that the to-form of the infinitive is used when its subject is the subject or object of the principal verb, and that elsewhere, according to 21 e, the infinitive has a subject of its own introduced by for; sometimes also in the case of some of the verbs in the above list, as the simplicity and clearness of this newer usage has a strong appeal and is gaining favor: 'I planned to go myself,' but 'I planned for him to go.' 'I hope for the book to make its mark' (Meredith, Letters, 550). 'I beg for dear little Molly to stay on here' (Mrs. Gaskell, Wives and Daughters, I, Ch. VII). 'Harry, Mrs. Roosevelt would like for you to lunch at the White House today' (Archie Butt, Letter, Dec. 7, 1908), or also as in older English with the simple accusative as subject of the infinitive: 'You mean you would like Captain Lay to lunch at the White House today' (ib.). 'I hate for them to whine like that,' or sometimes still as in older English with a simple accusative as subject of the infinitive: 'I had rather they would whine — though I hate them to whine, too' (Mary Johnston, Hagar, Ch. II); but we usually prefer to construct the clause so that the subject of the infinitive is the subject of the principal proposition: 'I hate to hear them whine like that.' In older English, there was another kind of for to used, as explained in 21 e, a mere substitute for simple to: 'The markis (marquis) cam (came) and gan (began) hir for to (now in the literary language simple to) calle' (Chaucer, The Clerkes Tale, 233). This old usage lives on in popular speech.

Just as in principal propositions an emphatic subject follows there is, as in 'There is here some mistake,' so in abridged clauses the emphatic subject follows there to be: 'I don't want there to be any mistake' (Stanley Houghton, Hindle Wakes, Act III). Similarly, an emphatic subject — especially when modified by a phrase
or clause — follows a passive infinitive: ‘Little did the fathers of the town anticipate this brilliant success when they caused to be imported from further in the country some straight poles with the tops cut off, which they called sugar maple trees’ (Thoreau, Journal, XI, p. 218).

The to be of the passive infinitive is often omitted, especially in American English: ‘I want these letters [to be] stamped and mailed at once.’ ‘He ordered a family in Shanty Town [to be] quarantined’ (Sinclair Lewis, Arrowsmith). The fact that to be is often omitted here indicates that this construction is influenced by the objective predicate construction in 15 III 2.

In older English, an infinitive with modal force could stand after doubt not but: ‘He doubted not but to subvert any villainous design’ (Fielding), now ‘He didn’t doubt that he could subvert,’ etc.

With the group of verbs in 15 III 2 B the simple infinitive without to is the usual form, now as well as in older English, although there is a tendency to use here the form with to, or in older English also for to.

In early Modern English, the old simple infinitive is occasionally still used here as in the case of the verbs in 15 III 2 B. This old usage lingered longest where there was present in the mind some analogy of meaning with the verbs in 15 III 2 B: ‘But first I forc’d him lay his weapons downe’ (Kyd, The Spanish Tragedy, I, ii, 158, A.D. 1585), after the analogy of ‘I made him lay his weapons down.’ Sometimes where there is at present no verb in the list to serve as an analogy, for in older English this list was larger and the feeling for the old simple infinitive was livelier than today: ‘And yesternight [she] sent her Coach twise to my lodging to entreat me accompanie her’ (Ben Jonson, Every Man out of His Humour, II, iii, A.D. 1600). This old usage still lingers where there is some analogy in mind: ‘Elementary humanity forbade him leave (after the analogy of the simple infinitive after bade, which is here associated with forbade) his lame old godmother one moment unattended’ (Agnes and Egerton Castle, The Lost Iphigenia, Ch. I). The simple infinitive is now most common here where it is felt as an imperative: ‘And you, Quentin, I command you be silent’ (Scott, Quentin Durward, II, 193) (or more commonly to be silent). ‘I was going to say wait for us, and then we could all have been married together’ (De Morgan, When Ghost Meets Ghost, Ch. XI).

The gerund clause is often used here instead of the infinitive, almost regularly so when the verbal idea is felt as the direct object of the verb, while the infinitive is more common when its expressed
subject is felt as having relations with the principal proposition: 'I don't remember ever being scolded by her' (or ever having been scolded by her). 'I shall not tolerate your talking so to Mother,' but 'I shall not allow you to talk so to Mother.' The verb to tolerate in this meaning usually takes a single object of the thing, while to allow usually takes an indirect object of the person and a direct object of the thing, and hence may take an infinitive, since its indirect object can serve also as the subject of the infinitive. We can either say, 'My convictions do not permit my taking part in this' or 'My convictions do not permit me to take part in this,' for to permit admits of either a single object of the thing or an indirect object of the person and a direct object of the thing. We can say, 'I planned going myself' or 'I planned to go myself,' since we feel that the subject of the infinitive, though unexpressed, has close relations with the principal proposition, for it is the subject of the principal proposition. We can either say 'I don't like the boy to come here so often,' or better with the newer form of the infinitive construction, for the boy to come here so often, or with the gerundial construction, the boy's (or often, the boy; see 50 3) coming here so often. 'I aim to be (American), or at being (British), brief.'

After help in its negative meaning avoid, prevent, we employ either the infinitive or more commonly the gerund: 'He could not help to weep and sigh' (Kingsley, Hereward the Wake, II, XVI) (or more commonly weeping and sighing). Much more common than the to-infinitive is but + the simple infinitive: 'He could not help but laugh' (S. Weir Mitchell, Hugh Wynne, Ch. III). 'He could not help but see them' (Hugh Walpole, Jeremy, Ch. XI, 2). 'He could not help but believe me' (Lord Alfred Douglas, Oscar Wilde and Myself, Ch. XXIV, 290). 'I could not help but feel that,' etc. (Theodore Dreiser, The Bookman, Sept., 1927, p. 8). This construction is an abridged form of the full clause introduced by but that following a verb of preventing. Examples of the full clause are given in 24 III, p. 244. The use of but + the simple infinitive has been criticized by American grammarians, but it is constructed after an old pattern once widely used. Moreover, it is still employed by good British and American authors. It is common in American colloquial speech. Choose has the same meaning and construction, but is not so common: 'He could not choose but love her' (Meredith, Ordeal of Richard Feverel, Ch. XXV). In older English to was sometimes used before the infinitive: 'I could not chase but to forgive her' (Richardson, Pamela, III, 70). The to should always stand before the infinitive, but the construction has been influenced by the elliptical con-
struction with but described in 49 4 E (4th par.). In older English this construction was used after other verbs of preventing: ‘You shall not faile but find them’ (T. Wilson, Rhetoric, 81, A.D. 1553). ‘She can not miss but see us’ (Paget, Tales of Village Children, II, 96, A.D. 1844). These examples have been taken from the Oxford Dictionary under But 22, where there is a fuller list. Where the but is not employed in the abridged clause, the to before the infinitive is better preserved. Fail usually takes a to-infinitive, but sometimes also a gerund, either in the accusative or the prepositional genitive, the old genitive of goal (13 3): ‘Don’t fail to come.’ ‘He never failed coming to inform them of this’ (Jane Austen, Pride and Prejudice, Ch. XXX). ‘My proposals will not fail of being acceptable’ (ib., Ch. XIX). Miss now usually takes a gerund, but a little earlier in the period also a to-infinitive: ‘I would not miss seeing it.’ ‘I was in pain Lest I should miss to bid (now bidding) thee a good morrow’ (Keats, Isabella, XXVI). Prevent takes either a gerund after the preposition from or an accusative participial or gerundial clause with an accusative or a genitive subject: ‘The troops tried to prevent the enemy from crossing the river’ (or to prevent the enemy, or enemy’s, crossing the river). Hinder takes either a gerund after the preposition from or less commonly a to-infinitive: ‘The noise hindered her from going to sleep again.’ ‘He don’t hinder you to tell’ (Charles Reade), now more commonly from telling. Avoid now usually takes a gerund, though in older English it often has a to-infinitive: ‘I avoided discussing (in older English also to discuss) the matter with him.’ ‘I cannot forbear expressing (or from expressing, or to express) my surprise.’

After verbs and the adjective worth (11 2 g) the gerund sometimes, in accordance with older usage, has active form though the meaning is passive: ‘It won’t bear thinking about’ (Conan Doyle, Tragedy of the Korosko, Ch. II) (or being thought about). ‘He deserves hanging for that.’ ‘He preferred burning to recantation.’ ‘These acts are worth recording.’ The gerunds in these cases are felt as nouns, rather than as verbal forms. Compare 50 1, 2.

PREPOSITIONAL CLAUSE, OBJECT OF VERB OR ADJECTIVE

24 IV. If we resolve the prepositional clause into its constituent elements, we find a preposition and a group of words forming a unit, a clause with the force of a substantive (noun) — a substantive (noun) clause. This clause has the peculiar form of a substantive clause, i.e., it is introduced by the usual conjunctions
and conjunctive pronouns, adjectives, and adverbs found in substantive clauses. These connectives are given below. This substantive clause is the object of the preposition, hence is an object clause. But we do not feel it as a direct object. Preposition and substantive clause together form a unit, a prepositional clause. This prepositional clause modifies a verb, verbal phrase, participle, or adjective. Sometimes this clause is felt as the prepositional object, i.e., the necessary complement, of the verb, verbal phrase, participle, or adjective which it modifies: ‘Your success will largely depend upon what you do and how you do it.’ ‘He had wisely made up his mind as to what could no longer be avoided.’ ‘He is conscious of what a fine opportunity he has.’ ‘He gets furious against whoever opposes him.’ ‘I am curious as to what he will say.’ Sometimes the prepositional clause is felt as an adverbial element rather than as an object or indispensable complement: ‘I walked over to where she sat’ (adverbial prepositional clause of place). ‘But you do as you like with me — you always did, from when first you begun to walk’ (George Eliot, Silas Marner, Ch. XI) (adverbial prepositional clause of time). ‘From what I know of him (adverbial prepositional clause of condition = If I may judge by what I know of him) I should say that he is unreliable.’

An anticipatory object, it or this, often precedes the clause, the real object: ‘I took his word for it that he would make an effort.’ ‘I am counting on it that you will come.’ ‘You may rely on it that I shall help you.’ ‘It has come to this, that he can’t support his family.’ The conjunction that may be suppressed here, as in 21 a: ‘Molly’s punishment had got as far as this: she longed for her mother at this time’ (Owen Wister, The Virginian, Ch. XXXIV).

In older English, in clauses with adverbial force, the anticipatory, or determinative (56 A, 3rd par.), object was often that, which soon formed with the preceding preposition a compound, the two words developing into an adverbial conjunction. This old type is preserved in a number of adverbial conjunctions: ‘He did not really know what he was going to say, beyond that (31) the situation demanded something romantic.’ Likewise in the case of in that (28 1), instead of that (28 3), besides that (28 3), and sometimes for that (30). In older English, there were many such conjunctions. Compare 27 3 (7th par.).

The preposition is often suppressed: ‘He boasted [of it] that he did it.’ ‘I give you my word [for it] that I wasn’t there.’ ‘I believe he made up his mind [to it] that I was heartless and selfish’
(Ruskin, *Praeterita*, II, 189). 'She hesitated [as to] whether she should break in on his affliction.' 'I don’t care [for, always omitted] who marries him.' 'I wonder [at it] that (often omitted) he didn’t kill you.' 'She was not aware [of] how wide a place she filled in his thoughts.' 'Be careful [as to] how (= in what manner) you do that.' 'The hawkers are wary [of it] how (= that) they buy an animal suspected to be stolen' (Mayhew, *London Labour*, II, 62, A.D. 1865). 'I shall write you as soon as I have made up my mind [to] what I should do.'

The substantive clause contained in the prepositional clause is introduced by: *that, what a,* and the indefinite relative pronouns, adjectives, and adverbs *what, whatever, who, whoever, which, whichever, where, when, how, why, whether,* etc. The forms with -ever have more indefinite force: 'I am pleased with what he has done, and I know I shall be pleased with whatever he undertakes in the future.' 'A gentleman has informed me of who were engaged in the affair, and he will inform me of whoever in the future will engage in anything similar.' 'I have made up my mind as to which plan I prefer, but I shall probably be contented with whichever plan Father will adopt.' Interrogatives are not used in this clause. Even in such sentences as 'I inquired about what he was doing and how his experiments were turning out' *what* and *how* are relatives, not interrogatives; for the statement here is not an indirect report of a direct question, but a declaration that information was sought with regard to certain matters.

In parallel clauses introduced by *what* the *what* needs to be repeated only when the construction is different in the two clauses: 'His name is associated with *what* is probably the best, and [what] has certainly proved to be the most popular, of English anthologies,' but 'He is entirely ignorant of *what* the house is and *what* its work consists of.'

In colloquial and popular speech the preposition often stands before a clause not formally introduced by a conjunction or an indefinite relative pronoun, adjective, or adverb: 'My head has been people-tired, I think, but my heart is just satisfied with being full of “I'm so glad you're better”' (Clyde Fitch, *Letter*, 1904). Usually, however, there is in such sentences a subordinating conjunction present. The preposition itself serves as a conjunction. The subordinate clause is of the old type described in the third paragraph, only that *that,* the anticipatory or determinative (56 A, 3rd par.) object of the preposition, has been suppressed, as in 27 3 (7th par.), so that the preposition itself serves as the conjunction, an adverbial conjunction: 'Q. You don’t know Mr. Scope? A. [I] Do not, *outside of [that] I have*
seen him here about town’ (Tennessee Evolution Trial, p. 12, July 10, 1925). ‘I’m just fat by [that] I eat so much victuals lately’ (Julia Peterkin, Scarlet Sister Mary, Ch. III). ‘They’d figgered on making him their victim on account [of that] he was the handiest’ (Will James, Smoky, Ch. IV). The that is sometimes expressed: ‘But, then, credit had to be handed to the little horse on account that, even though he still had a powerful lot to learn, he sure was all for learning’ (ib., Ch. VIII). Compare 27 3 (7th par.).

Examples:

I insist upon it that he go, should go, must go, shall go.
He is worrying about what we shall do next.
Jones and I had a bet [as to] who would stick out the longer.
The crowd was elated or dejected according to which of the two antagonists got the upper hand.
They were praised or scolded according to how they had done their work.
I am not informed [as to] whether he went, why he went, when he went, where he came from.
Instead of the clumsy correct ‘I am curious as to with whom she is going tonight,’ many who try to talk correctly say whom she is going with tonight, but in loose colloquial speech we usually hear who (see 11 2 e) she is going with tonight.
He looked from one to the other of us, as if uncertain [as to] which he was to address (or simply which to address).
Let them take care [as to] what they say.
‘She is worrying about it,’ or ‘She is worrying that he doesn’t come’ (or because he doesn’t come). There is often in the that-clause, as in this example, the idea of cause, which leads to the use of because instead of that. Compare 30 a.

a. ABRIDGMENT OF PREPOSITIONAL CLAUSE. The original concrete meaning of movement toward a person or thing found in the preposition to is still discernible in the to of the infinitive in infinitive clauses which form an indispensable complement to a verb, adjective, or participle: ‘His father forced him to make his own living.’ ‘I persuaded, induced, got him to do it.’ ‘He is eager to go.’ ‘He is inclined to take offense easily.’ Often also where the relation to the verb is not so close: ‘He prevailed upon his wife to join in the deceit.’ ‘I am counting upon John to do it.’ As in these examples, the subject of the infinitive is often the subject of the verb of the principal proposition, or it is the object of the verb or the preposition following the verb. The subject of the infinitive is not expressed if it is general or indefinite: ‘The work is hard to translate.’ If the infinitive has a subject of its own for is placed before it: ‘I am anxious for you to succeed.’ In all these cases the infinitive has more or less the
force of a prepositional object. It is interesting to observe that the gerund after to often replaces the infinitive after to here, while it cannot be used after to at all in the adverbial constructions described below: ‘Hunger forced him to steal’ (or to stealing). ‘I am accustomed to do it this way’ (or to doing it this way). In many adverbial clauses the to of the infinitive is still a preposition, but its original force has faded away to different shades of abstract meaning. Purpose: ‘He worked hard to get through early.’ The idea of purpose sometimes becomes quite dim: ‘Look out! I am going to shoot.’ Adverbial infinitive clauses of purpose are treated more fully in 33 2. Result: ‘He has come to see the error of his ways.’ ‘He (i.e., the little son) is exactly like Hugh (i.e., the father, a general in the army) — he only wants a uniform to be put on the Staff at once’ (De Morgan, Joseph Vance, Ch. XXX). After to be born the infinitive often has active form where the force is passive: ‘You was born to hang’ (Jack London, The Call of the Wild, Ch. I). Compare 28 5 d (4th par.). The infinitive after to expresses also other adverbial relations: ‘I was pleased to see him’ (cause). ‘I should be glad to go’ (condition). ‘You couldn’t do that to save your life’ (concession). This infinitive is a terse convenient means of expression, but, as it hasn’t a distinctive form in all the categories, it can be used only where the context makes the thought clear. In the categories, however, where there is a distinctive conjunction the expression is not only terse but also clear, as in clauses of purpose (33 2), modal result (28 5 d, 29 2 a), and exception (31 2, 5th par.).

The infinitive clause is often used after other prepositions than to if it is introduced by an indefinite relative pronoun, adjective, or adverb: ‘I am thinking of what to do next (= of what I should do next), of what course to pursue (= of what course I should pursue), of how to do it’ (= of how I should do it). ‘They could not agree as to whom to select’ (= as to whom they should select). ‘She hesitated [as to] what to reply’ (= [as to] what she should reply). The infinitive in such clauses is, of course, not a simple infinitive, object of the preposition to, but a modern formation, a to-infinitive in an abridged prepositional clause. As can be seen by the forms in parentheses, the infinitive here, as in 24 III d, often has modal force.

After other prepositions than to, in clauses not introduced by a relative, the gerund is used exclusively or alongside of the prepositional infinitive: ‘I am afraid of doing him an injustice.’ ‘He is dead set against doing anything for me.’ ‘They have often talked about going to America.’ ‘The prisoner rescued himself by making a rope out of his coat and letting himself down on it from
the window.' ‘He was dismissed from school on account of setting
the boys up to so much mischief.’ ‘She blamed herself for having
been such a dull companion.’ ‘She was worried over her little
boy’s (or, according to 50 3, boy) having to cross the railroad on
the way to school.’ ‘His present poverty comes from neglecting
his earlier opportunities.’ In all these cases a thing is the object
of the preposition, namely, the gerund. A gerund is usually
employed here where the sense requires a thing as object, but the
prepositional infinitive is here preferred, as in 24 III d, when the
sense requires as object a person who is at the same time felt as
the subject of the infinitive: ‘He insisted upon his wife’s joining
in the deceit,’ but ‘He prevailed upon his wife to join in the deceit,’
since we insist upon a thing but prevail upon a person. ‘I am
counting on John’s doing it’ or ‘I am counting on John to do it,’
as to count on takes an object of either the thing or the person.
The infinitive here is the object of the preposition to that stands
before it, as in the first paragraph, not the object of the prepo­
sition that stands before the subject of the infinitive.

There is sometimes a difference of meaning between gerund
and infinitive: ‘He is afraid of dying’ (= that he shall die). ‘He
is afraid to die,’ literally, in the direction of dying. The real
difference here lies in the use of different prepositions rather than
in the verbal forms themselves.

After certain prepositions the gerund sometimes, in accordance
with older usage, has active form though the meaning is passive:
‘I tried vainly to soothe her and reason with her; she was past
soothing or being soothed.’ ‘He was past saving.’ ‘He tried her
patience beyond bearing.’ ‘He got much sympathy in the con­
stituency for his rough handling by a band of hooligans’ (Man­
chester Guardian, IV, No. 10, 185, quoted by Poutsma in his
Grammar, IV, p. 481). In such cases the gerund is felt as a noun
rather than as a verbal form. Compare 50 1, 2.

As in older English, a participle employed as a predicate ap­
positive can still often be used instead of a gerund after a prepo­
sition: ‘Holding on to the rope firmly, I came safe to land’
(= By holding on to the rope firmly, etc.). The gerund is more
accurate, but the participle is more graphic. In lively style we
still use our simpler older forms of expression, since they are
usually more concrete and impressive.
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1. Different Types of the Adverbial Clause. There are two different types, one introduced by a conjunction, the other dependent upon a preposition. Conjunctional clause: 'I met him as I was coming home.' Prepositional clause: 'The light came straight towards where I was standing.' The conjunctional type is by far the more common type, so that for many centuries the prepositions in the prepositional clauses have been developing into conjunctions. Compare 24 IV (3rd and 7th parr.) and 27 3 (7th par.). The prepositional clause is discussed in 24 IV. The conjunctional clause is treated in detail in the following articles.

2. Origin and Development of the Conjunctional Clause. An adverbial clause performs the function of an adverbial element: 'He went to bed as soon as he came home' (= upon his return home). We now feel the group of words as soon as as a unit, as a subordinating conjunction introducing the subordinate clause of time. Originally, however, here as elsewhere in adverbial clauses, the expression was much more concrete. In the first stages of its development the clause under consideration was of the old determinative (56 A, 3rd par.) type. There were two forms.

In the older form the determinative adverb so stood after the adverb soon, pointing as with an index finger to the following explanatory remark: 'He went to bed soon, so: he came home.' The determinative so stood in such close relations to the adverb soon that the two words early fused into a compound. As this compound stood immediately before the explanatory remark of time, in close relations with it, it was often early felt as a part of it, serving as its connective, binding it to the principal proposition and thus developing into a subordinating conjunction; so now, however, in most categories appearing with its later, strengthened form as (from all so, i.e., quite so): 'He went to bed soon as he came home.' 'Soon as the evening shades prevail, The moon takes up the wondrous tale' (Addison, Hymn on Creation). In many sentences the adverb or adjective does not fuse with as into a compound conjunction that introduces the subordinate clause, as in these examples, but the adverb or adjective remains in the principal proposition, while as has been drawn into the subordinate clause as the introductory conjunction: 'Thoughts . . . Glance quick as lightning through the heart' (Scott, Rokeby, I,
XIX). ‘My good lady made me proud as proud can be’ (Richardson, Pamela, III, 241). ‘The desert was still as the sky’ (Wallace, Ben Hur, I, Ch. V). This old type of expression with a single as was once common here, but is now largely replaced by the type with as — as.

Alongside of the old simple determinative so was a double determinative so — so, pointing as with two index fingers to the following explanatory remark: ‘He went to bed so soon, so: he came home,’ now as soon as he came home. The group of words so soon so early fused into a unit and became a part of the subordinate clause, serving like soon so as its introductory conjunction. This type of expression with double as, as in as long as, as soon as, as early as, has long been the usual form in this group: ‘I stayed as long as I could.’ ‘I come home as early as I can.’ In many sentences, however, the adverb or adjective does not fuse with as — as into a compound conjunction that introduces the subordinate clause, as in these examples, but the first as + adverb or adjective remains in the principal proposition, while the second as has been drawn into the subordinate clause as introductory conjunction: ‘I threw it as far from me as I could.’ ‘He is as strong now as he has ever been.’

The introductory subordinate conjunction — both the simple and the double type, from the old single determinative so or the double determinative so as or so that — not only stands in close association with an adverb or adjective in the principal proposition, as in all the preceding examples, but it may be associated also with the verb of the principal proposition: ‘I am going to bed, as I’m very tired,’ originally ‘I am going to bed, so (= it is thus): I’m very tired.’ In some categories the old determinative form so is preserved: ‘You may go where you like so (or with double determinative form so that) you are back by dinner time.’ ‘I went early so (or with double determinative form so that) I got a good seat.’ ‘Many came unto them from diverse parts of England, so as (now so that) they grew a great congregation’ (Bradford, History of Plymouth Plantation, p. 40, A.D. 1630–1648).

The double determinative is characteristic of primitive expression, a double sign for the same thing, as the double negative still heard in popular speech, or the older double determinative forms who that, which that (23 II), where we now use simple relatives, who and which. We still, even in the literary language, often prefer the double determinative forms to the simple ones: ‘the book that I hold in my hand,’ often used rather than ‘the book I hold in my hand’; ‘as soon as I came home,’ much more common than ‘soon as I came home.’ Double expression arose in
the desire to make thought and feeling clearer. Oldest English is characterized by the liberal use of determinatives, spoken gestures freely used, like gestures in general, to explain the intended meaning, so that the expression was markedly concrete. Later, expression lost much of its concreteness and became more abstract, so that words that once had concrete force and were useful lost their meaning, and later as useless words without a function disappeared. In other cases, words that had lost their concrete meaning were nevertheless retained since they had acquired a new abstract force and hence were useful. In the development from the concrete to the abstract, expression became less exuberant and picturesque, more simple and exact. The double forms were often replaced by simple ones; on the other hand, the simple forms were often replaced by double ones, for a combination of words contained greater possibilities of shading the thought than a single form. Modern expression is averse to excess of expression, but it is fond of accuracy and hence does not avoid a combination of words merely because it is long. These general principles will in the following articles be illustrated by many concrete examples.

3. Classification. Conjunctional adverbial clauses are subdivided into classes corresponding to those of adverbial elements—clauses of place, time, manner, degree, cause, condition and exception, concession, purpose or end, and means.

**CLAUSE OF PLACE**

26. Conjunctions. A clause of place indicates the place where the action of the principal verb occurs: 'Corn flourishes best where the ground is rich.' This clause is now introduced by: where; nowhere (that), see 27 3 (5th par.); whereas (see page 265 and 27 4); as, in older English = where, now only used in a few expressions; whence or from whence in poetry and choice prose, or more commonly where — from, from where, from what place or source; whither in poetry and choice prose, or more commonly where; whereso, now archaic, now usually wherever, everywhere, everywhere that (27 3, 5th par.), or the less common but more emphatic wheresoever; whencesoever in poetry and choice prose, more commonly wherever — from, from whatever place or source; whithersoever in poetry and choice prose, more commonly wherever, everywhere, everywhere (that) (27 3, 5th par.), archaically also whereso. The parentheses around that in these conjunctions indicate that that may be used or suppressed.
Examples:

We live where the road crosses the river.
I will go nowhere that (27 3, 5th par.) she cannot go.
It is right in front of you as (= where) you cross the bridge.
Here, as (now where) I point my sword, the sun arises (Julius Caesar, II, i, 106).

'Go whence (or from whence) you came,' now usually where you came from.
For whither (now where) thou goest I will go (Ruth, I, 16).
She is the belle and the spirit of the company wherever she goes.

Clauses of place with general or indefinite meaning often have concessive force and might be classed as well as concessive clauses: 'It would have cost my poor uncle no pang to accept Blanche's fortune, whencesoever it came' (Thackeray, Pendennis, II, Ch. XXVI). 'Wherever he went, he was kindly received.' Compare 32.

In clauses of place, as in 22 (1st par. under Examples), there is sometimes, especially in older English, a demonstrative in the principal proposition, pointing back to some word in the preceding subordinate clause: 'Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also' (Luke, XII, 34). 'Then whither he goes, thither let me go' (Shakespeare, Richard the Second, V, i, 85).

In Old English, we often find in the subordinate clause instead of where the form there: 'Wuna þær þæ be leofost ys' (Genesis, XX, 15) = 'Dwell where it is most pleasant to thee,' literally, 'Dwell there: it is most pleasant to thee.' The there was originally a determinative (56 A), pointing to the following explanatory remark, later gradually becoming closely associated with it, forming with it a subordinate clause of place and serving as its connective, binding it to the principal proposition and thus becoming a relative conjunction. Although the old determinative had become a real relative, standing in the subordinate clause and often pointing backward to the principal proposition, it kept its old determinative form until the sixteenth century: 'It had been better for hym to have taryed there (now where) he was' (Lord Berners, Huon, LXIV, 221, A.D. 1534).

As can be seen by the form in parentheses there has been supplanted by where. Indefinite where, which here replaces older definite there, suggests in a general indefinite way the idea of place, but at the same time points to the following explanatory clause, so that in fact the reference becomes definite. This passing from the unknown to the known was a new means of expression that soon found favor here as well as in 23 II 1 and 27 1. The new form began to appear in Old English: 'Hwer am ic þær þegn min bip' (John, XII, 26, Rushworth MS.), i.e., 'where I am, there will also my servant be.' In accordance with older English
fondness for double or triple expression this indefinite determinative *where* was often accompanied by the double determinative *swa* — *swa* (later *so* — *so*), often simplified to a single *swa*: ‘*Sua huer ic am þer þegn min bib*’ (*ib.*, Lindisfarne MS.). In this example the single *swa* precedes *where*, but it often followed, and this form survives in our emphatic indefinite *wheresoever*. The old determinative *so* has survived here because it has a function, namely, the expression of indefiniteness, and hence is useful, but where the reference is more definite it has disappeared, as explained below.

Similar to the use of *swa* in connection with *hwer* for the sake of double expression, is the doubling of the determinative *there* in the subordinate clause, so that instead of *swa huer* in the last example in the preceding paragraph we find a double *there* in the same passage in the Corpus MS.: ‘*Min þen bib þar þær ic eom.*’

In Middle English, both the single and the double determinative type survive: ‘*Hir eyen (eyes) caste she ful lowe adoun Ther (now where) Pluto hath his derke regioun*’ (Chaucer, *The Knightes Tale*, 1223). In the double determinative type Old English *swa* appears in Middle English as *so* or *as* (contracted from *all so*, i.e., *quite so*), the former with its old indefinite force, the latter with more or less definite force: ‘And red wherso thou be, or elles songe, That thou be understonde I god beseche!’ (Chaucer, *Troilus and Criseyde*, V, 1797) = ‘I beseech God that thou (“Troilus and Criseyde”) mayst be understood wheresoever thou mayst be read or sung.’ ‘He came alone a-night ther as (now simple *where*) she lay’ (*id.*, *The Clerkes Tale*, 408). *There* and *there as* were at this time often replaced by *wher* and *wher as*: ‘*Let see wher the cut wol falle*’ (*id.*, *The Pardoners Tale*, 466) = ‘Let us see where the lot will fall.’ ‘This frere cam, as he were in a rage, *wher as* (now simple *where*) this Lord sat eting at his bord’ (*id.*, *The Somnours Tale*, 458). In the principal proposition there is often a *ther* pointing back to the *ther as* or *wher as* in the subordinate clause: ‘*Ther as* (now simple *where*) myn herte (heart) is set, *ther wol* (will) I wyve*’ (marry) (Chaucer, *The Clerkes Tale*, 117).

With verbs of motion the double determinative forms *thider as*, *thider that*, *whider as*, *wider that* were sometimes used in Middle English: ‘I moot (must) go *thider as* (now in choice English *whither* or in plain prose *where*) I have to go’ (Chaucer, *The Pardoners Tale*, 421). Instead of *thider as* here *thider that*, *whider as*, or *wider that* might have been used.

In Old English, the usual relative adverb of place with definite
reference is *par*. The usual Old English form for indefinite or general reference is *hwær* or so *hwær* so. In Chaucer’s language *ther* is still employed for definite reference, but also *wher* is used, or *ther* or *wher* accompanied by one or two determinatives — *ther as, ther that, ther as that, wher as, wher that*. Indefinite or general force is expressed by adding *so* or *so ever* to *wher: wherso, wherso ever*. Thus at this time determinative forms are used for definite or indefinite reference, but the forms are differentiated in meaning — *as* and *that* with more or less definite force, *so* or *so ever* with indefinite or general force.

After the different determinative constructions with definite *there* and *where* had developed into a relative construction, the *there* and *where* becoming relative conjunctions, pointing backward or forward to the principal proposition and linking the clause of place to it, the demonstrative *there* in the principal proposition, pointing back to the clause of place, lost its function and hence its usefulness and gradually disappeared, likewise the determinative adverbs *as* and *that* in the clause of place. This development became more marked after *where* had supplanted *there* as relative conjunction. The dropping of the formal particles *there* in the principal, and *as* and *that* in the subordinate, proposition made the sentence as a whole much more compact. The old type of expression is parataxis, the new type hypotaxis, as explained in 193. The old double determinative construction, however, lingered on for a long time, so that we find traces of it in the present period after both *there* and *where*, i.e., we find the relatives *there* and *where* occasionally followed by *as*: ‘He came *there as* (now simple *where*) she was’ (Lord Berners, *Huon*, I, p. 100, A.D. 1534). ‘*Whereas* (now simple *where*) the Ebrew speache seemed hardly to agree with ours, we haue noted it in the margent’ (Geneva Bible, A.D. 1578). This older use of *whereas* survives in two derived meanings, namely, *while* (on the other hand) and *as* (with causal force): ‘Those who are well assured of their own standing are less apt to trespass on that of others, *whereas* nothing is so offensive as the aspiring of vulgarity’ (Washington Irving). ‘*Whereas* Mr. James Smith has been employed in my service from . . . to . . . I hereby testify,’ etc. On the other hand, the indefinite determinative *so*, described in the preceding paragraph, did not disappear as did the definite determinative *as*. It has survived not as a determinative but as an indefinite particle felt as useful to stress the idea of indefiniteness: *wheresoever*, more emphatic than *wherever*.

a. ABRIDGMENT OF CLAUSE OF PLACE. The full clause of place is sometimes abridged to a predicate appositive clause, in which
the subject of the principal proposition is the subject and a participle is predicate: ‘Where having nothing, nothing can he lose’ (Shakespeare, *III Henry VI*, III, iii, 152). But in ‘Wherever [it has been] feasible, the illustrations have been taken from standard literature’ we have to do with an ellipsis. Compare 20 3 (5th par.) and 27 5 (2nd par.).

The old verbless appositional type of sentence described in 6 B a is sometimes found here: ‘Least said, soonest mended’ = ‘Where there is least said, there things are soonest mended.’

**CLAUSE OF TIME**

27. Conjunctions. A temporal clause limits the time of the action of the principal verb, which is thus represented as taking place simultaneously with, or before, or after that of the temporal clause. The following conjunctions introduce the temporal clause: soon as (25 1), now more commonly as (or so) soon as, in older English also anon as with the same meaning; as soon as ever, an emphatic as soon as; as (or so) long as; as (or also so in older English) often as; whenso, archaic, now usually whenever, or the less common but more emphatic whensoever; so surely as; if (= whenever); as; when, or, in older English, when as, or when that; the time (that); by the time (that) or in older English by that, by then (that), or by, the last form surviving in Scotch dialect; until, in dialect often used with the force of by the time that; the year (that), the month (that), the week (that), etc.; every time (that), the next time (that), at the same time (that), what time; while or, in older English, whiles, an old adverbial genitive from which has come a form with an excrescent t, whilst, still in use; in older English during (that), now replaced by while; now (that), once, directly, immediately, instantly; since; after, again (in older English) or against (now usually replaced by by the time or before), ere (archaic, poetic, or choice prose), before, till, until, all earlier in the period followed by that; in older English fore (that), afore (that), now replaced by before; no sooner — than, scarcely — but (see page 274). The parentheses around that in these conjunctions indicate that that may be used or suppressed.

In older English, that, like French que, was used as a substitute instead of repeating a conjunction that had already been used, a that thus repeating a preceding when, since, because, if, etc.: ‘When one of the parties to a treaty intrenches himself in ceremonies and that (used to avoid the repetition of when, which has already been used) all the concessions are on one side’ (Burke, *Letters on a Regicide Peace*, III, Works, VIII, 330). In older
English *that* is used also as a regular conjunction with the force of *when* after hardly, scarcely, not yet fully, not so soon: 'The kyng had not yet fullych eten *that* (now *when*) ther come in to the halle another messagyer' (Caxton, *Chronicle English*, CCVII, 189, A.D. 1480).  *But (that)*, however, was more common here: 'So she was not so soone there *but* there came a Knyghte of Arthurs courte' (Malory, *Le Morte d'Arthur*, Book X, Ch. XXXVIII, A.D. 1485). Compare 27 3 (last par.).

**Examples:**

I came as soon as I heard of it.

Anone as (now as soon as) the kyng wyst *that*, he took the quene in his hand and yode (went) unto syr launcelot (Malory, *Le Morte d'Arthur*, Book XVIII, Ch. VII, A.D. 1485).

'As soon as I saw his face, all my fears vanished.' Here a causal idea blends with the temporal.

I shall come as soon as ever I can.

'As long as the general spirit of the administration was mild and popular, they were willing to allow some latitude to their sovereign' (Macaulay, *History*, I, Ch. I). Here a strong causal idea blends with the temporal. Sometimes the causal idea overshadows the temporal. Compare 30.

Sometimes the idea of extent overshadows that of time: 'I have stood it as long as I can.' Compare 29 1 A d.

'So long as men believe that women will forgive anything, they will do anything' (Sarah Grand, *Heavenly Twins*, I, 120). Here a strong restrictive idea blends with the temporal. Compare 29 1 A c. There is often in so long as also a strong conditional idea: 'I do not care so long as (= provided) you are happy.' Compare 31.

I visit him as often as I can.

Whenever (or if) I feel any doubt, I inquire.

So surely as she came into the room, however, Martin feigned to fall asleep (Dickens, *Martin Chuzzlewit*, Ch. IV).

When you are done, let me know.

I shall be ready by the time (that) you get back.

After this course settled and by that (now by the time that) their corne was planted, all their victails were spente (Bradford, *History of Plymouth Plantation*, p. 147, A.D. 1630–1648).

Now was it eve by then that (now by the time that) Orpheus came Into the hall (Morris, *Jason*, III, 503, A.D. 1868).

It was done by (for literary by the time that) we came home (modern Scotch).

He will be ready till (= by the time that) you are (dialect).

Other examples are given in the following pages in connection with the further treatment of these conjunctions.

Clauses of time with general or indefinite meaning often have concessive force and might be classed as well as concessive clauses: 'Whenever they attack, they shall find us ready.' Compare 32.
1. **History of ‘When’**. *When* has become established after a long competition with other forms. In Old English, the most common temporal conjunctions were *ponne* and *pā*, both originally determinative adverbs with the force of *then*, pointing to the following explanatory clause, later gradually becoming closely associated with it, forming with it a subordinate clause of time and serving as its connective, binding it to the principal proposition: ‘Ic næbbe nanne man þæt me do on þone mere *ponne* wæter astyred bip’ (*John, V, 7, A.D. 1000*), literally, ‘I have no one to put me into the pool *then*: the water is troubled,’ now when the water is troubled. ‘Þā se hælend geseah þæt hēo weop he geomrode on hīs gaste’ (*John, XI, 33, A.D. 1000*), literally, ‘Then: the Saviour saw that she was weeping, he groaned in his spirit,’ now ‘When he saw her weeping, he groaned in his spirit.’ In Middle English, *ponne* appears as *than* or *then* and *pā* appears as *thō*: ‘Then (now when) hīs howndys began to baye, That harde (= heard) the jeant there (now where) he lay’ (*Sir Eglamour, 286, A.D. 1440*). ‘Þis was *þō* (now when) in Engoland Britones were’ (Robert of Gloucester, *Chronicle*, I, 2, A.D. 1300). Even in Middle English, *then* and *thō* were little used, although the corresponding older forms *ponne* and *pā* were the most common conjunctions of time in the Old English period. Early in Middle English, *when* began to supplant *than*, *then*, and *thō*, all three of which have entirely disappeared as subordinating conjunctions of time.

This new relative conjunction of time, now so common, was little used in Old English, but even in this early period it had begun to develop out of the old indefinite determinative adverb *when*: ‘*Hwenne ic bræc fif hlifas . . . hu fela wylegena ge namon fulle?’ (*Mark, VIII, 19, A.D. 1000*) = ‘When I broke the five loaves how many basketfuls took ye up?’ Indefinite *when*, which here replaces older definite *pā*, suggests in a general indefinite way the idea of time, but at the same time points to the following explanatory clause, so that in fact the reference becomes definite. This passing from the unknown to the known was a new means of expression which soon found favor here as well as in 23 II 1 and 26 (6th par.). In older English, in accordance with older fondness for double expression, *when* was sometimes accompanied by two determinatives, *so* — *so*, later often simplified to a single *so*: ‘*Weonne so ich beo uorb faren, Hengest eow wul makien kare*’ (*Layamon, Brut, 2, 206, A.D. 1205*) = ‘When I am gone, Hengest will cause you trouble.’ The old determinative *so* appears here later in the form of *as*. Also *that* was used as a determinative, so that the new definite temporal conjunction *when* accompanied by its determinatives appeared as *when as* and *when*
that. Later, after definite *when* became a relative conjunction, pointing often backward to the principal proposition, linking the temporal clause with it, the determinative lost its function and hence its usefulness and finally disappeared. Instead of *when*, however, we still find a little earlier in the present period *when as* and *when that*, i.e., *when* in connection with a determinative, which indicates that the old determinative construction was at this time in part still preserved: ‘When as (now simple *when*) the Palmer came in hall Nor lord nor knight was there more tall’ (Scott, *Marmion*, I, XXVIII). ‘My gracious liege, *when that* (now simple *when*) my father liv’d, Your brother did employ my father much’ (Shakespeare, *King John*, I, i, 95). In Middle English and early Modern English, the determinatives were for the most part differentiated. The form *so* had general or indefinite force, while *as* or *that* had more or less definite meaning. Today we still use *so* for indefinite reference, as in *whenever*, or more commonly *ever*, as in *whenever*. For definite reference we now employ simple *when*, dropping the old determinative *as* or *that*.

2. Original Meaning of ‘As’ and Its Present Uses. *As* is one of the commonest conjunctions in our language. It is not at all confined to clauses of time, but is found in a number of different kinds of clauses. In its oldest form *so* it was a determinative adverb pointing to a following explanatory statement. In this explanatory statement lay the idea of time, manner, result, cause, etc. These ideas did not lie in *as*. The *as* originally simply indicated that a following statement would explain the meaning that was to be conveyed. In the following paragraphs the use of *as* in clauses of time is illustrated, also its employment in several other kinds of clauses to give a general idea of the meaning of this favorite word and the simple concrete conception that lies at the base of all its meanings.

In oldest English, the determinative adverb *so*, or in strengthened form *all so* (i.e., *quite so*), later contracted to *as*, could stand after a verb pointing to a following explanatory clause. This clause did not have a distinctive meaning and still in our own day varies in force according to the context. The *so* standing immediately before the explanatory remark became gradually very closely associated with it, forming with it a subordinate clause and serving as its connective, binding it to the principal proposition and thus becoming a relative conjunction, now with its old form *so* only in the categories of condition, purpose, and pure result, elsewhere with its modern form *as*. Condition: ‘You may go where you please *so you are back by dinner time.*’
Purpose: 'They hurried so they wouldn't miss the train.' Pure result: 'He went early so he got a good seat.' Manner clause of modal result, in older English with as, which still survives in popular speech but in the literary language is replaced by that: 'I gained a son, And such a son as (now that) all men hailed me happy' (Milton, Samson, 358). Degree clause of modal result, in older English with as, which survives in popular speech but in the literary language is replaced by that: 'I feel such a sharp dissension in my breast as (now that) I am sick' (Shakespeare, I Henry VI, V, v, 84). Manner: 'He does as I tell him.' Accompanying circumstance: 'The enemy devastated the fields as he retreated.' Contemporaneous event: 'He returned home as I was leaving.' Cause: 'He stayed at home as he was ill.' Proportionate agreement: 'One advances in modesty as one advances in knowledge.' Alternative agreement: 'stones whose rates are either rich or poor As fancy values them' (Shakespeare, Measure for Measure, II, ii, 150). Place: 'It is right in front of you as (= where) you cross the bridge.'

In oldest English, simple so could stand after a noun or pronoun, pointing to a following explanatory remark, so that it gradually became very closely associated with this remark, forming with it a relative clause and serving as its introductory relative pronoun, now always with its modern form as. In the literary language relative as has never been widely used, but is well established in certain categories, especially after the same (pp. 219, 222) and such (pp. 219, 222), also in descriptive clauses where the reference is to a preceding or following statement as a whole, or to the idea contained in a preceding word, as illustrated in 23 II 6 (next to last par.). In popular speech as is widely used as a relative where the literary language has who, that, or which, as illustrated in 23 II 5 (toward end of 1st par.).

In the concrete expression of oldest English there are often two determinatives, pointing, as it were, with two index fingers to the following appositional clause which explains their meaning. Since the two determinatives stood immediately before the explanatory remark, they gradually became very closely associated with it, forming with it a subordinate clause and serving, both forms merged into a unit, as its connective, binding it to the principal proposition and thus becoming a relative conjunction.
This development took place: (1) in manner clauses of modal result introduced by as that, described in 28 5 (8th par.); in degree clauses of modal result introduced by as that and so as, described in 29 2; (2) in clauses of pure result introduced by so that and so as, described in 28 5 (6th and 9th parr.) and 28 5 d; in clauses of comparison introduced by so as, described in 28 2; in clauses of extent introduced by so as, described in 29 1 A d; in purpose clauses introduced by so that and so as, described in 33 and 33 2; (3) in clauses of place introduced by there as and where as, described in 26 (last par.); (4) in clauses of time introduced by when as, described in 1, p. 269. In the natural development toward greater simplicity the old double determinative has in several cases here as elsewhere been replaced by a simple form, as in the case of there as and where as replaced by simple where, as described in 26 (last par.), or when as replaced by simple when, as described in 1, p. 269, but in most of the cases already described and in others described in the following pages double or triple form has been retained as useful in differentiating the thought.

The two determinatives often modified an adverb and in course of time became so intimately associated with it that the three words have formed a unit, as: (1) in clauses of time: ‘I visited him as often as I could’; (2) in clauses of extent: ‘He held on as tight as he could’; (3) in clauses of restriction: ‘They were all pleased so far as I know.’ In many other cases the two determinatives have entered into close relations with an adjective or adverb, but the first determinative and the adjective or adverb still belong to the principal proposition, while the second determinative is now a subordinating conjunction of degree: ‘He is as tall as I am.’ ‘I threw it as far from me as I could.’

Determinative as points as with an index finger not only to a following clause but often also to a following noun which expresses the idea in mind, thus always indicating oneness with, identity, as in ‘I regard him as a true friend.’ In older English, either single or double so is used here. Compare 15 III 2 A.

a. ACCUSATIVE INSTEAD OF NOMINATIVE. In elliptical adverbial clauses introduced by as — as, where the finite verb is not expressed, the nominative of personal pronouns is often replaced by an accusative, as so often elsewhere in elliptical expressions, as described in 7 C a: ‘The post would have been as soon as me’ (De Morgan, The Old Madhouse, Ch. XXVII), instead of as soon as I.

3. Temporal Phrases and Adverbs Used as Conjunctions. In 1, p. 268, we have seen how determinative then developed relative
force and was later replaced by the indefinite relative when. The old determinative construction, however, is still common in a number of words. Thus a bit of the older life of our language is not only preserved but is still seemingly thriving amid the changed conditions of another age. The old determinative that, of the same stem as then, still follows a noun, as in oldest English, pointing to a following explanatory clause: ‘I bought my coat the year that I was in Europe.’ ‘I met him the week (or the day) that I was in Chicago.’ The hour that our committee met; the moment that I reached the platform of the car; the minute that I set eyes on him; the instant that he arrived; from the time that I first met him, etc.

In popular speech we often hear the determinative as here instead of that: the moment as I set eyes upon him.

In all the cases described above the definite article before the noun has so much determinative power that the that or the as following the noun may be omitted: ‘the year I was in Europe,’ ‘the minute I set eyes upon him,’ etc. Instead of the definite article before the noun we often find next and every and sometimes what as determinative: ‘next time, every time I see him.’ ‘It would be eminently reasonable to refreshen our memories of Dr. Kane’s plucky endeavors in northern icepacks what time the sun is doing his best to remind us of Central Africa’ (periodical in the hot summer of 1911). What time was once more common.

There is one case where both the the before the noun and the that after the noun have disappeared: ‘John worked while Henry played’; a little earlier in the period the while (still lingering in poetry and choice prose), the while that, or while that, or while as (the determinative as taking the place of the determinative that) Henry played. Thus while has developed out of the determinative construction into a relative conjunction of time. Also the other expressions, the day (that), the week (that), the moment (that), etc., are now, like while, in fact relative conjunctions of time, but the old determinative form that is still often used after day, week, moment, etc., and the definite article before the noun is still always retained, so that in a formal sense the development hasn’t gone as far as in the case of while. In early Modern English, while not only indicated duration, as in current speech, but also pointed to the point of time at the close of the waiting, i.e., it could have the force of until, now in this meaning always replaced by until: ‘Nothing is more short-liv’d then (now than) pride: It is but while (expressing duration) their clothes last; stay but while (= until and now replaced by it) these are worne out, you cannot wish the thing more wretched or dejected’ (Ben Jonson. Discoveries
p. 59, A.D. 1641). Adiel Sherwood in his *Gazetteer of the State of Georgia* (A.D. 1837) lists this usage as a provincialism, and gives an example: 'Stay while I come.'

After the analogy of using all these expressions of time as relative conjunctions of time we often employ certain adverbs of time and place as relative conjunctions of time and place, some with or without that, as in the case of now (that), anywhere (that), nowhere (that), everywhere (that); some without that, as in the case of once, directly, immediately, instantly: 'Now (or now that) we are at last gathered together, I desire to lay before you for your consideration an important family matter.' 'And everywhere That (or simply everywhere) a thought may dare To gallop, mine has trod' (Cale Young Rice, *Far Quests, The Mystic*). 'Once that Manchurian Campaign was over (after that Manchurian Campaign was once over), I never put pen to paper — in the diary sense — until I was under orders for Constantinople' (Sir Ian Hamilton, *Gallipoli Diary*, Preface). 'Once (= after once) a beast of prey has licked blood, it longs for it forever.' 'Directly I uttered these words there was a dead silence.' 'Immediately (or instantly) the button is pressed the mine explodes.' Directly, immediately, instantly are largely confined to British usage. In now and now that the idea of cause mingles with that of time, often overshadowing it. Compare 30.

In a number of cases the determinative following a preposition has almost or entirely disappeared. In since — the reduced form of sithen (Old English *sibban* = *sib* 'after' + *pan* 'that') + s (gen. ending) — the determinative element is now so fused with the preposition that we do not feel its presence: 'I haven't seen him since we were boys together,' originally since that: we were boys together. In older English, also the longer form sithens was used. Also forms without s, sithen and the shortened forms sith (or syth) and sin (or syn), were once widely employed.

After a number of prepositions the determinative *that* was used in older English, but has since disappeared: 'After that (now simple after) things are set in order here, we'll follow them' (Shakespeare, *I Henry VI*, II, ii, 32). 'From Oxford haue I posted since I dinde (dined), To quite (punish) a traitor fore that (now before) Edward sleepe' (Robert Greene, *Frier Bacon*, III, I, 957, A.D. 1594). After the preposition — after, against (or in older English also again), before, ere, till or until, and in older English fore, afore (= before) — had developed into a relative conjunction, often pointing backward to the principal proposition, the determinative no longer having a function to perform naturally dropped out as a useless form. This development began in Middle English:
and was still going on in early Modern English, the new form without *that* being used alongside of the old form with *that* and gradually supplanting it: ‘And rightful folk shal go, *after* they dye, To heven’ (Chaucer, *The Parliament of Fowles*, 55). ‘Bid your fellowes get their flailes readie *again*e (now by the time) I come’ (Ben Jonson, *Every Man out of His Humour*, I, III, A.D. 1600). ‘No, stab the earle, and *fore* (now before) the morning sun Shall vaunt him thrie ouer the loftie east, Margaret will meet her Lacie in the heuens’ (Robert Greene, *Frier Bacon*, III, I, 1019, A.D. 1594). ‘They will be here *afore* (now before) you can find a cover’ (J. F. Cooper, *The Prairie*, I, III, A.D. 1827). ‘She gathered fresh flowers to deck the drawing room agains (now more commonly before or by the time) Mrs. Hamley should come home’ (Mrs. Gaskell, *Wives and Daughters*, Ch. VII). Compare 24 IV (3rd par.).

In the case of *than* the old demonstrative form has been retained, but every vestige of feeling for it has disappeared: ‘He is taller than I,’ literally, ‘He is taller, *then* I come.’ *Than* is the old form of the adverb *then*. In older English, before a fixed differentiation had taken place between temporal *than* and comparative *than*, *then* was often used in comparative clauses: ‘That is more *then* (now *than*) is in our commission’ (Marlowe, *The Jew of Malta*, I. 251, about A.D. 1590). In this older English, the common use of the comma before *then* often makes the original temporal nature of the clause clearer: ‘Yet of the two, the Pen is more noble, *then* comes the Pencill’ (Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*, p. 59, A.D. 1641). As *than* now differs in meaning from *then* we no longer feel *than* (29 I B) as temporal, but construe it as a comparative conjunction. *Than* is now used with temporal force only after *no sooner*; where, however, it is quite natural since it follows a comparative: ‘I had no sooner done it *than* I regretted it.’ As, however, the temporal force here is sometimes felt, the temporal conjunction *when* is sometimes improperly used instead of *than*. After other words of similar meaning but without comparative form, as *scarcely*, *hardly* (both = *no sooner*), *not long, not far, not half* (an hour, etc.), *not + verb + object or adverbial phrase*, we regularly employ *when* or *before*: ‘I had scarcely done it *when* (20 1, 3rd par.) I regretted it.’ ‘Randal had scarcely left the house *before* Mrs. Riccabocca rejoined her husband’ (Lytton, *My Novel*, II, IX, Ch. XII). Sometimes *than* is improperly used here instead of *when*: ‘The crocuses had hardly come into bloom in the London Parks *than* (instead of *when*) they were swooped upon by London children.’ In older English, *till* was sometimes used instead of *when* or *before*: ‘I had not been
many hours on board until (in England now usually when or before) I was surprised with the firing of muskets' (Defoe, *Voyage round World*). In the *Oxford Dictionary* this usage is represented as now confined, in England, to dialect, but in America till is sometimes still used here alongside of before and when. Earlier in the period the negative form of the principal proposition often suggested the use of but here instead of before, when, or than: ‘Aurora shall not peep out of the doores, But (now before) I will haue Cosroe by the head’ (Marlowe, *Tamburlaine*, II, II, A.D. 1590). ‘Scarce have I arrived But (now when) there is brought to me from your equerry a splendid richly plated hunting dress’ (Coleridge, *Piccolomini*, I, 9). ‘I no sooner saw this venerable man in the pulpit, but (now than) I very much approved of my friend’s insisting upon the qualifications of a good aspect and a clear voice’ (*Spectator*, CVI). Compare 29 1 B (last par.). When, so often used after negative expressions, is sometimes employed with similar force after positive statements, where, however, it has the function of a relative pronoun (23 II 6, next to last par.): ‘There they repose, . . . When from the slope side of a suburb hill . . . came a thrill of trumpets’ (Keats, *Lamia*).

4. Adversative Conjunctions. In while, whilst, when, at the same time that, and in older English while as (II Henry VI, I, i, 225), while that (Henry the Fifth, I, II, 178), when as (III Henry VI, V, VII, 34), the original temporal meaning is often overshadowed by the derived adversative force, just as in whereas and in older English, as in Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus*, I, i, 104, also simple where the original local meaning is often overshadowed by the derived adversative force: ‘Whereas (or while, or at the same time that) in applied physics we hold our own, in applied chemistry we have lost much ground’ (*British Review*). ‘I am really very cross with you for sticking to your work, when you ought to be away having a change and a good rest.’ Simple where sometimes still has adversative force: ‘Twenty years ago I used to see a dozen or more (bald eagles) along the river in the spring when the ice was breaking up, where I now see only one or two, or none at all’ (John Burroughs, *Far and Near*, p. 155). Compare 20 1 (3rd par.).

5. Abridgment of Clause of Time. The full clause of time is often abridged to a predicate appositive clause, in which the subject of the principal proposition is subject and an adjective, noun, or participle is predicate: ‘When young (or when a boy) I looked at such things quite differently.’ ‘She always sings when doing her work.’ ‘In those days, when not knowing how to proceed in an emergency, he would consult his father.’ ‘Experience,
when dearly bought, is seldom thrown away.’ ‘John, don’t speak until spoken to.’ ‘Do not read while eating.’ ‘While regretting the sorrow which had fallen upon him, Miss Cuthbert was nevertheless glad that her brother was free’ (R. Bagot, Anthony Cuthbert, VI, 51). ‘But there was no spite in her quizzes, and Esther felt that while seeming to make a mock of her, she was defending her’ (George Moore, Esther Waters, Ch. III). ‘While resembling in some general traits the Yorkshire countryman, he (the Yankee) has developed in dress, mannerisms, and speech into a figure quite independent of foreign influence’ (Marie Killheffer in American Speech, Feb., 1928, p. 222). ‘The consciousness of his descent from good American stock that had somehow been deprived of its heritage, while a grievance to him, was also a comfort’ (Winston Churchill, The Dwelling-Place of Light, Ch. I, 1). ‘Going down town I met an old friend.’ ‘Having once acquired (= after one has once acquired) a taste for good things one doesn’t give them up readily.’ ‘Having finished (= after I had finished) my task I went to bed.’

In oldest English, the predicate was always a noun or an adjective. If a participle was used, it was an adjective in force. Today the participle has tense like a finite verb, as in the last two examples, where it is in the perfect tense. This development began with the present participle which had both adjective and verbal force. The strong verbal force in the present participle led later to the use of the perfect participle with the full force of a verb in the present perfect or the past perfect tense. The conjunctions when, until, while, before, as found in the first eight examples, are modern introductions, not appearing until the sixteenth century. In contrast to older English, the abridged clause here has the features of tense and conjunction which characterize the full clause. In English, the evident tendency has been not to discard the old primitive predicate appositive type of clause but on account of its terseness to retain it, adapting it to the modern need of accuracy of expression by giving the participle an appropriate tense form and conjunction in order to indicate precisely the time relations. Compare 20 3 (5th par.) and 30 b.

Instead of the participial construction we may often use the gerund, which vies with it in terseness. The gerund cannot be used with when and while, which are pure conjunctions, but on the other hand is freely employed after conjunctions which are also prepositions, for here as elsewhere the gerund is a natural form after prepositions: ‘I must write my exercise before going to school.’ ‘Since finishing these studies he has not taken up a new line of work.’ The gerund competes with the simple appositive
participle after the prepositions in and after: 'In going down town (or Going down town) I met an old friend.' 'After having finished my work (or Having finished my work) I went to bed.'

The participle is a favorite in lively language since it is more concrete and impressive, especially the present participle with its descriptive force, even though it cannot mark the time relations accurately: 'Passing (= having passed, but with more descriptive force) through the wall of mud and stone they found a cheerful company assembled' (Dickens, A Christmas Carol, II, 65). In both the participial and the gerundial constructions the subject of the principal proposition is also the subject of the abridged clause. The gerund with after or before, however, may take another subject: 'After his (or John's, or my neighbor's, or my neighbor) (50 3) acting in that way I can believe almost anything of him,' where the idea of time mingles with that of cause. Also after on: 'On someone's asking him derisively if he were a partner of mine, he replied,' etc. (Thomas Nelson Page, John Marvel, Assistant, Ch. VII).

Also the absolute nominative construction may be employed in abridged clauses of time: 'This disposed of, I turned at once to something else.' Compare 17 3 A a.

Sometimes the temporal clause can be abridged to an infinitive clause with to when the subject of the principal proposition can serve as the subject of the infinitive: 'Imagine how I felt to find (= when I found) that you had actually gone off without filling my traveling inkstand' (Mark Twain, Letter to Mrs. Crane, Sept. 18, 1892). 'He was surprised to see this' (= when he saw this). The idea of time here often mingles with that of cause, as in the second example.

The temporal clause is often abridged to a prepositional phrase: 'She died almost immediately upon her arrival' (= after she arrived).

**CLAUSE OF MANNER**

28. A clause of manner describes the manner of the action of the principal verb. This clause may define the action in each of the five following ways:

1. **Manner Proper.** An adverb or adverbial phrase of manner stands in the principal proposition, the adverb or some word in the adverbial phrase pointing forward as a determinative to the following appositional statement, which explains it: 'I interpret the telegram so (or thus, or in this way): he is coming tomorrow, not today.' In oldest English, there was often here a double so
(Old English swa swa), the old double determinative construction found so often elsewhere. The second determinative in this construction is now always that, which, however, is now felt as a conjunction introducing the subordinate clause: 'I interpret the telegram so (or in this way), that he is coming tomorrow, not today.' Instead of so or in this way we often use in this: 'This form of speech differs from the various regional dialects in many ways, but most remarkably in this, that it is not confined to any locality.'

The determinatives in what manner, in whatever manner, how, in that (in older English also simple that), and as, standing as they do immediately before the explanatory remark, have become closely associated with it, forming with it a subordinate clause and serving as its connective, linking it to the principal proposition and thus developing into relative conjunctions: 'They strove to escape in what manner they might,' originally in what (a determinative like that, but with indefinite force) manner: they might, the determinative what pointing to the following explanatory clause. We employ the same construction after how, which is an old contracted form from the same root as what and hence has the same indefinite meaning: 'Do it how (or in what manner, or in whatever manner) you can.' 'We must get on how we can.' 'A man has a right to spend his money how he pleases.' The determinatives that and as have more definite meaning, but they have the same construction: 'He differed from his colleagues in that he devoted his spare time to reading,' originally 'He differed in that: he devoted his spare time to reading.' 'Thou hast well done that thou art come' (Acts, X, 33), now in that you have come or more simply in coming. 'Do as (from older all so, i.e., quite so) you think best,' originally 'Do all so: you think best,' i.e., 'Act after the manner that your best thought will suggest to you.' 'Do as you please.' 'He described the scene to me as [it, i.e., the description] follows.' For the omission of the pronoun it, see 5 d. Since as has so many meanings, one often shading off into another, it is not always possible to distinguish this as from the one in 2, p. 280. This as expresses manner pure and simple without a thought of a comparison of one act with another, as in 2. The as-clause denotes manner pure and simple when it can be replaced by a participle in the predicate appositive or objective predicate relation: 'I must go just as I am' (or dressed in these clothes). 'I bought the house just as it stood' (or unreppaired and unpainted). The commonest use of this as is to indicate the manner in which a statement is made, so that the as-clause, like a sentence adverb (16 2 a, p. 132), modifies the governing proposition as a whole rather
than the verb and, like a sentence adverb, usually stands between subject and verb, or at the beginning or the end of the sentence or proposition: ‘Mr. Barkis’s wooing, as I remember it, was altogether of a peculiar kind’ (Dickens, David Copperfield, Ch. X). ‘As I view them now, I can call them no less than coward’s errands’ (Thackeray, Henry Esmond, II, Ch. IV). ‘If he comes tonight, as we all expect he will, it will be a happy household.’ ‘It is ten miles from here, as the crow flies.’ ‘I protest (declare) to you, as I am a gentleman and a soulard, I ne’re chang’d wordes with his like’ (Ben Jonson, Every Man in His Humour, I, v, 86, A.D. 1601, ed. 1616).

a. ABRIDGMENT OF CLAUSE OF MANNER PROPER. This clause is quite commonly abridged to the predicate appositive or objective predicate construction with a present or perfect participle as predicate appositive or objective predicate whenever the subject of the participle is the subject or the object of the principal verb: ‘She came into the house singing, crying, carrying an armful of clothes,’ etc. ‘He stood leaning against a tree.’ ‘We sat vacantly looking at each other.’ ‘Well, that is just our way, exactly — one half of the administration busy getting the family into trouble, the other half busy getting it out again’ (Mark Twain, Letter to Mrs. Grover Cleveland, Nov. 6, 1887). ‘He was (= was busy) two years writing this book’ (Galsworthy, Caravan, 421). ‘Five languages in use in the house (including the sign language, the hardest-worked of them all), and yet with all this opulence of resource we do seem to have an uncommonly tough time making ourselves understood’ (Mark Twain, Letter to Mrs. Crane, Sept. 30, 1892). ‘Don’t bother answering this’ (James Gibbons Huneker, Letter, Aug. 11, 1918). ‘It was kind of you to bother yourself asking her’ (id., Letter, July 15, 1919). ‘Will you never be done getting me into trouble?’ (L. M. Montgomery, Anne of Avonlea, Ch. III). ‘Are you through asking questions?’ ‘I beat him jumping.’ ‘I must go dressed in these clothes.’ ‘I bought the house unrepaired and unpainted.’ While a full clause can often be abridged to the participial construction, the latter is often older and hence independent of it, and often still much more common. The present participle is exceedingly frequent. It is here one of the tersest and most convenient constructions in our language. It specifies some activity that characterizes or specializes the act or state.

The participle is often introduced by as: ‘I rejoice that I am on record as having repudiated the financial part of it’ (i.e., the political platform) (James A. Garfield, Letter to J. H. Rhodes, May 15, 1868). ‘Pray do not understand me as having lost hope’ (Woodrow Wilson, Letter to Thomas D. Jones, 1910).
In older English, the simple infinitive was the common form after *come*, where we now use the present participle: "Thenne he looked by hym and was ware of a damoysel that cam ryde (now riding) ful fast as the hors mighte ryde" (Malory, *Le Morte d'Arthur*, Book II, Ch. VI, fifteenth century).

The gerundial construction after a preposition is much used: ‘He differed from his colleagues in spending his spare time in reading.’ ‘The fight began by John’s calling William names.’ ‘He spends his spare time in reading’ (or with the participle, *reading*).

The prepositional phrase is often simple—with an ordinary noun after the preposition instead of a gerund: ‘The assembly was opened with prayer.’ The phrase often specifies a detail or details in the statement—a phrase of specification: ‘The brothers differ in disposition.’ The phrase often serves as a sentence adverb (16 2 a): ‘The statement is without doubt exaggerated.’

2. Comparison. The action of the principal verb is compared with that in the subordinate clause: ‘Do at Rome as the Romans do,’ originally ‘Do at Rome all so (older form of *as*): the Romans do,’ where the determinative *so*, like an index finger, points to the following explanatory clause. ‘He treated me as a father would have done.’ ‘You do not act as you speak.’ ‘Let us do our duty as our predecessors did theirs.’

In older English, there was often a double determinative here: ‘Euen so betide my soul as I use him’ (Marlowe, *Edward II*, l. 2135, A.D. 1590, ed. 1594). In accordance with this older usage we still sometimes find a *so* in the principal proposition pointing to the *as* in the subordinate clause: ‘The committee was not so constituted as he had expected.’ In older English, the *so* was sometimes brought over from the principal proposition and placed before *as* in the subordinate clause: ‘to see thy power and thy glory, so as (now simple *as*) I have seen thee in the sanctuary’ (*Psalms*, LXIII, 2).

In another case the double demonstrative is quite common. The *as*-clause often precedes when it is desired to hold the principal proposition a while in suspense for emphasis, in which case the latter is introduced by *so*, pointing back to the subordinate clause: ‘As it is the nature of the kite to devour little birds, so it is the nature of such persons as Mrs. Wilkins to insult and tyrannize over little people’ (Fielding, *Tom Jones*). In this form of the clause the idea of cause sometimes mingles with that of comparison: ‘As a madman’s epistles are no gospels, so it skills (matters) not much when they are deliver’d’ (Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night*, V, 294). As in this example, the clause of comparison was
The clause of comparison is often elliptical: ‘She plays with him as a cat [plays] with a mouse.’ ‘Of course, our winters here in Chicago are not mild as [they are] in your native California.’ ‘Everything had happened exactly as [had been] expected.’

Instead of as we often find like as in older English: ‘Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him’ (Psalms, CIII, 13). Here like is an adverb with the meaning in the same manner. As performs the function of conjunction. But early like as became felt as a unit, and later as began to disappear since like was felt as expressing clearly alone both the meaning and the function. The like-as clause has the great advantage over the as-clause that like has a clear, distinctive meaning, while as has so many meanings that it is often difficult to discover what it means in the case in hand. Shakespeare, among other earlier writers, used like here as a short form for like as, just as after, while, etc., were used for older after that, the while that, etc., so that, just as the preposition after and the noun while have become subordinating conjunctions of time, the adverb like has become a subordinating conjunction of comparison, in accordance with sound grammatical analogies which have long been at work in English: ‘Like an arrow shot From a wel-experienc’d archer hits the mark’ (Pericles, I, i, 163). Our grammarians have recognized after, while, etc., but still combat like. They demand the use of as here. Like, however, is widely used in colloquial and popular speech, since its vivid concrete force appeals to the feelings more than the colorless as. It is, of course, very common also in literature which reflects colloquial usage: ‘They don’t marry like we do’ (A. Marshall, Abington Abbey, Ch. XIII). ‘Suppose we do knock militarism out of Germany, like we did out of France’ (Jerome K. Jerome, All Roads Lead to Calvary, Ch. XVI). In ordinary use the simple form like has entirely supplanted older like as, the older form now appearing only in archaic or poetic language, or in dialect.

On the other hand, where there is no finite verb expressed or understood, and there is present a noun or pronoun, like is not opposed by grammarians; it is indeed the usual form even in the best literary style, here felt as a preposition, forming with its object a prepositional phrase: ‘He treats his wife like a child.’ ‘His coat fits him like a glove.’ ‘He laughs like her.’ In elliptical clauses as was once used before a noun with the same force as like, only differing in grammatical structure, the preposition like taking an object, the conjunction as standing before a nominative
which is the subject of a suppressed verb: 'And the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose [rejoices and blossoms]' (Isaiah, XXXV, 1). Today we employ like here. We avoid the use of as in such elliptical clauses, since as is so often used in sentences of this form to introduce a predicate appositive (7 A b (3)), where it has quite a different meaning, indicating not mere similarity but complete identity, oneness with. If, however, a word or words follow this nominative which show that the nominative is not a predicate appositive but the subject of a suppressed verb, as is the usual literary form, not like: 'She took to the multiplication-table as a duck [takes] to water,' or in colloquial speech 'like a duck [takes] to water.' In poetical style like as is still used here instead of as: 'My spirit rises before it like as the lark awakened by the dawn' (Hall Caine, The Deemster, Ch. XLII). Like as survives here also in popular speech.

a. 'As If' AND 'As Though.' Before if and though all of the clause of comparison is usually suppressed except the conjunction as, since the thought is always suggested by the context: 'He acts as [he would act] if (or though = if, as in older English) he were in love with her.' The verbs look, seem, and be are much used in this category. They are not copulas here but full verbs: 'He looks (= has an appearance, acts) as if he were going through a great crisis.' 'They seemed (= seemed to act) as if they had never missed Sylvia' (Mrs. Gaskell, Sylvia's Lovers, Ch. VI). 'It seemed to me (= impressed me) as if they had never missed Sylvia.' 'It was (= seemed) almost as if people had sensed at once that she could never be held accountable for what she said and did' (Eleanor Carroll Chilton, Shadows Waiting, p. 28). The present indicative is used here to indicate greater confidence: 'He acts as if he is [in love with her]' (Tarkington, 'Juliette,' Ladies' Home Journal, Aug., 1925). 'It does look as if the very crisis is here' (Walter H. Page, Letter to Arthur W. Page, April 28, 1917).

Originally, if was not used here. In older English, the form of clause without if is common: 'He laye there nighe half an houre as [if] he had ben dede' (Malory, Le Morte d'Arthur, Book XVIII, Ch. XII, A.D. 1485). 'He looks as [if] he had seen a ghost' (Coleridge, Wallenstein, I, V, A.D. 1800). This older usage survives in the set expression as it were: 'She took him over as it were into her confidence.'

In popular speech like as if is much used instead of as if: 'She holds him round the neck, like as if she was protecting him' (Dickens, Our Mutual Friend).

In older English, like as is sometimes used instead of as if: 'Yet once methought It lifted up its head and did address Itself
to motion, *like as it would speak*’ (Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, I, ii, 217). The present tendency in colloquial and popular speech is to simplify these forms to *like*: ‘It looks *like he was afraid*’ (or to express greater confidence *like he’s afraid*).

b. ABRIDGMENT OF CLAUSE OF COMPARISON. This clause is often abridged to the predicate appositive construction, in which the subject is the subject of the principal proposition and the predicate is an adjective, participle, or prepositional phrase: ‘She hurriedly left the room *as though angry*.’ ‘He lay for several hours *as though stunned*.’ ‘She looked pleadingly at her parents *as though entreating forgiveness*.’ ‘She looked about as *if in search of something*.’ ‘The clouds had disappeared *as if by magic*.’ The *if* or *though* is sometimes lacking, as originally: ‘Then the herald raised his eyes *as seeking approval of someone far off*’ (Wallace, *Ben Hur*, Ch. XI). ‘Some birds, such as the true thrushes, impress one as *being of a serene, contemplative disposition*’ (John Burroughs, *Far and Near*, p. 192). ‘Walter S. Smith, not having completed his work, did not graduate with his class in 1924; but in the following year, finishing his work, was at his request graduated *as of the class of 1924*.’

If the predicate is a verb, the clause is often abridged to an infinitive clause: ‘He raised his head *as if (or as though) to command silence*.’ ‘When I appear upon the scene, the female (sapsucker) scurries away in alarm, calling as she retreats, *as if for the male to follow*’ (John Burroughs, *Under the Apple-Trees*, Ch. I). In older English, *if* is often lacking here, as originally: ‘Mr. Peters and Mr. Williams are to be here, *as [if] to breakfast with me*’ (Richardson, *Pamela*, I, p. 385). Older usage lingers on: ‘She paused a moment *as [if] to collect herself for an effort*’ (De Morgan, *The Old Madhouse*, Ch. XIII).

We sometimes find here the primitive verbless type of sentence described in 20 3: ‘Lightly won, lightly lost’ = ‘Just as something is lightly won, it is lightly lost.’

3. Attendant Circumstance. The action of the principal verb is accompanied by some attendant circumstance which is contained in the subordinate clause. The conjunctions here used are: *as; without that* (only in older English); *that — not, but, but that,* and colloquially *but what and without* (in older English a literary form); *moreover that* (especially in older English, as in Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, II, ii, 2); *besides that, in addition to the fact that;* *apart from the fact that, independently of the fact that, instead of that; sometimes instead of in contrasting two verbs and in elliptical clauses with verb understood; often also the temporal conjunctions while or whilst, at the same time that.*
Examples:

The enemy devastated the country as he retreated.

‘This seemed to be done without that the King was fully informed thereof’ (Lord Herbert, *Henry VIII*, 162, A.D. 1648), now replaced by the gerundial construction described in *a* below.

‘The artist, of whatever kind, cannot produce a truthful work without he understands the laws of the phenomena he represents’ (Spencer, *Education*, Ch. I), still heard in colloquial and popular speech, but in the literary language now replaced by the gerundial construction described in *a* below.

He never passed anybody on the street that he didn’t greet him (or but, but that, but what, or without, he greeted him).

It never rains but it pours.

I can’t think housekeeping will be any great addition to your expenses, and I am sure it will give some respectability to your house, besides that it will be much more agreeable than living in a boardinghouse (George Mason, *Letter to His Son John*, May 14, 1789).

Still we were grateful to him, for, besides that he showed an example of contentment to us slaves of unnecessary appetite, he sold vegetables (T. E. Lawrence, *Revolt in the Desert*, p. 70, A.D. 1927).

If Carlyle had written, instead of that he wanted Emerson to think of him in *America*, that he wanted his father and mother to be thinking of him at Ecclefechan, that would have been well (Ruskin, *Praeterita*, 1, 252).

I saw that you were the real person; someone I admired as well as loved, and respected instead of — well, patronized (Eleanor Carroll Chilton, *Shadows Waiting*, p. 286).

When I paint a picture, you think the net result is I and the picture, instead of [it is] I alone (Edward F. Benson, *The Judgment Books*, 162).

You ought to have told me this instead of I [told] you (Reade, *Cloister and the Hearth*, Ch. IX) (or instead of my having told you).

Now they rule him instead of him (incorrectly used for he) them (Sarah Grand, *Heavenly Twins*, 42) (or instead of his ruling them).

‘I should be his prisoner instead of he being mine’ (Doyle, *Strand Magazine*, Dec., 1894, 571), incorrectly used for instead of he mine or instead of his being mine. Mr. Doyle’s clause is a blending of the elliptical and the gerundial clause.

He was drowned while he was bathing in the river.

At the same time that our trials strengthen us, they make us more tender and sensitive to the sufferings of others.

The idea of attendant circumstance and that of result are often so closely associated that it is difficult to distinguish them. Hence we often find the same conjunctions for both, so that some of these conjunctions will also occur in 5, p. 289.

*a*. **ABRIDGMENT OF CLAUSE OF ATTENDANT CIRCUMSTANCE.**

An *as*-clause and a *while*-clause can be abridged to the predicate appositive construction with the present participle as predicate appositive whenever its subject is identical with that of the prin-
cipal proposition, or the participle may be replaced by in with the gerund: 'Retreating (or in retreating) the enemy devastated the country.' 'He was drowned bathing in the river' or while (20 3, 5th par.) bathing in the river.

Also elsewhere a predicate appositive has the force of a clause of attendant circumstance: 'Far from receiving help, he gave it.' 'So far from doing any good, the rain did a good deal of harm,' a blending of 'Far from doing any good, the rain did a good deal of harm' and 'The rain was so far from doing any good that it did a good deal of harm.' 'So far from intending you any wrong, I have always loved you as well as if you had been my own mother.' 'The certainty as to the amount of mineral wealth, so far from having improved the situation, made it distinctly worse.'

A clause that in older English was introduced by without that has been replaced by the gerundial construction: 'This seemed to be done without the King's having been fully informed of it.' A clause introduced by that—not, but, but that, or without is quite freely abridged to the gerundial construction with without, whether its subject is identical with that of the principal proposition or not: 'He never passed people without greeting them' and 'He never passed people without their greeting him.' Though without is now avoided in the literary language in the full clause, it is common in the gerundial clause. The conjunctions besides that, apart from the fact that, independently of the fact that, in addition to the fact that can be freely replaced by prepositions or prepositional phrases with the gerundial construction: 'Besides being rich, she is very pretty.' 'Besides John's (or my son's, or son; see 50 3) helping me with the heavy work, several of the neighbors lent a helping hand.' 'Quite apart from (or quite independently of) saving a good deal of money in drawing the illustrations myself, I derived much pleasure from it.' 'In addition to being charged with high treason, he was charged with fraud.' 'In addition to John's being blamed for this, he was blamed also for breaking the window.' After instead of we usually employ the abridged form of statement, rarely the full clause: 'Instead of doing it himself, he got a man to do it.'

The gerundial construction is also common after the preposition so far from, which is thus used not only as a predicate appositive adjective, as illustrated above, but also as a preposition: 'So far from the rain doing any good, it did a good deal of harm.' 'So far from there being any danger or need of accentuated foreign competition, it is likely that the conditions of the next few years will greatly facilitate the marketing of American manufactures' (Woodrow Wilson, May 20, 1919).
When two clauses have a gerund in common, the expression is sometimes elliptical where the thought would not be endangered. The gerund may be expressed in the first clause and understood in the second: 'Of course, boys cannot work together in a common cause without some doing too much and others [doing] too little.' The subject of the gerund here is always the accusative, never the genitive. We employ the elliptical construction when we desire to contrast the two subjects. Compare 50 3 (6th par.). In colloquial speech we often find in the second clause a nominative used as subject: 'The sleeping inmates of the room accompanied my recital with a snoring duet or tercet without my interfering with their sleep or they with my reading' (Vambéry, My Struggles, 93). The nominative here indicates the influence of the full clause with a finite verb. The correct elliptical structure here requires two accusative subjects: 'without me interfering with their sleep or them with my reading.'

A prepositional phrase may often take the place of the full clause: 'We went out without permission.' 'I shall act without regard to (or regardless of) consequences.' 'He sang with the window open,' not by the open window, which indicates a place, not attendant circumstance. Compare 17 3 A d.

Instead of a full clause we often find here the absolute nominative construction described in 17 3 A d.

4. Clause of Alternative Agreement. The action of the principal proposition is in alternative agreement with that of the subordinate clause. The conjunctions here used are as (in older English and sometimes still) and the more common according as: 'stones whose rates are either rich or poor As fancy values them' (Shakespeare, Measure for Measure, II, ii, 150). 'The shadow cast by an object is long or short according as the sun is high up in the heavens or near the horizon.' 'Things are often good or bad for us according as we look at them.' This idea can also often be expressed by a prepositional clause: 'They were praised or scolded according to how they had done their work.'

5. Manner Clause of Modal Result and Clause of Pure Result. In manner clauses of modal result the subordinate clause is represented as something which has resulted from the manner of the activity expressed in the principal proposition. There are two forms of the clause. In one form there is in the principal proposition a determinative — such or só — pointing to a following explanatory clause, originally an independent proposition, hence without an introductory subordinating conjunction: 'He has always lived such a life: he cannot expect sympathy now,' or 'He has always lived só: he cannot expect sympathy now,' where the
determinative *such* or *so* points as with an index finger to the following explanatory clause. This old type of clause without an introductory conjunction is still in use; in colloquial speech is even common: ‘Here lies our good Edmund, whose genius was such, *We can scarcely praise it or blame it too much*’ (Goldsmith, Retaliation). ‘His manner was *such* I could not help thinking he was unfriendly to Sherman’ (J. B. Foraker, Notes of a Busy Life, Ch. VI). ‘I tried to arrange *so* the sections would be far enough apart to allow each ample time to unload, feed, water, and load the horses at any stopping place before the next section could arrive’ (Theodore Roosevelt, The Rough Riders, Ch. II).

Alongside of this type of sentence there is another with a double determinative, in accordance with older English fondness for double expression, a *such* or *so* in the principal proposition and *that* in the clause of result: ‘He has always lived *such* a life *that* he cannot expect sympathy now,’ originally ‘He always lived *such* a life, *that*: he cannot expect sympathy now,’ the two determinatives *such* and *that* pointing as with two index fingers to the following explanatory clause. The second determinative *that*, standing immediately as it does before the explanatory remark, became early closely associated with it, forming with it a subordinate clause of result and serving as its connective, binding it to the principal proposition, and thus developed into a subordinating conjunction. Modern English has often rejected parts of older double determinative constructions as excessive expression, but the second determinative *that* has been retained here since it has developed into a conjunction and thus performs a useful function, marking the unity of the words in the clause, so that this form is now more common in the literary language than the simpler form of the clause without a conjunction. The old determinative *that* was originally an adjective element and could only be used when it could refer to a preceding noun as in this example referring to ‘such a life’; but its function as determinative or conjunction was early felt more vividly than its function as adjective, so that since the earliest historical records it has been used as determinative or conjunction even when the preceding word is an adverb: ‘He has always lived *so that he cannot expect sympathy now.*’ This explains the extensive use of the conjunction *that* in adverbial clauses of modal result whether of manner or degree. It is used also in clauses of pure result, as described below.

In oldest English, the determinative *so* was often used in the clause of result instead of *that*. These old determinatives — *so* and *that* — have throughout the history of our language been
competitors in a number of different kinds of subordinate clauses. *That* is now the literary form in the clause of result, but as (from *all so*, i.e., *quite so*), the modern representative of older *so*, was common earlier in the period: 'A man should study other things to make his base such as (now *that*) no tempest shall shake him' (Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*, p. 57, A.D. 1641). This old usage survives in popular speech, as illustrated on page 290. Of course, we today feel *that* and *as* merely as conjunctions and have so little feeling for their older concrete force that we do not feel *as* as containing the old determinative *so*.

In older English, the *such* of the principal proposition was often replaced by the determinative adjective *that*: ‘From me, whose love was of *that* dignity *That* it went hand in hand even with the vow I made to her in marriage’ (Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, I, v, 48). ‘She sat and looked on, keeping out of the way of her bustling aunt as far as possible; but Miss Fortune's gyrations were of *that* character that no one could tell five minutes beforehand what she might consider “in the way”’ (Susan Warner, *The Wide, Wide World*, Ch. XXII, A.D. 1851).

In all its modal meanings the *so* of the principal proposition is heavily stressed and usually follows the verb, but not infrequently the verbal idea becomes prominent and is heavily stressed, so that *so* has a little less stress than the verb and, like a sentence adverb (16 2 a), stands immediately before the verb or in a compound tense or modal form before the part of the verb containing the verbal meaning, thus indicating that the verbal idea is more important than the idea of manner: ‘It *so* happened that I was present.’ ‘We should *so* act in this matter that we shall have nothing to regret.’

The *so* of the principal proposition often loses its stress and is brought over to the subordinate clause, so that the modal idea of manner disappears entirely and the subordinate clause becomes a clause of pure result; in the literary language usually introduced by *so that*, in colloquial speech often still by simple *so*, as in older English: ‘He went early *so that* (or simple *so*) he got a good seat.’ ‘She sat directly before me, *so that* (or simple *so*) I could not see the expression on her face.’ ‘He didn’t go early, as he ought to have done, *so that* (or simple *so*) he didn’t get a good seat.’ ‘I would to heaven I were your son, *so you would love me, Hubert*’ (Shakespeare, *King John*, IV, i, 23). ‘With those (generals) present were their respective staffs, *so* (now more commonly *so that* in literary language) there were enough of them, all told, to make up a pretty large company’ (J. B. Foraker, *Notes of a Busy Life*, Ch. VII). ‘A man ought to have a settled job, with an office in
some fixed place, so (for literary so that) you always know where he is' (Christopher Morley, 'Thunder on the Left,' in *Harper's Magazine* for Sept., 1925, p. 397). 'You write that letter to Ninian, and you make him tell you so (colloquial for so that) you'll understand' (Zona Gale, *Miss Lulu Bett*, Ch. V). The subordinate clause introduced here by simple so is differentiated from the coordinate clause introduced by simple so, described in c, p. 291, by less stress and a slighter pause before it. We often use here a question instead of a negative so-that clause: 'He no longer has any backing, why should you fear him?' (or so that there is no need of your fearing him).

On account of its lack of distinctive form simple that, one of the oldest conjunctions used in clauses of pure result, has become rather rare and choice, although earlier in the period more common: 'Pray let your youth make hast; for I should have done a business an hower since, that (now usually so that) I doubt (fear) I shall come too late' (Ben Jonson, *Every Man out of His Humour*, IV, iv, A.D. 1600). 'The image of a bear stood out upon a Sign-Post, perk'd up on his Arse with a great Faggot-bat in his Claws, that (now usually so that) he look'd like one of the City Waits playing upon the Double CurteV (Ned Ward, *The London Spy*, p. 120, A.D. 1700, ed. 1924). 'A fire scorch'd me that (now usually so that) I woke' (Tennyson, *Lucretius*, 66). Simple that, however, is quite freely used when the clause of result follows a statement of the cause or the assumed cause couched in the form of a declarative sentence or very commonly a question: 'Something is wrong that he hasn't come before this,' or 'What is the matter that he hasn't come before this?' 'I must have been blind that I didn't see that post,' or 'Where were my eyes that I didn't see that post?' 'I should like to know what the matter was that he didn't come.' In negative clauses after a question, a negative, or a word with negative force, as scarcely, we may still use that not, or but, or but that, or in colloquial and popular speech but what or without, or instead of a subordinate clause often, even in the literary language, a principal proposition after and: 'Can you touch pitch that you do not defile yourself?' (or but, or but that, or but what, or without, you defile yourself? or and not defile yourself?). 'He scarcely ever played with the children that a quarrel didn't follow' (or but, or but that, or but what, a quarrel followed). Without that was once employed here, but it is now little used: 'It was next to impossible that a casket could be thrown... without that she should have caught intimation of things extraordinary' (Brontë, *Villette*, 107), now in colloquial speech sometimes without she should catch intimation, etc., but
usually in colloquial and literary language *without her catching intimation*, etc.

As described on page 288, as was once common instead of *that* in clauses of result. Modal result: ‘I gained a son, And such a son *as* (now *that*) all men hailed me happy’ (Milton, Samson, 358). ‘At last they were forced into a harbor, where lay a French man-of-war with his prize, and (23 II 9 b) had surely made prize of them also, but that the providence of God so disposed *as* (now *that*) the captain knew the merchant of our bark’ (Winthrop, Journal, June 15, 1637). Still in popular speech: ‘But you said they depended on you, papa!’ — ‘So they do, but of course not *so’s* (i.e., *so as*, current popular form for *so that*) they couldn’t get along without me’ (Tarkington, Alice Adams, Ch. IV). ‘They planted th’ tree *so’s* (i.e., *so as*) no one wouldn’t ever be buried in that spot agin’ (Amy Lowell, East Wind, p. 89). In older English, there was a double determinative here, *as that* instead of *as*, in accord with the old fondness for double expression: ‘The difficulty certainly is, how to give this power in such manner *as that* (now simple *that*) it may only be used to good, and not abused to bad, purposes’ (Richard Henry Lee, Letter to George Mason, May 15, 1787). This usage survives in popular speech: ‘There is boarders who is always laying in wait for the days when the meals is not so good as they commonly be, to pick a quarrel with the one that is trying to serve them *so as that* (for literary *that*) they shall be satisfied’ (Oliver W. Holmes, The Poet at the Breakfast Table, XII).

Similarly, *as* or *so as* was once common in the literary language in clauses of pure result instead of *that* or *so that*: ‘And matchlesse beautiful, *as* (instead of *that*, now more commonly *so that*), had you seene her, ’twould haue mou’d your heart’ (Marlowe, The Jew of Malta, 629, A.D. 1590, ed. 1633). ‘He miscarried by unskilfulness, *so as* (now *so that*) the loss can no way be ascribed to cowardice’ (Hobbes, Thucydides, 120, A.D. 1628). ‘Many came unto them from diverse parts of England, *so as* (now *so that*) they grew a great congregation’ (Bradford, History of Plymouth Plantation, p. 40, A.D. 1630–1648). This usage survives in popular speech: ‘P-pay anything *so’s* (for literary *so that*) you get it’ (Winston Churchill, Coniston, Ch. VII). In older English, we sometimes find three determinatives in clauses of pure result: ‘On that night ashes were thrown into the porridge, *so as that* (now *so that*) they could not eat it’ (Increase Mather, Remarkable Providences, Ch. V, Jan., 1684).

The determinative *so* in the principal clause has not a clearly defined meaning, denoting often manner or degree. Hence the
so in the example from Tarkington on page 290 may mean degree instead of manner and then would belong to 29 2.

a. ‘Till’ Instead of ‘So That.’ So that is often replaced by till where the idea of time seems more important to our feeling than that of result: ‘The dogs fought till the hair flew.’

b. Relative Clause Instead of Adverbial. An adverbial clause of pure result is often replaced by a descriptive relative clause introduced by whence, wherefore, why, or more commonly on account of which: ‘This bird (shrike) has a strong bill toothed at the end, and feeds on small birds and insects, whence or on account of which (= so that) it is known as the butcher-bird.’

‘I demand . . . What rub or what impediment there is, Why that (old form = why = on account of which, or more commonly that) the naked, poor and mangled Peace . . . Should not . . . put up her lovely visage’ (Henry the Fifth, V, ii, 32).

A relative clause is often used with the force of a clause of pure result when the reference is to a negative: ‘Nobody knew him who didn’t love him,’ or in adverbial form, that he didn’t love him, or but (or but that) he loved him. Compare 23 II 5 (2nd par.).

A restrictive relative clause often has the force of a clause of modal result when it is introduced by the relative pronoun as or that (expressed or understood) and there is in the principal proposition the determinative such or a expressing a kind or degree: ‘He lent his antagonist such a box on the ear as made him stagger to the other side of the room’ (or a box on the ear that made him stagger to the other side of the room, or in adverbial form, such a box on the ear that it made him stagger to the other side of the room). ‘We’ll each of us give you such a thrashing as you’ll remember’ (or a thrashing that you’ll remember, or a thrashing you’ll remember, or in adverbial form, such a thrashing that you’ll remember it).

c. Coordination Instead of Subordination. Instead of a principal proposition and a subordinate clause of pure result introduced by so that we often find two principal propositions connected by and: ‘My health is excellent, and I could settle down to a stiff task with ease.’ Instead of coordination with and we may coördinate with so (coördinating conjunction; see 19 1 e): ‘My health is good, so I could settle down,’ etc. And and so may be combined: ‘My health is good, and so I could settle down,’ etc. Compare 19 3.

d. Abridgment of Manner Clauses of Modal Result and Clauses of Pure Result. After such and so a that-clause of modal result can usually be abridged to an infinitive clause with as to when the subject of the principal proposition can serve as the subject of the infinitive: ‘This is not such weather as to encourage
out-door sports.’ ‘He lays out his work each day so as to be able to finish it by six o’clock.’ The as is not found here in oldest English, which clearly shows that it later entered the abridged clause under the influence of the as which introduced the full clause. In the literary language the as has been replaced by that in the full clause, but it survives in the abridged clause.

In older English, a so-that clause of pure result could be abridged to an infinitive clause with so to when the subject of the principal proposition could serve as the subject of the infinitive: ‘Here it (giddiness of head) increased upon me to an alarming degree, so to render me incapable of moving from my seat’ (Joseph Farington, Diary, Nov. 29, 1810).

A so-that clause of pure result is now usually contracted to an infinitive clause with so as to when the subject of the principal proposition can serve as the subject of the infinitive: ‘Put on your gloves so as to be ready!’ The so as is not found here in oldest English, which clearly shows that it later entered the abridged clause under the influence of the so as which introduced the full clause. In the literary language the so as has been replaced in the full clause by so that, but it survives in the abridged clause.

A simple that clause of pure result can be abridged to a to-infinitive clause, and is often even more common than the full clause by reason of the concrete force of to, which here has one of its common derived meanings, end, result: ‘He did not see Stenning again to speak to’ (A. Marshall, Anthony Dare, Ch. III) (or more commonly to speak to him). ‘A catbird sang to split its throat’ (Mary Johnston, Hagar, Ch. V). ‘Five of their six sons lived to grow up.’ ‘How old do you have to be to be grown up?’ (Christopher Morley, Thunder on the Left). ‘You have only to ask to get it.’ ‘Whole tracts of the Excursion (poem by Wordsworth) require considerable patience on the part of the reader to appreciate.’ ‘Poetry should not require considerable patience to be appreciated.’ The infinitive here may now have a subject of its own introduced by for: ‘In Ireland just now one has only to discover an idea that seems of service to the country for friends and helpers to spring up on every hand’ (Yeats, Plays and Controversies, p. 3). In this very common infinitive clause the form with to or for to is now the common one, but the old simple infinitive still lingers: ‘How came you take (now usually to take) up such an absurd habit?’ (Susan Warner, The Wide, Wide World, Ch. XLIX).

In older English, a simple as-clause of pure result could be abridged to a to-infinitive clause introduced by as: ‘Where is now the soul of god-like Cato? he that durst be good when Caesar durst be evill; and had power As not to live his slave, to dye his
master' (Ben Jonson, *Sejanus*, I, i, 89, A.D. 1616). We now suppress the as here.

The simple *that*-clause that follows a statement of the cause of the result, couched in the form of a declarative sentence or very commonly in the form of a direct or an indirect question, can often be abridged to a *to*-infinitive clause: ‘I suppose you think I am a very bad mother to be amusing myself while Joy is suffering’ (Galsworthy, *Joy*). ‘Who was I to go tearing through peaceful towns with my execrated locomotive and massacring innocent people?’ (W. J. Locke, *The Joyous Adventures of Aristide Pujol*, Ch. I). ‘When his old friend John Street’s son volunteered for special service he shook his head querulously and wondered what John Street was about to allow it’ (Galsworthy, *The Man of Property*, 86). Also the present participle is used here: ‘What’s got into you wanting all of a sudden to get married?’ (Mary Heaton Vorse, *Woman’s Home Companion*, Aug., 1927, p. 18).

A clause of pure result introduced by *that*—not, but, or *but that* can be abridged to a *to*-infinitive clause: ‘None knew him but to love him.’ After most verbs the negative clause is more commonly abridged to a gerundial clause with *without*: ‘The children never played together without getting into a fight.’ Though *without* is now avoided in the literary language in the full clause, it is common in the gerundial clause.

A full *so*-that clause of pure result that has considerable independence of thought can often be abridged to a participial clause, ‘He mistook me for a friend, *so that* he caused me some embarrassment’ (or *causing me some embarrassment*, or with a formal expression of the idea of result: *thus causing me some embarrassment*). The use of *thus* here has been unjustly criticized on the ground that a coordinating conjunction should not link a subordinate clause to the principal proposition. But such a clause of pure result is logically a principal proposition, for it does not in any way modify the meaning of the principal proposition, and can be replaced by a principal proposition.

The idea of result is often expressed by an objective predicate (15 III 2, 15 III 2 A): ‘She boiled the egg hard.’ ‘The President made him a general.’ ‘He got the machine running’ (or *to running*). ‘The garrison was starved into surrender.’ ‘He worked himself into a frenzy.’ ‘He smoked himself into calmness.’ Compare 20 3 (last par.).

The result in all the above cases is represented as the effect of the activity or state indicated in the principal proposition. The *to*-infinitive is often employed to express an entirely different kind of result, namely, a result which is the natural outcome of
events or plans which are independent of the action described in
the principal proposition: ‘They parted never to see each other
again.’ ‘He waked to find all this a dream.’

CLAUSE OF DEGREE

29. Clauses of degree define the degree or intensity of that
which is predicated in the principal proposition. The degree can
be expressed in the following ways:

1. **Comparison.** It is expressed in the form of a comparison:

   A. **Positive Clause,** signifying a degree equal to that of the
       principal proposition:

      a. A *Simple Comparison.* We sometimes employ *as* here: ‘She
          is true *as* gold.’ This corresponds closely to Old English usage,
          where we find *swa*, i.e., *so*, in the place of our *as*, which is a
          contraction of *all so*, i.e., *quite so*. Thus originally this was a
          determinative construction, the *so* pointing forward to the follow­
          ing explanatory word or remark: ‘She was true, *so: gold [is].’
          As the *so*, now *as*, stood immediately before the explanatory re­
          mark it early became closely associated with it and was felt as a
          conjunction introducing the subordinate clause. This simple
          type is not so common now as in older English, but it still lingers
          on: ‘There’s the boy with the basket, punctual *as clockwork*
          (Dickens, *Pickwick*, Ch. IX). ‘Quick *as thought* he seized the
          oars.’ Compare 25 1.

      Alongside of the old simple determinative construction with *so*
      was a double determinative construction with *so — so*, as de­
      scribed in 25 1. In oldest English, this double type was not
      common in the category of comparison, but it has gradually be­
      come the common form of expression here. In its present form
      it has the following two sets of correlatives, where the first corre­
      lative of each set belongs to the principal proposition and the
      second correlative of each set is now felt as a subordinating con­
      junction introducing the subordinate clause: *as — as* in positive
      sentences to express complete equality and *so — as* in negative
      statements and questions with negative force to indicate ineq­
      uality: ‘I am *as tall as she [is]’ (equality). ‘Is she *as tall as I [am]?’
      (question simply inquiring whether there is an equality). ‘She
      is not *so tall as I*’ (inequality). ‘But are you *so tall as she?’
      (question with negative force). ‘I am always *as busy as I am
      now,*’ but ‘I am not always *so busy as I am now.*’ ‘She wears
      her clothes *as gracefully as* a coat-rack wears the coats hung on
      it.’

      This differentiation between *as — as* and *so — as*, though recom
ABRIDGMENT OF CLAUSE OF SIMPLE COMPARISON

mended by grammarians, has not become established in the language. In fact there has long been a fluctuation of usage here, since the two forms so and as have the same origin and meaning and hence are naturally used interchangeably. In the colloquial speech of our time there is a strong drift in the direction of greater simplicity and uniformity, a trend to employ as—as in both positive and negative statements, following the simple principle that as—as expresses equality and not . . . as—as denies the existence of an equality: ‘I am as tall as she’ and ‘I am not as tall as she.’ We often, however, employ so as the first correlative instead of as when we desire to stress not equality or inequality but the unusually high degree: ‘You can’t get one so good as this.’ ‘In a country so large as the United States there must be a great variety of climate.’

Where the things compared are not concrete but mere conceptions, the clause of comparison may be introduced by as that: ‘Trying hard and failing is not so bad as [is] that one should not try at all.’ ‘Nothing vexes me so much as [does] that I cannot see in what I can be serviceable to you.’ In older English, the form with simple as could be used: ‘Nothing vexeth me as (now so much as) that I cannot see wherein I can be servisable unto you’ (Sir Philip Sidney, Arcadia, Book I, Ch. XIV, A.D. 1590). The subject of the clause of comparison here is itself a clause—a subject clause. The abridged form of the subject clause is more common here than the full clause. See bb below.

aa. ACCUSATIVE INSTEAD OF NOMINATIVE. In elliptical clauses where the finite verb is not expressed, the nominative of personal pronouns is often in loose colloquial language replaced by the accusative, as so often elsewhere in elliptical expressions, as described in 7 C a: ‘What, the one as big as me?’ (Dickens, A Christmas Carol, Stave V), instead of as I.

bb. ABRIDGMENT OF CLAUSE OF SIMPLE COMPARISON. The full subject clause introduced by that is little used. It is largely replaced by the infinitival or the gerundial construction. When the subject is indefinite, the subject of the infinitive and the gerund is always understood: ‘To go ahead resolutely and fail (or Going ahead resolutely and failing) is not so bad as not to try at all [is],’ or as not trying at all [is], or less commonly as [is] that one should not try at all.

If the subject of the subject clause is definite, there is often some noun or pronoun in the principal proposition which serves as the subject of the infinitive or the gerund: ‘There is nothing so natural to him as to crave recognition [is],’ or as craving recognition [is]. If there is no word in the principal proposition that
can serve as the subject of the infinitive or the gerund, they have a subject of their own. The subject of the infinitive is an accusative after the preposition for, as explained in 21 e; the subject of the gerund is a possessive adjective or a noun in the genitive: 'Nothing could be so unwise as for him to attempt it [would be],' or as his attempting it [would be], or as John’s attempting it [would be]. The gerund is sometimes replaced by the absolute nominative construction described in 17 3 B with the absolute nominative as subject and a present participle as predicate: ‘Nothing alters the case so much as [does] your saying (gerund; or sometimes as [does] you saying; present participle) you are sorry.’ ‘Nothing cheers us so much as [does] things going (present participle) right.’ ‘Nothing reduces men’s political power so much as [does] women having (present participle) the vote.’ In older English, the subject of the infinitive here was often the absolute nominative instead of the accusative after for: ‘That it (i.e., the child) shall [be found], Is all as monstrous to our human reason As my Antigonus to break his grave’ (Shakespeare, The Winter’s Tale, V, i, 40), now as for my Antigonus to break his grave. Compare 17 3 B (2nd par.).

b. Proportionate Agreement. This clause is introduced by the following conjunctions: as, according as, in degree as, in the same degree as, in proportion as, but as, except as, the instrumental correlatives the — the (16 4 c), and the following more formal and stately correlatives with the same meaning, which were much more used earlier in the period than now: in what degree — in that degree, by how much — by so much, so much the + comparative — by how much the + comparative, the + comparative — by how much + comparative, in older English also as — so, later entirely replaced by as, according as, in proportion as.

The old instrumental correlatives the — the, though now void of distinctive form, are still by reason of their terse and telling parallelism much used. They still, as in Old English, have two forms: ‘This stone gets the harder the longer it is exposed to the weather,’ originally ‘This stone gets in that [degree] harder, in that [degree]: it is longer exposed to the weather.’ Here we have the old double deterministic described in 27 2 for the similar use of as. Here the two the’s point as with two index fingers to the following explanatory subordinate clause. Here as so often elsewhere, the second deterministic was early felt as belonging to the subordinate clause and became its introductory conjunction.

In the other form of this construction the subordinate clause precedes to make way for the emphatic principal proposition: ‘The more money he makes the more he wants,’ originally ‘In that
[degree]: he makes more money, in that [degree] he wants more.'
The first the is a determinative, pointing to the following subordinate clause. The second the, like the that in 24 III a (2nd par.), is a demonstrative, pointing back to the preceding subordinate clause. In Old English, there was here in this form of the construction a complete parallelism between the two propositions, so that the subordinate clause had no clear formal sign of dependence. At the close of the Old English period a that was inserted to indicate subordination: 'The more money that he makes the more he wants.' The double determinative, as here the — that, is characteristic of older English. In many cases it has disappeared, but it still survives here, since it clearly marks the clause as dependent and hence performs a useful function: 'The more shy that Michael became, the more earnestly did this young man press him with intimate questions' (Compton Mackenzie, Youth's Encounter, Ch. VIII). But the old form that expresses complete parallelism is still, as in older English, the favorite. The form with inserted that in the subordinate clause is found also in the first form of this construction: 'This stone gets the harder the longer that it is exposed to the weather.'

The the — the of the second form may often in choice prose and poetry be replaced by the longer form in what degree — in that degree, since it distinguishes by its form the subordinate clause from the principal proposition and hence is often more suitable for accurate expression. For most purposes, however, even in poetry, the — the by reason of its terse forcefulness, dramatic parallelism, and elegant simplicity is still the favorite.

**Examples:**

'One advances in modesty as one advances in knowledge,' with the emphasis upon the subordinate clause, but the principal proposition stands last when emphatic or important: 'As I grew richer I grew more ambitious.'

'We can earn more or less according as we work,' or in the form of a prepositional clause according to how we work.

'His humid eyes seemed to look within in degree as (or in the same degree as, or in proportion as) they grew dim to things without,' with the emphasis upon the subordinate clause, but the principal proposition stands last when emphatic or important: 'For just in proportion as the writer's aim, consciously or unconsciously, comes to be the transcribing, not of the world, not of mere fact, but of his sense of it, he becomes an artist, his work fine art' (Walter Pater, Style).

'I desire no titles but as I shall deserve 'em (Fletcher, Prophetess, II, III, A.D. 1622).

When we come to the improvement of the teacher in service, can that
be done right except as the teacher is a participant in the effort for improvement? (Mary McSkimmon in National Educational Association, 1925, p. 104).

The more money he makes the more he wants. 'In what degree we get self under foot, in that degree we get a larger view of life'; or much more simply 'The more we get self under foot, the larger view of life we get.'

Being thought so much the more assured to their Master, by how much the more he sees them grow hateful to all men else (Sir Walter Raleigh, Historie of the World).

Which deserveth the more accurate handling, by how much it touches us more nearly (Bacon, Advancement of Learning).

As they excelled in abominacion, so preferred he theim (Elyot, Image of Governance, 8, A.D. 1541).

The full clause is often abridged to a prepositional phrase: 'The price of manufactured articles must rise in proportion to the cost of labor.'

A primitive form of this clause is preserved in old saws, as in 'The more, the merrier,' where we still find the old verbless type of sentence described in 6 Ba and 20 3.

c. Restriction. The following conjunctions are used to indicate a restriction of the action or the state of the principal proposition: so (or sometimes as) long as; so (or sometimes as) far as; in so far as; or sometimes simple as.

Examples:

He answered quietly that if I gave the order he would take possession of the mines and would guarantee to open them and to run them, so long as I told him to stay (Theodore Roosevelt, An Autobiography, Ch. XIII).

So long as a people retains its vigor and its vital energy, its language never grows old (Brander Matthews, Essays on English, p. 5).

So far as (or as far as) I could see or judge, they were all satisfied with the arrangement.

'His efforts were so far successful as they reduced the percentage of deaths' (H. W. Fowler, Modern English Usage, p. 170), or more commonly 'His efforts were successful so far as they reduced the percentage of deaths.'

The outlines of the proposal, in so far as (or so far as) they interest the general public, are well known.

'Mr. Carlton is not a prudent man as (5 d, p. 18) regards money matters' (or with regard to money matters, or so far as money matters go).

He recognized it for a fact, as (5 d, p. 18) regarded the past, no more was to be said.

Why, Hal, thou know' st, as (= so far as) thou art but man, I dare; but as (= so far as) thou art Prince, I fear thee as (= as much as) I fear the roaring of the lion's whelp (I Henry IV, III, iii, 165).

She's not a bad servant, as servants go (Mrs. Wood, East Lynne, I, 281).
In poetical language, there is sometimes a *so* in the principal proposition where the subordinate clause is introduced by an *as* that has the force of *so far as*: ‘But if I live, So aid me heaven, when at mine uttermost, As I will make her truly my true wife!’ (Tennyson, *The Marriage of Geraint*, 501). There is a more common form of this old adjuration, which is also old: ‘So (= to this extent) help me God, I will make her my wife!’ ‘[I] Wouldn’t take a sou less, so help me’ (Jack London, *The Call of the Wild*, Ch. I).

aa. **Clause of Restriction Replaced by Other Constructions.** A restriction is often contained in a substantive relative clause introduced by the relative pronoun *that* (or in popular speech *as*), which is used either as an adverbial accusative or as an object, object of a preposition that stands at the end of the clause: ‘He had never seen Hall *that he knew* before that day’ (Dasent, *Jest and Earnest*, II, 343), literally, as to what (*= so far as*) he knew. ‘An injunction to restrain such proceeding has never that I *know* of been granted since 1851’ (Sir N. Lindley in *Law Report*, 31 Chanc. Div. 367). ‘It has never been done before that (or in popular speech *as*) I ever heard of.’

A restriction is often expressed also by a prepositional phrase consisting of *for* and a pronoun (*aught, anything, or now more commonly all or what*) or noun modified by a relative clause, or instead of this construction we may employ a subordinate clause introduced by *so far as*, especially after a negative proposition: ‘He may be dead *for aught (that) — or for anything (that), or more commonly for all (that), or for what — I know,*’ but ‘He isn’t dead *so far as I know*’ rather than ‘He isn’t dead *for aught (that) — or for anything (that), or for all (that), or for what — I know,*’ although the prepositional construction sometimes occurs, as seen in the next two examples. ‘For aught that I could ever read, Could ever hear by tale or history, The course of true love never did run smooth’ (Shakespeare, *A Midsummer-Night’s Dream*, I, i, 132). ‘And for all we know, Xantippe had no mother to whom she could go and abuse Socrates’ (J. K. Jerome, *Idle Thoughts*, 155). ‘She seldom quitted her cabin; a pair of shoes may have lasted her five years for the wear and tear she took out of them’ (Frederick Marryat, *Jacob Faithful*, I) = *so far as the wear and tear she took out of them was concerned.* ‘But his ship might have sunk with all on board *for any sign he gave*’ (G. Atherton, *Sleeping Fires*, Ch. XXVI). The relative may be omitted after the governing pronoun or noun, and is always omitted after *what.* After a personal pronoun the relative clause is omitted as unnecessary: ‘“She’s got a pretty waist and a brown eye, Davy, and she’s seventeen.”’ — ‘“She may for me” (= *for all*
I care), said Davy' (Mrs. H. Ward, David Grieve, II, II). Similarly, after a possessive adjective, since the possessive adjectives have developed out of personal pronouns: 'The boy is clever for his age.' 'I for my part agree.'

Restrictions are often expressed by a phrase introduced by such prepositions as with (or in) regard to, with reference (or respect) to, as to, as for, touching, in the case of, of, as compared with, etc.: 'It is true, at least, with regard to (in the case of, or of) John.' 'As compared with the last season, there is an improvement in the catch of whales.' As for and as to are differentiated in meaning: When we desire to call attention to some particular person or thing in order to say something of that person or thing, we employ as for or as to; but when we desire to restrict the statement in some particular, we employ as to (not as for): 'As for (or as to) myself, my adversity was a blessing in disguise.' 'As for (or as to) cleverness, there isn't her like in all the county.' But 'He was invariably reserved as to (not as for) his private affairs.'

bb. ABRIDGMENT OF CLAUSE OF RESTRICTION. The full clause of restriction is often abridged to a participial clause introduced by a conjunction, usually so far as, or sometimes simple as: 'The inquiry, so far as showing that I have favored my own interests, has failed.' 'The facts as (= so far as) affecting the army are: The regular army at its present strength,' etc. (Editorial in Chicago Tribune, Feb. 19, 1925). But the construction after so far as may be construed as gerundial, for so far as is now sometimes used as a preposition. See next paragraph.

The full clause of restriction may be abridged to a gerundial clause after the preposition so far as: 'So far as its having been premeditated or made for the purpose of insult to the court I had not the slightest thought of that' (Clarence Darrow in Tennessee Evolution Trial, July 20, 1925).

We still sometimes find here the old verbless type of sentence described in 20 3: 'So far, so good.'

d. Extent, Degree, Amount, Number. Conjunctions: as long as; as (or so) far as; as (or so) far as that; to such an extent as, to the degree that, so as, or quite commonly simple as; as fast as, not so (or as) fast as; as proud as, not so (or as) proud as, etc., now only rarely proud as (with a single as), etc., as in older English; as much as, sometimes so much as; inasmuch as in older English, now usually with causal force; as many as. Here as in a, p. 294, we employ the old determinative construction in both of its forms, either with a single or a double determinative. The single determinative as, as in the eleventh and twelfth examples (p. 301),
is now in the subordinate clause, serving as its introductory con-
junction. In the double determinative construction — now the
common form — the two determinatives, as in the first two
examples below, have often formed a compound and have often
further entered into close relations with the accompanying ad-
verb, forming with it a compound, as described in 25. This
compound now usually stands in the subordinate clause, serving
as its introductory conjunction. Where, however, the word stand-
ing between the two determinatives is not an adverb, but an ad-
jective, as in the ninth and tenth examples below, the develop-
ment has not gone so far. The first determinative and the accompa-
nying adjective are still in the principal proposition, while the second
determinative is in the subordinate clause, serving as its introd-
tory conjunction.

Examples:
I have stood it as long as I can.
I followed him with my eyes as (sometimes so) far as I could.
I have gone as (or so) far as that I am collecting statistics for my inves-
tigation.
I know these people about here, fathers and mothers, and children and
grandchildren, so as (or to such an extent as, or simple as) all the science in
the world can't know them (Oliver W. Holmes, Elsie Venner, Ch. XV).

To the degree that the reader recognizes the force of these observations, he
will feel impelled to discount the author's condemnation of the course
pursued by the Mexican authorities (Milo Milton Quaife in 'Historical
Introduction' to Kendall’s Narrative of the Texan Santa Fé Expedition).
He ran as fast as he could.
He spends his money as fast as he gets it.
He will stand at the end of the class as sure as (or as surely as) the end
of the month comes around.
This morning my leg is as stiff as [it] ever [was].
He was not so (or 'as') patient as he might have been.
My good lady made me proud (now usually 'as proud') as proud can be
(Richardson, Pamela, III, 241).
His method of taking in Blackstone seemed absorbing (now usually 'as
absorbing') as it was novel (Meredith, The Ordeal of Richard Feverel,
Ch. XVI).
I had as much as I could bear.
The poorest memory will retain so (more commonly 'as') much as that
Let them blaspheme in private as (= as much as) they please, it hurts
nobody but themselves (Mrs. H. Ward, Richard Meynell, Ch. V).
Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye
have done it unto me (Matthew, XXV, 40).
Bring me as many flowers as (5 d, p. 18) you can find.
aa. Abridgment of Clause of Extent. A clause of extent introduced by as (or so) far as that is often abridged to an infinitive clause: ‘I have gone as (or so) far as to collect statistics for my investigation.’ Here as far as is a conjunction, but, as explained in 29 1 B b (2nd par.), it is now used also as a preposition. As the gerund can stand after a preposition, the infinitive after the conjunction as far as can be replaced by the gerund after the preposition as far as: ‘I have gone as far as collecting statistics for my investigation.’

Extent is often expressed by the adverbial accusative of a substantive form of a superlative with its modifying relative clause: ‘She sang the best (that) she could.’

We still sometimes find here the primitive verbless type of sentence described in 20 3: ‘so many men, so many minds.’

B. Comparative Clause. Following a comparative, introduced by the conjunction than (in older English also with the form then, see 27 3, last par.), in older English also by as, which survives in popular speech. In older English, in Scotch, and elsewhere in dialect, also nor was used, which survives in popular speech. The northern dialectic form an — an apocopate Danish form of the same word as English than — sometimes appears in older literary English in the erroneously expanded form and, having been confounded with conditional an or and (31).

Examples:

‘Nothing could be more disagreeable to me than that I should have to do that [would be],’ or than to have to do that [would be]. The subject of the comparative clause here is itself a clause — a subject clause. Compare 29 1 A a (last par.).

‘A heavier task could not have been imposed than I (17 3 B, 2nd par.) to speak my griefs unspeakable [would be]’ (Shakespeare, Comedy of Errors, I, i, 32), now than for me to speak my griefs unspeakable [would be].

It is better that ten criminals should escape than that one innocent man should be hanged.

I’d have done anything rather than [that] you should know (Sheila Kaye-Smith, Johanna Godden Married, II, Ch. XXIV).

He was more shy than [he was] unsocial.

She is better than [she was] when I wrote you last.

‘He more frequently ran than [he] walked to his work,’ where we speak of different acts, but in ‘He ran rather than [he] walked to the house’ we speak of two descriptions of one act, one of which is represented as more appropriate.

The English love their liberties even more than [they do] their kings.

She eats less than a bird [does].

His tolerance for people younger, or less instructed, or both, than [he] himself [was] was as unfailing as his courtesy to great and small.
No leader of a party in recent modern days has kept himself in greater detachment from the thought and the sentiment of his party than has the late Prime Minister (subject at the end for emphasis).

'He was more beloved than Cinthio, but not so much admired,' not 'He was more beloved, but not so much admired, as Cinthio.'

He will never be other than he is now

We are other than we should be.

Nought is more high, Daring, or desperate than offenders found; Where guilt is, rage and courage doth abound (Ben Jonson, Sejanus, II, ii, 119, A.D. 1616).

No thynge may sooner moue a man to be meke and shewe mercy as whan the persone whiche hath trespassed ayenst hym, lowly will submytte hymself, fall downe at his fete and mekely aske of hym forgyuwenes (John Fisher, E.E.T.S., Ex. Ser., XXVII, p. 161, early sixteenth century).

'A (he) made a finer end . . . and it had been any Christom (Chrisom) child (Shakespeare, Henry the Fifth, II, iii, 11).

When the verb in the subordinate clause is suppressed, the construction is often the same as in the principal proposition: 'We are moved by other than [by] pure motives.' 'Give it to someone else than [to] me.' 'I love him more than [I love] her.' 'She is regarded more highly than he [is regarded],' or he is [regarded]. Often, however, the person of the verb in the subordinate clause is different and has a different subject, thus requiring a different construction: 'I regard her more highly than [I do] he.' 'I regard her more highly than [I do] him.' The person is sometimes incorrectly changed where there is no need of it: 'I have left Jack to tell a part of my life which I am glad to leave to another than I [am]' (S. W. Mitchell, Hugh Wynne, Ch. XXVIII, p. 531), instead of than me. The personal part of the verb is often necessary to make the thought clear: 'Tom likes me better than he does Harry,' but 'Tom likes me better than Harry does.' A preposition is often necessary to make the thought clear: 'Evanston is nearer to Chicago than to Fort Sheridan.' If the to after than were omitted, the sentence might be felt as meaning, 'Evanston is nearer to Chicago than Fort Sheridan is,' which of course is false.

Other as a comparative formation takes than after it, as illustrated in the examples given above. Since different has the same meaning as other, many improperly employ than after it instead of the preposition from: 'Your idea is different than (instead of the correct from) mine.' On the other hand, different often improperly influences other, so that many use from after other: 'Yet dress, habits, politics, other things, were still, as it were,
of another world from ours’ (Saintsbury, ‘Introduction’ to Thackeray’s Virginians), instead of the correct than ours.

Examples of dialect and popular speech: ‘I like play better nor work’ (George Eliot, Adam Bede, Ch. I), literally, ‘Of the two I like play better, not work.’ ‘[the baby] Ain’t bigger nor a derringer’ (Bret Harte, The Luck of Roaring Camp, p. 4). ‘I would rather see him as you’ (U. S. A., Dialect Notes, 1895, 376). ‘I’d ruther see a railroad train as to eat’ (Lucy Furman, Mothering on Perilous, Ch. III), for literary than eat.

After a negative or a question but is sometimes employed in older English after a comparative instead of than: ‘If Mohamet should come from heauen and sweare My royall Lord is slaine or conquered, Yet shoulde he not perswade me otherwise But that he liues and will be Conquerour’ (Marlowe, Tamburlaine, III, III, a.d. 1590). Sometimes still: ‘What more natural but (now usually than that) there’s something for yourself?’ (Hall Caine, The Manxman, 138). After sooner this usage was once common: ‘He was no sooner landed, but (now than) he moved forward towards me’ (Defoe, Robinson Crusoe, 102). ‘And it (i.e., the spindle) was no sooner got into her hand, but (now than) the other people then present beheld that it was indeed a Real, Proper, Iron Spindle’ (Cotton Mather, Wonders of the Invisible World, a.d. 1693). The preceding negative or question here suggested the use of but, which usually stands after a negative or a question, but its negative force here in an affirmative proposition was later felt as inappropriate. Compare 27 3 (last par.).

a. ACCUSATIVE INSTEAD OF NOMINATIVE. In elliptical clauses, where the finite verb is not expressed, the nominative of personal pronouns is often replaced by an accusative, as so often elsewhere in elliptical expressions, as described in 7 C a: ‘They’re more serious than us’ (A. Marshall, The Old Order Changeth, Ch. XXXI), instead of than we [are]. ‘It is sometimes greater than me’ (George Bernard Shaw, Back to Methuselah, p. 16), instead of than I [am]. The use of the accusative here should be avoided, for it is often ambiguous. In such examples as ‘I regard her more highly than he [does]’ and ‘I regard her more highly than [I do] him’ only the correct use of the nominative and accusative forms can make the thought clear. Compare 31.

b. ABRIDGMENT-OF COMPARATIVE CLAUSE. This clause is often abridged to an infinitive clause with to when the subject of the principal proposition can serve also as the subject of the infinitive: ‘I knew better than to mention it.’ ‘I didn’t dare go farther than merely to suggest it’ (or to merely suggest it). The infinitive is much used also when the reference is general: ‘Nothing pays better
than to be (or being) kind [does].' 'To trust in Christ is no more but (now than) to acknowledge him for God' (Thomas Hobbes, Human Nature, Ch. XI, A.D. 1650).

Sometimes the gerund seems to stand in a comparative clause, while in reality the construction is a prepositional clause: 'I didn't dare go farther than merely suggesting it.' 'It hasn't gone any farther at present than me (or my; see 50 3) promising not to marry anyone else' (De Morgan, Somehow Good, Ch. XLVII). The use of the gerund here after farther than and any farther than indicates that these combinations of words are felt as compound prepositions, for the gerund can stand here only after a preposition. After the analogy of 'He has never gone to, or beyond, Chicago' we say, 'He has never gone as far as (farther than, any farther than) Chicago,' treating as far as, farther than, any farther than as prepositions. Compare 29 1 A d aa.

We often find in the subordinate clause a simple infinitive instead of the form with to: 'Age and good living had disabled him from doing more than [that he did] ride to see the hounds thrown off and make one at the hunting dinner' (Washington Irving, Sketch-Book, X). 'I had (or better would; see 43 I B) rather go than [I had or would] stay.' As can be seen by these examples, such clauses are elliptical, not abridged. For fuller information see 49 4 E. After rather than we sometimes find the simple infinitive even though no word can be supplied in thought which would require the simple infinitive, since the simple infinitive is so often properly used after rather than, as in the preceding example, that it sometimes becomes associated with it: 'He ought to have come by steerage rather than not [to] have started the same day' (Theodore Roosevelt as quoted by Archie Butt, Letter, Oct. 20, 1908). Compare 49 4 E (5th par.).

2. Degree Clause of Modal Result. This clause never indicates pure result as in 28 5, but always a result in association with the modal idea of degree.

The conjunctions are: that (28 5, 2nd par.) preceded by the determinative so or such or an adverb of degree; a little earlier in the period and in still older English as, as that, or so as, instead of that, as in 28 5, a usage still surviving in popular speech; after a negative the forms but that, but what, or that — not preceded by a determinative in the principal proposition; in descriptive clauses insomuch that (or, earlier in the period, insomuch as), to such a degree that, to such an extent that, so much so that, which differ from the preceding conjunctions in that the determinative has been brought over to the subordinate clause from the principal proposition. Earlier in the period and sometimes still than that is used
after a comparative to indicate result: ‘For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it’ (Isaiah, XXVIII, 20). The abridged infinitive clause is a little more common than the full clause form of this construction: ‘I think more highly of him than to suppose he would do that.’ ‘He knows better than to do that.’ In a formal sense such clauses are clauses of degree after a comparative, but the idea of result is present and this has led to the replacing of the comparative by too + the positive of the adjective or adverb and the blending of the old comparative construction with the clause of result: ‘The inquiry is too momentous than that it should be abandoned.’ This blended and the old comparative construction are now for the most part replaced by an abridged infinitive clause after too + the positive of the adjective or adverb: ‘The inquiry is too momentous to be abandoned.’ ‘I think too highly of him to suppose that he would do that.’

Earlier in the period, the determinative adjective that or those was often used in the principal proposition instead of so great or such: ‘This enlivened us to that degree that we were mighty good company’ (Duchess of Queensberry, Letter to Countess of Suffolk, A.D. 1734). ‘The town was reduced to those straights that, if not relieved, it must have surrendred in two daies time’ (Luttrell, Brief Relation, I, 567, A.D. 1689).

Examples:

He is speaking so loud that I hear him even from here (actual result).
He is so badly injured that he must die (inevitable result).
He is so badly injured that he will probably die (probable result).
He is so badly injured that he may die (possible result).
He is so badly injured that he might die (a result faintly possible).
He is so badly injured that he shall be taken to the hospital at once (a result determined upon by the speaker).
He is so badly injured that he should be taken to the hospital at once (a desired result expressed modestly).
He was so excited that he couldn’t sleep.
He spoke so loud that I could hear him upstairs.
He spoke in such a loud tone that I could hear him upstairs.
His efforts were so far successful that they reduced the percentage of deaths.
Steerforth laughed to that degree that it was impossible for me to help laughing too (Dickens, David Copperfield, Ch. XXII).

John is not old enough (or sufficiently old) that we can send him with this message.

She worried so that she couldn’t go to sleep.
I feel such a sharp dissension in my breast, As (now that) I am sick (Shakespeare, I Henry VI, V, v, 84).
He was so bad a scribe as (now that) his hand was scarce legible (Bradford, History of Plymouth Plantation, p. 181, A.D. 1630–1648).
We should have so much faith in authority as (5 d, p. 18; now that it) shall make us repeatedly observe and attend to that which is said to be right (Ruskin, Modern Painters, Part III, Sec. I, Ch. III).

It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation (of our slaves) peaceably, and in such slow degree as that (now simple that) the evil (of slavery) will wear off insensibly (Thomas Jefferson, Autobiography, p. 73).

Your informant seems to have given you no very clear idea of what you wish to hear, if he thinks that these discussions took place so lately as that (now simple that) I could have been of the party (Shelley, Banquet).

But they made so pore a bussines of their fishing so as (now simple that), after this year, they never more looked after them (Bradford, History of Plymouth Plantation, p. 201, A.D. 1630–1648).

It's far enough from the Union Station so's (i.e., so as, popular form for literary that) they haven't got any warehouses (Sinclair Lewis, Elmer Gantry, Ch. XXII, IV).

I shall never be so busy but that (or but what) I shall find time to answer your letters (or that I shall not find time to answer your letters).

Between spelling and pronunciation there is a mutual attraction, insomuch that (or to such an extent that) when spelling no longer follows pronunciation but is hardened into orthography, the pronunciation begins to move toward spelling (Earle).

Now this did more increase the people's good opinion of his sufficiency and wise conduction of an army, insomuch as (now insomuch that) they thought him invincible (North, Plutarch, 181, A.D. 1579).

Aldous silently assented, so much so that Hallin repented (Mrs. H. Ward, Marcella, III, 227).

The examples given above with a determinative in the principal proposition and that in the clause of result are the double determinative type described in 28 5. The single determinative type without an introductory conjunction, described in 28 5, is also used here, especially in colloquial speech: ‘I was so much upset I couldn’t fix my mind on it’ (Henry Arthur Jones, Mary Goes First, Act II). ‘She was so tired she could not go another step’ (Mary Heaton Vorse in Good Housekeeping, Sept., 1929, p. 42).

a. ABRIDGMENT OF DEGREE CLAUSES OF MODAL RESULT.

Clauses of degree to express a simple result can be abridged to an infinitive clause with as to when the subject of the principal proposition can serve as the subject of the infinitive and there is a determinative in the principal proposition: ‘He was so kind as to help me.’ ‘You can’t be such a fool as to be jealous of her!’ The origin and meaning of as here is the same as in 28 5 d. In older English, the as is lacking here: ‘there is No woman’s heart so big, to hold so much’ (Shakespeare, Twelfth Night, II, iv, 98). ‘I wish you’d be so kind to fetch me a rod and baits’ (Richardson, Pamela, Letter XXXII). The present use of as here shows that it has entered
the abridged clause under the influence of the as which once introduced the full clause, as described on page 305.

We sometimes find the simple infinitive here instead of the form with to: 'I wouldn't have made so free as drop (more commonly to drop) a hint of,' etc. (Dickens, Dombey and Son, Ch. XXII). In the majority of such examples the simple infinitive is employed since it is felt as an imperative: 'If you'll only be so good as try (more commonly to try) me, sir!' (ib., Ch. XLII).

A clause introduced by so much so that can be abridged to an infinitive clause introduced by so much so as to when the subject of the principal proposition can serve as the subject of the infinitive: 'Her attendant kept herself modestly in the background, so much so as hardly to be distinguished' (Scott, Count Robert, XVIII). Similarly, clauses introduced by so much—that are abridged to an infinitive clause with as to: 'Take so much leisure as to peruse this letter' (Scott, Kenilworth, Ch. XXXIX), or more commonly 'Take enough time to read this letter.' In older English, the as is lacking here, which clearly shows that it later entered the abridged clause under the influence of the as which once introduced the full clause. The older form of the abridged clause without as survives in poetry: 'Though I have not so much grace To bind again this people fast to God' (Swinburne, Bothwell, II, IX).

After enough and too the clause can be abridged to an infinitive clause with to when the subject of the principal proposition can serve as the subject of the infinitive and to an infinitive clause with for...to, when the infinitive has a subject of its own: 'I was not near enough to distinguish his features.' 'I was too near to avoid him.' 'He was too tactful to mention it.' 'I knew too well to disturb him in these silent moods.' But: 'He was not near enough for me to distinguish his features.' 'He was too near for me to avoid him.' Similarly, after other words indicating a degree: 'He came in time (= early enough) to help me,' but 'He came in time for me to help him.' 'The walls were high enough to keep out a foe,' but 'The walls must have been very high for the foe to have been kept out.' Compare 21 e. In older English, there is sometimes a superfluous than before the infinitive after too: 'You that are a step higher than a philosopher, a Devine, yet have too much grace and wit than to be a bishop' (Pope in a letter to Swift). For an explanation see 2, p. 306.

The idea of modal result is often expressed by a prepositional phrase: 'My emotion is too great for words' (= to be expressed by words).
CLAUSE OF CAUSE

30. Conjunctions. The subordinate clause contains the cause or reason, the principal proposition, the result or conclusion. This clause is usually introduced by the conjunctions: that, in popular speech often replaced by as; as, in older English sometimes as that; because (from by the cause that and in older English still often found with that, as in because that — Shakespeare, Comedy of Errors, II, ii, 26), now in popular speech often reduced to acause and cos; not that — but because (or simple but); not that not — but because (or simple but); not that not (or not but that, or not but what) — but because; since (compare 27 3, 6th par.), in older English also in the form of sithen, sithen that, sith, sith, sith that, sin, syn, sin that, syn that, sithens, sithens that, since that; now or now that; for the reason that, or by reason that; on the ground that; when, in older English also when as; after; once; as long as; whereas (26, last par.), in older English also simple where; insomuch as, in older English sometimes also insomuch as; for fear, for fear that, or lest (the reduced form of the old double determinative construction thy [old instrumental case of that] less the, literally, on that account, that, the two determinatives thy and the pointing as with two index fingers to the following explanatory statement describing a threatening occurrence, with the negative less [= not] inserted between the two determinatives to express the wish that the threatening occurrence may not take place); in that; in older English or still lingering on in poetic or archaic style: for or for that, reduced forms of Old English for ðæm (dative of that) þe, an old double determinative construction, literally, on account of that, that, the double determinative pointing to the following explanatory statement, in older English introducing either a subordinate causal clause with the meaning because, or, on the other hand, an independent explanatory remark, in the former function now surviving only in poetic or archaic style, while in the latter function simple for is still widely used, as described in 19 I d; for why or for why that (= because), originally for why? (i.e., literally, for what?), a question in two words followed by a clause which was the answer to for why?; for because (Shakespeare, Richard the Second, V, v, 3); for cause or for cause that; forasmuch as, in older English also with the form forsomuch as, as in St. Luke, XIX, 9; by that, now obsolete; in regard (that), now replaced by because. Chaucer's cause why (The Reues Tale, 224) survives in Irish English and in a limited way also in British dialect: 'I didn't go to the fair cause why the day was too wet' (Joyce, English as We Speak It in Ireland, 81).
Examples:

'I am sorry that he is going,' but in popular speech that is often replaced by as: 'I'm sorry as he didn't tell you' (Sheila Kaye-Smith, Green Apple Harvest, p. 35).

I rejoice that he is prospering.

The securing of the walrus had indeed been a Godsend, as it relieved their most pressing needs (Victor Appleton, Don Sturdy across the North Pole, Ch. XVIII).

All this was gall and wormwood to Jake, the more so as the disparaging sneers that he had ventured to offer on the subject had been resented with hot indignation or cold contempt (ib., Ch. XIV).

Greatly pitying her misfortune, so much the more as that (now simple as) all men had told me of the great likeness between us, I took the best care I could of her (Sir Philip Sidney, Arcadia, Book I, Ch. VII, A.D. 1590).

The crops failed because the season was dry.

She was suspected partly because that (now simple because), after some angry words passing between her and her neighbours, some mischief befel such neighbours in their Creatures (John Hale, A Modest Inquiry, A.D. 1697).

The Englishman is peculiarly proud of his country's naval achievements, not that he undervalues its military exploits, but simply because England is essentially maritime.

'He rarely ever saw the squire and then only on business. Not that the squire had purposely quarreled with him, but (or but because) Dr. Thorne himself had chosen that it should be so' (Trollope, Dr. Thorne, I, Ch. VIII). 'Not a word had been said between them about Mary beyond what the merest courtesy had required. Not that each did not love the other sufficiently to make a full confidence between them desirable to both, but (or but because) neither had the courage to speak out' (ib., II, Ch. VI).

I am provoked at your children, not that they didn't behave well (or not but that, or not but what they behaved well), but because they left us too early.

He cannot be tired since he has walked only half a mile.

And sith (now since) in cases desperat there must be vsed medicines that are extreme, I will hazard that little life that is left to restore the greater part that is lost (John Lyly, Campaspe, III, v, 54, A.D. 1584).

And syn that (now simple since) the cryminell Geant Corfus is dede, All the Remenaunt is as good as vaynquisshid (Caxton, History of Jason, p. 34, about A.D. 1477).

The idea of Marner's money kept growing in vividness, now the want of it became immediate (George Eliot, Silas Marner, Ch. IV, 30).

Now that he is sick, we shall have to do the work.

The blame cannot be put upon me, for the simple reason that I was not present and had nothing to do with the affair.

He refused to participate, on the ground that he was not in sympathy with the cause.

How convince him when he will not listen?

How can he be expected to be a scholar, when he has spent his whole life in a dancing-school?
For were a lady blinde, in what can she be beautiful? if dumbe, in what manifest her witte? when as (now simple when) the eye hath euer bene thought the Pearle of the face, and the tongue the embassadour of the heart (John Lyly, Euphues and His England, Works, II, p. 167, A.D. 1580).

I don't think much of John after he has treated me (in) that way.

Once (or after) you have made a promise, you should keep it.

As long as you act so mean, you can't expect anybody to do anything for you.

And where (= whereas) heretofore there hath been great diversitie . . . within this realme: Now from henceforth, etc. (Book of Common Prayer, Preface, A.D. 1548).

Whereas the Royal Kennel Club of Great Britain has stopped the exhibiting of dogs with cut ears, be it resolved that the American Humane Association ask the American Kennel Club to take like action.

He cannot be expected to know much Latin, inasmuch as he has been educated at a village school.

To be sure, the present law is inoperative, insomuch (now inasmuch) as the universities contain teachers who have never subscribed this famous confession (Westminster Review, XXIV, 105, A.D. 1836).

Flashman released his prey, who rushed headlong under his bed again, for fear they should change their minds (Hughes, Tom Brown, I, Ch. VI, 125).

But he did not want to ask any questions now for fear that Jake would think he was taking advantage of the debt he owed him (Victor Appleton, Don Sturdy across the North Pole, Ch. XXV).

Tom dared not stir lest he should be seen.

I was fearful lest my hostess should suggest the medieval church as a topic (Meredith Nicholson, The Siege of the Seven Suitors, Ch. IV).

Middle English spelling . . . is to a certain extent phonetic, in that there is often a genuine attempt to express the sound as accurately as possible (H. C. Wyld, History of Modern Colloquial English, p. 28).

And for that wine is dear We will be furnished with our own (Cowper, John Gilpin).

And, for (= because) himself was of the greater state, Being a king, he trusted his liege-lord Would yield him this large honor all the more (Tennyson, Gareth and Lynette, l. 387).

But for a time there was no need of additional territory for that already hers stretched from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains (Ephraim Douglass Adams, Great Britain and the American Civil War, p. 12, A.D. 1925).

This death's livery (soldier's uniform), which walled its bearers from ordinary life, was sign that they had sold their wills and bodies to the State and contracted themselves into a service not the less abject for that its beginning was voluntary (T. E. Lawrence, Revolt in the Desert, p. 317, A.D. 1927).

I weep for thee, and yet no cause I have, For why thou left' st me nothing in thy will (Shakespeare, The Passionate Pilgrim, l. 137).

For cause (now because) also the paynes of purgatory be moche more than the paynes of this worlde, who may remembre god as he ought to do beyng

*Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, etc.* (*Acts*, XVII, 28).

*By that hee calls him virum mortis, I may conclude, etc.* (Earl Northampton in *True and Perfect Relation*, Rr 4b, A.D. 1606).

He keeps himself a bachelor *by reason he was crossed in Love* (Steele, *Spectator*, No. 2, A.D. 1711).

There was a motion to put up a trading house there; *but in regard the place was not fit for plantation, we thought not fit to meddle with it* (Winthrop, *Journal*, July 12, 1633).

The idea of cause sometimes finds expression in an attributive element, either in the form of an attributive adjective or an attributive relative clause: ‘The cruel man didn’t pay any attention to their pleadings’ = ‘The man didn’t pay any attention to their pleadings since he was cruel.’ ‘John didn’t mind the sharp words, but Mary, who was of a very sensitive nature, burst out into tears’ = but ‘Mary burst out into tears since she was of a very sensitive nature.’

A principal proposition is often used instead of a subordinate: ‘I’m not going tonight. *I’m very tired.*’ ‘Round Audrey Noel’s cottage they (the owls) were as thick as thieves and almost seemed to be guarding the mistress of that thatched dwelling — so numerous were their fluttering rushes, so tenderly prolonged their soft sentinel callings’ (Galsworthy, *The Patrician*, Ch. XIII). ‘Even now many teachers do not realize, so great is the hold of tradition, that English nouns rarely have gender.’ ‘*These wares come from Russia* That is why they cost so much’ = ‘*These wares cost so much because they come from Russia.*’ Compare 19 3.

a. **ORIGIN OF THE CONJUNCTIONS OF CAUSE.** The *that*-clause here performs the function of an old instrumental, genitive, or prepositional phrase of cause. The clause is the old double determinative type found so often elsewhere in English: ‘These indications of inward disturbance moved Archer the (instrumental case of that) more that he felt that the Mingotts (name) had gone a little too far’ (Edith Wharton, *The Age of Innocence*, Ch. V), literally, *moved Archer more on that account, that: he too felt that the Mingotts had gone a little too far, the two that’s pointing as with two index fingers to the following explanatory clause. After the second determinative that had developed into a conjunction of cause, the first determinative was felt as excessive expression and was dropped except before a comparative, as *more* in the example just given: ‘I rejoiced that he came.’ ‘I am glad that I went.’ The *that*-clause in all these cases always denotes pure cause;
but, as its form is not distinctive, it is not now in wide use where accuracy of expression is required. The *that* in colloquial and lively literary language is often suppressed: ‘Winston was disappointed we didn’t dash away yesterday, but we have not really let much grass grow under our feet’ (Sir Ian Hamilton, *Gallipoli Diary*, I, 16). Except in such sentences as the preceding where the clause with or without *that* gives the cause of some feeling or emotion we now more commonly employ *because*: ‘I am urging his name *because* I believe in him.’

It has always been common in English to indicate the reason for an act by simply placing after a statement an explanatory sentence: ‘You had better be thankful *your life is spared, young man*’ (Oemler, *Slippy McGee*, Ch. II). Although such sentences are in a formal sense independent there is a logical tie that binds them together. In an early stage of our language development this was sometimes indicated by placing the determinative adverb *so* at the end of the principal proposition, which after the manner of concrete primitive speech pointed as with an index finger to the following explanatory remark: ‘I am going to bed, *so (= it is thus): I am very tired.*’ The *so* standing immediately before the explanatory remark early became closely associated with it, forming with it a subordinate causal clause and serving as its connective, linking it to the principal proposition and thus developing into a causal conjunction, now always in the form of *as* (from older *all so, i.e., quite so*): ‘I am going to bed, *as I’m very tired.*’ ‘I saw I had said something wrong, *as they all laughed*’ (De Morgan, *Joseph Vance*, Ch. XI). ‘*As he refuses, we can do nothing*’ (*Pocket Oxford Dictionary*).

Causal *as* (in Old English usually in the old simple form *swa, i.e., so*), although identical in form with the *as* introducing clauses of time and manner, maintained itself in Old English, Middle English, and early Modern English as an occasional form, and later gradually became common in colloquial speech and not infrequent in the literary language: ‘*We pe lofian, swa þu hælend eart*’ (Grein, *Hymnen und Gebete*, 7, 116) = ‘We love thee, *as thou art our Savior.*’ ‘*Lete me fro this deth fie, As I dede nevyr no trespace*’ (Cov. Myst., 181, A.D. 1400). ‘But att the laste, *as a man may not ever endure, Syre Launcelot waxed so faynt of fytting but (= absolutely) he mighte not lyfte vp his armes for to gylene one stroke*’ (Malory, *Le Morte d’Arthur*, Book XV, Ch. V, A.D. 1485). ‘And at our highest neuer joy we so, *as we both doubt and dread our ouerthrow*’ (Kyd, *Spanish Tragedy*, III, 1, 6, A.D. 1585) = ‘And even when we kings are at the height of our power, we never joy in having it so, *as we fear and dread our*
overthrow.' ‘If earthlie Kings reuenge any little wrong done to theyr Embassadours, now how much more shall the King of Kings reuenge the death and slaughterdom of his Embassadours? The Angels in heauen, as they are the Lordes Embassadours, would prosecute (revenge) it though he should ouerslip it’ (Thomas Nashe, *Chrits Teares ouer Ierusalem*, Works, II, p. 24, A.D. 1593).

As can be seen by the preceding examples, *as* is now as in older English peculiarly appropriate where it is desired to give an easy, natural, almost self-evident explanation of the statement in the principal proposition.

In early Modern English, a favorite way of expressing cause was to employ an *as*-clause of comparison that always preceded the principal proposition, which itself was always introduced by a *so* pointing back to the *as*-clause: ‘As a madman’s epistles are no gospels, so it skills (matters) not much when they are deliver’d’ (Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night*, V, 294). Compare 28 2 (3rd par.).

Today we avoid this once common causal construction, as we feel that its peculiar form, so closely associated with the idea of comparison, doesn’t give clear expression to the idea of cause.

The very common *as*-clause of manner, which is much used as a sentence adverb (28 1), often contains causal force, so that the idea of manner mingles with that of cause: ‘He has made me some offers, but, *as I am circumstanced,* [I] cannot accept them’ (Nicholas Cresswell, *Journal*, June 15, 1777), or more clearly according to b, p. 315: ‘circumstanced (or more commonly situated) *as I am,* I cannot accept them.’

Where there is a clear desire to emphasize cause, *because* is the common form: ‘He will succeed *because* he is in earnest.’ We always employ *because* after the emphatic *it is* described in 22 a: ‘It is only *because* I regard it as absolutely necessary that I take such harsh measures.’ Usually also when the clause is in the form of a question: ‘It would have been very unreasonable in the girl to say anything, *because why on earth shouldn’t Robert fasten up Vicy’s glove if it got unbuttoned?’ (De Morgan, *Joseph Vance*, Ch. X).

Temporal *since* often assumes causal force since what precedes an act is naturally construed as its cause: ‘*Since* John has lied to us several times, we cannot believe him any more.’ The causal force in *since* is stronger than that in *as*, but not as strong as that in *because*: ‘You shall have them cheap *since* there is little demand for them.’ ‘*Since* these men could not be convinced, it was determined that they should be persecuted.’

The coordinating conjunction *for* has causal force approaching that of subordinating *as* and *since*: ‘He could not have seen me,
for I was not there.’ The proposition introduced by coördinating
for is in current English always a remark loosely added to a pre­
ceding proposition to explain it. Hence it can never precede the
main proposition as an as-clause or a since-clause. For also differs
from as and since in that it can introduce an explanation that
does not contain the idea of cause: ‘It is morning, for (not as
or since) the birds are singing.’ Compare 19 1 d.

Inasmuch as is more formal than since, also more guarded,
qualified: ‘Inasmuch as the debtor has no property I abandon
my claim.’ Whereas, as a pure causal conjunction, is largely
confined to legal or official style. An example is given on page 311.

6. ABRIDGMENT OF CLAUSE OF CAUSE. A causal clause intro­
duced by since, because, as, and in that can sometimes be abridged
to a participle, adjective, noun, or prepositional phrase when the
subject, predicate, or object in the principal proposition is the
subject of the subordinate clause: ‘Being poor, he could not
afford to buy books.’ ‘Knowing him so well from childhood, I feel
that I can recommend him strongly.’ ‘Feeling that he disliked
me, I avoided him.’ ‘Seeing that he was in trouble, I went to his
aid.’ ‘Discovering that the next train didn’t leave till late, I decided
to stay and take a morning train.’ ‘Having passed through
severe trials myself, I have at last learned to sympathize with
others in their struggles.’ ‘In time these voluptuous experiences
had their effect, calling up a hitherto undeveloped sensuousness’
(Sheila Kaye-Smith, The Challenge to Sirius, p. 84) = in that
they called up a hitherto undeveloped sensuousness. ‘Conceding
this point (or employing a gerundial construction, in, or by, con­
ceding this point, or a full clause, in that you concede this point)
you destroy your entire argument.’ ‘The enemy, now in posses­
sion of all the bridgeheads, can be expected to advance soon.’
‘She is quite a different woman now, deprived of her wealth and
her beauty.’ ‘Dora did not reply, gentle creature that (relative
pronoun) she was.’ ‘She makes the first advances, dear kind soul
as (relative pronoun) she is’ (Pinero, Mid-Channel, Act III).
‘This is a very rare event, occurring as (relative pronoun) it
does only once in many years.’ ‘He has made me some good
offers, but, situated as (adverbial conjunction of manner) I am,
I cannot accept them.’ ‘A suppressed excitement in his manner
convinced me, used as (adverbial conjunction of degree) I was
to his ways, that his hand was upon a clue.’ ‘As (7 A b (3))
possessors of the bridgehead, they now had a decided advantage.’
‘He was shunned as (introducing the predicate appositive, as in
the preceding example, but here, perhaps, felt as a causal conjunc­
tion) a man of doubtful character.’ ‘Our remaining horse was
utterly useless as (used as in the preceding example) wanting an eye.’ ‘They criticized the boy as (used as in the two preceding examples) having no interest in his work.’ ‘I mightily approve Lady Craven’s blending the dairy with the library as (used as in the preceding sentence) an example to her sex, who at present are furiously apt to abandon the churn totally’ (Horace Walpole, Letter to Thomas Walpole, July 21, 1788). ‘But if you shall once more make me a tender Of that love which at your Castle I refus’d, As (causal conjunction) being then a prisoner to anothers beauty, Assure your selfe I shall redeem that error’ (Ludowick Carrell, The Fool Would Be a Favourit, Act IV, A.D. 1657). ‘It is an unpardonable slight since (causal conjunction) intentional.’ ‘The Sophists were hated by some because (causal conjunction) powerful, by others because (causal conjunction) shallow.’

The adjective, participle, noun, or prepositional phrase is the predicate of the abridged causal clause. This is the old verbless type of clause described in 6 B a and 20 3, but now after the analogy of usage elsewhere a copula is often inserted: ‘Sick and tired, I went to bed,’ now often ‘Being sick and tired, I went to bed.’ The copula, however, conforms to the old type in that it takes participial form as a predicate appositive to the subject of the principal proposition. The insertion of conjunctions, as, since, and because, in many of these abridged clauses indicates the influence of the full clause upon this old type. Compare 27 5 and 20 3 (5th par.).

Where the reference is indefinite, we often employ the present participle absolutely, i.e., without a subject, as explained in 17 4, 31 2, and 32 2: ‘Which isn’t to be wondered at, seeing (= as one can see) that he has just finished six weeks of examination work’ (Hughes, Tom Brown, II, VIII). ‘And it would be rather hard for him to overcome this handicap, seeing (= as one could see) that other boys with better homes were being trained for special kinds of work’ (T. Dreiser, An American Tragedy, I, 14). ‘It is no wonder that he learns so little at school, seeing that he doesn’t work’ (= as one sees that he doesn’t work).

Another kind of participial clause is very common here, a clause with an absolute nominative (17 3 A b) as subject and a participle as predicate: ‘The rain having ruined my hat, I had to buy a new one.’ ‘She was named for my father, there being no son in the family’ (Meredith Nicholson, The Siege of the Seven Suitors, Ch. IV). ‘It being very stormy, she stayed at home.’ The absolute nominative construction is often replaced here by a prepositional phrase: ‘She is lonely, poor thing, with her husband so much away.’
Instead of a full causal clause we can often after a preposition employ a gerundial clause: 'The Gunnings are not only resettled in St. James's Street as boldly as ever, but constantly with old Bedford, who exults in having regained them' (Horace Walpole, Letter to Miss Mary Berry, July 7, 1791). 'I can't do anything for thinking of her.' 'He quarreled with her for saying it.' 'You will be scolded for having torn your clothes.' 'We feel kindly toward him for (or because of) his waiting so patiently under such trying circumstances.' 'I haven't been invited in consequence of my being a profligate sinner.' 'I can't leave home on account of having a visitor.' 'He dared not fire for fear of hitting someone.' 'I don't think much of John after his treating me (in) that way.' 'Some of your suggestions could not be followed out from their not fitting into the plan I have adopted.' 'Owing to his (or John's, or the lad's, or the lad; see 50 3) bringing me word so late I couldn't go.' 'Hayward was lionized in London society on the strength of having written a prose version of about one-half of Goethe's masterpiece.' At this point the full clause is often avoided since it is often far inferior by reason of its clumsy form: 'Owing to John's bringing me word so late I couldn't go' rather than 'Owing to the fact that John brought me word so late, I couldn't go.'

The abridged clause often has the form of an infinitive clause with to if there is some word in the principal proposition that can serve as the subject of the infinitive: 'I was pained to hear it.' 'I was glad to see him.' 'Mary, hang the idiot to bring me such stuff!' The present participle is often used alongside of the present infinitive: 'You ought to be ashamed stealing from a little widow' (Joseph Hergesheimer, 'Collector's Blues,' in Saturday Evening Post, Oct. 2, 1926) (or to steal from a little widow). The subject of the infinitive is sometimes not expressed but merely suggested by the context, as in exclamations where the inference is that the speaker is the subject: '[I'm a] Fool! to have looked for common sense on such an earth as this!' The subject is understood if it is general or indefinite: 'To looke backe at Ills begets a Thankefulnesse to have escap'd them' (Thomas Dekker, London, Looke Backe! p. 1, A.D. 1630). Where the infinitive has a subject of its own, it is introduced by for . . . to: 'I know how deeply she must have offended you for you to speak like that.'

CLAUSE OF CONDITION OR EXCEPTION

31. Conjunctions. This clause states the condition upon which the action of the principal clause hinges, or adds an exception,
i.e., a fact or proviso that qualifies in some particular respect
the preceding statement. It is introduced by the following con-
junctions:

**Conjunctions of Condition:** if, on condition (that); if not,
were it not that, if it were not that; except that = were it not that;
only that = if not, were it not that, in this meaning often replaced
by adversative only (see 1 e, p. 328), in older English also with
the meaning unless; unless, in older English on lesse (or lasse)
than (or then), on lesse that, i.e., on less interference than, on a
less favorable condition than, short of; in popular speech less’n,
representing older on lesse than; without, in older English and still
in colloquial speech = unless; save or saving, in higher literary
style = if not, unless; except and excepting, in older English and
sometimes still in archaic language = if not, unless; but, but what
(colloquially and popularly), sometimes still as in older English
= if not, unless; but that (in older English sometimes simple
but) = if not, were it not that, often replaced by adversative but
(see 1 e, p. 328); provided or provided that, provided only, providing
or providing that (both forms now less common than provided or
provided that); so that, or in older English and still in popular
speech so as, or in older English and still often in colloquial speech
simple so, now also so only — all these forms now usually with the
meaning provided (that), on condition (that), but the so-forms in
older English could also mean if, in case; so be it = provided;
so long as or sometimes while; in case or in the event that; when
= in case; granted that; given that; once = if once. In older
English: and or an = if, still in certain dialects; if that, if so
(that), if so be (that); if so be as; so be (that); so be as; if case be
(that), if case that; conditionally (that); but if (that) = unless;
but that (= if not), after it is (or were) pity; foreseen that = pro-
vided; in dialect gin and gif = if. The parentheses around that
in these conjunctions indicate that that may be used or suppressed.

In older English, after no wonder, no marvel, or the negative
or interrogative form of the verbs wonder, marvel, be sorry, care,
a concessive clause introduced by though often lost its concessive
force and developed into a conditional clause, so that though is
now replaced by if: ‘Oh, how can love’s eye be true, That is
so vex’d with watching and with tears? No marvel then, though
(now if) I mistake my view’ (Shakespeare, Sonnets, CXLVIII).
‘What [do I care] though (now if) She strive to try her strength,
Her feeble force will yield at length’ (id., The Passionate Pilgrim,
317). ‘He cares not though the Church sinke’ (Gillespie, English
Popish Ceremonies, Ep. A. II. b, A.D. 1637), now ‘He doesn’t
care if the Church goes down.’ This old though, however, is
CONJUNCTIONS OF CONDITIONAL CLAUSE

preserved in the elliptical construction with as: 'He looks as [he would look] though (or if) he were sick.'

CONJUNCTIONS OF EXCEPTION: but that or less commonly simple but; except that, except (or but) for the fact that; beyond that (with the force of except that), after a negative proposition or a question; save that, saving that; only that, in colloquial speech also simple only; in elliptical clauses the simple forms but, except, save, saving, than, and sometimes unless (next par.).

In elliptical clauses of exception where there is no finite verb, we often find an accusative form employed in the subject relation: 'Nobody was there but me' = but [that] I [was there]. Many grammarians explain the accusative here by construing the but, except (17 3 A c), or save before it as a preposition. Since, however, in choice language it has long been customary to employ in the subject relation the nominative of a personal pronoun after all these words but except, it is evident that in our collected moments we feel them as conjunctions. Except has not been long felt as a conjunction here, but it is now being drawn into this group by the force of its meaning, which is the same as that of but. The common construction of these words as prepositions when an accusative follows is an inadequate explanation, for we find the accusative in many elliptical expressions where the word before it cannot possibly be construed as a preposition: 'They're more serious than us' (A. Marshall, The Old Order Changeth, Ch. XXXI) = than we are. The use of the accusative instead of a nominative in elliptical clauses of exception after but, except, save, is simply an illustration of the widespread employment of the accusative of personal pronouns instead of the nominative found everywhere in elliptical expressions not containing a finite verb, as described more at length in 7 C a. The frequent accusative after except is explained in part also by the fact that many feel except as the imperative of the transitive verb except. Compare 1 d aa, p. 328. The tendency toward the accusative is very strong in elliptical clauses of exception, especially after except, but many careful authors resist this drift and employ in choice language the nominative where the pronoun is used as subject, especially after but. The case is quite different with simple excepting, which is still, as it has always been, a present participle taking an accusative object or a clause. Alongside of it is the transitive verb except, which takes an accusative object. The present participle excepting, with the full force of the transitive verb except, is often used absolutely, as illustrated in 2 (4th par.), p. 330. This absolute participle has been often mistaken for a preposition. Also saving is a present participle, but no longer a live one. There
is alongside of it no transitive verb *save* with the meaning *except*. Even in early Modern English *saving* was construed as a conjunction, as illustrated on page 325 by the examples from Harvey and Spenser. As it is now little used, we have no live feeling as to how it should be treated, whether as a conjunction or as a preposition. Of all these forms *except* is the favorite before a prepositional phrase or an adverbial clause: ‘I take no orders *except from the King*.’ ‘He is never to be found *except in the wrong place*.’ ‘I never do such things *except when I have plenty of time*.’ ‘He is everywhere *except where he ought to be*.’ Sometimes, now rather infrequently, *unless* is used in both of these categories instead of *except*. Here we may construe *except* and *unless* as conjunctions standing in an elliptical clause or we may regard them as prepositions governing the following phrase or clause. *Unless*, unaccompanied by *when*, is often used in clauses with the force of *except when*: ‘I take a walk every day *unless it rains*.’

**Examples of Conditional Clauses:**

They’ll not go tomorrow *if it rains*.

*If the person who wrote the book is not wiser than you*, you need not read it; *if he be*, he will think differently from you in many respects (Ruskin).

In literature, in art, in politics a man is exceptionally fortunate *if he ‘arrive’* (or more commonly *should arrive*) by the time he is forty (British Review).

*If ever anyone on this earth was simple and unaffected*, Moltke was (Sidney Whitman).

Of course *if the king was in the right*, Fox was in the wrong.

*If I were rich*, I would travel.

I should have done it *before if I had had time*.

Lord, *if thou hadst been here*, my brother had not died (John, XI, 21).

You can have it for a few days *on condition (that) you return it next week some time*.

John is very much disheartened, and *if I did not encourage him* (or *were it not that I encourage him*) he would give up entirely.

‘It might have passed unnoticed, *except that he had made enemies by his readiness to saber foes with his speech*’ (Will Durant, *The Story of Philosophy*, p. 158), or *had it not been that*, or *had it not been for the fact that*, he had made enemies, etc.

I would come *only that I am engaged*.

She (i.e., the black heifer) let a drive with her horns, and *only that I gave her a belt with the stick I had in my hand*, she’d have her (i.e., the white cow) pinned against the wall (Lennox Robinson, *Harvest*, Act I).

*I wille not graunte the thy lyf*, said that knyghte, *only that* (now *unless*) *thou frely relece the quene* (Malory, *Le Morte d’Arthur*, Book XVIII, Ch. VII).
I shall go unless (in older English onless) it rains (literally, on less interference than rain, i.e., short of rain).

Robert will not suffer hym to be laten (let) to baile on lasse than (now unless) he will make a generall acquyltaunce (A.D. 1500, quoted from Oxford Dictionary).

Ne would I gladly combate with mine host . . . Unlesse that (now without that) I were thereunto enforst (Spenser, Faerie Queene, VI, iii, xxxix, A.D. 1596).

Haue a man neuer (now ever) so moche lyght of faythe onlesse (now unless) he haue also this hete of charyte sterlyng his soule and brynynyg forthe lyfely workes, he is but a dead stock and as a tree withouten lyfe (John Fisher, E.E.T.S., Ex. Ser., XXVII, p. 326, early sixteenth century).

Don't you ever let on I told you, less'n (current popular form representing older on lesse than, now replaced by unless in the literary language) you want to see me kilt (Lucy Furman, Mothering on Perilous, Ch. XXIII).

Mrs. Taylor told him last Sunday that, without (now usually unless) he understands Latin, he will never be able to win a young lady of family and fashion (Philip Vickers Fithian, Journal, March 15, 1774).

You will not have better health without (better unless) you take better care of yourself.

Who wept and said, That save they could be pluck'd asunder, all My quest were but in vain (Tennyson, Holy Grail).

For saving I be join'd To her that is the fairest under heaven I seem as nothing in this mighty world (Coming of Arthur, 1. 85).

Thou couldest have no power at all against me except (now in plain prose unless) it were given thee from above (John, XIX, 11).

Scindiah certainly could have done nothing excepting (now unless) he could bring his brigades to Poonah (Wellington, A.D. 1804, quoted from Oxford Dictionary).

The whiteness of this shadow was not like any other whiteness that we know of, except (archaic for unless) it be the whiteness of the lightnings (Mark Twain, Joan of Arc, I, Ch. VI).

‘May I die,’ cried Montague, ‘but I am shocked’ (Dickens, Martin Chuzzlewit, Ch. XL) = if I’m not shocked.

It shall go hard but I will get there = I am willing that it shall go hard with me if I can’t get there otherwise.

We will drain our dearest veins But they shall be free! (Burns, Scots, wha hae, V).

I’d burn the house but (or but what) I’d find it = I would burn the house if I couldn’t find it otherwise.

We’ll des nat’ally pull de groun’ out but w’at we’ll get deze creetur out (Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, p. 235).

‘Ten to one but he comes’ (= ‘I bet ten to one if it doesn’t turn out that he comes’), now usually replaced by ‘Ten to one he comes,’ since we now feel the clause as positive.

But (= unless) I be deceiv’d, our fine musician growth amorous (Shakespeare, Taming of the Shrew, III, i, 62).
Virtue is the very heart and lungs of vice; it cannot stand up but (= unless) it lean on virtue (Thoreau, Journal, I, p. 78).

No man ever did or ever will work, but (= unless) [he worked] either from actual sight or sight of faith (Ruskin, Modern Painters, IV, Ch. VII, 5).

We should have arrived sooner but that we met with an accident.

But that I saw it, I could not have believed it.

I would have told you the story, but that it is a sad one and contains another's secret (Thackeray, Pendennis, II, Ch. XX).

I should never have repeated these remarks, but that they are in truth complimentary to the young lady whom they concern (id., Vanity Fair, I, Ch. XII).

And, but (now but that) she spoke it dying, I would not believe her lips (Shakespeare, Cymbeline, V, v, 41).

I will come provided (or now less commonly providing) that I have time (or provided or providing I have time).

Once the travelers were shut up in the Advance (submarine), they could exist for a month below the surface, providing no accident occurred (Victor Appleton, Tom Swift and His Submarine Boat, Ch. IV).

The Romans were well enough satisfied with this, provided only they might remain inactive (Hale and Buck, Latin Grammar, p. 283).

You may go where you like so that you are back by dinner time.

I accept thy submission and sacrifice so as (now so that = provided that) yerelie at this temple thou offer Sacrifice (John Lyly, Midas, V, iii, 75, A.D. 1592).

PUFF. It would have a good effectefaith! if you could exeunt praying!
SNEER. Oh, never mind — so as (now so that) you get them off! I'll answer for't the Audience won't care how (Sheridan, The Critic, II, ii, 186, A.D. 1781).

He could play 'em a tune on any sort of pot you please so as (in popular speech instead of so that) it was iron (Dickens, Bleak House, Ch. XXVI).

Schiller seized the opportunity of retiring from the city, careless whither he went, so he got beyond the reach of turnkeys (Carlyle, Life of Schiller, I, 44).

Let them hate, so they fear (G. M. Lane, A Latin Grammar, p. 338).

Let him go so only he come home with glory won (ib.).

So (now if or in case) thou hadst been still with me, I could have taught my love to take thy father for mine (Shakespeare, As You Like It, I, ii, 11).

So that (now if or in case) you had her wrinkles and I her money, I would she did as you say (id., All's Well That Ends Well, II, iv, 20).

So as (now in case) thou liv'ist in peace, die free from strife (id., Richard the Second, V, vi, 27).

I also pray that that fine elevation and expansion of nature which ventures everything may go with us to the ends of the earth, so be it we go to the ends of the earth carrying conscience and the principles that make for good conduct (Woodrow Wilson, Dec. 2, 1900).

I do not care so long as you are happy.
Nothing matters so long as we are not found out.
The brothers, and other relatives, might do as they would, while they did not disgrace the name (Meredith, The Ordeal of Richard Feverel, Ch. I).

In case it rains (or in the event that it rains) we can't go.

When (= in case) great national interests are at stake, the party system breaks down.

Granted that he actually did it, we may now seek to explain his conduct.

Given that he and they have a common object, the one test that he must apply to them is as to their ability to help in achieving that object (Theodore Roosevelt, The Strenuous Life, p. 74).

But there's no dealing with him, once he's got a notion in his head (Brand Whitlock, J. Hardin & Son, Book III, Ch. VII, 2).

They will set an House on Fire, and (now if) it were but to roast their Egges (Bacon, Essays, 97, A.D. 1625).

An (= if) I could climb and lay my hand upon it, Then were I wealthier than a leash of kings (Tennyson, Gareth and Lynette, l. 50).

'An (= if) you do that, we're lost.' An is still to be heard in our southern mountains and here and there in New England.

If that (now simple if) you conquer, I live to joy in your great triumph (Byron, Sardanapalus, IV, I, 482, A.D. 1822).

I told them that to come to a publike schoole ... it was opposite to my humour, but if so they would give their attendance at my lodging, I protested (declared) to doe them what right or favour I could (Ben Jonson, Every Man in His Humour, III, VIII, 26, A.D. 1601, ed. 1616).

If so be the Lord will be with me, then I shall be able to drive them out (Joshua, XIV, 12).

If so be that I can get that affaire done by the next post, I will not fail for to give your Lordship an account of it (Chesterfield, Letters, II, CCIII, 269, A.D. 1749).

If so be as (older English preserved in dialect) he's dead, my opinion is he won't come back no more (Dickens, Dombey and Son, Ch. XXXIX).

I care not what I meet with in the way, so be I can also meet with deliverance from my burden (Bunyan, Pilgrim's Progress, 20).

It ought nat to be applyed, but yf case be that the paciynete were faynte herted (R. Copland, Gydon's Quest. Chirurg., A.D. 1541).

If case some one of you would fly from us, etc. (Shakespeare, III Henry VI, V, iv, 34).

I here entail The crown to thee Conditionally that here thou take an oath To cease this civil war (Shakespeare, III Henry VI, I, i, 196).

But if remedee Thou her afford, full shortly I her dead shall see (Spenser, Faerie Queene, III, iii, XVI).

Inasmuch as things which are præternatural do more rarely happen, it is pity but that they should (now if they should not) be observed (Increase Mather, Remarkable Providences, Ch. V).

I shal bere it as patiently as to me is possible foreseen (now provided) that ye shall promyse me, etc. (Caxton, History of Jason, p. 88, A.D. 1477).
Gin ye promulgat sic doctrines, it’s my belief you will bring somebody to the gallows (Scott, St. Ronan’s Well, XXXIV).
Dash me gif I can tell ye wha (= who) he is (Gorden, Carglen, 33).

Examples of Clauses of Exception:

I don’t believe that God wants anything but that we should be happy.
What can I say but that I hope you may be contented.
Here we live in an old rambling mansion for all the world like an inn, but that we never see company.
Nothing would content him but I must come.
My boy is quite as naughty as yours, except that he always begs my pardon when he has done wrong.
The copy was perfect except that (or except, or but) for the fact that, the accents were omitted.
He did not really know what he was going to say, beyond that the situation demanded something romantic (Francis R. Bellamy, The Balance, Ch. I).
He could not distinguish its meaning (the meaning of the cry), save that it seemed to convey an urgent appeal for help (Victor Appleton, Don Sturdy on the Desert of Mystery, Ch. I).
I’ve nothing against the man, only that I hate him (Marion Crawford, Katharine Lauderdale, II, Ch. VIII).
‘Is anything the matter with my Madeline?’ — ‘No, papa, only I have got a headache’ (Trollope, Orley Farm, II, Ch. III).
I don’t know anything, only he hasn’t any folks and he’s poor (Louisa Alcott, Little Men, Ch. VI).

Only (now usually only that, or more commonly except that when the subordinate clause precedes) he is very melancholy, he would be agreeable (H. Martin, Helen of Glenross, II, 226, A.D. 1802).
Who is glad but he? (Chaucer, The Marchantes Tale, 1168).
Apone this yt chaunced that vppon a day ther was no persone att dynner with vs but we three and Masone (Sir Thomas Wyatt, Declaration to the Councell, A.D. 1541).
Damon is the man, none other but he, to Dionysius his blood to pay (Richard Edwards, Damon and Pithias, 1. 1590, A.D. 1571).
Who but thou alone can tell? (Spenser, Faerie Queene, Book VII, Canto VII, II).

It was I and none but I (Sir Philip Sidney, Arcadia, Book V, p. 174, A.D. 1593).
Methinks nobody should be sad but I (Shakespeare, King John, IV, I, 13).

Who knows but He whose hand the lightning forms (Pope, Essay on Man, Epistle I, 157).
There’s nobody home but I (or in colloquial speech more commonly me). The boy stood on the burning deck whence all but he had fled (Mrs. Hemans, Casabianca).
No one ever knew but I (Dickens, *David Copperfield*, Ch. XI).
Who but he had betrayed me? (F. B. Aldrich, *The Story of a Bad Boy*, Ch. XX).
No one knows it but you and I (W. D. Howells, *A Modern Instance*, Ch. XXXVII).
Nobody knew her but I (Pinero, *His House in Order*, Act IV).
Who can have done it but I? (Hardy, *The Return of the Native*, V, Ch. I).
There's not a soul in my house but me tonight (id., *Far from the Madding Crowd*, Ch. XXXIV).
There is none to claim me but he (Meredith, *Rhoda Fleming*, Ch. XLI).
None in the world shall ever know But I who am his wife (Cale Young Rice, *Far Quests*, The *Wife of Judas Iscariot*).
There is none evil but I (Alfred Noyes, *The Paradox*, II).
Everybody is to know him except I (Meredith, *Tragic Comedians*, 28).
Every one, except me, seemed to dislike him (Beatrice Harraden, *The Fowler*, II, Ch. IV, 111).

Now he had lost her, he wanted her back, and perhaps everyone present, except he, guessed why (Kingsley, *Westward Ho!* Ch. XXV).

'Save I and a frere, In Engeland ther can no man it make' (Chaucer, *The Chanouns Yemannes Tale*, Ellesmere MS., 802), but in the accusative relation 'Ne I ne desire no thyng for to haue, Ne drede (nor dread I) for to leese (lose) saue oonly thee' (id., *The Clerkes Tale*, Ellesmere MS., 451).

None can helpe save we (John Heywood, *The Play of the Weather*, 1. 1136, a.d. 1533).

None heard save I (Bridges, *Demeter*, Act II).
All save he and Murray have pleaded guilty (Chicago Tribune, Nov. 12, 1924).
All were reddi saving I and Sir Flower (Gabriel Harvey, *Letter to Dr. Young*, Nov. 1, 1573).

All this worlds glory seemeth vayne to me, and all their showes but shadowes, saving she (Spenser, *Amoretti*, XXXV, 14, a.d. 1594).
Anybody but a fool (may be construed as nominative or accusative since the form is not distinctive) would understand.
She loved no one but (or except, or much less commonly unless) him (in the accusative relation, as here, always accusative, usage never varying).
He did not believe that he would ever obtain anything unless (now usually but or except) a species of elevated poor-law system of government (Pall Mall Gazette, Aug. 4, 1886).
Society can have no hold on any class except through the medium of their interests (Buckle, *Civilization*, I, XI, 632).
He is everywhere except in the right place.

There were two ponies in the stables of the Great House which they were allowed to ride and which, unless (now usually except) on occasions, nobody else did ride (Trollope, *Small House*, I, Ch. II).

'I take a walk every day except when it rains.' Sometimes, now rather infrequently, unless when is used here. On the other hand, unless unac-
companied by when is often used here instead of except when: 'I take a walk every day, unless it rains.'

He is to be found everywhere except where he is needed.

A beautiful horse, jet black, unless (now usually except) where he was flecked by spots of foam (Scott, Rob Roy, Ch. V).

A prophet is not without honor, save (more commonly except) in his own country.

He does nothing but [that he does] laugh.

He couldn't do anything but [that he did] mournfully acquiesce.

What could she do but [that she did] love him?

Such procedure cannot [do anything] but hurt his cause.

No one other than an Englishman dare do that.

He could not do otherwise than [that he did] assent.

Nor could his private friends do other than [that they did] mournfully acquiesce.

He will do anything except [that he should do] work hard.

For the explanation of these elliptical forms see 49 4 E. Note also the following: 'Who but (conjunction) he (or besides — preposition — him, or else than he, or other than he) could have done it?' 'No one but (conjunction) he (or besides — preposition — him, or else than he, or other than he) could have done it,' or sometimes a blending of two constructions: 'Who else but he (or else besides him) could have done it?' 'No one else but he (or else besides him) could have done it.'

The use of than in a number of the examples given above indicates that the subordinate clause has developed out of a comparative clause (29 1 B) and in a formal sense is still a comparative clause.

In older English, the negative ne (16 2 d) often stood before the principal verb: 'He nis (= ne is) but a child.' By the later omission of ne, as in 'He is but a child,' the old conjunction but has acquired the meaning of nothing but, and is now often felt as an adverb with the force of only and thus can now as an adverb be employed where it was not used in older English: 'We pass through life but (or only) once.' In older English, this but could be strengthened by only: 'I find but only (now simple but or only) two sorts of writings' (Milton, Areopagitica, 36).

1. Clauses of Condition and Exception Replaced by Other Constructions. These clauses may be replaced by the following constructions:

a. We often employ a relative clause instead of a conditional clause introduced by if: 'Any boy who should do that would be laughed at' = 'Any boy would be laughed at if he should do that.'

b. Instead of a conditional clause introduced by if we some-
times use a clause with question word-order, originally an independent question and in rhetorical style still occasionally appearing as such: 'Is any among you afflicted? let him pray' (James, V, 13). 'Don't you love Nature because she is beautiful? He (i.e., Thoreau) will find a better argument in her ugliness' (James R. Lowell, Literary Essays, I, p. 372). 'You would see for yourself, were you here.' 'Had I the time, I would go.' 'There are other articles, to which, did time permit, we might draw attention.' 'People will gather by hundreds outside a police court on the chance of catching a glimpse of a criminal; do they see but a corner of his hat, they go away happy.' 'Were I to be late, would you wait for me?' 'Should you find them, kindly let me know.' 'Would space allow, I should like to quote the notice in full.' This construction is now for the most part employed only where the verbal predicate is compound, made up of an infinitive or a participle and an auxiliary. Only in the case of be and have is it used with a simple verb. In older English, this construction was much more common than today. It could be used also with any simple verb of complete predication, where today, if the question form is used at all, an auxiliary verb must be used in connection with an infinitive: 'Call me their traitor! Thou injurious tribune! Within thine eyes sat twenty thousand deaths, . . . I would say "Thou liest"' (Shakespeare, Coriolanus, III, iii, 69), now, if used at all, 'Did twenty thousand deaths sit within thy eyes,' etc.

c. A conditional clause may be replaced by a wish impossible of fulfilment, with question word-order: 'Could I see her once more, all my desires would be fulfilled.' 'O had he only come, how different things now be!'

In older English, the conditional clause in b and c was sometimes confounded with the that-clause, so that instead of the question word-order the normal order was employed and that suppressed, as so often in that-clauses: 'I should be glad this compromise were made' (Southey in Life, III, 26). 'What would I give I could avoid it when people speak of you?' (Dorothy Osborne, Letters, 279, A.D. 1654).

d. One of two independent sentences linked by conjunctions or unlinked is often equivalent to a conditional clause or a clause of exception.

aa. Where there are two sentences linked by and or unlinked, one of which is an expression of will containing an imperative or a volitive (43 I A) subjunctive, the sentence containing an expression of will has the force of a conditional clause and may be replaced by such: 'Give him an inch and he'll take a mile.' 'Stir and you are a dead man.' 'One step further (= take one step
further) and you are lost.” ‘But enter a Frenchman or two and a
transformation effected itself immediately’ (Du Maurier, Trilby).
“She had no room for anything but pity; but let Alessandro come
on the stage again, and all would be changed’ (Helen Hunt Jackson,
Ramona, Ch. XIV). ‘Do it at once, you will never regret it.’
‘Suppose (or say = suppose, or assume) that he took a real fancy
to you, would you accept him?’ In accordance with older literary
usage the volitive subjunctive is still often employed in quaint
dialect where it is not now used in the literary language: ‘Come
(= if it comes, happens) [that] we can’t get the big things (i.e.,
trees) and their shade, we’re proud to take the little flower-things
and their sweetness’ (Maristan Chapman, The Happy Mountain,
Ch. XVI). ‘Old maids (a kind of flower) they’re going to be —
happen [that] they get their mind set to blooming ere frost’
(ib.).

Sometimes there is no expression of will at all in a sentence, and
yet it has the force of a conditional clause: ‘You don’t have to
be tender of my feelings. You can’t and be honest’ (= if you are
honest) (Eleanor Carroll Chilton, Shadows Waiting, p. 273).

A sentence containing an imperative is often used instead of
a clause of exception: ‘Bar Milner’s speech
there has scarcely
been a word about our policy in the whole of the debate.’ ‘She
is the best housekeeper in town bar no one.’ Except (17 3 A c)
is often felt as an imperative: ‘All men are fallible except the
Pope.’

bb. Where there are two sentences linked by or, otherwise,
else, or or else, the first of which is an expression of will, the sen-
tence containing the expression of will is often equivalent to a
conditional clause: ‘Do that at once, or (or otherwise, else, or or
else) you will be punished’ = ‘If you do not do that at once you
will be punished.’

cc. Where there are two unlinked expressions of will, the first
often has the force of a conditional clause: ‘Love me, love my
dog’ = ‘If you love me, love my dog.’ ‘Bestow nothing, receive
nothing. Sow nothing, reap nothing. Bear no burdens, be crushed
under your own.’ ‘Waste not, want not.’

dd. Where there are two independent declarative sentences
linked by a disjunctive (or, else, or otherwise; see 19 1 b), the
first sentence is often equivalent to a conditional clause: ‘He can-
not be in his right mind, or (or else, or otherwise) he would not
make such wild statements’ = ‘If he were in his right mind, he
would not,’ etc.

e. After the conclusion of an unreal condition (44 II 5 C) we
often employ an independent sentence instead of a conditional
clause. This independent sentence is coördinated with the preceding conclusion by means of adversative but or only (19 1 c): ‘The one (airship) that fell in Virginia would have made a safe landing all right, but the metal nose came up against an electric light wire and set fire to the gas’ (Victor Appleton, Don Sturdy across the North Pole, Ch. IV) = if the metal nose had not come up against, etc. ‘And we’d have done better, only we struck a hard wind against us about two miles up in the air’ (id., Tom Swift and His Submarine Boat, Ch. I) = if we had not struck, etc.

2. Abridgment of the Clause of Condition or Exception. When the subject of the principal proposition and that of the subordinate clause are identical, the subordinate clause introduced by if, provided, or unless can be abridged to a participle or an adjective, which is a predicate appositive to the subject of the principal proposition: ‘Born in better times, he would have done credit to the profession of letters.’ ‘Such things are better left unsaid.’ ‘It is best forgotten.’ ‘Left to herself, she would have been drawn into an answer.’ ‘This same thing, happening (= if it should happen) in wartime, would amount to disaster.’ ‘I have an income large enough to take care of me, living (= provided I live) as I live’ (Carrie Jacobs-Bond, Ladies’ Home Journal, Sept., 1927, p. 141). The participle failing belongs here in a formal sense, but it is now really a preposition, for it is no longer in this construction vividly felt as the present participle of fail. ‘They would prefer to come to us; failing that, they would have us visit them.’

The frequent insertion of if, unless, and except in these abridged clauses indicates the influence of the full clause upon this old type of expression: ‘Thus will I save my credit in the shoot: Not wounding, pity would not let me do ’t; If wounding, then it was to show my skill’ (Shakespeare, Love’s Labor’s Lost, IV, 1, 26). ‘Unless meeting with unexpected difficulties at the office today, I shall be home early tonight.’ ‘He will do it if properly approached.’ ‘The child is never peevish unless sick.’ ‘The whole Road from Hartford to Springfield is level and good, except being too sandy in places’ (George Washington, Diary, Oct. 21, 1789). Compare 20 3 (5th par.). It is possible to construe the third and fourth examples as elliptical: ‘He will do it if [he is] properly approached.’ ‘The child is never peevish unless [it is] sick.’ In the second and last examples unless and except may be construed as prepositions governing the following gerund. But unless is now little used as a preposition. Compare 31 (5th par.).

An elliptical clause is often used if its subject is situation it (4 A): ‘Come tomorrow if [it is] possible.’
Where the reference is general or indefinite, the present participle is often used absolutely, i.e., without an expressed subject, in accordance with the general principle observed with participle, infinitive, and gerund that there is no need of a subject if the reference is indefinite: ‘Strictly speaking (= if one must speak in a strict sense), that is not true.’ ‘Mildly speaking, that is an exaggeration.’ ‘Setting aside the £10,000 (= if one set aside the 10,000 pounds sterling), it did not appear that she was at all Harriet’s superior’ (Jane Austen, Emma, Ch. XXII). ‘Judging (= if one judged) from the traces of their (i.e., the beavers’) work, it (the beaver dam) had once held a large colony of beavers’ (Theodore Roosevelt, Hunting Trips of a Ranchman, Ch. II). ‘Excepting a few of Jonson’s earlier creations, I cannot see but that these (the characters in Magnetic Lady) are about as successful as the majority of the personages of his earlier plays’ (H. W. Peck, Introduction to Jonson’s Magnetic Lady, p. xxxiv). ‘Looking at his life from another point of view, his actions become intelligible.’ ‘It cannot be denied that, granting the difficulty of the undertaking, Mrs. Davis has done her work with great skill’ (Gamaliel Bradford in Harper’s Monthly, Aug., 1925). ‘Considering the circumstances, he is doing well.’ ‘Assuming the hearty cooperation of all the members (or that all the members will heartily cooperate), it is reasonable to expect that the celebration will be successful.’ ‘Objections to this plan, supposing there should be any, should be reported to the committee at once.’ ‘Barring accidents, he will arrive tomorrow.’ Some call the participle here a preposition or a conjunction, but it has in these and many other examples too much live verbal force to be regarded as crystallized into the rigid state of a preposition or a conjunction, as in the case of bating, which, no longer felt as a participle since the verb bate has become obsolete, has become a preposition. Similarly, providing is now felt as a conjunction, since the verb is not now commonly used in the special meaning contained in the participle: ‘I shall go providing (not now if you provide) it doesn’t rain.’ In clauses of exception the preposition except, the subordinating conjunction except, and the second person imperative except (1 d aa, p. 328) cannot be used at all if the clause is negative. Here except must be replaced by the absolute present participle excepting: ‘All men are fallible, not excepting the Pope’ or the Pope not excepted (17 3 A c). The present participle can be freely used here, as the reference is general or indefinite.

The full clause is often abridged to an infinitive clause with to in clauses of condition and but to or except to in clauses of exception, provided there is some word in the principal proposition which
can serve as the subject of the infinitive: 'It would hurt us to act hastily.' 'I should be glad to go.' 'There is nothing left to us but (or except) to go.' 'What am I here for but to talk' (Henry Watterson, Editorial, Feb. 19, 1908). The full clause can also often be abridged to a to-infinitive clause when the subject of the infinitive is general or indefinite, in which case the subject is usually understood: 'To judge by his outward circumstances he must be very rich' = if one may judge, etc. 'I was thinking of asking £30 for the month' (for the use of the boat). — 'The boat is not worth it to buy' (G. A. Birmingham, Spanish Gold, Ch. II) = if one should buy it for that price. 'The reason of man differs from the instinct of animals in that it can form abstract conceptions — conceptions that float free, so to speak (= if one may use such an expression), dissociated from particular concrete objects.' 'His language is irreverent, not to say (= if one may not say) blasphemous.' Often an indefinite pronoun in the principal proposition serves as the subject of the infinitive: 'I'm sure, nobody to read this would ever imagine I was an almost grown-up girl' (De Morgan, Joseph Vance, Ch. X). If the infinitive has a subject of its own, the subject is introduced by for: 'It would be delightful to me for us to work together.' 'I should be glad for Mary to go.' 'There was nothing now but for him and the footman to get into the carriage.'

The to-infinitive is much used in exclamatory conditional sentences with the principal proposition suppressed. The conditional clause has the form of an abridged to-infinitive clause with the subject unexpressed, as the natural inference is that the speaker is the subject: 'Oh, to be in England now that April's there!' (Browning, Home-thoughts from Abroad, I) = 'Oh, how happy I should be if I were in England,' etc. We often employ here a prepositional phrase introduced by for: 'Oh, for a friend to help us and advise us!' (Wilkie Collins, The Woman in White, p. 222) = 'Oh, how happy I should be if we only had a friend to help and advise us!'

The absolute nominative construction described in 17 3 A c often takes the place of a conditional clause. Sometimes the conditional clause has the form of an attributive adjective: 'A true friend would have acted differently' = 'A friend would have acted differently if he had been true.' 'There is little, if any, difference between them.' The adjective sometimes follows the noun as an appositive: 'With what species (of birds), if any, the marriage unions last during life, I do not know' (John Burroughs, Leaf and Tendril, VII).

Sometimes we find a prepositional phrase instead of a clause
of condition or exception: 'Without him I should be helpless.'
'Bating a little wilfulness I don't know a more honest or loyal
or gentle creature.' 'In a thorough analysis we shall find that
there is some good in every man.'

Instead of were it not for, had it not been for it is common to
employ but for, except for, save for, or, in older English and still
in colloquial speech, only for, which are now felt by many as
compound prepositions but which historically are elliptical expres­
sions introduced by the conjunctions but, except, save, or only:
'But [it were] for the thick trees the bitter wind would blow the
house to pieces.' 'We should have died but (or except, or save)
for him.' 'Only for my tea, I should have had the headache'
(Ora and Juliet, I, 30, A.D. 1811). 'We should have died only for
him' (in colloquial speech for but for him).

After the preposition without the to-infinitive may be used
provided the preposition has an object which can serve as the
subject of the infinitive: 'But he couldn't [have sat up], without
me to raise him' (De Morgan, Joseph Vance, Ch. XXXVI) = if I
hadn't raised him, or we can also use the gerund here: without
my raising him, or without my having raised him. The gerund is,
in general, common after prepositions: 'In case of John's (or the
boy's, or the boy; see 50 3) finishing the work tonight, let me know.'
'How many critics would be able, on being shown this drawing,
to say from whose pencil it had emanated.' 'Short of committing
suicide, he does his best to keep out of the way.'

A verbless conditional clause is sometimes contained in the
old verbless appositional type of sentence described in 20 3:
'Forewarned, forearmed!' 'Small pains, small gains!' 'Once a
gambler, always a gambler!' 'Better dead!' (Galsworthy, The
First and the Last, Scene III) = 'It would be better if we were
dead!' 'No song, no supper.'

CLAUSE OF CONCESSION

32. Conjunctions. The concessive clause contains a conceded
statement, which, though it is naturally in contrast or opposition
to that of the principal proposition, is nevertheless unable to
destroy the validity of the latter: 'Though he is poor, he is happy.'

The concessive clause is introduced by the following conjunc­
tions: if, even if; though, tho, even though, even tho, although,
altho; in older English, thof (a variant of though), surviving in
dialect; the adversatives (27 4) while, when, whereas, in older
English also where; as (as in bad as he is, in older English so — as,
or as — as, as in so bad as he is, or as bad as he is); in spite of the
fact that, despite that, notwithstanding (that); relative pronoun or adverb + ever or soever; for all or for all that; for as little as; granted that (17 3 A c). In older or archaic English: albeit (i.e., all be it = be it entirely) that or simple albeit, albe; al, with inverted word-order; howbeit (that); and or an (= if); so (= even if).

A pair of concessive clauses is usually connected by whether (in older English a pronoun = which one of the two, as in Matthew, IX, 5) — or, whether — or whether, if (more commonly whether) — or, simple or, in older English or whether — or.

As can be seen by the use of if, the concessive clause has in part developed out of the conditional clause with which it is often closely related. On the other hand, the concessive clause has affected the conditional clause, as can be seen in as though, which is often used with the force of as if: ‘He looks as [he would look] though (= if) he were sick.’

The use of though in concessive clauses indicates a relation with the older adversative coordinating conjunction though, which still as in oldest English stands in an independent proposition that expresses a contrast to the preceding statement: ‘This medicine is good for you; it is a little bitter though.’ ‘I have no doubt he will understand — though you never know.’ ‘He is an ingenious lad, though his brother is more ingenious’ (or his brother though is more ingenious). When such an adversative statement loses some-what of its independence and becomes logically subordinate to the other proposition, it becomes a concessive clause: ‘Though this medicine is a little bitter, it is good for you,’ or ‘This medicine is good for you though it is a little bitter.’ ‘Big though he was, he was not ashamed to learn,’ or ‘He was not ashamed to learn, big though he was.’ ‘Coward though he is, do not bully him,’ or ‘Do not bully him, coward though he is.’ Where the though clause precedes, as in the first alternate form of each of these examples, the subordination is evident, but where it follows, as in the second, the subordination can often be indicated only by a rapid enuncia- tion. Coordination can often be marked by putting though within the proposition or at the end, as illustrated in the examples given above. In Old English, the subordinate clause was usually dis-tinguished by the volitive (43 I A) subjunctive: ‘He bið þonne undeablic, peah he ær deablic ware’ (Blickling Homilies, 21, a.d. 888) = ‘It (the body) will then be immortal, though it was mortal be- fore.’ In older English, subordinating though was often indicated by putting a determinative, in Old English the, later that, after though, pointing forward to the following explanatory group of words, marking it thus as a subordinate clause: ‘Though that the queen on special cause is here, Her army is mov’d on’ (Shakespeare.
King Lear, IV, vi, 219). The form although is always a subordinating concessive conjunction.

A common form of the concessive clause originated in the clause of degree: 'Bad as he is, he has some good points,' in older English 'As (or so) bad as he is, he has his good points,' where as — as (= Old English swa — swa, i.e., so — so) contains an indefinite idea of degree, so that the clause has the force of however bad he is. 'Rashly (in older English as or so rashly) as he acted, he had some excuse.' In these clauses of degree we now often use the volitive (43 II A) subjunctive, once much less common: 'Bad as he may be, he has some good points,' literally, 'Let him be ever so bad, he has some good points.' In all these examples the as or so that once stood before the strongly accented word which introduced this clause has disappeared. After the old double determinative construction with as (or so) — as had developed concessive force and the original function of the double forms had become obscured, the first determinative as or so was dropped as a useless form, so that the heavily stressed word after it might stand in the important first place. The as after the heavily stressed word is now felt as a concessive conjunction.

In 'Boy as he was, he was chosen king' as is a relative pronoun with the force of that, but since boy is a predicate appositive with concessive force, as explained in 2, p. 339, this group of words is felt as a concessive clause, and as is construed as a concessive conjunction. Similarly, relative that, which is often used here instead of relative as, is often construed as a concessive conjunction: 'Apt scholar that he was, they were equally apt teachers, never allowing him to linger long in error' (Jack London, The Call of the Wild, Ch. II).

Another common form of the concessive clause makes use of an indefinite relative pronoun, adjective, or adverb + ever or soever: 'He was resolved to defend himself, whoever should assail him.' 'Whose-ever it is, I mean to have it.' 'His love will not fail, whoever else's may.' 'We will go on with the war, whatever it costs' (cost, or may cost). 'Whatever may be his weaknesses, he is generally liked.' 'I am going to pursue this course, whatever sacrifice it may demand.' 'He will find difficulties, whichever way (or whichever of these ways) he may take.' 'Human beings, of whichever sex they may be, will do amazing things.' 'However sick he is (or may be), he always goes to his work.'

Examples:

'I don't care if I do lose,' or in rather choice English 'I don't care though I lose.'
I couldn’t be angry with him if (or though, or stronger even if, or even though) I tried.
He is very kind-hearted, even if (or even though) he is outwardly a little gruff.
He will start tomorrow, though it rain cats and dogs.
Foolish though she may be, she is kind of heart.
A gentle hand... rough-grained and hard though it was (Dickens, Old Curiosity Shop, Ch. XV).
Strangely enough, staunch Royalist though he was, Thomas Chicherley must in early life have been brought into contact with Oliver Cromwell (Lady Newton, Lyme Letters, Ch. I, A.D. 1925).
A sailor will be honest, though (now though) mayhap he has never a penny of money in his pocket (Congreve, Love for Love, III, iv, 288, A.D. 1695).
Though (or although) he promised not to do so, he did it.
Though they worked never (once common in concessive clause, but since the later seventeenth century gradually replaced by ever) so hard, it was all in vain (Dickens, Martin Chuzzlewit, Ch. XLII).
Her mother, while she laughed, was not sure that it was good to encourage the pert little one.
We sometimes expect gratitude when we are not entitled to it.
Whereas I was black and swart before, With those clear rays which she infus’d on me That beauty am I bless’d with which you see (Shakespeare, I Henry VI, I, ii, 84).
And where thou now exact’st the penalty, Thou wilt... Forgive a moiety of the principal (id., Merchant of Venice, IV, i, 22).
Stupid as he is, he never loses his profit out of sight.
The world, as censorious as it is, hath been so kind (Swift).
Dr. Johnson admitted Boswell into his intimacy in spite of the fact that the latter was a Scotchman.
The amount of money in the family threatened to increase from year to year, despite that (or despite the fact that) Mr. Middleton’s good works were continued (L. Zangwill, Beautiful Miss Brooke, 33).
Notwithstanding that he is being lionized, he still keeps a level head.
He’s a scoundrel, whoever he may be.
She is always cheerful in whatever condition her health is.
Whichever you do here, whether you go or stay, you will have reasons to regret it.
Whatever (more indefinite than whichever) you finally decide to do, tell your father about it before you act.
I shall be quite content however and whenever you do it.
However lightly he treated the approaching trial (or Lightly as he treated the approaching trial), he became a different man afterwards.
However bad the weather may be (or Bad as the weather may be), we shall have to confront it.
However we may assess the merits or defects of the Confucian philosophy (or Assess the merits or defects of the Confucian philosophy as we may), the subject of China’s religion must always form a subject of the widest interest.
For all that (or simply for all) he seems to dislike me, I still like him.

They spoke in tones so low that Francis could catch no more than a word or two on an occasion. For as little as he heard (or Although he heard little) he was convinced that the conversation turned upon himself and his own career (R. L. Stevenson).

Granted that he had the very best intentions, his conduct was productive of great mischief.

Albeit she was angry with Pen, against his mother she had no such feeling (Thackeray, Pendennis, Ch. XXI, 275).

... of hem alle was ther noon y-slayn, Al were they sore y-hurt (Chaucer, The Knightes Tale, 1850).

The Moor, howbeit that I endure him not, Is of a constant, loving, noble nature (Shakespeare, Othello, II, i, 297).

If I have broke anything, I’ll pay for ’t, an it cost a pound (Congreve, Way of the World, V, 8).

‘Should I lie, madam?’ — ‘O, I would thou didst, So (= even if) half my Egypt were submerged’ (Shakespeare, Antony and Cleopatra, II, v, 94).

Whether he succeed(s) or fail(s), we shall have to do our part.

Whether he comes or not, I am not going to worry.

He promised him that, if (now usually whether) he fell on the field or survived it, he would act in a manner worthy of the name of George Osborne (Thackeray, Vanity Fair, I, Ch. XXXV).

Stewart was perhaps the most beloved member of Trinity, whether he were (43 II A, last par.) feeding Rugger blues on plovers’ eggs or keeping an early chapel with the expression of an earthbound seraph (Compton Mackenzie, Sinister Street, Ch. V).

Whether I go alone, or whether he go (or goes) with me, the result will be the same.

Or whether his fall enrag’d him, or how ’t was, he did so set his teeth and tear it (Shakespeare, Coriolanus, I, iii, 68).

In older English, there was a marked tendency to employ correlates in concessive sentences, an adversative, yet, still, nevertheless, etc., in the principal proposition corresponding to the concessive conjunction in the subordinate clause: ‘Although all shall be offended, yet will not I’ (Mark, XIV, 29). This adversative often seems superfluous to us today, since this idea is suggested by the context, hence we usually suppress it, following the modern drift toward terse, compact expression; but under the stress of strong feeling we still often employ it: ‘Although it may seem incredible, it is nevertheless true.’

1. Concessive Clause Replaced by Other Constructions. This clause is often replaced by the following constructions:

a. The concessive adverbial clause is often replaced by a principal proposition, which may be:

aa. An expression of will in the form of an imperative sentence, which, though independent in form, is logically dependent:
'Laugh as much as you like, I shall stick to my plan to the bitter end.' 'The massive person of Mr. Bradlaugh is entirely excluded from sight, crane your neck as you may.' 'Marietta's the best fore-and-aft, up-and-down little housekeeper on the island, bar none and challenge all comers' (Wallace Irwin, Seed of the Sun, Ch. XII). This is parataxis (193). We often employ coordination here with two sentences linked by and, the first of which is a command: 'Take any form but that and my firm nerves shall never tremble.'

The different personal forms of the imperative are quite common here: Third person singular: 'Let him be the greatest villain in the world, I would not keep from wishing to do some little thing to benefit him.' The old simple subjunctive, a mild volitive subjunctive (43 II A), frequently serves here as a mild imperative, often with suppressed subject. First person: 'There is no task to bring me; no one will be vexed or uneasy, linger I ever so late' (Gissing, Henry Ryecroft, II, p. 10). Willy-nilly, i.e., will he, nil (= ne will, the ne being an old negative) he (= whether he will or not), now, however, used as a mere adverb with reference to all persons and numbers, as in 'I, you, he, we, must go, willy-nilly,' but in Shakespeare's time still with the proper person: 'And, will you, nill you, I will marry you' (Taming of the Shrew, II, 273). 'Sink [I] or swim [I], I shall undertake it.' 'Say [I] what I will to the contrary, he tells the story everywhere.' Plural: 'Detest [we] him as we may, we must acknowledge his greatness.' 'Argue [we] as we like, dogmatize [we] as we please, experiment [we] up to the extinction of the canine race, no fellow can ever understand the mysteries and the vagaries of idiosyncrasy.' Third person: 'We cannot receive him, be he who he may.' 'Home is home be it ever so homely.' 'The business of each day, be it selling goods or shipping them, is going on pleasantly.' 'My mental vision is limited as is every man's to a greater or less degree, therefore there are certain great books that have for me no charm, charm they ever so many others whose opinions I respect and accept.' 'I shall have to buy the coat, cost [it] what it may.' 'I shall go rain [it] or shine [it].' 'But hate [he] Walpole as he might, the king was absolutely guided by the adroitness of his wife, Caroline of Anspach' (Green). 'Comfort [he] himself as he would, however, dream [he] as he would, Meynell's conscience was always sore for Hester' (Mrs. H. Ward, Richard Meynell, Ch. XIV). The suppression of the subject of the volitive forms here is modern. It has resulted from the analogy of the genuine imperative, where the omission of the subject has always been the rule.
bb. As in primitive speech, the concessive idea is still often in colloquial language expressed by simple declarative parataxis (19 3): 'The meat is good; it is a little tough, though (= although it is a little tough). 'I cannot keep these plants alive; I have watered them well, too' (= although I have watered them well). 'No matter (= it is of no importance) what he says (or it doesn't matter what he says), I am going' = 'Whatever he may say (concessive clause), I am going.'

Coördination is also employed here: 'Being the larger, she (the female squirrel) could have whipped him and not half tried' (= even though she hadn't half tried). 'I cannot keep these plants alive, and I have watered them well, too.' We often find here the old appositional type of sentence after and, i.e., subject and predicate adjective, participle, or noun lying side by side without being connected by a copula: 'They ne'er car'd for us yet: suffer us to famish, and their store-houses cramm'd with grain' (Shakespeare, Coriolanus, I, i, 81). This construction is especially common in popular speech. See 19 3.

cc. Instead of a concessive clause we sometimes find a clause in question word-order, which was originally an unreal wish. This construction was first used in unreal conditional sentences, as described in 31 1 c, and was later transferred to the concessive clause, as in the case of other features of the conditional clause which were employed also in the closely related concessive clause: 'Were the danger even greater, I should feel compelled to go.' Some adverb, as even in this example, now differentiates the concessive from the conditional clause. This form of the concessive clause is unknown in Old English.

As described in 31 1 b, a clause with question word-order, originally an independent question, is used as a conditional clause. This construction is sometimes employed in the closely related concessive clause: 'I, marrie, here comes majestie in pompe, Resplendent Sol, chief planet of the heauens: He is our Seruent, lookes he ne're (now ever) so big' (Thomas Nashe, Svmmers Last Will and Testament, l. 443, A.D. 1600). 'Mr. Gibson bowed, much pleased at such a compliment from such a man, was he lord or not' (Mrs. Gaskell, Wives and Daughters, II, p. 114, A.D. 1865).

b. The concessive idea sometimes finds expression in a relative clause: 'Many American boys who (= although they) have had few advantages in their youth have worked their way into prominence.'

2. Abridgment of Concessive Clause. The abridgment of the concessive clause is very common. Often in the form of a predicate appositive participle, adjective, or noun, sometimes as in primitive
speech without a subordinating conjunction, sometimes under the influence of the full clause with a subordinating conjunction, as explained in 27 5 and 20 3: 'From dawn till dark in this car, driving or riding, you'll never feel that you have put a whole day's miles behind you' (Advertisement). 'Well or sick, calm or worried (or whether well or sick, calm or worried), she is always restrained in her expression.' 'Though sick, she went to school.' 'For lovers' hours are long, though seeming short' (Shakespeare, Venus and Adonis, 842). 'His critics, though outvoted, have not been silenced.' 'The statutes, if not good, are tolerable.' 'The rumor, however incredible, was believed by the natives.' 'Vagabond or no vagabond, he is a human being and deserves pity.' 'While admitting that he had no sympathy with private capitalists, M. Dzerjinski said Soviet Russia could not exist without the participation of private traders in the general trade of the country' (Chicago Tribune, April 4, 1925).

As explained in 32 (7th par.), a predicate appositive noun in connection with a following relative clause often forms a concessive clause: 'Whig as (relative pronoun = that) he was and rather a rancorous one at that, Creevey was a welcome person even to the Duke of Wellington.' 'Strong man that he is, General Botha has been severely put to the test during the past few weeks.'

The participle is sometimes in apposition with a pronoun contained in a possessive adjective: 'Waking or sleeping, this subject is always in my mind.'

Where the reference is general or indefinite, the present participle is here, as in the closely related conditional clause in 31 2, often used absolutely, i.e., without an expressed subject, sometimes accompanied by even, which clearly differentiates the concessive from the conditional clause: 'Granting that this is true, the difficulty is not removed.' 'Even assuming a great willingness on the part of the members to work, few are properly prepared for the task.' 'Admitting (or even admitting) that the Governor was provoked, his procedure is censurable.' 'Conceding his superiority as a scholar, it is evident that he is inferior as a man.' Compare 17 4.

The appositional construction is sometimes still verbless as in primitive speech: 'Right or wrong — my country.'

The adjective here sometimes appears as an adherent (10 I) adjective instead of a predicate appositive: 'With a dogged perseverance and a keen, if narrow, insight into affairs President Kruger has worked with a single object.' 'This old woman dolls herself up like a young lady' = 'This woman dolls herself up like a young lady, although she is old.' The adjective is often in the substantive relation (57 1), i.e., stands alone, like a substantive
pointing to a following or preceding noun with which it is associated in thought: ‘It is one of the most spacious, if not the most spacious, of salons.’ ‘It is one of the finest poems produced in recent years, if not the finest.’

The abridged statement is sometimes an elliptical form of the full clause: ‘[whether he] Drink or [do] not drink he must pay.’ ‘The navy exists for the sole purpose of ensuring, [whether there be] war or no war, that the British people shall be properly fed.’ ‘Mr. Cecil Chesterton’s article, “Israel a Nation,” resolved itself into an attack on the political status of the Jews in the British commonwealth, while my reply to some of his statements must, albeit [it is done] unwillingly, assume a more or less defensive attitude’ (British Review). ‘Whatever the immediate result [may be], there can be no doubt that the dispute has raised issues which can no longer be ignored.’ In the last example, however, the subordinate clause may be the absolute nominative construction described in 17 3 A f.

The abridged form is often that of a prepositional phrase, especially one containing the word all: ‘His wife clung to him with all his faults.’ ‘With all I’ve done, and all I’ve spent on my garden, it’s fussy compared to this.’ ‘For all his learning he is a mean man.’ ‘Well, if I did, I shall do as I like for all him’ (Thomas Hardy, Jude the Obscure). ‘It’s clearing up after all.’ ‘The rain spoiled a part of our fun, but we had, after all, a fine time.’ ‘He is a blunt man, but he is kind of heart after all.’ Often in connection with a gerund: ‘But we haven’t got any wind, for all the barometer falling’ (Joseph Conrad, Typhoon, Ch. VII). Often after in spite of, despite, or notwithstanding, even where there is no all present: ‘In spite of (or despite, or notwithstanding) his untiring devotion to the community, he has not received the recognition he deserves.’ Instead of in spite of that we sometimes use at that: ‘At that (i.e., in spite of the very heavy duties of her social position) Mrs. Coolidge gets a good deal of fun out of her life in the White House’ (Winifred Mallon in Liberty, Feb. 28, 1925).

The concessive clause can sometimes be abridged to an infinitive clause when the subject of the infinitive is the same as that of the main proposition: ‘You couldn’t do that to save your life.’

CLAUSE OF PURPOSE

33. Conjunctions. The clause of purpose or final clause, as it is often called, states the purpose or direct end of the action of the principal proposition. It is introduced by the conjunctions: that, old but still often used, more commonly now, however, re-
placed by the more expressive forms in order that (i.e., with the purpose that), quite modern but by reason of its distinctive form in wide use in choice language, and the old but still very common so that or in colloquial speech simple so; as, much used in older English, but now replaced by that; for the purpose that, to the end that; till = in order that in Irish English, which preserves here an older literary meaning; in the hope that; after a negative or a question but that or more commonly unless that; three forms to express apprehension, that — not, for fear, for fear that, and sometimes lest, which is from older thy (old instrumental case form of that) less the, literally, on that account that — less (with negative force = not); in older English with the force of that, so that, in order that, also the following conjunctions: because, for, for that, for because, to the intent that. Also another conjunction, so as, was once widely employed and to a limited extent is still a living form. It corresponds to Old English swa swa (i.e., so so), and thus has been in use from the oldest period to our day. At present it is for the most part confined to popular speech in the full clause, while in the abridged clause it is widely used also in the literary language. In Old English, it was not used at all in the abridged clause, which shows that it entered the abridged clause later under the influence of the full clause at a time when it was in use in the full clause.

The conjunctions that, so that, so as, and simple so are also used in the closely related clause of result. In both clauses they perform the same function and have the same origin, as described in 28 5. The two clauses are, in the literary language, often differentiated not by their conjunctions but by the use of different moods. The indicative in the clause of result often represents the statement as an actual result, while in the clause of purpose may, might, shall, should, or sometimes the simple subjunctive form of the verb, represents the result as only planned or desired: ‘Turn the lantern só that we may see what it is’ (clause of purpose), but ‘He turned the lantern só that I saw what it was’ (clause of result). ‘I am going to the lecture early so that I may get a good seat’ (clause of purpose), but ‘I went to the lecture early so that I got a good seat’ (clause of result). There is often, however, no formal difference between the two clauses, the meaning alone distinguishing them. The subjunctive is frequently used in clauses of result to represent the result as possible or as desired or demanded: ‘It has cleared up beautifully, so that he may (or might) come after all.’ ‘You must proceed in such a manner that it shall not offend the public.’ On the other hand, the indicative is often used in clauses of purpose to indicate con-
idence of realization, especially in colloquial language: 'He is going to the lecture early so that he'll get a good seat.' A pause here before the conjunction so that converts the clause of purpose into a clause of pure result: 'He is going to the lecture early, so that he'll get a good seat.' A clause of pure result is logically an independent proposition and requires a slight pause to indicate its independence.

The clause introduced by for fear was originally a causal clause, but the idea of cause here is often overshadowed by that of purpose: 'She walked softly for fear she should wake the baby.'

Examples:

He told it so that it might not hurt our feelings.

I wish to have them speak so as (now that) it may well appear that the brain doth govern the tongue (Roger Ascham, The Scholemaster, p. 4, A.D. 1570).

They are climbing higher that (or so that, or in order that) they may get a better view.

They climbed higher that (so that, or in order that) they might get a better view.

'They are hurrying that (so that, or in order that) they may not miss the train,' or in colloquial speech so that (or simple so) they won't miss the train.

'They hurried that (so that, or in order that) they might not miss the train,' or in colloquial speech so that (or simple so) they wouldn't miss the train.

If a man be asked a question to answer, but to repeat the Question before he answer is well, that he be (now more commonly may be) sure to understand it, to avoid absurdity (Ben Jonson, Discoveries, p. 6, A.D. 1641).

Come here now till (= in order that) I beat you (an Irish mother to her child, quoted from Hayden and Hartog's The Irish Dialect of English).

He never comes but that (or unless that) he may scold us.

'He is keeping quiet that he may not disturb his father' (or lest, or for fear, or for fear that, he disturb, or shall disturb, or much more commonly may, should, or might, disturb his father, but for fear he will disturb his father, when the desire is to indicate that this result will surely follow if great care is not taken to prevent it).

He jotted the name down for fear (or lest) he might forget it.

Say as little as possible about it to Sybel lest she repeated (or more commonly should or might repeat) my account of the Happy Valley to that scoundrel Patterne (Sir Harry Johnston, The Man Who Did the Right Thing, Ch. XVII, p. 308).

They asked him ... because (= that) they might accuse him (Tyndale, Matthew, XII, 10).

And for (= that) the time shall not seem tedious, I'll tell thee what befell me (Shakespeare, III Henry VI, III, I, 9).

For that our kingdom's earth should not be soiled With that dear blood which it hath fostered ... Therefore, we banish you our territories (Shakespeare, Richard the Second, I, III, 125).
Also he weped not onely, but also very sore and pytefully for bycause he might washe every synne in hym with his bytter teres (John Fisher, E.E.T.S., Ex. Ser., XXVII, p. 17, early sixteenth century).

Syth so good and so holy a man desyred of god to be sharply punysshed in this lyfe rather than after this lyfe, to thentent (= the intent) he myght be able to haue the everlastynge kyngdome of heauen (ib., p. 41).

'What have you done to your neck?' — 'Oh, my wife put that in it so's (= so as = literary so that) I'd remember to get some things from town' (Punch).

Father has the first one (i.e., first whistle) blown at half-past six, so's (= literary so that) the men can have time to get their things ready (Dorothy Canfield, The Brimming Cup, Ch. VI).

With words nearer admiration then (now than) liking she would extoll his excellencies, the good lines of his shape, the power of his witte, the valiantnes of his courage, the fortunatenes of his successes, so as (now so that) the father might finde in her a singular love towards him (Sir Philip Sidney, Arcadia, Book II, Ch. XV, A.D. 1590).

1. Adverbial Clause of Purpose Replaced by Other Constructions. We often prefer to express the idea of purpose by a grammatical form other than an adverbial clause of purpose, namely, by:

   a. A relative clause: 'Envoys were sent who should sue for peace.' Compare 43 II B e.

   b. Instead of a subordinate clause of purpose we often employ an independent coordinate proposition connected with the preceding proposition by and: 'Won't you come and see us?' Compare 19 3.

2. Abridgment of Clause of Purpose. In this category abridgment often takes place, usually in the form of an infinitive clause with to when the subject of the principal proposition or some other word in it can serve as the subject of the infinitive, and in the form of an infinitive clause with for . . . to when the clause has a subject of its own: 'I am waiting to go with John when he comes,' but 'I am waiting for them to go before I speak of the matter.' 'I rang to them to come up,' but 'I rang for breakfast to be brought up.' Even where there is some word in the principal proposition that might serve as the subject of the infinitive, the infinitive often has a subject of its own to remove all ambiguity and make the thought perfectly clear: 'The lad had pulled at his mother for her to take notice of him.'

   Instead of the infinitive with for . . . to here we often find in older English a to-infinitive with a nominative as subject: 'Pray to thy Son aboue the sterris clere, He (now for him) to vouchasef by thy mediacion, To pardon thy seruaunt' (John Skelton, ed. by Dyce, I, 14).
Instead of the infinitive with to it is now also quite common to place so as, in order, or on purpose before the old to-form to bring out more clearly the idea of purpose: 'I am going early so as to (or in order to) get a good seat.' 'I went to Germany on purpose to study this question.'

In older English, a so-that-clause of purpose could be abridged to an infinitive clause with so to when the subject of the principal proposition could serve as the subject of the infinitive: 'Finding by his wisdome that she was not altogether faultlesse, he pronounced she should all her life be kept prisoner among certaine women of religion like vestall nonnes so to (now so as to) repaye their touched honour of her house with well observing a stryctt profession of chastitie' (Sir Philip Sidney, Arcadia, Book V, p. 173, A.D. 1593).

In older English, an as-clause of purpose could be abridged to an infinitive clause with as to: 'The messinger found Argalus at a castle of his owne sitting in a parler with the faire Parthenia, he reading in a booke, she bye him as to heare him reade' (Sir Philip Sidney, Arcadia, Book III, Ch. VII, A.D. 1590), now to hear him read.

Before the to of the infinitive, which has for its subject some word in the principal proposition, we find occasionally in Old English and frequently in Middle English and early Modern English a for of different origin from the for described on page 343 and more in detail in 21 e. This for, like to, meant purpose and was placed before to merely to bring out this idea more concretely; but, as its force was not vividly felt, it was gradually replaced by the more expressive forms so as, in order, on purpose: 'Are ye come out as against a thief with swords and staves for to (now simple to, or in order to) take me?' (Matthew, XXVI, 55). This old literary usage is well preserved in popular Irish English: 'There will a car be sent and two boys from the Union for to bear her out from the house' (Lady Gregory, McDonough's Wife). Also in English popular speech: 'She's an orphan, studying for to be a governess' (Pinero, The Schoolmistress, Act I). For a description of the historical development here and its reason see 21 e.

In oldest English, we often find the simple infinitive here, a usage which even in present-day speech in certain set expressions still lingers on quite generally in all parts of the territory: 'I'll go see' (Tarkington, Alice Adams, Ch. IV). For the original meaning of this form see 11 2.

The principal proposition upon which an infinitive clause with to depends is often suppressed: 'To be sincere, [I must tell
you] you have not done your best.' 'To tell the truth, [I have to say] the lecture was a great disappointment to me.'

The full clause is often replaced by the gerundial construction after the preposition for and the prepositional phrases for the purpose of, with the object of, with the intention of: 'We planted a hedge for preventing the cattle from straying.' 'I am not here tonight for the purpose of making a speech.' 'I didn’t come with the object (or intention) of destroying the good feeling prevailing among you.' Instead of the gerund we often use the prepositional phrase in support of (= to the end that he, they, may, might support): 'Several representative citizens volunteered their services yesterday in support of the traction ordinance.'

To indicate continued activity we employ the present participle: 'He went hunting, fishing, swimming.' 'He took me out riding.' 'Axemen were put to work getting out timber for bridges' (U. S. Grant, Personal Memoirs, II, 47). 'Joe had been sitting up nights building facts and arguments together into a mighty unassailable array' (Mark Twain, Letter to W. D. Howells, Christmas Eve, 1880). 'The populace were up there observing her fortunate performance and rejoicing over it' (id., Joan of Arc, II, Ch. XVIII).

In the early history of our country a gerundial construction was often employed where we now use a present participle — a gerund after on or to: 'In the beginning of March they sent her (i.e., the pinnace) well vitaled to the eastward on fishing' (Bradford, History of Plymouth Plantation, p. 165, A.D. 1630–1648). 'Then all went to seeking of shelfish, which at low water they dug out of the sands' (ib., p. 149). At this early time the present participle was used here alongside of the gerund, later for the most part replacing it.

CLAUSE OF MEANS

34. The clause of means indicates the means by which the effect mentioned in the principal proposition is produced: 'I recognized him by the fact (a formal introduction to the following clause) that he limped,' or in abridged form, by his limping. 'All strove to escape by what means they might.' 'I have been guided more by what I myself know of the situation than by what he said.' In such constructions there is always a preposition, so that the clause in fact is a prepositional clause and is identical in form with the prepositional clause in 24 IV. Hence it is not further discussed here.

Abridgment to a gerundial or participial clause is very common
here: 'By holding (gerund) on to the rope firmly, or holding (present participle) on to the rope firmly, I came safe to shore.' 'By John's holding the ladder firmly, I succeeded in climbing onto the roof.' 'He left a considerable fortune — made it selling (present participle) pictures.'
CHAPTER XVII
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35. The word-order has been a matter of constant attention throughout the syntax, so that the details have already been presented under the different grammatical categories. Attention is here directed to only the general larger outlines.

In English there are three word-orders: the verb in the second, the third, or the first place.

1. Verb in the Second or Third Place. In older English, the verb in a normal declarative sentence was usually in the second place; but now under certain conditions, described on page 349, it is usually in the third place.

The most common order is: subject in the first place, verb in the second: ‘The boy loves his dog.’ This is called normal order.

If any other word for emphasis, or to establish a nearer relation with what goes on before, or because it lies nearer in thought, stands in the first place, the verb often still maintains the second place, followed by the subject in the third place. This is called inverted order. This order, once common in English, is now as a living force pretty well shattered. It is now most common in the case of emphatic adverbs and other emphatic modifiers of the verb which are made prominent by being put into the first place in the sentence. We cannot, however, freely place emphatic adverbs and objects into the first place immediately before the verb. We usually do this when not only the adverb or object is emphatic but also the verb. In such cases we usually employ auxiliaries, so that the real verb appears in the form of an infinitive or participle which contains only the verbal meaning and hence when stressed calls especial attention to the activity in question: ‘Seven times did this intrepid general repéat his attack.’ ‘Bitterly did we repént our decision.’ ‘Gládly would he now have consénted to the terms which he had once rejected.’ ‘Particularly did Florian réjóice in the tale of the saint’s birth’ (Cabell, The High Place, Ch. II). ‘Néver had I even dréamed of such a thing.’ ‘Bitter as
the pill was, rarely did he fail to force it down.' ‘Only once before have I seen such a sight.’ ‘Only two had merciful death released from their sufferings.’ ‘Whom did you meet?’ ‘When did you meet him?’ ‘Where did you say she put it?’ where the interrogative adverb where is even brought forward from the subordinate clause to introduce the sentence. The light auxiliary in all such cases has become attached to the strongly stressed adverb or object, so that the inverted order has become fixed here.

By glancing at the examples it will be noticed that the most common forms causing inversion are negatives, interrogatives, and adverbs expressing restriction. We today feel these three elements as the cause of inversion — not the accent, for we invert in questions when neither the interrogative nor the verb is stressed: ‘When will you go next?’ We invert in all questions introduced by an interrogative object or adverb simply because inversion has become fixed here. Similarly, we invert after a restriction of any kind, even after a clause, so that it cannot be a strongly stressed word that causes the inversion: ‘Only when the artist understands these psychological principles can he work in harmony with them’ (Spencer). Originally, the accent was the controlling force and still is felt here, but the controlling force now is the association of inversion with negatives, interrogatives, and restrictions.

When the principal proposition is inserted in a direct quotation or follows it, the principal verb may sometimes still, in accordance with the old inverted order, uniformly stand before the subject, but it is now more common here to regulate the word-order by the modern group stress, so that the heavier word, be it subject or verb, stands last in the group, just as elsewhere the heaviest word stands last: ‘“Harry,” continued the old man, “before you choose a wife, you must know my position,”’ but ‘“George,” she exclaimed, ‘“this is the happiest moment of my life.”’ ‘“You have acted selfishly,” was her cold retort,’ but ‘“You have acted selfishly,” she replied.’ In accordance with this principle the subject here almost always stands before a compound tense form or a combination of verbal forms: ‘“You must think that over again,” our dear mother would say.’ The word-order is similarly regulated by the modern group-stress in the case of a sentence which is inserted with the force of a sentence adverb (p. 132) within a sentence or a subordinate clause: ‘The wind whistled and moaned as if, thought Michael, all the devils in hell were trying to break into the holy building’ (Compton Mackenzie, Youth’s Encounter, Ch. V), but ‘The wind whistled and moaned as if, it seemed to him, all the devils in hell were trying to break into
the holy building.' As the word-order verb before the subject is so often found with quotations, as just described, it has become associated with quotations, so that it is sometimes employed at the beginning of a sentence to introduce a quotation: 'In Philadelphia I met the black author, publisher, and sidewalk retailer of a work entitled "The Ethiopian-American of Ancient and Modern Education." Writes he, "The name Ethiopian-American was founded and edited in order that we might discontinue the nickname Negro'" (Rollin Lynde Hartt in World's Work for July, 1924, p. 321).

Where the old inverted word-order is seemingly preserved, it is usually, except in the cases described in the three preceding paragraphs, not in a strict sense inversion. The subject instead of standing before the verb has been put at the end of the sentence for emphasis, as explained in 3 a, p. 4: 'Now comes my best trick.' 'To the list may be added the following names.' 'Down the street came a girl and a dog, rather a small girl and quite a behemothian dog' (H. Sydnor Harrison, Queed, Ch. I). In this still very common construction, the introductory words are not usually emphatic. Sometimes, however, they are stressed, but usually less strongly than the following stressed subject: 'Then came the dreaded end! And fast into this perilous gulf of night walked Bostinney (name) and fast after him walked George' (Galsworthy, The Man of Property, p. 321). 'Such are the life and character of this man!' Though this construction is in general quite common, it has its limitations, as described in 3 a, p. 4.

One feature of the old inverted order is still well preserved in declarative sentences. We still quite commonly put into the first place a heavily stressed word in the predicate other than a finite form of a verb; but now, except after a negative or a restriction, or where there is a heavy subject, as described above, the subject usually follows the introductory word or phrase, and is itself followed immediately by the verb: 'The gallant fellow fought for appearances and down he went' (Meredith, The Ordeal of Richard Feverel, Ch. II). 'Cantankerous chap Roger always was!' (Galsworthy, The Man of Property, p. 24). 'Very grateful they were for my offer.' 'Lucky it is that we know her name.' 'This threat he was quite unable to carry out.' We sometimes find the infinitive or participle of a compound verbal predicate in the first place followed immediately by the subject: 'Growl you will, but go you must.' "If you telegraph at once, he can be stopped," said the Inspector. And stopped he was.' It should be noted, however, that where the subject is quite heavy it must stand after the verb at or near the end, even though the sentence is
introduced by an emphatic element: ‘Up went this roaring dragonfly in which Peter was sitting... Up they went and up, until the world seemed nearly all sea, and the coast was far away’ (H. G. Wells, Joan and Peter, Ch. XIII), where in the first proposition the subject stands after the verb on account of its length and heaviness, but in the second proposition stands before the verb in accordance with the general rule. In all these sentences the verb stands in the third place, which, except after an interrogative, or negative, or where there is a heavy subject, is the usual position for the verb in a sentence introduced by an emphatic modifier of the verb or a predicate noun or adjective.

There is another common word-order here where we desire to put some important word (subject, object, adverb, adverbial phrase, predicate noun, or adjective) in the important initial position. We construe the emphatic word or phrase as a predicate whether it is actually a predicate or not and place it after it is, so that, though in a formal sense the predicate stands in the third place, the verb in the second place, the subject in the first place, the emphatic word in reality stands in the first place, for it is preceded only by it is, a mere formal introduction: ‘It is John that is guilty.’ ‘It was on Saturday that I saw him.’ For fuller description of this construction see 4 C II (p. 12) and 21 c.

The word-order with the verb in the third place has not only in large measure destroyed the inverted order in declarative sentences, as described on page 349, but it has also for the same reason displaced it for the most part in exclamations, where inversion is very old but now little used: ‘What good friends horses have been to us for thousands of years!’ ‘What clever he has!’ ‘How diligent you are!’ We sometimes, however, still find the old inverted order here, especially in choice prose and poetry: ‘How pleasant is this hill where the road widens! And how beautiful, again, is this patch of common at the hilltop with the clear pool!’ Here again, as illustrated for the declarative sentence, the old inverted order is only seemingly preserved. In most cases the subject instead of standing before the verb in its usual position has been put at the end for emphasis. Occasionally, however, the old inverted word-order is still employed: ‘Judith, Judith, how lovely are you!’ (Mary Johnston, The Long Roll, Ch. XVII). The old inverted word-order, of course, is used regularly where the expression approaches the nature of a question, especially where the answer is self-evident and no answer is expected: ‘Won’t she live to know what she has done! I can tell her of one that won’t pity her’ (Trollope, Prime Minister, Ch. XVI). Exclamations containing a negative usually have inverted order, as they
contain a question: ‘How many times had she not sat there, in white frocks, her hair hanging down as now!’ (Galsworthy, Free-
lands, Ch. XV), a blending of ‘How many times she had sat there!’ and ‘Had she not sat there many times?’

Originally, the normal word-order, i.e., the subject in the first place, was identical with the inverted order, that is, the subject stood in the first place for emphasis, or to establish a relation with what preceded it. This is not now its usual force. The normal word-order has become the form of expression suited to the mind in its normal condition of steady activity and easy movement, from which it only departs under the stress of emotion, or for logical reasons, or in conformity to fixed rules.

a. Origin of the Word-order with the Verb in the Second Place. In oldest English, the verb didn’t stand in the second or third place so regularly as today. We often find it at or near the end of the sentence. This oldest word-order, as illustrated also in 6 A, is still possible: ‘This under such circumstances I often do.’ The verb is here at the end preceded by its modifiers. This principle of placing the modifiers of a word before it is still very common in old compounds or group-words, which represent the oldest type of expression in the language: hóme-máde = made at home, tábłe-lég = leg of the table, ear-ring = ring for the ear, eyélàshës = lashes of the eye, etc. Such words arose at a time when there was no inflection, so that the fixed word-order alone indicated the grammatical relations. In oldest English, this old word-order was still in use, although the rich inflection at this time now made it possible to deviate from the old word-order. The stress on the first element of old compounds indicates clearly that the modifier was more strongly stressed than the governing word. This explains the frequent changes in the word-order of the sentence, which ever became more common from the oldest historic times on. The emphatic modifiers of the verb were often put at the end of the sentence after the verb in order to create the feeling of suspense and thus increase the emphasis. As the verb was thus not the center of attention and was often weakly stressed, it gradually settled into the weakly stressed position after the subject or the strongly accented object or adverb which often introduced the sentence.

Besides this rhythmical principle, there was also a psychological force active in establishing the verb in this position. The verb contains the basic idea of the predication, so that there was often, especially in long sentences, a tendency to bring it near the subject in order that the subject and predicate together might at the outset make clear the general line of thought and thus relieve the tension somewhat and make it possible to concentrate the attention upon the important details which were to be presented later. This new word-order with the verb following the subject must not, however, be thought of as something English. It took place long before the historic period, and is indeed very old. In our oldest literature both word-orders — the verb following the subject and the verb
at or near the end — were in use, but gradually the newer word-order with
the verb after the subject supplanted the older. Thus it gradually became
usual to place the subject first, the verb next, and then after them arrange
the modifiers of the verb in positions in accordance with their importance
and the grammatical relations, so that the word-order gradually assumed
the functions of the old case endings, which now for the most part as use­
less forms little by little disappeared. The originally emphatic order with
the modifiers of the verb after the verb became the new normal or inverted
order as they exist today, the latter of which has in large measure been
replaced by the word-order verb in the third place. These new types,
however, are not entirely rigid since we often put an adverb between sub­
ject and verb, as in ‘I often do that’ and sometimes even put the verb in
the last place, as illustrated on page 351.

The present word-order became established in the principal proposition
first. The old word-order with the verb at the end lingered on in the sub­
ordinate clause for centuries. The evident reason is that the subordinate
clause is felt as a grammatical unit, a subject, object, or adverbial element.
The attention is directed not so much to important details as to the
thought as a whole. In the old word-order with the verb at the end, the
verb contained the basic thought and, standing as it did in the important
position at the end, had a distinct stress, though often not so much as its
important modifiers. Though this old word-order was at last given up
also in the subordinate clause and the word-order in general conformed to
that employed in the principal proposition for the sake of the advantages
of that word-order in making the grammatical relations clear, the strong
stress of the verb still often distinguishes the subordinate clause: ‘As soon
as I entered the room, I noticed the disorder.’ Where as here the sub­
ordinate clause is clearly felt as a unit with a definite function in the
sentence, the verb receives a little stronger stress than its modifiers, while
in the principal proposition the modifiers are usually stressed more
strongly than the verb. Of course, however, the more independent a
clause becomes the more the attention is usually directed towards the
important details. On the other hand, if the attention in the principal
proposition is directed to the thought as a whole the verb or verbal phrase
of the predicate receives the stress: ‘A brave man never forsakes his post.’

2. Verb in the First Place. As seen on page 347, the first place
in the sentence is emphatic. In oldest English, however, this
emphatic position was not only reserved for the subject and im­
portant objects and adverbs, as in the examples given in 1,
but also an emphatic verb could stand in the first place. This
older order of things survives in wishes, in expressions of will
containing an imperative and often in those containing a volitive
subjunctive, also in questions that require yes or no for an answer:
‘Wére he only here!’ ‘Hánd me that book!’ ‘Cóme what will.’
‘Cóst what it may.’ ‘Did he gó?’ in older English ‘Wént he?’
In questions requiring yes or no for an answer only the outward
form of the older usage is preserved; the spirit is lost. In these questions, the personal part of the verb now stands in the first place, as in older English the simple verb. As a mere auxiliary it hasn’t strong stress. But notice that in both the older and the newer usage the real verb is stressed. Today we prefer to secure emphasis in questions by the employment of another old Germanic principle. We introduce the sentence by an unimportant word, in this case an unstressed auxiliary, and withhold for a time the real predicate, the infinitive, thus creating the feeling of suspense, which imparts emphasis.

If in questions requiring yes or no for an answer the question is asked in a tone of surprise, the form is that of a declarative sentence; but it is spoken with rising inflection: ‘You are going?’ We may employ the declarative form also when we do not understand a statement and ask for the repetition of it: ‘He went where?’ = ‘Whére did you say he went?’

In oldest English, the verb could stand in the first place also in lively narrative, since action is here the conspicuous feature. As illustrated in 4 II C, p. 13, the spirit of this old principle is still preserved, since we now in lively narrative place the verb as near the beginning of the sentence as possible, sometimes even put it in the first place, as in oldest English.
36. Tenses and Their Sequence. There are four absolute tenses (present, past, present perfect, and future), which express time from the standpoint of the moment in which the speaker is speaking without reference to some other act; and two relative tenses (past perfect and future perfect), which express time relatively to the preceding absolute tenses.

Originally, there were only two tenses in English — the present and the past. The six tenses now in use are made up of a combination of verbal forms, but in each tense there is always a present or a past tense. A tense containing a present tense is called a present tense form: he writes, he is writing, he has written, he will write, etc. A tense containing a past tense is called a past tense form: he wrote, he was writing, he had written, etc.

In English, there is a general rule of sequence when a past tense form precedes. When the governing proposition has a past tense form, a past tense form usually follows whether it is suitable to the occasion or not: ‘He says he is going tomorrow,’ but ‘He said he was going tomorrow.’ ‘He says he will go tomorrow,’ but ‘He said he would go tomorrow.’ ‘He says he has often done it,’ but ‘He said he had often done it.’ ‘He will surely decide to do it before his father comes,’ but ‘He decided to do it before his father came.’

This fixed sequence, however, is often not observed if it is
desired to represent something as customary, habitual, characteristic, or as universally true: 'He asked the guard what time the train usually starts.' 'He told me that Mary is quite diligent, works hard, sings beautifully.' 'I remembered that boys will be boys, and that you cannot put old heads on young shoulders.' 'He didn't seem to know that nettles sting.' 'Columbus proved that the world is round.' It is also not observed after a past subjunctive, as this form indicates present time: 'I should say that this book meets your requirements.'

There is a modern tendency to disregard the old sequence in certain subjunctive categories, as described in 43 II B a, b, 44 II 3, 44 II 5 A a (2nd par.), 44 II 10.

There is also a tendency in indirect discourse to break through the old sequence when a more accurate expression suggests itself. Thus instead of the first example in the third paragraph we may with greater accuracy say: 'He said he is going tomorrow.' Other examples are given in 44 II 3 a.

37. Uses of the Tenses. The following articles apply principally to the tenses of the indicative. The tenses of the subjunctive are treated under the head of the subjunctive mood, 41-44.

1. Present Tense.
   a. It represents an action as now going on, or a state as now existing: 'He is writing.' 'There he comes.' 'He is quite sick.'
   b. It represents an act as habitual, customary, repeated, characteristic: 'He lives in town in winter, in the country in summer.' 'I call on him whenever I go to town.' 'He writes beautifully.' 'He loves his mother tenderly.'
   c. It expresses a general truth: 'Twice two is four.'
   d. Historical Present. In narrative, especially in a lively style, the historical present is much used to make more vivid past events and bring them nearer the hearer: 'Soon there is a crowd around the little prostrate form, the latest victim of reckless speeding. A strong man holds the little fellow in his arms. The crowd makes room for a little woman who cries out, "Give me my boy!"'

The historical present, though now a favorite in a lively literary style, was almost unknown in the literature of the Old English period. It did not become common in the literary language until about 1300. From then on its frequent use indicates that its evident advantages in lively description had at last become appreciated in the higher forms of literature.

Somewhat similar to the historical present is the annalistic present, which registers historical facts as matters of present
interest: ‘It is not till the close of the Old English period that Scandinavian words appear. Even Late Northumbrian (of about 970) is entirely free from Scandinavian influence . . . With the accession of Edward the Confessor in 1042 Norman influence begins’ (Sweet, New English Grammar, I, p. 216).

e. USE OF THE PRESENT TENSE FOR THE FUTURE. As in oldest English, when there was no distinct form for a future tense, the present is still often used for the future, especially when some adverb of time, or conjunction of time or condition, or the situation makes clear the thought: ‘I am going.’ ‘He is coming’ (compare 38 1, 9th par.) soon.’ ‘I want to see you and talk something over, so I am running’ (compare 38 1, 9th par.) down on Sunday afternoon’ (Galsworthy, The Country House, I, Ch. VII). ‘I am leaving’ (compare 38 1, 9th par.) Rose Cottage today’ (Mrs. Craik, John Halifax, Gentleman, Ch. XV). ‘When does the ship sail?’ ‘It sails tonight.’ ‘When does the train start?’ ‘When does the lease run out?’ ‘When can you start?’ ‘When must you be back?’ ‘The sooner you come back, the better it will be.’ ‘When you try it a second time, you’ll succeed better.’ ‘We are waiting until he comes.’ ‘If you move, I shoot.’ This old use of the present tense for future time is best preserved in abridged infinitival and gerundial clauses, where it is the regular future: ‘He is planning to go.’ ‘He promises to do it.’ ‘I am counting on his doing it.’

The idea of futurity often lies in the present tense form am (is, etc.) going in connection with a to-infinitive, originally a clause of purpose or result, so that the conception of intention or result is often still felt alongside of the idea of futurity: ‘I am going to walk to Geisingen; from there I shall go by train to Engen.’ ‘What are you going to be when you are grown up?’ Often to express an earnest purpose: ‘I am going to put my foot down on that!’ The idea of futurity is often associated with that of immediateness: ‘Look out! I am going to shoot.’ ‘I am going to call on him soon.’ ‘I am afraid it is going to rain.’ This future form often points to a result either near at hand or farther off with the implication of the certainty of fulfilment: ‘This show is going to attract a good deal of attention.’ ‘He is an unusually bright boy, and is moreover very energetic and diligent. He is going to be an important man sometime.’ Compare 38 2 b e (4th par.).

The idea of futurity and immediateness lies in the present tense of to be on the point (or verge) of in connection with the gerund: ‘She is on the point of crying.’ ‘He is on the verge of breaking down.’

The present is often employed in the subordinate clause with
the force of the future to indicate that something as yet merely desired or planned for the future is confidently expected to be realized, the present indicative here representing an older present subjunctive: ‘I'll see you get there’ (Edith Wharton, Ethan Frome). Compare 43 2 B a (1st par.).

The idea of futurity often lies in am (is, etc.) in connection with a predicate to-infinitive, usually, however, mingled with the modal force described in 7 D 2: ‘He is to be there.’ ‘He is to be hanged.’ ‘There is to be a dance after the program.’ ‘The children are to have a holiday tomorrow.’ Compare 38 2 b ee (4th par.).

f. The present is often used where the reference is to a past act and the present perfect might be used. The speaker uses the present tense as though the words had just been spoken, since he feels the matter as one of present interest: ‘We read in the paper that you are going to Europe soon.’ ‘We hear that you have had some good luck.’ ‘I learn that you are going to sell your house.’ Similarly, we quote an old author when we feel that his words have weight in questions of the hour: ‘Homer says that,’ etc.

g. The present is sometimes used instead of the present perfect to express that an action or state that was begun in the past is still continuing at the present time, usually accompanied by some adverbial element, such as these many years, these forty years, long since, long ago: ‘Lo, these many years do I serve thee,’ etc. (Luke, XV, 29). ‘Nicholas Vedder! Why he is dead and gone these eighteen years’ (Washington Irving, Sketch-Book, V). ‘Did you ever see any scalping, or anything horrible yourself, my dear?’ — ‘Oh no, Miss Tarlton, all that is over long ago. The Indians are in the reservations now’ (Mrs. Humphry Ward, Daphne). ‘When was that, Joan?’ — ‘It is nearly three years ago now’ (Mark Twain, Joan of Arc, I, Ch. VII) = ‘It has been nearly three years.’

In Irish English, the present progressive form accompanied by a temporal adverbial expression is much used, corresponding to the literary present perfect: ‘I am sitting here waiting for you for the last hour’ (Joyce, English as We Speak It in Ireland, 85).

h. In adverbial clauses the present tense is often used instead of the future perfect: ‘Telegraph me as soon as he arrives.’

2. Past. It is used to represent an act as done, or as regularly or habitually done, or as going on in time wholly past at the present moment, although it may have been performed only a few seconds before; but, if this tense is employed, the time of the act must be stated accurately or indicated clearly by the context, so that the idea of indefiniteness or generality is entirely excluded: ‘I bought this bronze when I was in Naples.’ ‘I misplaced my
pencil a moment ago and can’t find it.” ‘This man was rich in
days past.’ ‘The lightning struck a house yesterday.’ ‘Last week
I went to town every day.’ ‘I was working in the garden when he
came.’ This is the common tense of narrative, where one event
is represented as going on in connection with another.

3. Present Perfect. The present perfect tense represents an
act as completed at the present moment: ‘I have just finished my
work.’ ‘I have written a long letter to Father.’ Stress upon the
tense auxiliary emphasizes the idea of the reality of the attain­
ment: ‘Why don’t you finish your work?’ — ‘I have finished it.’
We belittle or ridicule the attainment by stressing the auxiliary
and speaking in a sarcastic tone: ‘Well, you have made a figure
of yourself’ (Susan Warner, The Wide, Wide World, Ch. X).
Compare 6 A d (1).

The present perfect has developed out of the present tense of
transitive verbs: ‘I have written the letter,’ originally ‘I have the
letter written,’ i.e., in a written state. As having the letter in a
written state implies previous action, have written gradually ac­
quired verbal force, serving as a verbal form, pointing to the past
and bringing it into relations with the present. Originally the
Germanic past tense had a similar force, but gradually the idea
of the past so overshadowed that of the present that a desire
arose for a new form that would express a close relation between
past and present. In early Old English this desire found an ex­
pression in the formation of the new present perfect tense. Sim­
ilarly, in Latin and Greek the idea of the past so overshadowed
that of the present in the perfect tense that it led in popular speech
to the creation of a new perfect, a present perfect formed with
the auxiliary have, which survives in the Romance languages and
Modern Greek. In the original form of the English construction
the past participle, as written in the sentence given above, was an
objective predicate participial adjective and as a predicate had
a strong stress. Even in oldest English the participle sometimes
assumed strong verbal force, transferring to the preceding noun
its strong stress, since the object is usually more forcibly accented
than the verb. Later, the strongly accented object was placed
after the participle, in accordance with the general tendency to
place strongly accented words after words with weaker stress.
Thus arose a clear formal differentiation between ‘I have the
letter written,’ the old present tense, and ‘I have written the letter,’
the new perfect tense. The development of the perfect tense
suggested the formation of the new past perfect: ‘I had written
the letter.’ Thus English was enriched by the creation of two
new tenses, the present perfect and past perfect, which were added
to the two original English tenses, the present and the past. Dura-
tive (38 1) intransitives followed the analogy of transitives: ‘I
have worked’ and ‘I had worked.’

Point-action (38 2) intransitives, however, did not at once
participate in this development. The present perfect remained
in reality a present tense, the perfect participle serving as a predi-
cate adjective indicating a state, the present tense of the copula
performing the function of predication: ‘The tree is fallen’ =
‘The tree is in a fallen state’ and ‘The tree has fallen.’ Similarly,
‘The tree was fallen’ had the meaning ‘The tree was in a fallen
state’ or ‘The tree had fallen.’ This old order of things continued
throughout the Old English period and into the Middle English
period, but in Middle English there began to appear alongside
of the forms with is and was forms with has and had wherever the
perfect participle had clear verbal force. The forms with is and
was slowly disappeared, but a few survivals are still to be found,
especially in poetic language and in a few set expressions: ‘The
melancholy days are come.’ ‘We are (or have) assembled here to
discuss a difficult question.’ ‘Our friend is (or has) departed’
(i.e., is dead). ‘The messenger is (or has) gone.’ ‘This morning
the police found the nest of the thieves, but the birds were (or had)
flown.’ Today we only, as in these examples, use is and was when
we feel the perfect participle as expressing more or less clearly the
idea of a state and hence as having the force of an adjective.
Earlier in the period, however, is and was could still be used where
the perfect participle had clear verbal force: ‘The King himself
is rode to view their battle’ (Shakespeare, *Henry the Fifth*, IV, III,
2). ‘I am this instant arrived here’ (Witham Marsh, *Letter*,
written at Albany, N. Y., April 18, 1763, to Sir William Johnson).
We must now in plain prose say here has ridden, have arrived.
The older usage of employing a present tense form for the present
perfect lingered also in the passive: ‘Besides I met Lord Bigot
and Lord Salisbury, With eyes as red as new-enkindled fire, And
others more, going to seek the grave Of Arthur, whom (23 II 8 d)
they say is (now has been) kill’d to-night On your suggestion’
(Shakespeare, *King John*, IV, ii, 162). ‘Since writing I am (now
have been) credibly informed that,’ etc. (Sir William Johnson,
*Letter*, written at Johnstown, N. Y., Feb. 9, 1764, to John
Penn).

Although the present perfect is no longer a present tense, it
still preserves much of its original meaning in that it is usually
employed when the time is felt as not wholly past but still at least
in close relations with the present: ‘My brother bought two hats
this morning,’ but ‘My brother has bought two hats this week,’
since the speaker feels that the period in question is not yet closed. ‘I went to the theater last night,’ but ‘I have been ill all night and do not feel like going to work this morning,’ since the speaker still feels the effects of the night’s illness. The present perfect can be used of time past only where the person or the thing in question still exists and the idea of past time is not prominent, i.e., where the reference is general or indefinite: ‘John has been punished many times’ (general statement), but ‘John was punished many times last year’ (definite). ‘I have been in England twice’ (indefinite time), but ‘I was in England twice last year.’ ‘England has had many able rulers,’ but ‘Assyria had many able rulers,’ since Assyria no longer exists as an independent country. ‘It was one of those epidemic frenzies which have fallen upon great cities in former ages of the world’ (Hall Caine, The Christian) (general and indefinite). ‘I have in times past more than once taken my political life in my hands’ (Daily Telegram, Sept. 8, 1903) (general and indefinite). There is often a marked difference of tone between the past and the present perfect tense. In referring to something that has taken place, the speaker uses the past when he speaks in a lively tone with a vivid impression upon his mind of what has occurred, while he employs the present perfect when he speaks in a calmer, more detached tone: ‘Did you ever see anything to beat it?’ (Tarkington, Napoleon Was a Little Man), but in a calmer, more detached tone: ‘Have you ever seen anything to beat it?’

a. Present Perfect to Represent an Act as Still Continuing. On account of the firm relation of the present perfect tense to present time it is much used to indicate that an act begun in the past is still continuing: ‘He has been working hard all day,’ but when the time is wholly past ‘He worked hard all day yesterday.’ ‘How long have you been studying German?’ ‘She hasn’t left her bed for a week.’ ‘I have known him for years.’

b. Present Perfect with Force of Present. With one verb, namely, get, the idea of present time in the present perfect tense often overshadows that of past time, so that the form has the force of a present tense: ‘I have got (=have) a cold, a new car,’ etc. ‘I have got (=have) to do it.’ Have got, however, is not an exact equivalent of have; it has more grip in it, emphasizing the idea of the possession or the necessity as the result of some recent occurrence: ‘He has a blind eye,’ but ‘Look at John; he has got a black eye.’ But in colloquial and popular speech the development has gone farther: has got often has the meaning of simple have: ‘What have you got (=have you) in your hand?’

In Negro dialect got (elliptical for have got) sometimes has the s-ending of the present tense, gots serving for all persons and numbers, as described in 8 I 1 h: ‘I gots good news’ (Du Bose Heyward, Porgy, p. 54). The
negative form is ain't gots: ‘Such as yuh ain't gots no use fuh he’ (ib., p. 53).

Similarly, the past-present verbs (Accidence, 57 4), can, may, etc., are now felt as present tense forms, although in fact they are old past tense forms. The Germanic past tense once had the force of our present perfect. In the past tense of most verbs the idea of past time finally overshadowed that of present time, but in these few past tense forms the idea of present time overshadows that of past time.

c. Present Perfect in Popular Irish. This tense is here often formed by placing the present of the verb be before the preposition after + a gerund, if one desires to indicate that something has taken place only a short while or immediately before the time one is speaking: ‘I'm after walking up in great haste from hearing wonders at the fair’ (J. M. Synge, The Well of the Saints, p. 8). Elsewhere the regular present perfect form is used. Occasionally, however, in the case of transitive verbs, Irishmen place the object before the perfect participle instead of after it, which gives a peculiar flavor to their language: ‘Have you your tea taken?’ (Lennox Robinson, The Whiteheaded Boy, Act I, p. 11).

To express that an action that was begun in the past is still continuing, the present progressive is often used in popular Irish instead of the literary present perfect progressive. For an example see 1 g, p. 357.

d. ‘Be’ for ‘Have’ in Dialect. In certain British dialects be is used as tense auxiliary instead of have. Also in certain American dialects: ‘Is you seed any sign er (of) my gran’son dis mawnin?’ (Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, p. 55).

4. Past Perfect Tense. This form represents a past action or state as completed at or before a certain past time: ‘After he had finished the book, he returned it.’ For the origin and the earlier form of the past perfect tense see 3, p. 358.

In colloquial speech, the past tense is still often used for the past perfect, as in the early period before the creation of a past perfect: ‘After he finished the book, he returned it.’ This usually occurs, as in this example, where the verb has point-action (38 2) force. Even in the literary language the past is used instead of the past perfect where some other idea overshadows that of the exact time relations: ‘John was punished because he broke a window.’ Of course, John broke the window before he was punished for it, but the fact of the breaking, in and of itself, is what is uppermost in the mind, not the exact time relations. In ‘As soon as he heard that, he turned pale’ heard cannot be replaced by had heard, although in fact the person in question heard the bad news before he turned pale. The use of the past perfect here would stress the time relation too much and call the attention away from the close relation of the two acts, the one following the other immediately.
In popular Irish English, the past perfect idea is expressed by
the past of be + after + gerund: 'To hear the talk of you, you'd think I was after beating you' (Synge, The Well of the Saints, Act II).

5. Future Tense. This form represents an action or state as yet to take place or to come into being: 'I shall be sorry if you do not come.' 'You will be sorry if you do not come along.' 'He will do it tomorrow.' This is the pure future.

The future is often used in commands. See 45 4 c.

The future often, most commonly, however, in the English of England, indicates a present probability, the future form implying that upon investigation the truth of the statement will become apparent: ‘This will be your luggage, I suppose," said the man rather abruptly when he saw me, pointing to my trunk in the passage' (Charlotte Brontë, Jane Eyre, Ch. XI). ‘At Okehampton a brisk young-looking man with a clean-shaved face appeared before Elizabeth. "You’ll be Miss Densham, I reckon," he said slowly' (Phillpotts, The Beacon, I, Ch. II, p. 13). ‘It’s not like Jolyon to be late! I suppose it’ll be June (name) keeping him’ (Galsworthy, The Man of Property, p. 48). ‘Mother will be expecting me.’ The future perfect in such expressions, of course, points to the past: 'You will have seen from my postcard that we were at Ostend.'

a. Form of the Future Tense. The contracted forms 'll, 'd represent usually reductions of will, would, never contractions of shall, should: 'I'll go, we'll go, I'd go.' In 'I'd better go' I'd stands for I had. The negative form will not appears often as won't, representing an older variant form of will, namely woll, woll not becoming won't. The contracted form of shall not is shan't. The written forms I shall, we shall are often in rapid speech pronounced Ishl, weeshl. In dialect I shall is often reduced to I'se: 'I'se lay a wager he was christened John Trotter' (Smollett, Roderick Random, Ch. XII).

In spite of the great importance of a pure future, English has not yet developed such a form. Our future tense is made up of modal auxiliaries which are not only used as future forms but are sometimes employed elsewhere with their old modal meanings, so that they sometimes do not convey the pure idea of tense but are associated also with modal conceptions. The following forms have grown up and are now recognized as a literary standard, but they are far from representing the usage of educated people in all parts of the English-speaking territory. They are followed in England proper better than anywhere else, but not uniformly even there.
In the declarative form, *shall* is used in the first person and *will* in the second and third persons: ‘I shall die, we shall die, you will die, he will die, they will die.’

The use of *shall* in the first person as a pure future has developed out of one of its modal meanings, *am to*, indicating a constraint of circumstances, duty, or the will of another, a meaning still common: ‘I’m bad enough, God knows, and I’m afraid, I shall (= am to, must) find my way to hell some day’ (Eggleston, *Circuit Rider*, p. 323). The idea of constraint in the first person is often overshadowed by the conception of future occurrence, which is often implied in the idea of constraint: ‘I shall return tomorrow.’ Thus the modal force often yields in the first person to the conception of pure futurity. *Shall* in the first person, singular and plural, is the standard usage in England, though not uniformly observed, and is still the preferred form in the higher grades of the literary language in America, though now not so uniformly used as it once was. In American colloquial speech *will* is now the more common form in the first person as well as in the second and the third: ‘We will be terribly poor, I know’ (Floyd Dell, *This Mad Ideal*, IV, Ch. VI). In the English of England *will* is used in the first person as a pure future only when in a compound subject *I* or *we* is preceded by a pronoun in the second person, or by a noun or pronoun in the third person: ‘You and I will get on excellently well’ (Dickens, *Martin Chuzzlewit*, Ch. V). ‘Eddie and I will be delighted to come on Monday’ (A. Marshall, *The Greatest of These*, Ch. X). The preceding pronoun or noun in the second or third person here influences the selection of the auxiliary. But we employ *will* here also to express willingness, intention, so that the tone of the voice or the situation must decide the meaning: ‘John and I will assist you.’

The use of *will* in the second and third persons as a pure future developed out of its modal meaning of *wish, desire*. The idea of desire was overshadowed in the second and third persons by the conception of future occurrence, pure futurity, which is often implied in the idea of *desire*. If a person desires to do something, we may often infer that he will do it: ‘He will go to town tomorrow.’ The use of *will* in the second and third persons in the last centuries to express pure futurity in contrast to the older use of *shall* here has resulted from a feeling of politeness, a desire to represent the act, not as a command of the speaker, but as springing from the will of the person addressed or the person spoken of. Though we now usually employ *will* in the second and third persons as an auxiliary to indicate pure futurity, it is still sometimes used with its older modal force expressing desire, will-
ingness, determination: ‘You will help me, I am sure.’ ‘They will not look the question in the face.’ ‘The Court cannot and will not stand journalistic personalities about its members’ (Nineteenth Century, Dec., 1891, p. 859).

If we use will in the first person, it is not a future tense auxiliary, but a modal auxiliary indicating a desire, intention, willingness, inclination, determination: ‘I’ll send it to you next week’ (promise). ‘I will do it for you,’ but ‘I shall be glad to do it for you,’ for we do not desire to say that we are willing to be glad but that we shall be glad, employing a pure future to express confidently a future result. ‘I will subscribe to your fund.’ ‘I’ll never give my consent to that’ (resolution).

In the first person alongside of modal will, which represents a resolution as sprung from the feeling of the moment, is modal shall, which represents the resolution as the result of previous deliberation, or deep conviction, or deeply rooted feeling, and represents the execution as assured — not future shall as claimed by some English grammarians, but a genuine modal shall, for it is used by Americans who use will for the pure future: ‘Then, Patty, since you make me choose, I shall not give up the Lord even for you’ (Eggleston, Circuit Rider, Ch. XIX). ‘I shall (= have decided to) send my two boys to Harvard.’ ‘I shall stand my ground as firmly as I can.’ ‘I shall do nothing of the kind’ (peremptory refusal). In questions shall in the first person often inquires after the will of the person addressed: ‘What shall I do next?’ But stressed shall often has quite a different meaning here: ‘What shall I (= am I to) do?’ Stressed will expresses determination in all three persons: ‘I will go, no matter what you say.’ ‘You will (he will) act foolishly, in spite of my advice.’ Unstressed will is often used in one of its old meanings inclined to when we desire to indicate an action as customary: ‘John will often sit for hours alone on the porch.’ ‘Courage will come and go.’ ‘Whenever I asked Edward about bis adventures he would begin to talk about something else.’ A strong stress here indicates a strong inclination, tendency: ‘Children will be noisy.’ ‘Acci­dents will happen.’

Just as will is a future tense auxiliary only in the second and third persons, shall is a future tense auxiliary only in the first person. Hence, when shall is employed in the second and third persons, it must be a modal auxiliary. As a modal auxiliary it indicates the will of someone other than its subject, representing its subject as standing under the will of another who commands him, promises or assures him something, wishes something to be arranged to suit him, threatens him, resolves to do something for
his benefit or injury, or it represents the speaker as determined to bring something about or prevent it: 'Thou shalt not kill' (commandment). 'I won't do it.' — 'You shall [do it]!' (a strong expression of will, of a command). 'You shall pay me at your convenience,' i.e., 'you are to pay me, it is my desire that you pay me at your convenience.' 'You shall have some cake' (promise). 'If you trust him you shall not misplace your confidence' (a personal assurance, a usage once common but now usually replaced by the future, you will not misplace). 'You shall not catch me again! ' 'You shall pay for that!' (threat). 'She shall not regret her kindness to me' (resolution). 'He shall pay for that!' (resolution). 'I mean it; nothing shall stop me!' 'You (or he) shall not have any' (refusal). The constraint is often that of authority, convention, good usage, etc.: 'Immigrants shall be treated with kindness and civility by every one' (notice posted at different points on Ellis Island). 'Why shall he (the pupil) not say, "He or I are going"?' (P. Chubb, The Teaching of English, p. 214). (Because it is illogical and is forbidden by good usage.) The constraint is often that of circumstances: 'I'll sell my new red cloak sooner than yo' (= you) shall (= must) go unpaid' (Mrs. Gaskell, Sylvia's Lovers, Ch. V). It represents the speaker as proclaiming the will of God or destiny in a prophetic or oracular announcement of something that shall take place: 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away' (Matthew, XXIV, 35). 'The time shall come when Egypt shall be avenged!' (Lytton, Pompeii, II, Ch. VIII). Often in rhetorical and deliberative questions (p. 212): 'When doctors disagree, who shall (= is to, can) decide?' 'Who shall (= is to, can) tell of what he was thinking?' (Galsworthy, The Man of Property, p. 367). 'Which of these views shall the student of English (= is the student of English to, or ought the student of English to) accept?'

In independent questions, shall and will are used as pure futures in the first and third persons, as in the declarative form, but in the second person that auxiliary is used which is expected in the answer, so that also in questions we must carefully distinguish between tense and modal auxiliaries: 'Shall (tense auxiliary) we have the pleasure of seeing you tomorrow?' 'Will (tense auxiliary) he come tomorrow?' 'Shall (tense auxiliary) you have time enough tomorrow to do this for me?' corresponding to the expected answer, 'I shall have time enough'; but 'Will (modal auxiliary) you do this for me?' i.e., 'are you willing to do this for me?' corresponding to the expected answer, 'I will do it for you.' Instead of the present tense will here we often use the past subjunctive would, the polite volitive (43 1 A), in order to put the
question more modestly or politely: ‘Would you tell me the time, please?’ If, however, the question is not a real one expecting an answer, but a so-called rhetorical question, we do not use shall anticipating a shall in the answer, but we employ will, the usual second person form: ‘Will you ever live to realize all these dreams?’

Shall is much used in questions in the first and third persons as a modal auxiliary to ascertain the will, idea, or thought of the person addressed: ‘What shall he do next?’ ‘What shall I help you to?’ (at the table). ‘Shall we go?’ but ‘We won’t pay till the end of the week — will we?’ since won’t has preceded, expressing the will of the speaker, and will is added to invite, as it were, the concurrence of the person addressed. Similarly: ‘We would do it for you, wouldn’t we, Graham?’ But ‘We will do it for you, shall we?’ since the speaker leaves the decision entirely with the person addressed.

In dependent statements and questions containing a pure future the auxiliaries are used in accordance with the general rule, shall in the first person and will in the second and third, usually entirely without regard to the auxiliary used in the direct form of statement: ‘He says that I shall (in American colloquial speech will) surely fail,’ direct ‘You will surely fail.’ ‘He fears he will not arrive in time,’ direct ‘I shall not arrive in time,’ or sometimes here in the third person with the auxiliary used in the direct statement, as explained more fully in 44 II 3 a: ‘He fears that he shall not arrive in time.’ On the other hand, in the case of modal auxiliaries we always use the auxiliary employed in the direct form, without regard to the person: ‘He says he will do it,’ direct ‘I will do it.’ ‘He often asks me whether I will do it for him,’ direct ‘Will you do it for me?’ Of course, in all these cases after a past tense shall becomes should and will becomes would: ‘He said that I should (in American colloquial speech would) surely fail,’ direct ‘You will surely fail.’ ‘He feared he would not arrive in time,’ direct ‘I shall not arrive in time,’ or sometimes here in the third person with the auxiliary used in the direct statement: ‘He feared he should not arrive in time.’ On the other hand, in the case of modal auxiliaries we always use the auxiliary employed in the direct statement: ‘He said he would do it,’ direct ‘I will do it.’ ‘He often asked me whether I would do it,’ direct ‘Will you do it?’ Compare 44 II 3 a.

Wherever the idea of uncertainty enters into our conceptions of the future, as in the principal proposition of a theoretical conditional sentence (44 II 5 B), we employ as future subjunctive forms to indicate a future result the past potential (41, 2nd par.) should
in the first person and the past potential *would* in the second and third. 'If he should go away without speaking to me, I *should* be grieved.' 'If I should go away without speaking to him, he *would* be grieved.' This use of *should* and *would* as potential subjunctive futures is modern. In older English, *would* in all three persons was often used in the principal proposition of a theoretical conditional sentence with its old volitive (43 I A, 7th par.) force, expressing desire, willingness, intention, and this old usage still not infrequently occurs: 'If he should treat me in that way, I just *wouldn't* stand it.' 'If we should treat you in that way, you just *wouldn't* stand it.' 'If we should treat him in that way, he just *wouldn't* stand it.' Compare 44 II 5 B.

Instead of the first person form *should* in the principal proposition of these theoretical conditional sentences we sometimes use *would*, provided it has just been used by someone in speaking to us, since we feel a desire to reply to him in his own terms, catching up the very word he used: 'You *would* think so yourself if you were in my position.' — 'No, I *wouldn't*,' or 'Would I though?' or with the regular form 'I *should not*.'

We often use the regular form of the principal proposition of a theoretical conditional sentence as a form to express an opinion modestly, employing *should* in the first person and *would* in the second and third: 'I *should* regard this course as unwise.' 'I *should* think so.' 'It *would* (sometimes, in accordance with older usage, *should*) seem so.' Compare 44 I and II 5 D. Such modest expressions containing the future subjunctive of result should not be confounded with modest expressions containing the modal *should*, which indicates that the subject is under some kind of constraint, the constraint of duty, circumstances, or the will of another: 'I *should* (ought to) help him.' 'I *should* (under the circumstances) go.' 'You *should* (ought to) go.' 'We *should* hurry' (admonition). *Should*, however, often becomes quite emphatic: 'You *should* go if I had my way.' 'You *should* mind your own business.' This modal *should* is used in all three persons.

In all expressions of desire with reference to the immediate future, the past subjunctive *would*, a modest optative (43 I B), is milder in force than *will*: 'I *would* not have you think unkindly of me.' 'Your present plan may have its advantages, but I *would* suggest quite a different course.' 'Would you pass the salt?' 'I think he *would* do it for you.' 'I am sure your father *would* not have you neglect this opportunity.' But in the first person we usually employ *should* in 'I *should* like to go' and 'I *should* prefer to stay at home,' for the idea of desire is expressed in *like* and *prefer* and to use *would* here would be expressing this idea
twice. We usually employ the pure future form *should* here, as we desire something for the immediate future and wish to express this desire modestly. Similarly, we employ *should* in questions where we expect *should* in the answer: ‘How *should* you like to go to New York?’ corresponding to the expected answer ‘I *should* like to go to New York.’ ‘*Should* you prefer to stay at home?’ corresponding to the expected answer ‘I *should* prefer to stay at home.’ Even good authors, however, often use *would* improperly in the first person in declarative statements and in the second person in questions, not feeling the tautology: ‘I *would* like to show you my den’ (Mrs. H. Ward, *Richard Meynell*, II, Ch. X). In questions this tendency to use *would* instead of *should* is especially strong: ‘*Would* you like to go to New York?’ Some employ in the first person *should* instead of *would* when the auxiliary is associated with *rather*, feeling that the adverb contains the idea of desire: ‘They bury men with their faces to the East. I *should rather* have mine turned to the West’ (Kingsley, *Westward Ho!* Ch. XVI). But *would* is the proper form here, for *rather* has other common meanings and hence does not of itself express desire or preference: ‘I *would rather* stay at home.’ In all declarative statements we, of course, always use *would* with *like, prefer, rather, etc.*, in the second and third persons, for *would* is here a pure future: ‘I know you *would* like to go.’ ‘He *would prefer* to stay at home.’ ‘He *would rather* stay at home.

The usage described above began to take definite shape in the southeast of England in the second half of the sixteenth century, and became fairly well fixed there in the course of the seventeenth. Although at this time *will* had become the usual pure future form in the second and third persons, older *shall* still continued to be used alongside of it, usually with a slight modal tinge: ‘What will you say if I make it so perspicuously appeare now that yourself *shall* (now in plain prose *will*) confesse nothing more possible’ (Ben Jonson, *Every Man out of His Humour*, IV, v, A.D. 1600). Similarly, in theoretical conditions *should* was still often used at this time in the second and third persons: ‘[if we *should* act so] This *should* (now *would*) be treacherie’ (Marlowe, *Tamburlaine, Second Part*, II, i, A.D. 1590). The pure future form *shall* was at this time fairly well fixed here in the first person: ‘Gentlemen, you three take one Boat, and Sogliardo and I *will* (modal) take another: we *shall* (pure future) be there immediately’ (Ben Jonson, *Every Man out of His Humour*, IV, v). ‘But I *will* (modal) say that unless you take some speedy and effectual resolution in this particular, I *shall* (pure future) look like the veriest rogue’ (Sir William Temple, *Letter*, Oct. 13, 1665).
As there was a strong immigration into our country from the southeast of England at this time, shall was often used as a pure future sign in the first person, so that at the very beginning of our literary language it became more or less firmly established as the literary form, although will was sometimes used here, and later became the common form in colloquial and popular speech: ‘I shall not need to name particular, they are too well known to all’ (Bradford, History of Plymouth Plantation, p. 299, A.D. 1630–1648). The Englishman, Sir William Temple, quoted on page 368, employs shall in the third person of indirect discourse, corresponding to a shall in the first person of direct discourse, as described on page 366: ‘He says, if he failes in his enterprise, he shall esteem his condition not at all the worse’ (Letter, Sept. 6, 1665). This use of shall (or, after a past indicative, should) in indirect discourse is in British English still not infrequent, but is not so common as will (or would). In American literary English, this use of shall or should is still less common. In our older American literature, however, it often occurs: ‘Their answer was, as before, that it was a false calumniation, for they had many amongst them that they liked well of, and were glad of their company; and should (now usually would) be of any such like that should come amongst them’ (Bradford, History of Plymouth Plantation, p. 184, A.D. 1630–1648). ‘He used to tell his friends after his release that he verily believed, if he had not taken this method, he should (now usually would) have lost his senses’ (Benjamin Franklin, Writings, II, p. 70). The use of shall or should in the first and third persons, as illustrated above, is preserved in part in the native popular and colloquial speech of New England: ‘Give wut they need, an’ we shell git ’fore long A nation all one piece, rich, peacefle, strong’ (J. R. Lowell, The Biglow Papers, No. XI). ‘He sez he shall vote for Gineral C.’ (ib., No. III). ‘Charley Marden remarked that he shouldn’t be surprised if,’ etc. (Thomas Bailey Aldrich, The Story of a Bad Boy, Ch. VIII). ‘I shall go mad ’fore long if some-thin’ don’t happen’ (Amy Lowell, Selected Poems, p. 179).

Our present literary usage is characterized by a much less frequent employment of shall in the second and third persons than found in early Modern English, since shall in these persons is so intimately associated with the idea of the constraint of circumstances or the will of another than the subject that it is now avoided here as an unclear form in favor of will, which in these persons is not so charged with modal force.

The expression of future time in our common colloquial English follows, in general, the usage of England, as described above, but differs from it in one important point, namely, will and would
are used as the signs of the pure future, not only in the second and third persons, but also in the first person: 'Patty, I tell you I'm wretched and will be till I die' (Eggleston, Circuit Rider, p. 290). 'Do you really think we would (for literary should) be happy [if we should marry]?' (Floyd Dell, This Mad Ideal, IV, Ch. VIII).

Under the influence of the strong national drift, will and would often occur here also in the literary language of prominent Americans: 'I have come to believe that should I violate this law (i.e., the law he had made for himself never to ask for an office) I would fail' (James A. Garfield, Journal for December, 1880). 'If men cannot now, after this agony of bloody sweat, come to their self-possession and see how to regulate the affairs of the world, we will sink back into a period of struggle in which there will be no hope, therefore no mercy' (Woodrow Wilson, March 5, 1919). 'If I could feel that our laws and the administration of our laws were in the future to be such as would be conducive to the health and morals, the prosperity and happiness, of the average citizen of our country, I would feel confident, wholly confident of the future' (William E. Borah in the U. S. Senate, 1916).

The use of will as a sign of the pure future in all three persons is also a marked characteristic of popular Scotch, Welsh, and Irish English. This usage was already in early Modern English fairly well established in the popular English of Scotland and Wales and in general also of the intervening western shore country. After the invasion of Ireland in the twelfth century English colonies were established in the southeast. English spread in the thirteenth century, but in the next centuries declined. Still later, in the seventeenth century, new life came into the colonization of Ireland. The Irish English of our time rests for the most part upon this later stream of immigration. As these colonists were largely from the western part of Great Britain, the will-future became established in these colonies. In the seventeenth century under James I a large part of Ulster in North Ireland was given over to Scotch settlers, who, of course, brought their will-future along with them. Settlers from southwestern Lancashire carried it to the Isle of Man. Scotch, Irish, and Welsh immigrants have furthered this usage in American colloquial speech.

The use of will as a pure future sign in the first person as well as in the second and third is, however, not unknown in the English of England proper: 'An (= if) bad thinking do not wrest true speaking, I'll offend nobody' (Shakespeare, Much Ado about Nothing, III, iv, 33). 'Very well; then I will be the miserablest woman in the world' (Hardy, Return of the Native, I, Ch. V). Thus the forces that have been operating in the English-speaking
territories outside of England have long been felt also in England itself. Will, now everywhere used in the second and third persons, is being carried by the force of leveling into the first person.

If the present widespread use of will in all three persons as a sign of the pure future should become finally established in the literary language, it would be a distinct gain to English expression in the direction of greater simplicity. We should, however, in this event lose some useful distinctions in the first person. These distinctions are not so intricate that they could not be grasped by most people, for in England the uneducated, in general, observe them. But the great mass of English-speaking people are today at this point borne along unconsciously by the strong drift toward a greater simplicity of expression. Grammarians, in general, and many educated people in the English-speaking territories outside of England proper still follow the usage of England, feeling that it is superior. Which force shall ultimately prevail?

Though the English-speaking territories outside of England proper, in general, go together in the colloquial use of will as the sign of the pure future, they differ somewhat in the use of will and shall as modal forms, so that peculiar uses here characterize different sections. Thus, Irishmen often attract our attention by their use of will instead of shall in inquiring after someone's will or desire: 'Will I cut another piece for you?' (St. John Ervine, John Ferguson, Act II). This same usage is common also in Scotland: 'Will you tell her, man, or will (instead of shall) I?' (J. M. Barrie, Tommy and Grizel, Ch. XII). Also in the Isle of Man: 'Will (instead of shall) I go home with ye?' (Moore, Anglo-Manx Dialect, p. 202). This is a modern development. In America older shall is here as well preserved as in England proper. On the other hand, the Irish cling conservatively to older usage in expressing dutiful assent by shall: 'Please have breakfast for me at 8 o'clock.' — 'I shall, sir,' where we today in literary speech usually employ will since there now prevails here the desire to express the idea of willingness to comply with the request.

b. OTHER MEANS OF EXPRESSING THE IDEA OF FUTURITY. The idea of futurity is still, as in older English, often expressed by the present tense, as described in 1 e, p. 356.

6. Future Perfect Tense. This form represents that an action or state will be completed at or before a certain time yet future: 'I shall have completed the task by evening.' 'He will have completed the task by evening.' The same use of will and shall is observed here as described for the future tense in 5 a, p. 362. Of course, shall and will here become should and would after a past
tense form: ‘I said I should have reached home before Easter.’
‘I was sure they would have finished my house by then.’

Will and would are often replaced in temporal clauses by shall and should to give the statement modal force, the idea that the future act is the result of a natural development, or is arranged, planned, desired: ‘Our salvation will come when the search for friendship shall take (or shall have taken) the place of the search for wealth.’ ‘I shall pay him as soon as he shall finish (or shall have finished) the work.’ ‘I was to pay him as soon as he should finish (or should have finished) the work.’ Compare 43 II B c.

In principal propositions the future perfect is used in choice, accurate language, but in colloquial speech it is avoided as too formal. This form is a late and learned development which has not yet become established in simple expression. It is not found in the language of Shakespeare. In informal speech we employ here the future in connection with a perfective adverb or a perfect participle to indicate completion: ‘I shall have finished the work before you return,’ or in colloquial speech ‘I shall (or in America will) be through with the work (or I shall, or in America will, have the work finished) before you return.’

The future perfect is avoided still more in the subordinate clause. Here it is usually replaced by the present or future, the present perfect, the past or past perfect: ‘He is standing there reasoning out the steps to be taken when the fog lifts’ (or shall lift = shall have lifted). ‘I shall pay him as soon as he has finished (= shall have finished) the work.’ ‘I was to pay him as soon as he finished (or had finished = should have finished) the work.’
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38. Aspect indicates the aspect, the type, the character of the action. The following classes occur:

1. **Durative Aspect.** This type represents the action as continuing. We usually employ here the progressive form: 'He is eating.' To express different shades of the idea of continuance also other forms are often used, especially remain, keep, keep on, go on, continue with a present participle as predicate after an intransitive, and an infinitive or gerund as object after a transitive: 'Don’t you see, you foolish girl, that he'll remain hanging (participle) about?' 'He kept working (participle) until he was tired out,' or 'He continued to work (object of transitive continued), or working (predicate participle or gerund object according as continued is felt as intransitive or transitive), until he was tired out.' 'He was tired, but he kept on working' (participle). 'I could go on writing (participle) about it forever if I only had time.' Other forms of expression are given in a, p. 377. In older English, the present active participle was used also with passive force: ‘The books continue selling’ (Priestley, Rudiments of English with Notes and Observations, p. 111, A.D. 1769), now being sold or to be sold.

In older English, the simple form of the verb often had durative force, but it now usually represents an action as a whole, i.e., is terminate (3, p. 385). It still often implies the idea of duration, but this conception is now never the leading one here. It expresses the idea of a general truth, an act as a fact or as a whole, or an act as habitual, customary, characteristic, while the progressive form stresses the conception of continuation, repetition, the frequent exercise of a habit at the present moment or at a definite past time: ‘Dogs bark’ (a characteristic act), but ‘Dogs are barking’ (act now going on). The copula is expressed in the progressive form when the subject is a nominative, as in the last example.
But it is regularly lacking when the present participle is predicated of an accusative object: ‘I saw him working in the garden.’ ‘I kept him waiting.’ Compare 15 III 2 (2nd par.), 15 III 2 A, and 48 2 (3rd and 4th parr.).

As the present participle in the progressive form has not only verbal force, but is also a predicate adjective, it frequently, like an adjective, has descriptive force and by reason of its concrete meaning and the emphasis or peculiar tone often associated with it is charged with feeling, indicating that the speaker is affected by something, often expressing joy, sorrow, pleasure, displeasure, praise, censure, also emphasis, implying that the person in question is convinced of the truth or importance of the statement, i.e., the progressive form often differs from the simpler form in that it has modal force: ‘John bothers me a good deal’ (fact). ‘John is bothering me a good deal of late and keeping me from work’ (spoken in a complaining tone). ‘John does fine work at school’ (fact). ‘John is doing fine work at school’ (spoken in a tone of praise). ‘When Elizabeth put Ballard and Babington to death, she was not persecuting’ (Macaulay, Essays) (important statement spoken in tone of conviction).

Stress upon the copula often emphasizes the idea of actuality, usually with feeling: ‘Why aren’t you studying?’ — ‘I am studying.’ Compare 6 A d (1).

In questions with the stress upon the present participle or some more important part of the predicate, the progressive form often indicates curiosity: ‘What are you doing, children?’ Feeling of different kinds: ‘Why aren’t you studying?’ (censure). ‘How are you feeling this morning?’ or ‘Are you feeling better this morning?’ (sympathy, concern). Stress upon the copula here often indicates a marked displeasure with the condition of things: ‘Children, what are you doing?’ Compare 6 A d (1).

It is very common to use the simple form to express a general truth, as in ‘Twice two is four,’ but it is also common to employ the progressive form here in lively style when we feel the truths as living forces, always at work, usually accompanied by some adverbial expression, as always, forever, to indicate their incessant action: ‘True taste is for ever growing, learning, reading, worshiping, laying its hand upon its mouth because it is astonished’ (Ruskin, Modern Painters, Part III, Sec. I, Ch. III). ‘You are not surprised to see his (i.e., the chipmunk’s) face so clean, because he is washing it on all occasions’ (John Burroughs, Field and Study, Ch. IX).

It is very common to employ the simple form to express a fact or an act as a whole, either in present or past time: ‘The town
lies on a river’ (a fact, a permanent situation), but ‘The wounded
man is still lying on the ground’ (continuation). ‘He made a
home of our house, while he stayed in our town’ (act as a whole),
but ‘While my father was trying to make me a good merchant, my
good mother was seeking all the while to make a musician
out of me’ (emphasizing the unceasing efforts upon both sides).
‘There he comes’ (a fact), but ‘He is coming down the road’
(descriptive). We should, however, not be misled by the word ‘de-
scriptive.’ The simple past and present tenses are the usual
tenses of narrative and description; they relate and describe,
but they represent events only as facts in a development and
describe persons and things only as details in a picture, so that
they are immediately replaced by progressive forms when the
narrative becomes a description of unfolding events or unfolding
details in a picture: ‘We reached (fact in a description) the lake
just as the sun was rising (unfolding event) above it.’ ‘A blow
well given now would not only disperse the mob and set the
Nazarene free; it would be a trumpet-call to Israel, and pre-
cipitate the long-dreamt-of war for freedom. The opportunity
was going (unfolding event); the minutes were bearing (unfolding
event) it away; and if lost! God of Abraham! Was there nothing
to be done — nothing?’ (Wallace, Ben Hur, VIII, Ch. IX). As
can be seen by the last example, it is absolutely necessary in
narrative to employ the past progressive when it is desired to
represent a past act as unfolding at a definite point of time, for the
simple past tense here would represent the act as completed. In
general, however, in description the simple tenses are the rule
in narrative, as the described persons and things are felt as details
of a picture: ‘She seemed about fifteen, and had her apron full of
pears.’ ‘Beside her on the table lay a large pan.’ This is normal
narrative or description, but in lively style we often employ here
the progressive forms since we feel the phenomena, not as actual
events and persons and things known to us but as unfolding before
us, in the vivid play of the imagination arising and taking form:
‘I coughed all night’ (objective statement), but ‘I was coughing
all night’ (vivid style). ‘It is the representation of a lady. She
lies on a couch. At her side sits a woman in grief’ (objective state-
ment), but ‘It is the representation of a lady. She is lying on a
couch. At her side is sitting a woman in grief’ (vivid style).

‘I live (or am living) in Chicago,’ a habitual, customary act at
the present time, often as here without an essential difference of
meaning between the two forms, but the progressive form becomes
more natural when feeling of any kind enters into the statement:
‘I am now living in a very pleasant flat’ (feeling of satisfaction,
arising perhaps from a change of residence for the better). The progressive form is a favorite in the lively description of things going on at the present time: ‘We are tramping over the hills and reading and writing and having a restful time’ (Jean Webster, *Daddy-Long-Legs*, 225). The simple present tense here would be only an objective statement of fact.

The present tense of the progressive form often represents, not an act as actually taking place, but a person as looking forward to it with a lively feeling of expectancy: ‘Aunt *is coming* soon.’ ‘*We are having* a few guests tonight.’

Instead of the simple present we often use the present of will (= *apt to, inclined to*) in connection with a dependent infinitive: ‘John *will* often *sit* on the veranda alone for hours, or *will go off* alone into the woods.’ We stress *will* here to indicate a strong tendency to do certain things: ‘Children *will* be noisy.’ ‘Accidents *will* happen.’

With the aid of appropriate adverbs both forms of the present perfect, the usual tense form and the progressive, may express a habitual act in a time past but connected with the present: ‘Recently John *has done* his work regularly’ (fact), but in a tone of praise or censure we say: ‘Recently John *has been doing* his work quite regularly, or very slovenly.’ The usual present perfect tense form expresses a habitual act after the subordinating conjunction *after*: ‘After *I have seen* her, I feel encouraged’ (Mildred E. Lambert in *American Speech*, Oct., 1928). Similarly, after the subordinating conjunction *until*: ‘I don’t go to bed *until I have finished* my work.’

Past habit: ‘Even when a little girl she *ran* (used — now in contrast to older English only used in the past tense — *to run, or would run*) after the boys’ (fact), but in a tone of censure: ‘Even when a little girl she *was always running* after the boys,’ where we usually have to employ an adverb, as *always, all the time, forever,* to make the situation clear. ‘I knew John smoked (a fixed habit, well known and characteristic of John, but here merely stated as a fact without reference to its exercise at any particular time), but he emphatically declined to do so in my presence’; but to emphasize the frequent exercise of the characteristic habit at some particular period of time we say: ‘In those days John *was always smoking.*’

Both forms are used with reference to the future: ‘We shall soon have plenty of rain’ (something so confidently expected that it is here stated as a fact), but to express the displeasure that the thought arouses in us we say: ‘We shall soon be having rain, rain, and nothing but rain.’
a. Often to emphasize the idea of duration we add on, or on and on, to the simple verb, or we add and and repeat the verb: 'When the Elsmere's were gone, Hester sat on alone in the drawing-room' (Mrs. H. Ward, The Case of Richard Meynell, III, Ch. XVII, 359). ‘The prayers and talks (in the prayer-meeting) went on and on’ (W. S. Cather, The Song of the Lark, Ch. XVII). ‘When they (i.e., Mexican women) are in trouble, in love, under stress of any kind, they comb and comb their hair’ (ib., Ch. VI).

Intermittent action is expressed by off and on: ‘I slept off and on all the way to Chicago.’

b. In older English, after be the progressive idea was sometimes expressed by the prepositional infinitive, which originally was an infinitive of purpose but finally often became a mere parallel of the progressive form: ‘AMIENS. He hath been all this day to look you (= to look for you). — JAQUES. And I have been all this day to avoid him’ (As You Like It, II, v, 34–35). Compare 7 D 3.

c. The progressive form has been steadily spreading at the expense of the simple form. Earlier in the present period we often find the simple form where we now use the progressive: ‘The whole fleet that went from hence rides (now is riding) now before the enemies’ harbours’ (Earl of Clarendon, Letter, Aug. 2, 1666).

2. Point-action Aspects. The point-action aspects call attention, not to an act as a whole, but to only one point, either the beginning or the final point. There are thus two classes:

a. INGRESSIVE ASPECT. This point-action type directs the attention especially to the initial stage of the action or state: ‘He awoke early,’ i.e., came into a waking state early. ‘The boat slowed up as it came in.’ ‘They went the moment it cleared.’ This idea is expressed in various ways:

aa. The ingressive aspect is often expressed by begin, commence, or start in connection with an infinitive or gerund as object. The simple present tense form of begin, commence, start (in colloquial American also start in), start out indicates that the beginning is habitual: ‘When we scold her, she begins to cry’ (or begins crying). The progressive form of begin, commence, start, start out, start in (in America used of a prolonged activity) denotes the beginning of an activity in present time: ‘It is beginning (starting) to rain.’ ‘The baby is beginning (starting) to cry.’ ‘He is starting out to write his report without knowing all the facts.’ The simple past tense represents the beginning of an act in past time as a fact; the progressive past represents it as an unfolding event: ‘When I said that, she began to cry.’ ‘When the horses got stuck with the load, the driver started to abuse (or abusing) them.’ ‘It was just beginning to rain as I awoke.’ ‘The United States commis-
sioner for Dakota started in to give the world a comprehensive idea of the resources of the territory' (Lisbon Star, Jan. 2, 1885). The infinitive after start in and start out has adverbial force expressing purpose. To express the idea of beginning work on something we employ here set about: 'As soon as the flood was over, they set about (preposition) repairing (gerund) the damage' or 'they set about (adverb) to repair the damage.' Compare 50 4 c dd. Of things we use here set in to express steady, continued action, development: 'It set in to rain.' 'It had set in snowing (predicate appositive participle) at breakfast.' 'A reaction set in.' Start is often used in connection with a direct object and an objective predicate participle: 'It started him coughing.' Compare 15 III 2 A. See also hh, p. 380.

The ingressive aspect is often expressed by to break out, burst out in connection with a present participle: 'He broke out laughing.' 'She burst out crying.'

The present tense of be about (7 F) in connection with a to-infinitive and the present tense of be on the point (or verge) of in connection with a gerund indicate an action that will take place in the immediate future in accordance with some plan, or as the result of circumstances, or a natural development: 'I am about to leave for Europe.' 'He is about to break down.' 'It is about to rain.' 'She is on the point of crying.' 'She is on the verge of breaking down.' The gerund is sometimes used after is about. See 50 4 c dd.

bb. The ingressive idea is often expressed by the ingresses get, grow, fall, turn, wax, become, run, go, come, set, start, take (take up as a habit) in connection with a predicate adjective, participle, noun, or a prepositional phrase: 'He often gets sick.' 'Things often assume distorted forms when we get to worrying about them.' 'It is growing dark.' 'She turned (became, got, grew) pale.' 'Our funds are falling short.' 'He waxed hotter.' 'The captain's voice came (got) thick.' 'He fell asleep' (from older on sleep). 'He fell again to speculating (less commonly fell speculating; in older English also fell on speculating, fell a-speculating, or fell to speculate) on the probable romance that lay behind that loneliness and look of desolation.' 'The cow ran (or went) dry.' 'The engine went dead.' 'He went to sleep.' 'Go to work.' 'They went to housekeeping.' 'He started the ball rolling.' 'That set me thinking' (or to thinking). 'He took to drinking.' 'He took to going out nights and coming home at late hours.' Often after am (was) going to: 'Look out! I am going to shoot.' In older English, going to could follow the present participle being, while today we suppress being: 'I do assure you that nothing
would surprise me more than to hear of their being going to be married' (Jane Austen, *Sense and Sensibility*, II, Ch. VII). Compare *b ee*, p. 383, and *37 1 e*.

In the preceding paragraph the gerund is used after take, but the infinitive is sometimes employed here: 'She has taken to like him' (Meredith, *One of Our Conquerors*, III, XI, 233). In older English, instead of the meaning *take up as a habit* the ingressive *take* had the general force of *start, proceed*, employed usually of vigorous action with the implication that the action would be carried through successfully. In the thirteenth century coordination (19 3, 4th par.) was employed here instead of the infinitive: 'He tok (took) and wente' (Genesis and Exodus, 1751). This usage is still common in popular speech: 'Ever since Mallie tuck'n (took and) died in April, hit's been the same old story' (Lucy Furman, *The Quare Women*, Ch. V). 'He tuck'n set a trap for Brer Rabbit' (Joel Chandler Harris, *Uncle Remus*, p. 142).

Verbs made from adjectives have ingressive force: 'They went out the moment it cleared.' 'The milk soured.'

*cc.* We often use *catch and take* here in connection with an object: 'I caught sight of him.' 'I caught a cold.' 'The plant took root.' 'He took heart.'

*dd.* Ingressive force often lies in the adverbs up, down, out, off, in, away, in the prefix a- and the suffix -en: 'He stood up.' 'He hurried up.' 'He didn't show up' (colloquial = appear). 'He sat down.' 'Children, quiet down!' 'The lilacs have come out.' 'He dozed off.' 'His regular breathing told that he had gone off' (= fallen asleep). 'He jumped onto his horse and rode away.' 'Then a heated discussion arose.' 'Her face reddened with anger.' 'He quickened his pace.' Borrowed verbs often have ingressive force by virtue of their prefixes: appear, introduce, etc. *In* is much used in American colloquial speech to indicate the beginning of a prolonged activity: 'When are you going to begin your new work?' — 'I start in tomorrow.' Compare *aa*, p. 377. *Pitch in, sail in, light in* have the additional idea of energetic action: 'When he has a job to do he pitches (or sails, or lights) in at once' (Crowell's Dictionary of English Grammar).

*ee.* The imperative of all verbs, durative as well as point-action verbs, usually has ingressive force, since the expectation is that the action will be begun or performed at once: 'Run!' 'Come in!' 'Hand me that book!' The progressive form is much used in lively style, where feeling of different kinds enters into the expression: 'Let every man take his wife and his children and be going' (Coverdale, *I Samuel*, XXX, 22, A.D. 1535). 'Be tredging (trudging) or in faith you bere me a souse' (Jack Juggler,
Leat vs be trudging! (John Heywood, *Proverbs and Epigrams*, 37, A.D. 1562). "Up, be doing everywhere, the hour of crisis has verily come!" (Carlyle, *Latter-Day Pamphlets*, 28). Let's be going! We must be going!

On the other hand, the negative form of the progressive imperative usually has durative force: ‘Don't be trying to make me a participator in your wickedness!’ (Meredith, *Sandra Belloni*, 297). ‘Don't be talking! Let me just suck this in as we go along!’ (Phillpotts, *Beacon*, I, Ch. V).


The *be* of the progressive form has ingressive force in the imperative as often elsewhere, as described in ff below. In the imperative it is often rather literary, replaced in colloquial speech by get: ‘Get goin’, Bozo!’ (Chicago Tribune, Harold Teen Cartoon, Jan. 20, 1929). An ingressive particle is often used instead of an ingressive copula: ‘Hurry up!’ ‘Brace up!’

**ff.** The verb *be* has had for many centuries both durative and ingressive force, but the former has so overshadowed the latter that we do not now have a vivid feeling for the latter. For the most part *be* as an ingressive copula or auxiliary is now replaced by other ingressive forms, such as *become*, *get*, etc., but its old ingressive force still lingers: ‘He was (= became) both out of pocket and out of spirits by that catastrophe’ (Thackeray, *Vanity Fair*, Ch. XXXVII). ‘I must be going’ (Kingsley, *Hypatia*, I, 246).

In the actional passive, *be* still regularly has ingressive force. Compare 47 b. It often has the same force in the progressive form. See ee, p. 379, and hh below. It is often a full verb with ingressive force = *come into being, take place*: ‘It was not until they had turned aside that she asked him why he was so quiet’ (Tarkington, *The Plutocrat*, p. 292).

**gg.** The ingressive idea sometimes lies in the meaning of the verb: ‘The buds will soon show’ (make their appearance). ‘The real test begins tomorrow.’ ‘We start tomorrow at six.’

**hh.** The progressive form, though usually durative in force, often with ingressives indicates the beginning of an activity: ‘It is clearing.’ ‘The lilacs are just coming out.’ ‘I am getting tired of it.’ ‘I was getting tired of it.’ ‘The children are quieting down.’ ‘He is quickening his pace.’ ‘It is starting to rain.’ In English, it has become necessary to employ the progressive form to express the beginning of an activity at the present moment or to represent the activity as unfolding at some moment in the past.
With ingresses we employ the progressive form of the ingresses themselves. With duratives we employ the progressive form of *start, begin*, etc., as in the last example. Compare *aa*, p. 377. For the use of *be* here in the progressive form with ingressive force see *ff*, p. 380. Compare *b hh*, p. 385.

*Effective Aspect.* This point-action aspect directs the attention to the final point of the activity or state, to a result that has been reached, hence it often indicates attainment or failure: ‘The two friends fell out.’ ‘He knocked him out in the fourth round.’ ‘I at last, becoming discouraged, gave up hope.’ ‘The plan fell through.’ In these examples the verbs have point-action force. They are pure effectives. A durative in connection with an effective particle has durative-effective force, indicating that the action continues to the end and often implying attainment, thoroughness: ‘I hunted him up.’ ‘We must clean up here.’

The effective idea is usually expressed by:

\*\*aa.\* Adverbs and prefixes. Pure effectives: ‘He set up in the school a new standard of attainment.’ ‘He put the rebellion down.’ ‘He passed away quietly in the night.’ ‘The rumor turned out false.’ ‘It will turn out all right.’ ‘Our finances gave out.’ ‘His right leg gave out.’ ‘I at last found out what the matter was.’ ‘They were paid off and discharged.’ ‘I’ll lay off (colloquial = cease work) for a month’ (James Gibbons Huneker, Letter, Oct. 11, 1918). ‘The company laid off ten men today’ (Crowell’s Dictionary of English Grammar). ‘Several banks have gone under this year.’ ‘We hope to bring it about soon.’ ‘He got by with it’ (American slang = succeeded). ‘He got there’ (American slang = succeeded). ‘He put the nefarious design through.’ ‘They put it across’ (colloquial American). ‘They put it over on him’ (colloquial American). Durative effectives: ‘He not for his own self caring but her, Her and her children, let her plead in vain, So grieving held his will, and bore it through’ (Tennyson, *Enoch Arden*, 167). ‘I’ll fight it out on this line if it takes all summer.’ ‘It requires exceptional courage to stand out against a popular cry.’ ‘He held out although it was a severe test.’ ‘They sat out the next dance.’ ‘The result of the sad experiences was that he pined away.’ ‘He kept his courage up.’

The English adverbs here have in general strong concrete force, but they are acquiring abstract ingressive or effective force, as can be clearly seen in *up*. We say ‘I ate the apple *up,*’ although we know very well that the apple went *down* and not *up.* This shows that *up* has lost its old concrete force and has become a point-action particle. Similarly, *a* in *arise* (see *a dd*) once meant *out*, but we now have no feeling for its old concrete meaning.
Some point-action verbs take no effective particle since the simple form has effective force, as in the case of die, win, stop, etc.: 'He died this morning.' 'He won by a head.' 'He stopped in the middle of the sentence.' 'My watch has stopped.' Die out and win out are durative-effectives: 'My interest in the subject died out.' 'A good cause often makes little headway at first, but in time it wins out.' Stop in connection with a prepositional phrase is much used in colloquial speech as an effective-durative: 'We stopped at the Pennsylvania Hotel.' 'I have been stopping in Cornwall with friends' (Concise Oxford Dictionary). The prepositional phrase indicates that a sojourning takes place after the journeying ceases. Some criticize the use of stop here and suggest that it be replaced by stay, but stay does not say so much as stop does.

bb. The effective idea is often expressed by a prepositional phrase instead of an adverb: 'He shot the hat to pieces.' 'He developed into a strong man.' 'He worked himself into a frenzy.'

c. The final point in an activity is also indicated by cease, stop, leave off (or in older English also simple leave), finish, quit (American), or do, with an infinitive or gerund as object: 'She ceased to cry' (or ceased, or stopped, crying). 'I have left off (or in older English also simple left) sleeping (in older English sometimes to sleep) with the windows shut.' 'I have just finished reading the book.' 'I have quit smoking.' 'Quit teasing her.' 'I have (in America, Scotland, Ireland often am) done packing.' In the American construction, done is a predicate adjective, and packing is a present participle employed as a predicate appositive expressing manner or specification — a very common construction, which is illustrated in 28 1 a by a number of examples. In this construction the adverb through is often used as predicate instead of done: 'I am through trying to please her' (Mildred E. Lambert in American Speech, Oct., 1928).

In the passive form of statement the present participle usually has passive form: 'I finished sowing my clover field yesterday' (active form). 'My clover field was finished being sown yesterday' (passive form). In older English, the participle often had active form: 'Upon inquiring [I] found that my Clover Field was finish'd sowing and rolling' (George Washington, Diary, May 1, 1760).

dd. With transitive point-action verbs the final result is often indicated by an object or an object in connection with an objective predicate: 'He has won great fame.' 'We shall reach the city within an hour.' 'They got the thief.' 'I remember them, but I
forget their names,' literally, 'I fail to get hold of their names.'
'He has made himself skilful in this kind of work.'

In colloquial speech, to express the cessation of an activity, it is often used as object, referring to something being done by another or others, usually in a tone of disapproval: 'Cut it out!' 'Quit it!' 'Drop it!' (principally British).

ee. After point-action copulas, like become, catch (6 B, 7 F), come, get, turn, etc., we use a predicate noun, adjective, or prepositional phrase to indicate the final goal or state: 'He became a lawyer.' 'I was behind him for a while, but I have caught up (adverb used as predicate adjective; see 7 F) with him.' 'His prediction came true.' 'They at last came to terms.' 'He got to be rich, my best friend, a great lawyer.' 'He turned out to be a rascal.' 'He turned traitor.' As we have seen in a ff, p. 380, be is sometimes used as a point-action copula with ingressive force. Like a number of other ingressive forms, it points also to the final point in the development: 'He wants to be (become) a lawyer.' The extensive use of ingressive and effective copulas is a marked feature of modern English. They are often used where in other languages a prefix is employed in connection with the verb. For a full list of these copulas see 6 B.

In colloquial speech, we are very fond of speaking of an attained state, employing a predicative perfect participle after get, where in more formal language we speak of an act, employing a simple finite verb of complete predication: 'It will be ten o'clock before we get started' (or in more formal language start). 'We all lost our patience before we got started' (or simply started). 'I was tired long before I got done (colloquial American) with my work' (or more formally 'finished my work').

It is usually necessary to employ here a copula and an adjective to predicate a quality of a person or thing, but in verbs made from adjectives the verb performs the functions of copula and adjective: 'Her hair grayed and whitened.'

The infinitive is much used after be, stand, get, be growing, be coming, and be going (37 1 e), or simple grow, come, go, to indicate the actual or forthcoming result, outcome of some action, influence, development, or state of things: 'Better things are to follow.' 'You must get down to work if you are ever to accomplish anything.' 'The situation is such that we stand (indicating imminence) to lose a large sum of money.' 'We gazed in despair, for we were only three hundred yards from the railway, and stood to lose the car when the enemy came along in ten minutes' (T. E. Lawrence, Revolt in the Desert, p. 272). 'I got him to do it.' 'I got to talk with him.' 'I got the machine to run.' 'I am growing to believe
(or I am coming to believe) that my sacrifice has been in vain.'

'He is going to be rich.' 'I am going to injure him (purpose) all I can,' but 'Don't you see that you are going to injure him (result) by this course?' 'Naturally, being fond of boxing, I grew to know a good many prize-fighters' (Theodore Roosevelt, An Autobiography, Ch. II). 'Sooner or later the world comes round to see the truth and do the right.' 'I went to help him (purpose), but now it is quite evident that I actually went to disturb his peace of mind' (result). After got the infinitive here is regularly replaced by a gerund or a predicative present participle when the force becomes descriptive, i.e., when it is desired to represent the resultant activity as proceeding steadily rather than merely to state a bare result as a fact: 'I got the machine to running (or simply running) smoothly.' 'The machine got to running (or running) smoothly' in contrast to 'The machine was running smoothly.' 'Uncle Gus's got going' (Harriet Connor Brown, Grandmother Brown's Hundred Years, 359), i.e., he got to singing the favorite songs of his earlier years and overpowered by memory couldn't stop. The substitution of the infinitive to go here for the participle going would change the meaning entirely: 'Uncle Gus has got to go,' i.e., must go. 'The machine has got to go,' i.e., 'I am determined that the machine shall go.' The infinitive expresses result after all these verbs except the present perfect tense of get, which has the force of must. The verbs stand, be growing, be coming, be going, grow, come, go are usually found with the infinitive, as in the above examples, since the idea of an actual result is prominent. There is here often a modal force associated with the effective force. Compare 43 I A (6th par.), 43 II B c.

ff. The same form is often used for both point-action aspects. The context alone can then indicate whether the expression is ingressive or effective: 'The children quieted down' (ingressive), i.e., came into a quiet state, but 'He put the rebellion down' (effective), the final result of the action. 'He became sick' (ingressive), entrance into a new temporary state, but 'He became rich,' final state, final result of a development.

gg. In all point-action verbs, ingressive as well as effective, the perfect participle of intransitives was in compound tenses originally felt as a predicate adjective expressing a condition, either a resultant state or a new state just entered upon, hence it was linked to the subject by the copula be. Compare 37 3. This older usage still occasionally occurs since the original construction is still dimly felt: 'The melancholy days are come' (Bryant). 'You knew I was returned to London, Major Winter?' (Galsworthy, Beyond, I, Ch. VI, 57). 'Many of our apples are fallen,' i.e., are
lying on the ground in a fallen state. ‘He is gone,’ always so in ‘My money is gone.’ This older usage also survives in the present perfect imperative ‘Be gone!’ See also 45 6. Point-action intransitives are now usually conjugated with have since verbal activity and tense are now more prominent here than state and aspect. We now use be only when we feel the idea of state strongly.

hh. To indicate that the final point of the activity, or that attainment, is approaching at the present moment or was approaching at some moment in the past, we employ the progressive form of a pure effective in the case of pure effectives and the progressive form of cease, stop, etc., in the case of duratives: ‘He is dying.’ ‘I am catching up with him.’ ‘My strength is giving out.’ ‘They are putting it across’ (colloquial American).

‘I was winning him to all that was good when I fell sick.’ ‘It is ceasing to rain.’ Compare a hh, p. 380.

3. Terminate Aspect. A large number of simple and compound verbs indicate an action as a whole. Such verbs are called terminates. This aspect is especially associated with the simple form of the verb just as the durative aspect is associated with the progressive form. In 1, p. 373, examples have been given illustrating the difference of meaning between the simple form of the verb with terminate force and the progressive form with durative force. In terminates the action often begins and terminates within a limited period: ‘He motioned to me.’ ‘He didn’t even wince.’ ‘He hit the mark.’ ‘He handed me a book.’ ‘He shot a duck.’ ‘The bullet pierced his heart.’ ‘She sighed.’ ‘A snowflake lit upon his nose.’ ‘He stumbled and fell.’ ‘The thugs killed him, took his money, and threw him into the river.’ ‘An idea flashed on me.’ ‘This news dashed, shattered, our hopes.’ ‘She misunderstood me.’ ‘I overlooked this item in my calculation.’ The terminate aspect is the largest category, and hence is associated with many verbs of quite a different meaning from those just mentioned. Any verbal form that represents the act as a finished whole is a terminate whether the duration of the act be long or short: ‘He went (here thought of as a finished whole, not as continuing) to church this morning.’ ‘Last summer I built a fine new house.’ ‘Next summer I expect to build a fine new house.’

A terminate indicates an action as a whole, while a point-action verb indicates only a point in the activity. In ‘As soon as I shot, I saw the bird drop’ drop is a terminate, for the action is considered as a whole. But in ‘She dropped asleep’ dropped is an ingressive, for it indicates the point of entrance into a new state. In ‘She dropped dead’ dropped is an effective, for it indicates the point of entrance into a final state. In ‘He put the book upon
the table’ put is a terminate, for the action is considered as a whole; but in ‘He put the nefarious design through’ put through is an effective, for it calls attention to the final point in the activity. A terminate expressing momentary action often becomes a point-action verb when it stands in progressive form. In ‘I couldn’t see where I stepped’ stepped is a terminate, but it is an ingressive in ‘He is just stepping into his car,’ for it indicates the beginning of the action. The point-action aspect is closely related to the terminate aspect. The point-action idea is present when the conception of a point becomes more prominent than that of the action as a whole. On the other hand, in a point-action verb we often lose sight of the point and feel the action as a whole, shifting the stress from the particle to the verb: ‘He is just getting up’ (ingressive), but ‘This morning I got up (terminate) early.’ ‘I bought his shoes only a few weeks ago, but he’s about worn them out’ (effective), but ‘He wears out (terminate) shoes faster than any boy I know.’ ‘It is just setting in (ingressive) to rain,’ but ‘It sets in (terminate) to rain here in April.’ ‘They have just paid off (effective) the debt on their house,’ but ‘Honest people pay off (terminate) their debts as fast as they can.’ ‘He has fooled away (effective) all his money,’ but ‘Shiftless people fool away (terminate) their money.’

The terminate aspect has relations also to the durative aspect. A terminate often becomes a durative when it stands in the progressive form: ‘The mercury is slowly falling.’

4. Iterative Aspect. This type indicates an indefinitely prolonged succession of like acts: ‘He pooh-poohs at everything.’ ‘He threw his head back and haw-hawed.’ ‘Outside the wind blew gustily and set a loquacious tassel tap-tapping against a pane’ (Maud Diver, Desmond’s Daughter, I, Ch. V, 36).

The suffixes -le, -er are often used to suggest repetition, but we have no strong feeling for their meaning and cannot use them freely with any verb, employing them only in certain words where they have become fixed: ‘The fire crackles.’ ‘Geese gabble.’ ‘Hens cackle.’ ‘Girls giggle.’ ‘The flame flickers.’ ‘He went off muttering something to himself.’

We often use the auxiliary keep along with a present participle: ‘He kept looking back as he ran,’ but the idea of repetition here is only inferred from the meaning of the verbal stem of the participle, for with many verbs this same form indicates duration: ‘He kept working until it became dark.’

Repetition is also expressed in other ways: ‘She sang it over and over again’ (or again and again). ‘He is (or was) accustomed (or in choice language wont) to think before he speaks’ (or spoke):
or we can employ be used here, sometimes with the infinitive or more commonly with the gerund: 'He is (or was) used to think (or more commonly to thinking) before he speaks' (or spoke). ‘What things have they been used (or accustomed) to tell you?’ (Mark Twain, Joan of Arc, I, Ch. VII). ‘She looked at him pretty much as Mrs. Pipchin had been used (or accustomed) to do’ (Dickens, Dombey and Son, Ch. XII). ‘And you are to know that in Hampshire they use (now only used in the past tense) to catch Trouts in the night by the light of a Torch or Straw’ (Izaak Walton, Compleat Angler, p. 128, A.D. 1653), now ‘are accustomed to catch trout in the night,’ or ‘are used to catching them in the night.’ ‘You don’t use (now are not accustomed) to be so shy to speak your mind’ (Richardson, Clarissa, IV, 164, A.D. 1768). ‘She used (still common in the past tense) to sing it,’ now usually, however, with the implication that the habit has ceased. ‘She was in the habit of singing it.’ ‘Courage will come and go.’ ‘She would sing it upon every occasion.’ ‘I’ve tried and tried, but I’ve not succeeded.’ ‘We insisted and insisted and insisted, not once but half a dozen times, at the very beginning of the war, on England’s adoption of the Declaration of London’ (W. H. Page, Letter to Edward M. House, Aug. 4, 1915). ‘He is always getting angry.’ ‘I have often got the machine to running smoothly.’ ‘He is perpetually complaining.’ In the second from the last example repetition is associated with the ingressive aspect, in the next to the last example with the effective aspect, in the last example with the durative aspect. Thus the iterative aspect is often associated with other aspects.

The past tense and past participle used, employed in the preceding paragraph in illustrative examples, is pronounced uesta as a result of assimilation with the unstressed to of the infinitive that always follows it. As it is thus pronounced uesta to indicate repetition, while it is pronounced uzd in its more general meanings, it is evident that uesta is now felt as having a special function, namely, that of an iterative aspect auxiliary: ‘He used (uesta, iterative auxiliary) to visit us frequently,’ but ‘The whistle was used (uzd, full verb) to call the dog.’

5. Aspect in Popular Scotch and Irish English. The progressive form in Scotch and Irish English is used to express any kind of action, hence it is here often used where the literary language requires the simple verb: ‘I was never knowing such a girl, so honest and beautiful’ (R. L. Stevenson, David Balfour, Ch. XXI). ‘Try again, Martin, try again, and you’ll be finding her yet’ (J. M. Synge, The Well of the Saints, p. 31). In Irish English the idea of duration or habit is expressed by using do in connection
with the progressive form. 'It's small joy we'd have hearing the lies they do be telling from the gray of dawn till the night' (J. M. Synge, *The Well of the Saints*, p. 91). 'The young and silly do be always making game of them that's dark' (blind) (*ib.*, p. 4). In the case of the copula *be* the idea of habit is expressed by *do* and the infinitive *be*: 'I do be at my lessons every evening from 8 to 9 o'clock' (Joyce, *English as We Speak It in Ireland*, p. 86).