CHAPTER XX
MOOD

39. Mood is a grammatical form denoting the style or manner of predication. There are three moods, the indicative, subjunctive, and imperative.
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INDICATIVE

40. The indicative, the mood of simple assertion or interrogation, represents something as a fact, or as in close relations to reality, or in interrogative form inquires after a fact. A fact: 'The sun rises every morning.' In close relation to reality: 'I shall not go, if it rains.' The indicative rains here does not state that it is raining, but indicates that the idea of rain is something close to a reality, for the speaker feels it is an actual problem in the near future with which he has to reckon and is reckoning. We sometimes still, as very commonly in older English, use the present subjunctive here, 'if it rain,' which has about the same meaning as the indicative rains, only representing a little different point of view. The subjunctive indicates that the idea of rain is merely a conception, but at the same time represents the act in question as something with which we may have to deal. There is at present also a stylistic difference between the two forms. The present indicative is everyday expression; the present subjunctive, like old forms in general, belongs to a choice literary style. The common preference for the indicative in this category and a few others has led some grammarians to talk about the slovenly use of the indicative and the slighting of the subjunctive in present-day English, while in fact the increasing use of the indicative in these categories doesn't indicate carelessness, but rather a change in our way of thinking. Today we decidedly prefer to look at many things, not as mere conceptions, but as things near to us, as actual problems with which we must deal. The indicative is never a substitute for the subjunctive, but is always felt as an indicative. Even when used as an imperative (45 4 c) it does not lose its old indicative character, for it represents the command as executed, the desired act as an actuality. Though the indicative, in common expression, is supplanting the subjunctive in certain categories, the subjunctive in general is not on the decline. Indeed, we are coining new subjunctive forms to express ourselves more clearly and more accurately. In life we have to deal not only with facts but with conceptions of many kinds.

SUBJUNCTIVE

41. Classification of the Meanings and the Use of the Tenses. The function of the English subjunctive is to represent something, not as an actual reality, but only as a desire, plan, demand, requirement, eventuality, conception, thought; sometimes with more or less hope of realization, or, in the case of a statement,
with more or less belief; sometimes with little or no hope or faith. The subjunctive is also often used of actual facts, but it represents them as conceptions of the mind, general principles rather than as facts. See 44 II 1 (2nd par.), 3 (last par.), 10. Thus, though the subjunctive has a number of distinct functions, they are all united in a higher unity — they all represent the action or state as a conception of the mind rather than as a reality.

The different uses of the subjunctive may be classified under two general heads, which are hereby only briefly outlined, but are treated more fully in the following articles: (1) The optative subjunctive, which represents the utterance as something which is desired or planned, a present tense form (36) indicating hope of fulfilment; a past tense form (36) indicating little or no hope of fulfilment. We frequently avoid a blunt expression of will by using a past tense form of the subjunctive, thus indicating that we do not count upon the fulfilment of our wish. Here the past tense forms lose in large measure the element of unreality and are called the subjunctive of modest wish. (2) The potential subjunctive, which represents the statement, not as an actual fact, but only as a conception of the mind, a present tense form indicating that the speaker or writer feels the conception as probably conforming to fact or reality, or regards the occurrence of the act in question as likely, probable, sometimes, however, indicating doubt as to the matter of fact or the occurrence of the act; a past tense form indicating decided doubt as to the matter of fact and pronounced improbability as to the occurrence of the act. We frequently avoid a blunt expression of our opinion by using a past tense form of the subjunctive, thus expressing hesitation. Here the past tense forms of the potential subjunctive lose in large measure the element of doubt and uncertainty and are used to state an opinion modestly, politely, or cautiously in a less positive and abrupt way than in the indicative. This is the polite subjunctive, or the subjunctive of modest or cautious statement.

The two groups of tenses employed in the subjunctive — the present tense forms (present, present perfect, or will, may, or shall with a dependent infinitive) and the past tense forms (past, past perfect, or would, might, or should with a dependent infinitive) — stand out in general quite distinctly from each other. The different tenses within each group mark different distinctions of time, while the tenses of one group as compared with those of the other group do not mark different distinctions of time, but differ only in the manner in which they represent the statement. Thus the present and the past subjunctive both denote present or fu-
tured time, but they usually differ in the manner of the statement, the past tense indicating a greater improbability, or even unreality: 'If there be a misunderstanding between them, I don't know of it,' but 'If there were a misunderstanding between them, I should know of it.' 'If it rain, I'll not go,' but 'If it were to rain, I wouldn't go.' Likewise the present perfect and the past perfect subjunctive both denote past time, but differ in the manner of the statement: 'I ask that every man of any standing in Rome be brought to trial even if he have remained (a quite probable case) neutral' (Masefield, *Pompey the Great*, Act II). 'Even if he had been (contrary to fact) here, I should have said the same thing.' We feel the distinctions of manner today most vividly in the auxiliaries. *Will, may, shall*, on the one hand, and *would, might, should*, on the other hand, all represent present or future time, but the two groups differ markedly in the manner in which they represent the thought: 'I am hoping that he *may* come this evening;' but 'I think he *might* come this evening but I am not expecting him.'

In oldest English, when there were only two tenses, the present and the past, the past subjunctive, like the past indicative, pointed to the past, differing from it only in that it represented the act as a mere conception or as contrary to reality. It is sometimes still employed for reference to the past where it is desired to represent something not as a concrete reality but as conceivable, probable, as occurring. Interesting examples are given in 44 II 5 A b (last par.). It is no longer employed for reference to the past when it is desired to express unreality, for we now have much better means of expression here and moreover have found a better use for this old form. In Old English, it was still used for reference to the past to express unreality: 'Gif þu være her nære min broðør dead' (John, XI, 21, A.D. 1000) = 'If thou hadst been here, my brother would not have died.' The past subjunctive form with the peculiar idea of unreality that had become associated with it was sometimes used also for reference to the future, as the present subjunctive forms could not express this idea. Later when the past perfect indicative came into use, its subjunctive gradually assumed the functions of the old past subjunctive where the reference was to the past, and the past subjunctive was reserved for reference to the future. As the modal auxiliaries, however, are defective verbs that have never had a past perfect subjunctive, we have to employ here another means to express unreality when the reference is to the past, namely, the past subjunctive of the auxiliary in connection with a dependent perfect infinitive: 'He *might have succeeded* if he had tried'
(past perfect subjunctive). Similarly, the present tense subjunctive forms of these auxiliaries with their implication of greater probability may be used for reference to the past if they are associated with a perfect infinitive: ‘The train may have arrived by this time.’

As indicated on page 391, the tense of the subjunctive employed is a point of vital importance. Unfortunately, however, this feeling for the meaning of the subjunctive tenses is only active after a present tense form (36). After a past tense form (36) it is entirely destroyed by the law of the sequence of tenses described in 36: ‘I am hoping that he may come this evening,’ but ‘I was hoping that he might come that evening.’ Here might does not have the usual force of a past subjunctive, for it is a present subjunctive that has been attracted into the form of a past tense after a past tense.

42. Subjunctive Form. Since the time of the earliest records the simple subjunctive forms have lost much of their original distinctiveness, so that they now cannot always be distinguished from indicative forms. The forces that called the original forms into being, however, did not cease their activity. As described on page 390, the subjunctive is an important means of expression, vital to an accurate expression of thought and feeling. As the simple subjunctive forms in the course of a long phonetic development lost their distinctive endings, modal auxiliaries were pressed into service to express the same ideas. In large measure they are subjunctive forms, although not recognizable by a distinctive ending. In fact, however, whether indicative or subjunctive in form, they perform the function of the older simple subjunctive and are here treated as our modern subjunctive forms. For clear formal proof that a number of these so-called modal auxiliaries have entirely ceased to be verbs and are now in reality mere grammatical forms to color the statement, see 44 I. In the same way the original endings of the simple subjunctive forms had been pressed into service to color the statement. The mind seeks until it finds a means to express its thought and feeling. The first means which the mind employs to express itself are usually concrete in meaning. The endings of the old simple subjunctive were doubtless originally more concrete than they were even in oldest English. They had become mere abstract symbols, so that even in the Old English period the English mind was already seeking a more concrete and a more accurate expression for its subjunctive ideas, and began to employ the auxiliaries which are now so much used. The fact that some of these auxiliaries were employed at a time when the subjunctive had distinctive endings
shows clearly that they did not come into use on account of the lack of distinctive subjunctive forms. The use of the auxiliaries evidently indicates a desire for a more concrete and a more accurate expression of thought and feeling. The auxiliaries have more and brighter shades of meaning than the old simple subjunctive forms.

OPTATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE

43. This subjunctive is used in the following expressions of will:

I. In Principal Propositions:

A. VOLITIVE SUBJUNCTIVE. The old simple subjunctive is, in general, now little used in decided expressions of will — the volitive subjunctive. Third person: ‘Suffice it to say that,’ etc. ‘Perish the colonies rather than a principle!’ ‘Be this purse an earnest of my thanks!’ (Lytton, Rienzi, I, Ch. III). ‘Laugh those that can, weep those that may!’ (Scott, Marmion, 5, 17, 1. 3). It is most common with a subject of general or indefinite meaning: ‘Everybody stand up!’ ‘Please forgive me everybody!’ (Pinero, His House in Order, Act II). It is also still quite common where the subject is a substantive limiting adjective modified by a partitive genitive of a personal pronoun: ‘One of you go and hasten it!’ (Alfred Noyes, The Torch-Bearers, p. 24). It is also frequently used with witness in the sense serve as proof, be the proof: ‘The literary works that have fascinated mankind abound in strokes of invention: witness Homer, Shakespeare,’ etc. (Bain, Rhetoric). ‘The drama of literary moralizing is growing increasingly, as witness the plays by Mr. Shaw, Mr. Barker, Mr. Galsworthy’ (Bookman). We now usually employ here let (imperative) with a dependent infinitive clause: ‘Someone is inquiring for you.’ — ‘Let him come in!’ ‘Let them take care what they say!’ The form with let here is the modern subjunctive form corresponding to the old simple subjunctive. In popular speech, leave is often used here instead of let; always without to after the analogy of let: ‘Leave him come in.’ In the negative form of statement, we use here the present subjunctive of do with a dependent infinitive: ‘Don’t everybody talk at once!’ ‘Don’t anybody tell me that!’ ‘Don’t talk to me anybody!’ (Pinero, Sweet Lavender, Act III). The first person plural of the old simple subjunctive is now possible only in poetry: ‘Part we in friendship from your land’ (Scott, Marmion, 6, 13), now expressed by the new let-form: ‘Let us part!’ Compare 45 3.

To convey stronger force we employ must: ‘You must go!’ ‘He must go!’ ‘We must go!’ ‘The world must be made safe for de-
mocracy’ (Woodrow Wilson, April 2, 1917). ‘It must succeed!’ Often, however, with the stress upon the form that has the verbal meaning where the verbal meaning seems important to the mind: ‘We must go!’ Also have to and have got to are used here. The latter is the more emphatic of the two, but is for the most part confined to the present tense and to colloquial language. Although have to and have got to usually denote an objective necessity that lies in circumstances, they are also not infrequently used to indicate that the objective necessity lies in the will of another, hence the speaker often employs them instead of must when he desires to represent his will or, in the language of kindness and politeness, his wish as an objective necessity that constrains another or brings about some result: ‘I order it and you have to do it; this is my last word.’ ‘You have to (or have got to) come to our cottage over Whitsuntide.’ ‘It has to succeed.’ They often denote the constraint of another than the speaker: ‘I don’t want to do it, but I have to’ (or have got to). We often have to use had to and have had to as must has no clear forms for reference to the past: ‘I had to do it.’ ‘I have often had to do it.’ Compare 45 4 e. Alongside of this common use of have to, have got to, and must is their common use to indicate the constraint of circumstances: ‘We have to (or must) sell our house.’ ‘In life we have to (or must) do many things we do not desire to do.’ Perverse constraint: ‘Just when I was dropping off, a door had to (or must) bang.’ Must was originally a past subjunctive. We now feel it as a present tense. Where the reference is to the will of a person the force is that of a volitive subjunctive. Where the reference is to the constraint of circumstance the force is thought by some to be that of the indicative, though the form was originally a subjunctive. On the other hand, have to was originally an indicative indicating the constraint of circumstances, but it is now used also with subjunctive force indicating the will of a person. In both forms, however, there is always present the idea of a constraint of some kind, so that there is a unity of meaning in all the examples. There is a certain volitive force here, for the aim is not to express the act of a free subject, but to represent the act as determined by another, or by circumstances, or by natural law. Sometimes other forms of expression, need, want (popular), am obliged, am compelled, etc., are employed to express this modal idea: ‘He need not wait.’ ‘You want (= need) to keep your eyes open in the city or you will be taken in’ (Krapp, Comprehensive Guide to Good English). ‘I am obliged to be away tomorrow.’ Also sentence adverbs (16 2 a) have this modal force: ‘He will necessarily (or of necessity) arrive late.’
Am (or is, are) to is often used instead of must or have to, usually with a little milder force: 'You are to stay here until I come back.' Sometimes in sharper tone: 'You are always to shut the door when you enter this room!' For a fuller description of this modal force see 7 D 2. Compare 45 4 f. Going to has the same general meaning, but is more forcible: 'All policemen are going to go to work or get off the force' (words of the Chief of Police in Chicago, July 16, 1930).

To indicate the will of the speaker with reference to the future we use will in the first person and in questions also in the second person, but in declarative statements employ shall in the second and third persons: 'I will do all I can' (promise). 'I won't have you children playing in my study!' In 'Will you sit down?' and in still more friendly tone 'Won't you sit down?' the force is kind, but in 'Will you children be quiet!' the words and tone have the force of a command. 'You shall have some cake' (promise). 'You shall smart for it' (threat). 'You shall do as I say!' (command). A mild form of expression of will is found in permissions: 'You may go.' The Concise Oxford Dictionary gives must not, cannot as the usual negative forms of may: 'You must not (or cannot) go.' This corresponds closely to our colloquial American usage: 'May I (or mayn't I) play ball this morning?' — 'No, you cannot; but you may play this afternoon' (Kittredge and Farley, Advanced English Grammar, p. 126). But may not is sometimes used here, especially in the literary language: 'Why mayn't I say to Sam that I'll marry him? Why mayn't I?' (Hardy, Life's Little Ironies, I, II, 29). 'Would he break faith with one I may not name?' (Tennyson, Lancelot and Elaine, 681). 'Now the dilemma is acute, and settlement may not be deferred' (editorial in Chicago Tribune, Dec. 9, 1929). 'Rooms may not be sub-rented' (The University of Chicago Announcements, Jan. 15, 1930, p. 18).

May not is most common here when the word may immediately precedes: 'It is not always easy to know what we may do and what we may not do.' 'May I go now?' — 'No, you may not!' Can is not infrequently employed also in positive permissions: 'You can go' (Concise Oxford Dictionary). Of course, also in the sub-ordinate clause: 'Why won't you say when I can see you again?' (Tarkington, Mirthful Haven, Ch. XIV). In questions may and can here have the force of a request: 'May I come in?' 'I may come and see you, mayn't I?' (Susan Warner, The Wide, Wide World, Ch. XIII). 'Can I come in?' (Rider Haggard, Mr. Messon's Will, Ch. VIII). The positive form of statement with may or can often has the force of a mild command: 'Pretty Cousin. — "Bobby, how dare you give me a kiss?"

Bobby (unabashed).
— "Well, if you don’t like it, you can (or may) give it me back again." (Punch). Compare 45 4.

To ascertain the will of a person to whom we are speaking, we employ shall or am (or is, are) to: ‘Shall I (or he) come again tomorrow?’ ‘Am I (or is he) to come again tomorrow?’ Compare 37 5 a (pp. 366, 371).

Shall or am (or is, are) to is employed to predict that something will come about in accordance with the will of God or destiny: ‘Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away’ (Matthew, XXIV, 35). ‘The time shall (or is to) come when Egypt shall be avenged’ (Lytton, Pompeii, II, Ch. VII). Similarly, shall, am (is, are, was, were) to, going to, and come to are used to represent an act or state as the inevitable outcome of events or as the natural result of a development: ‘We shall then (or are then to) be partners with all the business men of the country, and a day of freer, more stable property shall have come’ (Woodrow Wilson, Aug. 7, 1912). Is to cannot replace shall in the future perfect relation, as in the case of the second shall here, but elsewhere it is the common form in everyday language, while shall is the favorite in higher diction: ‘Better days are soon to (or shall soon) follow.’ ‘The worst was over. Better days were soon to (or should soon) follow.’ These forms point to the future — from the present or from a point of time in the past. Going to points to the future from the present: ‘We are going to lose all that we have earned in a lifetime.’ In the case of come to all the different time relations can be expressed, as come has retained enough of its original concrete meaning to point, like any verb, to the present, past, or future: ‘He is coming (came, has come, will come) to see the error of his ways.’ In the case of is coming, came, has come the reference is to actual events, but these forms express something more than actual events. They contain a modal idea. They represent the events as the result of the constraint of educating personal experiences. This modal idea is often expressed by a sentence adverb (16 2 a): ‘Our cause will ultimately (or eventually) prevail.’

The past subjunctive should is much used as a modest or polite volitive: ‘You should go at once,’ much milder than ‘Go at once!’ or ‘You shall go at once!’ ‘He should go at once.’ ‘We should go at once.’ This form, however, sometimes becomes quite emphatic: ‘You should go if I had my way!’ ‘You should mind your own business!’ The past subjunctive would is here usually associated with the idea of politeness, modesty: ‘I would speak a few words to you, sir.’ ‘Would you tell me the time, please?’ ‘Mrs. Ralston, also Mr. Brown would like a cup of tea’ (indirect
polite request), but, according to 37 5 a (p. 367), we say 'I should like a cup of tea' (direct polite request) to avoid expressing the idea of desire twice. The past subjunctive would is sometimes quite sharp and emphatic: 'If he should treat me in that way, I just wouldn't stand it.' The past subjunctive might is much used in polite and modest requests: 'You might call at the baker's and get some bread.' 'Aunty, might (or could) I bother you again with a few questions?' Might sometimes becomes sharp and emphatic: 'You might offer to help me!' Compare 45 4. For reference to the past we employ the perfect infinitive: 'You should have gone at once.'

The past subjunctives ought (past subjunctive of owe), must, and should are often used to express modestly and politely the idea of constraint of duty, i.e., moral necessity or obligation: 'We ought (literally, should owe) to (or must, or should) do something to help him.' Ideal constraint, i.e., fitness and expediency: 'She ought to (or should) be praised for that.' 'A liar ought to (or should) have a good memory.' Should is often used ironically: 'He—as he put it colloquially to himself—should worry!' (Lawrence Perry, Collier's, Sept. 3, 1927, p. 32) = 'It wasn't anything he should worry about.' 'You'll get a good thrashing for that.' — 'I should worry' = 'I'm not worrying about that.' Compare 44 I a. For reference to the past we employ the perfect infinitive: 'We ought to have done something to help him.'

A polite expression of will often takes the form of a simple question calling for a statement of fact: 'Who lives here?' See 2 (3rd par.), p. 1.

B. SUBJUNCTIVE OF WISH. The present subjunctive is often used to express a wish which in all probability may be realized, the sanguine subjunctive of wish: 'God bless you!' 'The Lord have mercy upon us!' 'The Lord save us!' 'Thy kingdom come!' 'Heaven forbid!' Often in oaths as an expression of irritation: 'God damn you!' (or it). 'Be damned to you!' a blending of 'Be [you] damned!' and 'Woe [be] to you!' Often with milder words: '[God] Confound you!' (or it). 'The devil take him!' 'Plague take them!' 'Grammar be hanged!'

In general, the new subjunctive form with may and a dependent infinitive clause is more common: 'May you see many happy returns of this occasion!' 'May he return soon!' 'May I never see such a sight again!' 'So mote (archaic present subjunctive of must, once used here with the force of may) it be!' In oaths and mild imprecations will with a dependent infinitive clause is often used in the first person: 'I'll be damned (hanged, or dashed) if I do it!' '[I'll be] Dashed if I like it.'
A past tense form, the unreal subjunctive of wish, conveys the idea of unreality, indicating that fulfilment is not expected: 'O were he only here!' 'O had I wings!' 'Would God that thou couldst hide me from myself!' (Tennyson, Guinevere, 117), now usually 'I would to God that,' etc., after the analogy of 'I wish to God.' Modal auxiliaries are now more common here, serving as the modern subjunctive forms: 'Too late! O might I see her just once more!' 'Could we only look forward in life and see as clearly as we do looking backward in memory!'

The past tense often expresses a modest wish (41): 'Might this little book contribute something toward arousing interest in this important question.' 'I would not have the affair known for all the world.' 'I would rather stay than go.' Instead of would rather we often employ the past subjunctive had with rather: 'I had rather err with Plato than be right with Horace' (Shelley, Essays, II, 155). The adverb rather has displaced here older tiefer. The newer form began to appear here in the fifteenth century, but the older lingered on for a long while: 'Far liever would I face about, and step back to my Emperor' (Coleridge, Piccolomini, IV, V, a.d. 1800). It survives in dialect. Earlier in the present period the positive of this old form was still in use: 'I would as lief go there as anywhere' (Thackeray, Henry Esmond, I, VI). It survives in colloquial speech. In more formal language we use as readily here. In less formal language older liefer, as lief are now represented by sooner, as soon: 'I would (or had) sooner die than let him find it out.' 'I would (or had) just as soon stay at home as go.' In all these cases had is now less common than would. The past optative had with an adverb should be distinguished from the past potential described in 44 I (10th par.). The past potential is associated with an adjective, not with an adverb: 'I had better (objective predicate adjective) go,' literally, 'I should regard going as better.' 'I had best go.' In the potential category had is much more common than would. The latter, however, is sometimes used. Examples are given in 44 I (10th par.).

In all these examples the past subjunctive expresses a desire of the speaker, but it is often employed to report the desire of another: 'He would gladly do it.' 'He would rather stay at home.'

For reference to past time we employ the past perfect subjunctive, or in the case of auxiliaries use the perfect infinitive instead of the present: 'O had he only been here!' 'O might I have known it in time!' 'O could I have understood him better!' 'I would gladly have done it.' 'I should have liked a glass of water.' 'He would gladly have done it.'
C. Subjunctive of Logical Reasoning. In logical reasoning in laying down one or more desired propositions from which conclusions are to be drawn, the present tense of the simple subjunctive is now entirely replaced by let with the infinitive: 'Let the figure abc be an isosceles triangle and bd a perpendicular line on the base,' etc.

D. Subjunctive of Plan. Am (or is, are) to and shall are much used to represent the act as merely planned, but usually with the implication that the plan will be carried out: 'I am to go by train to Jerusalem tonight. There I am to meet Ellington' (Sir Walter Raleigh, Letter to H. A. Jones, March 22, 1922). 'There shall (or more commonly is to) be a girth of buildings down the avenue that leads to the woods below, and there shall (or more commonly is to) run by those buildings a path which leads to the open quadrangles of the professional schools' (Woodrow Wilson, Dec. 9, 1902).

To express an unrealized past plan we employ was to followed by a perfect infinitive: 'He was to have dined with us today.'

The finite verb in the case of am (or is, are, was) to is always in the indicative. It indicates the time of the action — future or past. The subjunctive or modal idea lies in the to-infinitive in connection with the verb be (am, is, are, was). Compare 7 D 2.

II. In Subordinate Clauses. Here the optative subjunctive represents the action as conceded or desired.

A. Action Conceded. The present subjunctive is often used as a weak imperative, a mild volitive. Originally, these propositions were independent sentences and may still be regarded as such, but as their logical dependence is evident they may be regarded as subordinate clauses: 'Say [he] what he will, he cannot make matters worse,' or 'Let him say what he will,' etc. Other examples in 321 a aa.

Also in really subordinate concessive clauses: 'Though he make (shall make, or more commonly may make) every effort, he cannot succeed.' 'But whether the extensive changes which I have recommended shall be thought desirable or not, I trust that we shall reject the Bill of the noble Lord' (Macaulay). 'However hard it rain (shall rain, or more commonly may rain, or rains, if we desire to indicate that we are reckoning with this factor), we shall have to go.' 'Whosoever he be (now more commonly may be) that doth rebel, he shall be put to death' (Joshua, I, 18). 'I ask that every man of any standing in Rome be brought to trial even if he have remained neutral' (Masefield, Pompey the Great, Act II). The past tense forms convey the idea of unreality: 'Even if (or though) it were more dangerous, I should feel com-
 compelled to go.’ ‘Even though (or if) he were here, I should say the same thing.’ Improbability: ‘Though he might (or should) make every effort, he could not succeed.’ The past subjunctive of the simple verb or the past subjunctive might or should in connection with a present infinitive points to the present or the future. If the reference is to the past, we must use the past perfect subjunctive or the past subjunctive might or should in connection with a perfect infinitive: ‘Even if (or though) it had been more dangerous, I should have felt compelled to go.’ ‘Even if he should have made every effort, he could not have succeeded.’

The past subjunctive sometimes, as in 44 II 5 A b (last par.), has the modal force of the present subjunctive, indicating that the statement is probably true, but it differs from it in that it refers to the past: ‘Stewart was, perhaps, the most beloved member of Trinity, whether he were feeding rugger blues on plovers’ eggs or keeping an early chapel with the expression of an earth-born seraph’ (Compton Mackenzie, Sinister Street, Ch. V). In older English, the past subjunctive often pointed to the past. See 44 II 5 A b (last par.). Now we more commonly employ the past indicative here, since we feel that we have to do with actual facts.

B. ACTION DESIRED. A present tense form represents the statement only as desired or planned, but implies the expectation that the desire or plan will be realized. It expresses various shades of the volitive and the sanguine subjunctive of wish described in I A and B. A past tense form represents the thing desired or planned as a mere conception of the mind, not resting upon any expectation of realization, or, on the other hand, by thus using here a past tense form and thus indicating that we are not counting upon a realization of our expectations we can often modestly express earnest wishes and plans which we inwardly hope to see realized.

The subjunctive of action desired occurs in the following categories:

a. In substantive clauses:

In object clauses after verbs of advising, beseeching, warning, praying, wishing, willing, demanding, deciding, providing, seeing to, taking care, etc., also after adjectives of similar meaning: ‘Pray God it last not long!’ (S. Weir Mitchell, Roland Blake, Ch. II, p. 15). ‘She desires that he do (or may do) it,’ or with milder force, ‘She begs that he will (consent to) do it,’ ‘that I will do it.’ ‘I hope (= desire and expect) that he may recover.’ ‘I tell you what let’s do: let’s all run away’ (Margaret Deland, The Iron Woman, Ch. II). ‘I insist that he be allowed his freedom.’ ‘I require that you be here by eight.’ ‘We demand that
this burden must (or shall — a modern subjunctive, originally the present indicative of the modal auxiliary shall, hence stronger than may) be removed. ‘I will arrange that another consultation shall be held.’ ‘The doctor insists that I shall give up smoking.’ ‘The will provides that the estate be (or shall be) divided among his children.’ ‘Let him that hath ears and understanding see that he hear (now more commonly hears) God’s word regardfully’ (Baxter, Paraphrase on the New Testament, Mark, IV, 23, A.D. 1685). ‘See to it that my boots be (or shall be) blacked,’ but more commonly are blacked, to indicate that we are counting on it. ‘Take care that she may not jilt you,’ or more commonly doesn’t jilt you, since we are reckoning with this factor. ‘But mind your human debts are paid’ (Edwin A. Robinson, Collected Poems, ‘Ballad by the Fire’), the indicative emphasizing the absolute necessity of complying with this injunction.

As described in 7 D 2, there is a peculiar modal force in the indicative forms am to, is to, are to; also shall often has this same force: ‘Father has finally decided that Fred is to go, that we are to go.’ ‘I stipulate that I shall, you shall, he shall do it.’ ‘I beg that I shall not suffer from it.’ Shall is especially common here to represent an act or state as the inevitable outcome of events or as the natural result of a development: ‘I trust that you shall have no cause to regret making this appointment’ (Charles P. Taft, Letter, Jan. 29, 1887). Am to, is to, are to often have about the same meaning here and elsewhere, but there is a little difference in the style. Is to, are to are more common in everyday language.

The future indicative, so often used in direct commands, as described in 45 4 c, is often used also in indirect form here in object clauses: ‘I desire you will do no such thing’ (Jane Austen, Pride and Prejudice, Ch. I). The form will is often found here with milder meaning, but it is, of course, modal will, not the future tense auxiliary: ‘I beg that you will draw your chair up to the fire’ (Conan Doyle, Sherlock Holmes, I). ‘He begs that I will do it.’

A past tense form in this category often conveys the idea of unreality: ‘I wish I were dead!’ or here often in colloquial speech with the past subjunctive form was, after the analogy of other past subjunctives which all have the same form as the past indicative, the reference to the present or the future alone distinguishing the subjunctive here from the indicative: ‘I wish it was to-morrow!’ (Farjeon, London’s Heart, I, 188). ‘I wish I had wings!’ ‘They afterwards wished they had arrested him,’ where, however, in popular speech a have (frequently in the contracted
form of a or of) is often inserted after the had of the past perfect subjunctive to distinguish here the subjunctive from the indicative and thus impart the clear modal idea of unreality, as explained in 49 3 b (3rd par.) and 44 II 5 C (last par.): ‘They did most earnestly wish they had of arrested him’ (A. S. M. Hutchinson, This Freedom, p. 370). The past subjunctive might is much used here: ‘I too wish our efforts might be successful, but I scarcely expect it.’ A past tense subjunctive form is often a modest expression of desire: ‘I wish I might not have my labor in vain!’ ‘I wish you would stay a little longer!’ ‘He wishes I would go and visit him.’ ‘I wish that success might come to you speedily!’ ‘I would rather he took (or should take) me over the crossing.’ ‘Which would you rather took you over the crossing? Me or Papa?’ (May Sinclair, Mary Olivier, p. 88). ‘Would you rather I went on to the house?’ (Mary Johnston, The Long Roll, Ch. XVII). Polite command: ‘I (a physician) desire the patient should have a bath every day.’

After a past indicative tense form the distinction of meaning between present and past tense forms usually disappears entirely: ‘She desired that he might come at once.’ ‘We demanded that the burden should be removed.’ In recent literature and present colloquial usage, however, the tendency occasionally found in early Modern English to break through our rigid sequence and employ the simple present subjunctive even after a past tense has grown stronger, since the simple present subjunctive with its implication of early and immediate execution has become associated with the expression of will in general without reference to the tense of the principal verb: ‘I desire, demand, or suggest, or I desired, demanded, or suggested, that action be postponed.’ ‘She insisted that he accept, and, indeed, take her with him’ (Edgar Rice Burroughs, Tarzan of the Apes, Ch. I, 3). ‘He was glad his sisters had suggested that the Holtons be invited’ (Meredith Nicholson, Otherwise Phyllis, Ch. X).

The subjunctive is found with verbs with these meanings not only in object clauses, but also often in subject clauses: ‘It has long been desired by us all that this privilege be extended to others.’ ‘Twere to be wish’d not one of them survived’ (Robert Rogers, Ponteach, I, II, A.D. 1776), or should survive. ‘It seems to be fixed that Fred is to go to college’ (George Eliot).

This subjunctive is much used in subject clauses also after nouns and adjectives with these meanings: ‘It is my ardent wish, or very desirable, that he come (or may come, or shall come) at once.’ ‘The essence (= thing required) of originality is not that it be new’ (Carlyle). There is a tendency here to disregard the
old sequence and employ a present subjunctive after a past tense in the principal proposition, especially when immediate action seems desirable: 'It was more than ever imperative now that he forestall that desperate action' (Brand Whitlock, *J. Hardin & Son*, III, Ch. X, 4). 'For our good name it was essential that they (the notes) be early redeemed' (T. E. Lawrence, *Revolt in the Desert*, p. 121).

This subjunctive is much used also in attributive substantive clauses after nouns with these meanings: 'Father's advice that Mary wait until next week is quite reasonable.' 'The Committee on Curriculum presents the recommendation that the cases of all students who do not fully meet the requirements for a degree shall be considered by a committee consisting of the Dean, the Registrar, and the Committee on Registration.' 'When one runs against a post like that, one can't help expressing the wish that the post were in the infernal regions.' 'She has left the written request that you would (or stronger should) come soon.' 'He has given the order that the patient should have a bath every day.' Of course, with a past indicative the present subjunctive is attracted into the form of the past: 'I promise secrecy on the understanding that the thing end (or shall end), but 'On the understanding that the thing ended, secrecy was promised' (Jerome K. Jerome, *Harper's Monthly*, July, 1925), or 'on the understanding that the thing should end.' Often, however, here, as above, a present subjunctive after a past tense: 'He issued the order that the work be done at once.'

The past tense subjunctive forms are often used in the subordinate clause where the principal proposition is suppressed: 'Oh! that I were young again!' 'Ah! that your excellency but saw the great duel which depends on you alone!' (Kingsley, *Hypatia*, Ch. II). 'Oh! that I had but known!' (Hall Caine, *The Deemster*, Ch. XVIII).

In the preceding examples the idea of wish, desire, demand is expressed by the meaning of the verb or some noun or adjective in the principal proposition as well as by the subjunctive form of the verb in the subordinate clause. Often, however, the idea of wish, desire, demand is expressed only by the subjunctive form of the verb in the subordinate clause.

In object clauses: 'Therefore they thought it good you hear a play' (Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew*, Induction, II, 136), or more modestly 'should hear a play.' 'He thought it good that a young man now and then hear (or should hear) a play.' 'We regard it of the highest importance that Kinney be nominated' (Chicago Tribune, April 12, 1926). 'Mary will telegraph him that
he is to (shall, or more modestly should) come at once.' It can be seen by the first examples that the old sequence is not always observed here.

In subject clauses: 'It is a matter of the highest importance to the whole world that there shall be a free ballot and a fair count' (J. B. Foraker, Notes of a Busy Life, Ch. XVI). 'It is biologically important that the sex-complex leave nothing to chance' (George A. Dorsey, Why We Behave as Human Beings, p. 438). 'It is best that he go at once.' 'It is sufficient, not sufficient, that he read his lesson over only once.' 'The only form of independence that is possible or desirable for a woman is that she shall be (or simple be) dependent upon her husband, or if she is unmarried, on her nearest male relative' (St. John Hankin, The Last of the DeMullins, Act III), or more modestly 'should be dependent upon,' etc.

In predicate clauses: 'What this country needs now more than it ever did before, what it shall (or is to) need in the years following is knowledge and enlightenment' (Woodrow Wilson, Dec. 9, 1902). The force of shall and is to in this example is the same as in the example from Charles P. Taft on page 402.

In attributive substantive clauses: 'It is high time that he go' (or more modestly went, or were going, or should go). 'It is time that you either showed your authority or openly confessed you had none.' As were is the only distinctive past subjunctive in the language, in all other verbs the past subjunctive having the same form as the past indicative, we sometimes even in the literary language and frequently in colloquial speech find the past indicative used as a past subjunctive: 'It's really time something was done' (Marion Crawford, The Undesirable Governess, Ch. I).

b. In adverbial clauses of purpose introduced by that, so that, in order that, for fear that, lest, with the same use of forms and tenses as in a: 'In order that this measure be useful, it must be put into force at once.' 'I move that the case be adjourned until tomorrow in order that further inquiries may be made.' 'I locked myself into my study that I might not be disturbed.' 'I would give all my goods that it had never happened' (Dasent, Burnt Njal, II, 118), or more commonly 'might never have happened.' For other examples see 33.

As in object clauses, as described in a (5th par.), there is also here in adverbial clauses of purpose, especially those introduced by lest, a tendency after a past tense to break through our rigid sequence and employ the simple present subjunctive to indicate more vividly that the thing feared is felt as imminent: 'We helped down the Indians from their burdened camels that no sound betray
(instead of might betray) us to listening ears’ (T. E. Lawrence, *Revolt in the Desert*, p. 177). ‘And lest she disobey (instead of disobeyed, or more commonly should disobey), he left her’ (Amy Lowell, *Men, Women, and Ghosts*, p. 111). ‘He desired rather to keep free of these follies lest they confuse him and make him soft’ (Sinclair Lewis, *Arrowsmith*). The use of may instead of might after a past tense is a prominent feature of colloquial Irish English: ‘Last week when I set out on my long train journey I brought a book that I may read as I traveled along’ (Joyce, *English as We Speak It in Ireland*, 84).

*Shall*, here as elsewhere in purpose clauses, has a strong force. It represents something as yet only conceived, but at the same time as something that must be attained: ‘They (i.e., the trappers) go about their business in a stealthy manner for fear that any shall see where they set their traps’ (Thoreau, *Journal*, XI, p. 456). ‘The one command laid upon him (i.e., the real playwright) is to see things nobly — that his deeper vision shall help the crowd’ (L. Merrick, *The Actor-Manager*, Ch. I, p. 13). ‘He brushes his hair up over his head from behind, so that it shall not be seen how bald he is’ (Anne Douglas Sedgwick, *The Little French Girl*, Part III, Ch. IV).

c. In temporal clauses after *until*, *till*, *when*, *whenever*, *as soon as*, *before*, *against* (= before), *ere* the subjunctive shall is sometimes employed to represent a future act, not as a fact, but only as the result of a development, the outcome of circumstances, or as planned, desired: ‘Is she going to keep a lonely vigil till that time shall come?’ (Florence Montgomery, *Thrown Together*, I). ‘Do my errand when it shall be most convenient for you in the course of the day’ (Stevenson, *Dr. Jekyll*, Ch. IX). ‘There is much to be done before every child in the country shall speak English as could be wished’ (H. C. Wyld). ‘There is a month yet, and I promise you to be back ere it shall have elapsed.’ *Come to* is often used here instead of *shall*: ‘It will be a better and a happier world when greater numbers of men come to (or shall) see the need of serving others.’ Of course, shall and *come to* become *should* and *came to* after a past indicative: ‘Many years passed by before he should (or came to) realize his error.’

In older English, the simple subjunctive was used here: ‘The tree will wither long before it fall’ (Byron, *Childe Harold*, III, XXXII). ‘The most forward bud Is eaten by the canker ere it blow’ (Shakespeare, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, I, i, 45). This usage lingers on in poetry and choice prose: ‘Not though all men call, Kneeling with void hands, Shall they see light fall Till it come for all Tribes of men and lands’ (Swinburne, *Songs before
Sunrise, 'Christmas Antiphones,' III). 'I am now going down to Garden City and New York till the President send for me; or, if he do not send for me, I'm going to his house and sit on his front steps till he come out!' (Walter H. Page, Letter to Irwin Laughlin, August, 1916). 'It follows that all gods must pass until — perhaps — a god be found who satisfies the requirements of this disastrously exigent human dreaming' (Cabell, The High Place, XXIX).

After the past subjunctive forms ought, might, should, etc., the present subjunctive is usually attracted into the form of the past: 'You ought not to decide this matter until you were (or should be) calmer.' 'You ought to be beaten until you fell down' (Hergesheimer, Cytherea, p. 288) (or should fall down). 'She might say it until she dropped dead before me, and I should know it wasn't true' (Alice Brown, The Winds between the Worlds, Ch. XXIII). 'You should be kept at this work until you finished it.'

The present indicative is now more common here than the form with shall or the simple present subjunctive, since we desire to represent the thought, not merely as something planned or desired, but as an actual factor with which we are reckoning: 'When he comes, bring him into the room.'

d. The old simple volitive subjunctive (I A) is still sometimes used in a proposition which, though formally independent, has the logical force of a temporal when-clause: 'She will be eighteen years old come Easter' (= when Easter shall come), literally, Let Easter come. 'I almost think if I could do like you, Drop everything and live out on the ground — But it might be, come night (= when night should come) I shouldn't like it' (Robert Frost, North of Boston, p. 71).

e. In relative clauses expressing shades of the volitive subjunctive and the subjunctive of wish:

Often to express purpose: 'Envoys were sent who should sue for peace.' 'The system of Divine Providence leaves it open to us, by humble and loving ways, to make ourselves susceptible of deep delight from the meanest objects of creation — a delight which shall not (= is not intended to) separate us from our fellows, nor require the sacrifice of any duty or occupation, but which shall bind us closer to men and to God' (Ruskin, Modern Painters, Part III, Sec. I, Ch. III).

Often in choice language to represent a future act or state as the inevitable outcome of events or as the natural result of a development: 'May my beloved old college have the unspeakable privilege of helping on my country towards the days when its people shall respond to the world that invests it, by learning
its laws and obeying them, by loving its beauty,' etc. (Sir Henry Jones, Letter, May 7, 1920). ‘It is hard to construct an argument here which shall not be heated’ (Woodrow Wilson, Jan., 1901). Am (or is, are) to often has the same force. Of course, the past subjunctive form must be used after a past indicative: ‘The year was now at hand in which he should draw the proconsulate of Africa as his lot’ (Haie and Buck, Latin Grammar, p. 268).

Often as a strong volitive: ‘I am engaged in an enterprise that must and shall succeed.’ ‘But even more do we need criticism which shall be truthful both in what it says and in what it leaves unsaid’ (Theodore Roosevelt, The Strenuous Life, p. 74). Also with milder force: ‘After a time she was telling herself that she did love the Butler (name) of that remote past, but that, as (see 23 II 6, next to last par.) witness what had just occurred, she did not love the Butler of the present’ (Cameron Mackenzie, Mr. and Mrs. Pierce, Ch. XIX).

Also the subjunctive of wish is common: ‘Moreover, the work in which this appears is not intended for the enjoyment of erudite scholars, whom God preserve, but for the enlightenment of the ordinary innocent weakling who is only too easily led away from the faith.’ Also when the antecedent is a previous clause or statement: ‘its interest to be paid to her if she’s a spinster at thirty . . . which Heaven forbid’ (Granville Barker, The Madras House, Act IV).

The past tense forms are used here to express a modest wish: ‘I hear a voice I would not hear, a voice that now might well be still’ (Byron, Away, Away, Ye Notes of Woe!).

f. Optative Subjunctive in Adverbial Clauses of Modal and Pure Result. May indicates a desired result: ‘We should proceed in such a manner that the public may indorse our cause.’ Here shall is employed to indicate a result determined upon or demanded by the speaker: ‘He is so badly injured that he shall be taken to the hospital at once.’ ‘A hundred and twenty little incidents must be dribbled into the reader’s intelligence in such a manner that he shall himself be insensible to the process’ (Trollope, Is He Popenjoy? Introductory). ‘We should have so much faith in authority as (5 d) shall make us repeatedly observe and attend to that which is said to be right’ (Ruskin, Modern Painters, Part III, Sec. I, Ch. III). We employ should here to state the desired result modestly: ‘He is so badly injured that he should be taken to the hospital at once.’ Compare 29 2 (Examples).

We express the constraint of circumstances or natural forces by have to, must, or come to; the outcome of events and natural developments by shall, come to, or is to: ‘The seed corn has come
up so poorly that (or very poorly so that) the farmers have to (or must) plant over again. 'The world sometimes treats us so roughly that we come to be contented with things that once made us miserable.' 'Can human progress ever advance so far that justice shall (or is to) come to all men?' 'I believe that the mind can be profaned by the habit of attending to trivial things, so that all our thoughts shall (or come to) be tinged by triviality' (Thoreau, Journal, II, p. 290). In older English, the simple subjunctive of result was in use here: 'He that smiteth a man so that he die shall be surely put to death' (Exodus, XXI, 12). Where it is desired to represent the result not as the constraint of circumstances but as a simple fact, we still, as in older English, employ the indicative: 'The seed corn has come up so poorly that the farmers are planting over again.'

g. Optative Subjunctive in Adverbial Clauses of Condition. We often employ the unreal subjunctive of wish (I B, p. 398) in the condition of conditional sentences. Examples are given in 44 II 5 C a. Also the volitive subjunctive is used in conditions. See 44 II 5, 44 II 5 A a, b.

POTENTIAL SUBJUNCTIVE

44. The potential subjunctive (41) shows the same use of the tense forms which have been described in 41 and illustrated in the different articles of 43. Here as elsewhere the old sequence (36) usually destroys after a past tense form all the fine distinctions observed after a present tense form. The following categories occur:

I. Potential Subjunctive in Principal Propositions. Can, though an indicative form, has potential force. It is much used to express ability to perform an act: 'Mary can walk, can write.' Will is sometimes used in the same meaning: '[His] words, though they will bear, yet do not warrant, such a translation' (R. Simpson, Life of Campion, IX, 279, A.D. 1866). Can and will, though indicatives, do not express action here. They express only the possibility of an action. They have in a certain sense the force of the potential subjunctive, but they have retained a good deal of their original concrete meaning. Also their past tense forms could and would, like past indicatives, can point to the past.

The present indicative may is now very commonly used as a present potential subjunctive to mark the thoughts which are busying the mind at the present moment as mere conceptions: 'It may rain today.' 'He may come today.' 'You may be right.' This old indicative is now rarely used as an indicative with its original meaning to have power, to be able: 'Try as he may he
never succeeds.' 'Try as he might he never succeeded.' Here might refers to the past.

The fact that might now usually refers to the present or future indicates clearly that it is prevailingly employed as a subjunctive. The past tense form was employed as an indicative and as a subjunctive in oldest English, a slight difference of form distinguishing the two functions, but only the subjunctive survives in wide use, so that might, now with the same form for indicative and subjunctive, is felt as a subjunctive referring to present or future time, which thus prevents its use as an indicative referring to the past. The present tense may, though originally an indicative and still possessing somewhat of its older concrete force, has developed into a present subjunctive, widely used in principal propositions and subordinate clauses to correspond to the past subjunctive might in the same positions, the former in accordance with the nature of the present subjunctive expressing a greater degree of probability: 'It may rain today,' where may expresses more probability than might in 'It might rain today.'

Grammarians usually consider may a present indicative when it stands in a principal proposition, but the fact that we do not use it in the past indicative except in a few rather rare expressions shows clearly that we do not feel it as an indicative. We do not have the least inclination to use it with reference to the past, as in the case of would and could, which, though their indicative and subjunctive are alike in the past tense, are much used as indicatives and subjunctives, referring to either the past or the present. Might, like should, has lost its indicative function. May and might, like shall and should, are both felt as subjunctives, both referring to the present or future, differing from each other only in the degree of probability which they express.

Must and ought are old past subjunctives which are not felt as related to other forms from the same stem. They differ from the other modal auxiliaries in that they do not have alongside of them a present tense form with a different shade of meaning. The one form must perform both functions.

May, might, shall, should, must, and ought are not now felt as belonging to a conjugational system like other verbs. They indicate present or future time when associated with a present infinitive, but point to the past when associated with a perfect infinitive, so that it is not they but the infinitive that indicates the time. All these forms are usually called modal auxiliaries, but they differ markedly from the modal auxiliaries will and can, and from all the modal auxiliaries in the closely related German in that they rarely have an indicative form and cannot show time
relations. They are used with an infinitive, which indicates the verbal meaning and the time relations, while they themselves only give a touch of color to the statement, each having a distinct shade, which is again in the case of *may*, *might*, *shall*, *should* differently shaded according as the form is in the present or the past tense: ‘He *may* miss the train’ (future possibility). ‘He *might* miss the train’ (faint future possibility). ‘He *may* have missed the train’ (past possibility). ‘He *might* have missed the train’ (faint past possibility). *Shall* and *should* are differentiated in the same way and have the same use of the dependent infinitive forms. *Shall* is little used in the potential category, but is very common in the optative category (43). *Should* is common in both categories, also *may* and *might*. The only function of *may*, *might*, *shall*, *should*, *must*, and *ought* is to color the statement. They perform the same functions as the subjunctive endings in Latin, but as there are a number of different auxiliary verbs in English and each verb retains a little of its original concrete meaning and the present and the past tense forms *may*, *shall*, *might*, *should* have a different shade of meaning, the English coloring is more varied and considerably richer. Compare Accident, 57 4 A h.

The auxiliary *can* is developing in the direction of *may*. It has become a subjunctive form when it expresses a possibility due to circumstances, having here the same force as *may*, only stronger, and, like *may*, not capable of indicating past time when used in the past tense: ‘We *can* (stronger than *may*) expect opposition from vested interests’ (London Times). ‘It *cannot* (or with much weaker force *may not*) be true.’ ‘*Can* it be true?’ In ‘*Could* this be true?’ *could*, though a past tense, refers to the present.

*Can* is often also a subjunctive when used of the possibility that lies in the ability of a person. ‘*I am at last able to do it*’ is an objective statement of fact, but in ‘*I can do it!*’ *can* is a subjunctive when spoken by someone who is confident of his ability to do something that he has never as yet done. It expresses here the abstract subjunctive idea of possibility.

While *would* and *could*, like past indicatives, often point to the past, they can do this only when the context clearly indicates that the reference is to the past: ‘I tried to get it into my suitcase, but it *wouldn’t* (= *couldn’t*) go in.’ ‘He tried to get it into his suitcase but *couldn’t*.’ Where the context does not clearly indicate that the reference is to the past, *would* and *could* point to the present or the future, like other modal auxiliaries, and, like them, are now usually felt as subjunctive forms: ‘We *could* never get that into the suitcase! It *wouldn’t* (= *couldn’t*) go in.’ Thus *would*
and could are developing in the direction of the other modal auxiliaries, i.e., they cannot now of themselves indicate time relations and are becoming mere coloring forms. Can, could, will, would are used in both the optative and the potential category and with the same differentiation of the tenses as found in the other modal auxiliaries.

The past subjunctive forms are widely used in principal propositions in the potential category. Possibility that lies in the ability of a person or in circumstances: 'He could easily do it.' 'It couldn't possibly be done.' 'It might possibly be true.' 'He might come today.' Doubt or uncertainty: 'Could he mean it?' The polite subjunctive of modest or cautious statement: 'It were wise to be silent.' 'I had better (objective predicate adjective) go,' literally, 'I should hold or regard going as better.' 'I had best (adjective) do it now.' 'I had as good (adjective) do it now,' or sometimes 'I had as well (adverb) do it now' after the analogy of 'I might as well (adverb) do it now.' 'All's over for us both; 'Tis vain contending; I would (not so widely used here as had) better go' (Browning, A Soul's Tragedy, I). 'We would (not so widely used here as had) better wait and see if they wish to come' (Mary Roberts Rinehart, The Circular Staircase, Ch. VI). 'I think you would (not so widely used here as had) better read it aloud' (Willa Cather, Death in the Desert, p. 293). 'I should (37 5 a, p. 367) think so.' 'I should hope so.' 'It would (37 5 a, p. 367) seem that the War Office is not as it ought to be.' 'This would seem to confirm his statement.' 'The royal power, it should (now more commonly would) seem, might be intrusted in their hands' (Hume, History of England). 'That would be rather difficult.' 'Your refusal to come might give offense.' Should is often used in all three persons to express modestly a strong probability: 'We should be there within an hour.' 'He should (or ought to) succeed this time.' In should the tone of modest assurance is often intensified to that of positive affirmation: 'Is anybody deceived by such words?' — 'I should say not.' In rhetorical questions (p. 212) should is often used after how to express impossibility: 'How should I know that?' (Tarkington, The Magnificent Ambersons, Ch. XXII) = 'I couldn't possibly know that.' Compare II 5 D, p. 428.

The form should is sometimes not a direct past subjunctive but the indirect form, corresponding to a first person present subjunctive of the direct, as described in 3 b, p. 419: 'He sat brooding. What should he (in the direct shall I) say when Father came (in the direct comes) home?'

With reference to the past, the perfect infinitive is used instead
of the present. Possibility: 'He could easily have done it.' 'He might have missed the train.' Doubt or uncertainty: 'Could he have meant it?' 'Might he have missed the train?' Subjunctive of modest or cautious statement: 'I should have thought it rather unfair.' 'He would have thought it rather unfair.' 'That would have been rather difficult.' 'He should have succeeded.'

In the potential category there are other quite different means of expression. The copulas seem, appear, and often look represent the statement as uncertain: 'He seems (or appears) friendly.' 'He looks perplexed.' Also sentence adverbs (16 2 a) are employed to express this idea: 'He is apparently friendly.' Since there are a large number of such adverbs or adverbial phrases, as seemingly, to judge by appearances, as far as we can see, etc., with different shades of meaning, the adverb is a highly prized means of expression.

a. 'OUGHT' AND 'MUST.' These past tense subjunctive forms are usually optatives with volitive force, as described in 43 I A (2nd and next to last parr.). Not infrequently, however, they have potential force. Strong probability: 'You have no occasion whatever to worry. He is an old experienced man and ought to (or must, or should) know what he is about.' 'Eclipse (horse) ought to (or should) win.' Inferred or presumed certainty: 'You must (or should) be aware of this.' 'You must (or should) have been aware of this.' With a tinge of doubt: 'He must come soon.' 'He must have missed his train.'

In neither potential nor volitive (43 I A) meaning do ought and must now have alongside of them a past indicative or a present indicative or subjunctive to make us feel that they are past subjunctives. As they usually point to the present, they have gradually come to be felt as present subjunctives; but we still have enough feeling for their old meaning to use them in dependent sentences as past subjunctives, as in older English; i.e., like every other past subjunctive they can be freely used in indirect discourse after a past tense, thus here pointing to a past duty or a past necessity: 'I thought he ought to do it and told him so.' 'I thought it must kill him' (Meredith, The Ordeal of Richard Feverel, Ch. XLV).

Sometimes under the influence of this common construction must is used elsewhere with reference to the past, in independent sentences as well as subordinate clauses, in some cases seemingly as a past indicative; but in fact in such instances it always stands in the neighborhood of some other verbal form which clearly points to the past and is thus in reality the means of conveying the idea of past time: 'A commander like Mansfield, who could not pay his soldiers, must, of necessity, plunder wherever he was. As soon as his men had eaten up one part of the country, they must go to another, if they were not to die of starvation' (Gardiner, Thirty Years' War, 47). 'In reading the fine books in the British Museum] My hunger was forgotten, the garret to which I must return to
pass the night never perturbed my thought' (Gissing, Henry Ryecroft, Ch. XVII). Compare II 3 a, p. 418.

The common people often replace the unclear old past subjunctive ought by a clear modern past subjunctive, employing the past subjunctive auxiliaries should, had, or did: 'A woman should ought to be modest' (Sheila Kaye-Smith, Joanna Godden, p. 31). 'You should ought to have seen them' (ib., p. 29). 'He'd oughter (i.e., had ought to) know better.' 'He'd oughter've known better.' 'And now the old lady downstairs is turning down the gas; she always does at half past ten. She didn't ought' (H. G. Wells, Mr. Britling Sees It Through, II, Ch. IV). 'There didn't ought to have such things.' 'He didn't ought to have done it.' Instead of adding the negative to the auxiliary, as in the last examples, it is sometimes added to ought, as the auxiliary and ought are together felt as a unit, a new clear past subjunctive form: 'D'you claim he'd (= he had) oughtn't?' (Owen Wister, Extra Dry, last page). To convey greater assurance the common people place the present tense do before the old past subjunctive ought, and have thus created a new present subjunctive form: 'He don't ought to go.' Alongside of the past subjunctives might, should, would are the present subjunctives may, shall, will for more positive assertion. There is in the literary language no present subjunctive corresponding to the old past subjunctive ought. The common people feeling the deficiency of form here have created two clear subjunctive forms, a present and a past, with the usual differentiation of subjunctive meaning. They have thus given clarity to English expression at a point where the literary language is regularly unclear. The common people instead of neglecting the subjunctive, as is so often claimed, are creating new and clearer subjunctive forms in accordance with their natural tendency toward concrete expression. Compare 49 3 b (3rd par.).

II. Potential Subjunctive in Subordinate Clauses.

1. Potential Subjunctive in Subject Clauses. It represents the thought which is busying the mind as a mere conception; but the indicative is used to indicate that the thought appears almost as a reality, as a practical problem with which we must deal: 'It is not impossible that he may change his plans.' 'It seems quite probable that it may (or with different force the indicative will) rain today.' 'What he may do next is now the absorbing theme.' Shall is employed to indicate a future contingency: 'Whoever shall violate the law shall pay the penalty.' 'My one great fear is that he shall some day return.' The past tense might indicates uncertainty: 'It is possible that it might rain.' Modest statement: 'It is easily conceivable that he might outstrip them all.'

We often use should even of facts, as the abstract conception, the principle involved, is more prominent in the mind than the concrete fact: 'That many men should enjoy (or of course also enjoy) it does not make it better' (Matthew Arnold, Essay on
Keats). 'It is extraordinary, Dorian, that you should have seen (or, of course, also saw) this in the portrait' (Wilde, Dorian Gray, 190). 'It is surprising that I, you, he should be (or should have been) so foolish.'

After a past indicative, of course, in accordance with the law of sequence (36), we employ a past tense of the subjunctive instead of the present: 'At that moment it seemed quite probable that it might rain.' 'My one great fear was that he should some day return.'

2. Potential Subjunctive in Predicate Clauses: 'My health is not what, under favorable circumstances, it may (probability) or might (possibility) be.'

3. Potential Subjunctive in Object Clauses. In object clauses introduced by the interrogative or indefinite whether or if, we sometimes still in choice prose and poetry employ the simple subjunctive, as in older English, to express the doubt in our mind, but in plain prose we now use the indicative, since we feel the reality, the actuality, of the problem stronger than the idea of doubt as to the proper solution: 'We doubt whether it be (in plain prose is) possible to mention a state which on the whole has been a gainer by a breach of faith' (Macaulay). 'She'll not tell me if she love (in plain prose loves) me' (Tennyson). 'I sometimes wonder if it be (in plain prose is) understood in the United States' (Walter H. Page, Letter to Woodrow Wilson, Jan. 12, 1915).

After a past tense we, of course, employ a past tense form of the subjunctive. This past subjunctive which results from attraction seems a little more common than the present subjunctive after a present indicative: 'That's just the answer Tertius gave me when I first asked if she were (in plain prose was) handsome' (George Eliot). 'He decided that he would go and see whether Rachel were (in plain prose was) in' (Hugh Walpole, The Duchess of Wrexe, p. 261). 'Esther trembled like one grown suddenly old. She did not know whether it were (in plain prose was) with pleasure or fear' (Max Pemberton, Doctor Xavier, Ch. IX). There is a modern tendency after lest to disregard the old sequence where the thing feared is felt as imminent: 'Each was playing a part and dreading lest the other suspect it' (G. Atherton, Sleeping Fires, Ch. XX) (or should suspect it).

We sometimes in choice prose and poetry use the simple subjunctive after other interrogatives and indefinites, what, how, where, why, etc., but we now usually employ the indicative, as in the second paragraph: 'A wise horseman should, in such a case, take care how he pull (in plain prose pulls) the rein' (Lytton,
Rienzi, II, Ch. III). After a past indicative the simple subjunctive — of course here the past subjunctive — seems a little more natural: 'I could not, when the scheme was first mentioned the other day, understand why a visit from the family were (in plain prose was) not to be made in the carriage of the family' (Jane Austen, Mansfield Park, I, Ch. VIII).

In older English, the simple subjunctive could be used not only after interrogatives and indefinites, but also in indirect statements: 'I think the King be (now is) stirring, it is now bright day' (Richard Edwards, Damon and Pithias, l. 132, A.D. 1571). 'I think it be (now is) not so' (Chapman, All Fooles, IV, I, 223, A.D. 1605). 'I fear me "faire" be (now is) a word too foule for a face so passing fair' (John Lyly, Sappho and Phao, I, IV, 6, A.D. 1584). 'I think my daughter be (now is) an exception' (Scott, Fair Maid of Perth, Ch. XXIX). The past subjunctive of modest statement is better preserved and can still be used in choice language: 'But I should say that men generally were (in plainer style usually are) not enough interested in the first-mentioned sciences (i.e., botany, anatomy, mathematics, chemistry) to meddle with and degrade them' (Thoreau, Journal, III, p. 326).

On the other hand, when the idea of doubt or uncertainty is strong we still quite commonly employ the subjunctive in all kinds of object clauses, even in the categories discussed above; now, however, in its modern form with an auxiliary: 'The doctors do not yet know whether there may be any change in his condition during the night.' 'I am going to ask him whether there may be any chance of an opening in his business for me.' 'I fear that he may not recover.' 'I now believe it possible that he may recover.' 'He now feels (or thinks) that he may be mistaken about it.' 'I have heard that he may return soon.' However, we use the indicative wherever we desire to indicate that the statement is felt not as a mere conception but rather as a reality, truth, sure result: 'He now feels that he is mistaken about it.' 'I fear that he will not recover.' 'I think this will meet with your approval.' In all these cases a past tense form is, of course, employed after a past tense: 'I feared he might not recover.' 'I had heard that he might return soon.' 'I feared that he would not recover.' 'He felt that he was mistaken about it.'

The past tense forms of the simple subjunctive and the modal auxiliaries are much used after a present tense with different shades of meaning. Possibility: 'Whether such a development were possible or not is not for me now to discuss.' 'I see that that might have proved disastrous.' Often to put the thought upon a basis of pure imagination: 'Suppose he were here?' 'Suppose
that I were to tell you that you had no need to be alarmed’ (Black, Daughter of Heth, I, 270). Modest statement: ‘I think that might (or should) please anybody.’ ‘I think you would be better pleased with this book.’ The past subjunctive is often used instead of the present indicative since the abstract principle is felt as more important than the concrete fact: ‘I regard it as the saddest of things that a man should be allowed to bring up his son in that way.’

a. Indirect Discourse after Verbs of Saying, Reporting, REMARKING, etc. After these verbs we now employ the subjunctive in indirect discourse only where it is used in the direct form. Direct: ‘I may finish the work tomorrow.’ Indirect: ‘He says he may finish the work tomorrow,’ or ‘He said he might finish the work tomorrow.’ We employ the indicative uniformly in all indirect statements where the indicative is used in the direct form. Direct: ‘I am sick.’ Indirect: ‘John says he is sick’ or ‘John said he was sick.’ There is often here an element of uncertainty or unreality. Today we feel this as amply expressed by the meaning of the verb in the principal proposition and the change of person and tense in the subordinate clause. These characteristic features of indirect discourse show us that we have to do with an indirect, hence not necessarily reliable, statement. In Old English, as still in modern German, the subjunctive was used here to indicate uncertainty or unreality: ‘Oft un men seegap þæt hi unsynne beon’ (Ælfric, Homilies, II, 330) = ‘Often men tell us that they are without sin.’ ‘Nu cwædon gedwolmen þæt deofol gesceope sume gesceafeta’ (ib., I, 16) = ‘Now heretics said that the devil created some creatures.’ But in this oldest period the subjunctive was often used also of actual facts: ‘Tc gehyrde seegan þæt hwaete ware on Egypta lende’ (The Heptateuch, Genesis, XLII, 2) = ‘I have heard that there is corn in Egypt’ (King James Version). The potential idea has here entirely disappeared, the subjunctive expressing merely indirectness of statement. This subjunctive survives in German, but has been discarded in English as superfluous expression. At least one of the characteristic features of indirect discourse described above is always present and indicates indirectness of statement.

The following additional examples are given to illustrate present usages more fully:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I come as often as I can.</td>
<td>He says he comes as often as he can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will do it for you.</td>
<td>He says he will do it for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would come if you should ask me.</td>
<td>He says he would come if I should ask him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may rain.</td>
<td>He thinks it may rain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I making progress?</td>
<td>He often asks me whether he is making progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no difficulty here except in the case of the pure future, which has different forms for the different persons. In the indirect statement we here usually, without regard to the auxiliary used in the direct statement, employ shall in the first person and will in the second and the third, in accordance with the usual way of using these forms in the future tense:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You will surely fail.</td>
<td>He says I shall (or in American colloquial speech will; see p. 369) surely fail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I shall return tomorrow.</td>
<td>He says he will return tomorrow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is, however, a tendency here, especially in the third person of the indirect statement, to retain the auxiliary used in the direct, just as we do everywhere else:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I shall come to stay at Diplow.</td>
<td>Sir Hugo says he shall (usually will; see pp. 366, 369) come to stay at Diplow (George Eliot).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course, after a past tense, in accordance with our law of sequence (36), a present tense form becomes past. The only difficulty here is the proper treatment of the pure future forms. The rules given in the preceding paragraph apply here, except that every present form becomes past: ‘He said I should (in American colloquial speech would; see p. 369) surely fail’; direct: ‘You will surely fail.’ ‘He said he would return tomorrow’; direct: ‘I shall return tomorrow,’ or sometimes with the auxiliary used in the direct: ‘He told her plainly he should be a prince before he died’ (Kingsley, Westward Ho! Ch. I); direct: ‘I shall be a prince before I die.’

In the case of modal auxiliaries the auxiliary used in the direct is always retained in the indirect statement, the present, however, becoming past: ‘I told him I would help him if he needed it.’ Direct: ‘I will help you if you need it.’ Must and ought do not change their form after a past tense since, according to I a, p. 413, they are past subjunctive forms: ‘I thought it must kill him’ (Meredith, The Ordeal of Richard Feverel, Ch. XLV). ‘I thought he ought to do it and told him so.’

A past tense subjunctive of the direct is, of course, not affected by a preceding past tense when the statement becomes indirect: ‘My reason often asked harshly why I should be so desolate.’ Direct: ‘Why should I be so desolate?’

The present perfect of the direct statement usually becomes past perfect in the indirect, but the present perfect may be retained to emphasize the close relations of the act to the present: (direct) ‘I have been sick,’ but in the indirect form: ‘I met John on the street this morning and he told me that he had been sick,’ or in the form of a subject clause: ‘His first remark was that he had been sick.’ Direct: ‘The painters haven’t finished work on the house yet,’ but in indirect form: ‘John told me this
morning that the painters hadn’t (or often haven’t) finished work on his house yet,’ or in the form of a subject clause: ‘His greatest worry this morning was that the painters hadn’t (or often haven’t) finished the work on his house yet.’

Similarly, the present and the future of the direct discourse may be retained in the indirect to indicate that the act is still continuing and will go on for some time: (direct) ‘The painters are still at work on the house and will be for some time,’ and in indirect form: ‘He told me this morning that the painters are still at work on his house and will be for some time,’ or in the form of a subject clause: ‘His first remark this morning was that the painters are still at work on his house and will be for some time.’

Often also where the reference is to a point of time still vividly felt as future at the time of speaking: ‘He told me this morning that he is going (or will go) with us tomorrow.’

Moreover, the present must be used to represent something as habitual, customary, characteristic, or as universally or locally true: ‘I told him that the morning train leaves at nine, that John is diligent and energetic,’ ‘I told him where the post office is.’ ‘He asked me what the properties of acetylene are.’

There is one point in indirect discourse not covered by the above description. In reporting indirectly a command we never employ the imperative, but an optative — the volitive — subjunctive or an infinitive with the force of a volitive subjunctive: (direct) ‘Come at once.’ (indirect) ‘He said I should come at once’ (or I was to come at once), or ‘He told me to come at once.’ We say also: ‘He wrote, telegraphed, to me to come at once’ (or that I should come at once). In American English it is common to say also: ‘The teacher says (= tells us) to come early’ (or that we must come early). ‘When the Federal Board says for it (the stabilization corporation) to do so (or that it must do so), it borrows money from the Government and casts it into the wheat pit’ (Garet Garrett in The Saturday Evening Post, June 21, 1930, p. 6). In the Oxford Dictionary this use of say for tell is marked obsolete. It was once literary usage in England.

Of course, a direct quotation is given exactly as it is spoken and is distinguished by quotation-marks: ‘He extended his hand to me and said, “I am grateful to you for all that you have done for me,”’ but in indirect form: ‘He extended his hand to me and said that he was grateful to me for all that I had done for him.’

b. Independent Form of Indirect Discourse. In a lively style, the author often strips off all formal signs of subordination and reproduces the thoughts, feelings, dreams, impressions, fears, etc., of another in grammatically independent form. The words are not represented as a free report of the author or speaker, but as a close, though indirect, reproduction of the thoughts, musings, reveries, etc., of another. The tenses are the past tense forms usually employed in narrative: the past tense to correspond to the present indicative or subjunctive of the direct discourse, whether used as a present or a future, or with reference to the future we may use would + infinitive without regard to the auxiliary employed in the
direct statement, or sometimes should instead of would where shall is used in the direct; the past perfect indicative to correspond to the past or the present perfect of the direct; the past subjunctive of simple verb or modal auxiliary to correspond to a past subjunctive of the direct where the reference is to the moment at hand, i.e., the moment the writer is describing, but the past perfect subjunctive or the past subjunctive of a modal auxiliary (could, should, etc.) in connection with a dependent infinitive in the perfect tense may also be used here if the feeling prevails that the words are a narration of a past musing: ‘James looked at his daughter-in-law. That unseen glance of his was cold and dubious. Appeal and fear were in it. Why should he (direct should I, with reference to the moment described by the writer) be worried like this? It was (direct is) very likely all nonsense; women were (direct are) funny things! They exaggerated (direct exaggerate) so, you didn’t (direct don’t) know what to believe; and then nobody told (direct tells) him (direct me) anything, he had (direct I have) to find out everything for himself’ (direct myself) (Galsworthy, The Man of Property, Ch. III). ‘When he came out of Timothy’s his intentions were no longer so simple. He would (direct I will) put an end to that sort of thing once for all . . . A divorce! The word was paralyzing. She would (direct will) pass out of his (direct my) life, and he — he should (direct I shall) never see her again!’ (ib., Ch. VI), or instead of should in the third person more commonly would corresponding to shall in the first person in the direct form: ‘He considered whether it wouldn’t be wiser to go to his room and lock himself in. But then he would (direct I shall) miss Miss Corner’ (H. G. Wells, Mr. Brilling Sees It Through, I, Ch. III). ‘He ordered himself, too, the very dinner the boy had always chosen — soup, whitebait, cutlets, and a tart. Ah! if he were (direct if he were) only opposite now!’ (Galsworthy, The Man of Property, Ch. II), where the use of were indicates that the writer is referring to the moment that he is describing, but under the influence of narrative, as often elsewhere in this book, he might have said: ‘Ah! if he had only been opposite!’ ‘In a few kindly words the Field-Marshall (Moltke) told me he was (direct I am) unable to fathom the source of my apparent intimate knowledge of the Prussian army. How could a stranger have grasped (direct could a stranger grasp) the spirit which pervaded (direct pervades) it?’ (Sidney Whitman, German Memo­ries, Tauchnitz Collection 4393, p. 127). The first sentence of the last quotation is the usual form of indirect discourse. In the second sentence the writer passes over into the independent form, representing the words as a report of the musing of Moltke.

This form of indirect discourse is widely used also by newspaper men, who in this manner report indirectly the things that have been told them: ‘Bishop Charles P. Anderson, primate of the Episcopal Church of America, critically ill with heart trouble, was beginning to show signs of exhaustion this afternoon, though otherwise his condition was unchanged. This was stated in a bulletin issued by Dr. James B. Herrick’ (The Chicago Daily News, Jan. 25, 1930). It is used also in novels instead of ordinary indirect discourse: ‘“What can I do for you?” Swithin asked
ironically. The Hungarian seemed suffering from excitement. Why had Swithin left his charges the night before? What excuse had he to make? What sort of conduct did he call this? Swithin, very like a bulldog, at that moment, answered: "What business was it of his?" (Galworthy, Salvation of a Forsyte, p. 218). In the last sentence the proposition in which this construction stands is not independent as usual but dependent, object of a verb, as in the case of ordinary indirect discourse.

4. Potential Subjunctive in Adjective Clauses:
   a. Attributive Relative Clause: 'It is a book that may (or the indicative will to indicate that the speaker is counting on a positive favorable result) help many a poor struggling fellow.' 'Here is a book that may (or more modestly might) interest you.' In Masefield's The Everlasting Mercy, p. 65, there is an example of the older simple subjunctive here, but it may have been chosen for the sake of the rime: '[he] Has got his dirty whores to speak to, His dirty mates with whom he drink (for may drink), Not little children, one would think.'

   Shall is used to express a future contingency: 'I offer a reward to anyone who shall give me the desired information.'

   Should is often employed to express a strong probability: 'He is a bright young man who should succeed.' Would and should are used to represent something as merely conceived: 'I should like to see the man who would dare to insult me in Illfracombe's presence' (Florence Marryatt, A Bankrupt Heart, II, 62). 'He was not the kind of a man whom a servant would ever have dared to express any sympathy with' (Sarah Grand, The Heavenly Twins, I, 85). In the preceding examples the relative clause has the force of a conclusion to a condition. It may have the force also of a condition: 'A man might pass for insane who (= if he) should see things as they are' (Channing). 'Two months ago I should have scouted as mad or drunk the man who (if he) had dared tell me the like' (Kipling, The Phantom Rickshaw, 9).

   Unreality: 'Here is a man that might have become a power in the land.'

   b. Attributive Substantive Clause: 'The thought that he may miss his train is worrying her.' 'He dismissed the suspicion that she might be deceiving him.'

5. Subjunctive and Indicative in Conditional Sentences. For practical considerations conditional sentences of all kinds are here treated together. In some of the categories the indicative and the subjunctive are employed side by side, while in others the subjunctive alone is used. The potential subjunctive is the more common subjunctive use, especially after if, unless, in case. Examples are given in A, B, C, D. But also the volitive subjunc-
tive (43 I A) occurs, especially after provided, on condition that, so, so only, so that, often after unless: ‘I will help him provided (or on condition that) he do (shall do, or more commonly does; indicative) what I say.’ ‘I will not help him unless he do (shall do, or more commonly does; indicative) what I say.’ Besides the examples given below there are others in 31.

A. Practical Condition. This category has to do with the things of practical everyday life — things with which in our world of action and thought we may have to do in the immediate future or with which we may have to do in the present moment. This category has to do also with the things of the past, for the things of the past often affect us in one way or another. When the things with which we are dealing or shall soon deal present themselves to the mind under the aspect of facts, we employ the indicative. Many of the mere conceptions that are passing through the mind are felt by us at the time as realities even though they have not as yet become facts. They are so near to us that they appear to us under the aspect of facts; so near often that we base conclusions on them. Often, however, in our more composed moods we feel these things as conceptions, as things near to us but yet as mere conceptions, and when we speak of them we use the subjunctive. This attitude of mind was more common in older English, so that the subjunctive here was more common then.

a. Future Time. When the action or state expressed in the condition seems of practical importance to us, something which in the near or more remote future will concern us, hence something well within the realm of reality, we usually employ in the condition the present indicative, which here as so often elsewhere has future force; in the conclusion we use will in the first person to express intention and in all three persons employ the future indicative to indicate a future result: ‘If it rains (or is stormy) I’ll not go.’ ‘If it rains (or is stormy) we shall (in American colloquial speech will) all be very much discouraged’ (or ‘they will all be very much discouraged’). ‘They will go unless it rains.’

In the condition alongside of the present indicative with future force there has always been employed here a present subjunctive with future force, with the same meaning as the indicative, only representing a little different point of view. The present indicative represents the assumed act or state as so near to us that we regard it as a future actuality or at least as something with which we may have to deal: ‘If it rains, I’ll not go.’ The present subjunctive represents the act or state as a mere conception but at the same time marks it as something with which we
may have to deal — the potential subjunctive — or after provided, so, so that, so only, on condition (that) as something desired or required — the volitive (43 I A) subjunctive: ‘The gathering will be large if (or in case) the weather be (or is) good’ (or ‘unless the weather be, or is, bad’). ‘Let him go, so only (= provided) he come (or comes) home with glory’ (G. M. Lane, A Latin Grammar, p. 338). ‘I’ll lend it to him on condition he return (or returns) it tomorrow.’ Sometimes after a past indicative there is a tendency to disregard the old sequence (36): ‘She was granted a year’s probation on condition she send (instead of should send, or sent) her son to school’ (New York Evening Post, July 12, 1929).

In everyday life the indicative is the common form in all these cases, but the subjunctive is still in use in choice language. Alongside of the simple present subjunctive we often find in older English the newer form with shall, and in those palmy days of the simple subjunctive it was much needed, for the simple subjunctive can frequently not be distinguished from the indicative: ‘If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it’ (John, XIV, 14). Shall is still often used here in one special case, namely, to represent the act as the assumed final outcome of events, or the assumed result of a development, where in choice language it is not infrequently preferred to either the present indicative or the present subjunctive: ‘If annihilation shall end (or ends, or end) our joys, we shall never regret the loss of them.’ ‘If you shall fail to understand What England is . . . On you will come the curse of all the land’ (Tennyson). In everyday language is to (43 I A, 6th par.) is common here: ‘It (the government) will have to maneuver skilfully if it is to avoid being caught in a snap vote’ (The New York Times, July 7, 1929).

b. Present and Past Time. Often in our daily life we are forced to draw conclusions from what seem to us, so far as our practical experience goes, to be facts of the present and the past. Here we often employ in both condition and conclusion a present, past, or present perfect indicative, thus for the time being in the absence of fuller evidence recognizing the reality of the assumed act or state, but not committing ourselves to this view: ‘If he is doing this, he is doing wrong.’ ‘If this is true, that is false.’ ‘If he lies, he probably cheats also.’ ‘If he did this, he did wrong.’ ‘If the weather was pleasant (and you admitted it was) why didn’t you go to school every day?’ ‘If it has thundered, it has also lightened.’ Condition and conclusion are often in different times: ‘If he did this, he is in the wrong.’ ‘If he had fair warning, he has nothing to complain of.’ ‘If he has found it, he will send it.’

In older English, we often find here instead of a present, past,
or present perfect indicative the corresponding tense of the subjunctive with about the same meaning, only from a little different point of view. The subjunctive represents the statement as a mere conception but at the same time marks it as probably or presumably true. The present subjunctive after provided, so long as, so that, and often unless, but (= unless) represents the action as desired or required, as illustrated in the next paragraph, hence has volitive (43 I A) force. The indicative recognizes the act or state as a reality.

To express present time or a general truth the present subjunctive is still common in choice language: 'But the slight, if there be one, was unintentional' (Stevenson, Treasure Island). 'But I confess, so long as (= provided) a volume hold together, I am not troubled as to its outer appearance' (Gissing, Henry Ryecroft, Ch. XII). 'We care little what he (i.e., man) believes or disbelieves, so that he believe in sobriety, justice, charity, and the imperativeness of duty' (John Burroughs, The Light of Day, Ch. XIV, VI). 'Virtue is the very heart and lungs of vice: it cannot stand up but (= unless) it lean on virtue' (Thoreau, Journal, I, p. 78). The present subjunctive as well as the present indicative can be used of actual facts, the subjunctive form representing the assumed act or state as a general conception, i.e., as a general principle rather than as a particular concrete act or state: 'If God so clothe the grass . . . how much more will he clothe you?' (Luke, XII, 28). 'If a straight line be bisected,' etc. (Mansford, School Euclid, 95). 'If the planet be close to the sun, its speed increases.' In all these examples we may use the indicative instead of the subjunctive. The difference is one of style rather than of meaning. The subjunctive is characteristic of choice language and elevated discourse.

The present perfect subjunctive was much used in older English to represent a past act or state as only conceived but at the same time to mark it as probably a fact: 'If experience haue not taught you this, you haue lyued long and learned lyttle' (John Lyly, Euphues, Works, I, p. 193, A.D. 1578). This older usage is still occasionally found in choice language: 'It ought to weigh heavily on a man's conscience, if he have (in plain prose has) been the cause of another's deviating from sincerity' (W. J. Fox, Works, III, 283).

If the reference is to time wholly past, the past indicative is the usual form for the condition. But the past subjunctive is sometimes employed in choice language. It has the same modal force as the present and the present perfect subjunctive. It represents the statement as a mere conception but at the same
time marks it as probably true: 'If it were so, it was a grievous fault' (Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, III, ii, 84). 'If ever poet were a master of phrasing, he (Tennyson) was so' (A. C. Bradley, Commentary on Tennyson's 'In Memoriam,' Ch. VI). 'No Thanksgiving dinner was quite complete unless there were a baby on hand belonging to some branch of the family' (George F. Hoar, Autobiography, I, 57). Similarly, in the closely related concessive clause: 'If the cavern into which they entered were artificial construction, considerable pains had been taken to make it look natural' (W. Black, Daughter of Heth, II, Ch. XVI).

The past subjunctive here for reference to the past is much less common than the present subjunctive for reference to the present and future, for it is contrary to the now almost universally recognized principle that the past subjunctive refers to the present or the future. In older usage the past subjunctive was often used here for reference to the past: 'She wolde wepe, if that she sawe a mous Caught in a trappe, if it were deed or bledde' (Chaucer, Prologue, 144). The past perfect subjunctive is impossible here since it represents the statement as contrary to fact, so we now usually employ the past indicative. Compare 41 (4th par.).

B. Theoretical Condition. In the theoretical condition, or less vivid condition, as it is often called, the action or state seems less near to us, seems to us of only theoretical nature with no prospect of our having to deal with it practically, hence we employ here a past tense form of the subjunctive, namely, should, to indicate that the situation is only conceived, and in the conclusion we use the past volitive (43 I A, 7th par.) subjunctive would in all three persons to express intention or willingness, and employ the past potential should in the first person and the past potential would in the second and third persons as future subjunctive forms to indicate a future result: 'If it should rain tomorrow, I wouldn't go.' 'If he should treat me in that way, I just wouldn't stand it.' 'If he should treat you in that way, you just wouldn't (volitive) stand it.' 'If we should treat him in that way he just wouldn't (volitive) stand it.' 'If he should go away without speaking to me, I should be grieved,' but 'If I should go away without speaking to him, he would (potential) be grieved.' It should be noticed that in the second and third persons there are in the conclusion a volitive and a potential would with quite different meanings. Compare p. 367. Instead of the first person form should 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 uses: '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.' In the subordinate clause of all these conditional sentences, we normally employ potential should, but instead of the should we may use the simple past subjunctive, or were to, usually, however, with the differentiation that simple past subjunctive, should, and were to indicate decreasing grades of probability: 'If we missed (or should miss, or were to miss) the train, we should have to wait an hour at the station.' We sometimes find in the condition a would instead of a should, since the clause in which it stands is a conclusion to a suppressed condition: 'If you would be patient for yourself [if occasion should arise], you should (= ought to; see next par.) be patient for me.'

A should in the condition always indicates that the subject acts, not of his own free will, but under the constraint of circumstances, business, etc., as in 'If he should fail, I would help him,' but if he acts of his own free will, we must use will here: 'I should be (or he would be) glad if she would (expressing desire) only come.' If the subject in the conclusion acts under the constraint of duty should, not would, must be used: 'He should (constraint of duty) go, if his father should (constraint of circumstances) call him.' Should in the conclusion often indicates the desire of the speaker: 'You (or he) should go, if it were left to me.' 'You (or he) should not go, if it were left to me.' The condition may be according to A and the conclusion here according to B: 'If he lies, he should be punished.'

The past subjunctive could and might are often used in the conclusion to express the idea of possibility, the former the possibility that lies in the ability of a person, the latter the possibility that lies in circumstances: 'He could do it if he tried.' 'We might miss the train if we walked slower.' 'If he could hold out a little longer, he might succeed.' Might also has optative force indicating the possibility of a permission: 'You might go if you would only behave a little better.' Could is used also in the condition, as in the third example. To express the idea of constraint we now employ should (or would) have to, not must, as we no longer vividly feel the latter as a past subjunctive: 'If he should not come, I should have to do the work.' 'If I should not be able to come back in time, he would have to do the work.'

C. Condition Contrary to Fact. In conditions contrary to fact, or unreal conditions, as they are often called, we employ the simple past subjunctive in the condition, and in the conclusion use would or should, as described in B: 'If he were here, I would speak to him.' 'If father were here and saw this, we should have to suffer for it.' 'If father were here and saw this, he would punish
us.' 'He looks as [he would look] if he were sick.' In poetry and rather choice prose, we sometimes still use the old simple past subjunctive were in the conclusion instead of the newer, now more common, form should be, would be: 'It were (= would be) different if I had some independence, however small, to count on' (Lytton, *My Novel*, I, III, Ch. XIX).

As the past subjunctive has through phonetical change become identical in form with the past indicative in all verbs except be, we often in loose colloquial speech find the past indicative singular was used as a past subjunctive singular instead of the regular were, after the analogy of other verbs in which the past subjunctive is identical in form with the indicative: 'If it was (instead of were) not so cold, he would be allowed to go out.' Sometimes even in choice language: 'What appears more real than the sky? We think of it and speak of it as if it was as positive and tangible a fact as the earth' (Burroughs, *The Light of Day*, Ch. XIV, VIII). In older English, this usage was much more common than now: 'I shall act by her as tenderly as if I was her own mother' (Richardson, *Pamela*, Vol. II, p. 216, and often elsewhere in this work). 'Was I in a desert, I would find out where-with in it to call forth my affections' (Sterne, *A Sentimental Journey*, 'Calais'). This use of was as a past subjunctive arose in the seventeenth century: 'She told him if he was not a fool he would not suffer his business to be carried on by fools' (Pepys, *Diary*, July 12, 1667). In spite of the long use of was in the literary language as a subjunctive form it has not become established there with this meaning. Were is still the usual form.

When the reference is to past time, we usually employ in the condition the past perfect subjunctive and in the conclusion the same auxiliary used for present time, should, would, could, might, but put the dependent infinitive in the perfect tense instead of the present: 'If it had rained, I would not have gone.' 'If he had gone away without speaking to me, I should have been grieved.' 'If I had gone away without speaking to him, he would have been grieved.' 'He should have gone, if it had been left to me.' 'If he had been present, I would have spoken to him.' 'He could have done it if he had tried.' 'We might have missed the train if we had walked slower.' In older English, the past perfect subjunctive was used in both propositions: 'If thou hadst been here, my brother had not died' (John, XI, 21). This older usage lingers on in poetry and choice prose: 'Her anger frightened him. It had been no surprise to him if she had fallen dead at his feet' (Max Pemberton, *Doctor Xavier*, Ch. XX). The condition is sometimes
abridged to a prepositional phrase: ‘Mrs. Doria, an amiable widow, had surely married but for her daughter Clare’ (Meredith, Richard Feverel, Ch. XIII) = ‘if it had not been for her daughter Clare.’ The condition is sometimes implied in the context: ‘Tis mercy that stays her hand, Else she had cut the thread’ (Thomas B. Aldrich, The Bells at Midnight). In lively style, the past indicative sometimes takes the place of the regular subjunctive form in the conclusion, since the past act does not seem to us a mere conception, but something so close to us that we feel it as a reality which we relate: ‘Surely if they had been zealous to pluck a brand from the burning, here was a noble opportunity’ (W. Gunnyon, Biographical Sketch of Burns, 41).

In strong contrast to the tendency in colloquial and popular speech to neglect an opportunity to distinguish between indicative and subjunctive by the use of distinctive forms in the case of was and were is the decided tendency to distinguish in the past perfect tense the subjunctive from the indicative by the insertion of have after had, as explained in 49 3 b: ‘If they had ’a’ said so, you’d ’a’ sat and listened to ’em’ (De Morgan, Alice-for-Short, Ch. II). The reason that the tendency to distinguish between was and were here is so weak is that all the analogies in the language are against a distinction, the past tense indicative and subjunctive always being alike except in the case of was and were, while after had, as described in 49 3 b, there are analogies favoring a distinction between indicative and subjunctive. Compare 43 2 B a (4th par.) and 44 I a (last par.).

a. Optative in Conditions. It should be noted that in unreal conditions the past tense forms are often optative, not potential: ‘Were he only here, I would give all that I have!’ ‘Had he only been here, I would have given all that I had!’ This is the unreal subjunctive of wish (43 I B).

D. Subjunctive in Elliptical Conditional Sentences. A sentence that is seemingly independent is often in fact the conclusion of a conditional sentence with the condition suppressed: ‘I should say [if I were asked] that it were better to say nothing about it.’ In this sentence that it were better serves as an object clause, the object of the verb say, but it were better is also the conclusion to the condition to say nothing about it = if one said nothing about it. The apparently independent sentences in I, p. 409, are in fact largely conclusions with the conditions suppressed. The condition in most cases can easily be supplied. Sometimes a blending has taken place: ‘The face is a curious mixture: the soft dreamy eyes contrast so sharply with the firm, I had almost said, hard little mouth’ (Florence Montgomery, Thrown Together, I, 72),
where I had almost said is a blending of I almost said and I had said if I hadn't checked myself.

6. **Potential Subjunctive in Clauses of Manner.** *May* is much used here to mark the thoughts which are busying the mind at the present moment as mere conceptions: 'It looks as if (or as though) it may rain,' or indicating more doubt and uncertainty: 'as if it might rain.' Modest statement: 'It seems to me as though he might (or a little more positively should) outstrip all the others.' "'The world is not your nursery, Angel!'" Agatha closed her lips very tightly, as who (= one who) should imply: "'Then it ought to be!'" (Galsworthy, *The Patrician*, p. 298). Often with more positive force: 'I feel as if (or though) I were going to fall.'

7. **Potential Subjunctive in Adverbial Clauses of Modal and Pure Result.** In clauses of modal result *may* is used to express a possible result and *might* a result only faintly possible: 'He is so badly injured that he may (or might) die.' Compare 29 2.

In clauses of pure result *may* or *might* indicates a possible result: 'It has cleared up beautifully, so that he may (or might; faint possibility) come after all.'

8. **Potential Subjunctive in Comparative Clauses.** The simple subjunctive is often used here in choice language to represent something as a mere conception: 'Nor is there fairer work for beauty found than that she win in nature her release from all the woes that in the world abound' (Bridges, *The Growth of Love*, 8), or now more commonly the modern form with the past tense of a modal auxiliary, *should win*.

9. **Potential Subjunctive in Clauses of Extent.** The simple subjunctive is much used here in older English to represent the act as a mere conception, while today we usually employ the indicative, as we feel the act as a fact: 'The only trial that a lady requireth of her lover is this, that he perform as much as he sware' (John Lyly, *Euphues and His England*, Works, II, p. 168, A.D. 1580), now promises.

10. **Potential Subjunctive in Causal Clauses.** We often use *should* here to express an abstract conception, an abstract principle. We use it even of facts, since the abstract conception, the principle involved, is more prominent in the mind than the concrete fact: 'Yes, [I am] ashamed that I should have (or, of course, also the simple present indicative have) a mother who could show so little thought for another's feelings' (J. Hartley Manners, *The Harp of Life*, Act II).

After *for fear (that)* and in choice language *lest* we sometimes find the simple subjunctive here, now more commonly the modern
form with the past tense of a modal auxiliary, to represent something as a mere conception: 'Let us act and not shrink for fear (that, or lest) our motives be (or should be) misunderstood.' 'I tremble for fear that (or lest) you should be seen.' 'In England many legislators are uneasy for fear that (or lest) they should not get away to the country for the grouse shooting.'

Sometimes after a past indicative there is a modern tendency to disregard the old sequence (36) in clauses introduced by lest where the thing feared seems imminent: 'People dared not venture into the street lest they be shot' (G. Atherton, Sleeping Fires, Ch. III), or should be shot.

**IMPERATIVE**

45. The imperative is the mood of command, request, admonition, supplication, entreaty, warning, prohibition. This is one of the oldest grammatical categories. Forms for the expression of will are older than those for the expression of actual fact. The simple imperative, as in eat, sit, etc., antedates inflection. It is an old uninflected form, which along with interjections, like O! ouch! belongs to the oldest forms of spoken speech. Though the oldest imperative form, it is still widely used, but now it is only one of many forms, for today the expression of one’s will is no longer a simple matter as in the earliest period when men were less differentiated and less sensitive.

The following categories indicate the means we now employ to express our will:

1. **Old Simple Imperative Form.** In direct address we usually employ in commands, admonitions, requests, supplications, wishes the simple stem of the verb without a subject, as the direct address of itself suggests the subject: 'Hurry!' 'Shut the door!' 'Keep quiet!' 'Come in!' 'Mind your own business!' 'Shut up!' 'Be here at noon!' ‘Study your failures and be instructed by them.’ ‘Pass me the bread, please.’ ‘Give us this day our daily bread.’ The one form here with its many meanings represents the simplicity of primitive speech. The meaning here is not conveyed by the form alone, but also, as in primitive speech in general, by the situation, the accent, and the tone of voice. Often to suggest a course of action politely we make the real command an object clause after the imperative suppose, thus presenting the command merely as a case for discussion: ‘Gerry found a friend there last night. Very likely he’s walked up to say goodbye to him. Suppose you go to meet them!’ (De Morgan, Somehow Good, Ch. XLVI).

The simple imperative is often used to express a wish: 'Good
night. *Sleep well!* (Galsworthy, *Indian Summer of a Forsyte*, Ch. V). Such a permutation — here clothing a wish in the language of a command — imparts a sprightliness and hopefulness of tone not found in the usual forms of wishing.

The subject is often expressed:

a. In older English, where we now and in oldest English find the simple imperative: *Enter ye in at the strait gate . . ., because strait is the gate and narrow is the way* (Matthew, VII, 13). There are survivals of this older usage: *Mind you, he hasn’t paid the money as yet.* Especially common in the colloquial expression *Look-a-here!* for ‘Look you here!’ The subject here follows the imperative. In certain dialects, as in Scotch English, this older usage is still quite common: ‘Sit ye doon’ (George Macdonald, *Robert Falconer*, Ch. XLII).

b. In present English, in order to indicate a contrast, usually with the subject before the imperative: ‘I don’t know what to say. Norah, *you go.*’ “*You watch her,*” the doctor said to his assistant, “‘I shan’t be back before eight.’” ‘I must go about my work. *You amuse* yourself in any way you like.’

c. In lively language, to indicate that the person addressed should take an interest in something, or that it is intended especially for his good or for his discomfiture, or that it should concern or not concern him especially: ‘*You mark my words. It’s a certainty.*’ ‘*You bèt,*’ in slang = ‘*You may risk a bet on that.*’ ‘He’s not an unpleasant fellow at all.’ — ‘*Just you get better acquainted with him and sée!*’ ‘*You follow my advice and don’t you go!*’ ‘It’ll never work!’ — ‘*Just you wait and sée!*’ ‘*You leave that alone!*’ ‘*Never you mind, Master Impertinent!*’ Similarly, in negative do-form: ‘*Don’t you be cocksure!*’ ‘*Don’t you dare to touch a single thing!*’ ‘*Don’t you say that again!*’ Compare 2 b, p. 432.

2. Modern Do-Form:

a. Negative commands are expressed by the form with unstressed *do:* ‘*Don’t tálk so loud!*’ In popular Irish English *let* is often the auxiliary here: ‘*Let you not be a raving fool, Mary Doul!*’ (Synge, *The Well of the Saints*, Act III). Compare 3, p. 432.

In older English, the simple imperative is employed here. This older usage survives in connection with the adverb *never* and sometimes elsewhere in solemn language and in poetry: ‘*Never mention it again.*’ ‘*Tell me not in mournful numbers . . .*’ This older construction is in harmony with the old Germanic principle of putting emphatic words at or near the beginning. The modern use of *do* with dependent infinitive, which contains the
verbal meaning, has in part resulted from the desire to suspend
the real verb for a time in order to create the feeling of suspense
and thus increase the emphasis: ‘Don’t you ever tell!’ See also
6 A d (2), (3).
b. The form with do is often employed in entreaties and as
an emphatic prohibition or a negative entreaty, here usually with
stressed do: ‘Dó go, please!’ ‘Dón’t go!’ ‘Give me a penny, Papa!’ — ‘I have nothing for you.’ — ‘Dó give me just one penny!’
‘Dó get up, it’s very late.’ ‘Sit down for a moment, pray, dó!’
When the tone becomes that of an emphatic prohibition or a
negative entreaty, the subject, according to 1 c is often expressed:
‘Dón’t you do that!’ ‘Dón’t yóu forget!’ or to call attention to
the verbal activity: ‘Don’t forgét.’ But ‘Don’t think it for a
minute!’ (Mildred E. Lambert in American Speech, April, 1928,
p. 332) is not a prohibition at all but an emphatic denial. Also
in positive entreaties we stress the infinitive to emphasize the
activity: ‘Do finish your work!’ ‘Do húrry!’ In popular Irish
English let is often the auxiliary here: ‘Let you make haste; I
hear them trampling in the wood’ (Synge, The Well of the Saints,
Act III). ‘Oh, let you not endanger yourself!’ (Lady Gregory,
The Full Moon). ‘O Hilaria, you who are blind, let you open your
eyes!’ (Donn Byrne, Blind Raftery, p. 145).
Also the progressive form is used here. See 38 2 a ee.
3. Subjunctive Forms in Commands. In older English, the
volitive (43 I A) subjunctive forms were used instead of the
imperative when the subject was in the first or the third person.
‘Climb we not too high, Lest we should fall too low’ (Coleridge).
These subjunctive forms survive only in set expressions, now in
contrast to older English usually with suppressed subject after
the analogy of the old imperative: ‘Say [ʃ] what I will, he doesn’t
mind me.’ ‘Say [we] what we will, he doesn’t mind us.’ ‘Say
[he] what he will, no one believes him.’ ‘Cost [it] what it may, I
shall buy it.’ ‘Try [they] as they may, they never succeed.’ In
a few expressions with the subject expressed: ‘She be hanged!’
(De Morgan, The Old Madhouse, Ch. XXVII). The subject is
most commonly expressed when it is a general or indefinite pro-
noun. For examples see 43 I A.
Instead of the simple form of the subjunctive we now usually
employ here the modern form with the unstressed modal auxiliary
let (originally the stressed imperative of the verb let = allow,
permit) and a dependent infinitive: ‘There is a man at the door
wants to see you.’ — ‘Let him cóme ín!’ quite different in meaning
from ‘Létt (= allow, permit) him come in!’ ‘Let me sáy what I
will, he doesn’t mind me.’ ‘Let us gó!’ ‘Let them gó!’ Let can
be used with all persons but the second. It can, however, be used with the second if combined with another person: ‘Let you and me go by ourselves!’ In popular Irish English, let, after the analogy of the first and third persons, can be used also with the second person, where the literary language requires the simple imperative of the second person: ‘Let you quit mocking and making a sport of me!’ (Lady Gregory, The Bogie Man, p. 18). ‘Let you get up out of that!’ (Synge, The Well of the Saints, Act III).

The let-form often occurs in a substantive relative clause: ‘Ah’ll (I’ll) tell you what let’s do, Miss Leighton!’ (W. D. Howells, A Hazard of New Fortunes, II, Ch. II). ‘I tell you what let’s do: let’s all run away!’ (Margaret Deland, The Iron Woman, Ch. II). Compare 43 II B a (1st par.).

When we speak in a pleading tone, we place the imperative do before the let-form: ‘“I say, Ellen! Suppos’n we follow the brook instead of climbing up yonder again!” — “Oh, do let’s,” said Ellen’ (Susan Warner, The Wide, Wide World, Ch. XII).

Negative form: ‘Let’s not dó that!’ When we speak in a pleading tone, we employ the do-form, or often also the regular negative form with a don’t as negative instead of not: ‘Dón’t let us do that!’ ‘“Let’s dón’t (prolonged, i.e., drawled out) be serious, George,” she begged him hopefully. “Let’s tálk of something pleasant!”’ (Tarkington, The Magnificent Ambersons, Ch. XVII).

Instead of a let-form we often, to suggest a course of action politely, make the real command an object clause after the imperative suppose, or sometimes the present participle supposing (31 2), originally an elliptical condition with the conclusion suppressed: ‘Suppose (or sometimes supposing) we all go together and ask him about it! [would it be agreeable to you?]’

Past subjunctive forms are used in polite admonitions: ‘We should do it’ or ‘We ought (old past subjunctive) to do it.’ ‘You should do it,’ ‘You ought to do it,’ or ‘You had better do it.’ ‘I thought to myself: “Old chap, you had better look into this matter.”’ For another form of admonishing one’s self see 4 b, p. 434. To convey mild force we often use might: ‘Perhaps you and I might run round to Sir Thomas’ (Henry Arthur Jones, Mary Goes First, Act II).

4. Auxiliary Verbs in Expressions of Will. The use of auxiliary verbs here has been touched upon above. A number of other auxiliaries, such as will, shall, must, etc., have clear modal force, likewise certain verbal formations containing auxiliaries, such as the future tense and the progressive form:

a. A present tense of a modal form is used in connection with
the old imperative, especially common in requests: ‘Just hold the light for me a moment, will you?’ Can is used when the request is spoken in impatient tone: ‘Come down quietly, can’t you?’ But will you? is often used when the utterance is more an exclamation than a request: ‘Look at that, will you?’ (Mildred E. Lambert in American Speech, April, 1928, p. 332).

b. Use of Modal ‘Will’ and ‘Shall’ Instead of ‘Let.’ Instead of let (see 3, p. 432) we often use modal will: ‘Everybody get (subjunctive imperative) ready, we’ll try again!’ = ‘let us try it again!’ “‘Granny,” said Barbara, “you must go quietly on to the stile. When you’re over I’ll come too.” — “Certainly not,” said Lady Casterley, “we will go together”’ (Galsworthy, The Patrician, p. 86). “‘We’ll carry these (i.e., the bookshelves) longways,” Sabre (name) directed, when the first one was tackled’ (Hutchinson, If Winter Comes, p. 25). When we are not so sure of assent and desire to defer to the wishes of others, we use modal shall here and employ the question form: ‘Shall we try it again?’ In an admonition to one’s self, where there is, of course, no fear of opposition, we employ will and declarative form, as in the first example: ‘I said to myself: “I’ll go and see.”’

c. Use of the Future and the Progressive. We employ the future indicative when we desire to speak courteously and at the same time indicate that we are confidently expecting that our wish will be fulfilled: ‘Heads of departments will submit their estimates before January first.’ When spoken in earnest tone the future becomes almost a command: ‘‘You will do nothing of the sort!’ she (grandmother to grandchild) said’ (Galsworthy, The Patrician, p. 87). On the other hand, since we feel a certain bluntness in the future we often soften the force of the expression here by the use of please, kindly, perhaps, I know, etc.: ‘Intending subscribers will please to note the following terms on which the Graphic will be posted to any part of the world’ (Graphic). ‘You will kindly excuse me as I must go back to my work.’ ‘As you are going to the post office, you will, I know (or perhaps), mail these letters for me.’ We often soften the expression by employing modal will and question form in connection with a negative: ‘Mrs. Jones, won’t you sit down?’ ‘You’ll stay to tea, won’t you?’ The use of the past subjunctive would in a dependent clause is a still more modest form of expression: ‘I wish you would come over soon to see me.’

As described in 38 1, the progressive form often has modal force. Hence its imperative is often charged with feeling: ‘Up, be doing everywhere, the hour of crisis has verily come!’ (Carlyle, Latter-Day Pamphlets). Compare 38 2 a ee. As the present indicative
of the progressive form of *go* often indicates a prospective action which is to take place in the immediate or near future, it is often used in expressions of will to indicate that the command is to be carried out at once or soon and is usually charged with feeling: ‘John, you’re going to bed early tonight!’ ‘You sit down! You’re not going yet!’ (George Bernard Shaw, *Candida*, Act III).

d. *Shall* is used in commands issued in a tone of authority: ‘Thou shalt not steal!’ ‘‘No, my dear, you had better stay in.”’ — “But I should like to go.” — “Well, you shall not go!”’ ‘Positively, you shall not do that again!’ ‘We shall have courteous language or none at all.’ The past subjunctive *should* has very much milder force, representing the words as friendly advice kindly given: ‘You should go at once!’ ‘We should go at once!’ ‘He should go at once!’ Negative question form has still milder force: ‘Should you not go over all the factors in the case once more very carefully before you make a final decision?’

e. *Must* is much used in commands or prohibitions to indicate that something should be done or not done since it is proper or improper: ‘John, we have company today. You must behave!’ ‘You mustn’t knock against the table in that way when I’m trying to write!’ ‘You must not talk so loud!’ As explained in 43 I A we may use also *have to* here in positive commands. *Must* often denotes a strong determination. See 43 I A.

f. *Are to.* This form is much used to convey the will of someone other than the subject, representing the order as something that has already been determined upon and here is simply transmitted: ‘You are to be up at six!’ ‘You are always to shut the door when you enter this room!’ ‘You are to come down! Mamma wants you.’ Compare 43 I A.

5. In lively language, expression is often terse, since the situation makes the thought clear, so that nouns, adverbs, prepositional phrases, etc., serve as imperatives: ‘The salt, please!’ ‘All aboard!’ ‘Down in front!’ ‘Hats off!’ ‘Forward, brave companions!’ A noun or a noun and an adjective often serve as a warning: ‘Danger!’ ‘Fresh paint!’ Compare 2 a, p. 1.

The gerund preceded by *no* has the force of a negative command: ‘No parking here’ = ‘Do not park here.’

6. **Tenses of the Imperative.** Commands, such as have been treated in the foregoing articles, usually have reference to the present moment or the future. We sometimes use also the present perfect tense of the imperative to represent the action as already performed: *Have done!* or in popular speech ‘*a* done!’ ‘Have done with such nonsense!’ In the tone of entreaty the imperative of *do* is used here in connection with the perfect infinitive: ‘Do
have done with this nonsense!' Found also in popular speech: ‘Now, Mother, 'a’ done do wud such silly talk!’ (Sheila Kaye-Smith, *Green Apple Harvest*, p. 117). As described in 38 2 b gg, the tense auxiliary be is still sometimes used with point-action (38 2) intransitives in the present perfect and past perfect tenses of the indicative and subjunctive. This older usage survives here intact in the present perfect imperative Be gone!

7. Passive Imperative. The positive passive is, in general, avoided: ‘We welcome you,’ not ‘Be welcomed by us!’ ‘Listen to your higher nature!’ or also ‘Be guided by your higher nature!’ ‘Heed my warning!’ rather than Be warned! (Phillpotts, *Eudocia*, I, II). Of course, in some cases the passive is common, especially the colloquial form with get: ‘Get shaved before you come home!’ Also the negative imperative with do is common: ‘Don’t be swayed by such considerations!’ or perhaps more commonly ‘Don’t allow yourself to be swayed by such considerations!’ A present perfect passive is sometimes used: ‘Don’t have been told anything about it!’ (De Morgan, *The Old Madhouse*, Ch. XVI), i.e., ‘Arrange it so that you have not been told anything about it.’
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46. Active Voice. A marked peculiarity of present-day English is the freedom with which a transitive verb is used without an object — either absolutely or with reflexive, intransitive, or passive force.

We often use a transitive verb absolutely, without an object, because we are not thinking of a particular person or thing as receiving the action, but have in mind only the action itself, pure and simple: ‘He likes to give.’ ‘As a teacher, he not only interests and inspires, but also stimulates and incites to further investigation.’ ‘No doubt extraordinary men are in a measure the result of happy accident. There are determining or favoring factors — race, climate, family inheritance, and so on’ (John Burroughs, Under the Apple-Tree, XIII, IV). ‘It is my turn to milk [the cow].’ ‘I’m laying [an ambush] for that Encyclopedical Scotchman’ (Mark Twain, Letter to W. D. Howells, Oct. 24, 1880). ‘He never laid [his sword] about him in his imaginary battles in a more tremendous way than he did in this real one’ (id., Joan of Arc, II, Ch. XVIII). ‘The hens are laying [eggs] again.’

English shares this feature with a number of tongues, but the wide use of this principle in English has led to distinctive features. For many centuries there has been a growing tendency to employ transitive verbs intransitively without an object for the purpose of predicating an act pure and simple of some particular person or thing: ‘He is very weak this morning, is breaking fast.’ ‘The bread baked too long.’ ‘The turkey is roasting nicely.’ ‘Stir till the pulp cooks to a marmalade.’ ‘The cloth tears at a touch.’ At this point has arisen a long list of new intransitives, which in many cases have developed a peculiar meaning, as described on page 440.

In English, there has arisen another peculiar group of intransi-
tives made from transitives. We say, ‘Mary is dressing,’ or ‘Mary dresses plainly,’ although it is quite evident that Mary acts upon herself. Modern German and other languages use in these cases a reflexive pronoun as object: ‘Mary dresses herself.’ We say, ‘Her eyes filled with tears,’ ‘The thick fog lifted,’ while in German in many such cases where the subject seems to act of itself the subject is personified, i.e., a reflexive pronoun is used as object, as if the subject were a person acting upon himself: ‘Her eyes filled themselves with tears.’ We sometimes find the reflexive form in English: ‘round which the heart’s best affections have twined themselves’ (Robertson, Sermons, III, XVII, 216). ‘Some such impression conveyed itself to the two men who were walking with Mrs. Reffold’ (Beatrice Harraden, Ships That Pass in the Night, I, Ch. III). ‘In a few years the population of the town doubled’ (or doubled itself). ‘The convulsion soon exhausted itself.’ With reference to persons the reflexive pronoun in its older, shorter form was once very common where there is now no reflexive object at all: ‘Which way will I turne me?’ (Lyly, Euphues and His England, Works, II, p. 142, A.D. 1580), now simple turn. ‘I met a fool; who laid him down and bask’d him (now simple basked) in the sun’ (Shakespeare, As You Like It, II, vii, 15). ‘At the breach of day we sixe made us [go] for the mountaine’ (Lithgow, Travels, VI, 261, A.D. 1632), now ‘We sixe made for the mountain.’ ‘We put (for older put us) up at the hotel.’ In older English, set was used reflexively or intransitively in the sense of seat one’s self, sit down: ‘My doughter, sette you here by me’ (Mélusine, 154, A.D. 1500). ‘He made them set vpon a benche’ (Caxton, Sonnes of Aymon, XVI, 377, A.D. 1489). The intransitive form is still common in popular speech: ‘Set by me.’ ‘Set down.’ ‘Our hen is setting.’ Intransitive set, developed out of reflexive set, occurs also in the literary language in many set expressions, for the most part figurative or abstract: ‘Plaster of Paris sets quickly.’ ‘His character has not yet set.’ ‘About a dozen fruit set, of which six ripened.’ ‘The sun is setting.’ ‘The tide sets in’ (out). ‘They set about repairing the bridge.’ ‘We set off (or out) together for the base of the mountain.’ After a number of verbs, absent, bear, bestir, betake, bethink, busy, comport, compose, conduct, demean, deport, intoxicate, perjure, pique, plume, pride, etc., the reflexive pronoun is still the rule, of course, now in its modern compound form: ‘She prides herself on her cooking.’ With a number of verbs the reflexive pronoun can be used or omitted: Behave, or behave yourself. ‘I dressed’ (or dressed myself). ‘I hid’ (or hid myself). ‘I overslept’ (or now rarely overslept myself). ‘I overate’ (or now rarely overate myself). ‘The horse reared’ (or less com-
monly reared himself). ‘She likes to show off,’ or ‘She likes to show herself off.’ ‘A sweet smile spread (or spread itself) gently over his face.’ ‘I rested (or rested myself) an hour or two.’ ‘I washed, bathed’ (or washed myself, bathed myself). ‘A new sense of duty is developing (or is developing itself) in him.’ In America we say, ‘He hired out to a farmer,’ while in England it is still, as in older English, usual to say, ‘He hired himself.’ In the case of the one verb rest the intransitive is the older form.

In general, we use the reflexive or the reciprocal pronoun when we think of a person or thing as acting on himself or itself, or as having mutual relations with another, while we employ intransitive form when the idea of an action pure and simple, or a development or result presents itself to our mind: ‘I applied myself to my difficult task,’ but ‘I applied to my friend for advice.’ ‘I qualified myself (= made myself fit) for the position,’ but ‘I qualified (= passed the examination, or gave a bond) for the office.’ ‘A door can’t open itself,’ but ‘The door suddenly opened.’ ‘He proved himself to be worthy of the place,’ but ‘He proved intractable’ and ‘He made acquaintance with a lady who proved to be the Countess of Drogheda’ (Macaulay). ‘He felt himself degraded,’ where we feel the thought of the subject as turned in on himself; but we say ‘He felt disgusted,’ as we feel felt as a mere copula. There is the same fluctuation in the use of the reciprocal pronoun: ‘They kissed each other tenderly,’ but without the pronoun to express action pure and simple: ‘Kiss and be friends.’ ‘Our letters crossed’ (or crossed each other). ‘They met (or sometimes met each other) at the gate,’ but ‘They separated at the gate.’

This fluctuation between reflexive or reciprocal and intransitive with a general drift in the direction of the intransitive is old, for it is not only going on now, but it was going on also in Old English: ‘Hie gedældon hie’ (or simply gedældon, i.e., they parted). ‘Hie oft gemetton hie’ (or simply gemetton, i.e., they often met).

There has been here a steady development away from reflexive form toward intransitive wherever there has been a development of reflexive meaning into intransitive. As, however, the old transitive meaning of such verbs often maintained itself alongside of the new intransitive, the same verb often had either transitive or intransitive force according to the connection. Thus early in the history of our language there began to be felt the principle, now widely observed, that the same verb may be used both transitively and intransitively. Even in Old English, there were a number of such verbs. In many other cases transitive and intransitive verbs had in this early period the same stem but were slightly differentiated in form. Later, through natural phonetic develop-
ment and under the influence of the growing feeling that a difference of form was not necessary here, both transitive and intransitive form became in many words identical.

There is often a further development here. Since many of the new intransitives from the two groups described in the third and fourth paragraphs, as well as many old intransitives, represent something as naturally developing or accidentally entering into a new state, or as having the power or fitness to enter it, consequently as affected or capable of being affected, they acquire passive force, so that now passive force is often associated with intransitive form: ‘Muscles, nerves, mind, reason, all develop (or are developed) under play.’ ‘This cloth has worn (or has been worn) thin.’ ‘This cloth feels (i.e., is felt as being) soft.’ ‘The first consignment sold out (or was sold out) in a week.’ ‘He graduated (or was graduated) last year.’ ‘The wheat in our northern states often winterkills.’ ‘The boat upset (= was upset).’ ‘The right to rule derives (= is derived) from those who gave it.’ ‘The two of them traced (= were traced) back to a Samuel Lincoln who had come two hundred years before to Hingham’ (Carl Sandburg, Abraham Lincoln, I, p. 82). ‘Women could go hang (i.e., to be hanged), because she did not want them’ (W. J. Locke, The Glory of Clementina, Ch. II). ‘My hat blew (or was blown) into the river.’ ‘These plans are working out (or are being worked out) successfully.’ ‘The plans worked out (or were worked out) successfully.’ ‘The eggs hatched out easily.’ ‘My coat caught (or got caught) on a nail.’ ‘The door doesn’t lock (or can’t be locked).’ ‘Such houses rent, sell (or can be rented, sold) easily.’ ‘Ripe oranges peel (or can be peeled) easily.’ ‘Sugar dissolves (or can be dissolved) in water.’ ‘The vessel steers (or can be steered) with ease.’ ‘These colors do not wash (or cannot be washed) well.’ ‘This cloth doesn’t cut (or cannot be cut) to advantage.’ ‘This cake doesn’t break (or cannot be broken) evenly.’ ‘This paper doesn’t tear (or cannot be torn) straight.’ ‘This wood doesn’t split (or cannot be split) straight.’ ‘The bread doesn’t bake (or cannot be baked) well in this oven.’ ‘The travel-book did not finish (or could not be finished) easily, and more than once when he (Mark Twain) thought it completed, he found it necessary to cut and change’ (Albert B. Paine, Mark Twain’s Letters, II, p. 644). ‘I don’t know that I can write a play that will play’ (or can be played) (Mark Twain, Letter to W. D. Howells, Jan. 22, 1898). ‘This play reads better than it acts’ (or should be read rather than acted).

The boundary line between the new passive and the older intransitive force is often quite dim and cannot be accurately de-
terminated by a distinctive formal mark of any kind nor by any inner shade of meaning, for intransitive and passive force are so closely related that the one shades imperceptibly into the other. Thus the examples from Robertson and Beatrice Harraden given in the fourth paragraph may be construed not only as intransitive but also as passive. Similarly, when the reflexive has been dropped and the form becomes outwardly intransitive the inner meaning often hovers between intransitive and passive. In many cases, however, the passive idea here is so strong that intransitive can be replaced by passive form as indicated on page 440 in parentheses. But these two passive forms are often not identical in force. The passive with passive form represents a person or thing as being affected by an agent working under resistance vigorously and consciously to a definite end, while the passive with intransitive form represents an activity as proceeding easily, naturally, often almost spontaneously. Compare 47 a.

The development of form and meaning here is often uneven. The original reflexive form here is often retained although the meaning after having become intransitive has finally become passive: 'No progress can establish itself (i.e., be established) without a partial retrogression.' 'The fire communicated itself to the next house.' 'He fell down and hurl himself' (i.e., was hurt).

As can be seen from the above account, a large number of intransitives or passives with intransitive or reflexive form have developed out of transitives, so that the same verb can be used actively, intransitively, or passively without a change of form. In contrast to this group there is another in which transitive verbs have developed out of intransitives. There was in Old English, in a number of cases, a difference of form between a transitive causative and the intransitive from which it was derived: 'bærnan' (trans.), to make something burn, to burn up, but 'beornan' (intrans.) to burn; 'sencan' (trans.), to make something sink, but 'sincan' (intrans.), to sink, etc. There are still a few cases where there is here a difference of form between the transitive causative and the intransitive from which it is derived: 'He falls (literally, makes fall) the tree' and 'The tree falls' (intrans.). In other cases where the two forms are preserved we do not now feel their original force: 'The storm drenched our clothes' (literally, made our clothes drink) and 'He drank (intrans.) deeply.' 'He sets (literally, makes sit) the pot on the stove' and 'He sits (intrans.) by the window.' 'He lays (literally, makes lie) his book on the table' and 'The book lies (intrans.) on the table.' 'Her family reared (or in Danish form raised; literally, made rise) a sumptuous mausoleum over her remains' and 'He rose to the occasion.' In
a special sense also rise is used as a causative: ‘We rose many birds in the course of the day’s hunt.’

In this category we now employ usually in most cases, in accordance with the usage so common elsewhere, only one form for both transitive and intransitive function: ‘I burned up the rubbish’ and ‘The rubbish burned up.’ ‘He sinks the boat’ and ‘The boat sinks.’ In all these cases the verb was originally intransitive, but the corresponding transitive causative was already in oldest English in common use, at first with a somewhat different form, later usually with the same form. Of course, when causatives were later formed from originally intransitive verbs they assumed the form of the intransitive, as in the case of fall (in older English), swim, starve, stand, fly, gallop, leap, run, drop, march, flash, jingle, grow, stay, walk, sit, rise, etc.: ‘A little child learning to walk often falls’ (intrans.). ‘The common executioner, Whose heart the accustom’d sight of death makes hard, Falls (trans. caus.) not the axe upon the humbled neck But first begs pardon’ (Shakespeare, As You Like It, III, v, 5). ‘The horses plunged into the river and swam (intrans.) over.’ ‘We in the Evening Swam (trans. caus.) our horses over’ (George Washington, Diary, March 20, 1748). ‘They had so little to eat that they almost starved’ (intrans.). ‘He starved (trans. caus.) his old father to death.’ ‘They starved themselves (reflex.) to buy books.’ ‘Here once stood (intrans.) a huge oak.’ ‘I stood (trans. caus.) my rifle against the oak.’ ‘The kite is flying (intrans.) high.’ ‘The boy is flying (trans. caus.) his kite.’ ‘She (airship) flew (intrans.) to Spitzbergen, where she replenished her supplies’ (Victor Appleton, Don Sturdy across the North Pole, Ch. XXV). ‘Croil (name) flew (trans. caus.) me to Suez’ (T. E. Lawrence, Revolt in the Desert, p. 192). ‘He flies (trans. caus.) his own plane.’ ‘He sprang (intrans.) up from his seat.’ ‘He loves to spring (trans. caus.) surprises on us.’ ‘The horse galloped (intrans.) away and leaped (trans. caus.) over the fence.’ ‘. . . the horsemanship of the cavalry, who galloped (trans. caus.) their horses at full speed over the ground and leaped (trans. caus.) them over formidable obstacles’ (Theodore Roosevelt, The Winning of the West, Vol. IV, Ch. V). ‘The water ran (intrans.) off.’ ‘He ran (trans. caus.) the water off.’ ‘He ran his canoe ashore.’ ‘He dropped the letter into the box.’ ‘The guard marched the prisoner off.’ ‘From a little handmirror he flashed sun into their eyes.’ ‘He jingled the loose coins in his pockets.’ ‘He grows vegetables for the market.’ ‘Who can stay the hand of death?’ ‘He drew me out of my study and walked me off to the woods.’ ‘He (Voltaire) was refused Christian burial in Paris; but his friends sat him up grimly in a
carriage, and got him out of the city by pretending that he was alive’ (Will Durant, *The Story of Philosophy*, p. 275). ‘We rose many birds in the course of the day’s hunt.’

In most cases, however, the causative idea is now expressed by placing the auxiliary *make* or *have*, or in a number of expressions, as in older English, the auxiliary *let*, before the infinitive of the verb in question: ‘Money makes the mare go.’ ‘That makes you look miserable.’ ‘I’ll make him take it back.’ ‘I’ll have him do it.’ ‘I’ll let you know tomorrow.’ ‘Let him see that you are dissatisfied.’ ‘Let him feel it.’ When the infinitive is to have passive force, the usual causative auxiliary is *have* in connection with the past participle of the verb, which contains the passive force: ‘I had a new suit made.’ Compare 15 III 2 B (4th and 5th parr.). In accordance with older usage *let* is sometimes still employed as auxiliary here, in connection, however, with the passive infinitive: ‘He let it be known to only a few friends.’ ‘He soon let his power be felt.’ In older English, the active infinitive was used here with passive force: ‘He let make a proclamacion þorþ (through) all his Empire’ (*Gesta Romanorum*, I, VI, 15, A.D. 1440). Compare 15 III 2 B (4th and 6th parr.). In older English, the causative idea could be expressed by *do* with an infinitive: ‘Sometimes to do him laugh she would essay To laugh’ (*Spenser, The Faerie Queene*, II, vi, vii).

There is another group of transitives that have developed out of intransitives — intransitives that take an accusative object to complete their meaning. This group of verbs is treated in 11 2 (4th par.).

47. Passive Voice. The passive forms in English are used to express two quite different things, *action* and *state*.

a. Actional Passive. The simpler passive form with *be* and the perfect participle is used to denote an act as a whole: ‘The house is painted every year.’ ‘The house was painted last year.’ ‘Since we have lived here, the house has been painted every year.’ ‘For as the sun is daily new and old, So is my love still telling what is (now has been; see 37 3, 3rd par.) told’ (*Shakespeare, Sonnet LXXVI*).

The progressive form is employed to represent an act as going on. In the literary language, it is made up of the progressive form of the verb *be* and the perfect participle of the verb to be conjugated: ‘The house is being painted.’ This progressive form arose in the fifteenth century: ‘Wyne (wine) is being y-put (old perfect participle for *put*) to sale’ (in a letter of John Shillingford, about 1447). It spread at first very slowly and did not really become established in the literary language until about
1825. During this period (1447–1825) there were two other competing progressive forms, a gerundial and a participial: (gerundial) 'The house is in building,' or in contracted form a-building; (participial) 'The house is building' (the present participle with passive force). The gerundial construction in its contracted form, 'The house is a-building,' survives only in popular speech; in the literary language it was earlier in the period gradually supplanted by the participial construction.

Between 1700 and 1825 the participial construction (is building) gained temporarily the ascendency in the literary language and was widely used also in colloquial speech. Thus in colonial times and the early days of the Republic this passive form was the common one: 'Some of the Peas are up and some are now sowing' (Richard Smith, A Tour of Four Great Rivers, II, 19, A.D. 1769), now being sown. 'This being the Anniversary of American Independence and being kindly requested to do it, I agreed to halt here this day and partake of the entertainment which was preparing (now was being prepared) for the celebration of it' (George Washington, Diary, July 4, 1791). From 1825 on, however, the form with being + perfect participle began to lead all others in this competition, so that in spite of considerable opposition the clumsy is being built became more common than is building in the usual passive meaning, i.e., where it was desired to represent a person or thing as affected by an agent working under resistance vigorously and consciously to a definite end: 'The house is being built.' 'My auto is being repaired.'

On the other hand, the form with the present participle did not now disappear, but continued to be widely used. This was because the present participle had been gradually developing a peculiar passive meaning, which was felt as distinctive and useful. While this peculiar force of the present participle rendered it unfit to express the usual passive meaning, it came into wide use in its own distinctive field, namely, to represent an activity as proceeding easily, naturally, often almost spontaneously: 'These books are selling out fast.' 'Our plans are working out successfully.' 'Dust is blowing in at the open door.' The development of passive force here out of active form is explained in 46 (7th and 8th parr.)

Thus the form with being and the form with the present participle were at first competing constructions without a difference of meaning, but later became differentiated, enriching the language. This differentiation, however, is incomplete, for the form with being is used only in the present and the past tense: 'The house is being built, was being built.' In the compound tenses the
construction with the present participle is still, as in older English, employed in the usual passive meaning: ‘The house has been building, had been building, will be building.’ The form with being is employed in the present and the past tense for the sake of its accuracy, but we hesitate to extend this principle of accuracy to the compound tenses, where the accumulation of auxiliary forms would be intolerable. For a similar reason we avoid the form with being in the imperative, infinitive, participle, and gerund, since the use of being after the form be or being would sound too harsh. In older English, the form with the present participle could be used in the infinitive: ‘After passing Beverly we come to the Cotton Manufactory, which seems to be carrying (now carried) on with spirit by the Mr. Cabbots’ (George Washington, Diary, Oct. 30, 1789). In the dialect of the southern counties of Scotland, the form with the present participle is still, as in older literary English, employed also in the present and the past tense in the usual passive meaning: ‘The hoose is buildan.’ This older usage still occasionally occurs also in the literary language: ‘My horse!’ — ‘My Lord, he’s shoeing’ (George H. Boker, Francesco da Rimini, V, II, A.D. 1856). Most commonly, however, where the idea of conscious agent is little felt, overshadowed by that of natural development or process: ‘Tea was preparing in the kitchen’ (A. Marshall, Anthony Dare, Ch. X).

The gerundial construction survives only in popular speech, now only in contracted form: ‘The house is a-building.’ This contracted form was once in use in the literary language: ‘Now we have shown our power, Let us seem humbler after it is done Than when it was a-doing’ (Shakespeare, Coriolanus, IV, II, 3). Likewise the full form was once common in the literary language: ‘Forty and six years was this temple in building’ (John, II, 20).

Alongside of the literary passive with be and the past participle is a common, more expressive, colloquial form conjugated with get instead of be: ‘Our house gets painted every year.’ ‘Our house is getting painted.’ Compare b below.

Besides the various means of expressing the passive idea described above, there are still others, described elsewhere. See 15 I 2 a (last par.), 15 III 2 B (4th, 5th, 6th parr.), 46 (next to last par.), 7 D 2.

b. STATAL PASSIVE. The simpler passive form is also used to denote a state: ‘The house is painted.’ Past state: ‘The house has been painted, although no trace of paint can now be detected upon it.’ ‘The door was shut at six when I went by, but I don’t know when it was shut.’ The first was shut in the last sentence is used to denote a state, the second was shut to denote an act.
Thus the one form is employed to denote two quite different things. For many centuries the verb be, whether used as copula or passive auxiliary, has had a twofold meaning, expressing on the one hand the idea of state, on the other hand the idea of ingression (38 2 a ff) with the meaning of become, hence used in the passive to express action: ‘Our house is (expressing state) painted.’ ‘Our house is (= becomes, hence expressing action) painted every year.’ In be the idea of state so overshadows that of ingression or action that its establishment as an auxiliary in the actional passive is a great misfortune for our language. This lack of an adequate form in the literary language to express action has led in colloquial speech to the use of a more expressive actional form, namely, get with ingressive force, like become, hence fitted for the expression of action: ‘I fear that all books that really do their work get used up’ (Sir Walter Raleigh, Letter to Evan Charteris, May 9, 1917), i.e., ‘a good book gets read so much that it gets used up.’ ‘A man gets driven into work’ (H. G. Wells, The New Machiavelli, p. 207). ‘Your nature is an overbearing one, Sophia, and for once you got punished for it’ (A. Marshall, Many Junes, Ch. I, p. 2). ‘The poor little fellow gets punished almost every day.’ — ‘He’s never yet got punished enough. Some day he’ll get punished the way he deserves.’ ‘I suppose it will get whispered about and they’ll hear it’ (Tarkington, Gentle Julia, Ch. XVIII). ‘And now what was this wonderful game where so many people got killed?’ (Rupert Hughes, Clipped Wings, Ch. I). If this expressive, actional, passive form with the auxiliary get, already quite common colloquially, ever becomes established in literary English, it will be a decided gain to the language. Our present use of get as the auxiliary of the actional passive alongside of be corresponds closely to the Old English use of weorpan as the auxiliary of the actional passive alongside of the be forms. Weorpan was an ingressive with the force of our modern auxiliary get, which at that time had, of course, not yet come into existence, hence was not available. Weorpan was superior to be in expressive power, but its form was so heavy that even in the Old English period it began to be replaced by its lighter competitor. Our present wide use of get here shows plainly that we feel the inability of be to express our thought clearly. Get, unlike Old English weorpan, is a light, handy word that gives promise of a long period of usefulness.

The past participle of certain verbs have almost pure adjective force. The use of get or become with such past participles does not indicate action at all, but merely the beginning of a temporary or a final state: ‘I am getting (or becoming) tired.’ ‘Dialectic
expressions sometimes become established in the literary language.' Compare 38 2 a bb and 38 2 b ee. The use of the auxiliary be with such participles indicates an actual state: 'I am tired.' 'The expression is established in the literary language.' The auxiliary stand here has the force of be with the implication that the state is the result of a decision or act that has just preceded: 'The meeting stands adjourned to five o'clock.' 'I stand corrected.' 'We stand committed to this action.' 'The delegates stand pledged to this course.' 'He took the key and opened the lid, when the cakes and wine stood revealed in all their damning profusion' (Anstey, Vice Versa, Ch. V). Sometimes stand indicates readiness: 'I stand prepared to dispute it.'
CHAPTER XXII

THE INFINITE FORMS OF THE VERB

In contrast, in a formal sense, to the finite forms of the verb, i.e., those limited by person, number, and mood, are the infinite forms, i.e., those not thus limited, verbal forms without person, number, and mood. There are three such forms— participle, infinitive, and gerund. The extensive use of these forms is an outstanding feature of English. No other part of our grammar is at the present time developing so vigorously. Compare 20 3.
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Complete Outline of Functions

48. The participle, true to its name, participates in the nature of an adjective and a verb.

1. Functions Other than Those with the Force of a Finite Verb.

There are five categories:

a. Participe Used as an Adjective with More or Less Verbal Force. Attributively with active meaning and descriptive stress (10 I 1): a grasping nature; a captivating manner; the risen sun; often in connection with a modifier (adverb, object, etc.) or a predicate adjective: a well-meaning boy; a well-behaved boy; a well-read man; a well-dressed woman; an unrelenting woman; a full-blown rose; a beautifully dressed woman; a heart-breaking scene; a healthy-looking boy; but in the predicate relation the adverb is usually stressed less than the participle; of course, also in the attributive relation if the adverb is unstressed.
in the compound verb: 'The boy is well-meaning, well-behaved.' 'The woman is well-dressed, unrelenting.' 'The rose is full-blown.' 'The woman is beautifully dressed.' 'An overdressed woman' and 'The woman is overdressed,' since in the compound verb overdressed the verbal form is stressed. Attributively with passive meaning: a bròken chair; a well-known man; a fully equipped army; an unopened letter; a well-dressed little girl (i.e., 'a little girl who has been well dressed,' while in 'a well-dressed woman' the participle has active meaning); an ivy-clad castle; a storm-tossed ship; a long-looked-for occasion; unheard-of wonders; carved-in-wood idols; but in the predicate relation: 'The man is well-known.' 'The army is fully equipped.' 'The letter is unopened.' 'The little girl is well-dressed.' Attributively with classifying or distinguishing stress (10 I 1): the first of living artists; the following day; (with passive meaning): washing ties (i.e., ties that wash, are washed); cooking apples (i.e., apples that cook well, can be cooked). Appositively after the noun: 'the little boy sitting on the last chair,' 'a new sect lately risen in India.'

Predicatively: 'He is always reserved.' 'The book is interesting.' As objective predicate (15 III 2, 15 III 2 A): 'I find the book interesting.' As predicate appositive (6 C): 'He awoke the next morning rested and refreshed.'

b. Participle Used as a Noun. As an adjective the participle can be used as a noun: the wounded and dying; the deceased; my intended, etc. Compare 58.

c. Participle Used as an Adverb. The participle is used also as an adverb: boiling hot; piercing cold.

d. Participle Used as a 'Pure Adjective. In a number of cases the adjective nature of the participle has entirely overshadowed the verbal nature, so that the words are now felt as adjectives pure and simple and have, in the case of perfect participles, become differentiated in form from the participle by the retention of the older participial form in -en, while the participle with verbal force has developed a new form, if it is preserved: one's bounden duty; a cloven hoof; sunken eyes; a graven image; a drunken man; a clean-shaven or clean-shaved face, etc.

e. Participle Used with More Verbal than Adjective Force. The participle now for the most part has more verbal force than formerly. The present participle in connection with an auxiliary is much used in the progressive form of verbs, where, though still a predicate adjective, it has the full force of a verb: 'He is writing a letter.' 'He was, has been, will be, writing a letter.' This form often has passive meaning: 'There is a new house building on the corner.' 'These books are selling out fast.' For a fuller treatment
of this passive construction see 47 a. The progressive form has become a powerful construction by the fusion of the gerundial construction with it: 'as she was writing (older form in writing) of it' (Shakespeare, As You Like It, IV, iii, 10), now 'as she was writing it,' the dropping of in and of indicating that the gerundial construction has merged into the participial. This fusion of the two constructions was made possible by the earlier fusion of their endings and the general similarity of their meaning. In the fourteenth century, the participial ending -inde became confused with the gerundial ending -inge, so that -ing became the common ending for both forms. In the dialect of Northumberland and the southern counties of Scotland the two forms still have different endings, -an (pronounced on) for the participle, -in for the gerund. The fusion of the two forms in the literary language often makes it difficult to distinguish them: the form in -ing a gerund in dining-car (i.e., a car for dining), ironing-board (i.e., a board for ironing), but a present participle with passive (47 a, 46) force in cooking-apple (i.e., an apple that cooks well, can be cooked), breech-loading gun (i.e., a gun that loads, is loaded at the breech).

The present participle is much used as predicate also after the copula seem: 'Instead of offering any explanation he seemed waiting for her to say something.' The predicative infinitive of the progressive form competes with the predicative participle: 'He seemed to be waiting for her to say something.'

Also the past participle is much used in verbal forms as a predicate adjective, namely, in the passive: 'The house is painted.' Here the participle has almost pure adjective force expressing a state. But it often has strong verbal force: 'The house is (or gets) painted every year.' There is here also a progressive form: 'The house is being (or getting) painted.' Compare 47 b. In older English, also the past participle of point-action (38 2 b gg) intransitives was used as a predicate and occasionally is still so used: 'My money is all gone.' 'The leaves are all fallen.' 'The melancholy days are come.' After the verbal force here had overshadowed the adjective force, is, are, was, etc., were gradually replaced by has, have, had, so that we today usually employ a present perfect or a past perfect tense where our ancestors used an adjective construction: 'Much snow has (once is) fallen.' 'Much snow had (once was) fallen.' Compare 37 3 (3rd par.).

2. Functions with the Force of a Finite Verb. Our English ancestors made a liberal use of the two participles when they fashioned our conjugational systems, and the following generations continued this work by employing both participles in abridged
clauses (20 3), which they began to develop more carefully to replace, for practical purposes, the more formal subordinate clause with a nominative subject and a finite verb as predicate, so that participles were used to build up the verbal systems and later to replace these same systems.

After a noun a participle often forms with the words near it an attributive clause, in which the preceding noun serves as subject and the participle as predicate. Here the participle is not in a formal sense a predicate adjective after a finite copula or auxiliary, as in I e, p. 449, but predicates of itself, just like a finite verb: 'It (the circus) was all one family — parents and five children — performing (= who performed) in the open air.' 'Good things long enjoyed (= which have long been enjoyed) are not easily given up.' 'The large building being constructed (= which is being constructed) in the field yonder is the new schoolhouse.' 'The bridge seized (= which had been seized) two hours before by the enemy was now retaken.' 'We shall arrive too late to catch the train leaving (= which will leave) at eight.' The participle, though it has fewer forms than the finite verb, expresses the time relations quite accurately.

The participle is often employed to predicate something of the object of the principal verb, i.e., it serves as an objective predicate (15 III 2, 15 III 2 A). In this construction the object of the principal verb and the participle together form a kind of subordinate clause, in which the object serves as the subject and the participle as the predicate. The participle performs the function of predicate just as in the progressive form and in the passive of finite verbs, but there is present in this construction no finite auxiliary verb to serve as a formal sign of predication. The participle predicates of itself: 'I saw him lying under a tree.' 'I have my work done.' 'I had my work done.' This use of the past participle as objective predicate has led to one of the most important developments in the history of our language. By simply changing the word-order in such sentences as the last two we have developed the present perfect and the past perfect tense of transitive verbs: 'I have done my work.' 'I had done my work.' Compare 37 3 (2nd par.). The use of have and had here in the new present perfect and past perfect tenses proved so useful that they were similarly employed with intransitives, so that has, have, had are now used uniformly with all verbs. Compare 37 3.

The predicative past participle out of which the present perfect and past perfect tenses developed had a good deal of adjective force, expressing a condition or state. This old participle is still widely used with the same force: 'I had the letter written before
he came.' 'I got my work done before twelve o'clock.' Both the present and the past participle, however, often have here almost pure verbal force: 'I watched the net being hauled in.' 'I saw the thing shaping' (active form with passive force; see 15 III 2 B, 6th par.). 'He felt himself seized by a strong arm from behind.' 'She represents him as having ever struggled for the best things.' The form shaping represents the original condition of things as far as the form is concerned. It was originally an adjective and has still its old adjective form, but it has acquired a good deal of verbal force. Being hauled has the force of a passive verb and has been given passive form to express it. Having struggled has the force and the form of the present perfect active. We often employ the present infinitive instead of the present participle, but each form has a little different shade of meaning. The participle has descriptive force, expressing duration or repetition, while the infinitive represents the action as a finished whole, a fact: 'I heard him coming slowly up the steps as if under a heavy load' (duration), but 'I heard him come up the stairs a few minutes ago' (a fact). 'We should be sorry to see English critics suggesting (repetition, one critic suggesting in one periodical, another in another periodical) that they ought to or could have acted otherwise.' Compare 50 3 (3rd par. from end). The present participle has this force also when it is used to predicate something of the object of a preposition: 'Do not send any more of my books home. I have a good deal of pleasure in the thought of you looking on them' (Keats). Compare 50 3 (4th and 5th parr. from end).

The most common use of the participle is to employ it as a predicate appositive (6 C). We bring it into relation to the subject or the object of the principal verb that it may predicate something of it and at the same time, as a predicate appositive, serve as an adverbial element indicating some adverbial relation, such as time, cause, manner, condition, purpose, means, etc. The participle has the force of a finite verb. Its subject is not expressed but implied in the subject or the object of the principal verb: 'Going (= while I was going) down town I met a friend.' 'Having finished (= after I had finished) my work I went to bed.' 'Being (= as I was) sick I stayed at home.' 'I feel it as a rare occasion, occurring as it does only once in many years' (= since it occurs only once in many years). 'I beat him jumping' (clause of manner, indicating manner, respect in which he excelled). 'He went hunting' (clause of purpose). In older English, instead of 'He went hunting' it was common to say, 'He went on hunting.' Compare 33 2 (last par.). Thus the more accurate gerundial construction
has been replaced by the simpler participial form. Simplicity is a marked characteristic of English. Compare 20 3 (3rd par.).

Hampered by their original adjective nature and form, these participles have not yet developed forms for mood and have not as many tenses as verbs have. Thus, the same participle must often serve as an indicative and a subjunctive: ‘This thing, happening (= since it happened; past indicative) at the right time, has helped our cause’ and ‘This same thing, happening (= if it should happen; past subjunctive) in wartime, would amount to disaster.’ Again, the present participle must serve, not only as a present tense, but also as a future: ‘My train starts at six, arriving (future time) in Chicago at ten.’ Similarly, the perfect participle must serve as a present perfect and as a past perfect: ‘Having been (= as I have been) sick so much, I have learned to take good care of my health.’ ‘Having finished (= after I had finished) my work, I went to bed.’ Compare 27 5.

As the participle never assumes a form to indicate person, number, and mood, and in these categories never has a subject of its own expressed, the construction is an exceedingly simple one. The great ease of movement associated with it explains its wide use. While it is terse and convenient, there is often in it no clear expression of the adverbial relations. Instead of rejecting it as inadequate for accurate purposes we have for a long time been trying to improve it by introducing into it features, i.e., the conjunctions, of the full clause: ‘While going down town I met an old friend.’ Compare 20 3 (5th par.). On the other hand, in lively style, as illustrated in 24 IV a (last par.) and 27 5 (4th par.), the simpler older form is still often preferred, since it is more concrete and impressive.

a. Voices of the Participle. There are active and passive forms. Examples are given in 2, p. 450.

b. Tenses of the Participle. Though the participle has fewer tenses than the finite verb, it can express the time relations quite accurately. Examples are given in 2, p. 450.

c. Subject of the Participle. In all the categories described in the preceding pages the subject of the participle is always understood, never expressed. It is usually implied in some noun or pronoun that stands near it, which at the same time performs some function in the principal proposition, usually that of the subject or the object of the principal verb. Examples are given in 2, p. 450.

Sometimes the subject of the participle is not implied in any word in the sentence, as the reference is general and indefinite. Such a participle is called an absolute participle. This construction is described in 17 4.
Sometimes the participle has a subject of its own, which is usually in the nominative. This is the so-called absolute nominative construction. It is described in detail in 17 3 A, B, C.

3. Complete Outline of Functions. In accordance with its importance, the participle has been carefully discussed under the different grammatical categories treated throughout the syntax. The following references are given in order that the student may get a clear view of the entire field of its present usefulness in the language: 4 I c; 6 C; 7 B a, b, c; 10 I 1; 15 III 2 A, B; 17 3 A a, b, c, d, B, C, 4; 20 3; 21 e; 23 II 11; 24 IV a (last par.); 27 5; 28 1 a; 28 2 b; 28 3 a; 28 5 d; 29 1 A c bb; 29 1 A d aa; 30 b; 31 2; 32 2; 33 2; 34; 47 a, b; 58.
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49 1. Origin. The infinitive is a verbal noun which for many centuries has been gradually acquiring more and more verbal force. In Old English, the infinitive was still inflected as a noun except in the genitive, which was lost in the prehistoric period: Nominative and accusative writan (to write), dative to writenne or writanne. The dative consisted of a distinctive dative form, writenne, etc., and the governing preposition to, which in Old English usually took a dative object, not an accusative object as today. The remnant of this older inflection is the so-called infinitive with to, which retains the to of the old dative form but has lost the infinitive suffix -en and the dative sign -e, so that the dative now, aside from its distinctive to, is identical in form with the nominative and accusative. The old dative -e was dropped in the twelfth century. After the dative sign -e disappeared, there still survived the infinitive suffix -en, which now served as the infinitive ending not only when the infinitive was used as the subject or the object of a verb but also when it was the object of the preposition to. In all these grammatical relations it was becoming ever more common to place to before the infinitive, as to had come to be felt as the sign of the infinitive. The suffix -en was often reduced to -e, as in to aske, and in this form remained in use in the South and the Midland until the sixteenth century, when it disappeared, to aske becoming to ask, since the to before the infinitive was felt as sufficiently distinctive. After auxiliaries, as in 'It may rain,' 'I shall go,' 'He will go,' the simple infinitive, as in these examples rain and go, is no longer felt as an infinitive,
but as a component element of a subjunctive form or the future tense form.

The infinitive with to was originally a noun in the dative governed by the preposition to, hence was in the first stages of its development a prepositional object modifying the verb. This to, as can still be seen in many sentences, originally meant toward and pointed to that toward which the activity of the principal verb was directed: 'Jealousy drove him to do it,' i.e., drove him toward the doing of it. Similarly, after adjectives: 'I am ready to do it,' i.e., ready in the direction of doing it. As described in 24 IV a, the to of the prepositional infinitive is still in a number of grammatical categories more or less vividly felt as the preposition to or upon reflection can be recognized as such. This to, however, is now often not felt as a preposition but rather as a part of the infinitive itself, and hence the prepositional infinitive is now no longer confined to a prepositional relation, but may be used also as the subject or the object of a verb, where to cannot be construed as a preposition governing the infinitive: 'To err is human.' 'Learn to labor and to wait.'

As the prepositional infinitive originally stood in a close relation to the verb or adjective, it gradually came to be felt as the proper form to use with a verb or adjective to complete its meaning. In oldest English, the prepositional infinitive was still in large part a prepositional phrase in which the preposition to still had its original meaning. Preposition and infinitive together formed a unit, a prepositional object, which completed the meaning of the verb. The simple infinitive was often employed to complete the meaning of a transitive verb, performing the grammatical function of a direct object: 'Pa ongan he wepan' (object), now 'Then he began to weep.' As can be seen by the translation of this example, the Old English simple infinitive in the object relation is now replaced by the prepositional infinitive. The development had already begun in the Old English period. Gradually the prepositional infinitive came to be felt as the proper form to complete the meaning of the verb in all categories. As the prepositional infinitive had come to be felt as a unit, a verbal noun, it became natural to employ it not only as the object of the verb but also as the subject, for a noun may be used as either the subject or the object of the verb. This development was greatly favored by the distinctive form of the prepositional infinitive. The simple form would not be equal to the difficult task of performing all the delicate work now done so well by the prepositional form. The simple infinitive survives as a fossil in various categories described in the following pages.
2. Form of the Infinitive Clause.

a. Subject of the Infinitive. For centuries the to-infinitive and its modifiers have been developing into a distinct subordinate clause of a new type, which has been crowding more and more out of common use the older that-clause with a finite verb, so that the to-infinitive has acquired functions unknown to the simple infinitive. Today the infinitive clause introduced by to is a form of expression which is felt and used as a more convenient subordinate clause than the more formal clause introduced by that, followed by a nominative subject and a finite verb. In a grammatical sense they are two expressions for the same thing. The to of the infinitive has become in all such abridged clauses a conjunction, so that we speak of a to-clause just as we speak of a that-clause: 'I am not eager to go' (or that I should go). Originally, the subject of the infinitive was not expressed but was contained in some noun or pronoun of the principal proposition, as in this example in I, the subject of the sentence. As described in detail in 24 III d and 24 IV a, the subject of the infinitive may be the subject of the principal verb or an accusative, dative, or prepositional object of the verb. In the earliest stages of development the subject of the infinitive always performed thus some function in the principal proposition and was only by implication also subject of the infinitive. This terse older form of the clause is still very common. The simple compact form of this construction brought it from the start into ever greater favor.

In the fourteenth century, as described in 21 e, there arose a desire to extend the use of the convenient infinitive construction, and people began to give the infinitive a subject of its own when there was no noun or pronoun in the principal proposition which could serve as a subject. The subject was put before the old to-form of the clause and for was used as a formal sign of the introduction of this new element: 'I am not eager for him to return.' This is only a slight variation of the old Zo-form. In the original infinitive construction, as explained above, the subject was not expressed but was contained in some noun or pronoun in the principal proposition. Thus from the very start the subject was not a part of the infinitive construction; and later when the infinitive could have a subject of its own, it was placed before the clause outside of its construction, just as it had always stood outside of it. The for, whose origin is explained in 21 e, here merely indicates that in the case in hand the infinitive has a subject of its own. In older English, there was before the infinitive a for . . . to of a different origin. This older for . . . to hadn't the functions of the later for . . . to but was used interchangeably.
ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF SPLIT INFINITIVE

with simple to. This older *for . . . to* has disappeared from the literary language but is still widely used in dialect. Examples are given in 21 e (8th par.), 24 III d (3rd par.), 33 2 (6th par.).

When the subject of the infinitive is general or indefinite, it is often not expressed: ‘It is wise to be cautious.’

b. Elliptical Form of the Infinitive Clause. In oldest English, *to* was still largely felt as a preposition governing the infinitive, its object, but it gradually became the distinctive feature of the clause, marking the following group of words as a grammatical unit, often even representing it alone, the other words dropping out where the reference is to a thought previously expressed which is to be briefly repeated in substance in the form of an abridged infinitive clause: ‘I shall go to the celebration tomorrow, or at least I am planning to [go to it].’ This construction arose in the fourteenth century, but did not become common until the second half of the nineteenth century. It gradually developed power along with the infinitive clause, which it now often represents. In older English, it was more common here to place the preposition *to* before the neuter pronoun *it*, which pointed back to the thought previously expressed: ‘But shall we dance, if they desire us *to’*? (Shakespeare, *Love’s Labor’s Lost*, V, ii, 145). This old form of expression lives on in popular speech: ‘I can’t read, nor I don’t want *to it*’ (Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend*, I, 31). Besides the common *to*-form described above there is now another less common elliptical construction, which has no distinctive mark and consists simply in suppressing the infinitive clause entirely and leaving us to gather the thought from the context: ‘Do you write to him!’ — ‘I will since you wish me [*to do so*]’ (Marryat, *The Settlers in Canada*, 11). ‘Meanwhile she opened the little door of Ellen’s study closet and went in there, though Ellen begged her not’ (Susan Warner, *The Wide, Wide World*, Ch. XX, A.D. 1851), now usually ‘begged her not to.’ On account of the lack of distinctive form to make the thought clear this construction can often not be used at all.

c. Split Infinitive, Origin and Development. As explained in 16 2 a, the sentence adverb stands before the stressed simple verb or the stressed verbal phrase and is itself usually unstressed, but under the influence of strong emotion or on account of its logical force is often heavily stressed. This peculiar word-order with its peculiar stress is absolutely rigid for the *that*-clause. Since the *to*-clause has the same force as the *that*-clause, there is a widespread feeling that this peculiar word-order with its peculiar stress should obtain also in the *to*-clause. The *to* is thus separated from the infinitive by the adverb, which has led to the expression ‘split
infinitive': ‘To almost succeed (or That I should almost succeed) is not enough.’ ‘I don’t expect to ever see him again’ (or that I shall ever see him again). ‘I wish to utterly forget my past’ (or that I may utterly forget my past). ‘It’s a sad experience to always live from hand to mouth’ (or when one must always live from hand to mouth). The insertion of the adverb here between to and the infinitive cannot even in the strictest scientific sense be considered ungrammatical. As explained on page 456, to, in certain common categories, has long since ceased to be a preposition, just as that in the corresponding that-clause has long since ceased to be a determinative pronoun pointing to the following clause. Both to and that have in the course of the development here lost their old force and have assumed a new function. Both words introduce a clause and naturally all words that belong to the clause should follow. In the newer for-to-infinitive construction all words belonging to the predicate similarly follow to: ‘I am not eager for him to ever return.’

In the older form of the infinitive construction the sentence adverb preceded the to and this is still the more common form of expression; but, as the feeling grows that to should introduce the clause, it becomes more common to place the adverb after the to. In the older form with the adverb before the to there is no clearly marked beginning to the infinitive clause, which sometimes leads to ambiguity: ‘He failed entirely to comprehend it.’ It is not clear here whether entirely modifies failed or comprehend. We can construe the sentence either way with a difference of meaning. If entirely modifies comprehend it would be better to place it before comprehend: ‘He failed to entirely comprehend it.’ Thus the split infinitive is an improvement of English expression.

The old position of the adverb before to is most common in the case of such distinguishing (16 2 b) adverbs as are distinctly felt as belonging to the infinitive clause as a whole rather than to the infinitive itself: ‘I’ve dropped in just (or merely, or only) to inquire how your father is doing.’ Especially not clings to the old position before to: ‘I desire, not to discourage, but to encourage.’ But even these adverbs are sometimes placed after to when they are distinctly felt as belonging to the infinitive itself. Examples are given on page 460.

The adverb sometimes stands after the infinitive instead of before it, but this change of word-order is always associated with a different shade of meaning, indicating emphasis upon the adverb, as described in 16 2 a, while in the split-infinitive construction the infinitive itself is the important word and has a strong stress: ‘He understood a good deal of it, but he failed to comprehend it.
entirely.' The adverb is sometimes stressed in the split-infinitive construction. There are then two strong accents, both adverb and infinitive receiving a strong stress: 'She wishes to utterly forgét her past.' Compare 16 2 a (2nd and 3rd parr.).

The split infinitive began to appear in the fourteenth century. The oldest examples do not have the characteristics which mark the construction as we use it today: 'He louied þe lasse auber to lenge lye or to longe sitte' (Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight, ll. 87–88) = 'He (Arthur) did not like to either lie or sit long.' 'Bot to take þe toruayle to my-self to trwluf expoun' (ib., l. 1540) = 'but to undertake the task to expound true love.' Today, we put the adverbal modifier and the object here after the infinitive. These interesting old examples show one thing very plainly. The to is no longer felt as a preposition, so that adverbs and objects can stand between to and the infinitive. The idea of a to-clause, which had long lain in English feeling, received here for the first time a formal expression in the language. The future development of the new clause was now possible. Changes soon took place in the word-order which affected also the to-clause, so that these early examples now look strange to us, but the important point here is that an interesting development had begun which was to go on for many centuries and is still going on. Late in the fourteenth century two scholars — Wyclif and John Purvey — employed the split infinitive as it is used today, even in the case of not, which is still in our day not so thoroughly established here as other sentence adverbs: 'It is good to not eþe fleisch and to not drynke wyn' (Romans, XIV, 21, Purvey's ed., A.D. 1388).

In the fifteenth century this construction was used by Pecock and Sir John Fortescue. Pecock employed it in his philosophical writings with as great frequency as it is found in authors of the present time, and with the same force: for to so leie a side, etc. (The Folewer to the Donet, E.E.T.S., No. 164, p. 97, about A.D. 1454) = to thus lay aside, etc. Even in the case of not, which is still in our day not so thoroughly established here as other sentence adverbs: 'Y schall . . . swere to not discouere hem' (ib., p. 138) = 'I shall pledge myself to not inform on them.'

In the next three centuries the split infinitive was used freely by only a few authors, but the construction was spreading. It was employed occasionally by a large number of writers: Thomas Cromwell, Lord Berners, Tyndale, Sir Philip Sidney, Donne, Sir Thomas Browne, Pepys, Bentley, Defoe, Thomas Godfrey, Jr., Robert Rogers, Benjamin Franklin, Dr. Johnson, Burke, Coleridge, Southey, Lamb, De Quincey, and others.

The split infinitive has been censured by grammarians to whom
grammar is not an objective study of the living language but a
fixed body of rules that has come down to us from the past. Also
a number of good writers avoid the split infinitive. Since the
fourteenth century, however, the split infinitive, by virtue of its
declared advantages, which are unconsciously widely felt, has been
gradually gaining ground, in recent times even making headway
against deeply rooted prejudices, so that it frequently appears
in good authors, among them many of our best, sometimes only
occasionally, sometimes more freely. But it is never used with such
consistency that it is uniformly employed where it should be.
In the feeling of speaker or writer there is a struggle here between
older and newer usage. He now follows the one, now the other,
but yielding ever more and more to the powerful new drift in the
direction of greater precision of expression.

Although this new drift has long been regarded by many who
do not understand it as plebeian or vulgar, there have never been
any real grounds for such an attitude, for it has never been char­
acteristic of popular speech. Although it is now rapidly spreading
in the language of the common people, it was not prominent there
in older English, so far as we can judge from the evidence at our
disposal. On the other hand, it has long been used in literary and
colloquial language. In general, it is more characteristic of our
most prominent authors than of the minor writers, who avoid it
as they fear criticism. In the last fifty years, however, its use in
literature has spread more rapidly than in any previous period
of its development. It has become such a necessary form of
English expression that we often cannot avoid it if we would em­
ploy the infinitive at all: ‘This earl would have deemed it a
condescension to so much as invite me to his house’ (Marie Corelli).
‘He stood high in the colony, was extravagant and fond of display,
and, his fortune being jeopardized, he hoped to more than retrieve
it by going into speculations in Western lands’ (Theodore Roose­
velt, The Winning of the West, Vol. I, Ch. VI). ‘Her husband was
sure to enable her to more than better her old position’ (Edwin Bal­
mer, The Breath of Scandal, Ch. II). ‘I’ve heard enough to about
do for me’ (Willa Cather, The Professor’s House, p. 241).

The split infinitive has become so common that an adequate
idea of its extensive employment cannot be conveyed by illustra­
tions, but a large number of characteristic examples, taken from
the author’s much larger collection, are given here in order that
the student may get a general idea of the wide use of the con­
struction by good authors: ‘to nobly stem tyrannic pride’ (Burns),
‘to still further limit the hours’ (William Wordsworth), ‘without
permitting himself to actually mention the name’ (Matthew Ar-
nold), ‘of a kind to directly stimulate curiosity’ (Walter Pater, Appreciations, Sir Thomas Brown, p. 132). ‘New emissaries are trained with new tactics, to, if possible, entráp him and hoodwink and handcuff him’ (Carlyle). ‘To slowly trace the forest’s shady scene, Where things that own not man’s dominion dwell’ (Byron, Childe Harold, II, 25). ‘In order to fully appreciate Lord Holland’ (Macauley, Critical and Historical Essays), ‘to still live on’ (Whittier, Cambridge ed., p. 401), ‘being told to just step on seven miles farther’ (Mrs. Gaskell, Wives and Daughters, Ch. VII), ‘to half surmise the truth’ (Robert Browning, The Ring and the Book, Cambridge ed., p. 513), ‘to straightway murder’ (ib., p. 561), ‘to longer bear’ (ib., p. 563), ‘to worthily defend’ (ib., p. 563), ‘to bravely disbeliéve’ (ib., p. 570), ‘to quietly next day at crow of cock Cut my throat’ (ib., p. 588). ‘Escape? To even wish that would spoil all’ (id., Pippa Passes; and many other examples in this and others of his works). ‘How much better to thus save the money which else we sink for ever in the war’ (Abraham Lincoln, July 12, 1862). ‘The fury of the Confederate assault soon halted this advance force and ultimately inflicted upon it such loss of men and guns as to seriously cripple McCook’s corps’ (P. S. Sheridan, Personal Memoirs, I, Ch. XI). ‘Things which few except parents can be expected to really understand’ (Oliver W. Holmes, Elsie Venner, Ch. XIX). ‘I wish the reader to clearly understand’ (Ruskin). ‘I undertook to partially fill up the office of parish clerk’ (George Eliot, Silas Marner, p. 56). ‘To an active mind it may be easier to bear along all the qualifications of an idea than to first imperfectly conceive such idea’ (Herbert Spencer, Philosophy of Style). ‘To further confirm this, Sherman’s advance division will march direct from Whiteside to Trenton’ (U. S. Grant, Personal Memoirs, II, p. 51). ‘The commission’s scheme to arbitrarily and permanently confine the channel’ (Mark Twain, Life on the Mississippi, p. 224). ‘I don’t ask you to vote at all— I only urge you to nót (not as often found here after the to as other sentence adverbs, but with an evident drift in this direction) sóil yourself by voting for Blaine’ (id., Letter to W. D. Howells, Sept. 17, 1884). ‘The cost has to all cóme (after the analogy of must all come) out of a year’s instalments of Autobiography in the N. A. Review’ (id., Letter to H. H. Rogers, May 29, 1907). ‘Enough to thoroughly appréciate’ (Ellis, Early English Pronunciation, 1875, p. 1087). ‘Which women do not like in a woman and men prefer to distantly admire’ (Meredith, Diana of the Crossways, London, 1914, p. 103). ‘But the tendency of the study of science is to utterly uproot such notions’ (John Burroughs, The Light of Day, Ch. XIV, I). ‘The great point of honor on these occasions
was for each man to strictly limit himself to half a pint of liquor’ (Hardy, The Mayor of Casterbridge, Ch. XXXIII); frequently in this author in the descriptive portions of his works, occasionally also in the portions reproducing popular speech, for this construction is now affecting the language of the common people: ‘Don’t let my sins, when you know them all, cause ’ee to quite forget that though I loved ’ee late I loved ’ee well’ (ib., Ch. XLIII). ‘To utterly forget her past’ (Henry James, Adíná). ‘To só arrange it’ (Helen Hunt Jackson, Ramona, Ch. I). ‘The old man only simulated deafness all these years to one day catch your father out’ (De Morgan, Joseph Vance, Ch. I, p. 2); here in popular speech, but more commonly in literary language: ‘to merely fill up to the brim’ (ib., p. 5). ‘There can be nothing to — to nóts (not as often found here after the to as other sentence adverbs, but with an evident drift in this direction) talk about, between you and me, dear mother’ (id., Alice-for-Short, Ch. XXXV). ‘Which prompts a man to savagely stámp on the spider he has but half killed’ (Kipling, The Phantom Rickshaw). ‘I was able once more to calmly review my chances of escape’ (id., The Strange Ride). ‘The Cavalry were to gently stimulate the break-up which would follow’ (id., The Drums of the Fore and Aft). ‘To basely désért his friend’ (Du Maurier, Trilby, p. 185), ‘to honestly féél’ (id., Peter Ibbetson, p. 155), ‘to selfishly overrâte’ (id., The Martian, p. 215), ‘to thoroughly understand life’ (ib., p. 352), ‘to basely lóng for these’ (ib., p. 371). ‘I am asking myself how difficult it will be to quite understand these people’ (Frances Hodgson Burnett, The Shuttle, Ch. XXVIII). ‘The idlers of the town might not have been able to accurately define the moment when the drama of defeat lost its interest’ (Charles Egbert Craddock, The Prophet of the Great Smokey Mountains, Ch. XII). ‘Ask cook to kindly máké me a sandwich’ (C. Haddon Chambers, The Tyranny of Tears, Act IV; also often elsewhere in this drama). ‘Unable to squarely fáce Aurelia’s ardent assumption’ (Henry Blake Fuller, The Chatelaine), ‘to further complicate our problem’ (Hamlin Garland, A Daughter of the Middle Border, p. 328), ‘to quite fill the measure’ (John Fox, Jr., The Kentuckians, Ch. I), ‘to firmly carry out one’s ideas’ (Margaret Deland, The Apotheosis of the Reverend Mr. Spangler, Ch. I). ‘Just sensible enough of his own callousness to intensely enjoy the humor and adroitness of it’ (George Bernard Shaw, You Never Can Tell, Act II). ‘The observer who had thoroughly understood one link in a series of incidents should be able to accurately state all the other ones’ (A. Conan Doyle, Sherlock Holmes, I, 211). ‘You are to please côme óver here’ (Mrs. H. Ward, Marcella, IV, Ch. VI). ‘I’ve
presumed to call on you in the hope that I may be permitted to modestly reason with you’ (Pinero, *The Amazons*, Act I). ‘I’m old-fashioned enough to really believe there is that difference’ (Stanley Houghton, *Hindle Wakes*, Act II). ‘And after that he had made up his mind to always start on a Friday’ (Jerome K. Jerome, *Diary Pilgrim*, 13). ‘It really almost frightened the poor girl to suddenly find herself in this strange position’ (Rider Haggard, *Mr. Meeson’s Will*, p. 55). ‘She proceeded to securely cover over the sunshade’ (W. Black, *Highland Cousins*, II, 28). ‘She had cause to bitterly repent it’ (F. C. Philips, *One Never Knows*, II, 125). ‘You appear to me not to quite know what you are about’ (B. L. Farjeon, *London’s Heart*, II, 32). ‘Why you should have been made to half kill yourself over the matter is more than I can understand’ (W. J. Locke, *The Red Planet*, Ch. XVIII). ‘It would have overburdened the text to there incorporate many details’ (G. Hempl, *Modern Language Notes*, XIII, 456). ‘To so judge literature would be tantamount to,’ etc. (Edward Sapir, *Language*, p. 24). ‘It is doubtful if he had quite listened—he having so much to not listen to at the Home Office that the practice was growing on him’ (Galsworthy, *Freelands*, Ch. XVI); in general, often found in the works of this author, sometimes even in the case of *not*, as in this example. ‘Well, Dad oughtn’t to ever let you have it’ (Sinclair Lewis, *Babbitt*, Ch. II); frequently elsewhere in this book, occurring even in the case of *not*: ‘[1] Always figured somebody’d come along with the brains to not leave education to a lot of bookworms’ (ib., Ch. VI, III). ‘I’ll have time to really finish my research’ (id., *Arrowsmith*, Ch. XXIX). ‘The truth is I have come to rather dislike him’ (Tarkington, *The Magnificent Ambersons*, Ch. XVIII); in colloquial language found frequently throughout the many books of this writer. ‘He decided to again attack Rivas’ (Richard Harding Davis, *Real Soldiers of Fortune*, p. 160). ‘But it is hard to always have to brace yourself to be a prop to the weak’ (Hubert Henry Davies, *Mrs. Gorringe’s Necklace*, Act I). ‘Nobody dared to even question the truth of that report’ (Oemler, *Slippy McGee*, Ch. IX). ‘He used to keenly question’ (J. R. Green, *A Short History of the English People*, 1911, p. 50). ‘Mr. Man, that ought to pretty nearly fix it’ (William Allen White, *A Certain Rich Man*, Ch. XIII). ‘I thought I was pretty good to even try it’ (F. Scott Fitzgerald, *This Side of Paradise*, p. 203). ‘When I hear gentlemen say that politics ought to let business alone, I feel like inviting them to first consider whether business is letting politics alone’ (Woodrow Wilson, Feb. 24, 1912). ‘How satisfactory it must be to really know,’ etc. (W. S. Cather, *The Song of the Lark*, p. 421). ‘I do
not know that she ever hoped to really solve it' (Francis R. Bellamy, The Balance, Ch. XX). 'Why, it would be such fun to just forget all about the hours when the sun didn't shine, and remember only the nice, pleasant ones' (Eleanor A. Porter, Just David, Ch. X). 'To só act that,' etc. (Webster's International Dictionary, 1921, p. 1301, 13), 'designed to further centralize government in Washington' (editorial in Chicago Tribune, Feb. 28, 1924), 'something that would command me to utterly submit' (De Voto, The Crooked Mile, p. 342), 'to publicly baptize Psalmanazar' (Sir Sidney Lee, Dict. Nat. Biography, Psalmanazar, p. 440). 'This knowledge has been so applied as to well-nigh revolutionize human affairs' (Harvey Robinson, The Mind in the Making, p. 7). 'I don't want you to even speak to her' (Floyd Dell, This Mad Ideal, II, Ch. VII). 'To devise measures to vigorously restore and expand our foreign trade' (Herbert Hoover, Oct. 15, 1928).

If the to before the second of two infinitives is suppressed, the sentence adverb invariably stands immediately before the infinitive: 'We pray you to proceed And justly and religiously unfold' (Shakespeare, Henry the Fifth, I, ii, 9). This construction, which has been in universal use for many centuries, has facilitated the spread of the split infinitive.

Similar to the prepositional infinitive is the prepositional gerund. The preposition here serves as a conjunction introducing the gerundial clause. Here, as in the case of the infinitive clause or the full clause with a finite verb, sentence adverbs stand before the verbal element, i.e., before the gerund: 'When he looked at her he usually ended by smiling and sometimes by suddenly laughing' (A. Marshall, The Old Order Changeth, Ch. XIII). When the subject of the gerund is expressed, the sentence adverb, as in a full clause, stands between subject and gerund: 'It (i.e., your case) will rest upon my actually having no complaint against you' (ib., Ch. XXII). These examples clearly show how closely related a full clause with finite verb, an infinitive clause, and a gerundial clause are. Curiously enough it has never occurred to a grammarian to censure the placing of a sentence adverb before a gerund, while the grammarians who have written our schoolbooks quite generally censure this word-order in the infinitive clause. In full clause, infinitive clause, gerundial clause the same forces are at work; in all three cases the development is natural and in accord with the development in an independent sentence, and should be furthered rather than censured, for it makes for clearer expression.

In all the cases just discussed, the split infinitive is the simple form without an auxiliary. In a compound form containing an
auxiliary the sentence adverb usually stands before the stressed form of the verb, which in most cases is the part having the verbal meaning: ‘Life’s aim is simply to be always looking for temptations’ (Oscar Wilde, A Woman of No Importance, Act III). In the passive, the form is slightly different wherever there are two participles, one the passive auxiliary, the other the form containing the verbal meaning. These two participles usually form a unit, so that the sentence adverb cannot stand between them before the stressed verbal form, but for the most part stands before the participial unit: ‘She seems to have always been admired.’ But even in the case of these participial units we must put the adverb between the participles before the stressed verbal form wherever the adverb indicates the manner or degree of the verbal activity: ‘She seems to have always been kindly received.’ ‘She seems to have always been greatly admired.’ As in these examples, there are often two adverbs, one in the usual position before the passive auxiliary, the other, an adverb of manner or degree, before the stressed verbal form. This form with the sentence adverb before the stressed part of the verb is widely used, even by many who do not split a simple infinitive. It does not seem to be generally felt as a split infinitive, though the adverb plainly stands between the auxiliary and the form of the verb containing the verbal meaning. The word-order, here as elsewhere, corresponds closely to that found in an independent sentence and in the that-clause: ‘She has always been kindly received.’ ‘It seems that she has always been kindly received.’ In the infinitive construction the unsplit infinitive, i.e., the form with the adverb before the to, is also used here: ‘The former I do not remember ever to have seen’ (Thomas B. Aldrich, My Cousin the Colonel, Ch. I). ‘She seems always to have been happy.’ This construction, however, is often ambiguous: ‘I remember plainly to have refused his offer.’ Here plainly may modify either remember or refused. If we mean the latter, the split infinitive conveys this meaning clearly: ‘I remember to have plainly refused his offer.’

Also when the infinitive is the copula to be and the real predicate in the infinitive clause is an adjective, noun, or prepositional phrase, we usually place the sentence adverb before the stressed predicate: ‘I intend to be always watchful’ (a watchful observer, or on the watch). Sometimes, however, the sentence adverb stands before the to, as in the unsplit infinitive construction: ‘The girl seemed always to be in half-mourning’ (Thomas B. Aldrich, The Stillwater Tragedy, Ch. IX).

There is one case where the sentence adverb always precedes the to, namely, when the infinitive clause follows the copula with
the force of a predicate adjective or noun: ‘It was hardly to be expected.’ ‘Life’s aim is simply to be always looking for temptations.’ As the infinitive clause in each of these sentences has the function of a predicate and thus is felt as a unit, the sentence adverb, which belongs to the sentence as a whole, cannot enter it. Of course, where the sentence adverb belongs only to the infinitive clause, as always in the second example, it rightfully stands within the clause.

3. Tenses and Voices of the Infinitive. Although the infinitive was originally a noun, it has in the course of time acquired the properties of tense and voice, thus approaching the nature of a verb. Like a finite verb, the infinitive has two voices — active and passive. There are no peculiar difficulties here except in the case of the passive form. The infinitive in passive function gradually developed passive form, but in a few categories retained its original active form in passive function. For fuller information see 7 D 2, 15 III 2 B, 46 (next to last par.).

Unlike the finite verb, the infinitive has only two tenses — present and perfect. As the use of these two tenses presents peculiar difficulties, they are treated in detail in a and b below.

Although the infinitive has no special forms to indicate mood, it can render fairly accurately some of the relations expressed by the subjunctive forms of the finite verb: ‘I wrote him to come at once’ (= ‘that he should come at once’). ‘I do not know what to do’ (= ‘what I should do’). ‘I should be happy if I knew how to accomplish (= I might accomplish) this.’

a. Use of the Tenses of the Infinitive after a Full Verb. The tenses of the infinitive here express time relatively to that of the principal verb. The present tense indicates time contemporaneous or future with reference to that of the principal verb: ‘I wish to do it.’ ‘He was very foolish to do it,’ not usually now as in older English ‘He was very foolish to have done it.’ ‘The Indian must have possessed no small share of vital energy to have rubbed (incorrectly instead of to rub) industriously stone on stone for long months till at length he had rubbed an ax’ (Thoreau, Journal, I, p. 40). ‘I intend to write a line or two to her soon.’ ‘I yesterday intended to write a line or two to her, but forgot to do so.’ ‘I managed to do it without his help’ (i.e., ‘I did it without his help’). ‘It was the fourth case of lockjaw to occur (i.e., that occurred) within a week.’ Of course, the present infinitive refers to the past after the annalistic present (37 1 d), for the annalistic present itself points to the past: ‘This is the fourth case of lockjaw to occur (i.e., that has occurred) within a week.’ The perfect tense of the infinitive indicates time prior to that of the principal verb: ‘I am
proud to have been able to help. It gives recreation a better relish to have first accomplished something’ (Harriet Connor Brown, Grandmother Brown’s Hundred Years, 279). ‘He found about a half dozen Seniors whom he did not remember to have noticed before.’ ‘I consider myself lucky to of (reduced colloquial form of have) found out about it before it was too late’ (Ring Lardner, Saturday Evening Post, July 11, 1914). Looking backward from the present to a past situation, having in mind one’s present state of feeling: ‘I should like to have given him something’ (Dickens, A Christmas Carol, II, 41), but (with reference to a past situation, but looking forward) ‘I should have liked to make her a little present’ (Thackeray, Vanity Fair, I, Ch. XII). The principle that the perfect tense of the infinitive should indicate time prior to that of the main verb is not always observed, as will be seen in the following paragraphs, but it is now much better observed than earlier in the present period. The steadily increasing observance of this principle shows clearly that its importance for English expression is gradually becoming more widely felt. In our language the infinitive has only two tenses, and unless their use be regulated by some such fixed principle our expression will become unclear.

In unreal conditions, the infinitive is often used as an abridged clause to form the condition or the conclusion, with the same use of the tenses described in the preceding paragraph: ‘I should be glad to go’ (= if I could go). ‘I should have been glad to go’ (= if I could have gone). ‘He would have been foolish to do it’ (= if he had done it). ‘What would I give not to have heard the calamities fallen on the heads of the King and Queen of France’ (Horace Walpole, Letter to Miss Mary Berry, June 28, 1791) (= if I had not heard, etc.). ‘Here was enough to have infected (now usually to infect = that it could have infected) the whole city, if it had not been taken in time’ (Ben Jonson, Every Man in His Humour, V, v, 28, A.D. 1616). ‘[it was] A glorious vision to the youth, who embraced it as a flower of beauty, and read not a feature. There were curious features of color in her face for him to have read’ (Meredith, The Ordeal of Richard Feverel, Ch. XV), instead of the better for him to read = which he could have read if he had observed. As can be seen by the examples, there has long been a tendency here after a past tense to employ a perfect infinitive instead of a present infinitive. This usage seems at present to be less common in good literature than formerly, and it is to be hoped that it will disappear altogether, for it violates the widely observed principle that the perfect infinitive indicates time prior to that of the main verb.
Where, however, the situation clearly shows that the reference is to the future, the perfect infinitive represents the action as completed at a point of time in the future: ‘He expects to have written the last chapter by tomorrow evening.’

Where it is desired to indicate that a past intention, hope, expectation has not been realized, we often instead of the regular past perfect subjunctives *I had meant, thought, intended*, etc., in connection with a present infinitive, as in ‘I had meant, thought, intended to write a line to you,’ employ, as in older English, the past subjunctives *meant, thought, intended* with a dependent perfect infinitive after the analogy of the past subjunctive *would*, which in older English was used in the sense of intention in connection with a dependent perfect infinitive to indicate that a past intention was not realized: ‘I meant, thought, intended to have written a line to you’ = older ‘I would have written a line to you,’ i.e., ‘I had intended to write a line to you.’ Such a sentence with *would* has developed out of a full unreal conditional sentence, as ‘I would have written a line to you if I had been able to find the time.’ We still use *would* in a full conditional clause, or where we feel the statement as containing an unreal condition, as in ‘In your place I would have acted otherwise.’ We do not now use *would* in an independent sentence where the idea of unreal condition has disappeared and there remains only the idea of unreality, as in ‘I would have written a line to you.’ But in older English, beginning in Middle English, this use of *would* is common: ‘For summe of hem wolden haue take hym, but no man sette hondis on hym’ (John, VII, 44, John Purvey’s ed., A.D. 1388). ‘He, following that faire advantage fast, His stroke redoubled with such might and maine, That him upon the ground he groveling cast; and leaping to him light would have unlast (unlaced) His helme to make unto his vengeance way’ (Spenser, The Faerie Queene, VI, i, xxxix). The context in both examples clearly shows that *would* with its dependent perfect infinitive expresses an unrealized past intention.

Even as early as the thirteenth century *would* began to be replaced here by *thought, meant*, or *weened* as clearer expressions for this idea. These past tense forms had become very common by the fourteenth century. That these verbal forms were felt as past tensesubjunctives with the force of *would* can be seen by the frequent use of the perfect infinitive after them without *to* as after *would*: ‘He thought (= would) have slaine her in his fierce despight (anger); But hastie heat tempring with suffrance wise, He stayde his hand’ (Spenser, The Faerie Queene, I, I, li). This old use of *meant, thought, intended*, etc., long remained quite
common, except that the dependent perfect infinitive later always took to: ‘Long as this letter is, I intended to have written a fuller and more digested one upon this important subject’ (George Washington, Letter to Benjamin Harrison, Oct. 10, 1784). ‘I intended to have written a line to you’ (Mrs. Gaskell, Life of Charlotte Brontë, 299). The old list of past tense forms has been increased by a few others of related meaning: ‘I hoped to have left them in perfect safety’ (Dickens, A Tale of Two Cities, III, Ch. IX). ‘I wanted to have seen you ever so much, but I did not like to trouble you’ (F. C. Philips, Mrs. Bouverie, 89).

The use of the perfect infinitive to express an unrealized purpose or plan is found not only in object clauses, as in the preceding examples, but also in adverbial clauses, especially in older English: ‘Sir Beaumayns felle vpon hym and vnlaced his helme to have slayne hym, and thenne he yelled hym and asked mercy’ (Malory, Le Morte d’Arthur, Book VII, Ch. XVII, A.D. 1485). ‘This traine he laid to have intrap’d thy life’ (Marlowe, The Jew of Malta, 2375, A.D. 1590). It is sometimes still found after am (is, are) going, where it was originally an adverbial clause of purpose: ‘Were you going to have walked?’ (Temple Thurston, The City of Beautiful Nonsense, Ch. XV).

As the idea of result is closely related to that of purpose, the perfect infinitive is employed to express an unrealized result, especially in older English: ‘He was readie to have striken his tapster for interrupting him, but for feare of displeasing mee he moderated his furie’ (Thomas Nashe, Works, II, p. 212, A.D. 1594). ‘I was ready to have gone with her, but this will do just as well’ (Jane Austen, Emma, Ch. XLIII). ‘Several times we were like to have been staved against Rocks’ (George Washington, Diary, Dec. 16, 1753), or, in older English, often the incorrect had instead of was or were: ‘One thing more remains, which I had like to have forgotten’ (id., Letter to Benjamin Harrison, Oct. 10, 1784). ‘The evening liked to have been a tedious evening’ (J. A. Benton, California Pilgrimage, 127, A.D. 1853). The perfect infinitive after liked, as in the last example, is still common in popular speech. In the literary language we say, ‘The evening came near to being tedious.’

In spite of the long and wide use of most of these forms the construction is bad and useless. Meant, thought, intended, hoped, etc., are not modal auxiliaries and should indicate past time, not by a dependent perfect infinitive, but by the regular past perfect subjunctive with a present infinitive, also an old construction hallowed by long and good usage: ‘I had not thought to see thy face, and, lo, God hath shewed me also your seed’ (Genesis,
XLVIII, 11). 'I had meant, thought, intended, hoped, wanted, wished to write a line to you.' With the verbs intend, mean, hope, think the past perfect subjunctive is quite common, but with the other verbs we may use also the longer subjunctive form with should in the first person and would in the second and third in connection with the perfect infinitive: 'I should have wished to go to France, but I must take what I can get' (Galsworthy, Saint's Progress, IV, I, 354). 'He would have longed to give his arm to the fair Blanche' (Thackeray, Pendennis, II, Ch. I).

On the other hand, as explained in b, p. 472, would and the other modal auxiliaries can only indicate past time by means of a dependent perfect infinitive, so that this construction is proper for them. In older English, this usage was improperly extended to meant, thought, intended, etc. Alongside of this incorrect usage is the correct one with a past perfect subjunctive and a dependent present infinitive, and this correct usage is widely followed by careful speakers and writers and should finally supplant the incorrect usage: 'I had meant to go to China, but,' etc. (Edith Wharton, The Glimpses of the Moon, Ch. XIII). Likewise in the case of like (= come near to), once widely used in the literary language, but now avoided: 'Ellen's tears had been like to burst forth again at his words; with great effort she controlled herself and obeyed him' (Susan Warner, The Wide, Wide World, Ch. XLVII).

The past subjunctives meant, thought, etc., described above, have long been erroneously felt as past indicatives, so that when this construction spread to the verb be when used in the sense of an unrealized intention, the form was to was employed: 'She was to have dined with us here the day after her father's death' (Gissing, A Life's Morning, Ch. XIV). The past indicative has become established here and will have to remain as it is, for we cannot here use the past perfect subjunctive had been, since it would mean something quite different.

In another respect the infinitive construction after full verbs is often influenced by that found after modal auxiliaries. After modal auxiliaries the perfect infinitive is necessary to convey the idea of time past. After the past perfect subjunctive of intend, mean, think, hope, want, desire, wish, like, long, or after their longer subjunctive form with should or would with the perfect infinitive, we sometimes, after the analogy of usage with modal auxiliaries, find the perfect infinitive instead of the present, which here is sufficient, as the preceding subjunctive clearly indicates time past: 'I had thought, sir, to have held (instead of the correct to hold) my peace until You had drawn oaths from him not to stay' (Shakespeare, The Winter's Tale, I, ii, 28). 'The rabble had lik'd
to have pulled him to pieces’ (Mrs. Behn, Novels, I, 282, A.D. 1689), now came very near to pulling him to pieces. ‘I had hoped to have procured (instead of the correct to procure) you some oysters from Britain’ (Lytton, Pompeii, I, Ch. III). ‘He would have liked to have hugged (instead of the correct to hug) his father’ (Hughes, Tom Brown’s School-Days, I, Ch. IV). In older English, the have of the perfect infinitive here was often suppressed to avoid the heaping up of auxiliary forms: ‘My men would have had me [have] given them leave to fall upon them at once’ (Defoe, Robinson Crusoe, A.D. 1719), now would have had me give them leave. Similarly, the perfect infinitive has often been used instead of a present infinitive in a full subordinate clause that depends upon a past perfect subjunctive: ‘I am glad to see you so well, Miss Cardinal . . . I had been afraid that it might have exhausted (instead of the correct exhaust) you’ (Hugh Walpole, The Captives, I, Ch. III). The incorrect perfect infinitive in all these cases, though still to be found in current English, is not so common as it once was. Of course, the perfect infinitive is in order when it is desired to indicate that the intention at the time was that a contemplated act should take place prior to another act that is mentioned in connection with it: ‘I had meant to have visited Paris and to have returned to London before my father arrived from America.’

b. Use of the Perfect Infinitive with Modal and Tense Auxiliaries. The present and past subjunctive forms of the modal auxiliaries are now so commonly used to give modal force, the present and the past subjunctive each imparting a distinctly different shade of feeling or thought rather than conveying different time relations, that we feel them now only as modal forms without distinction of time. Both the present and the past subjunctive here indicate present or future time when used in connection with a present infinitive. Reference to the past can be secured only by using a perfect infinitive instead of the present: ‘He may have gone.’ ‘He might have gone.’ As these auxiliaries were once concrete verbs and could indicate time relations like other verbs and in part can still do so, we must always note carefully whether we are using a concrete verbal or a mere modal form. As can be seen by the two examples just given and as explained more fully in 44 I, may and might are now usually felt as subjunctive modal forms and regularly require a perfect infinitive for reference to the past. Likewise the past subjunctives ought and must (43 I A, next to last par.; 44 I a): ‘He ought to have done it.’ ‘He must have done it.’

Similarly, the past subjunctive had and in negative statements
and in questions usually need and sometimes dare, which are now felt and used as past subjunctives: ‘He had better have taken a return ticket.’ ‘She need not have done it,’ but sometimes with the incorrect past indicative form described in a, p. 467: ‘She hardly needed to have asked the question’ (Mrs. Gaskell, Life of Charlotte Brontë, 209), instead of ‘She need hardly have asked the question.’ ‘Why need he have gone so soon?’ ‘You know you daren’t have given the order if you hadn’t seen us on the other side’ (George Bernard Shaw, The Man of Destiny), or more commonly ‘You wouldn’t have dared to give the order,’ etc. The indicative could, as in ‘He tried yesterday, but couldn’t do it’ can point to the past, but the subjunctive could can only indicate past time when its dependent infinitive is in the perfect tense: ‘He could have done it yesterday if he had tried.’

After the analogy of examples like the last, where a perfect infinitive follows a past subjunctive, we often hear in popular speech instead of a perfect participle a perfect infinitive after the past subjunctive had of the regular past perfect subjunctive, i.e., ‘if they had have said so’ instead of ‘if they had said so,’ or, stated in other words, a have (frequently in the contracted form of ’a’ or of) is often inserted after the had of the regular past perfect subjunctive: ‘If they had ’a’ said (instead of the correct had said) so, you’d ’a’ sat and listened to ’em!’ (De Morgan, Alice-for-Short, Ch. II, p. 16). Here had is a past subjunctive and hence has modal force; but, since the form is the same as the indicative, the common people, unworried by historical considerations and actuated by the desire to impart the modal force which is present in their feeling, insert here have, which so often follows a past subjunctive, as in ‘you’d ’a’ sat’ (= ‘you would have sat’) in this same sentence. The literary language permits this usage only after modal auxiliaries; popular speech extends it also to tense auxiliaries. This incorrect usage makes the thought clear, so that even educated people sometimes use it unconsciously, but there is at present no tendency in the literary language to use it consciously, hence it is never found in careful speech. Compare 44 II 5 C (4th par.), 43 II B a (4th par.), and 44 I a (last par.). This a should not be confounded with the a which is the reduced form of the old prefix of the perfect participle corresponding to German ge-, once found in literary English, now surviving only in certain South English dialects: ‘I’ve a zin (better written a-zin = seen) a young chap make a vool ov hiself avore’ (Maxwell Gray, Ribstone Pippins, 8).

In older English, the have of the dependent perfect infinitive was sometimes suppressed: ‘I would have sworn the puling girl Would willingly [have] accepted Hammon’s love’ (Dekker, Shoemaker’s
Holiday, III, 2). This suppression of have has become a characteristic feature of our popular speech: 'If Smoky could only [have] knowed, there'd [have] been a lot of suffering which he wouldn't [have] had to've went through' (Will James, Smoky the Cowhorse, Ch. IV).

With auxiliaries that point to the future the perfect infinitive represents the action as completed at a point of time in the future: 'I shall have completed it before you return.' 'He will have completed it before you return.' 'If things go right, they should have completed the work by tomorrow evening.'

4. Functions of the Infinitive. In order that the student may get a clear view of the entire field of the present usefulness of the simple infinitive and the form with to or for . . . to, an outline of their different functions is given below along with references which refer to sections where these functions are discussed. From a close study of these references it will become evident that the infinitive is an amazing tangle of the old and the new, now with its modern function or form, now with the function or form of an earlier period. As the infinitive often competes with the gerund, it ought to be studied in connection with the gerund, as presented in 50 4.

The infinitive is now used as:

A. Subject, usually with to or for . . . to: 'To err is human.' 'It is better for you to go.' Sometimes with its simple form: '[it is] Better bend than break.' See 4 I d, 21 e (9th par.).

B. Predicate, usually with to:
   (1) Normal Form:
   a. After a copula: 'To do good is to be happy.' See 7 D 1 a.
   b. After passive verbs: 'He was made to shut the door.' See 7 D 1 b.

   (2) Modal Form:
   After the copula with the modal force described in 7 D 2: 'This story is not to be repeated.' 'He is soon to be married.'
   In the abridged attributive relative clause there is of course no copula before the predicate infinitive: 'Here is the man who is to be sent,' but 'Here is the man to be sent.' 'I have much to do' (= that I am to do). Compare 23 II 11 and 7 D 2.
   (3) After a copula to express purpose. See 7 D 3.
   (4) In the nominative absolute construction. See 17 3 A d (3rd par.) and B (2nd par.).

C. Object:
   (1) With its simple form:
   a. After: do; the modal auxiliaries may, can, shall, etc.; the future tense auxiliaries will and shall; often also dare and
need; in older English, sometimes ought and note. Explanations and examples are given below.

Dare is not only treated as a common verb with the to-infinitive after it, but often also, when not standing in the form of a present participle or in a compound tense, is used, like a modal auxiliary, with a simple infinitive after it, especially in the negative and interrogative forms of statement and in the now rare old past tense form durst and the new past subjunctive form dare, which after the analogy of must (old past subjunctive) is now often employed where the context makes the thought clear.

Similarly, need is frequently still, as in older English, treated as a common verb with a to-infinitive after it; indeed regularly so in positive indicative form; usually also in negative statements and questions in its newer periphrastic form with do; or, on the other hand, when not standing in the form of the present participle, or in a compound tense, or in the form with do, it may be used as a modal auxiliary with the simple infinitive after it when negatived, qualified, used in a question, and when after the analogy of must it takes the past subjunctive form need, which is now often employed where the context makes the thought clear.

Examples: 'Why don't you work hard?' — 'I do work hard.' 'I will do it,' i.e., 'I will the doing of it.' 'I must do it.' 'He shall do it.' 'I shall do it.' 'He will do it.' 'He lay flat on his face, not daring to look (not simple look) up.' 'He has never dared to say (not simple say) it.' 'Who dare set (or dares to set) a limit to woman's tenderness?' 'Didn't he dare do it?' or 'Didn't he dare to do it?' 'He dare not (or does not dare to) tell the truth.' 'He felt that he didn't dare venture (or didn't dare to venture, or dared not venture, or dared not to venture, or dare — past subjunctive — not venture) upon the subject.' 'You know you daren't (past subjunctive) have given (more commonly would not have dared to give) the order to charge the bridge if you hadn't seen us on the other side' (George Bernard Shaw, The Man of Destiny). 'Her spirit failed her a little. She daren't (past subjunctive; or dared not, or didn't dare to) climb after him in the dark.' (Mrs. H. Ward, David Grieve). 'He durst (usually dared) not deny it.' 'If I durst (usually dared, or dared to) speak, I should have something interesting to say.' 'Not needing to hurry (not hurry), I walked along leisurely.' 'He has never needed to hurry (not hurry) more than now.' 'He needs to hurry,' but 'He need not hurry,' or 'He doesn't need to hurry.' 'He didn't need to hurry.' 'Need he hurry?' or 'Does he need to hurry?' 'What more needs to be (now more commonly need be) said?' (Draper, History of the Intellectual Development of Europe). 'He only need inquire (or needs to inquire) of the
porter.' 'That is all that need be (or needs to be) said.' 'The waiter was told that he need (past subjunctive) not stay' (or did not need to stay). 'He had a good hour on his hands before he need (past subjunctive) go back' (A. Marshall, Anthony Dare, Ch. XI). 'He hesitated for a moment. Need (past subjunctive) he go?' (or Did he need to go?) 'Had he done his duty in that respect, Lydia need (past subjunctive) not have been indebted to her uncle' (Austen, Pride and Prejudice, 274). The formal proof that dare and need are felt as past subjunctives is that they can stand after a past indicative: 'He felt he dare (like the past subjunctive must) not reply.' 'I told him that he need (like must) not wait longer.' Compare 44 I a.

Ought, by reason of the similarity of its meaning to that of should, was, in older English, sometimes drawn into this group of verbs which take after them a simple infinitive: 'Y ouȝt løyve my neiʒbɔr' (Pecock, Folewer, p. 91, about A.D. 1453). Ought is the past subjunctive of owe, as explained in 43 I A (next to last par.). The original meaning of owe is have, possess; later, the idea of having went over into that of having to do as a duty, i.e., ought. Under the influence of the verb have, which is related to it in meaning, there was in the oldest examples of owe or ought with the infinitive a to before the infinitive, and later, after a long competition with the simple infinitive, this usage became established: 'I ought to love my neighbor.' Ought now usually takes to after it even when combined with modal auxiliaries: 'We should be sorry to see English critics suggesting that they ought to or could have acted otherwise' (Fowler, Modern English Usage) or 'could or ought to have acted otherwise' (ib.).

In early Modern English, note (= ne wot; see Accidence, 57 4 A e) was often drawn into this group by reason of its meaning. Wot meant know, but in connection with an infinitive the meaning know how to often went over into be able to, can. This development, however, took place only where the form was negative and the context clearly referred to past time. Here note, though a present tense form, had the force of couldn't, pointing to the past: 'Ere long so weake of limbe and sicke of love He woxe that lenger he note stand upright' (Spenser, The Faerie Queene, IV, xii, xx, A.D. 1596) = 'Ere long he became so weak of limb and sick of love that he couldn't stand upright any longer.' Similarly, in our own time ought (44 I a), must (44 I a), dare, need, though elsewhere felt as present tense forms, often point to the past when the context clearly refers to past time. The explanation is, that these verbal forms are felt as past subjunctives. Compare second paragraph above this, also 44 I a (2nd par.).
In older English, the dependent infinitive after do was sometimes attracted to the form of the past tense after a past tense: 'He dyd made to rayne fourty dayes' (Caxton, A.D. 1483, Oxford Dictionary under Do, 25 d). This is still common in popular Southern American English: 'I done tole you 'bout ole Mr. Benjermin Ram' (Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, p. 297). A similar attraction took place in older English after a past participle. See E (3rd par.). Compare 6 A d, p. 23.

b. The simple infinitive is used also after had as good, had better, had best, had (or would) rather, etc.: 'A man had as good go to court without a cravat as [he had] appear in print without a preface.' 'I had better go.' 'Had we not best go and ask?' 'I had rather wait a day.' In older English, the to-infinitive was sometimes used here: 'He knew not whether he had best to run or to stand his ground' (Richardson, Clarissa, III, 209), now always run or stand his ground. In older English, an impersonal construction was much used here: 'Me (dative) were as lief, liever, better, etc., to go,' now 'It were as good, better (etc., but no longer as lief, liever) for me to go.' The impersonal construction came in contact with the personal construction, 'I had as lief,' 'I had liever' (no longer in use), 'I had as good, better,' etc., and began to blend with it: 'I were better to be married' (Shakespeare, As You Like It, III, iii, 91), now 'I had better be married.' 'I were (now had) as good haue a quartane feauer follow me now, for I shal ne'r bee rid of him' (Ben Jonson, Every Man out of His Humour, II, iii, A.D. 1600). Much less frequently did the personal construction blend with the impersonal: 'Nat longe tyme after that this Grisild Was wedded, she a doughter hath ybore, Al had Mr lever have born a knave child' (Chaucer, The Clerkes Tale, 386), now 'although she had rather have born a male child.' The blended constructions have disappeared. Compare 43 I B (4th par.) and 44 I (10th par.).

After had the have of the perfect infinitive is sometimes suppressed: 'The country finds itself faced with arrears of legislation which for its peace and comfort had far better [have] been spread over the previous years.' The have should not be dropped here, for it obscures the construction. The had been might be taken for a past perfect tense. The suppression of have was once more common than now. Compare 3 b (next to last par.), p. 473.

c. With its simple form after a few other verbs, but here only as an objective predicate: 'I heard him say it.' See 15 III 2 B.

d. After the one preposition to, as explained in 1, p. 456: 'Hunger drove him to steal food' = to the stealing of food. 'She persuaded, induced, got him to do it.' 'I hired him to do it.' Historically the
infinitive here is a verbal noun, object of the preposition to. To
and the infinitive together form a prepositional object, i.e., an
indispensable complement of the verb. Although the infinitive
here is still a verbal noun, object of the preposition to, it has also
the force of a verb, for it takes an object in the accusative case.
Compare 24 IV a.

This prepositional object construction is common also after
adjectives and participles: 'He is ready to go, eager to go, eager
for you to go.' 'The question is difficult to answer.' 'The room is
difficult to heat.' 'He is hard to approach, to understand, to cook
for, to get along with.' 'He is easy to understand, to get along with.'
'He is sure to come.' 'You would be sure to dislike him.' 'He is
unfit to work, slow to sympathize with others.' 'It was sad to
listen to.' 'It is a calamity hard to bear' (or to be borne). 'I am
ready to be shaved.' 'He is worthy to be thus honored.' 'He is
inclined to take offense easily.'

After verbs and participles the gerund competes here with the
infinitive. See 50 4 c dd (2nd par.).

(2) After other verbs usually with to: 'I wish to go.' Often
in connection with an objective predicate: 'I find it difficult to
do that,' i.e., 'I find the doing of that difficult.' 'I felt it useless
to say anything further.' Here anticipatory it points to the fol­
lowing infinitive.

The infinitive as object has a wide field of usefulness in abridged
clauses: 'He begged to go, begged me (accusative) to go.' 'I
told him (dative) to do it.' 'I planned for him to go.' For a full
description of these objective clauses and their development see
24 III d.

The older simple form of the infinitive, still preserved in
(1) a, b, c, was also in part still preserved here in early Modern
English in archaic, poetic language, where after a few verbs, es­
specially begin, older usage lingered on for a while longer: 'Then
gan she wail and weepe' (Spenser, The Faerie Queene, Book I,
II, vii), now 'Then she began to wail and weep.' Sometimes still:
'The sunshine went out of his soul with a thrill, The flesh 'neath
his armor 'gan shrink and crawl' (J. R. Lowell, The Vision of Sir
Launfal, I, V). Other survivals of older usage here are given
in 24 III d.

D. As an Adjective Element Modifying a Noun. See 10 I 2
(next to last par.); 10 V 1, 2, 3; 23 I a; 23 II 11; 50 4 d (3rd par.).
The prepositional form is always used here.

E. The Infinitive in Elliptical Constructions. The simple in­
finitive is much used in elliptical constructions: 'I [should] ask
his pardon!' 'Why [should we] not go at once?' In older English,
the infinitive with to was much used in such exclamations, and
this old usage lingers on: 'I to marry before my brother, and
leave him with none to take care of him!' (Blackmore, Lorna Doone,
Ch. XXX). This construction, however, is not elliptical, but the
old loose infinitive form of expression, once common and often
described elsewhere in this book, which could replace almost any
finite form of the verb. Compare 6, p. 481.

The infinitive is much used in another elliptical exclamatory
construction, an unreal conditional sentence with the principal
proposition suppressed. Here the subordinate conditional clause
has the form of an abridged to-infinitive clause (3 a, 2nd par.,
p. 468) with the subject unexpressed, as the natural inference is
that the speaker is subject: 'Oh to be in England now that
April's there!' (Browning, Home-Thoughts from Abroad, I) =
'Oh how happy I should be, were I in England now that April's
there!'

Especially common are the elliptical constructions after the
conjunctions but (= except), except, save, than. If the construc-
tion in the subordinate clause follows closely that in the principal
proposition, the verbs do, had (past subjunctive), will, would,
can, could in the subordinate clause are suppressed before their
dependent simple infinitives if they have already been expressed
in the principal proposition: 'She does nothing but [that she does]
laugh.' 'I'll do anything to show my gratitude but (or except)
[that I do] marry the daughter.' 'All day he has done nothing but
work' (in older English, often worked, which was attracted to the
form of the participle under the influence of done). 'Since her
interview with him she has done little else than [that she does]
think about him.' 'You can't do better than [that you do] go.' 'I
had rather err with Plato than [that I had] be right with Horace.'
'I would rather (or sooner) die than [that I would] yield.' These
constructions arose in older English, and for some of them we no
longer have a live feeling, so that today we do not use some of the
fuller forms given in brackets. The construction with do arose
at a time when the do-form of the verb was not differentiated in
meaning or function from the simple form, as described in 6 A d.

In but-constructions anything is sometimes omitted, often also
anything and do: 'It cannot be [anything] but a dishonor and dero-
gation to the author' (Milton, Areopagitica, 56). 'Under such
circumstances he could not [do anything] but fail.' 'I cannot
[do anything] but admire his courage.' 'I cannot [do anything]
but be gratified by the assurance' (Thomas Jefferson, Writings,
IV, 180). The infinitive that follows but here is always without
to, for it is dependent upon a do understood, as explained in the
preceding paragraph. In this construction there is always the idea present that something cannot be prevented. Instead of a suppressed do after cannot or could not we may employ an expressed verb, namely, choose: ‘I could not choose but speak the truth’ (Mrs. Gaskell, A Dark Night’s Work, Ch. VI). There ought to be a to here before the infinitive that follows but, for the words form an abridged clause, which regularly requires a to before the infinitive. In older English, we sometimes find a to here, as illustrated in 24 III d (next to last par.). But this clause has the same meaning as the elliptical do-construction and has been influenced by it, so that to has dropped out. The verb choose is not now so common here as earlier in the period. It is now usually replaced by help: ‘We could not help but love each other’ (Hall Caine, The Christian, IV, Ch. XV). ‘The cause of peace could not help but be advanced today’ (Westminster Gazette, No. 9370). ‘Their one aim is to push the British empire into a corner where it cannot help but fight a foredoomed battle’ (F. Britten Austin in The Saturday Evening Post, June 7, 1930, p. 165). These are British examples. The construction is quite common also in American English, especially in the language of every day: ‘You can’t help but notice the pride that owners everywhere express for Essex’ (advertisement of an auto in Saturday Evening Post, July 12, 1930). Examples from our literature have already been given in 24 III d (next to last par.). Several American grammarians have censured this construction without giving any grounds whatever. It has long been employed by good writers, and is still supported by good usage. There is, however, another construction — the gerund without but — which is now competing with it and is gradually becoming the more common form: ‘I cannot help feeling gratified by the assurance.’ ‘We could not help loving each other.’

Since we do not have a vivid feeling for the constructions containing rather, illustrated on page 477, we have come to feel that the simple infinitive is to be used with rather, so that we now sometimes find the simple infinitive with rather even though no word has been previously used which could be supplied in thought before it: ‘Rather than disturb him she went for a light-box and his cigar-case to his bedroom’ (Thackeray, Pendennis, I, Ch. XVIII). Similarly, after ‘there is nothing to do but’ and ‘we have nothing to do but’ we often employ the simple infinitive, as it so often elsewhere follows do but: ‘There is nothing to do (or we have nothing to do) but enjoy ourselves.’ But we often use also the to-infinitive here, as we feel the construction as an abridged infinitive clause, as in the second paragraph on page 481: ‘I am sure we in England
had nothing to do but to fight the battle out' (Thackeray, The Virginians, Ch. LXXXIV).

We often suppress the governing noun before its dependent to-infinitive if the noun has already been used in the principal proposition: 'I have no choice but [the choice] to accept the fact.' ‘He hath never spoken a word save [the word] to ask for his food' (Scott, Kenilworth, Ch. I).

Except in the case just mentioned the to-infinitive constructions after these conjunctions, i.e., but, except, save, than, are not elliptical but abridged infinitive clauses of condition or exception (31 2) or abridged comparative clauses (29 1 B b), where the subject of the infinitive, as elsewhere, is usually not expressed but implied in some word in the principal proposition: ‘What was left to them but to drink and get merry?’ ‘You ought to know better than to believe all the gossip you hear.’ If the infinitive has a subject of its own the subject is introduced by for: ‘There was nothing now but for him and the footman to get into the carriage.’

F. As an Adverbial Element, originally modifying the verb, now along with its expressed or unexpressed subject and its expressed modifiers forming an adverbial clause. This important construction is discussed in detail in 24 IV a; 27 5; 28 2 b; 28 5 d; 29 1 A a bb; 29 1 A d aa; 29 1 B b; 29 2 a; 30 b; 31 2; 32 2; 33 2. The prepositional form is always used here except in a few set expressions in clauses of purpose and result. See 11 2; 28 5 d (4th par.); 29 2 a (2nd par.); 33 2 (7th par.).

5. Repetition of ‘To’ with the Infinitive. When there are several infinitives with the same or similar construction, it is common usage to employ to with the first infinitive and understand it with the next one or the following ones: ‘I wished to finish my business and [to] get away’ (Meredith Nicholson, The House of a Thousand Candles, Ch. I). ‘I hoped to draw him into the open and [to] settle with him’ (ib., Ch. XI). ‘I thought it better to take the anthem myself than [to] give it to a junior, who would be sure to make a mull of it’ (Mrs. Wood, The Channings, Ch. I, 4). However, whenever the second or later infinitive becomes important by reason of a contrast or a wish to emphasize it in any way, it becomes at once more natural to repeat the to: ‘It was better to laugh than to cry.’ ‘To be or not to be, that is the question.’ In involved constructions it is always desirable to repeat to to make the grammatical relations and the thought clear.

6. Infinitive Used to Carry On a Construction. In older English, it was not uncommon to put a to before an infinitive although a preceding infinitive having the same construction was without to: ‘And bids you, in the bowels of the Lord, Deliver up the crown,
and to take mercy on the poor souls' (Shakespeare, Henry the Fifth, II, iv, 102). 'She tells me here she'll wed the stranger knight, or never more to view nor day nor night' (id., Pericles, II, v, 17). The to-infinitive is much used in older English, as in the last two examples, to carry on a construction once begun and thus avoid the repetition of verbal forms used in the construction. The second and third propositions may even have a different subject, in which case the subject of the infinitives carrying on the construction is in the nominative: 'Heaven would that she these gifts should have, And I to live and die her slave' (id., As You Like It, III, ii, 161). In the following example the to-infinitive clause with an absolute nominative subject carries on the preceding concessive clause construction introduced by though: 'I could then have look'd on him without the help of admiration, though the catalogue of his endowments had been tabled by his side and I to peruse him by items' (id., Cymbeline, I, v, 4) = I could study him by items.

The infinitive construction was sometimes used in the first dependent clause, even after the conjunction that, which always calls for a finite verb: 'Iff all my saide children deceze, I will that the saide goodes to them bequethed to be bestowed in charitable deades' (Lincoln Diocese Documents, p. 138, July 22, 1529).
CHAPTER XXIV

THE GERUND

50 1. Origin and Development. The gerund was originally a verbal noun in -ing (until about 1250 also with the form -ung). Thus it differed from the present participle in meaning, which was originally an adjective and until about the fourteenth century had a different ending, namely, ende (or inde, ynde, ande), so that the two suffixes were farther apart in form and meaning than they are today. They have both in course of time acquired more verbal force, but the gerund is still a noun and the present participle is still an adjective. In Old English, the gerund was a feminine noun with the inflection of a strong feminine, as described in Accidence, 56 3 c. The gerund is still often a simple noun without any of the characteristics of a verb except its verbal meaning. The noun gerund always preserves its original transitive form even where it has strong passive force, and is usually formally distinguished by a preceding adjective, descriptive or limiting, and often also by a following of-genitive object: 'He has not committed any act worthy of transportation or hanging' (active form with passive force). 'Horsewhipping (passive force) would be too good for such a scoundrel.' His forearms and clean-shaven face were brown from prolonged tanning (passive force) by the sun.' 'The candle is in need of snuffing' (passive force). 'The singing was good.' 'The shooting of birds (genitive object) is forbidden.' A verbal gerund now rarely has an adjective before it and takes after it an accusative, dative, or prepositional object and adverbial modifiers of all kinds: 'Shooting birds (accusative object) is useless.' 'It is fun shooting at a mark' (prepositional object). 'It is dangerous playing recklessly with fire' (two adverbial modifiers).

As we have seen above, the gerund was once felt only as a noun and, like a verbal noun, took a genitive object, and still takes a genitive object when it is felt only as a noun. Where, however, the verbal force is strong, it now takes regularly an accusative
object, as in the first of the last three examples just given. The accusative occurred only rarely in Old English, but became more common in Middle English. This development was facilitated by the example of the present participle, which had the same form and took an accusative object. It was facilitated also by the example of the closely related infinitive, which, though originally a noun, had acquired so much verbal force that it took an accusative object, like a verb. The natural influence of the infinitive upon the gerund was greatly increased in older English by the confounding of their forms. The older infinitive in -n (49 1) and the gerund in -ing often had in the spoken language the same form. However, in older English literature, the original genitive object in its modern form with of lingered long after the gerund, even where the verbal force was strong, and in popular speech it still lingers: ‘employed onely in casting up of earth and digging of trenches’ (Thomas Dekker, The Wonderfull Yeare, p. 32, A.D. 1603), now ‘employed in casting up earth and digging trenches.’ ‘Whom I left [in, i.e., engaged in] cooling of the air with sighs’ (Shakespeare, The Tempest, I, II, 222), now ‘Whom I left cooling the air with sighs.’ ‘He was by nature unfortunate and was always a-missing (i.e., in missing) of everything’ (De Morgan, Joseph Vance, Ch. I), now in literary English ‘was always missing everything.’ As can be seen by the present form appended to the last two examples, the gerund has here often been replaced by the present participle. Compare 4 c dd, p. 494. On the other hand, where the gerund has an article or other limiting adjective modifier before it and thus has the characteristic mark of a noun, there is today a strong feeling that a direct object should be in the genitive, just as nouns in general take only a genitive object: ‘the trusting of a secret to a woman.’ Earlier English, however, did not differentiate so carefully between these two classes of gerunds, and this older usage which admitted of an accusative after a gerund modified by an article or other limiting adjective still occasionally occurs: ‘the trusting a secret to a woman’ (Meredith, Diana of the Crossways, Ch. XXXV).

2. Voice and Tense. As the gerund in the sixteenth century was felt as having strong verbal force, it began to appear with forms for voice and tense, which have become established: ‘So my heart, although dented at with the arrowes of thy burning affections, shall always keepe his (now its) hardnesse and be so farre from being mollyfied that thou shalt not perceiue it moued’ (John Lyly, Euphues and His England, Works, II, p. 139, A.D. 1580). ‘In having known no travel in his youth’ (Shakespeare, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, I, III, 16, A.D. 1591–1595).

Passive force today usually requires passive form and an ap-
propriate tense, although in older English we find here active form and we may even still use a present tense for past time, as originally: 'A Shootyng Gloue is chieflye for to saue a mannnes fyngers from hurtynge' (Roger Ascham, *Toxophilus*, Book II, p. 4, A.D. 1545), now from being hurt. 'Shall we send that foolish carrion, Mistress Quickly, to him, and excuse his throwing (now being thrown, or having been thrown) into the water?' (Shakespeare, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, III, iii, 205). By comparing these older gerunds with the accompanying newer ones and the newer ones in the following sentences we may see how much our language has gained by the introduction of passive form for the expression of passive force: 'The fact of being backed by my friends is a great comfort' = 'The fact that I am backed by my friends is a great comfort.' 'The fact of his being (or having been) convicted so promptly is gratifying' = 'The fact that he was convicted so promptly is gratifying.' 'I have read of its being (or having been) done before' = 'I have read that it has been done before.' 'After having been so thoroughly punished he became more tractable' = 'After he had been so thoroughly punished, he became more tractable.' 'There is no hope of his being convicted' = 'There is no hope that he will (or may) be convicted.'

The active forms now usually indicate tense, although the older use of the present tense for past time occasionally occurs: 'His having such poor health is against him' = 'The fact that he has such poor health is against him.' 'There is a possibility of his having arrived this morning' = 'There is a possibility that he arrived this morning.' 'I have heard of his being (or having done) it before' = 'I have heard that he has done it before.' 'After having finished my task I went to bed' = 'After I had finished my task, I went to bed.' 'There is no hope of his coming soon' = 'There is no hope that he will (or may) come soon.' 'There is hope of his finishing it by evening' = 'There is hope that he will have finished it by evening.'

Thus the gerund, though having only two tenses, can express all the time relations expressed by the more complicated finite verb. Though it has no special forms to indicate mood, it can render fairly accurately some of the relations expressed by the subjunctive forms of the finite verb. Its great simplicity in connection with a fair degree of accuracy has made it one of the favorite means of English expression. It is the very embodiment of English practicality.

3. Subject of the Gerund. Like a verb, a gerund may have a subject, but, like other verbal nouns, its subject is in the genitive, here, however, only the old subjective genitive in -s, or instead of
the genitive the person implied in a possessive adjective, my, his, etc., which were originally genitives of the personal pronouns and are still often used as such, as illustrated in 10 II 2 D (last par.): 'I am provoked at John's talking so rudely' (or 'at his talking so rudely'). In older English, the his-genitive (10 II 1) was sometimes used instead of the s-genitive: 'The governor and assistants met at Boston to consider of the deputy his deserting his place' (Winthrop, Journal, May 1, 1632). The development of the gerundial construction is hampered at the present time by the lack of s-genitive forms in current English and by the lack of a clear form for the possessive referring to a female. Her is either a personal pronoun or a possessive adjective. Many common substantive limiting adjectives, as this, these, those, any, several, all, two, three, etc., have no s-genitive. Here, of course, as the genitive is impossible, we have to use the accusative: 'Was it thou who didst tell the boy this foolishness of these being our arms?' (S. Weir Mitchell, Hugh Wynne, Ch. VII). 'Some families may possibly have moved away on account of the repeated failure of crops, but I do not know of any having done so.' There are also nouns that have no genitive form. Here we must have recourse to the accusative: 'I am not surprised at young or old falling in love with her' (Thackeray, Pendennis, I, 151). 'There is no hope of good coming from it.' 'There is no expectation of the French withdrawing their demands.' A clause used as a subject always has accusative form, for it is not possible for a clause to indicate the genitive relation by taking an 's: 'There is, however, a middle class prejudice against the possibility of what is ornamental being useful' (Cornhill Magazine, Sept., 1912).

Moreover, many avoid, in the case of common nouns, the genitive singular as subject, for in most words the singular and the plural here both end in -s, and thus sound alike to the ear, so that, unless the connection makes the thought clear, the singular is not heard as a singular: 'I don't approve of my son's (often replaced by the accusative son to make it clear that a singular form is intended) doing that.' In the plural, the accusative is usually employed to bring out clearly the plural idea: 'I don't approve of cousins marrying' (Sir Harry Johnston, The Man Who Did the Right Thing, Ch. III). 'A stout fox had been turned out of Hartover copse within a few minutes of the hounds being put in it' (A. Marshall, The Eldest Son, Ch. XXVIII). Even where there is a clear plural form we avoid the genitive subject and usually employ the accusative: 'She would have despised the modern idea of women being equal to men' (Mrs. Gaskell, Cranford, Ch. II, p. 15). The genitive subject here is rather uncommon:
'It does not at first appear easy to prove that men ought to like one thing rather than another, and although this is granted generally by men's speaking of "bad" or "good" taste, yet,' etc. (Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, Part III, Sec. I, Ch. III). In the case of nouns denoting lifeless things or abstract ideas, many avoid the genitive as subject also in the singular, even where the connection makes the thought clear, for in general they use the s-genitive very little of lifeless things and abstract ideas. They employ the accusative here as subject: 'When a man goes back to look at the house of his childhood, it has always shrunk: there is no instance of such a house being as big as the picture in memory and imagination call for' (Mark Twain, *Letter to W. D. Howells*, Aug. 22, 1887). ‘It was a sweet consolation to the short time that I have left to fall into such a society; no wonder then that I am unhappy at that consolation being withdrawn’ (Horace Walpole, *Letter to Miss Mary Berry*, Oct. 10, 1790). In circles strongly disposed to use the genitive as subject of the gerund, however, we not infrequently find it even in the case of nouns denoting lifeless things — provided, of course, that the connection makes the thought clear, and the genitive is possible: ‘On the permission's being granted she left the room.’

Even though the connection should make the thought clear and there is a disposition to use the genitive as subject with the names of lifeless things as well as with the names of living beings, the genitive is not a good, ever ready instrument of thought, for it cannot be used at all when it is modified by a noun, phrase, or clause, in which case we must have recourse to the ever ready accusative: ‘On the permission to go being repeated she left the room’ (George Gissing, *The Unclassed*, p. 6). ‘There is danger of a woman's head being turned’ (Meredith, *Diana of the Crossways*, Ch. VI). ‘Have you heard of Smith the carpenter being injured?’ ‘Have you heard of Smith, who used to be pitcher, being injured?’ ‘Did you ever hear of a man of good sense refusing such an offer?’ ‘In spite of Clyde Fitch's play "Glad of It" having been a failure, Howells had given a fair appreciative criticism of it in *Harper's Weekly*’ (Mildred Howells, *William Dean Howells*, p. 182). ‘I remember each one's (or each one) saying it,’ but only ‘I remember each one of them saying it.’ ‘Harder than to give up was to be given up, or to be the cause of some one you love giving up for you’ (Galsworthy, *To Let*, Part II, Ch. IX). ‘I hate the thought of any son of mine marrying badly’ (Hardy, *The Return of the Native*, p. 251). In this large category the genitive subject has entirely disappeared. Our feeling today is against the employment of a modified genitive as subject of the gerund. There are no exceptions
when the modifier is a noun, phrase, or clause. Our present feeling is also against employing the genitive as subject when followed by an adjective. The only exception is the occasional use of the old genitive of personal pronouns followed by *all*: ‘Isn’t it dreadful to think of *their all* (or *them all*) being wrong!’ (Sir Harry Johnston, *The Man Who Did the Right Thing*, Ch. II).

‘I suffer at the idea of *its all* (or *it all*) being rendered useless perhaps by one fault’ (Clyde Fitch, *Letter*, Sept. 20, 1905).

In a number of cases the subject of the gerund cannot for a double reason be in the genitive — it has no s-genitive form and it is modified by a noun or phrase: ‘In this morning’s letter I have told you that, in the uncertainty of *any* of my letters reaching you, I must, until I know they do, use many repetitions’ (Horace Walpole, *Letter to Miss Mary Berry*, Dec. 17, 1790).

Furthermore, we always use the accusative — never a genitive — subject when the subject follows the gerund: ‘He would always ignore the fact of there being a *back-door* to any house’ (Mrs. Gaskell, *Cranford*, Ch. VIII).

We regularly use the accusative as subject when the subject is emphatic: ‘She was proud of *him doing it*.’ The emphasis often comes from contrasting the subjects: ‘We seem to think nothing of *a boy smoking*, but resent *a girl smoking*.’ Contrasting subjects is frequently associated with elliptical form. See next paragraph.

When the gerund is understood in the second of two clauses having a gerund in common, the subject of the gerund is always an accusative, never a genitive: ‘I don’t like the idea of *method being everything* and *individuality [being] nothing*.’ We employ the elliptical construction when we desire to contrast the two subjects. Compare the second paragraph below this, also 28 3 a (5th par.).

Some writers often employ the accusative even where it is not absolutely necessary to make the thought clear, as in the case of names and titles where the genitive could not be construed as a plural: ‘At *Elizabeth Jane* mentioning how greatly Lucetta had been jeopardized, he exhibited an agitation different in kind no less than in intensity from any she had seen in him before’ (Hardy, *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, Ch. XXIX). ‘He gives an account of the stormy scenes in the House of Commons, the Parliament insisting upon the *King* withdrawing or altering his Declaration of Indulgence before any money could be voted for carrying on the war’ (Lady Newton, *Lyme Letters*, Ch. V, A.D. 1925).

In one category the accusative has not become so well established as in the others, namely, in personal pronouns. As these pronouns all have a genitive and all the genitives except *your* distinguish
singular and plural, there has never been a strong need of the accusative in this group. In older English, it occasionally occurs in good authors: 'Take no displaysure at me so presuming' (Caxton, fifteenth century). 'I would haue no mans honestye empayred by me tellynge' (Latimer, Seven Sermons, p. 160, A.D. 1549). We must still use the accusative when we desire to describe rather than merely to state a fact, i.e., when we desire to represent something as proceeding or as being repeated. But then the form in -ing is a present participle, not a gerund: 'I caught a glimpse of you (never your) looking on,' and similarly in 'Do not send any more of my books home. I have a good deal of pleasure in the thought of you looking on them' (Keats). 'I couldn’t think of him greeting (expressing repetition) people kindly as he passes them on the street.' In non-descriptive language the accusative is often employed in colloquial speech also as the subject of the gerund: 'We were talking only the other day of you going with us' (Victor Appleton, Tom Swift and His Submarine, Ch. VII). In choice language we employ here the possessive adjectives my, your, etc., which are historically genitives of the pronouns. But we must have recourse to the accusative of the pronoun where the expression is elliptical: 'There is danger of you being dismissed as well as me [being dismissed].’ We employ the elliptical construction when we desire to contrast the two subjects. Compare the fourth paragraph, p. 488.

In Old English, the subject of the gerund was always in the genitive: 'He saet to þam casere and hi swyðe blyðe weron for marlimes gereordunge' (Ælfric, Lives of Saints, II, p. 258, l. 629) = 'He sat by the Emperor, and they were very cheerful on account of Martin’s feasting with them.' In Middle English, the genitive often lost its distinctive form, so that it could not be distinguished from an accusative: 'For the quene comynge he was fol glad' (Robert Brunne, Chron., 682, A.D. 1338). Quene seems to be the indistinctive genitive that was in use at this period. The construction resembles that in the sentence from Ælfric. But this is not at all sure, for comynge may be a present participle. Just about this time the present participle in -and had through phonetical development lost its old ending and had become identical in form with the gerund. If comynge is a present participle its subject quene is an accusative, object of the preposition for. In the literary language of the North the present participle in -and was still in use at this time, so that we can find after prepositions clear examples of a present participle with an accusative subject: 'þe stok nest þe root growand es þe heved with nek followand' (Rolle, Pricke of Conscience, 676) = 'The stock growing
next to the root was the head with the neck following.’ After the ending -ing became established in the literary language as a participial form as well as a gerundial, it was difficult to distinguish the two constructions after prepositions. We still, however, clearly feel the form in -ing here as a present participle when it has descriptive force, representing something as continuing or as being repeated: ‘It is dreadful to think of him lying out there in his cold grave tonight.’ ‘From our veranda we can enjoy the beautiful sight of the waves beating on the shore.’ But the present participle does not always have descriptive force. It may, like a gerund, refer to an act as a whole: ‘I am proud of him acting so unselfishly’ = ‘I am proud of him, as he acted so unselfishly.’ Thus, after a preposition the form in -ing became associated with an accusative subject as well as with a genitive subject, and participle and gerund became confounded here. As the gerund has always been more common after a preposition than the participle, we usually feel the form in -ing here as a gerund, but we now use either a genitive or an accusative as its subject. Similarly, in clauses that are the object of a verb, the gerundial and the participial clause have been confounded. In ‘I remember his mother’s saying it’ saying is a gerund, as we can see by its genitive subject. In ‘I remember his mother saying it’ saying was originally a present participle. Mother was the accusative object of the verb remember and at the same time the subject of the present participle saying. As the gerundial and the participial clause have been confounded, we now usually feel the form in -ing as a gerund whether its subject is a genitive or an accusative. However, where it has descriptive force, representing something as proceeding or as being repeated, we feel it as a present participle: ‘I see him (not his) coming up the road.’ ‘We could see him (not his) bowing graciously to the people as he drove along.’ The uniform use of the accusative here shows that the form in -ing is a present participle. The participial construction is described in 15 III 2 A. Compare 48 2 (4th par.).

Thus in choice language the accusative is found as subject of the gerund or participle only in object clauses that are the object of a preposition or a verb. In subject and predicate clauses the gerund with a genitive subject is the usual construction in the literary language, the accusative subject being confined to popular speech: ‘Does our (in popular speech us) singing in the room above disturb you?’ ‘It was our (in popular speech us) coming late that disturbed him.’ The participial clause competes here with the gerundial, but it is largely confined to colloquial speech: ‘He saying (present participle) he is sorry alters the case,’ or in
the literary language usually ‘His saying (gerund) he is sorry alters the case.’ For a fuller description of the participial clause see 17 3 B.

Often, however, the gerund has no subject of its own, as there is elsewhere in the sentence a noun or pronoun which is felt not only as performing its own proper function but as serving also as the subject of the gerund: ‘I am going down there this evening; so you must excuse me for hurrying away.’ ‘I am afraid of hurting his feelings.’ In older English, the subject of the gerund was often expressed even though it was the same as some word in the principal proposition: ‘Since her (now suppressed) being at Lambton she had heard that Miss Darcy was exceedingly proud’ (Jane Austen, Pride and Prejudice, III, Ch. II). The suppression of the subject of the gerund is discussed in detail throughout the Syntax where the different gerundial categories are described. In such constructions the gerund should be distinguished from the present participle. The gerund performs the function of a noun; the present participle performs the function of an adjective: ‘That set me thinking’ (present participle). ‘That set me to thinking’ (gerund). Compare 15 III 2 A. When the subject of the gerund is general or indefinite, it is often not expressed: ‘It is dangerous playing with explosives.’

4. Functions of the Gerund. In spite of the strong verbal force of the gerund and its assumption of tense and voice forms, it remains a noun. It can still stand in the sentence only where a noun can stand, and it still always performs the function of a noun. But as it now often has strong verbal force, it may have accusative objects and adverbial modifiers. These modifiers usually follow the gerund, but sentence adverbs precede it: ‘When he looked at her he usually ended by smiling and sometimes by suddenly laughing.’ Compare 49 2 c, p. 465. On account of the importance of the gerundial construction it has been treated in detail under the different categories throughout the Syntax. In order that the student may get a clear view of the entire field of its present usefulness, an outline of its different functions is given on page 492, with references to paragraphs where these functions are discussed. It often competes with the infinitive in certain categories, as described in the articles referred to in the following pages.

Attempts have been made to prove that there is a differentiation of meaning between gerund and infinitive where the two forms compete with each other. It has been claimed that the gerund is preferred in stating a general fact, while the infinitive is used in referring to special circumstances of a particular individual act: ‘Talking (in general) mends no holes,’ but ‘To delay (in this
functions of the gerund

special case) is dangerous.' Actual usage knows nothing of this distinction: 'No letter today! It has a bad air your forgetting me so early' (Horace Walpole, Letter to Mary and Agnes Berry, June 23, 1789). The reference here is not general, but to the special case in hand. The writer might have used the infinitive here: 'It has a bad air for you to forget me so early.' The gerund is similarly used in 'It's (i.e., your pushing your scientific studies) far more important for us than getting the Vote' (Sir Harry Johnston, Mrs. Warren's Daughter, Ch. XIII, p. 207), where the speaker in referring to the special case in hand says that it is much more important to women that Professor Rossiter, at this time member of the House of Commons, should return to his scientific studies than that he should stay in politics to secure to women the Vote. The speaker here might have said to get instead of getting. In the first example we might use the infinitive: 'It doesn't mend holes to talk.' In the second example we might employ the gerund: 'It is dangerous in this special case, your delaying.' Thus we often may use either the gerund or the infinitive. They are usually competing constructions, although in certain categories the one or the other form is preferred. In colloquial use the gerund is more likely to stand in the first position than is the infinitive. Except after to, as described in d, p. 495, the gerund is alone used after prepositions. It is also often preferred in accusative clauses, as described in 24 III d. On the other hand, where modal force is to be conveyed, the infinitive is usually employed, as described in 7 D 2, although this idea is in a restricted sense found in the gerund, as described in 4 II C (3rd par.). For the one point where the gerund and the infinitive are differentiated in meaning, see c dd (3rd par.), p. 494.

The gerund is used as:

a. Subject: 'Seeing is believing.' See 4 I e, h; 4 II C; 21 e.
b. Predicate: 'Seeing is believing.' See 7 E; 22 c.
c. Object:

aa. Accusative object, object of a verb: 'I like getting up early.' The to-infinitive competes here with the gerund. See 24 III d. On the other hand, the object of the adjective worth is always a gerund: 'A thing worth doing at all is worth doing well.'

bb. Dative object, object of an adverb or adjective, or indirect object of a verb: 'He came near being killed.' 'Next to being married, a girl likes to be crossed in love a little now and then' (Jane Austen). 'I don't feel like laughing today.' 'He is devoting his time to improving (indirect object) his garden.' The Old English forms corresponding to the adverbs near and next to and the adjective like governed the dative, so that we might call the
nour or pronoun following these words a dative object. But as we
now feel near, next to, like for the most part as prepositions, we may
consider the object here as the object of a preposition, the prepo-
sition and object together forming a prepositional object. The
to and the indirect object represent an older dative, but we now
often feel them as a prepositional object.

cc. Genitive object, object of a verb or an adjective: ‘I con-
vinced him of his being able to do it.’ ‘I am not sure of having
seen him.’ This object may be classified also as a prepositional
object.

dd. With a preposition the gerund often forms a prepositional
clause, which is used as a prepositional object of a verb or adjective
or as a prepositional predicate (7 F) after a copula: ‘They set
about repairing the damage.’ ‘I am afraid of their seeing it.’ ‘Her
son had not written to herself to ask a fond mother’s blessing for
that step which he was about taking’ (Thackeray, Henry Esmond,
III, Ch. II). ‘England seems about deserting him’ (Carlyle,
Frederick the Great, IX). After about the prepositional infinitive
may be used instead of the gerund, but the constructions are not
the same, about before a gerund being a preposition but before the
infinitive being an adverb, for a prepositional infinitive cannot
now stand after a preposition: ‘They set about (adverb) to repair
the damage.’ ‘He is about (adverb; see 7 F) to take (more common
than taking) the step.’ ‘England seems about (adverb; see 7 F) to
desert (more common than deserting) him.’ There is sometimes a
difference of meaning between a gerund and an infinitive, but the
difference lies in the use of different prepositions rather than in the
verbal forms themselves: ‘He is afraid of dying’ = that he shall
die. ‘He is afraid to die’ = He fears dying, literally, is afraid in
the direction of dying.

The gerund is much used thus in prepositional clauses that
complete the meaning of a verb or an adjective. The gerund is
employed quite freely after all the prepositions except the one
preposition to. After to we still often use the infinitive where to
is not a mere sign of the infinitive but a preposition indicating a
movement toward a person or thing: ‘Hunger drove him to
steal’ (or to stealing). ‘I am accustomed to do it this way’ (or to
doing it this way). The gerund is often used here alongside of the
infinitive, as it is in general natural to employ a gerund after a
preposition. But often the gerund cannot be used here at all,
as the infinitive is still the favorite form after to. In adverbial
clauses after to the gerund is never used: ‘He worked hard to get
(never to getting) through early.’ On the other hand, the gerund is
employed to make it clear that the prepositional construction is
a prepositional object, not an adverbial element: ‘I am looking forward with pleasure to seeing you soon.’ Compare 24 IV a.

The gerund after the preposition to or on, when used in the sense of entrance into a state of activity, has the same force as the present participle when used as predicate after an ingressive or an effective point-action (38 2 a bb and 38 2 b ee) verb, such as get, fall, burst out, set, which indicate entrance into a state of activity. After ingressives: ‘He fell again speculating’ (pred. part.), or to speculating (gerund), or in older English also to speculate. ‘She burst out crying’ (pred. part.), or in popular speech a-crying, in older English, a literary form contracted from on crying (gerund). ‘That set me thinking’ (objective pred. part.), or to thinking (gerund), or as in older English: ‘It was what put Cit’s back up so two years ago that set me on thinking (gerund) it’ (De Morgan, The Old Madhouse, Ch. XXV). After effectives: ‘The machine got running’ (pred. part.), or to running (gerund). ‘I got the machine running’ (objective pred. part.), or to running (gerund). The infinitive can be used here instead of the gerund, but it is differentiated in meaning from it. The infinitive represents the activity merely as a result pure and simple, while the gerund represents the resultant activity as proceeding steadily: ‘I finally got him to do it.’ ‘I soon got the machine to running.’ Compare 38 2 b ee (last par.).

In the same way we may use either the present participle or the gerund to represent an action as continuing: ‘There is a new church building’ (pred. part.), or in popular speech a-building, from older literary English in or on building (gerund). Through the suppression of the preposition here the old gerundial construction has merged into the participial. That the preposition has been suppressed here can be clearly seen in older literary English, and still in popular speech by the objective genitive following the form in -ing, which thus clearly shows that the form in -ing is a gerund, not a present participle: ‘as she was [in] writing of it’ (Shakespeare, As You Like It, IV, iii, 10). ‘She fancied the bull was a-chasing of her’ (Mrs. Alexander, For His Sake, I, Ch. III). The history of these two constructions is given in 47 a and 48 1 e.

Similarly, the predicate appositive participle competes with the gerund after in: ‘I wasn’t long getting (or in getting) out of the room.’ ‘We must not be late getting (or in getting) home.’

Instead of construing the gerund as a prepositional object we may often regard it as an accusative object, for the preposition is now frequently felt as a part of the verb, verb and preposition forming a compound, as becomes evident in the passive form of
statement, where the object here, just as any accusative object of the active, may become the subject: (active) 'They often laugh at my doing it in this way,' but in the passive 'My doing it in this way has often been laughed at, but it has proved best after all.'

d. As an Attributive Element. The gerund is common here in three grammatical relations, as an attributive genitive, as an appositive noun, and as an attributive prepositional phrase.

As an attributive genitive: 'the love of indulging self,' 'the fear of losing his friendship,' 'the hope of John's coming soon,' 'the fear of his wife's mother (accusative subject; see 3, p. 487) coming.'
The prepositional infinitive competes with the gerund here: 'It is the best way to do it' (or of doing it). 'They approach the subject with the honest desire of getting (or to get) at the truth.' In the last example either the infinitive after to or the gerund after of can be used after the noun desire, but often the infinitive alone can be employed when the idea of desire, wish, demand, command, or modality (23 II 11, 2nd par.) is present: 'There is a strong public demand for him to take the place,' not of his taking the place. 'She has a strict charge to avoid the subject.' 'He received the order to retreat.' 'He is the man to do it' = who should do it. 'That is not the way to do it' = in which it should be done. In such examples the to before the infinitive has its original meaning of towards, in the direction of, as in the second paragraph below.

In the appositive relation we may use the gerund in the appositive genitive or as an appositive agreeing with its governing noun in case: 'I now have the pleasant work of preparing boys for college,' or 'I now have very pleasant work, preparing boys for college.' The infinitive competes with the gerund here: 'I claim the right to do it (or doing it, or of doing it) in my own way.' 'What right's he got telling (or to tell) me where I head in' (Sinclair Lewis, Elmer Gantry, III, III). Compare 23 I a (next to last par.).

The gerund is common also in attributive prepositional clauses: 'His joy on account of my (or John's) coming,' 'his sorrow on account of his wife's mother (accusative subject; see 3, p. 487) coming,' 'his disappointment over attaining so little.' After the one preposition to, however, we still often prefer the infinitive where the to is not a mere sign of the infinitive but a preposition with the meaning of towards, in the direction of: 'a strong impulse, or tendency, to do it,' 'an incentive to do it' (or to doing it), 'an additional stimulus to do it' (or to doing it), 'a natural reluctance to do it' (or to doing it), 'a disposition to exaggerate,' 'a strong temptation to do it.' But when to has the clear meaning of against the gerund is more common: 'his opposition to my going,' 'many
obstacles, or objections, *to building now,* 'an aversion to *shedding blood*' (or *to shed blood*). When the infinitive has a subject of its own, *for* must stand before it: 'That will be an additional inducement *for him to do it.*' Compare c dd (2nd par.).

e. *In Abridged Adverbial Clauses.* This common use is discussed in detail in 27 5; 28 1 a; 28 3 a; 28 5 d (7th par.); 29 1 A a bb; 29 1 A c bb; 29 1 A d aa; 29 1 B b; 30 b; 31 2; 32; 33 2.
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51 1. Functions. Adjectives and participles can be used predicatively, attributively, appositively, and substantively. Some adjectives and participles can be used also as nouns. The nominative predicate is discussed in 6 B a; 7 B a, c; 17 A a, b, c, B, C; the objective predicate in 15 III 2 A; the attributive adjective in 10 I 1, 2, 3, 4; the appositive adjective in 10 I 1 and 1 a; the predicate appositive adjective in 6 C; 7 B b; 20 3. Further details with regard to attributive, predicate, and appositive adjectives are given in the following pages, where also the substantive (i.e., pronominal) use and the use as nouns are discussed.

2. Classes. There are two classes of adjectives — descriptive and limiting. A descriptive adjective expresses either the kind or the condition or state of the living being or lifeless thing spoken of: a good boy; a bright dog; a tall tree; a sick boy; a lame dog. The participles of verbs in adjective function are all descriptive adjectives, since they indicate either an active or passive state: running water; a dying soldier; a broken chair.

A limiting adjective, without expressing any idea of kind or condition, limits the application of the idea expressed by the
noun to one or more individuals of the class, or to one or more parts of the whole, i.e., it points out individuals or individual parts: *this* boy; *that* tree; *my* hat; *these* books; *this* part of the country; *other* parts of the country. Limiting adjectives are divided into classes. These classes are described in The Parts of Speech, 10.

**INFLECTION OF ADJECTIVES**

**Inflection of Descriptive Adjectives**

52. Inflection in the Positive. The entire loss of adjective inflection in the positive degree at the close of the Middle English period gradually brought to the descriptive adjective a great extension of its boundaries. After the loss of adjective inflection it became possible to place a noun, adverb, prepositional phrase, or even a whole sentence before a noun to modify its meaning as a descriptive adjective, for, since there is no longer an adjective ending present, there is nothing here to call attention to a conflict between the former and the present function of the modifying word: the *stone* bridge; the *down* stroke; an up-to-date *dictionary*; a *go-ahead* city. For fuller information see 10 I 2.

Although the loss of adjective inflection was, in general, an advantage, it was at points a real loss, as can be seen in its use as a noun, described in 58. We now feel the disadvantage here and are restoring inflection; of course, not by putting into use again the old forms, but by employing modern means which we understand, as described in 58.

At another point the loss of inflection was felt so keenly that attempts to restore inflection began in the fourteenth century, namely, in substantive function, i.e., when an attributive adjective stands at some distance from its governing noun, apparently alone, like a substantive, but in fact in relation to a noun, as in 'a black sheep and a *white* one.' The object of inflecting the adjective is to bring it into relation to the governing noun. When the adjective stands immediately before the noun we need no ending to indicate its relation to the noun, but when we remove it from the noun, we need a sign to relate it to the noun. In the fourteenth century, *one* was placed after the adjective to perform this function. At first this *one* had its original concrete meaning, *one*, but, as we now can say 'the black sheep and the *white* ones' it is evident that this *one* no longer denotes *one*, but has developed into an adjective suffix with the same force as the Old English adjective inflectional ending, namely, to bring the adjective into
relation to the governing noun. Though this one is separated from
the adjective in writing, it is suffixed immediately in the spoken
language and has the weak stress of a suffix. Similarly, other words
in the course of their development have assumed new functions.
Has, a verb originally denoting possession, is often also used as
the sign of the present perfect tense, as in 'He has gone.' Likewise
the preposition of often loses its prepositional force entirely and
merely serves as the sign of the genitive, as in 'the father of the
boy.' Grammarians do not usually call the one found after an
adjective in substantive function an adjective suffix; but they
should, for it is a simple fact, though not generally recognized.

Though the descriptive adjective is not so much inflected as
formerly, it is still inflected in the comparative and the superlative
and often also in the positive in substantive function and when
used as a noun. The detailed description of present usage is
given below for the means of indicating comparison. The means
of indicating the substantive relation are described in 57. The
inflection of adjectives used as nouns is given in 58.

Comparison of Adjectives

53. Degrees. There are three degrees — the positive, the com­
parative, the superlative. The positive is the simple form of the
adjective: 'a strong man.' The comparative indicates that the
quality is found in the person or thing described in a higher
degree than in some other person or thing: 'the stronger of the
two men.' 'This tree is taller than that.' The superlative is
relatively the highest degree and often indicates that the quality
is found in the highest degree in the person or thing described:
'Mt. Everest is the highest mountain in the world.' Often, how­
ever, the superlative is used in a relative sense, indicating that
of the persons or things compared a certain person or thing pos­
sesses the quality in the highest degree, which need not be a very
high or the highest degree in general: 'John is the strongest
of these boys, but there are others in the school stronger than he.'

In general, comparison is characteristic of descriptive adjectives,
the comparative and the superlative indicating different degrees
of a quality. But a number of limiting adjectives are compared.
Here the comparative and the superlative do not indicate differ­
ent degrees, but point out different individuals: the former; the
latter; the first; the last; the topmost round; the southernmost
island of the group. In the following discussion of comparison,
descriptive and limiting adjectives are, for convenience, treated
together.
54. Comparison to Denote Degrees of Superiority:

1. Relative Comparison. In contrast to the older uniform use of endings to construct the comparative and the superlative, we today with some adjectives employ the old terminational, or synthetic, form in -er and -est; with others, influenced by our fondness for analytic form, as described in b, p. 504, we prefer comparison with more and most; with others we fluctuate between the old terminational, or synthetic, form and the new analytic form. The wide use of the analytic form with more and most in modern English is explained not only by its expressiveness, as described in b, p. 504, but also by its agreeableness of sound and its ease of pronunciation in the case of long adjectives.

Monosyllables and a large number of dissyllables are compared by means of the comparative ending -er and the superlative ending -est: quick, quicker, quickest; sturdy, sturdier, sturdiest.

While we may thus compare with -er and -est a number of dissyllables, especially those in -er, -le, -y, -ow, -some, such as tender, bitter, clever, sober, able, noble, idle, holy, goodly, narrow, wholesome, winsome, and some words accented upon the last syllable, such as profound, remote, etc., and also others that cannot be easily described, such as pleasant, cruel, quiet, etc., or in these same words and many others may use both the old form in -er and -est and the newer analytic form with more and most, as in pleasanter or more pleasant, crueler or more cruel, serener or more serene, in many others we usually prefer comparison by means of more and most, as in the case of earnest, eager, proper, famous, comic, docile, fertile, hostile, certain, active, content, abject, adverse, and participles in -ed and -ing and adjectives in -ful and -ish, as learned, strained, charming, useful, childish, etc.

A few monosyllables, like, real, right, wrong, and wan, which do not naturally incline to comparison, are usually compared by more and most when they are compared, although the terminational form occasionally occurs; in the case of like, however, only in older English, and sometimes still in poetry and dialect, never in colloquial or literary prose: ‘I’m liker (now usually more like) what I was than you to him’ (Dryden, All for Love, I, 247, A.D. 1678). ‘Father is more like himself today.’ ‘The figures of Spartacus, Montrose, Garibaldi, Hampden, and John Nicholson were more real to him than the people among whom he lived’ (Galsworthy, Freeland, Ch. X). ‘It is wrong to even think it; it is more wrong to do it.’

Monosyllabic adjectives, however, are often compared by more when the adjective is placed after the noun to give it more emphasis and at the same time impart descriptive (10 I 1) force:
With classifying force 'There never was a kinder and jüster man,' but with descriptive force 'There never was a man more kind and just.'

In ordinary literary language, words of more than two syllables are seldom compared otherwise than by more and most: beautiful, more beautiful, most beautiful.

a. Irregular Comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bad, ill, evil</td>
<td>worse, badder (in older English)</td>
<td>worst, baddest (in older English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far</td>
<td>farther, further</td>
<td>farthest, furthest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fore</td>
<td>former</td>
<td>foremost, first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good, well</td>
<td>better</td>
<td>best, bettermost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late</td>
<td>later, latter</td>
<td>latest, last, lattermost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little</td>
<td>less, lesser</td>
<td>least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much, many</td>
<td>more, or in older English, mo or moe</td>
<td>most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nigh</td>
<td>nigher</td>
<td>highest, next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>older, elder</td>
<td>oldest, eldest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east, eastern</td>
<td>more eastern</td>
<td>easternmost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td></td>
<td>endmost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hind</td>
<td>hinder</td>
<td>hindmost, hindermost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>lower</td>
<td>lowest, lowermost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>north, northern</td>
<td>more northern</td>
<td>northmost, northernmost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nether</td>
<td>nethermost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outer, utter</td>
<td>outmost, outermost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rear</td>
<td></td>
<td>utmost, uttermost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>south, southern</td>
<td>more southern</td>
<td>southmost, southernmost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top</td>
<td>upper</td>
<td>topmost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under</td>
<td></td>
<td>undermost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west, western</td>
<td>more western</td>
<td>westernmost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In older English, mo or moe (Old English ma) was used instead of more when the reference was to number: 'Send out moe horses' (Shakespeare, Macbeth, V, iii, 34).

In a few cases the variant forms indicate a differentiation of meaning or function. The usual comparative and superlative of old are older, oldest; always so in the predicate relation, but we may use elder, eldest in the attributive and the substantive (57 1) relation and elder as a noun, especially of relationship and rank: the elder brother; the elder Pitt; I am the elder; He is my elder in service; the eldest brother, etc. 'He is an elder in the church.'

We use farther and further with the same local and temporal
meaning, but further has also the meanings additional, more extended, more: 'The cabin stands on the farther (or further) side of the brook.' 'I shall be back in three days at the farthest' (or at the furthest). But: further details; without further delay. 'After a further search I found her.' 'Have you anything further (= more) to say?' In adverbial function farther and further are used indiscriminately: 'You may go farther (or further) and fare worse.' There is, however, a decided tendency to employ further to express the idea of additional, more extended action: 'I shall be glad to discuss the matter further with you.'

Later and latter are now clearly differentiated in meaning.

The terminations in some of these forms, as lesser, innermost, etc., express the degree two or three times instead of once. Compare aa below.

aa. Older Comparison, Pleonasm, Excess of Expression. In older English, old was not the only adjective that might have a change of vowel in the comparative and superlative. Once this change, called mutation, was with certain words the rule. Later, the tendency toward uniformity brought the vowel of the positive into the comparative and superlative. In the early part of the sixteenth century there are still two adjectives which have mutation, but alongside of the old mutated form is the new unmutated, both forms with exactly the same meaning: long, lenger or longer, lengest or longest; old, elder or older, eldest or oldest. Toward the close of the century the old mutated forms of long disappeared, while old kept both forms but now with differentiated meaning, as described on page 501.

In older English, the comparative and superlative were formed by means of suffixes, not only in the case of monosyllabics but also in the case of longer adjectives, often where it is not now usual: 'Nothing certainer' (Shakespeare, Much Ado About Nothing, V, iv, 62); 'one of the beautifullest men in the world' (Thomas Fuller, The Holy State and the Profane State, V, II, 362, A.D. 1642). Long terminational comparatives and superlatives can still be heard in popular speech, which here preserves older usage: beautifuler, beautifulest, etc. This older usage still occurs also in emphatic and excited colloquial speech, especially in the attributive relation: 'The machine was perfect as a watch when we took her apart the other day; but when she goes together again the 15th of January, we expect her to be perfecter than a watch' (Mark Twain, Letter to Joseph T. Goodman, Nov. 29, 1889). 'There was no cráftier or croókedder director in the habitable world' (Sinclair Lewis, Arrow-smith, Ch. XXX, IV). 'Joe Twichel was the delightedest old b6y I ever saw when he read the words you had written in that book'
(Mark Twain, Letter to W. D. Howells, Dec. 18, 1874). ‘Our baby is the blessedest little bundle of sunshine Heaven ever sent into this world.’ ‘It is the stupidest nonsense!’ The analytic forms with more and most began to appear in the thirteenth century in connection with participles, where they are still the most thoroughly established. This tendency to place the comparative and superlative of an adverb before a participle had already begun in Old English, where the forms swipor and swipost were used, which were replaced by more and most in the thirteenth century. The participles as verbal forms could take adverbs before them just as finite verbs do. The adverbs more and most were often retained when the participles were used as adjectives, since more and most as common adverbs had more concrete force than the endings -er and -est. This new usage spread to adjectives. It was and still is absolutely necessary in the case of nouns, adverbs, and prepositional phrases used as adjectives, as in ‘He was more knave than fool’ and ‘I was more in doubt about it than any of them.’ The general development in the direction of more and most was facilitated by the strong English trend toward analytic forms and was also furthered by French influence.

The new analytic forms at first gained ground only slowly, not becoming common until the sixteenth century, then gradually establishing themselves in the literary language alongside of the terminational forms, as we find them today.

The new analytic forms occur also in popular speech, but for the most part only pleonastically alongside of the usual terminational forms: a more abler man; the most carelessest man. Such double forms were once in use in the literary language: ‘we will grace his heels With the most boldest and best hearts of Rome’ (Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, III, i, 120). In older literary English, we often find double comparison in worser, which still survives in popular speech. Double comparison still survives in the literary language in lesser, which replaces less in attributive and substantive function in certain expressions, especially with reference to concrete things: in lesser things; the lesser grammarians; the lesser of two evils; but less with more abstract reference, as in less degree; at a less depth; also to express amount, quantity, and in adverbial use, as in ‘He has less money than I’ and ‘He works less than I.’

We no longer feel the double comparison in near (comparative of nigh, but now felt as a positive with regular comparison, near, nearer, nearest) and adjectives in -most (now confounded with most, but in older English with the form mest, which consists of the two superlative suffixes, -m and -est), as in foremost, hindmost,
inmost, utmost. From the superlative foremost the comparative former has been formed. In aftermost, hindermost, innermost, nethermost, outermost, uppermost, uttermost, we have a comparative + the two superlative suffixes -m and -est.

While we today in general avoid pleonastic comparison, we do not feel such forms as more perfect, most perfect, deader, deadest, more unique, etc., as pleonastic, since we have in mind degrees of approach to something perfect, dead, or unique.

Somewhat similar to the pleonasm of older English was its excess of expression in using the superlative of two, which still survives in popular and colloquial speech, as in 'the smallest of the two.' Sometimes in the literary language: 'They (i.e., the two squirrels) seemed to vie with one another who should be most bold' (Thoreau, Journal, XIII, p. 189).

b. Advantages of the Analytic Forms. It should be noticed that in the old terminational form the sign of the degree is intimately associated with the stem, so that it is a mere suffix and can never be stressed. On the other hand, in the analytic form the sign of degree, more or most, is still an independent word and is often stressed. There are here two parts, one indicating the degree, the other the meaning. We here, as in 6 A d (1), are fond of using the analytic form, since by means of it we can better shade our thought. We stress the adjective when we desire to emphasize the meaning, but stress the more or most when we desire to emphasize the idea of degree: 'She is more beautiful than her sister,' but 'She is indeed beautiful, but her sister is still môre beautiful.' 'Of the sisters Mary is the most beautiful and Jane the most beloved,' but 'The sisters are all beautiful, but Mary is by far the most beautiful.'

c. Different Form for Different Function. The different degrees have different forms when used substantively (57 1), the form with one being required in the positive, but not always necessary in the comparative and superlative, as explained more at length in 57 1 (next to last par.): 'This cord is strong' (predicate adjective) or a strong one (used substantively). 'This cord is stronger' (predicate adjective), or in substantive use the stronger or the stronger one, but always a stronger one. 'This cord is strongest (predicate adjective) at this point,' but in substantive use 'This cord is the strongest,' or the strongest one. 'The lake is deepest (predicate adjective) at this point,' but in substantive use 'Of these lakes this one is the deepest,' or 'This lake is the deepest one,' or simply the deepest.

In the predicate relation, instead of the adjective superlative, the adverbial accusative (16 4 a) of the noun made from the
adjective superlative preceded by the definite article is sometimes used here: ‘I doubt whether the actions of which we are the very proudest will not surprise us, when we trace them, as we shall one day, to their source’ (Thackeray, *Pendennis*, Ch. XXXI), instead of indeed proudest. ‘The rooks settle where the trees are the finest’ (Lytton, *My Novel*, I, Ch. V), instead of finest. ‘Of these specimens my friend is naturally the múst proud’ (J. Conrad, *A Set of Six*), instead of múst proud. ‘It was, perhaps, at this time that Mrs. Henry and I were the múst uneasy’ (R. L. Stevenson), instead of múst uneasy. This superlative is always used when it is modified by a restrictive relative clause: ‘On that day she looked the happiest that I had ever seen her,’ or often with suppressed relative pronoun: ‘Louise was sitting in a deep chair, looking the happiest [that] I had ever seen her’ (Mary Roberts Rinehart, *The Circular Staircase*, Ch. XXXIV). ‘On that day she looked the múst beautiful that I had ever seen her.’ As described in 16 5 a bb, this adverbial accusative is sometimes used with verbs as the superlative of the adverb, hence it is used also here in the predicate, just as adverbs in general are often used in the predicate (7 F).

In the predicate instead of the simple superlative without the or the adverbial accusative of the superlative with the, we may also use an adverbial phrase with at and the superlative modified by a possessive adjective: ‘The steps are at their steepest (or steepest, or the steepest) just here’ (F. M. Peard, *Madame’s Granddaughter*, p. 74). ‘She knew that she looked at her best in this attire’ (C. Garvice, *Staunch as a Woman*, p. 83). Similarly, as objective predicate: ‘She first saw the hill at its gayest when that brief, brilliant hour before autumn bedecked Cosdon’ (Phillpotts, *The Beacon*, I, Ch. VI). ‘In “Doctor Dick” we have the author at his most useful’ (Literary World, April 19, 1895, p. 362).

d. Two Qualities of One Person or Thing Compared. In comparing two qualities of one person or thing we usually employ more: ‘She is more proud than vain.’ ‘He is more shy than unsocial.’ However, in the case of a few monosyllables, long, wide, thick, high, we still regularly employ the old simple comparative, usually with full clause form in the subordinate clause: ‘The wall was in some places thicker than it was high.’

e. Comparative of Gradation. To indicate that the quality increases or decreases at a fairly even rate we place ever before the comparative, or we repeat it: ‘The road got ever worse (or worse and worse) until there was none at all.’

f. Comparison of Other Parts of Speech Used as Adjectives. Here we usually employ more and most: ‘John is more in debt than I am.’
'She is more mother than wife.' 'Though the youngest among them, she was more woman than they.' Where we feel a comparative more as a pronoun than as an adjective we say: 'Charles was more of a gentleman than a king, and more of a wit than a gentleman.' 'Smith is more of a teacher than his brother.'

**g. Comparative of Limiting Adjectives Not Used in Predicate.** The comparative of limiting adjectives, inner, outer, former, latter, etc., cannot be used as a predicate followed by than, since, according to the second paragraph of 53, limiting adjectives do not indicate degrees, but merely point out individuals. The comparative older can, as a descriptive adjective, be used as a predicate; but elder cannot be so used, for it is a limiting adjective: 'He is older (not elder) than I,' but 'This is the elder brother.'

**h. Comparison of Compounds.** We compare the first element of a compound where this is possible, usually employing the terminational form, but if the first element is a word that does not admit of this form we use more or most: 'the biggest-chested and longest-armed man I ever saw,' but 'This is the most up-to-date book I know.' Even if the first element admits of the terminational form, we employ more or most if the first element has fused with the other component so closely that it is not felt as a separate element with a separate function: well-known; better-known; but the more well-to-do tradesmen.

Of course, we compare the last component if it contains the element capable of comparison, usually employing the form we should use if it were an independent word: bloodthirstier, blood(thirstiest; praiseworthyst, or most praiseworthy, etc.

2. **Absolute Comparison:**

**a. Absolute Superlative.** In all the preceding examples the degrees express superiority in a relative sense, some person or thing excelling all the members of a definite group in the possession of a certain quality, while in fact the higher or highest degree here may be a comparatively low degree: 'John is the taller of the two, the tallest of them all, but he is notwithstanding quite small.' We may in the case of the superlative, quite commonly, express superiority in an absolute sense, indicating a very high degree in and of itself, not necessarily, however, the very highest.

In lively style, we here often place unstressed most before the stressed positive of the adjective or participle: (relative superlative) 'It is the most lovely flower in the garden,' but in an absolute sense: 'He has the most beautiful of gardens.' 'Everything about the place tells of the most dainty order, the most exquisite cleanliness' (Mrs. Gaskell, *Life of Charlotte Brontë*, Ch. I). 'It was a most magnificent exhibition of courage.' 'We shall soon see George
and his most beautiful wife." 'Most lovely flowers everywhere greet
the eye and most fragrant perfumes fill the air.' We can distinguish
only by the stress 'Most réputable (absolute superlative) writers
have now abandoned this claim' from 'Móst (= the great majority
of) reputable writers have abandoned this claim.'

Instead of the usual absolute superlative with most, we some-
times in the case of adjectives which admit of the terminational
form employ the simple superlative, often drawling it out and
stressing it: 'Oh, he made the rûdest remark!' 'The letter did
not meet with the wûrmest repection.' 'I'm in the bést of health.'
'She is in the bést of company.' 'At all times her dress was of
the pôorest.' 'Humphrey's ideas of time were always of the vàquest
order' (Florence Montgomery, Misunderstood, Ch. III). 'The
letter was written in the kindest terms.' Besides such expressions
we find this form sometimes, especially in our own time, when the
superlative is modified by a limiting adjective, my, any, every,
each, no, some, certain, etc., or, on the other hand, sometimes when
it is entirely unmodified, especially in the case of abstract and
plural nouns: 'my déarest darling'; 'any plânist man who reads
this' (Trollope, Framley Parsonage, Ch. XIV); 'so completely
did it fulfil every fâintest hope'; 'there is no smallest doubt.' 'It
was perhaps on some dârkest, müddiest afternoon of a London
February' (Times Literary Supplement, June 9, 1918). 'A stronger
lens reveals to you certain tiniest hairlets, which make vortices
for these victims' (George Eliot, Middlemarch, I, Ch. VI). 'Mi-
chael and Guy left Oxford in the mellow time of an afternoon in
éârst August' (Compton Mackenzie, Sinister Street, p. 760).
'I owed her dèepest gratitude' (Elinor Glyn, Reflections of Am-
brosine, III, Ch. V). 'Our friendship ripened into clôsest intimacy.'
'From éârst times.'

The most common way to express the absolute superlative is to
place before the positive of the adjective a simple adverb, such as
very, exceedingly, highly, absolutely, etc., or in colloquial speech
awfully, dreadfully, terribly, beastly, etc., sometimes without the
suffix -ly, as in the case of awful, even regularly so in the case of
real (16 4; widely used in America), mighty, jolly (British collo-
quial for very), devilish, damned, bloody (British), bally (British),
etc.: very cold weather; an exceedingly intricate problem; a highly
polished society. 'I am awfully (sometimes awful) glad,' but after
a verb: 'I dread awfully (not awful) to go.' 'It's real cold.' 'I'm
jolly glad anyhow.' 'It's damned hot.' Also only too, simply too,
just too, and just are so used: 'I shall be only too glad if you accept
my invitation.' 'It's simply too bad of him!' 'It's just too awful!'
'It's just splendid!' In older English, pure was used with the
meaning of absolutely: ‘It is pure easy to follow god and serue hym in tyme of tranquylite’ (Caxton, Chast. Goddes Chyld, 89, A.D. 1491). This usage is preserved in certain American dialects: ‘Dey hides is pure tough’ (Julia Peterkin, Scarlet Sister Mary). Compare 16 2 a.

b. Absolute Comparative. The absolute comparative is not as common as the absolute superlative: the lower classes; the higher classes; higher education; a better-class café; the more complex problems of life; ‘the mist, like a fleecy coverlet, hiding every harsher outline’ (H. Sutcliffe, Pam the Fiddler, Ch. I).

We usually place here before the positive of the adjective a simple adverb, such as tolerably, fairly, rather, etc.: a tolerably (or fairly, or rather) long walk; somewhat talkative, etc.

55. Comparison to Denote Degrees of Inferiority. Here we uniformly employ less and least: wise, less wise, least wise.

Inflection and Use of Limiting Adjectives

56. Attributive limiting adjectives are inflected in the positive only in the case of: this, these; that, those. These forms are also used substantively. In substantive function that, those are now often replaced by the one, the ones, comparatively recent formations but now widely used. Many limiting adjectives, such as many, several, two, three, etc., have no plural form, but contain the plural idea in their meaning.

A number of limiting adjectives have a comparative and a superlative form, as explained in 53 (2nd par.).

A. Use of Demonstrative Adjectives. Demonstrative limiting adjectives point out persons or things either by gesture, or by the situation, or by an accompanying description.

By gesture: ‘Thése flowers bloom longer than thóse,’ or in popular speech where there is a great fondness for excess of expression: ‘These hére flowers bloom longér’n those thère’ (or them thère). ‘Thóse (in popular speech often thém, or them thère) flowers are the finest.’ In older literary English, there is here the same fondness for excess of expression as found in current colloquial speech, only in different form, usually with a redundant same after the demonstrative: ‘Call that same Isabel here once again’ (Shakespeare, Measure for Measure, V, i, 270). In Middle English also here and there were used redundantly after a demonstrative, as described above for popular speech, where older literary usage survives. Where the persons referred to are supposed to be known and there is no need of identification, the demonstratives are often employed unaccompanied by a gesture and marked by
a peculiar tone of voice expressing praise or censure, pleasure or displeasure: ‘I am coming soon to see that dear little grandson.’ ‘I hate that Johnson boy.’ ‘These inexperienced maids are always breaking dishes.’ ‘I was attacked by one of those huge police dogs.’ These demonstratives that are charged with feeling have become intimately associated with the lively double genitive (10 II 1 b): ‘this broad land of ours,’ ‘that kind wife of yours.’ ‘I want you to keep that old dog of yours at home.’

Where the persons and things referred to are not supposed to be known, demonstratives unaccompanied by a gesture point them out in a twofold way. They either have anaphoric force, i.e., point backward to some person or thing that precedes, as in ‘In this old castle there lived once a king who had an only child, a daughter. The (or this) daughter was very beautiful.’ Or they have determinative force, i.e., they point forward to a following remark which defines or describes some person or thing. The determinative is often used substantively (57 1), i.e., as a pronoun, preceded by an antecedent or followed by a limiting genitive, prepositional phrase, adverb, or relative or participial clause: ‘this hat and that (not the one) of my brother’s’; ‘this book and that one (or now also quite commonly the one) upon the table in the next room’; ‘these books and those (or the ones) upon the table in the next room,’ ‘this window and that one (or the one) upstairs’; ‘these windows and those (or the ones) upstairs’; ‘these books and those (or the ones) lying, or piled up (or which are lying, or which are piled up) upon the table in the next room’; ‘these books and those (or the ones) we bought yesterday.’ Instead of that one’s Milton in Paradise Lost, V, 808, employs whose, a survival of the older determinative force of who: ‘Vengeance is his or whose he sole appoints.’

The determinative is often used substantively (57 1), i.e., as a pronoun, followed by a limiting noun or pronoun and also by a relative clause which limits it as restricted by its limiting noun or pronoun: ‘I like those of your friends whom I have met.’ There is here a double restriction. Compare 23 II 6.

Also a number of indefinites are used as determinatives, especially one, ones, any, etc.: ‘When you buy a new pen, get one with a sharper point’ (or ‘one that has a sharper point’). ‘When you buy new pens, get ones with a sharper point’ (or ‘ones that have a sharper point’). ‘You may have any of the books that you may select.’ Compare first paragraph, p. 510.

Of these forms that and those are either demonstratives proper or determinatives; the one, the ones, one, ones are only determinatives.
In loose colloquial speech there is a qualitative determinative, *like = that kind*: ‘pies like mother used to make.’ ‘I was going to bring some port wine like we drink at school in our crowd there’ (Tarkington, *The Magnificent Ambersons*, Ch. III). ‘When a young gentleman marries, he can’t expect to live in a house like he was brought up in’ (A. Marshall, *Anthony Dare*, Ch. II). Though common, this *like* is confined to the one case that a relative clause with suppressed relative pronoun follows. In the literary language we use here *such* followed by a relative clause introduced by the relative pronoun *as*, or we employ *like that* followed by a relative clause, usually with suppressed relative pronoun: ‘pies such as mother used to make’ (or *like those mother used to make*). Elsewhere we can use either *such as* or *like that* as a qualitative determinative: ‘a house such as that of my father’s’ (or ‘like that of my father’s’); ‘books such as those upon the table’ (or ‘like those upon the table’). Where the reference is indefinite, *one, ones* are often used as a qualitative determinative instead of *such*. For examples see next to last paragraph, p. 509, and 575b (3rd par.). In older English, *such* often loses the idea of quality entirely and has the force of *this, that, these, those*. This old usage still lingers where there is a somewhat indefinite reference to a group of persons or things: ‘It seems to have cooled the ardor of such of the Bishops as (or those of the Bishops who) at first tended to favor Sinn Fein as a means of smashing the Irish party’ (London Times, Educational Supplement, Nov. 18, 1918). There is a tendency to differentiate *those* and *such* here by employing *such* where we feel the reference as more indefinite. Compare Parts of Speech 777b (last par.).

The determinative is often used as an adherent (10 I) adjective: *the* hat of my brother; *the* book upon the table; *the* window upstairs; *the* boys playing in the street; *those* people who never forget an insult; *such* books as I have. In the singular, *a* is often used as a qualitative determinative instead of *such*: ‘We need a man that we can trust.’

Also the pronouns *he, they,* or now more commonly *those,* are used as determinatives, pointing to a following relative clause introduced by *who* (or in older English also *that*). For further particulars and examples see 23 II 5 (2nd par. of Examples). *He* and *she* also point to a following genitive of characteristic or a prepositional phrase: ‘she of (or with) the auburn hair.’

B. Use of the Definite Article. The definite article *the* is the weakened form of an old demonstrative now represented by *that,* and true to its origin points to a definite person or thing. As a demonstrative it has a twofold function: anaphoric *the,* pointing
backward to a person or thing already mentioned, as in 'There lived once in this old castle a powerful king. The king had a lovely daughter'; determinative the, pointing to a definite person or thing, described usually by a following genitive, adverb, positional phrase, or relative clause: the hat of my brother; the tree yonder; the hat on the table; the hat which I hold in my hand. Of course, a person or thing which is single in kind needs no description: the king; the queen.

In oldest English, the definite article was little used with nouns, not even with common class nouns. All things living and lifeless were conceived of as individuals, and were used without the article, just as names of persons had no article. In set expressions there are many survivals of this old usage: 'He is going to bed, to school, to ruin, on foot, by water,' etc. Very early, however, the old idea of individuality became much restricted. Many lifeless things were divided into classes, as trees, flowers, stones, rivers, etc. There are usually many individuals in a class; hence in order to point to a definite individual within a class, the definite article was placed before the noun, which was followed by a descriptive genitive, etc., as illustrated above: the hat of my brother; the hat upon the table. Of course, where a person or thing is single in kind within any definite group, circle, commonwealth, etc., it needs no description: the king; the queen; the mayor; the captain; the president; the army; the navy; the bridge (where there is only one in the neighborhood); the school; the post office, etc. Outside of such cases of evident uniqueness we now stress the the to mark a person or thing as unique: 'He is the pianist of the day.' 'That is the hotel of the city.'

The names of individuals within a family or a class at school have remained without the article. We still say: John, Mary, etc. This is the old style of individualization. The definite article before a noun also individualizes, but it is felt as individualization within a class. It is the new style of individualization. The idea of a personal, inner individuality is what characterizes the old style of individualization: God, man, woman, and persons in general: Gladstone, Lincoln, John, Mary. By vivid personification we also say gold, silver, copper, honesty, chastity, beauty, antiquity, death, spring, winter, diphtheria, rheumatism, consumption, etc., feeling that they are things single in kind: 'Honesty is the best policy.' But when we think of the concrete manifestation of honesty we feel these acts as members of a class and hence employ the new style of individualization. 'The honesty of these boys ought to be rewarded.' On the other hand, the new style of individualization often borders closely on that of the old:
the King; the Queen; the Duke; the Savior, etc. Germans employ the new style for the members of the family: the John; the Mary, etc., i.e., the John, the Mary of their circle, individualizations within a class, a circle. In recent English, there is a slight tendency in this direction: 'the old man' or 'the governor' (= Father); 'the dad' (Galsworthy, In Chancery, p. 57); 'the poor old dad!' (id., The Man of Property, p. 41); 'the mother' (De Morgan, The Old Madhouse, Ch. XXVII); 'the electrical surprise and gratitude and exaltation of the wife and the children' (Mark Twain, Letter to Oliver Wendell Holmes, Dec., 1885); 'the wife' (Hutchinson, If Winter Comes, p. 321), etc.

In Old English, it was the rule to say 'the little John,' an individualization within a class, but in colloquial speech we now usually say 'little John' after the analogy of 'John.' This usage is very common where there is the warmth of interest or personal feeling in the tone: 'Poor Tom is in trouble again.' 'Good Saint Francis loved every created thing.' In more formal and dignified literary language, however, the definite article is still the more natural expression: 'the late Mr. Byron Jones'; 'the elder Pliny.' Similarly, older 'the king Arthur' has for the most part become 'King Arthur,' but older usage still not infrequently occurs: 'Tell the Countess Shulski I wish to speak to her' (Elinor Glyn, The Reason Why, Ch. I, 8). Of course, the article is usually employed when the title is followed by a prepositional phrase designating a place, as the title is felt as an individualization within a class: 'the Earl of Derby,' but 'Lord Derby' as the words are felt as a name. Wherever the idea of individuality or singleness in kind is strong, we today prefer the form without the article: January, heaven, hell, etc. But the development here is quite uneven: God, but the Lord, the devil; Parliament, Congress, but often the Congress, especially in the language of congressmen, senators, etc.; dropsy, but the measles or simple measles; Mars (planet), but the moon, the earth, the Hudson, the Cape of Good Hope; Genesis, but the Bible.

The article is dropped in a enumeration of things or particulars, for here the idea of unit, sovereign individuality, separate item, something single in kind, overshadows all other conceptions: 'He studied the history of early dramatic efforts in church, university, school, court.' Similarly, where the words come in pairs: 'He is tired body and soul.' 'He works day and night.' 'He is happy in shop and home.'

On the other hand, the absence of the definite article is today often felt as a contrast to its presence and hence indicates an indefinite portion, amount, or extent: 'the dust on the veranda,' but in an indefinite sense 'In these dry days we see dust every-
The absence of the definite article often suggests the general conception of class or kind with only a general characterization, while the definite article points to something definite, a definite variety or a definite individual: 'I write with black ink,' but 'the black ink that this firm makes.' 'She suffers much from headache,' but 'The headache that she had yesterday has rendered her unfit for her duties.'

A noun is often without an article in the predicate when the noun does not designate a definite individual but something abstract, such as an estate, rank, relationship, calling, or capacity of any kind: 'This thesis — for thesis and nothing more it at present is — would no doubt make the basis of a very keen discussion in any gathering of naval men.' 'He turned traitor.' 'He fell heir to a large estate.' 'Williams was son of an officer in the service of the East India Company.' 'Of this society Mr. Smith is now president.' 'Mr. Boyd is Irishman first, critic next.' 'German tribes deposed the last Roman emperor and proclaimed their leader Odoaker king (objective predicate) of Rome.' Similarly, in abridged clauses: 'Child though he was, consciousness of self had come to him.' Predicate appositive: 'In this eventful year Tennyson succeeded Wordsworth as poet laureate.'

Of course, a noun is also elsewhere without the article when the noun does not denote a definite individual but only an abstract or general idea: 'He is doing all that mortal man can do.' 'Fully a century has passed since mason's hand has touched it.' 'If ever poet were a master of phrasing, he (Tennyson) was so.' This usage is very old and hence still a favorite in poetry and choice prose, but the indefiniteness usually present here leads to the use of the indefinite article in plain prose.

a. DEFINITE ARTICLE WITH GENERALIZING FORCE. The definite article usually has individualizing force; but when there is no reference to a definite individual, it assumes generalizing force, i.e., the representative idea becomes more prominent than the conception of a sharp individualization, one individual representing a whole class: 'The rat is larger than the mouse,' or also 'A rat is larger than a mouse.' 'The child is father of the man.' 'He is a lover of the beautiful.' The plural is also used where the plural idea is prominent: 'The English are a vigorous people.' In a few common words indicating individuals with highly developed personality the old style of individualization without the article is used here: 'Man is mortal.' 'Woman is frail.' Also the plural without the article can be used here, as an articleless plural lacks definiteness and hence can be used with general force: 'Owls cannot see well in the daytime.'
b. **Use of the Definite Article in Direct Address.** Today, proper names or common class nouns used in direct address are without the article: ‘John, come here.’ ‘John, dear brother, I want you to help me.’ ‘Smith, old boy, trust of friends, I come again to you for counsel.’ ‘Little boy, what do you want?’ In older English, both common and proper nouns were often used with the definite article, since they were felt as individualizations of the new style. This older usage has come down almost to our own day: ‘The last of the Romans, fare thee well!’ (Shakespeare, *Julius Cæsar*, V, iii, 99). ‘What ho! The Captain of the Guard! Give the offender fitting ward’ (Scott, *Lady of the Lake*, V, 26).

c. The definite article *the* is sometimes still for archaic effect written *ye*, the *y* representing older thorn (*þ*), hence pronounced *th*: ‘ye old town.’

C. **Form and Use of the Indefinite Article.** The indefinite article *a* or *an*, the reduced form of the numeral *one*, has preserved the *n* of the original word only before a vowel sound: *a* boat; *a* house; *a* union (*yūnyan*); not *a* one (*wun*), but *an* apple; *an* heir (with silent *h*).

There is fluctuation of usage before an initial *h* where the syllable is unaccented. In the literary language of England it has long been usual to place *an* here before the *h*: *an* historical character; *an* hotel, etc. At the present time, however, this usage is not universal in England. The British scholar H. W. Fowler in his *Modern English Usage* even calls it pedantic. In America it is usual to employ *a* here, although some follow the prevailing British usage. The difference of usage here rests upon an older difference of pronunciation. In America, Ireland, Scotland, and the extreme northern part of England initial *h* has been preserved. In the English dialects it has for the most part been lost, but in standard English under the influence of the written language and Scotch and Irish usage it has been restored. For a long time, however, it was pronounced weakly or not at all in unaccented syllables, which gave rise to the spelling *an* in ‘*an* historical character,’ ‘*an* hotel,’ etc. Older spelling, such as ‘*an* hundred crowns’ (Shakespeare, *Taming of the Shrew*, V, ii, 128), ‘*an* hill’ (Matthew, V, 14), shows that in early Modern English initial *h* was not always pronounced in England even in accented syllables.

The indefinite article *a*, true to its origin, singles out one object, action, or quality from among a number. It designates an individual in different ways:

*a.* It points to an individual person or thing without fixing its identity: ‘We met *an* old man on our way here.’ ‘There is *a* book lying on the table.’
b. In its more indefinite sense a is equal to any, designating no individual in particular: ‘There isn't a man in our community in whom I have more confidence.’

c. Like the it often has generalizing force. See B a, p. 513.

d. It is used as a determinative with the force of such: ‘It was a sight that would make angels rejoice.’ ‘He is a man that must be treated kindly.’

e. Often with its original meaning: ‘a foot long.’ ‘Wait a minute.’

f. It sometimes represents older on, hence is the reduced form of a preposition. This a occurs in adverbial expressions denoting repetition: ‘He goes to the city several times a year.’ Compare 16 4 a (last par.).

g. It can stand before a proper name in only two cases: (1) to designate one member of a family: ‘There isn't now a single Jones in our village, although it once seemed full of them’; (2) to convert a proper name into a common class noun: ‘He is a regular Hercules.’

D. Use of Intensifying 'Myself,' 'Himself,' etc. In Old English, the simple limiting adjective self was used appositively after nouns or pronouns to make them more emphatic; in older periods with either weak or strong inflection: ‘He selfa (weak nominative) hit segb,’ ‘He himself says it.’ The dative of a personal pronoun was often in Old English placed between the governing noun or pronoun and self: ‘He him (dative) selfa (nominative) hit segb,’ ‘He himself says it,’ literally, ‘He says it himself, on his own account.’ The dative of interest (12 1 B b) was inserted here to call especial attention to the person involved in the act by personal interests. We now often employ a modern dative with for instead of the old simple dative: ‘Few among our statesmen have seen anything of colonial life and colonial institutions for themselves’ (London Times), instead of themselves. ‘She bade him, if he doubted her, go see for himself’ (Kingsley, Westward Hol).

In older inflected English, in such a sentence as ‘He him (dative) selfa (nominative) hit segb,’ the self used in connection with the simple dative long continued to take the case required by the construction, i.e., was nominative, dative, or accusative according to the case of the noun or pronoun with which it stood in apposition, but it was sometimes attracted into the dative, the case of the him, her, or them that stood before it, both words thus standing in the dative, indicating that they were felt as one, as a compound. We now regularly construe the two forms as a compound, an appositive to the noun or pronoun to which it refers. As, however, the original grammatical relations here are
no longer understood there have arisen two groups of compounds; on the one hand, the group just described, the old simple dative group *himself*, *herself*, *themselves* (until about A.D. 1550 *them selfe*), and after the analogy of these also *itself*; on the other hand, a group of nine words of quite different formation replacing the older type, *myself*, *ourselves* (after the plural of majesty *we* and editorial *we* = *myself*), *ourselves*, *thyselvse*, *yourself*, *yourselves*, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries also *itself* (now replaced by *itself*), in dialect also *hisself*, *theirselves*, all nine after the analogy of *herself*, in which *her*, although originally a dative, was in the thirteenth century falsely construed as a possessive adjective and *self* construed as a noun. Although these two groups are of different form, they both perform the same function, serving as intensifying adjectives. All eleven compounds now have the same function as the old simple adjective *self*, serving as appositives to the noun or pronoun to which they refer: ‘*I myself think so*,’ or ‘*I think so myself*.’ ‘*We think we have hinted elsewhere that Mr. Benjamin Allen had a way of becoming sentimental after brandy. The case is not a peculiar one as we ourselves can testify*’ (Dickens, *Pickwick*, Ch. XXXVIII). ‘*We ourselves think so,*’ or ‘*We think so ourselves.*’ ‘*I gave it to John himself.*’ ‘*I saw John himself do it.*’ For sake of emphasis in lively style the intensifying adjective often stands at the beginning of the sentence: ‘*Himself an artist in rhetoric, he (Thoreau) confounds thought with style when he attempts to speak of the latter*’ (James R. Lowell, *Literary Essays*, I, p. 374). It often also stands within the sentence before the word to which it refers where there is a contrast to what precedes: ‘*He had always taken it for granted, since he was eighteen, that she would marry him and from that age herself she had tacitly accepted the position of his fiancee*’ (Sir Harry Johnston, *The Man Who Did the Right Thing*, Ch. IV, p. 48).

As the intensifying adjective often emphasizes a personal pronoun and is thus closely associated with it, it has gradually acquired the function of the personal pronoun in addition to its own, so that since the eleventh century the personal pronoun often in certain categories drops out as a useless form and the intensifying adjective becomes an emphatic personal pronoun, especially in the subject relation at the end of the sentence introducing an abridged subordinate clause with the finite verb omitted: ‘*My boy played with several others who were of about the same age as himself*’ (= *he himself was*). ‘*Did you ever know a woman pardon another for being handsomer than herself*?’ (= *she herself was*). Quite often also at the end of a full independent proposition for especial emphasis: ‘The poor boy of whom I have just related
was *myself* (= *I myself*). Frequently also at the beginning of a full independent proposition, provided the logical subject is expressed in a preceding proposition: ‘With a sudden rough movement she all but snatched the child out of the other’s arms and *herself* saw to Sheila’s comfort’ (W. J. Locke, *The Glory of Clementina*, Ch. XIX). In the nominative absolute construction: ‘But he did want very much to meet Roy Carrington, whose novel “Gentlemen, The King” everybody had read, *himself* included’ (A. Marshall, *Anthony Dare*, Ch. III). As predicate: ‘You are not *yourself* today.’ After *like* or a preposition: ‘I am a stranger here *like yourself*.’ ‘It is satisfactory to them, if not to us’ (or *ourselves*). ‘You can’t do that by *yourself*.’ As object of a verb: ‘Most people do not realize how closely the mute creatures of God resemble *ourselves* in their pains and griefs.’ In older English, it was common where it cannot now be used — namely, at the beginning of a sentence instead of a personal pronoun, pointing back to some person already mentioned: ‘But *himself* (now simple *he*) was not satisfied therewith’ (Bradford, *History of Plymouth Plantation*, p. 363, A.D. 1630–1648). ‘*Himself* (now simple *he*) and Montmorin offered their resignation’ (Thomas Jefferson, *Autobiography*, p. 138). This elliptical construction is now less common than earlier in the period and grammarians often oppose it, but it is old and still widely used. A feeling of modesty often suggests its use instead of the pompous *I myself, me myself*: ‘General Lee surrendered the Army of Northern Virginia this afternoon on terms proposed by *myself*’ (U. S. Grant, *Telegram to E. M. Stanton*, April 9, 1865). The censure of the grammarians seems justified where the intensifying adjective is used instead of an ordinary personal pronoun which, though stressed, is not important enough to take after it an intensifying adjective: ‘There’s *only myself* and Louisa here’ (Hugh Walpole, *The Duchess of Wrexe*, Ch. XIII), instead of ‘There are only Louisa and *I* here.’ ‘A few moments later *Tommy and herself* (instead of *she and Tommy*) were speeding westward in a taxicab’ (W. J. Locke, *The Glory of Clementina*, Ch. XXIII). As in older English, the intensifying adjective is still in popular Irish English used at the beginning of a sentence instead of a personal pronoun, pointing backward to some person already mentioned: ‘*Mildred. Dear me, what’s the matter with Jack?* — *Bridget. Himself* (= *he*) is vexed about something’ (Lennox Robinson, *Harvest*, Act II). In commercial language simple *self* is often used instead of *myself*: ‘Pay *self* or order Ten Pounds’ (check). Sometimes also in colloquial speech: ‘As both *self* and wife were fond of seeing life, we decided,’ etc. (Sir John Astley, *Fifty Years of My Life*, II, 31).
As described in 11 2 c, we sometimes still use the objective form of the personal pronouns me, him, etc., as reflexive pronouns. This was normal usage in Old English and long remained so. To distinguish reflexive from personal pronouns and thus emphasize the reflexive idea, intensifying self was in Old English often added to the personal pronoun. These old intensive forms have become the modern normal reflexive pronouns himself, herself, itself, themselves (until about A.D. 1550 them selfe). This usage, once found with all the reflexives, is now confined to these four words. As early as the thirteenth century herself, which originally consisted of her, the objective form of the personal pronoun she, and intensifying self, was sometimes construed as being the possessive adjective her and the noun self. This conception affected other reflexive pronouns, so that we now employ several reflexives of this type: myself, thyself, ourself (after the plural of majesty and editorial we = myself), ourselves, yourselves, instead of meself, theeself, usself, usselves, youselves. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries its self was in limited use, but is now replaced by itself. In popular speech hisself, theirselves are common forms.

The simple form self survives as a noun made from the old adjective self: ‘a truth which purifies from self’; ‘love of self.’ ‘The next morning all the guests at the hotel except us (or ourselves, or our two selves) went back.’ ‘Have you hurt your little self?’ ‘Baby fell and hurt its dear little self.’ ‘I hope you are your old self again.’ ‘You must not blame anybody but your own self.’ ‘A man’s better self should lead him.’ ‘Sometimes one must think of one’s own self.’ The compound forms are sometimes needlessly used here instead of the simple form: ‘Himself is the only consideration with himself’ (Meredith, The Egoist, 231), instead of ‘Self is the only consideration with him.’

THE SUBSTANTIVE FUNCTION OF ADJECTIVES

57 1. Use of the Suffix ‘One.’ The adjective is used substantively when it stands alone like a substantive. The adjective used substantively, however, differs from a real substantive in that it is not used independently, but always refers to a preceding or following noun. The adjective used substantively sometimes has after it the suffix one (by some improperly called ‘prop-word’) to indicate that it refers to a preceding or following noun; sometimes it has no formal sign to indicate such a relation, the context alone suggesting it.

Pointing backward: ‘a white sheep and a black one’; ‘white sheep and black ones’; ‘this book and that one lying upon the table.’
'Here are two fine pencils. You may have either' (or either one). 'Here are two fine pencils. You may have both.' ‘Of these apples you may select any two.’

Pointing forward: ‘each (or each one) of the books which I hold in my hand’; ‘to every (now each) of the ministers one (heifer) and the rest to the poor’ (Winthrop, Journal, July, 1634); ‘promising to them and every (now every one) of them rewards’ (Slingsby, Diary, 420, A.D. 1658); ‘every one (or in older English, simple every) of the books upon the table’; ‘either (or either one) of these two books’; ‘neither (or neither one) of these two books’; ‘either (either one, or more accurately any one) of these three books’; ‘either (either one, or much more commonly any one) of these twelve books’; ‘none of the books,’ with singular or plural meaning, more commonly the latter, while with reference to one we usually say ‘not one of the books’; ‘some of the boys’ with plural meaning, but ‘I don’t know which one of them, but some one of them did it.’ ‘I don’t know which of the hats is mine.’

In American English and also the English of England, it is common to say: ‘All three boys have a good record at school, but I do not know which one’s is the best.’ ‘Here are the books. Which one is (or which ones are) yours?’ ‘Here are some new books. You may have whichever one (or whichever ones) you select.’ ‘Which (or which one) of these books is yours?’ ‘Which of these books are yours?’ But, especially in American English, where the reference becomes more general or indefinite, there is a strong tendency both in colloquial speech and the literary language to employ what one(s) or whatever one(s) in referring backward: ‘Our teacher is a stickler for dates but in examinations we never know what ones he will spring on us.’ ‘About the middle of the eighteenth century it (i.e., the French Academy) altered the spelling of five thousand words. Perhaps it would be juster to say that it indicated, in the case of a number of these, what one should be adopted of several forms which were then in use’ (Lounsbury, English Spelling, Ch. I, 51). ‘I have made some bad blunders in my life, and I may yet make still worse ones; but I have the consolation that whatever ones I shall make I shall have the sympathy of my wife.’

In general, the substantive relation is usually indicated by the accompanying one, but all, many, few, enough, both, and the cardinals two, three, etc., never take one. The use of one here is a modern innovation that has not yet become established with all adjectives. In older English, the adjective was inflected, so that the ending of the adjective in the substantive use was sufficient to indicate that the adjective had a relation to a preceding or
following noun. In Middle English, the inflection of the adjective was so reduced that it frequently had no ending at all. This often left the descriptive adjective in substantive use without any sign indicating its relation to a preceding or following noun: 'a knight a worthy and an able,' now a worthy one and an able one, or simply a worthy and able one. The feeling of the lack of a clear sign for the substantive relation led in the fourteenth century to the use of one. In certain British dialects, as in Scotch English, the old substantive form without one is still used: 'He is a fine lad and a clever' (George Macdonald, Robert Falconer, Ch. V). Also in certain American dialects, as in the mountains of Kentucky: 'A rude race they were, but a strong' (Lucy Furman, The Quare Women, p. 53).

Grammarians call this one a prop-word, but this term is a bad one, for one is here not a word at all. It is a suffix to indicate the substantive relation. Of course, one was originally a limiting adjective meaning one, referring backward or forward to a noun indicating some concrete thing, as can still be seen in our hesitation to use it where the noun to which the substantive form of the adjective refers is not a single object but a coherent mass or a group of individuals massed together, or, on the other hand, something abstract: 'I like bathing in salt water better than in fresh.' 'Efficiently trained troops should not be filled up with the partially trained.' 'He has no books other than English.' 'I judge of his public conduct by his private.' 'His religion is the Mohammedan.' But, in general, we now add one to an adjective in order to indicate the substantive relation, so that one assumes an abstract meaning and becomes a suffix. As a suffix, one is unstressed and should not be confounded with stressed one, which is a numeral, although it often has outwardly the form of the suffix when it follows the limiting adjectives any, some, no, this, that, my, etc.: 'You can have any one (or two, three) of these apples.' 'She might rescue from the mire some one struggling soul.' 'In no one instance was he your partner in any of these transactions.' 'He doesn't get so much pleasure from his many acres as we get from this one' (or our one). However, in 'I want every one of you to come' one in spite of its accent is not numeral one but the suffix of every. As can be seen in the third paragraph of this article, every one represents older every. The double stress here is a common feature of emphatic language in English. We find the same double stress in 'I want the candid opinion of each one of you.' 'I don't know which one of them, but some one of them did it.'

Since any other part of speech or a group of words is in English
often used as an adjective, as described in 10 I 2, one may be added as a suffix to any other part of speech or to a group of words that has the force of an adjective used substantively, pointing back to some preceding noun: ‘You can easily get another secretary. Another time you shall have a man one, as you originally wanted to’ (C. Haddon Chambers, The Tyranny of Tears, Act II).

‘On a side line was a little train that reminded Peter of the Treliss (town) to Truro (town) one’ (Hugh Walpole, Fortitude, p. 57).

‘This time it (i.e., the new idea) was an awfully better than usual one’ (De Morgan, The Old Madhouse, Ch. II). The substantive form of ‘as beautiful a sight as’ is ‘as beautiful a one as’: ‘The sight was as beautiful a one as I have ever seen.’ But we say, ‘The sight was one as beautiful as I have ever seen,’ corresponding to ‘a sight as beautiful as I have ever seen.’ As a genitive is often felt as an adjective, it often takes one in the substantive relation: ‘The higher course is a two years’ one’ (London Times, Educational Supplement, Aug. 8, 1918).

One was introduced much later with limiting than with descriptive adjectives, and with the former class it has not yet in many cases become established, since three of the limiting adjectives, these, those, others, have distinct plural form; a number of others, two, three, many, all, several, certain, etc., have distinct plural meaning, so that the thought thus through form or meaning becomes clear; others are accompanied by a gesture which indicates the situation; others are limited by a genitive or a relative clause which shows the thought, for an attributive genitive or relative clause can modify only a noun or an adjective used substantively: ‘these books and those,’ rarely those ones, but in popular speech often ‘these here books and those ones’ (or those, or them there ones); ‘those books and these,’ rarely these ones, but in popular speech often ‘them there books and these ones’ (or these, or these here ones); ‘these books and others upon my table’; ‘these books and two upon my table’; ‘this chair and that’ (accompanied by gesture); ‘my book and that of my brother’; ‘each of the books’; ‘which (or which one) of the books?’ One, however, is employed when it is needed to indicate clearly the thought: ‘any one (quite distinct in meaning from any one) of the books,’ to bring out clearly the singular idea in contrast to the plural idea in ‘any of the books’ and the idea of an indefinite amount in ‘[I don’t want] any of your nonsense’; ‘this book and that one (or the one) upon the table,’ to show that that indicates an individual, but ‘this sugar and that upon the table,’ to indicate a mass; ‘this pencil and that one (or the one) in my pocket,’ to express the idea of an individual, but ‘The pain of her mind had been much
beyond *that* in her head,' to refer to an abstract conception; 'thèses books and *thòse* (or *tònes*) upon the table,' because the plural form *those* brings out clearly the idea of a number of individuals. 'This butter is better than *that* (mass) we got last week, but it will probably not prove as good as *what* (indefinite mass) we shall get next week.' 'My father is a man of few affections, but *what* (indefinite number) he has are very strong' (Mrs. Gaskell, *Wives and Daughters*, Ch. XVIII). 'Which (indefinite number) of the books are the most interesting?' In connection with *same* and *such* we may use *one* or *ones* to bring out the idea of a concrete thing or distinct concrete things, but avoid these forms when the idea is abstract or indefinite: 'Her dress was the *same* (or the *same one*) she wore last week.' 'His shoes were the *same* (or the *same ones*) he wore last week,' but 'His condition remains the *same*.' 'His objections remain the *same*.' 'His cell was *such* (or *such a one*) as a convict would now disdain to inhabit,' but 'His kindness was *such* that I could not withstand it.'

There are several other categories of limiting adjectives in which *one* is only slowly gaining ground. In the case of the ordinals we often avoid *one*, since ordinals of themselves clearly indicate a relation to a preceding noun or pronoun: 'William is the second scholar of the class and Henry *the third*.' 'He *is the second* on the list.' Similarly, in expressions where the situation suggests that the substantive adjective stands in relation to a noun, especially in the case of two things that are closely associated: 'The right hand is clean and so is *the left*.' 'The southern dialect is more tenacious of these forms than *the northern*.' Sometimes here even in the case of descriptive adjectives: 'Only two balls — *the red* and *the white* — are used.' Similarly, in contrasts where persons and things of two different kinds are brought into close relations by way of contrast we usually avoid *one*: 'He could not bring himself to tackle new books, and *the old* had lost the potency of their appeal' (G. Cannan, *Round the Corner*, Ch. XXII). The use of *one* here would often weaken the expression.

In popular speech the personal pronouns are often used as adjectives, possessive adjectives, as described in 5a, p. 528. Hence it is only natural that as limiting adjectives they are used also substantively with the *one*-forms, the *one*-forms of the first and second persons often serving as personal pronouns: 'Did *you uns* sleep good last night?' (*American Speech*, II, p. 345). *Them + ones* becomes a demonstrative pronoun: 'these books and *them there ones*.'

The *one*-form is, in general, quite firmly established in the case of descriptive adjectives, since it is here needed to indicate sub-
stantive function. Examples are given on page 518. There are, however, certain limitations to the use of one here. It is still not necessary in case of reference to abstract nouns or nouns denoting a mass, as illustrated on page 520.

The comparative and the superlative of descriptive adjectives often do not need one, since in connection with the definite article, the degree ending, and the context they become in large measure limiting adjectives; i.e., they do not merely describe persons and things but assign to them a definite place and thus mark them so clearly as individuals that one is not necessary to indicate the grammatical relation: 'Which of the two brothers did it?' — 'The younger' (or 'The younger one'). But in 'the youngest of the two brothers,' 'the youngest of the brothers' one is not usually felt as necessary. One, however, is now, in contrast to older usage, felt by most people as indispensable after the indefinite article, since the reference is not clear and definite: 'This cord will not do; I need a stronger one.' 'I am not looking for a room today. I have just found a most comfortable one.'

The suffix one has come to stay because it is useful, but no one feels it as elegant. In choice language we try to avoid it. Hence we say 'mingling playful with pathetic thoughts' rather than 'mingling playful thoughts with pathetic ones.' We not infrequently repeat a preceding noun rather than employ one: 'An Oxford man will differ all his life from a Cambridge man' (The New Statesman, No. 152, 512a).

2. Difference of Nature between a Pure Pronoun and a Substantive Form of an Adjective. A form that is used only as a pronoun is a mere substitute for the name of a person or thing. In the case of I and you the pronoun in connection with the situation indicates the person. The pronouns he, she, it, they are mere substitutes for nouns that have already been mentioned. The interrogative who is used instead of a noun, since the speaker does not know the person and inquires after him. Nobody, somebody, nothing, something are mere substitutes for the names of persons and things so vaguely conceived that no names can be given.

Similarly, forms that are still often used as attributive — descriptive or limiting — adjectives become pronouns in the substantive relation, for they are here mere convenient substitutes for nouns or nouns modified by an adjective: 'the black sheep and the white one' (= white sheep); 'these books and those (= those books) on the table.' But the substantive forms of descriptive and limiting adjectives differ from pure pronouns such as you, I, he, she, etc., in one important point. They not only perform
the pronominal function, but they describe or point out, i.e., they have meaning, while the pure pronouns, meaningless and colorless, are mere conventional symbols standing for persons or things. These substantive forms differ from pure pronouns also in that they are freely modified by adherent (10 I) adjectives, betraying thus their substantive origin, their relation to some noun understood: ‘quaint old houses and beautiful new ones;’ ‘these books and all those;’ ‘these books and many more’ (a few more); ‘some fifty of them;’ ‘John, Fred, and some others;’ ‘some few of us,’ etc.

3. The Substantive Forms of Limiting Adjectives Used as Pronouns. A number of limiting adjectives when used in the substantive relation become pronouns, referring like a pronoun to a preceding noun or to a following modifying of-genitive, prepositional phrase, or a relative clause. The reference is sometimes definite, sometimes more or less indefinite. When the reference is intentionally entirely general and indefinite, the indefinite pronoun stands alone without referring to anything that precedes or follows, thus indicating a person or thing in only a vague way.

With definite reference, this, these, that, those, such and such a one, the former, the latter, both, either, neither, the first (one), the second (one), each (now often replacing older every) or each one, every one (or earlier in the period simple every), two, three, half, etc.: ‘Work and play are both necessary to health; this (or the latter) gives us rest, and that (or the former) gives us energy.’ ‘Dogs are more faithful animals than cats; these (or the latter) attach themselves to places, and those (or the former) to persons.’ ‘Hand me the books on the table and those on the window.’ ‘You may have these books, but give me those you hold in your hand.’ ‘Associate with such as will improve your manners.’ ‘Oh! it was hard that such a one should be chosen.’ ‘John and Henry, you shouldn’t quarrel. It isn’t either’s book.’ ‘John and Henry are not working hard. Neither’s record at school (or the record of neither of them at school) is creditable.’ ‘There are in this Isle two and twenty Bishops, which are as it were superentendaunts over the church, appoynting godlye and learned Ministers in every (now each) of their Seas,’ etc. (John Lyly, Euphues’ Glasse for Europe, Works, II, p. 192). ‘Each (or each one) of us has his just claims.’ ‘I want every one (in older English, simple every) of you to come.’ ‘Every (now every one) of this happy number That have (now has) endur’d shrewd days and nights with us shall share the good of our returned fortune’ (Shakespeare, As You Like It, V, iv, 178). ‘Half of the cake is gone.’ ‘Half of the cakes are gone.’ ‘The cake was cut in half, or in two (both
forms limiting adjectives used as plural pronouns), or into halves’ (plural noun). ‘He has a whole apple but I haven’t even half a one.’ Compare Parts of Speech, 7 7 b, and Accidence, 42 b.

With indefinite reference, all (singular and plural), none, this one and that, or this one and that one, any (plural), anyone (or earlier in the period simple any), any (= any amount), everyone, some (= a fair amount, and some people, earlier in the period also with the meaning of someone), someone (or earlier in the period simple some), many a one, such (5 b, p. 530), such and such a one, one, no one, another, others, much, etc. Examples: ‘All is not gold that glitters.’ ‘I haven’t any of your patience.’ ‘A woman’s injured honor, no more than a man’s, can be repaired by any (now anyone) but him that first wronged it’ (Wycheley, Country Wife, V, IV, 100). ‘Everyone knows better than that.’ ‘When a great aim miscarrieth, the blame must be laid on some’ (now someone) (Thomas Fuller, Holy War, II, 45). ‘Some agree with me, some do not.’ ‘There is much to learn.’ ‘If you want to know who such and such a one is (or such and such are), ask Jones.’ ‘He is always ordering me about and telling me to do such and such.’

Two neuter singualars, none and other, are treated in 5 b and c, pp. 532-534. Compare Parts of Speech, 7 7 c, and Accidence, 42 c.

The accusative singular of neuters, such as all, some, any, much, none, a little, is much used adverbially. See 16 4 a.

Four limiting adjectives — which, what, whichever, whatever — are used as indefinite relative pronouns (23 II, 2, 3): ‘Here are two hats, but I don’t know which one is mine.’ ‘Here are some new books. I don’t know which ones to select.’ ‘By quoting (we will not say whence — from what one of her poems) a few verses’ (Poe, Works, 565). ‘Here are a number of books on the subject. You may take whichever one (or ones) you like.’ ‘My father will approve these plans and whatever ones we may make in the future.’ Which and whichever have an s-genitive: ‘All three boys have a good record. I don’t know which one’s is the best, but whichever one’s is declared the best, it will not be much better than that of the others.’ Compare 5 a (close of 2nd par.), p. 527. When the reference is to an indefinite mass or number what and which do not take the one-form. See 1, p. 522. For fuller treatment of these forms see 1 (4th par.), p. 519; 23 II, 2, 3; Accidence, 38 b.

The substantive forms of the interrogative adjectives which and what are used as interrogative pronouns: ‘Here are several interesting books. Which one (or which ones) do you want?’ ‘The three sisters all have a good record. Which one’s is the best?’
The principal has requested us to propose some themes for future discussion. What ones are you going to suggest? For fuller treatment see Parts of Speech, 7 6, and Accidence, 41.

4. The Substantive Forms of Limiting Adjectives Used as Nouns. The substantive forms of certain limiting adjectives are also used as nouns: 'I have spent my all.' Other examples are given below under 5 and in 58 (last par.).

5. Special Substantive Forms and Their Use as Pronouns and Nouns:

a. Substantive Forms of Possessive Adjectives. The substantive forms of the possessive adjectives my, thy (in current American Quaker speech often thee; see p. 528), our, your, her, and their are mine, thine, ours, yours, hers, and theirs: 'My fault is serious' but 'The fault is mine.' 'This is our house' but 'This house is ours' and 'His house is larger than ours [is],' 'Their house is large' but 'This house is theirs.' His is used both as an attributive and a substantive form: 'It is his book' and 'The book is his.' His was also the usual form for things until the close of the sixteenth century, when its (in older English, often with the apostrophe, it's) began to replace it here: 'Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his (now its) savor,' etc. (Matthew, V, 13). This old usage lingered on until the close of the seventeenth century. The new form its developed out of the old possessive it, which arose in the fourteenth century in the western Midland dialects and later about 1600 became common elsewhere. About this time its new genitive form its came into use, which by reason of its distinctive genitive ending soon gained favor and supplanted older it and the still older his. The older form it occurs in the Bible of 1611, and in the original editions of Shakespeare: 'of it own accord' (Leviticus, XXV, 5, in the edition of 1611, in the edition of 1660 changed to its). Its was first used as an adjective, as in 'The salt has lost its savor,' and is now also sometimes used substantively: 'The children's health is poor except the baby's and its is perfect.' 'Women take to a thing, anything, and go (= let them go) deep enough, and they're its; they never, never will get away from it' (A. S. M. Hutchinson, This Freedom, p. 253).

We call these forms today adjectives, but they were originally the genitives of the personal pronouns I, thou, he, etc., most commonly a possessive genitive, but also often used in other functions of the genitive. We can often still feel the old genitive force: 'his (subjective genitive) love of his (possessive genitive) children'; 'my (objective genitive) punishment' (punishment of me). In the case of the double (10 II 1 b) genitive the form is
still always a genitive: 'that patient wife of yours.' In the predicate where the subject is not a noun but an indefinite pronoun, the form can be only the genitive of the pronoun: 'I don't want what is yours or anybody else's.' Where a noun is subject, the predicate may be regarded either as a substantive adjective form or the genitive of a personal pronoun: 'This hat is mine.' But in such a sentence as 'Yours is the greater treason, for yours is the treason of friendship' yours cannot possibly be construed as the genitive of the pronoun, for it is the subject of the sentence. It would be impossible to construe the construction as elliptical, as in 'John's is the greater treason, for his is the treason of friendship,' where we might supply the noun treason after John's and his. The fact that we cannot supply a noun after yours, mine, hers shows plainly that the old possessive genitive in all these cases has become a substantive adjective form, or we may call it a possessive pronoun, for in fact, according to 2, p. 523, the substantive form of an adjective is a pronoun. But it should be clearly understood that this pronoun is not the genitive of the old personal pronoun, but the nominative of the new pronoun, formed from the substantive form of the possessive adjective. Likewise the possessive genitive of any noun or pronoun which, unaccompanied immediately by a governing noun, points backward or forward to a preceding or following governing noun, becomes a substantive possessive adjective, or, in other words, a possessive pronoun, for we do not now here place a noun immediately after it: 'My hand is larger than John's.' 'Mary's is a sad fate.' Compare 5 c, p. 10. Even the genitive of the substantive form of an adjective used as a pronoun can be employed as a possessive pronoun in the nominative or the accusative: 'Both boys have a good record, but the younger one's is a little better.' 'All three boys have a good record. I don't know which one's is the best, but whichever one's is declared the best, it will not be much better than that of the others.' 'Both John and William have a good record. I regard the latter's as a little better.' Although possessive pronouns are freely employed in literary English, they are little used in Irish English: 'Who is this book belonging to?' — 'It's belonging to me, Teacher' (Mary Hayden and Marcus Hartog, The Irish Dialect of English) = 'Whose book is this?' — 'It is mine, Teacher.' There are no possessive pronouns in Gaelic; hence in the early Modern English period when the Irish people were struggling to acquire English, they naturally avoided this construction, so that it did not become well established in Ireland.

In older English, mine and thine were used both attributively
and substantively. In the twelfth century, they began in attributive function to lose their -n before consonants: ‘min (mine) arm,’ but ‘mi (my) fot’ (foot). This phonetic distinction disappeared about 1700, so that my, thy were used before vowels as well as consonants, thus becoming the regular attributive forms: my arm, my foot. As the old forms mine, thine had remained in constant use in substantive function, the differentiation just described became established, i.e., my, thy in attributive, mine, thine in substantive, function. The old attributive use of mine, however, still lingers in the language of affection: ‘sister mine,’ etc. The old forms in -r — her, our, their — were originally felt as the genitives of the personal pronouns she, we, they, as can still be felt in ‘We mourn their (objective genitive) loss’ (= ‘the loss of them’).

About 1300 an -s was added to these forms to make the genitive form more distinctive, her, our, their becoming hers, ours, theirs. As the old forms, however, continued to be used alongside of the new, they finally about 1550 became differentiated in function, as described on page 526. His and its, both originally genitives, are now the only forms which still perform both attributive and substantive functions. In the dialects in the south of England and in the Midland, also here and there in America among uneducated people, we find instead of the substantive forms his, hers, ours, yours, theirs the forms hisn, hern, own, yourn, theirn, where an n characterizes the substantive forms after the analogy of -n in the substantive forms mine and thine. In these sections and circles we find also the substantive form whosen instead of whose: ‘If it ain’t hisn, then whosen is it?’ In America sometimes also thisn, thatn, theseen, thosen: ‘Thisn is better’n thatn.’ ‘Theseen are better ’n thosen.’ On the other hand, in the attributive relation certain British and American dialects employ a personal pronoun instead of a possessive adjective: ‘at us (= our) own fireside’ (Lancashire); ‘arter we horses’ (Gepp, Essex Dialect Dictionary, p. 131) = after our horses. ‘He roll he (= his) eyeballs ‘roun’’ (Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, p. 69). ‘Look, Margaret, thee’s (4 II H, last par., and 8 I 1 h) tearing the skirt of thee dress’ (American Speech, Jan., 1926, p. 118). Similarly, who for whose: ‘SCIPIO. “I been to de trial.” VOICE. “Who trial?”’ (Edward C. L. Adams, Congaree Sketches, p. 4).

In the seventeenth century arose the usage of suffixing one to the possessive adjectives to form possessive pronouns. This development has never been strong, and is for the most part confined to British English: ‘When a woman is old . . . but my one! She’s not old’ (Trollope, The Duke’s Children, 3, 163). This form, however, becomes indispensable when the possessive
The substantive forms of possessive adjectives are used when two possessive adjectives or a possessive adjective and a genitive are connected by *and* and together modify a noun. This form is common in older English and sometimes still used, especially in writing. For example:

- "I bought them both the same day, mine and your ticket" (Sydney Smith, *Moral Philosophy*, 209, A.D. 1804–1806), now usually "your and my ticket" (or sometimes tickets) or more commonly and more clearly "your ticket and mine"; "mine and her souls" (Browning, *Cristina*, VI), now usually "my and her soul" (or sometimes souls) or more commonly and more clearly "my soul and hers"; "mine and my husband's fortunes" (Middleton-Rowley, *The Spanish Gipsie*, III, II, 125, A.D. 1661), now usually "my and my husband's fortune" (or sometimes fortunes), or more commonly and more clearly "my husband's fortune and mine." Sometimes the substantive form cannot be used here at all: "her and my mutual dislike." Compare 10 4.

The substantive forms are also used as nouns, indicating a family, a friend, a circle of friends, property, personal belongings or deserts, a letter, etc: "Do no harm to mine, and mine will do no harm to you." 'He and his are all well.' 'Yours truly' (at the close of a letter). 'He doesn't seem to know the distinction between mine and thine.' ‘Everything of mine is at your disposal.’ 'Well, little Miss Stuck-up, you got yours at last, didn't you?' (Floyd Dell, *The Mad Ideal*, II, Ch. V) = 'got what was coming to you.' 'I have just received yours (= your letter) of the eighteenth.'

The idea of possession in the possessive adjectives is often emphasized by adding the adjective *own*, both in the attributive and the substantive relation: 'It is my own book.' 'The book is my own,' where *my* is attributive and *own* the substantive form. 'It had a value all its own.'

In connection with a verb, *own* preceded by a possessive adjective often emphasizes the idea of independent action on the part of the subject: 'She makes her own dresses' = 'She makes her dresses herself.' 'He rolls his own' (cigarettes). In the predicate after a copula, *own* preceded by a possessive adjective often emphasizes the idea of independence on the part of the subject: 'I am my own master.'

*Own* preceded by a possessive must often be used instead of a simple possessive to make it clear that the reference is to the subject, not to some noun standing near the possessive: 'He seems to love his brother's son more than his own.'
Own preceded by a possessive adjective is often used as a noun: 'I have a house of my own.' 'May I have it for my very own?' 'I can do what I will with my own.' 'He is coming into his own.' 'He is holding his own.' 'In a period of hard struggle it adds to our strength to feel that our own believe in us.' 'She has a will of her own.' 'He had reasons of his own for doing it.'

b. Substantive Forms of 'One,' 'No.' One is used attributively or substantively without change of form; of course, usually only in the singular: 'I have only one apple.' 'How many apples have you?' — 'I have only one.' Often unstressed with indefinite force, referring to a noun preceded by the indefinite article: 'Take an apple.' — 'I already have one.' One is used not only with reference to a noun but also often with reference to a noun and its modifying descriptive adjective: 'It's my town. It could be a mighty good town. It's going to become one' (Oemler, Slippy McGee, Ch. VI). Attributive one often has pronounced indefinite force: 'I met him one night, on one occasion.'

In the substantive relation, indefinite reference is in the singular expressed by one when it is desired to refer back to a noun that has just been mentioned, but such is sometimes still as in older usage employed here: 'He is a friend, and I treat him as one.' 'Two or three low broad steps led to a platform in front of the altar, or what resembled such' (Scott, Aunt Margaret's Mirror, II), or now more commonly one. As indefinite one cannot refer back to an abstract noun or any other noun that does not denote an individual, person or thing, it is here usually replaced by it, this, or such: 'I offer you my cooperation if this will help you.' Similarly, as indefinite one usually has no plural, it is replaced here by they, these, or such: 'I should like to find other examples if they are to be had.' 'To call for more facts and experiments, if such are possible' (Geike in Nature, Sept. 19, 1889).

When the reference is not to an individual or individuals indicated by a preceding noun, but to the idea of specific character or capacity, such is the usual pronoun: 'It is needless to demonstrate that a poem is such only inasmuch as it intensely excites by elevating the soul' (Poe, Philosophy of Composition, p. 4). 'A heroic poem, truly such' (Dryden, Æneid, Dedication). 'He is a member of this organization, and as such he deserves a hearing.' But one(s) may be employed here when the form is used determinatively (56 A), pointing to a following clause or phrase: 'Why not plain white for the walls and no curtains at all, until you can get ones (or such as) you really do like?' (Mackenzie, Guy and Pauline, p. 57). 'It is a matter of common notoriety that the habitual drinker, even one who (= such a one as) drinks in modera-
tion, desires to buy his liquor a drink at a time' (The Christian Science Monitor, March 29, 1930). Compare 56 A (5th par.) and Parts of Speech, 7 7 c (3rd par.).

Provided the word is unstressed, the indefinite substantive form drops out in the predicate relation after the copula be, regularly in the plural, often also in the singular: 'They are members, and we are too.' 'He is a member, and I am too' (or 'I am one too'). But 'They have been friends to us, and such we want to be to them.'

Indefinite one is also used as an absolute indefinite pronoun, i.e., without reference to a noun that has been previously mentioned, usually with a genitive in -s: 'He died in 1859, leaving his property to one Ann Duncan' (i.e., to a certain one, namely; Ann Duncan, the name standing in apposition with one). 'He looked like one [who was] dead.' 'One must do one's duty.' The reflexive form is either one's self or oneself, the former, the older form, after the analogy of a man's better self, one's own self, myself (56 D, last and next to last parr.), the latter, the newer form, after the analogy of himself (56 D, next to last par.), both forms in common use in America, while in England the newer form is probably more common than the older: 'One should not praise one's self' (or oneself). Both one's self and oneself, however, are comparatively recent formations, which do not occur in Shakespeare. In older English, himself was used here.

The nominative, genitive, dative, accusative corresponding to indefinite one in present-day English are one, one's, one, one, but the older forms he, his, him, him still linger on: 'One never realizes one's blessings while one enjoys them.' 'One hates one's enemies and loves one's friends.' 'In life one only notices what interests one' (but in Galsworthy's Patrician, p. 48, we find here him as in older English). 'Vulgar habit that is people have nowadays of asking one, after one has given them an idea, whether one is serious or not' (Oscar Wilde, A Woman of No Importance, Act I). But he, his, him correspond to the numeral one, to one . . . another, and to no one, someone, everyone, anyone: 'One of these men hates his enemies.' 'One hates his enemies and another forgives his.' 'If someone (or anyone) should lose his purse, he should apply to the Lost Property Office.' Similarly, the reflexive object one's self, or oneself, corresponds to the indefinite subject one, while himself corresponds to the numeral one, to one . . . another, and to no one, someone, everyone, anyone: 'One cannot interest one's self in everything,' but 'One of the boys fell and hurt himself' and 'No one can interest himself in everything.' We often, however, hear himself instead of one's self or oneself,
as in older English: ‘One might fall and hurt himself.’ In careless expression we often find here even in good authors a plural form corresponding to one: ‘As though one went to tea with a woman for the sake of talking about the very things you (= one) have been doing all day’ (Mrs. Ward, *Sir George Tressady*, I, Ch. V). ‘One must be on their (= one’s) guard against bargains that are worthless’ (Rev. E. J. Hardy, *How to Be Happy Though Married*, Ch. XII, 128).

The substantive form of attributive no is none: ‘Lend me your pencil.’ — ‘I have none,’ or ‘I haven’t any.’ ‘Of all the crimes committed by Englishmen none is so hideous as this.’ ‘None of the books is (or are) fit to read,’ or to convey emphasis we replace none in the singular by nót óne but retain it in the plural: ‘Nót óne of the books is fit to read,’ but ‘Nóné of the books are fit to read.’ ‘I have no fear, if you have none.’ ‘Where are the apples?’ — ‘There are none.’ ‘Give me another pen!’ — ‘I have no other,’ where no is attributive and other the substantive form. In answer to the question ‘Have you four-bladed knives?’ it was once common to say ‘We have no such,’ where no is attributive and such the substantive form. Today the answer in rather choice language is ‘We have none such,’ where none is the substantive form and such a predicate adjective, none such thus having the force of none that are of that kind. The more common answer is ‘We haven’t any of that kind’ (or sort).

In older English, emphatic nót a óne is often used instead of nót óne, and this older usage survives in colloquial speech: ‘There’s nót a óne of them but in his house I keep a servant fee’d’ (Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, III, iv, 131). After the analogy of nót a bøy, etc., we say nót a óne: ‘There isn’t a boy absent, no, nót a óne.’ Similarly, nèver a óne is still sometimes used instead of nèver óne: ‘I have sung many songs, But nèver a óne so gay’ (Tennyson, *Poet’s Song*, 19). In popular speech, in England and America, the contraction nary (i.e., ne’er a from never a) is common, often with a repetition of a, as it is not felt in the contraction: ‘Ask others for a loan. You’ll get nary one (or nary a one, or nary red [cent], or nary a red) from me.’

The two forms no and none come from the Old English singular form nān = ne + ān, i.e., not one, ne being the old negative and ān the form corresponding to modern one. In Old English, the form nān was used both attributively and substantively; in attributive function standing either before a noun beginning with a vowel or one beginning with a consonant. Later, as in the case of the possessives in a, there arose two attributive forms, no before consonants, as in no good, and none before a vowel, as in
to none effect (More, *Utopia*, 87). Later, about 1600, no became established as the attributive form in all positions, i.e., before a vowel or a consonant, while none remained in the substantive relation, the differentiation described on the preceding page. Older usage still lingers on before other: ‘On these terms it shall be, and upon none others’ (Allen, *The Woman Who Did*, 57), now usually no others, as explained on page 532.

The form none is used in older English, and sometimes still in choice language, also as an indefinite pronoun referring to one person. Today it is more common to use no one for one person and none for more than one: ‘No one (or nobody) gave him anything.’ ‘None are so deaf as those that will not hear.’

None is used also as a neuter pronoun with the force of not any: ‘It is none of my business.’ ‘None of your cheek, please!’ ‘None of your tricks!’ Just as the adverbial accusative of the neuter pronoun nought has developed into the negative not, so has the adverbial accusative of the neuter pronoun none developed the force of a negative with much the same meaning as an emphatic not: ‘I am none the less obliged to you.’ ‘I was none too sure of it.’

c. **Substantive Forms of ‘Other.’** The form remains unchanged in the singular and takes –s in the plural, or to emphasize the idea of individual units the form with one or ones may be used: ‘this book and the other, another, one other, no other’; ‘this book and two others, the others, several others’; ‘these books and no others.’ ‘These apples are larger and more beautiful than the other ones.’ In older English, there was in the simple form no plural ending as a result of the disappearance of the ending which originally was found here: ‘Some seeds fell by the wayside. . . . But other fell into good ground’ (Matthew, XIII, 4–8). This old plural without an ending is still often found alongside of the more common new plural others when the noun or pronoun to which it refers follows it: ‘many others (or other) of the men and women I met last night,’ but always ‘this book and others of the same kind,’ since the noun to which it refers precedes it. The old endingless form is still, however, the rule before than wherever the noun to which it refers follows it, for it is here used not substantively but attributively: ‘I have never heard other than laudable things said of him.’ The other before than is also often not a substantive form but an ordinary predicate adjective: ‘These precepts lighted her to conclusions [which were] quite other than those at which he had arrived himself.’ ‘I would not have my boys other (objective predicate) than they are.’

In appositive function we often use after pronouns the adverb else instead of other: who else; somebody else; anybody else;
no one else; nothing else, etc.; genitive: who else's (or whose else); somebody else's; anybody else's; no one else's. Thus else here now usually forms a compound with the preceding pronoun. Compare Accidence, 40 and 41.

Other is used also as a pronoun: 'He and another, no other'; 'they and two others, no others.' 'The thief was no (or in choice language still sometimes none) other than his own son.' 'They rode for miles in silence, each knowing what was passing in the other's mind.' 'What understanding of others' pains she had!' 'Nor could his private friends do other (anything else) than mournfully acquiesce.' 'He spoke no more and no other (once more common, now usually replaced by nothing else) than he felt' (A. Hope, Rupert of Hentzau, 153). The accusative of the pronoun other was once used adverbially with the force of otherwise and this older usage still lingers. Compare Accidence, 42 c (4th par. from end).

When other refers to a plural subject, it is used in connection with each or one to indicate a reciprocal relation, each other (with reference to two, or often two or more), one another (sometimes with reference to two, usually, however, to more than two):
'These two never weary of each other,' or in genitive form 'each other's company.' 'The three gentlemen looked at one another with blank faces,' or in genitive form 'The three never weary of one another's company.'

ADJECTIVES AND PARTICIPLES
USED AS NOUNS

58. In English more easily than in most languages a word can be converted, i.e., made into another part of speech. This usually takes place without any modification whatever, except, of course, the necessary change of inflection. Thus the noun eye is converted into a verb by merely giving it verbal inflection: 'They eyed the prisoners with curiosity.' As adjectives are now always uninflected, the conversion of nouns, adverbs, phrases, and sentences into adjectives is very easy. Compare 10 I 2. On the other hand, the conversion of adjectives into nouns is more difficult and irregular. In Old English, adjectives, converted into nouns, often retained their old adjective form. In many cases this old usage survived even after the adjective endings had disappeared; in other cases the loss of the adjective endings brought about new forms of expression. The breakdown of the adjective inflection at the close of the Middle English period forced the English people, who are fond of short-cuts in language, to do something contrary
to their nature — to go a roundabout way to express themselves. If we now say the good it can only mean that which is good, but in older English, according to the form of article, it could mean the good man, the good woman, the good thing. We now regularly use man, woman, and thing here, but there are numerous individual survivals of the older use of the simple adjective where the situation of itself without the help of the form of article or adjective makes the thought clear. Of persons: the deceased; the dear departed; my intended; the accused; the condemned; a lover clasping his fairest; my dearest (in direct address), etc. In a few cases a modern genitive form has been created: the Almighty’s strong arm; her betrothed’s sudden death, etc. A number have a genitive singular in –’s and a plural in –s, since they have become established as regular nouns: a savage, genitive a savage’s, plural savages. Similarly, native, equal, superior, private, male, three-year-old, grown-up, Christian, criminal, etc. ‘She is such a silly!’ ‘They are such sillies!’

Alongside of modern plurals here in –s are a number of older plurals without an ending, which are the reduced forms of still older inflected forms: my own (i.e., my kindred); the rich; the poor; the really (adverb) poor; the seriously (adverb) wounded; the worst (adverb) wounded; the living and the dead; the blind; our wounded; 2000 homeless poor; a new host of workless walking the streets; four other accused; 2000 killed and wounded; rich and poor; old and young; big and little. These nouns usually have no case ending throughout the plural, taking the modern forms of inflection: the wounded; gave food and drink to the wounded; the friends of the wounded. The s-genitive is rare: ‘Always just the pausing of folks for the bit of offhand chat and then the hurrying away to their own dinner bells and their own’s voices, calling’ (Fannie Hurst, ‘White Apes,’ in Forum for March, 1924, p. 290).

These nouns without an ending in the plural have been preserved because in the competition between the old and the new plural in older English they became differentiated in meaning. They acquired collective force: ‘The poor of our city,’ but ‘the two poor men entering the gate’; ‘the state of the heathen and their hope of salvation,’ but ‘Smith and Jones are regular heathens.’ On account of the lack of a plural ending the old uninflected plural, however, is usually ambiguous, so that we often cannot use it at all. We may say ‘the poor of the South,’ but we must say ‘the blacks (or the black people) of the South,’ for the black now suggests a singular idea since it is sometimes used in the singular, thus now being felt as a noun: ‘‘Fetch a light,’’ she said to the black
who opened for us’ (S. Weir Mitchell, *Hugh Wynne*, Ch. XXVII). We say also ‘the whites of the South.’ The old form is thus in quite limited use. A pastor might say to his congregation ‘I urge old and young,’ but he could not say ‘I desire to meet after our service the young.’ He would say the young people. But we say ‘a picture of a willow-wren feeding its young’ (or young ones). In a broad sense the young is used also of human beings: ‘Men rode up every minute and joined us, while from each village the adventurous young ran afoot to enter our ranks’ (T. E. Lawrence, *Revolt in the Desert*, p. 303).

Since the names of some peoples have been made from adjectives, as the English, the French, the old uninflected adjective plural has become productive here, and is now used with many names of peoples: the Swiss (in older English Swisses), Portuguese (in older English Portugueses), Japanese, Chinese, etc. We sometimes use the same form for the singular just as we use ‘the deceased’ for the singular, but we avoid these singulars since we feel these forms as plurals and prefer to say ‘a Portuguese gentleman, lady,’ etc. In Chinaman, plural Chinamen or Chinese, we have, for singular and plural, forms which may become established. The singular Chinee, a back-formation from the plural Chinese, is common in a derogatory sense. We usually say ‘three, four Chinamen,’ but ‘10,000 Chinese, the Chinese’ (not the Chinamen, although in a narrow sense we may say ‘the Chinamen sitting on the bench yonder’). The uninflected plural is especially common with the names of uncivilized or less civilized peoples: the Iroquois, Navaho, Hupa, Ojibwa, Omaha, Blackfoot, Duala, Bantu, Swahili, etc. Here the same form is freely used also as a singular: a Blackfoot, etc. We say the English, French or Englishmen, Frenchmen, but in the singular only Englishman, Frenchman. Many other words, however, may assume the new, more serviceable, type with the genitive singular and the plural in –s: a German, a German’s, the Germans; an American, an American’s, the Americans; a Zulu, a Zulu’s, the Zulus; and even many of those given above with uninflected plural: an Omaha, an Omaha’s, the Omahas. The plural of Blackfoot is often Blackfeet.

In some cases we make nouns out of the substantive form (57 1), i.e., the one-form: the Crucified One; the Evil One. ‘He is a queer one.’ My dear ones; our little ones; my loved ones; the great ones of earth, etc.

In a few cases nouns made from adjectives may drop the article as in older English: ‘My good lady made me proud as proud can be’ (Richardson, *Pamela*, III, 241). ‘Eleven years old does this sort of thing very easily’ (De Morgan, *Joseph Vance*, Ch. XV).
‘Sweet Seventeen is given to day-dreams.’ ‘Slow and steady wins the race.’ ‘For ’tis the eternal law That first in beauty should be first in might’ (Keats, Hyperion, II, 228). ‘First come, first served.’ ‘First come, first in.’ In plain prose an article is usually placed before the noun: ‘He is strong for an eleven-year-old.’ ‘I was the first one served.’ ‘We were the first ones served.’

Nouns made from adjectives often denote lifeless things, usually with a meaning more or less general or indefinite. They are usually preceded by the definite article or some other limiting adjective: the present (= the present time); the beautiful; the sublime. ‘You ask the impossible.’ ‘He did his best.’ As such forms, though now employed as nouns, were originally adjectives, they still are often, like adjectives, modified by adverbs: the genuinely lovable; the relatively unknown, etc. There are still many neuter nouns made from adjectives, but in older English, the tendency to use them was stronger than today. A number of these nouns have since been replaced by other words: ‘Let me enjoy my private’ (Shakespeare, Twelfth Night, III, i, 99), now privacy. ‘Whereat a sudden pale (now paleness) . . . . Usurps her cheeks’ (id., Venus and Adonis, 589).

While the neuter nouns made from adjectives now usually have the definite article or some other limiting adjective before them, we still not infrequently find the older articleless form, especially in the case of two adjectives connected by and: ‘I can spy already a strain of hard and headstrong in him’ (Tennyson). ‘That is good, but there is worse to follow.’ ‘There is worse ahead.’

The modified or unmodified form has become fixed in many set expressions: in the dark; after dark; through thick and thin; from grave to gay; to keep to the right; to go to the bad; to go from bad to worse; to make short of long; the long and the short of it; before long. ‘After frequent interchange of foul and fair’ (Tennyson, Enoch Arden, 529). ‘The police came up to see fair between both sides’ (London Daily News, March 11, 1891).

A large number of neuters have become concrete nouns: German; Luther’s German; the German of the present time; my German; a daily (paper), plural dailies; a weekly, plural weeklies; the white of an egg, the whites of eggs. ‘What is the good of lying?’ ‘It is no good trying to conceal it,’ but the plural goods has a much more concrete meaning. A large number are employed only in the plural: greens, woolens, tights, necessaries, movables, valuables, the Rockies, etc.

Most of the adjectives used as nouns in the examples given above are descriptive adjectives, but also some limiting adjectives
are used as nouns: ‘He has lost his all.’ ‘He and his (57 5 a) are all well.’ ‘I wrote you the details in my last’ (= last letter). ‘He was successful from the first’ (= the beginning). Proper adjectives are limiting adjectives. They can, of course, be used also as nouns: a German; a German’s; the Germans, etc. The use of these adjectives as nouns is treated on page 536.
59. There is often a conflict between form and meaning. A singular form is often plural in meaning and a plural often singular. A form that is a plural in one generation may be interpreted as a singular by the next. Thus there arise certain difficulties in the use of the plural. Some of the more common or more peculiar are treated here.

1. Collective Nouns. While in general the singular denotes one and the plural more than one, in certain cases the opposite may be true, namely, that one denotes many and many one. A group of persons or things may be felt as a unit, a whole: the gentry; the army; the navy; the cavalry; the infantry; the police; the public; fruit; poultry; a dozen; a score; a myriad; the seaworthiness of the English craft, etc. 'Poultry is high here.' For the number of the verb see 8 I 1 d. In spite of the singular form here the idea of a plurality, a number of individuals, is so strong that we not infrequently find before these collective nouns a limiting adjective plural in form or meaning: 'the hostile feelings with which the child regarded all these offspring of her own heart and mind' (Hawthorne, The Scarlet Letter, 104); 'many gentry' (Barrie, The Little Minister, 268); 'eighty clergy' (Caine, The Christian, p. 266); '80,000 cattle.' 'Some few infantry were doubling out into the defence position' (T. E. Lawrence, Revolt in the Desert, p. 275). 'About a dozen fruit are setting, of which at least half will ripen.' Such nouns when used as subject quite commonly require a plural verb, as in the last two examples. See also 8 I 1 d.

With a number of words there are two forms, a singular to express the idea of oneness, a distinct type, and a plural to indicate different individuals or varieties within a group or type: 'an abun-
dance of good fruit, of good grain,' but 'the fruits and grains of Europe'; 'peasant folk, gentlefolk,' but more commonly folks where the idea of individuals is prominent: 'young folks, old folks.' 'It is bedtime for folks who want to get up early in the morning.' 'His folks are rich.' 'Why should I expose myself to the shot of the enemy?' but 'Two shots hit the mast.' 'We have just enough shell for one more attack' (Sir Ian Hamilton, Gallipoli Diary, p. 340), but 'Two more shells exploded not far away.' 'The one half of his brain,' but 'He blew out his brains' and 'Perhaps I haven't brains (intellectual powers) enough to understand metaphysics.' To indicate the idea of separate units we often use another word in plural form in connection with the collective noun: 'our cattle,' but 'forty head of cattle'; 'the furniture of our room,' but 'three pieces of furniture.' In a few cases the collective singular is used also as a plural: 'the English people' (collective singular) and 'Many good people (plural) believe this.' 'The cannon (collective singular) were still thundering at intervals' (J. T. Trowbridge, The Drummer Boy, Ch. XXIII) and 'she did not seem aware of the gallant figure standing between the two little bright brass cannon' (plural) (Tarkington, Mirthful Haven, Ch. I). Sometimes the plural expresses a part of a whole, hence has less extensive meaning than the singular: 'She has gray hairs' indicating a smaller number than 'She has gray hair.'

Of course, a collective noun can always take plural form to indicate different groups of the same kind: 'the army of France,' but 'the armies of Europe'; 'the English people,' but 'the peoples of Europe.'

2. Plural Used as Singular. A number of individual things expressed by the plural form of the noun may acquire a oneness of meaning, so that in spite of the plural form we use the noun as a singular: pains (8 I 2 f); means (8 I 2 f); news (8 I 2 f); tidings (8 I 2 f); amends (a singular or a plural); barracks (sometimes a singular, usually a plural); links (sometimes a singular, usually a plural); stamina (Latin plural used as a singular); odds (used as a singular in the meaning of difference; elsewhere a plural; see 8 I 2 f); works (usually a plural, but often, especially in England, a singular in a gasworks, an ironworks, etc., where Americans often prefer plant, as it can form a plural: a gas plant, gas plants, etc.); smallpox (for smallpocks, the singular still preserved in poxmarks); measles; mumps; lazybones; sobersides; gallows; innings, the usual British singular and plural, but in America the singular is inning and the plural innings except in such figurative expressions as 'The Democrats now have their innings' (singular) and 'It is your innings (singular = opportunity) now'; a bellows
(or more commonly a pair of bellows); the bellows (plural, sometimes singular: 'The bellows need — sometimes needs — mending'); two bellows (or more commonly two pairs of bellows); a rather uncomfortable ten minutes; another two weeks; every five minutes; every five miles. 'Their (i.e., the rivers') confluence was above the town a good two miles' (Owen Wister, The Virginian, Ch. XXXV).

We say 'desirous of seeing another United States than that of today' and feel the name of our country often as singular in many other expressions, while in others the plural idea is more natural to us, as in these United States, etc. The names of sciences in -ics (the singular form in -ic still found in arithmetic, magic, music, rhetoric), as in mathematics (comprising the various branches of this subject), physics, etc., are, in spite of their plural form, now usually felt as singulars; while the names of practical matters, as gymnastics, athletics, politics, tactics, etc., are now usually felt as plurals. See 8 I 2 f. In older English, a number of plurals could be treated as singulars preceded by much when the idea of quantity or mass was present: 'much (now many) goods' (Luke, XII, 19); 'much (now many) people' (Acts, XI, 26). Older 'Much oats is grown here' is now replaced by 'Large quantities of (or in colloquial speech lots of) oats are grown here.' On the other hand, there are a number of old plurals now regarded as singulars. We treat such plurals as Des Moines, Athens, Brussels, etc., as singulars, since we do not feel them as plurals; but certain other proper names we treat as plurals, since we still feel the plural form: 'Kew Gardens, which have become famous throughout the world' (Ferrars, Rambles through London Streets, p. 83).

3. Plural Nouns with Form of Singular. The Old English plural of neuters had a form like the singular, as still preserved in 'one sheep, two sheep.' Shakespeare still sometimes used the old plural horse: 'I did hear The galloping of Ziorse' (Macbeth, IV, i, 140), now horses. The old plural horse survives only in the sense of cavalry: 'the enemy's horse.' When the new plural in -s came into use the old plural lingered for a while and finally became in a number of cases differentiated in meaning, so that this type has been preserved and has even become productive, influencing other words. The plural in -s is applied to words taken separately; the one that takes no plural ending, in accordance with its apparently singular form, is, in a few expressions, once more numerous, invested with collective force to express weight and measure, especially in British English and in popular American English: 15 pound; a few ton; a few hundredweight (in universal use) of coal; five brace of birds; ten gross (in universal use) of buttons; a gross = twelve dozen (thought of as a mass; in this sense in universal use);
often forty head of poultry, cattle; ten yoke of oxen; three score and ten; a couple of year (dialect in mountains of Kentucky). We often hear ‘He is not more than five foot ten.’ ‘I should say that three pound ten were plenty.’ In older English, the plural pair was used in the literary language, but today the literary plural is pairs, the form pair surviving as plural only in colloquial and popular speech. In older English, the plural sail (= ship) was common: ‘a fleet of thirty sail’ (Hume, History, III, p. 448).

On the other hand, in the case of gregarious animals, where the idea of separate individuals is not pronounced, the plurals without -s are still common, even increasing. We now regularly say ‘a herd of deer’; ‘two carp’; ‘two perch’; ‘a string of fish’; ‘a boatload of fish’; ‘I caught six fish.’ Vermin is now used so much as a plural that it has become rare as a singular. The singular form is widely employed by hunters of game also as a plural: to hunt pig (but to raise pigs); kill duck (but raise ducks); a jungle abandoned to water fowl (but the fowls have gone to roost). ‘I shot two elk and some antelope’ (Theodore Roosevelt, Letter to Henry Cabot Lodge, June 19, 1886). ‘There was plenty of lion about this camp, but few buffalo’ (Mary Hastings Bradley, Caravans and Cannibals, IX, A.D. 1925). ‘Very soon the little dog treed a flock of partridge’ (E. T. Seton, Rolf in the Woods, Ch. XXXI). In older English, the idea of separate individuals was still firm in a number of cases: ‘five loaves and two fishes’ (Matthew, XIV, 17). ‘We ate the carp’ (Swift). ‘A dish of trouts’ (Macaulay, History of England, I, Ch. III). We still say crabs, lobsters, oysters, eels, sharks, whales, etc. Usage here is very capricious.

The plural without -s, so common in nouns representing animal life, is sometimes found also in nouns representing plant life, as also here the idea of separate individuals is sometimes not pronounced: ‘The crowd had destroyed my pleasure in Azrak, and I went off down the valley to our remote Ain el Essad, and lay there all day in my old lair among the tamarisk’ (T. E. Lawrence, Revolt in the Desert, p. 268). ‘In spring and early summer, daffodils, daffodils, bluebells, honeysuckle, cowslips, are seen on every side’ (Calendar of Historic and Important Events, A.D. 1930, p. 41).

The noun ski often has the same form for the plural when the plural idea is not prominent: ‘We traveled on ski,’ but ‘Two broken skis were lying on the ground.’

4. Names of Materials. Names of materials do not from their very nature admit of a plural in the usual sense: wine, gold, copper, silver, etc.

a. The plural is often used to indicate different species, varieties, or grades of the same thing: French wines, Rhine wines, etc. An-
other word in plural form is often used in connection with the material to indicate different varieties: different teas or sorts of tea.

b. The plural often denotes definite portions of the material: ‘He washed his hair’ (mass), but ‘The very hairs of your head are numbered.’ ‘My father is sowing turnip-seed (in mass) in the garden,’ but ‘There are 100 seeds in this packet.’ ‘We are carrying a fine line (or stock) of linens.’ ‘Silks and satins put out the kitchen fire’ (proverb). A glass (drinking utensil), plural glasses; a copper (coin), plural coppers; iron (for ironing), plural irons, etc.

5. Abstract Nouns. Abstract nouns do not admit of a plural as a rule: beauty; the beautiful; liberty; disease, etc.

a. They have a plural when they assume concrete force by representing concrete objects, or by indicating a number of kinds or distinct actions or concrete manifestations: writing (in the abstract) without a plural; writing in the sense of book, work, plural writings; thus also beauties (of nature); liberties; diseases. ‘Hopes, suspicions are entertained.’ In words like filings, sweepings, we have plurals indicating the concrete results of the abstract actions filing, sweeping.

b. The plural of abstract nouns sometimes expresses a part of a whole, hence has less extensive meaning than the singular: ‘truth broader than truths.’ ‘There are a number of pronounced successes to his credit, but he has not as yet attained to full success.’ ‘She possessed certain perfectly definite beauties, like her hair’ (Edwin Balmer, The Breath of Scandal, Ch. II). ‘No, it wasn’t their manners that bewildered me, but their manner’ (Lewis Browne, The American Magazine, Jan., 1929, p. 7). ‘The facts in the case are clear,’ but ‘In our scientific libraries are vast stores of fact.’

Sometimes both singular and plural have abstract force but different shades of abstract meaning: ‘He had nerve but no nerves’ (Walter Noble Burns, The Saga of Billy the Kid, Ch. V) = ‘He had physical courage but no nervousness.’

c. A number of abstract nouns cannot form a plural in the usual way, but with the help of another noun in plural form can convey the idea of a number of concrete manifestations of the abstract idea: gratitude, expressions of gratitude; fortune, pieces, or strokes, of fortune; death, deaths, or cases of death.

6. Nouns without a Singular. Some words occur only in the plural since the things represented are never simple in their make-up, so that the plural idea is uppermost in our minds: the Alps, annals, ashes (from the furnace, stove), athletics, bellows, billiards, the Cyclades, the Dardanelles, dregs, eaves (8 I 2 f), entrails, goods, lees, the Netherlands, nuptials, oats, obsequies, pincers, proceeds, the
Pyrenees, riches, scales (for weighing), scissors, shears, spectacles (eyeglasses), stocks (timbers on which a ship rests during construction), suds, tweezers, tongs, trousers, victuals, vitals, etc. The plural contents is the usual form of the word, as in the contents of a purse, a drawer, a barrel, a book. But the singular is sometimes used in abstract meanings, holding capacity, substance as opposed to form, sum of inner qualities: ‘Gaugers glance at a barrel to tell its content.’ ‘In this course on English literature we shall turn our attention, not only to structure, but also to the content of what is read.’ ‘Many judge a book by its ethical content.’ Usually we say, ‘the scissors, pincers, etc., are on the table,’ but the singular form of the verb is sometimes used where the tool is thought of as a unit: ‘There is a scissors, pincers, etc., on the table,’ or in careful language much more commonly ‘There is a pair of scissors, pincers, etc., on the table.’

7. Plural of ‘Kind,’ ‘Sort,’ ‘Manner.’ When the reference is to more kinds than one, we employ the plural here: ‘There are many kinds of apples.’ In older English, manner often seemingly had no distinctively plural form. In certain expressions it seemingly still has a plural like the singular: ‘We played all manner of games.’ The explanation is that all here retains the old meaning of every, so that this example really means ‘We played every kind of game.’ Thus the form manner here is really a singular.

Where the reference is to only one kind, we often hear the singular form kind after the plural limiting adjectives these, those: ‘these kind of apples’ = ‘apples of this kind.’ In all such expressions kind has the force of a genitive dependent upon a governing noun. At the close of the Old English period the genitive was still always used here. The genitive form employed was cynnes, the Old English equivalent of of kind, but as an s-genitive it always stood before the governing noun: ‘alles cynnes deor’ = ‘animals of every kind.’ Later cynnes lost its genitive ending, becoming kin: ‘al kin deer’ = ‘animals of every kind.’ The loss of the genitive ending obscured the grammatical relations. At this point of the development kin was replaced by kind. The new form was construed as the governing noun, and there was placed after it a dependent of-genitive: ‘al kynde of fisshis’ (Matthew, XIII, 48, Purvey ed., A.D. 1388) = ‘every kind of fish.’ This construction has become established in the language. Today, however, we prefer to place the dependent genitive in the generic singular instead of the plural, as in this example from the fourteenth century: ‘this kind of shoe,’ ‘this kind of boy.’ ‘What kind of cherry tree flourishes best in this region?’ ‘What kinds of cherry flourish best in this region?’ But the old plural is still used where the idea of
number is prominent: ‘Our hills are covered with this kind of trees.’ ‘What kind of trees are those?’ ‘How do you like this kind of people?’ Though the new construction became established in the literary language of the Middle English period, the feeling for the older was not lost. Many felt kind as an adjective element modifying the following noun. Its predecessor kin was such an adjective element. Many felt kind as assuming the function of kin. They were not disturbed by the of that followed kind in the new construction. They even accepted the of and joined it to kind, treating kind of as a compound adjective. This is a blending of the old kin construction with the new kind of construction. When kind of, sort of, etc., came to be felt as attributive adjectives standing before a noun, it followed as a matter of course that the inflected demonstrative before them was regulated in number by the governing noun, also the verb if the governing noun was subject: ‘This kind of man annoys me,’ but ‘These kind of men annoy me.’ In both examples the reference is to only one kind: ‘a man of this kind,’ ‘men of this kind.’ In older English, this construction is used also where the reference is to more kinds than one: ‘To some kind (now kinds) of men Their graces serve them but as enemies’ (Shakespeare, As You Like It, II, III, 10). Where the reference is to only one kind, the construction of kind of as an adjective has always had a wider currency than where the reference is to different kinds. In early Modern English, it was still commonly used by good authors: ‘these kind of people’ (Sir Philip Sidney, Trewnesse of the Christian Religion, Ch. I, A.D. 1587) = ‘people of this kind’; ‘these kind of knaves’ (Shakespeare, King Lear, II, 11, 107) = ‘knaves of this kind.’ At the present time this construction is still used in England in colloquial speech: ‘these ingenious sort of men’ (H. G. Wells, Twelve Stories and a Dream, p. 116). In America it is now largely confined to popular speech.

Preceded by a the expression kind of expresses a certain approach to something: ‘He is a kind of stockbroker.’ ‘I feel a kind of sympathy for him.’ This kind of is often used in colloquial speech as an adverb with the force of ‘to a certain extent’: ‘I kind of expect it.’ Sort of has the same meaning: ‘If I were you, I would hunt him up and sort of get in touch with him.’ The attributive genitive of a kind has quite a different meaning. It expresses contempt: ‘We had coffee of a kind.’

In choice language the original genitive construction discussed on page 544 is still well preserved, now, of course, in its modern form with of following its governing noun, since with names of things we no longer freely use an s-genitive before the governing noun; ‘an apple of this kind’; ‘apples of this kind’; ‘people of this kind.’
This literary construction, however, still seems a little strange to us, since the word-order is different from the old familiar word-order. This has led to such expressions as ‘this kind of people’; ‘this kind of apples.’ This type of expression preserves the old order, but when the noun becomes subject we see by the singular form of the verb that the construction is not the old type, but a curious mixture of the old and the new: ‘Apples of this kind are highly prized,’ or with the old word-order ‘This kind of apples is highly prized.’ The latter type of expression has been in use for centuries. In the second paragraph (p. 544) the history of the construction is given and an example is cited from the fourteenth century. Sort has followed the same pattern: ‘I know that sorte of men ryght well’ (Daus, Sleidan’s Commentarii, 63, A.D. 1560). As can be seen, however, by the example from Shakespeare’s King Lear, given on page 545, the use of the plural form those or these here before sorte would not have been contrary to the literary standard of that time. Both forms — that and those — were in use, with the verb in the singular or plural if the noun was subject. In British speech the three types are still used: ‘Men of that sort are highly prized.’ ‘Those sort of men are highly prized.’ ‘That sort of men is highly prized.’ In America the second type is avoided.

Where there is a reference to more than one in the dependent genitive, we now, as mentioned on page 544, prefer the generic singular, with its abstract general force, to the concrete plural, which, however, in older English was the usual form: ‘They do not seem to be the kind (sort) of horse (or horses) to stand much knocking about.’ ‘An apple-tree on Luther Burbank’s Sebastopol Farm, where, when this picture was taken, 526 varieties of apple were ripening’ (The Saturday Evening Post, April 24, 1926, p. 29). Where the abstract idea is prominent, we do not use the plural at all, as an abstract idea demands singular form: ‘You are the kind (sort) of man I want.’ ‘He is a kind of fool.’ For many centuries there has been a tendency here in the singular to place the indefinite article a before the noun following kind of, sort of, and in older English also manner of to give it abstract general force: ‘Cokodrilles (crocodiles), bat is, a manner of a long serpent’ (Mandeville, Travels, fourteenth century, MS. Cotton, A.D. 1410–1420); ‘a kind of a knave’ (Shakespeare, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, III, 1, 262); ‘a very good sort of a fellow’ (Fielding, Tom Jones). This usage is still common in colloquial speech, but it has not become established in the literary language.

In Middle English, manner, like kin, was employed as an un-inflected genitive preceding the governing noun. This usage still lingered in early Modern English: ‘to give notice that no man-
ner person Have any time recourse unto the princess’ (Shakespeare, Richard the Third, III, v, 108). Gradually manner was replaced by manner of and had the meaning and the constructions of kind of, which have been described on page 546. In modern usage manner of has been largely replaced by kind of, sort of. The words manner, type, and class, similar to kind in meaning and hence influenced by it, have in the singular the same construction when the dependent genitive has abstract force: ‘It enabled him to show what manner of man he was’ (Macaulay, History, III, Ch. V). Where the reference is to more than one and the plural idea is strong, many still employ plural form here: ‘Mary and Ann represent the new type of girls’ (or girl). The abstract singular is very common here in recent literature. ‘It would be easy to multiply examples of this type of town’ (H. W. C. Davis, Medieval Europe, p. 220). ‘The usual type of successful teacher is one whose main interest is the children, not the subject’ (Sir Walter Raleigh, Letter to J. C. Dent, Oct. 29, 1921). ‘The real facts are little known to either type of theorist’ (Arthur Ruhl in New York Herald Tribune, July 8, 1928). ‘His rebels show hardly a trace of the arrogant self-sufficiency which makes that class of person objectionable’ (Athenaeum, 23/12, 1915). ‘Selling for the most part standardized goods, both firms appealed to the same class of customer’ (E. Phillips Oppenheim, A Minor Hero, A.D. 1925).

8. Plural of Titles. When a proper name with the title is put into the plural the rules are as follows:

a. The plural of Mr. is Messrs. (mēsərz): ‘Messrs. Smith and Brown’; ‘the two Mr. Smiths,’ or still, in accordance with older usage, ‘the two Messrs. Smith’; ‘Messrs. Smith’s works’; ‘Mr. Paul [Smith] and Mr. John Smith,’ or ‘Messrs. Paul [Smith] and John Smith.’ Similarly, ‘Master Smith’; ‘the two young Master Smiths,’ or still, as in older usage, ‘the two young Masters Smith.’ The title Mr. was originally the same word as Master, serving at first as one of its abbreviations. By the close of the seventeenth century master and Mr. had become differentiated in pronunciation, form, and meaning. Master, as in ‘Master of Arts,’ is still used as a title, representing a certain degree of learning. In older English, it had a much wider meaning, being used of a man of high social rank or considerable learning. On the other hand, it is used of young men, who are not old enough to be addressed as Mr.

In the case of brother and sister we may say: ‘the Smiths,’ or ‘the Smith brothers,’ or ‘the brothers Smith,’ but on a sign without the article ‘Smith Brothers’; ‘the Smith sisters.’ Likewise in the case of other titles of males: ‘the two Drs. Brown’ or ‘the two Dr. Browns.’ But if there are two or more names, the title
is always plural: 'Drs. William Smith and Henry Brown'; 'Professors Smith and Brown'; '[the] Captains Smith and Brown.'

b. In the case of the title Mrs. the name assumes the plural: 'the two Mrs. Smiths,' in contrast to 'the two Misses Smith.' But 'Mr. and Mrs. Smith.' In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Mrs. was used not only with its present force, but also with the force of our present Miss. The form Miss itself originated in the seventeenth century, and only slowly became differentiated from Mrs. Both Mrs. and Miss are abbreviations of Mistress. Before the present differentiation was effected, Mrs. was often used to an elderly maiden lady and Miss to a young unmarried woman.

c. In the case of the title Miss we may still, in accordance with older usage, say 'the Misses Woodhouse'; 'the Misses Woodhouse's little orchard' (Margaret Deland, John Ward, Preacher, Ch. I); especially so in the formal language of invitations, also in business language, as in 'The Misses Smith & Company' (on a sign); also when different Christian names or other titles stand before the name, as in 'the Misses Mary and Ann Brown,' or when the name is followed by others, as in 'the Misses Smith, Brown, and Read'; but elsewhere, just as common or perhaps more so, the newer usage 'the Miss Woodhouses'; 'the Miss Woodhouses' little orchard'; 'both the pretty Miss Gibbes' (Ethel Sidgwick, A Lady of Leisure, p. 465); 'the two youngest Miss Fawns' (Trollope, Eustace Diamonds, I, 24). We should say 'the numerous Mrs. and Miss Grundys' rather than 'the numerous Mrs. and Misses Grundy' to avoid the plural of Mrs., which is not in use. We should also say Mrs. Smith and the Miss Smiths, not Mrs. and the Miss Smiths, for it is inaccurate.
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60. The necessities of life require us still in a large number of cases to indicate sex, but in the literary language there is a marked and growing disinclination to do this with reference to man or beast. In loose colloquial speech, on the other hand, there is a strong tendency to throw off this reserve and go to the other extreme, so that even lifeless things are freely but capriciously endowed with sex. This same inclination is seen also in higher diction, but there is more moderation and more consistency in the use of genders.

1. Natural Gender. In English, gender is the distinction of words into masculine, feminine, and neuter. Our nouns follow natural gender. Names of male beings are masculine: man, father, uncle, boy, etc. The names of female beings are feminine: woman, mother, aunt, girl, etc. The names of inanimate things are neuter: house, tree, street, whiteness, etc. Thus natural gender is a grammatical classification of words according to the sex or sexlessness of the persons and things referred to. Sex is denoted by nouns, pronouns, and possessive adjectives in the following ways:

a. The male and the female are in many cases denoted by a different word: man, woman; salesman, saleswoman; foreman, forewoman; horseman, horsewoman; laundryman, laundrywoman; gentleman, lady; Sir, Madam; Lord, Lady; father, mother; papa, mama; dad or daddy, mum or mummy; grandfather, grandpa, granddad, grandmother, grandma, granny; brother, sister; bridegroom, bride; husband, hubby, wife, wifie; uncle, aunt; nephew, niece; monk, nun; king, queen; earl, count, countess; bachelor, old maid or spinster (the -ster originally a feminine suffix, but now usually masculine: youngster, teamster, etc.), or now often bachelor girl; wizard, witch; boy, girl or maid, maiden; milkboy, milkmaid; cash boy, cash girl; lad, lass; tom, tabby; dog, bitch or slut; cock or rooster, hen; gander, goose; drake, duck; fox, vixen; sire, dam; buck, doe; hart or stag, hind; ram or wether, ewe; bull, cow; bullock or steer, heifer; stallion, mare; colt, filly, etc.
Some feminine nouns, as duck, goose, and many masculine, as dog, horse, teacher, editor, are often used to denote either sex where there is no desire to be accurate. Such nouns are said to be of common gender.

There are a number of words that apply only to females without a corresponding word for males: frump, dowd, slattern, termagant, virago, minx, hussy, prude, dowager, etc. On the other hand, there are a number of words which apply only to males: dude, hop, masher, bruiser, ruffian, etc.

b. The male and the female are in many cases distinguished by placing before the noun an adjective or more commonly a noun or pronoun used as an adjective — where, however, the two forms are in some cases written together, since they are felt as forming a compound: woman friend, woman friends (in popular speech lady friend, lady friends); man friend, men friends (in popular speech, gentleman friend, gentlemen friends); boy friend, boy friends; girl friend, girl friends; woman servant, women servants; women students; manservant, menservants; woman doctor (or lady doctor), women doctors (or lady doctors); woman clerk (or lady clerk); women voters; woman witness (or lady witness); girl cashier, girl cashiers; stag party, hen party; hen bird (or lady bird); cock pheasant, cock pigeon, cock robin, cock sparrow, but guinea cock, peacock, turkey cock; hen pheasant, hen pigeon; jenny robin, hen sparrow, but guinea hen, peahen, turkey hen (also a hen turkey); buck rabbit, doe rabbit; dog fox; she bear, he bear; tomcat, tom lion, she cat or tabby cat; billy goat, she goat, nanny goat; he ass, jackass, jenny ass; cow rhinoceros; heifer calf or cow calf, bull calf; the fair singer; fair readers; female (or better woman) novelist; female cat, female dog; bulldog, female bulldog.

c. The female is distinguished in a number of cases by adding -ess to the masculine form: god, goddess; count, countess; viscount, viscountess; duke, duchess; peer, peeress; emperor, empress; prince, princess; marquis, marchioness; baron, baroness; ambassador, ambassadress; Lord Mayor, Lady Mayoress (in England); abbot, abess; prior, prioress; actor, actress; adulterer, adulteress; adventurer, adventuress; ancestor, ancestress; benefactor, benefactress; caterer, cateress; enchanter, enchantress; founder, foundress; giant, giantess; governess; heir, heiress; host, hostess; hunter, huntress; inheritor, inheritress or inheritrix; Jew, Jewess; launderer, laundress; leopard, leopardess; lion, lioness; master, mistress; murderer, murderess; Negro, Negress; ogre, ogress; panther, pantheress; patron, patroness; poet, poetess; priest, priestess; procurer, procuress; prophet, prophetess; proprietor, proprietress; protector, protectress;
shepherd, shepherdess; Quaker, Quakeress; songster, songstress; seamstress; sorcerer, sorceress; servitor, servitress; steward, stewardess; tempter, temptress; tiger, tigress; traitor, traitress; votary, votaress; waiter, waitress; warder, wardress. Other suffixes are used in a few words: hero, heroine; administrator, admin­istrator; aviator or more commonly flyer, aviatrix; executor, execatrix or executress; testator, testatrix; sultan, sultana; czar, czarina; Joseph, Josephine; Francis, Frances, etc.

The ending in -ess was once more common. There is a derogatory touch in it which makes it unsuitable when we desire to show respect, but on the other hand appropriate when we speak slight­ingly. Rather than use it we go a roundabout way: ‘wife of the ambassador,’ ‘wife of the pastor,’ etc.; ‘woman doctor,’ ‘lady doctor,’ ‘woman student,’ etc. If we stress the idea contained in the stem of the word, we use the feminine form for females: ‘Dr. Louise Jones.’ ‘George Eliot is a great author, writer.’ ‘She is an able editor, teacher,’ etc. The forms in -ess have become es­tablished in certain titles and a few other words given above, but even some of these are avoided.

Widower is formed by adding -er to the feminine form.

d. The male and the female are often distinguished only by a possessive adjective or a pronoun that refers back to the noun: ‘The speaker, doctor, teacher, etc., shook her head as she heard these words.’ It is now usual to treat animals as neuter, since the idea of personality is not prominent and the idea of sex doesn’t seem important to us, but we not infrequently regard them as masculine, employing masculine pronouns and possessives without regard to sex: ‘The camel is inestimable for long desert journeys, for he has strong powers of endurance.’ ‘If you want to kill a tortoise, wait until he puts out his head.’ ‘ Probably we have no other familiar bird keyed up to the same degree of intensity as the house wren. He seems to be the one bird whose cup of life is always overflowing’ (John Burroughs, Field and Study, Ch. IV). In con­tradistinction to other animal life there is a tendency to regard birds as feminine, especially in the case of swallow, dove, sparrow, lark, thrush, etc.; sometimes also other little animals and insects, as mole, bee, etc.: ‘How winsome is the swallow! How tender and pleasing all her notes! Is it boyhood that she brings back to us old men who were farm boys in our youth?’ (John Burroughs, Field and Study, Ch. XIII, II). ‘Like a skilful surgeon, the wasp knows just what to do, knows in what part of the head to insert her sting to produce the desired effect’ (ib., Ch. XIII, III). But, for the most part, the masculine prevails if we do not choose to employ the neuter. Of course, the feminine pronoun occurs with reference
to all kinds of animal life where the idea of a female animal naturally suggests itself: 'The cat looked from one sister to the other, blinking; then with a sudden magnificent spring leaped onto Agnes's lap and coiled herself up there' (Mrs. Ward, Robert Elsmere, I, 124). It is quite probable that Burroughs' use of the feminine gender in the examples quoted above rests upon the conception of sex, for he is an accurate observer. The wasp is referred to as a female because only the female wasp has a sting. The bee is often referred to as a female because it is the female bee that is so often seen gathering sweets from the flowers. Compare 23 II 7.

The masculine pronoun and possessive adjective are usually employed for persons without regard to sex wherever the antecedent has a general indefinite meaning and hence doesn't indicate sex and the situation doesn't require an accurate discrimination: 'Everybody is to do just as he likes.' Often, however, the natural feeling here that he is one-sided prompts us to use both he and she, his and her: 'Everybody is to do as he or she likes.' 'Each of us must lead his or her own life.' In choice English, however, this accuracy is often quite out of place, since the idea of the oneness of man and woman is present to our feeling: 'Breathes there the man, with soul so dead Who never to himself hath said, This is my own, my native land!' not 'Breathes there the man or the woman,' etc. 'Who is a neighbor, he who shows love, or he who shows it not?' (French, Parables). In popular speech, as in the older literary language, they is much used, as it is inclusive in gender: 'Everybody is to do just as they like.'

With reference to a baby or little child we often use the masculine pronoun he or the feminine form she according to sex when we happen to think of personality or sex, but usually when we speak of a little child or a small insect we do not think of personality or sex, and hence with reference to either child or insect employ the neuter pronoun it and the possessive adjective its: 'She had to pass our door where stood Mrs. Todd and the baby. It stretched out its little arms to her.' 'Something flew on to my neck and I soon felt it crawling downward.' Similarly, we find it with reference to a person that has been presented to us in only shadowy outlines which do not afford a clear idea of the personality: 'The street was empty but for a solitary figure sitting on a post with its legs dangling, its hands in its trousers-pockets' (Du Maurier, Trilby, I, 241). This it, thus closely associated with the idea of the lack of personality, is often used disparagingly of persons, similarly also that and what: 'Would you like to marry Malcolm? Fancy being owned by that! Fancy seeing it every day!' (Elinor Glyn, Vicissitudes of Evangeline, p. 127). 'Well — [she is] the sort that
takes up with impossible people — you really never know *What* you may meet in Agnes Hyde’s rooms’ (Mrs. Cecily Sidgwick, *The Severins*, Ch. XVI). It is also used in kindly humor: ‘It’s a wise nephew that knows *its* own aunt’ (W. W. Jacobs, *The Castaways*, Ch. V), where the speaker claims superiority of knowledge and humorously looks down on the person addressed for not knowing his own aunt better. This *its* is also in a playful humorous tone used for *your*: ‘There, run along and put *its* (= *your*) pretty things on for the theater!’ (Pinero, *Sweet Lavender*, Act II).

On the other hand, *it*, like the relative *which* (23 II 7, 4th par.), is used to indicate estate, rank, dignity: ‘She is a queen and looks *it*.’ Likewise *itself*: ‘The Gaul asserted *itself* in a shrug, a form of expression rare in him’ (Meredith Nicholson, *Lady Larkspur*, Ch. I). The author is here speaking of an old French servant in an American home, but the reference is not to the man but to the Gallic trait of his shrug, which hadn’t entirely disappeared in spite of his long American experiences.

2. Grammatical Gender and Gender of Animation. In Old English, as in modern German, there are three grammatical genders. Of nouns denoting inanimate objects one large group was masculine, one large group feminine, a third large group neuter, i.e., neither masculine nor feminine. The original idea of this grammatical gender was that of personification. In the earlier stages of language development the imagination played a much bigger rôle than it does today. In the Indo-European period many inanimate things, such as the sun, the moon, the earth, the sky, the sea, the stars, shrubs, plants, flowers, trees, rivers, winds, water, fire, actions, processes, etc., were conceived as animate beings, while other things were conceived as inanimate. The animate was distinguished from the inanimate by the form, but the animate was not distinguished as to sex, i.e., masculine and feminine nouns and pronouns did not have different endings in the names of either living beings or personified things. This older order of things survives in *who* and *what*. Here as in Indo-European the animate stands in contrast to the inanimate, but there is no distinction of sex. Certain pronouns early developed distinctive forms for sex. Although adjectives originally derived their inflection from that of nouns, they gradually in many languages developed distinctive forms for the three genders. Nouns went much slower in developing distinctive forms for the three genders, but distinctive forms appeared in many words. Even in the period of the first records of the older languages the original conception of grammatical gender based upon personification had in large measure faded away. The inherited gender of nouns representing inanimate
things had become a matter of form or meaning, i.e., the nouns were masculine, feminine, or neuter according to their form or their meaning.

The use of grammatical gender in Old English was not so foolish as it might at first seem to a modern English or American boy or girl who is beginning to study Old English. After adjective inflection had disappeared in Middle English, it was soon discovered that something valuable had been lost. The inflection of the adjective so that it always agreed with the noun in gender and case kept the adjective in close relations with its governing noun. After the distinctive endings of adjective and noun had disappeared there was nothing to bring the adjective into relation to its governing noun when it stood at some distance from it in substantive function. It became necessary to insert *one* or *ones* here to relate the adjective to its governing noun, as described in 57 1: ‘a black sheep and a white one,’ ‘black sheep and white ones.’ Here *one, ones* took the place of the old endings that indicated gender and case. Thus the employment of different genders here binding adjectives to their governing nouns was useful, only unnecessarily complicated. We all know how colorless our *one, ones* are. They are mere abstract signs to relate adjective to noun and have nothing whatever to do with gender. The gender endings of Old English used here have seemingly more color than our *one, ones*, but in reality they were not much less abstract. They were, like our *one, ones*, mere formal devices to relate adjective to noun, only more complicated.

After the gender endings had been dropped there was nothing that brought lifeless things into relation to sex, nothing in the form of noun or adjective to guide the memory when it became necessary to refer to the noun by means of a personal pronoun, which still retained its distinctive forms. The old usage of associating lifeless things with sex had to be abandoned in the literary language, and it here gradually became established to refer to lifeless things by a neuter pronoun as being the most natural course under the circumstances, thus avoiding inconsistency and caprice. This new development, however, was not entirely new. Even in Old English, there was a strong tendency to use the personal pronouns in accordance with natural sex or sexlessness. The selection of a masculine or feminine personal pronoun in harmony with the sex was quite common when the reference was to a neuter noun denoting a living being. This strong sense of sex in the Old English period helped develop the idea of sexlessness, so that a neuter personal pronoun was sometimes used when the reference was to a masculine or feminine noun denoting a lifeless thing. Later, at the close of the Old
English period in the North, at the beginning of the thirteenth century in the Midland, and the end of the fourteenth in the Southeast, when article and descriptive adjective had lost their distinctive endings for gender and case, grammatical gender could no longer be distinguished and was replaced by natural gender, which even in Old English was in use with personal pronouns, and now after the disappearance of distinctive forms for grammatical gender in article and descriptive adjective came to be the predominant conception of gender in our language.

The new usage did not come in all at once, but appeared at first alongside of the old historic grammatical gender, at last gradually supplanting it in the normal form of expression. But the old habit of giving lifeless things sex, still common in our playful moods, never died out entirely. In moments of vivid feeling the old association of sex with lifeless things reappeared, no longer, however, influenced by the form of noun and adjective, but entirely under the sway of psychological forces, the mind assigning the gender under the influence of the conceptions suggested by the grammatical gender of Latin and French words, as in the case of rivers, lakes, and mountains, which became masculine as in Latin; as in the case of the vices, which became masculine after the analogy of Old French *vice*; and the virtues, feminine after the analogy of Old French *vertu*; and the word *ship*, feminine after the analogy of Old French *nief*. In this new reign of psychological influences, however, the mind is often swayed by mere caprice. Thus, the grammatical gender of older English has become in modern English the gender of our animated moods; hence we call it here the gender of animation.

Although the gender of animation now rests upon a psychological basis, while, in Old English, grammatical gender was closely associated with the form and inflection of nouns, the inner nature of Old English and modern usage is exactly the same — both rest upon a mild personification of lifeless things, not a vivid one born of the imagination. Both are a lively form of speech that has resulted from associating things with sex in a mere formal way for thousands of years; a long step removed from concrete expression, which has at last been attained in modern scientific English, where usually natural gender has full sway. If we have banished this mild form of fancy from our scientific language, we still feel its charm in our poetry and colloquial speech. In our ordinary literary language we often use *sun* as a masculine: 'The sun was shining in all his splendid beauty,' etc. (Dickens); but, of course, at any time we may lapse into scientific English again and say: 'The sun performs one revolution about *its* own axis in about 25 days,' etc.
We sometimes in choice prose make the earth, the world, and the moon feminine, but may at any moment become scientific again and treat them as neuter nouns. We are inclined to make church, university, state, and especially ship feminine. With a good deal of persistency we say of a ship: 'She behaves well, she minds her rudder, she swims like a duck,' but lapsing into a scientific mood may say: 'The boat was attacked by a constant fire from both banks as it drifted along.' In higher diction, where we employ grammatical gender more freely than in the ordinary literary language, we are often inclined to treat as masculine mountains, rivers, the ocean, time, day, death, love, anger, discord, despair, war, murder, law, etc.; as feminine spring, nature, the soul, night, darkness, cities, countries, arts, sciences, liberty, charity, victory, mercy, religion. In our playful moods we have a great fondness for the feminine: 'That helps the blood to draw the wart and pretty soon off she comes' (Mark Twain, Tom Sawyer); but the masculine is not unknown here: "You are provided with the needful implement—a book, sir?"—"Bought him at a sale," said Boffin' (Dickens, Our Mutual Friend). In American English, there has been for a long while a steady trend toward the feminine in colloquial and popular speech, so that here the feminine is now the favorite form. The masculine is now rather uncommon except in quaint dialect where older usage is still preserved, as in Maristan Chapman's The Happy Mountain, where the hero's 'fiddle' is treated as masculine throughout the book. The feminine is the usual form even where the masculine is employed in higher diction: 'Sun, she rise up en shine hot' (Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, p. 34). 'I've swum the Colorado where she runs down clost to Hell' (Mulford, Bar, 10, 115). The feminine here is characteristic also of Irish and northern British dialects, which through Irish and northern British immigrants into our country may have influenced our American development.
CHAPTER XXVIII

PRONOUNS

61. A pronoun, as indicated by its literal meaning standing for a noun, is usually a mere substitute for some person or thing suggested by the situation, as in the case of I, we, you, or by a gesture, as in the case of this, that: 'This (or that) is a photograph of my wife'; or is a substitute for some person or thing already mentioned, as in the case of he, she, it, they. As in these cases, the reference is usually definite, but a number of pronouns contain only an indefinite reference, as in the case of many, some, somebody, none, nobody, etc. In the case of the interrogatives who, etc., a pronoun is used instead of a noun, as the speaker does not know the fact and inquires after the person or thing in question.

In a series I, for politeness' sake, is put last: 'John, Fred, and I arrived at the same time.' 'You and I had better go.'

a. Agreement. A pronoun as a mere substitute for a noun agrees with its antecedent in gender, number, and person wherever there is a distinctive form to indicate these conceptions, but, of course, it takes a case form in accordance with the grammatical function it performs in the proposition in which it stands: 'Your sister borrowed my dictionary yesterday. I met her this morning and she gave it back to me.' When the reference is to the indefinite pronoun one the proper pronoun is one, not he: 'It offends one to be told one (not he) is not wanted.' See 57 5 b (6th par.).

When a pronoun refers to two or more antecedents of different persons, the first person has precedence over the second and third, and the second person precedence over the third: 'You and I divided it between us.' 'You and he divided it between you.'

Where a pronoun or possessive adjective refers to a word plural in meaning, but in form being an indefinite pronoun in the singular or a singular noun modified by an indefinite limiting adjective, it was once common to indicate the plural idea by the form of the following pronoun or possessive adjective, but it is now usual to put the pronoun or possessive adjective into the singular in accordance with the singular form of the antecedent: 'Nobody knows what it is to lose a friend, till they have (now he has) lost him' (Fielding). 'If the part deserve any comment, every considering Christian will make it themselves (now himself) as they go' (now he goes) (Defoe). 'I do not mean that I think anyone to
blame for taking due care of their (now his) health' (Addison).
Older usage, however, still occasionally occurs: 'Everybody is discontented with their (instead of his) lot in life' (Beaconsfield).
This older literary usage survives in loose colloquial and popular speech: 'Everybody has their (instead of his) faults.' ‘It is the duty of each student to interest themselves (instead of himself) in athletics.’

If there is a reference to your Majesty, her Grace, etc., usage requires the repetition of the full title or the use of you, your, he, his, etc., instead of the grammatically correct it, its: ‘Your Majesty can do as your Majesty will with your Majesty’s ships,’ or ‘Your Majesty can do as you will with your ships’ (Fowler, Modern English Usage). ‘His (Her) Majesty can do as he (she) will with his (her) ships.’ ‘Her Grace summoned her chef.’

The antecedent is sometimes not a noun or pronoun, but the idea contained in a group of words or a single noun or adjective.

See 7 C; 23 II 6 (6th par.).

Some pronouns (relatives, interrogatives, etc.) perform not only the function of a pronoun but also that of a conjunction, linking the clause in which they stand to a preceding word or clause. See Conjunctive Pronouns in Index.

For the agreement of the relative pronoun with its antecedent see 23 II 8 a, b, c, d; 21 c.

b. Case of the Predicate Pronoun. This subject is discussed in 7 C a.
62. Very closely allied in nature to adverbs are prepositions, which, like adverbs, limit the force of the verb as to some circumstance of place, time, manner, degree, cause, condition, exception, concession, purpose, means. But a preposition and an adverb differ in this, that the latter limits the force of the verb in and of itself, while the former requires the assistance of a dependent noun or some other word: ‘Mary is in’ (adverb), but ‘Mary is in (preposition) the house.’ A preposition is closely related also to a subordinating conjunction. It often stands before an abridged clause as a sign of its subordination to the principal verb. See 203 (next to last par.).

A preposition and its object perform various functions. They modify a verb and thus serve as an adverbial element: ‘I wrote the letter with care.’ Where they stand in a very close relation to the verb, forming its necessary complement, they serve as an object, a prepositional object (14): ‘He is shooting at a mark.’ They often serve as the object of an adjective or a participle, forming its necessary complement: ‘He is fond of music.’ ‘He is given to exaggeration.’ After a noun they form an adjective element: ‘the book upon the table.’ After a linking verb they serve as a predicate adjective: ‘The country is at peace.’ For a fuller statement of the functions of the preposition and its object see 7, p. 570, and the articles there referred to.

The usual object of the preposition is a noun or a pronoun, the noun or pronoun forming with the preposition a prepositional phrase: ‘He plays with my brother or with me.’ If the object of
the preposition is an adverb or some other part of speech or a clause, it serves here as a noun or a pronoun: 'after today' (an adverb serving as a noun). 'I saw him a year ago, but since then (an adverb serving as a demonstrative pronoun) we haven't met.' 'I met him a year ago, since when (an adverb serving as a relative pronoun; see 23 II 6, next to last par.) I haven't seen anything of him.' When the object of the preposition is a clause, we call preposition and clause a prepositional clause: 'He is thankful for what I have done for him.'

In 'A rat ran out from under the stable' from was originally a preposition governing the prepositional phrase under the stable, but we now feel from under as a compound preposition in which under indicates a position and from a movement from that position. Similarly, in into and onto the first component indicates a position and the second a motion into that position. Originally, simple in and on were used with a following dative noun to indicate rest in a position and with a following accusative noun to indicate a motion toward a position. After adjectives and nouns lost their distinctive endings it became necessary to add to to in and on to bring out the idea of motion toward a position, while simple in and on were retained to indicate rest in a position.

We often bring a predicate adjective or participle and the preposition that usually accompanies it into relation to a verb of complete predication and thus convert adjective and preposition into a compound preposition. We often indicate the prepositional function of the new compound by giving the adjective adverbial form by the addition of the suffix -ly: 'The science has a speculative interest which is irrespective of all practical considerations' (Buckle, Civilization, III, V, 416), but 'He values them irrespectively of the practical conveniences which their triumph may obtain for him' (Matthew Arnold, Essay in Criticism, V, 192). 'His actions are inconsistent with his professions,' but 'He acts inconsistently with his professions.' In many of these compounds, however, the adjective form remains unchanged, or the unchanged form is used alongside of the adverbial: 'I shall speak to him relative to the matter.' 'This course will be pursued regardless of consequences.' 'The company, previous (or previously) to his majesty's arrival, were all assembled.' 'They will be chosen irrespective of age.' 'This was owing (adjective) to bad luck,' but 'Owing to (preposition) drought the crops are suffering' (or 'the crops are short'). This process is going on all the time. As can be seen in the last example, a participle or an adjective becomes detached from nouns and is often for convenience attached to a verb or a statement as a whole. Grammarians would often arrest this useful development.
The Concise Oxford Dictionary recommends, 'The difficulty is due (adjective) to ignorance,' but condemns as 'incorrect': 'I came late due to (preposition) an accident.' The preposition due to is not more incorrect than the preposition owing to, which is approved by the same dictionary, but it is not as yet so thoroughly established in the language. Compare 17 4 (4th par.).

As a preposition usually stands before the dependent word it is called a preposition (Latin 'prae' before and 'positio' position). Where several prepositions connect different words with a common dependent word or object, the object need be expressed only once, standing after the last preposition: 'I do not think a man is fit to do good work in our American democracy unless he is able to have a genuine fellow-feeling for, understanding of, and sympathy with his fellow-Americans' (Theodore Roosevelt, An Autobiography, Ch. III). In English, however, we often detach the preposition from the noun or pronoun and place it at the end of the proposition or clause, as described in 4, p. 566.

The preposition now brings a noun or some other word into relation with a verb, noun, adjective, etc.: 'Mary works in the house.' Here in brings house into relation with the verb works. Originally, however, in was an adverb modifying the verb works. The idea now conveyed by in the house was at this early period expressed by house in the old locative case. The adverb in with the meaning inside expressed the same idea as the old locative case, but expressed it more concretely, hence more forcibly. Gradually in came into a closer relation with house, so that it became more intimately associated with house than with the verb and thus developed into a preposition, and since its force was stronger than the old locative, the latter gradually disappeared as superfluous. Thus we lost an old case form, but the prepositions in, inside, within, outside, on, at, by, under, etc., which took its place, more than made up for the loss, because they have more and finer shades of meaning. In the same way the old instrumental case, denoting association, instrument, and cause, has been displaced by the prepositions with, by, through, by means of, on account of, etc. Similarly, the old ablative case, denoting a direction toward, has been in large measure replaced by the prepositions to, toward, at, etc. Compare 12 2. After the disappearance of the locative, instrumental, and ablative, the dative and accusative forms for a long while served as the sign of subordination to the new prepositions, as the prepositions had to govern some case to indicate the relation between preposition and dependent noun. The prepositions themselves indicated the relation between the
dependent noun or other word and the verb or the governing noun or adjective. As there is now no distinction of form between dative and accusative, we may say that all prepositions govern the accusative.

The loss of the old case forms and the development of prepositions brought us new and considerably improved means of expression. As we feel the possibilities of this construction, we are constantly forming new prepositions for fuller or more convenient expression of our thought. We form them not only from adverbs but also from nouns and present participles: beside (i.e., by the side of), alongside of or alongside, instead (i.e., in the place) of, on account of, during, pending, regarding, etc. A perfect participle occurs in past and as compared with. There is a tendency, as in the first two examples, to suppress parts of the prepositional phrase as unnecessary to the thought. For the origin of the use of participles here see 17 3 A c, 4.

1. List of Prepositions.
The most common are:

abaft
aboard, on board of, or simply on board
about
above
abreast of, abreast with
according to
across
adown (poetic for down)
afore (now replaced by before)
after
against (in older English also again)
agreeably to
ahead of
along, amongst (once widely used, but now obsolete)
along of (now replaced by on account of)
along with
alongside of, or alongside amid, amidst (in poetry mid, midst)
among, or amongst
anent
antecedent to
anterior to
apart from
apropos of
around
as against (= against)
as between (= between)
as compared with (29 1 A c aa)
as distinct (or distinguished) from
as far as (‘I traveled with him as far as Chicago’; see 29 1 B b, 2nd par.)
as far back as
as for (29 1 A c aa)
as opposed to
as to (29 1 A c aa)
as touching (now replaced by touching)
aside (now replaced by beside)
aside from (American)
aslant
astern of
astride of
at
at the cost of
at the hands of
at the instance of
at the peril of
at the point of
at the risk of
athwart
atop
back of (from at the back of),
  colloquial for behind
bating (31 2, 4th par.)
because of
before
behind
below
beneath
beside
besides
between
betwixt
beyond
beyond the reach of
by
by dint of
by (the) help of
by means of
by order of
by reason of
by the aid of
by virtue of
by way of
care of (in addresses; = in care
  of)
concerning (17 4)
concurrently with
conditionally on
conformably to
contrary to
counter to
despite
differently from
down
down at
down to
due to (62, 5th par.)
during
east of, to the east (or eastward)
of
eres
eexclusive of
face to face with
failing (31 2)
farther than (29 1 B b, 2nd par.)
for
for fear of
for lack of
for the behoof of
for the benefit of
for the ends of
for the purpose of (33 2)
for the sake of
for want of
fore (now replaced by before)
forth (now replaced by from
  out of)
from above
from among
from behind
from below
from beneath
from between
from beyond
from forth (obsolete)
from in front of
from lack of
from off
from out of, from out
from over
from under
hand in hand with
in
in accordance with
in addition to
in advance of
in agreement with
in back of (= back of), popular American, after the analogy of in front of
in behalf of (= in the interest of)
in between
in care of (or in addresses care of)
in case of (= in the event of)
in common with
in company with
in comparison with (or to)
in compliance with
in conflict with
in conformity with
in consequence of
in consideration of
in contrast with (or to)
in course of
in default of
in defiance of
in disregard of
in (the) face of
in favor of
in front of
in fulfilment of
in lieu of
in obedience to
in opposition to
in place of
in point of
in preference to
in process of
in proportion to
in pursuance of
in quest of
in re or re (legal term; = concerning)
in recognition of
in regard to (or of)
in relation to
in respect to (or of)
in return for
in search of
in spite of
in support of (33 2)
in the case of (= as regards; 29 1 A c aa)
in the event of
in the matter of
in the middle of
in the midst of
in the name of
in the presence of
in the room (or place) of
in the teeth of
in the way of
in token of
in under, popular for under ('The dog ran in under the barn.')
in view of (= considering)
including (17 4)
inclusive of
inconsistently with
independently of (28 3 a)
inside of, or inside
instead of
into
irrespective of
less (8 I 2 e)
like (28 2, 6th par., 50 4 c bb)
long of (= along of; both now replaced by on account of)
mid, midst, see amid
midmost of, midmost
minus (8 I 2 e)
near (40 4 c bb)
ext door to
next room to
next to (40 4 c bb)
north of, to the north (or northward) of
notwithstanding
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of (o’ in o’clock, etc.)
off (in popular speech off of)
on account of
on behalf of (= in the name of)
on board of, on board
on pain of
on the face of
on the occasion of
on the part of
on the point of
on the pretense of
on the score of
on the side of, (on) both sides (of); (on) each side (of), (on) either side (of), (on) the other side (of), (on) that side (of), (on) this side (of), always with of before a pronoun; (on) both sides of it, (on) each side of her
on the strength of
on the top of, or on top of
on top of, or on the top of
onto, or on to
opposite to, or opposite
out of, or less commonly out
out of regard for (or to)
outside of, or outside
over
over against
over and above
overthwart
owing to (17 4, 4th par.)

past
pending
per
plus
preferably to, or in preference to
preliminary to
preparatory to
previous(ly) to
prior to
pursuant to

re, see in re
regarding (17 4, 4th par.)
regardless of (28 3 a)
relative to
respecting
round
round about
short of
side by side with
since
so far as (29 1 A c bb)
so far from (28 3 a)
south of, to the south (or south-ward) of
subject to
subsequent(ly) to
suitably to
thanks to
through
through lack of
throughout
till
to
to and fro
to the order of
touching (17 4)
toward or towards
under
under cover of
under pain of
underneath
until
unto
up
up against
up and down
up at
up till
up to
upon
via
west of, to the west (or westward) of
with, sometimes withal ¹
with a view to
with an eye to
with reference (or respect) to,
or sometimes in respect to
with regard to (29 1 A c aa)

with the exception of
with the intention (or object) of
with the purpose of
with the view (or intention) of
within
within reach of
without
without regard to (28 3 a)

Some of the old forms listed above, as afore, along of, survive in popular speech.

a. The preposition onto, or less properly on to, corresponds closely to into. As it indicates motion toward the upper surface of something, it differs distinctly from on or upon: ‘The boys jumped onto the ice and played on it until sundown.’ The use of onto or on to ought not to be discouraged, as is done by many grammarians, but strongly encouraged, for it enables us to express ourselves more accurately.

Onto should be distinguished from on to, where on belongs to the verb: ‘We must struggle on to victory.’ Similarly, in to: ‘We went in to dinner.’

2. Contraction of ‘On’ to ‘A.’ The preposition on is often contracted to a: athwart, abreast, aslant, asleep, aglow, aflame, on fire or afire, on shore or ashore, on board or aboard, on top of or atop, etc. Except in established set expressions, like these, this usage is characteristic of popular speech. See 50 4 c dd (4th par.).

3. Omission of Prepositions. Prepositions are often omitted in colloquial speech in set expressions since they are lightly stressed and of little importance to the thought: ‘He must never treat you [in] that way again.’ In such expressions the element as a whole is felt as an adverb, or an adverbial accusative, so that the preposition really has no function any more and drops out. Compare 16 4 a (9th par.). In the same way of often drops out of many prepositions, as in inside instead of inside of. The moment that such a group of words as a whole is felt as a preposition, of ceases to have a function and naturally drops out as superfluous.

4. Preposition at End of Sentence. The preposition often seems to stand at the end of the sentence or clause: ‘I have lost the pen I write with.’ According to 19 3 (3rd par.) this is a sentence containing a primitive type of relative clause in which there is no relative pronoun, since in this old type the subordination is indicated

¹ Found only at the end of a relative clause: ‘Such eyes and ears as Nature had been pleased to endow me withal’ (Lowell, Democracy, 6).
by simply placing the dependent clause alongside the principal proposition and suppressing the personal pronoun, thus indicating that the person or thing in question is to be supplied from the preceding proposition: 'I have lost the pen: I write with [it].' In this old type of expression the, the weakened form of the demonstrative that, not only modifies pen, but also by virtue of its old demonstrative force serves as a determinative (56 A), pointing as with an index finger to the following explanatory clause. In this old type there are often two determinatives, one before the governing noun and another after it, the two determinatives pointing as with two index fingers to the following explanatory clause: 'I have lost the pen that (= that one:) I write with [it].' 'He should read such books as (= that kind:) we all approve of [them].' The suppression of the personal pronoun here causes us to look to what precedes for the connection and thus marks the clause as dependent. In spite of the fact that we now feel that and as, not as determinatives, but as relative pronouns, we still retain here the old sentence structure. Similarly, in relative clauses with which, who, what, which have developed out of determinative constructions, as described in 23 II 1, 2, 3: 'the pen which I write with.' 'Lord Hubert Dacey whom she ran across on the Casino steps' (Edith Wharton, House of Mirth). 'It all depended on what one was accustomed to.' Also in relative clauses where there is no relative expressed: 'That is nothing to joke about' = about which one should joke. Where, however, the relative clause expresses manner, cause, place, or time, so that the relative pronoun is not vividly felt as an object, the relative which is expressed, and the preposition stands before it, or the relative that is employed, and the preposition is suppressed as unimportant, especially when the same preposition is used in the same construction in the principal proposition; sometimes also the relative pronoun is suppressed: 'By the sharp tones in which he spoke of his brig it was plain to both of us that he was in deadly earnest.' 'I wish you would only see things in the light that we see them' (or in which we see them). 'He took him for his model for the very reason that (or for which) he ought to have shunned his example.' 'They now find themselves in the same predicament that (or in which) we once found ourselves' (or that we once found ourselves in). 'I was getting ready to leave on the very day he came' (or on which he came).

We also retain the old determinative structure after the subordinating conjunctions as and than: 'The case is as sad as I've ever heard of,' where originally the two as's were felt as pointing forward, like two index fingers, to the following explanatory clause. 'He writes with a worse pen than I write with,' originally 'He writes
with a worse pen, \textit{then} (modern form of \textit{than}) \textit{I write with [a bad one].}'

Thus for many centuries the position of a preposition at or near the end of a proposition has been one of the outstanding features of our language. It is so natural to put the preposition at the end that we have extended this usage beyond its original boundaries. The prepositional dative follows the analogy of other prepositional constructions, so that \textit{to} or \textit{for} often stands at the end of the relative clause: ‘That is the man (\textit{that}) I gave it to’ (or \textit{did it for}). In the case of an emphatic prepositional object we often for the sake of greater emphasis put the object — word, phrase, or clause — into the first place and put, as so often elsewhere, the preposition after the verb at the end, for we hesitate to begin the sentence with an unstrressed preposition: ‘Where does he come \textit{from}?’ ‘Well, \textit{where} that rolling-pin’s got \textit{to} is a mystery’ (Compton Mackenzie, \textit{The Altar Steps}, Ch. III). ‘Which pen did you write with?’ ‘What is he writing \textit{with}?’ ‘What is he \textit{up to}?’ ‘Who (instead of the correct \textit{whom}; see 11 2 e) does this dreadful place belong \textit{to}?’ (Mrs. H. Ward, \textit{Robert Elsmere}, II, 141), or ‘To \textit{whom} does this dreadful place belong?’ ‘How many scrapes has he gotten \textit{into}?’ also in indirect form: ‘I asked him \textit{how many scrapes} he had gotten \textit{into}.’ ‘They (instead of the correct \textit{them}; we now use \textit{those} here) who have saluted her (i.e., poetry) on the by and now and then tended their visits she hath done much \textit{for}’ (Ben Jonson, \textit{Discoveries}, p. 27, A.D. 1641). ‘\textit{These reports} Inglesant does not seem to have paid much attention \textit{to}’ (J. H. Shorthouse, \textit{John Inglesant}, Ch. I). ‘\textit{What I have commenced} I am prepared to go on \textit{with}.’

Similar to these prepositions that stand at the end of a proposition are the prepositional adverbs that often stand at the end of a proposition because of the suppression of a governing noun or pronoun, which is omitted since it is suggested by a preceding noun or by the situation: ‘I threw the ball at the \textit{wall}, but I threw too high and it went \textit{over}.’ ‘John drew the heavy sled up the \textit{hill}, then he and Mary rode \textit{down}.’ ‘We soon reached the \textit{park} and strolled \textit{through}.’ Prepositional adverbs now usually have the same form as the prepositions that stand before a noun, but in older English, they often had a different form and, except in relative clauses, are sometimes still distinguished in the case of \textit{out, in,} and \textit{on} in connection with verbs denoting motion from or toward: ‘He came \textit{out of} (preposition) the house’ and ‘This is the house (that) he came \textit{out of}’ (preposition), but ‘He is now in the house but will soon come \textit{out}’ (prepositional adverb). ‘From my window I saw him come \textit{into} the house’ and ‘This is the house (that) I saw him go \textit{into},’ but ‘Come \textit{in}!’ (spoken by someone from the window of a
house to someone passing on the street). 'He jumped onto the car just as it started' and 'This is the car (that) he jumped onto,' but 'Just as the car started he jumped on.' In older English, adverbial form could even stand in a relative clause, where we now use the prepositional form: 'wo that she was inne' (Chaucer, The Man of Lawe, 420), now 'the distress that she was in.' In older English, in was the form for preposition, inne for adverb. In the earlier periods when the sentence structure was much more loosely fitted together than today, there was a natural tendency to construe the preposition that stood at the end of the proposition without an accompanying governing noun as an adverb and give it adverbial form. In the more compact sentence of our time, especially in relative clauses, we feel the reference to a preceding noun as indicating a prepositional relation and give the word prepositional form. In the relative clause we feel this so distinctly that the word usually loses the strong stress which characterizes adverbs: 'the fence that he jumped over.' Compare 5 below.

In contrast to prepositional adverbs and all the prepositions previously discussed — all of which usually follow the verb — are prepositions which always precede the verb, forming with it a compound: 'The river overflowed its banks.' 'A great principle underlies this plan.' 'Water permeates the ground.' As the object of the preposition always follows the verb, it is now felt as the object of the compound verb. Where the preposition is no longer used outside of these compounds, as in the case of be- (= over, upon), it is called a prefix: 'to bemoan (= moan over) one's fate,' 'befriend (= bestow friendly deeds upon) one,' etc., but with privative force in behead.

5. Prepositional Adverbs. In older English, certain adverbs had also prepositional force, so that they were not only stressed as adverbs but governed a case like a preposition: 'God him com to,' now 'God came to him.' In Old English, as in this example, the prepositional adverb might follow its object. The prepositional force of such forms has so overshadowed the adverbial that they now regularly stand before the noun which they govern. Not infrequently, however, we feel their adverbial force so clearly that we still stress them: 'He stood bravely by my brother.' 'It becomes necessary to look into this matter.' 'I looked straight at him.' 'The ball went clear over the house without striking it.' 'The child wants in' (adv.; see 6 A a, 3rd par., p. 21), but 'Belgium wants in (prepositional adv.) this protective arrangement' (Chicago Tribune, Nov. 10, 1919, p. 8). In poetry these prepositional adverbs not only have their distinctive stress but still, as in older English, may stand after their object: 'Soft went the
music the soft air along’ (Keats, Lamia, II, 199). Sometimes in plain prose: ‘I have read the letter through.’ ‘I want to think the matter over.’ ‘Let us pass the matter by.’ As described in the last paragraph on page 568, stressed prepositional adverbs still often stand at the end of a proposition where the dependent pronoun has been suppressed, as it is suggested by a preceding noun.

6. Fluctuation. With certain words usage fluctuates without a difference of meaning: Thus we say different from or to, averse to or less commonly from: ‘It is a different sort of life to (or perhaps more commonly from) what she’s been accustomed to’ (George Eliot, Silas Marner, Ch. IX).

In older English, beside and besides were not differentiated in sense, being two forms with the same meanings — alongside of, in addition to, other than. Now, beside has the first meaning and besides the others.

7. Functions of the Prepositional Phrase or Clause. It is used with the force of:

a. A predicate adjective. For examples see 7 F. In the examples referred to, the object of the preposition is a noun, but it can, of course, be also a pronoun. It is sometimes an it that is explained only by the situation or context: ‘There was nothing for it (= feasible) but to grin and bear it.’ ‘I am glad that I am out of it.’ ‘Their team was not in it’ (colloquial for outclassed, had no chance to win).

b. An attributive adherent (10 I) adjective: ‘an up-to-date dictionary.’ See 10 I 2. An attributive appositive adjective. For examples see 10 IV, 10 IV a.

c. An object of a verb or an adjective. For examples see 14, 24 IV. In the examples referred to, the object of the preposition is a noun, but it can be, of course, also a pronoun. It is sometimes an it that is explained only by the situation or context: ‘He goes at it right.’ ‘I am sick of it.’

d. A prepositional phrase is very often used as an adverb: ‘He is working in the garden’ (place). ‘He arrived in the evening’ (time). ‘He wrote the letter with care’ (manner proper). ‘In my opinion (manner, here a sentence adverb; see 16 2 a, 6th par.) they are wise.’ ‘He is lacking in initiative’ (manner, specification; see 28 1 a). ‘She passed me on the street without speaking to me’ (attendant circumstance). ‘He worked himself to death’ (result). ‘He is taller by two inches’ (degree). ‘He may be dead for all I know’ (restriction). ‘He was beheaded for treason’ (cause). ‘Without him (condition) I should be helpless.’ ‘His wife clings to him with all his faults’ (concession). ‘John works for grades’
(purpose). ‘He cut the grass with a lawn mower’ (means). ‘The trees were trimmed by the gardener’ (agency). Compare Index under Prepositional Phrase. In these examples the object of the preposition is a noun, but it can be, of course, also a pronoun. It is sometimes an it that is explained only by the situation or context: ‘He is always putting his foot in it.’ ‘He is trying to lie out of it.’ ‘He was hard put to it for an answer.’ ‘He made a clean breast of it.’ ‘We had a bad time of it.’ ‘Step on it!’ (slang). Instead of a noun or pronoun we sometimes employ a prepositional phrase as object of the preposition: ‘Many place-names do not go back to before the Norman conquest’ (W. J. Sedgefield, Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names). ‘I’ll flog him to within an inch of his life.’ In both examples the prepositional phrase is a noun, object of the preposition to.

A prepositional clause is sometimes used adverbially: ‘Say, can’t you get that husband of yours to come right back from wherever he is?’ (Hichens, Ambition, Ch. XXVII). Compare 16 1, 24 IV, 25 1.
CHAPTER XXX

GROUPS AND GROUP-WORDS

63. Just as a word has syllables, just so has a sentence groups of words, and just as a word has one syllable more strongly stressed than the others, just so has one word in a group a stress stronger than the others. Group stress, usually in normal groups, rests upon the last member of the group. A group of a noun and its modifiers: 'the little bôy'; 'a white hórse'; 'a blàck bérry'; 'Jôhn's hât'; 'the bòok upon the tâble.' A verb and its modifiers: 'He căme in'; 'he wènt óut'; 'he stòod úp'; 'he writes bêtàutìfùly'; 'he càme with a friénd'; 'he wròte a lèttér.' A verb and its subject: 'This sòap flòats'; 'the sôn is rising.' But, of course, the subject is often more important than the verb and receives a stronger stress: 'Look yonder where the dead lèaves lîe.' In a normal modern group the chief stress rests upon the last word; the secondary stress occurs near the beginning of the group. In such groups the force is usually descriptive.

In Old English, things were quite different. The chief stress was often upon the first word of a group: 'He in căme.' 'He úp stòod,' etc. In the course of the Old English period a great change took place. The heavily stressed word that stood at the beginning of a group took a position at the end of the group: 'He úp stòod' became 'He stòod úp.' 'He a lèttér wròte' became 'He wròte a lèttér.' The old stress has been kept though the word-order has changed. The old word-order and stress are still preserved in group-words, described below. The object of the new development is evident. The heavily stressed word was withheld for a moment to create the feeling of suspense and thus render the word more prominent. It is only a matter of course that groups in which the first member was not heavily stressed did not participate in this change of word-order. There are three classes of such groups. The first member is a genitive with secondary stress: Jôhn's hât. The first member is an adjective with secondary stress: the lîttle hât. The first member is an adverb with secondary stress: to ûplift, ûndergò, óver-câme, óutstrîp. Though these classes of groups did not suffer a change of word-order, they are in perfect harmony with the large class of groups that did suffer a change of word-order. In all of them the heavily stressed member stands in the last place. More-
over, they all have a pronounced descriptive character. The change of word-order in the one group brought it into harmony with the three others and established the general character for the normal English group.

In marked contrast to these normal groups are a very large number of old groups which represent an older type of English expression. This type originated in the prehistoric period at a time when inflection was still unknown. As there were no inflectional forms the grammatical relations of the members of the group could only be conveyed by the establishment of a fixed word-order: the modifying member always precedes. The first member is an uninflected subjective genitive: ‘éarthquåke = the quaking of the earth.’ The first member is an uninflected possessive genitive: ‘wågon-whèel = wheel of a wagon’; ‘trée-tôp = top of a tree.’ The first member has the force of a genitive of origin: ‘firelight = light from the fireplace.’ The first member is an adverb: icoming; outgòing; förthcòming; dównfàll. The first member has the force of a prepositional phrase: ‘stòrm-tòssed = tossed by the storm’; ‘stàrlít heaven = heaven lit up by the stars’; ‘tóothpíck = a pick for the teeth’; ‘sléeping-càr = a car for sleeping’; ‘dríking-wàter = water for drinking’; ‘fròning bòard = a board for ironing,’ etc. ‘Let your next car be purolator equipped’ (advertisement) = ‘equipped with a purolator.’ The first member is an object: shòemàker; hòuse-clèaning; pléasure-lòving; époch-màking. We often call such groups compounds, but they are not compounds in the sense in which goodbye (a contracted form of God be with you) is a compound. The syntactical relations of the different members of the group are just as clear as in a modern group, although there are no inflectional forms to indicate these relations. The fixed word-order here takes the place of inflection. They differ from modern groups, however, in that they have a peculiar oneness of meaning which resembles the oneness of meaning found in a word. They have the general characteristics of a group of words but also the oneness of meaning found in a word, hence we call them group-words. They have two other features that distinguish them from modern groups — they have the chief stress upon the first member of the group and most of them have a pronounced classifying or distinguishing force: (with classifying force) wàter-pòwer, stèam-pòwer; hédáche, bàckàche; (with distinguishing force) Jàcksonville, Lòuisville. Though the group-word construction in all its functions is a survival of prehistoric usage, it is still, as can be seen by the numerous examples given above, playing an important rôle in the life of our time. It is a particular favorite in the headlines of our daily newspapers:
IOWA BATTLES WISCONSIN TODAY FOR BIG TEN LEAD (Chicago Tribune, Nov. 17, 1928).

This old type of expression was so useful that our ancestors retained it and improved it by introducing inflectional features into it: bird’s-nest; wasp’s-nest; a child’s voice; a woman’s hand; a mother’s love; children-lover; children’s language; printers’ errors; life-destructor; savings bank; backwoodsman, etc. We may call these formations younger group-words in contrast to the old group-words. They differ only in inflectional form from the older formations; the typical features of stress and meaning are exactly the same in the older and the younger group. The influence of these old types of expression is still very powerful. When we form new group-words we still usually give them the form of one of these two old types: men’s shoes; women voters; woman’s college; tie up; lock out. The first three of these examples are in harmony with the spirit of the old type of expression. The last two examples have the form of the old type, but they don’t have its spirit. They are decidedly descriptive. We often feel this in forming group-words with descriptive force and hence give them modern form in harmony with their meaning: the way out; the way in; the ride home; yellow fever; New York; Harper’s Ferry, etc.

On the other hand, old group-words have in very many cases been influenced by modern groups. Old English group-words of the type of stánbrýcg (stone bridge) are often as useful in modern life as in early times, as, for instance, when we desire to classify or distinguish, as in stóne bridges, iron bridges, etc., or not an iron bridge but a stóne bridge; but they are often in open conflict with our modern feeling when we describe, hence we have to give them modern form: a bridge of dressed stóne, a stóne bridge. The last example represents one of the most characteristic changes that have taken place in modern English. The expression a stóne bridge is formed after the analogy of a white bridge. The adjective with secondary stress stands before the strongly stressed noun describing it. Similarly, we now construe stone, originally a noun, as an adjective and give it the secondary stress of an adjective, although it was once more strongly stressed than the noun that forms the second member of the group. Thus we have used old material for our modern construction, but have given it modern form. On the other hand, we often use an adjective, adverb, or genitive in -s with classifying or distinguishing force, but, of course, we place the stress as in an old group, i.e., upon the first member: a blackberry; the White House; Newcastle; the red book not the równ one; all-wool; near beer (i.e., almost beer); ‘Trusts and
Near-Trusts' (heading of an editorial in *Saturday Evening Post*, July 21, 1928); Pittsburg; Johnstown, etc. Compare 10 I 2, 10 II 1.

In old compounds and group-words the first component is often a modern descriptive group: ‘a dirty clothes basket’ = ‘dirty clothes + basket’; ‘a new and second-hand bookseller’ = ‘new and second-hand book + seller’; ‘a practical joker’ = ‘practical joke + -er.’
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The references are to sections and subsections. The contraction syn. stands for syntax, i.e., the grammatical construction required.

A, an, indefinite article, form and use, 56 C; a qualitative determinative, 56 A (next to last par.).
A-, contraction of on, 7 F (4th par.), 62 2, 47 a (2nd par.), 50 4 c dd (3rd par.).
A-, ingressive prefix, 38 2 a dd.
A-, old prefix of past part., 49 3 b (3rd par.).
'A,' contraction of have, see Had 'a.'
Abaf, prep., 62 1.
Ablative case, 62 (7th par.).
Aboard, prep., 62 1.
About, pred. adv., 7 F; adv. after verbs: 'They set about to repair the damage'; prep., 62 1; in prepositional clauses, 7 F, 50 4 c dd; effective particle, 38 2 b aa.
Above, prep., 62 1.
Abreast, pred. adv., 7 F, 62 1; prep., 62 1.
Abridged clauses, 20 3, 21 e, 23 I a, 23 II 11, 24 III d, 24 IV a, 26 a, 27 5, 28 1 a, 28 2 b, 28 3 a, 28 5 d, 29 1 A a bb, 29 1 A c bb, 29 1 A d aa, 29 1 B b, 29 2 a, 30 b, 31 2, 32 2, 33 2, 34.
Absent, reflex. verb, 46 (4th par.).
Absolute:
Nominative: in adverbial clauses, 17 3 A; in subject clauses, 17 3 B; in predicate clauses, 17 3 C; in appositive clauses, 17 3 D.
Participles, 17 4.
Superlative, 54 2 a, 16 5 b.
Comparative, 54 2 b.
Use of transitive verbs, 46.
Abstract nouns, 59 5.
Acause, sub. conj. for because, 30.
Accent, see Stress.
Accept, syn., 13 3.
According as, sub. conj. of: alternate agreement, 28 5; proportionate agreement, 29 1 A b.
According to, prep., 62 1.
Accordingly, coord. conj., 19 1 e.
Accusative:
Form and position, 11 1.
Meaning and use, 11 2.
Metonymic object, 11 2 a.
Reflexive object, 11 2 c.
Reciprocal object, 11 2 d.
Interrogative and relative whom as object, 11 2 e.
Object of an adjective, 11 2 g.
Dative and accusative, 16 I.
Accusative of the person and genitive of the thing, 15 II.
Double accusative: accusative of the person and accusative of the thing, 15 III 1; accusative of the direct object and an objective predicate, 15 III 2.
Accusative of the person or thing and a prepositional phrase, 15 IV.
Adverbal accusative, 16 4 a.
Accusative clause, 24.
After a verb, 24 III; in the form of a question, 24 III c; abridgment, 24 III d.
After a preposition, 24 IV; abridgment, 24 III d.
Accustomed, 38 4 (next to last par.).
Across, prep., 62 1; effective particle, 38 2 b aa.
Act, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).
Actional passive, 47 a.
Active voice, 46; intransitive form with reflexive force, 46 (4th par.); active form with passive meaning, 46 (7th par.).
Adapt, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.
Address, nominative of, 17 2.
Adherent adjectives and participles, 10 I, 10 I 1.

Adjective clauses:
- Attributive substantive clause, 23 I; abridgment, 23 I a.
- Attributive relative clause:
  - Original nature of the clause, 23 II.
  - Older forms of the clause, 23 II (4th par.).
  - Descriptive and restrictive relative clauses, 23 II 6.
  - Complex relative clause, 23 II 6 a.

Personality and form in the use of relative pronouns, 23 II 7.
- Case of the relative pronoun and its agreement with its antecedent, 23 II 8.
  - False attraction, 23 II 8 d.
  - Position and repetition of the relative pronoun, 23 II 9.
  - Personal pronoun instead of a relative, 23 II 9 a.
  - Independent proposition instead of a relative, 23 II 9 b.

Asyndetic relative construction, 23 II 10: hypotactic clause, 23 II 10 a; paratactic clause, 23 II 10 b.
- Abridgment of relative clause, 23 II 11.

Adjective modifiers:
- Adherent and appositive adjective and participle, 10 I.
- Position and stress, 10 I 1.
- Nouns, adverbs, phrases, and sentences used as adjectives, 10 I 2.
- Repetition of limiting adjective, 10 I 3.
- Noun modified by two possessive adjectives connected by and, 10 I 4.
- Logical relations of the adjective to its governing noun, 10 I 5.

Attributive genitive, 10 II.
- Form, position, and stress, 10 II 1.
- Position of genitive among other attributive modifiers, 10 II 1 c.

Categories, 10 II 2.
- Genitive of origin, 10 II 2 A.
- Possessive genitive, 10 II 2 B; group genitive, 10 II 2 B d;
  - unclear genitive forms, 10 II 2 B e.

Subjective genitive, 10 II 2 C.
- Objective genitive, 10 II 2 D.
- Genitive of material or composition, 10 II 2 E.

Descriptive genitive: genitive of characteristic, 10 II 2 F a; genitive of measure, 10 II 2 F b.

Appositive genitive, 10 II 2 G.
- Partitive genitive, 10 II 2 H;
  - genitive of gradation, 10 II 2 H e.

Apposition:
- Apposition proper, 10 III 1;
- loose apposition, 10 III 1 A;
- close apposition, 10 III 1 B.

Improper apposition, 10 III 2.
- Prepositional phrase, 10 IV.
- Infinitive, 10 V.
- Adverb, 10 VI.
- Clause, 10 VII.

Adjectives:
- Functions, 51 1.
- Classes, 51 2.
- Position and stress, 10 I 1.

Repetition of limiting adjectives, 10 I 3.
- Nouns, adverbs, phrases, and sentences used as adjectives, 10 I 2, 7 B a aa.

Adjectives and participles used as nouns, 58.
- Adjectives used as pronouns, 57 2, 3.

Inflection of descriptive adjectives, 52.

Inflection and use of limiting adjectives, 56.

Substantive form of adjectives, 52 (3rd par.), 57.

Comparison, 53-55.
- Older comparison, pleonasm, excess of expression, 54 1 a aa.
- Advantages of analytic form, 54 1 b.

Different form for different function, 54 1 c.
- Two qualities of one person or thing compared, 54 1 d.

Comparison of other parts of speech used as adjectives, 54 1 f.
Comparison of compounds, 54
1 h.
Absolute superlative, 54 2 a.
Absolute comparative, 54 2 b.
Adject, 9 2.
Admit, syn., 13 3.
Admitting that, absolute part., 32 2.
Adown, prep., 62 1.
Adverbial accusative, 16 4 a.
Adverbial clauses, 25, 26-34.
Clause of place, 26; abridgment, 26 a.
Clause of time, 27; abridgment, 27 5.
Clause of manner, 28.
Manner proper, 28 1; abridgment, 28 1 a.
Comparison, 28 2; abridgment, 28 2 b.
Attendant circumstance, 28 3; abridgment, 28 3 a.
Alternative agreement, 28 4.
Manner clause of modal result and pure result, 28 5; replaced by other constructions, 28 5 a, b; abridgment, 28 5 d.
Clause of degree, 29.
Comparison:
Positive clause, expressing a degree equal to that of the principal proposition:
A simple comparison, 29 1 A a; abridgment, 29 1 A a bb.
Proportionate agreement, 29 1 A b.
Restriction, 29 1 A c; abridgment, 29 1 A c bb.
Extent, 29 1 A d; abridgment, 29 1 A d aa.
Comparative clause, 29 1 B.
Degree clause of modal result, 29 2; abridgment, 29 2 a.
Clause of cause, 30.
Origin, 30 a; abridgment, 30 b.
Clause of condition or exception, 31.
Replaced by other constructions, 31 1; abridgment, 31 2.
Clause of concession, 32.
Replaced by other constructions, 32 1; abridgment, 32 2.
Clause of purpose, 33.
Replaced by other constructions, 33 1; abridgment, 33 2.
Clause of means, 34; abridgment, 34.
Adverbial genitive, 16 4 a.
Adverbial modifiers, form and function, 16 1.
Adverbial prepositional clause, 16 1, 62 7 d.
Adverbial prepositional phrase, 16 1, 17 3 A b, c, d, e, f, 28 1 a, 28 2 (6th par.), 28 3 a, 28 5 d (next to last par.), 29 1 A c aa, 29 1 A d aa, 30 b, 31 2 (9th par.), 32 2 (next to last par.), 33 2.
Adverbs:
Form and function, 16 1.
Position and stress, 16 2.
Sentence adverb, 28 2 a; with the force of the subjunctive, 43 I A (2nd par.), 44 I (last par.).
Distinguishing adverb, 28 2 b.
Position of only, 28 2 c.
Position of not, 28 2 d.
Contraction of not, 28 2 e.
Negatives, 16 3.
Double negation, 16 3 a.
Rhetorical question instead of a negative statement, 16 3 b.
Form of simple adverbs, 16 4.
Genitive, dative, and accusative used adverbially, 16 4 a.
This and that used adverbially, 16 4 b.
Adverbial use of the, 16 4 c.
Comparison of adverbs, 16 5 a aa, bb.
Absolute superlative, 16 5 b.
Adverbs used as:
Adherent adjectives, 10 I 2.
Appositive adjectives, 10 VI.
Predicate adjectives, 7 F.
Nouns and pronouns, 62 (3rd par.), 16 1 (5th and 6th parr.), 23 II 5.
Conjunctions:
see Conjunctive adverbs; coordinating, 19 2.
First component of compounds, 16 1 (3rd par.).
Adversative, coord. conj., 19 1 c; sub. conj., 27 4, 32.
Afoot, 7 F, 62 1 a.
Afore, prep., 62 1; sub. conj., 27, 27 3 (7th par.).
After, prep., 10 IV a, 62 1; sub. conj. of time, 10 IV a, 27, 27 3 (next to last par.); imparting the idea of a habitual act, 38 1 (3rd par. from end); adj. compar., 54 1 a.

After all, coörd. conj., 19 1 c; = sub. concessive clause, 32 2 (next to last par.).

Aftermost, 54 1 a, 54 1 a aa.

Afterward(s), 16 4 a.

Again, coord. conj., 19 1 o c; sub. conj., 27, 27 3 (next to last par.); prep., 62 1.

Against, prep., 62 1; sub. conj., 27 3 (next to last par.).

Agent in the passive voice expressed by by and of, 11 2 f.

Agreeably to, prep., 62 1.

Agreement of: Predicate and subject in: number, 8 I; person, 8 II, 21 c, 23 II 3; gender, 8 III; case, 8 IV.

Appositive with governing noun or pronoun, 10 III 1 A, B, 10 III 1 A a.

Pronoun with antecedent, 61 a, 57 5 b (6th par.), 23 II 8.

Ah, interj., 17 1.

Ahead of, prep., 62 1.

Aim, syn., 24 III d (9th par.).

Ain't, 16 2 e.

Al, sub. conj., 32.

Alas, interj., 17 1.

Albe, sub. conj., 32.

Albeit, sub. conj., 32.

All, uninflected limiting adj., 57 1 (5th par.); used as predicate appositive, 6 C; used as pronoun, 57 3; used as noun, 58 (last par.); used as adverb, 16 4 a.

All the same, coörd. conj., 19 1 c.

All too, 16 2 c.

Allow, syn., 13 3.

Ally, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Alms, 8 I 2 f.

Alone, distinguishing adv., 16 2 b.

Along, alongst, prep., 62 1.

Along of, prep., 62 1.

Along with, prep., 62 1.

Alongside of, prep., 62 1.

Also, distinguishing adv., 16 2 b; coörd. conj., 19 1.

Alternative agreement, clause of, 28 4.

Although, sub. conj., 32.

Amends, 59 2.

Amid or amidst, prep., 62 1.

Amn't, 16 2 e.

Among or amongst, prep., 16 4 a, 62 1.

An or a, indefinite article, form and use of, 56 C.

An, sub. conj.: = whether, if, 24 III; = if, 31, 32; = than, 29 1 B.

Analytic form, advantages of, 6 A d (1), (2); 54 1 b.

Anaphoric force of demonstratives, 56 A, B.

And, coörd. conj., 19, 19 1 a; sub. conj.: = whether, if, 24 III; = if, 31, 32; = than, 29 1 B.

And — as well, coörd. conj., 19 2 a.

And which, 23 II 6 c.

And who, 23 II 6 c.

And yet, coörd. conj., 19 1 c.

Anent, prep., 62 1.

Annalistic present tense, 37 1 d.

Anon as, sub. conj., 27.

Another from instead of another than, 29 1 b.

Answer, syn., 15 I 1.

An't, 16 2 e.

Antecedent, 61 a, 23 II 8; the antecedent not a noun or pronoun, but the idea contained in a group of words or a single noun or adjective, 7 C, 23 II 6 (6th par.).

Antecedent to, prep., 62 1.

Antelope, pl., 59 3.

Anterior to, prep., 62 1.

Anticipatory: subject it and there, 4 II C; object it, 11 2 b.

A number (of), 8 I 1 d.

Any, adj., in substantive function, 57 1, 3; any one, 57 1 (6th par.); any one, 57 1 (8th par.); any, much used as an adverb, especially in American speech, 16 4 a (5th par.).

Anybody else's, 57 5 c (2nd par.).

Anywheres for anywhere, 16 4 a.

Apart from, prep., 62 1; with gerund, 28 3 a.

Apart from the fact that, sub. conj., 28 3.

Apostrophe with the genitive, 10 II 1.

Apparently, adv. with subjunctive force, 44 I (last par.).
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**Appear**, copula, 6 B; with subjunctive force, 44 I (last par.).

**Apply**, intrans. or reflex., 46 (5th par.).

Appositional type of sentence, 6 B a.

Appositive:
- Adjectives and participles, 10 I 1.
- Nouns and pronouns, 10 III 1 A a, b, B, 10 II 2 G (4th par.), 10 II 2 H b.
- Genitive, 10 II 2 G.
- Adverbs, 10 VI.
- Prepositional phrases, 10 IV.
- Clauses, 10 III 1 A b, 10 VII, 23 I.
- Infinitives, 10 V.
- Gerunds, 50 4 d (3rd par.).
- Predicate appositive, 6 C.

**Approve**, syn., 13 3.


**A quarter**, syn., 6 C.

**Around**, prep., 62 1.

**Article**, definite, 56 B; indefinite, 56 C; repetition of, 10 I 3.

**As**:
- Original meaning, 27 2, 23 II (3rd par.), 25.
- Present functions:
  - Used before predicate complement, 7 A b (3).
  - Before objective predicate, 15 III 2 A.
  - Before appositives, 10 III 1 A (4th par.), 6 C, 7 A b (3).
  - Relative pronoun, 23 II (3rd par.), 23 II 5, 27 2 (3rd par.), 29 1 A c aa.
- Coordinating conjunction, 19 I a, f.
- Subordinating conjunction for that in substantive clauses, 21, 24 III.
- Subordinating conjunction used to introduce a predicate clause, 22.
- Widely used in adverbial clauses, 25.
  - Place, 26.
  - Time, 27, 27 2.
  - Manner proper, 28 1.
  - Manner clause of comparison, 28 2, 28 2 a.
  - Attendant circumstance, 28 3.
  - Alternative agreement, 28 4.
  - Manner clause of modal result, 28 5 (3rd par. from end); 28 5 d; pure result, 28 5 (next to last par.), 28 5 d.
- Degree clause of comparison, 29 1 A a, 29 1 A a bb.
- Proportionate agreement, 29 1 A b.
- Restriction or extent, 29 1 A c, d.
- In comparative clause with the force of than, 29 1 B.
- Degree clause of modal result, 29 2, 29 2 a.
- Cause, 30, 30 a.
- Cause and manner, 30 a (6th par.).

**Purpose**, 33.

**As against**, prep., 62 1.

**As also**, coörd. conj., 19 I a.

**As between**, prep., 62 1.

**As compared with**, prep., 62 1.

**As distinct (or distinguished) from**, prep., 62 1.

**As far as**, sub. conj., 29 1 A c; prep., 62 1, 24 IV, 29 1 A d aa, 29 1 B b.

**As fast as**, sub. conj., 29 1 A d.

**As if or as though**, 28 2 a.

**As it were**, 28 2 a.

**As long as**, sub. conj. of: time, 27; cause, 30; extent, 29 1 A d.

**As often as**, sub. conj. of time, 27, 27 2 (5th par.).

**As opposed to**, prep., 62 1.

**As regards**, 29 1 A c.

**As soon as**, sub. conj., 29 1 A c.

**As such as ever**, sub. conj., 27.

**As that**, sub. conj. of: manner clause of modal result, 28 5 (3rd par. from end); degree clause of simple comparison, 29 1 A a (last par.); degree clause of modal result, 29 2; cause = as, 30.

**As though**, see **As if**.

**As to**, prep., 62 1, 29 1 A c aa.

**As touching**, prep., 62 1.

**As well as**, coörd. conj., 19 I a, 8 I 1 b.

**As which**, 23 II 6 b.

**As who**, 23 II 6 b.

**Ashore**, 7 F, 62 2.

Ask, with two accusatives, 15 III 1.
Aslant, prep., 62 1, 62 2.
Aspect:
  Durative, 38 1.
  Point-action aspects: ingressive, 38 2 a; effective, 38 2 b.
  Terminate, 38 3.
  Iterative, 38 4.
  Aspect in popular Scotch and Irish, 38 5.
Assuming, absolute part., 31 2 (4th par.), 32 2.
Astern of, prep., 62 1.
Astride of, prep., 62 1.
Asyndetic relative construction, 23 II 10.
  Hypotactic clause, 23 II 10 a.
  Paratactic clause, 23 II 10 b.
At, prep., 62 1; prep, adv., 62 5.
  At least, distinguishing adv., 16 2 b.
  At the cost of, prep., 62 1.
  At the hands of, prep., 62 1.
  At the instance of, prep., 62 1.
  At the peril of, prep., 62 1.
  At the point of, prep., 62 1.
  At the same time that, sub. conj. of: time, 27; attendant circumstance, 38 3; with adverساطive force, 27 4.
  At times — at times, coord. conj., 19 1 a.
Athletics, 59 2.
Athwart, prep., 62 1, 62 2.
Atop, prep., 62 1, 62 2.
Attendant circumstance, clause of, 28 3; abridgment, 28 3 a.
Attraction, infinitive attracted to the form of a past tense or participle, 6 A d, 49 4 C (1) a (last par.), 49 4 E (3rd par.).
Attributive adjective clauses, see Adjective clauses.
Attributive adjective modifiers, 10; see also Adjective modifiers.
Attributive genitive, 10 II.
Attributive prepositional clause, 10 IV a.
Attributive prepositional phrase, 10 IV.
Attributive substantive clause, 23 I; abridgment, 23 I a.
Auxiliaries:
  Do, 6 A d.
  Have and be to form the present perfect and the past perfect, 37 3.
  Shall and will to form the future and the future perfect, 37 5 a, 37 6.
Passive auxiliaries, 47 a.
  Used to form the subjunctive, 42, 43–44.
  Used to form the imperative, 45 2, 3, 4.
Stressed to emphasize the idea of actuality or modality, 6 A d (1), 38 1 (4th and 5th parr.).
  With causative force, 46 (next to last par.).
Ariatrix, 60 1 c.
Avoid, syn., 24 III d (next to last par.).
Away, compound, 7 F; ingressive particle, 38 2 a dd; effective particle, 38 2 b aa.
Back of, prep., 62 1.
Backward(s), 16 4 a.
Bad, badly, comparison of, 54 1 a, 16 5 a. ‘I feel bad’ (not badly; see 7 B a), but ‘I wanted it badly (not bad; see 16 4, 4th par.) enough.’ Bad used as noun, 58 (3rd par. from end).
Badder, compar., 54 1 a.
Bah, interj., 17 1.
Bake, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).
Bally, adv., 54 2 a (last par.).
Bang, copula, 6 B.
Banish, with two accusatives, 15 III 1, 15 III 1 a.
Bantu, pl. of, 58 (4th par.).
Barracks, pl., 59 2.
Barring, absolute part., 31 2.
Bask, syn., 46 (4th par.).
Bathe, syn., 46 (4th par.).
Bating, prep., 62 1, 31 2.
Be, copula, 6 B, 7 A, B, C, 7 D 1; modal auxiliary, 7 D 2, 43 I A (3rd and 6th parr.), 44 I I 5 A a (last par.); with durative force in the progressive form, 38 1, 47 a (2nd par.); with ingressive force, 38 2 a ee, ff, hh, 38 3 (2nd par.), 47 b; with effective force, 38 2 b ee (last par.), 38 2 b gg, hh; with future force, 37 1 e; be for have in the perfect tense
active, 37 3 d; passive auxiliary, 47 a, b.
Be—, 62 4 (last par.).
Bear, reflex., 46 (4th par.).
Beat: I beat him jumping, 28 1 a.
Beauty, beauties, meaning, 59 5 b.
Because, sub. conj. of: cause, 30,
30 a (7th par.); purpose, 33;
introducing subject clause, 21; intro­
troducing predicate clause, 22.
Because that, sub. conj. of cause, 30.
Become, copula, 6 B, 38 2 a bb,
38 2 b ee.
Before, prep., 10 IV a, 62 1; sub.
conj., 10 IV a, 21, 27, 273 (7th par.).
Begin, with ingressive force, 38 2 a aa.
Behave, syn., 46 (4th par.).
Behind, prep., 62 1.
Behold, syn., 15 III 2 B.
Believe, syn., 7 A a (1), 12 1, 24 III,
24 III d.
Bellows, 59 2.
Below, prep., 62 1.
Beneath, prep., 62 1.
Beside, prep., 62 1, 6.
Besides, prep., 62 1, 6.
Besides that, sub. conj., 28 3.
Bestir, reflex., 46 (4th par.).
Bet, syn., 12 I B a.
Belay, reflex., 46 (4th par.).
Bethink, reflex., 46 (4th par.).
Betroth, with dat. and ace, 15 I 1.
Better, compar., 54 1 a, 16 5 a; me
were better (or I were better) to go,
49 4 C 1 b.
Bettermost, superl., 54 1 a.
Between, prep., 62 1.
Betwixt, prep., 62 1.
Beyond, prep., 62 1.
Beyond that, sub. conj., 31.
Beyond the reach of, prep., 62 1.
Bid, syn., 15 III 2 B.
Billy, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.
Bit, a bit, 64 4 a.
Black, noun, pl. of, 58 (3rd par.).
Blackfoot, noun, pl. of, 58 (4th par.).
Blending, 4 II C (4th par.), 10 II
2 H c, 20 3 (5th par.), 24 III c, 31
(near end), 49 4 C (1) b, 59 7 (2nd
par.).
Bloody, adv., 54 2 a (last par.).
Blow, copula, 6 B; with passive force,
46 (7th par.).
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But then, coörd. conj., 19 I 1 c.
But which, 23 II 6 c.
Buy, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.
By, prep., 62 I; used with a passive verb to denote the agent, 11 2 f; prep. adv., 62 5; sub. conj., 24 IV (7th par.), 27.
By dint of, prep., 62 I.
By (the) help of, prep., 62 I.
By how much — by so much, 29 I A b.
By means of, prep., 62 I.
By order of, prep., 62 I.
By reason of, prep., 62 I.
By reason that, sub. conj., 30.
By that, sub. conj.: of time, 27; of cause, 30.
By the fact that, sub. conj. of means, 34.
By then that, sub. conj., 27.
By virtue of, prep., 62 I.
By way of, prep., 62 I.

Call, syn., 15 III 2, 15 III 2 A a.
Can, 49 4 C (1) a; modal auxiliary, 44 I.
Cannon, pl. of, 59 1.
Can't help but feel that, etc., 24 III d (next to last par.), 49 4 E (4th par.).
Care of, prep., 62 I.
Case, see Nominative, Accusative, Dative, Genitive.
Catch, copula, 6 B, 7 F; with in­gressive force, 38 2 a cc; with effective force, 38 2 b ee, hh; with passive force, 46 (7th par.).
Causal clause, 30; abridgment, 30 b; causal conjunctions, 30 a.
Causative auxiliaries, 46 (next to past par.).
Causatives, 46 (the two parr. preceding the last one).
Cause, clause of, 30; abridgment, 30 b.
Cause, syn., 24 III d; with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.
Cause why, sub. conj., 30.
Cease, with effective force, 38 2 b cc.
Chance, copula, 6 B, 7 D 1 a.
Characteristic, genitive of, 10 II 2 Fa.
Chinamen, Chinese, Chinee, 58 (4th par.).
Choose, syn., 24 III d (next to last par.), 49 E.
Classifying stress of: adjectives, 10 I 1; genitives, 10 II 1 (next to last par.).
Clause, subordinate: grammatical function, 20 I; position, 20 2; abridgment, 20 3.
Subject clause, 21.
Position and stress, 21 b.
Emphasis and attraction, 21 c. Abridgment, 21 d.
Predicate clause, 22.
Position and stress, 22 a.
Abridgment, 22 c.
Adjective clause:
Attributive substantive clause, 23 I; abridgment, 23 I a.
Attributive adjective clause, i.e., relative clause. See Attributive relative clause under Ad­jective clauses.
Object clause:
Genitive clause, 24 I; abridgment, 24 I a.
Dative clause, 24 II; abridgment, 24 II a.
Accusative clause, 24 III; abridgment, 24 III a.
Prepositional clause, 24 IV; abridgment, 24 IV a.
Adverbial clause, 25.
Place, 26; abridgment, 26 a.
Time, 27; abridgment, 27 5.
Manner with its various forms and their abridgments, 28.
Degree with its various forms and their abridgments, 29.
Cause, 30; abridgment, 30 b.
Condition or exception, 31; re­placed by other constructions, 31 1; abridgment, 31 2.
Concession, 32; replaced by other constructions, 32 1; abridgment, 32 2.
Purpose, 33; replaced by other constructions, 33 1; abridgment, 33 2.
Means and its abridgment, 34.
Clergy, pl., 59 1.
Co-, 16 I (3rd par.).
Cock, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.
Cognate accusative, 11 2 (3rd par.).
Collective nouns, 55 1; agreement of verbs with, 8 I 1 d.
Come, copula, 6 B, 7 B a, 38 2 b ee;
full verb, syn., 16 4 a (next to last par.).

Come to, am coming to, with effective force, 38 2 b ee; with modal force, 43 I A (4th par. from end), 43 II B c.

Command, see Imperative.

Commence, copula, 6 B; with inceptive force, 38 2 a aa.

Common case, or common form, 3.

Common gender, 60 I a.

Communicate, reflex., with passive force, 46 (9th par.).

Comparative:

Of adjectives, relative comparative, 54 I a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, 55; different form for different function, 54 I c; comparatives not followed by than, 54 I g; double comparative, 54 I a aa; absolute comparative, 54 2 b.

Of adverbs, 16 5 a.

Comparative clause, 29 1 B; abridgment, 29 1 B b.

Comparison:

Of adjectives characteristic of descriptive adjectives but found also with a number of limiting adjectives, 53; present forms of comparison, 54-55; older comparison, pleonasm, and excess of expression, 54 I a aa.

Of adverbs, 16 5 a aa, bb.

Comparison, clause of, 28 2; abridgment, 28 2 b.

Complement, predicate, 7.

Complete: predicate, 6 A; subject, 4.

Complete predication, verbs of, 6 A.

Complex: sentence, 18, 20; subject clause, 21 (last par.); predicate clause, 22 b; object clause, 24 III (last par.); relative clause, 23 II 6 a.

Comport, reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Compose, reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Composition, genitive of, 10 II 2 E.

Compound: adjectives, 10 I 2, 16 I (3rd par.), 16 4 a (4th par. from end); nouns, 10 II 1 (10th and 11th par.); verbs, 16 I (3rd par.), 62 4 (last par.); compounds in general, 63.

Compound sentence, 19 1.

Conceding, absolute part., 32 2.

Conceive, syn., 13 3.

Concerning, prep., 62 1, 17 4 (4th par.).

Concessive clause, 32.

Replace by other constructions, 32 1; abridgment, 32 2.

Concord, see Agreement.

Concurrently with, prep., 62 1.

Conditional clause, 31.

Mood and tense in, 44 II 5 A, B, C.

Replace by other constructions, 31 1; abridgment, 31 2.

Conditionally (that), sub. conj., 31.

Conditionally on, prep., 62 1.

Conduct, reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Conformably to, prep., 62 1.

Conjunctive:

Adjectives, introducing a subordinate clause, usually called relative adjectives, 23 II 2 (5th par.), 23 II 3 (2nd par.), 21, 24 III.

Pronouns:

In coordinated propositions, 19 2.

Introducing a subordinate clause: in attributive relative clauses, 23 II 5; in substantive clauses, introduced by indefinite relative pronouns or interrogative pronouns, 21 (1st, 2nd, and 4th par.), 24 III.

Adverbs:

In coordinated propositions, 19 2.

Introducing a subordinate clause: in substantive clauses introduced by indefinite relative adverbs or interrogative adverbs, 21 (1st, 2nd, and 4th par.), 24 III; in attributive relative clauses used as relative pronouns, 23 II 5.

Consecrate, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Consecutive clause, see Result clauses.

Consequently, coord. conj., 19 1 e.

Consider, syn., 7 A b (2), 15 II 2 A.

Considered, part. in absolute nominal construction, 17 3 A c.

Considering, absolute part., 31 2.
Content, contents, 59 6.
Continue, copula, 6 B; with durative force, 38 1.
Contraction of: compound sentence, 19 1; not, 16 2 e.
Contrary to, prep., 62 1.
Conversely, coord. conj., 19 1 c.
Conversion, 58.
Convey, reflex., 46 (4th and 8th parr.).
Coordinating: conjunctions, 19 1; pronouns and adverbs, 19 2.
Copulas, 6 B; often with such concrete force that to be must be added to indicate that they are copulas, 7 A a (1) (3rd par.); often in other meanings with their original concrete force, 6 B (2nd par.).
Copulative conjunctions, 19 1 a.
Correlative conjunctions: coordinating, 19 1 a; subordinating, 29 1 A b, 32 (last par.).
Cos, sub. conj. for because, 30.
Counter to, prep., 62 1.
Cow, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.
Cross, reciprocal verb without use of reciprocal pronoun, 11 2 d, 46 (5th par.).
Cut, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).
Cut out, with effective force, 38 2 b dd.
Cut up, copula, 6 B.
Czar, czarina, 60 1 c.

Damned, adv., 54 2 a (last par.).
Dangling participles, 17 4.
Danish origin, 16 3 (6th par.);
Danish influence, 23 II.
Dare, syn., 49 4 C (1) a.
Dative case: original meaning, 12 2; form and use, 12 1; indirect object, 11 1, 15 I 1; dative of reference, 12 1 B a; dative of interest, 12 1 B b; ethical dative, 12 1 B c; adverbial dative, 16 4 a.
Dead, deader, deadest, 54 1 a aa.
Dear me, interj., 17 1.
Debar, with two accusatives, 16 III 1, 15 III 1 a.
Declarative sentence, 2; word-order of declarative sentence sometimes used in questions, 35 2 (3rd par.).
Declension, see Inflection.
Dedicate, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Definite article, use of, 56 B.
Degree in adjectives and adverbs, see Comparison.
Degree, clause of, 29.
Comparison:
Positive clause:
Simple comparison, 29 1 A a; abridgment, 29 1 A a bb.
Proportionate agreement, 29 1 A b.
Restriction, 29 1 A c; abridgment, 29 1 A c bb.
Extent, 29 1 A d; abridgment, 29 1 A d aa.
Comparative clause, 29 1 B.
Result, 29 2; abridgment, 29 2 a.
Deliberative question, see Questions.
Demean, reflex., 46 (4th par.).
Demonstrative adjectives: inflection and use, 56, 56 A; charged with feeling, 56 A; with anaphoric force, 56 A, B; with determinative force, 56 A, B.
Deny, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.
Depart, syn., 11 2.
Dependent, see Subordinate.
Deport, reflex., 46 (4th par.).
Derive, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).

Descriptive:
Adjectives: defined, 51 2; used as nouns, 58.
Genitive, 10 II 2 F.
Relative clause, 23 II 6.
Desire, syn., 24 III, 24 III d.
Desirous of, 13 3 (4th par.).
Despite, prep., 62 1.
Despite that, sub. conj., 32.
Determinative: adjectives and pronouns, 56 A, B, 23 II, 23 II 10 a; adverbs, 25, 27 2.
Develop, intrans. or reflex., 46 (4th par.); passive force, 46 (7th par.).
Devote, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.
Different from or different to, 62 6.
Different than, 29 1 B.
Differently from, prep., 62 1.
Direct: address, 17 2; object, 11 1, 15 I 1, 2, 15 II, 15 III 1, 2, 15 IV; discourse, 44 II 3 a.
Directly, sub. conj., 27 3 (5th par.).
Dis-, 16 1 (3rd par.).
Disjunctive conjunctions, 19 1 b.
INDEX

Dismiss, with two accusatives, 15 III 1, 16 III 1 a.

Dissolve, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).

Distinguishing: adjective stress, 10 I 1; genitive stress, 10 II 1 (next to last par.); adverbs, 16 2 b.

Do, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1; used to prevent a repetition, 6 A c; used as an auxiliary, 6 A d, 45 2; with effective force, 38 2 b cc; I have (or am) done packing, 38 2 b cc; causative auxiliary, 46 (next to last par.).

Doe, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 6.

Dog, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 a, 6.

Done: Done told you about that, 6 Ad, 49 4 C (1) a (last par.); 'Will you ever be done getting me into trouble?', 28 1 a; 'I have (or am) done packing,' 38 2 6 cc.

Don't, 8 I 1 h, Note (next to last par.), 16 2 f.

Double: comparison, 54 I a aa; negation, 16 3 a; genitive, 10 II 1 b.

Double, intrans. or reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Doubt, with reflex. dat., 12 1 B b (next to last par.); conjunctions used after doubt, 24 III; doubt not but, with infinitive, 24 III d (6th par.).

Down, prep., 62 1; prep. adv., 62 4 (next to last par.); adv. with ingressive force, 38 2 a dd; adv. with effective force, 38 2 b aa; adj., 7 F.

Down at, prep., 62 1.

Down to, prep., 62 1.

Dozen, pl. of, 10 2 H b, 59 3.

Dread, intrans. or reflex., 46 (4th par. from end).

Dress, intrans. or reflex., 46 (4th par. from end).

Drop, causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).

Duck, pl., 59 3.

Due to, prep., 62 (5th par.), 62 1.

Durative, aspect, 38 1.

During, prep., 62 1; origin, 17 3 A c; sub. conj., 27.

Each, each one, 57 1, 3; number of verb with, 8 I 1 e, 61 a.

Each other, reciprocal pron., 57 5 c.

Eager for, 14.

Early, adv., 16 4 (4th par.); comparison of, 16 5 a.

East, eastern, comparison of, 54 I a.

East of, prep., 62 I.

Easy, adv., 16 4 (4th par.); comparison of, 16 5 a.

Eat, copula, 6 B.

Eaves, 8 I 2 f.

Editorial we, 4 II E.

Be = you, 4 II H (2nd par.).

Effective aspect, 38 2 b.

E.g., coörd. conj., 19 1 f.

Either, number of verb with, 8 I 1 e.

Either: not (or never) — not (or nor) . . . either, 19 1 a.

Either — or, coörd. conj., 19 1 b.

Elder, eldest, 54 1 a; elder cannot take than after it, 54 1 g.

Ellipsis: in infinitive clause, 49 4 E; in clause of exception, 31 (5th par. and 3rd par. from end); in comparative clause, 29 1 B, 29 1 B a; in clauses of comparison, 28 2 (4th par.), 29 1 A a.

Elliptical clause different from the abridged clause, 20 3 a.

Else: no one but he, or else than he, or other than he, or besides him, 31 (3rd par. from end); other often replaced by else after pronouns, 57 5 c (2nd par.); disjunctive adv., 19 1 b.

Emotive sentence, 2.

Emphatic: subject, 3 a, 4 II C, 35 I (5th and 6th parr.); verb, 4 II C (last two parr.), 6 A d (1), (2), 35 2, 45 2 a, b; word in the predicate other than a finite verb, 35 1; adjective stress, 10 I 1; 'the,' 56 B (2nd par.).

Enable, syn., 24 III d.

End, comparison, 54 I a.

Endmost, superl., 54 I a.

English: Middle, period from A.D. 1150 to A.D. 1500; Modern, period from A.D. 1500 to the present day; Old, period down to A.D. 1150; popular, Preface, p. vi.

Enough, sentence adv., 16 2 a (next to last par.).

Entreat, syn., 24 III.
Entreaty, how expressed, 45 2 b.

Envy, syn., 15 III 1.

-er, iterative suffix, 38 4; masculine suffix, 60 i c.

Ere, prep., 62 1; sub. conj., 27, 27 3 (7th par.); with subjunctive, 43 II B c.

Especially, distinguishing adv., 16 2 b.

-ess, suffix indicating a female, 60 I c.

Establish, reflex., 46 (9th par.).

Ethical dative, 12 I B c.

Every, every one, 57 1, 3; with sing. verb, 8 I 1 e, 61 a.

Everybody, with sing. verb, 8 I 1 e, 61 a.

Everyone, 57 3; with sing. verb, 8 I 1 e, 61 a.

Everywhere that, sub. conj., 26, 27 3 (5th par.).

Exactly, distinguishing adv., 16 2 b.

Except, except that, sub. conj., 31, 31 2; origin, 17 3 A c; except in elliptical clauses, 49 4 E; except felt as a prep., 31; often felt also as an imperative, 31, 31 1 d aa; never used with a negative, 31 2 (4th par.).

Except as, sub. conj., 29 1 A b.

Excluding, absolute part., 31 (5th par.), 31 2 (4th par.).

Exception, clause of, 31.

Excess of expression, 54 1 a aa, 56 A (2nd par.).

Exclamation, see Interjection.

Exclamatory sentence, 2.

Exclusive of, prep., 62 1.

Excuse, with two accusatives, 15 III 1, 15 III 1 a.

Exhaustrix, 60 1 c.

Exhaust, reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Exhortation, subjunctive of, see Volitive subjunctive.

Expect, syn., 24 III, 24 III d.

Exep, with two accusatives, 15 III 1.

Explain, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Extent, clause of, 29 1 A d; abridgment, 29 1 A d aa.

Face to face, prep., 62 1.

Fact, facts, meaning, 59 5 b.

Fail, syn., 24 III d (next to last par.).

Failing, prep., 62 1, 31 2.

Fair, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.

Fall, copula, 6 B, 7 B a; with ingressive force, 38 2 a bb; causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).

Far, comparison of, 16 5 a aa, 54 1 a.

Farther, compar., 54 1 a, 16 5 a aa.

Farther than, prep., 62 1, 29 1 B b (2nd par.).

Fear, with reflex. dat., 12 1 B b (next to last par.).

Feel, copula, 6 B, 7 A a (1), 7 A e, 7 B a, 7 B a aa; trans. verb, syn., 15 III 2 B; intrans. with genitive object, 13 3; with passive force, 46 (7th par.); intrans. or reflex., 46 (5th par.).

Fell, causative, 46 (4th par. from end).

Feminine gender: in nouns, 60 1 a, b, c; in pronouns and possessive adjectives, 60 1 d; in grammatical gender and the genitive of anima­tion, 60 2.

Figure, syn., 7 A b (3).

Fill, intrans., 46 (4th par.).

Final clause, see Purpose clause.

Find, syn., 15 III 2 B.

Finish, with passive force, 46 (7th par.); with effective force, 38 2 b cc.

Finite verb, one limited by person, number, and mood, and having more tenses than the infinite forms (participle, infinitive, and gerund); predicate a finite verb, 6 A; omission of, 6 A a.

First, firstly, coord. conj., 19 1 a.

Flame, copula, 6 B.

Flash, copula, 6 B; causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).

Flee, syn., 11 2.

Flush, copula, 6 B.

Fly, copula, 6 B; causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).

Folk, pl. of, 59 1.

Foot, noun, pl. of, 59 3; verb, foot it, 11 2 b.
For, prep., 62 1; introducing a predicate complement, 7 A c, 7 B c; introducing an objective predicate, 15 III 2 A (2nd par.); introducing as conjunction a coordinate proposition, 19 I d, 30 a (next to last par.); introducing a subordinate clause, 30, 33; dative sign, 12 1 B b, 14 (last par.); for + noun (or pronoun) used as subject of an infinitive, 49 2 a; for to before an infinitive with the force of simple to, 21 e (8th par.).

For all that, sub. conj. of concession, 32; coörd. conj., 19 I c.

For as little as, sub. conj. of concession, 32.

For as much as, sub. conj. of cause, 30.

For because, sub. conj. of cause, 30; sub. conj. of purpose, 33.

For cause that, sub. conj., 30.

For example, coord. conj., 19 I /.

For fear of, prep., 62 1.

For fear that, sub. conj. in clause of: cause, 30; purpose, 33.

For instance, coord. conj., 19 I /.

For lack of, prep., 62 1.

For that, sub. conj. of: cause, 30; purpose, 33; introducing subject clause, 21; for formation see 24 IV (3rd par.).

For that reason, coörd. conj., 19 I e.

For the behalf of, prep., 62 1.

For the benefit of, prep., 62 1.

For the ends of, prep., 62 1.

For the purpose of, prep., 62 1.

For the purpose that, sub. conj., 33.

For the reason that, sub. conj., 30.

For the sake of, prep., 62 1.

For want of, prep., 62 1.

For why, sub. conj. of cause, 30.

Forbear, syn., 24 III d (next to last par.).

Forbid, syn., 15 III 1 (2nd par.).

Fore, adj., comparison of, 54 1 a; prep., 62 1; sub. conj., 27, 27 3 (7th par.).

Foremost, superl., 54 1 a.

Foreseen that, sub. conj., 31.

Forgetful of, 13 3 (4th par.), 7 B a (4th par.).

Forgive, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Former, compar., 54 1 a, 54 1 a aa.

Forsomuch as, sub. conj., 30.
s-genitive associated with the conception of life, 10 II 1 a; double genitive, 10 II 1 b; position of genitive among other attributive modifiers, 10 II 1 c.

Outline of functions:

Predicate genitive, 7 A e.
Attributive categories, 10 II 2.
Genitive of origin, 10 II 2 A; two names connected by and, 10 II 2 A b.
Possessive genitive, 10 II 2 B.
Adverbs inflected like nouns, 10 II 2 b.
Inflection of proper nouns connected by and, 10 II 2 b.
Omission of governing noun, 10 II 2 c.
Group genitive, 10 II 2 B d.
Unclear old genitive 10 II 2 B e.
Subjective genitive, 10 II 2 C.
Objective genitive, 10 II 2 D.
Genitive of material or composition, 10 II 2 E.
Descriptive genitive, 10 II 2 F.
Genitive of characteristic, 10 II 2 F a.
Genitive of measure, 10 II 2 F b.
Appositive genitive, 10 II 2 G.
Partitive genitive, 10 II 2 H.
Nature, 10 II 2 H a.
Replaced by the appositional construction, 10 II 2 H b.
Appositional construction replaced by the partitive genitive, 10 II 2 H b.
Blending, 10 II 2 H c.
Genitive of gradation, 10 II 2 H d.
Genitive as object of verbs and adjectives, 13 I, 2, 3.
Adverbal genitive, 16 IV a.

Gentry, pl., 59 I.

Gerund: origin and development, 50 I; voice and tense, 50 II; subject of the gerund, 50 III; differentiation between infinitive and gerund, 50 IV.

Functions:

As subject, 50 IV a.
As predicate, 50 IV b.
Had, tense auxiliary, 37 3; past sub-
junctive with dependent infinitive, 43 I B, 44 I (10th par.), 49 4 C (1) b.

Had 'a' or had of, 49 3 b (3rd par.).

Had as soon, had rather, had better, had as lief, 43 I B (2nd par.), 44 I (10th par.), 49 4 C (1) b.

Had like to have forgotten, 49 3 a (7th par.).

Had of, see Had 'a.'

Hain't, 16 2 e.

Hair, hairs, meaning, 59 1, 4 b.

Half, adj., used as predicate appositive, 6 C; pron., as in 'cut a cake in half,' 57 3 (2nd par.); noun, used in the ace. as an adv., as in 'go halves,' 16 4 a (next to last par.).

Hand, with dat. and ace, 15 I 1.

Hand in hand with, prep., 62 I.

Hang, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).

Happen, copula, 6 B, 7 D 1 a.

Hard, adverbs hard and hardly differentiated, 16 4.

Hardly — when, 27, 27 3 (last par.).

Hatch, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).

Hate, syn., 24 III d.

Have, tense auxiliary, 37 3; have got, with the force of the present tense, 37 3 b; modal auxiliary, 43 I A; causative auxiliary, 46 (next to last par.); an auxiliary expressing a suffering or experiencing, 15 III 2 B (1st and 5th parr.); used in a peculiar passive construction, 15 III 2 B (4th par.), 15 I 2 a (last par.); syn., 15 III 2 B; 'have it out with someone,' 11 2 b; 'rumor has it that,' etc., 11 2 b; 'have it your own way,' 16 4 a (next to last par.).

He, pers. pron., 61; determinative, 56 A (last par.); adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b; poss. adj., 57 5 a (3rd par.).

Head, pl. of, 59 3.

Hear, syn., 15 III 2 B; 15 III 1 (3rd par.), 15 II 1 a.

Heifer, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.

Help, syn., 15 III 2 B, 24 III d (next to last par.); not more than I can help, 16 3 a.

Hen, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.

Hence, coord. conj., 19 1 e.

Her, pron. and adj., 57 5 a; used as sign of genitive, 10 II 1.

Her, reflex. pron., 11 2 c.

Hern, 57 5 a (3rd par.).

Hero, heroine, 60 1 c.

Hers, poss. pron., 57 5 a.

Herself, reflex. pron., 11 2 c, 56 D (next to last par.); pers. pron., 56 D (3rd par.); intensifying adj., 56 D.

Hev, 8 I 1 h, Note (next to last par.).

Hide, syn., 46 (4th par.).

High: higher and more highly differentiated, 16 4; high church, adj., 7 B a a a (last par.).

Him, reflex. pron., 11 2 c.

Himself, reflex. pron., 11 2 c, 56 D (next to last par.); pers. pron., 56 D (3rd par.); intensifying adj., 56 D.

Holv, comparison of, 54 I a.

Hinder, compar., 54 I a.

Hinder, verb, syn., 24 III d (next to last par.).

Hindermost, superl., 54 I a, 54 I a a.

Hire, intrans., 46 (4th par.).

His, pron. and adj., 57 5 a; used as sign of genitive, 10 II 1, 50 3; = its, 57 5 a.

Hisn, 57 5 a (3rd par.).

Hisself, 56 D.

Historical present tense, 37 1 d.

Hit, syn., 15 III 1.

Hold, copula, 6 B, 7 B a.

Home, adv. acc., 16 4 a (7th par.): locative, 16 4 a (7th par.).
Hoof, verb, hoof it, 11 2 b.

Hope, syn., 13 3 (2nd par.), 14, 24 III d (3rd par.); hoped to have left them in perfect safety, 49 3 a (5th par.).

Horse, pl., 59 3; collective noun, 59 3.

Hortatory subjunctive, see Volitive subjunctive.

How, indef. rel. adv., 21 (2nd par.), 24 IV; interrog. rel. adv., 21 (2nd par.); sub. conj. = that, 24 III, 24 IV; adv. conj., 28 1; in indirect exclamations, 21.

Hovbeit, coörd. conj., 19 1 c; sub. conj., 32.

However, coörd. conj., 19 1 c; sub. conj., 32 (8th par.); = how — ever, 16 2 a (last par.).

Howsomdever, howsumever, coörd. conj., 19 1 c.

Hundred, pi. of, 10 II 2 H 6.

Hundredweight, pi. of, 59 3.

Hurt, reflex, with passive force, 46 (9th par.).

Hypotactic asyndetic relative clause, 23 II 10 a.

Hypotaxis, 19 3 (2nd, 3rd, 4th parr.).

I, pron., in a series put last for politeness’ sake, 61 (2nd par.).

I.e., coörd. conj., 19 1 f.

If, sub. conj. in adverbial clauses, 27, 31, 32, 28 2 a; = whether, 21, 24 III.

If — or = whether — or, in concessive clauses, 32; in substantive clauses, 24 III.

If that, if so be that, if case be that, if so be as, sub. conj. = if, 31.

Ignorant of, 7 B a.

Il, illy, comparison of, 16 5 a aa.

I'll, contraction of I will, 37 5 a.

Illative conjunctions, 19 1 e.

Im, 16 1 (3rd par.).

Imagine, syn., 24 III d.

Immediately, sub. conj., 27, 27 3 (5th par.).

Imperative mood: old simple form, 45 1; used in wishes, 45 1; modern do-form, 45 2; subjunctive forms, 45 3; compound forms containing a modal or a tense auxiliary, 45 4; elliptical forms, 45 5; tenses of the imperative, 45 6; passive form, 45 7; replaced by other forms in indirect discourse, 44 II 3 a (next to last par.).

Impersonal subject, it, 4 II B.

In, prep., 62 1; prep. adv., 62 4 (next to last par.), 62 5; with ingressive force, 38 2 a aa, ad.

In-, 16 1 (3rd par.).

In accordance with, prep., 62 1.

In addition to, prep., 62 1.

In addition to the fact that, sub. conj., 28 3.

In advance of, prep., 62 1.

In agreement with, prep., 62 1.

In back of, prep., 62 1.

In behalf of, prep., 62 1.

In between, prep., 62 1.

In care of, prep., 62 1.

In case, sub. conj., 31.

In case of, prep., 62 1.

In common with, prep., 62 1.

In company with, prep., 62 1.

In comparison to, prep., 62 1.

In comparison with, prep., 62 1.

In compliance with, prep., 62 1.

In conflict with, prep., 62 1.

In conformity with, prep., 62 1.

In consequence of, prep., 62 1.

In consideration of, prep., 62 1.

In contrast with, prep., 62 1.

In course of, prep., 62 1.

In default of, prep., 62 1.

In defiance of, prep., 62 1.

In (the) face of, prep., 62 1.

In favor of, prep., 62 1.

In front of, prep., 62 1.

In fulfilment of, prep., 62 1.

In lieu of, prep., 62 1.

In obedience to, prep., 62 1.

In opposition to, prep., 62 1.

In order that, sub. conj., 33; in order to, 33 2.

In place of, prep., 62 1.

In point of, prep., 62 1.

In preference to, prep., 62 1.

In process of, prep., 62 1.

In proportion as, sub. conj., 29 1 A b.

In proportion to, prep., 62 1.

In pursuance of, prep., 62 1.

In quest of, prep., 62 1.

In re, prep., 62 1.

In recognition of, prep., 62 1.

In regard (that), sub. conj., 30.
In regard to, prep., 62 1.
In relation to, prep., 62 1.
In respect of, prep., 62 1.
In return for, prep., 62 1.
In search of, prep., 62 1.
In so far as, sub. conj., 29 1 A c.
In spite of, prep., 62 1.
In spite of the fact that, sub. conj., 32.
In support of, prep., 62 1.
In that, sub. conj., 28 1, 30.
In the case of, prep., 62 1.
In the event of, prep., 62 1.
In the event that, sub. conj., 31.
In the hope that, sub. conj., 28 1, 30.
In the matter of, prep., 62 1.
In the meantime, coord. conj., 19 1 C.
In the middle of, prep., 62 1.
In the midst of, prep., 62 1.
In the name of, prep., 62 1.
In the teeth of, prep., 62 1.
In the way of, prep., 62 1.
In to, 62 1 a.
In token of, prep., 62 1.
In under, prep., 62 1.
In view of, prep., 62 1.
In what degree — in that degree, correlative conj., 29 1 A b.
In what manner, sub. conj., 28 1.
Inasmuch as, sub. conj. of: cause, 30, 30 a (last par.); extent, 29 1 A d.
Including, prep., 62 1; origin, 17 4 (4th par.).
Incomplete of, prep., 62 1.
Inconsistent with, prep., 62 1.
Indefinite article, form and use, 56 B.
Indefinite pronouns used adverbially, 16 4 a.
Indefinite relative adjectives, see Relative.
Indefinite relative adverbs, see Relative.
Indefinite relative pronouns, see Relative.
Indefinite subject, agreement of verb with, 8 1 1 e, 61 a.
Independently of, prep., 62 1; with gerund, 28 3 a.
Independently of the fact that, sub. conj., 28 3.
Indicative mood, meaning of, 40.
Indirect command, 44 II 3 a (next to last par.).
Indirect discourse, 44 II 3 a, b; mood in, 44 II 3 a.
Indirect object, 11 1 (2nd par.), 15 II 2; becomes subject of the verb in the passive, 15 II 2 a.
Indirect questions, 23 II 1 (last par.), 23 I; mood in, 44 II 3.
Infantry, pl., 59 1.
Infinite forms of the verb, those not limited by person, number, and mood, and having fewer tenses than the finite verb; treated at length in, 48–50.
Infinite, origin, 49 1; the to-form, 49 2 a; younger for . . . to-form, 49 2 a; older for . . . to-form, 49 2 a; subject of the infinitive, 49 2 a, 24 III d, 24 IV a, 21 e, 30 b (last par.), 29 1 B b, 31 2 (5th par.), 33 2; elliptical form of the infinitive construction, 49 2 b; origin and development of the split infinitive, 49 2 c; tenses and voices of the infinitive, 49 3; governing verb a full verb, 49 3 a; use of the perfect infinitive with modal and tense auxiliaries, 49 3 a; present infinitive with active form but with passive force, 7 D 2, 15 III 2 B (6th par.), 24 IV a, 46 (next to last par.), 49 3; repetition of to with the infinitive, 49 5; infinitive used to carry on a construction, 49 6; infinitive used in indirect discourse corresponding to an imperative in direct discourse, 44 II 3 a (next to last par.).
Outline of functions, 49 4.
Subject, usually with to, but sometimes with simple form, 49 4 A.
Predicate, usually with to, 49 4 B.
Normal form: after a copula, 49 4 B (1) a; after passive verbs, 49 4 B (1) b.
Modal form, 49 4 B (2); after the copula to express purpose or result, 49 4 B (3); in the nominative absolute construction, 49 4 B (4).
Infinitive (cont.):  
Object, 49 4 C.  
With its simple form: after the modal auxiliaries, the tense auxiliaries _shall_ and _will_, and the auxiliary-like verbs _dare_ and _need_, 49 4 C (1); after _had better_, _had rather_, _had as soon_, etc., 49 4 C (1); after the list of verbs in 15 III 2 B; after the preposition _to_, 49 4 C (1) _d_.  
With _to_ after other verbs, 49 4 C (2); with the force of a subjunctive, 24 III _d_, 44 II 3 _a_ (next to last par.), 49 3.  
As an adjectival element modifying a noun, always with _to_, 49 4 D.  
In elliptical constructions, sometimes with _to_, more commonly with simple form, 49 4 E; after _but_, _except_, _save_, _than_, 49 4 E.  
As an adverbial element, usually with _to_, but sometimes with simple form, 49 4 F.  
Inflection of the parts of speech, treated in Accidence.  
Inflectional prepositions, 14 (last par.).  
_ing_, suffix of both gerund and present participle, so that they are sometimes hard to distinguish, 48 1 _e_.  
Ingressive aspect, 28 2 _a_.  
_Inner_, compar., 54 1 _a_.  
_Innermost_, _inmost_, superl., 54 1 _a_, 54 1 _a aa_.  
_Innings_, sing. and pl., 59 2.  
_Inside of_, prep., 62 1.  
_Insomuch as_, sub. conj., 29 2, 30.  
_Insomuch that_, sub. conj., 29 2.  
_Instantly_, adv.: _‘The explosion followed instantly’_; sub. conj., 27, 27 3 (5th par.).  
_Instead of_, prep., 62 1, 28 3 _a_; sub. conj., 28 3.  
_Instead of that_, sub. conj., 28 3.  
_Instrumental case_, 62 (7th par.), 16 4 _c_.  
_Intended to have written you a line_, 49 3 _a_ (4th par.).  
_Intensifying adjectives_, 56 D; used as emphatic personal pronouns, 56 D.  
_Interjections_, 17 1.  
Intermittent action, how expressed, 38 1 _a_.  
_Interrogative_:  
_Pronouns_, used in:  
Direct questions: ‘Who did it?’ _‘What do you want?’_ See Questions. For use of _whom_ as object, see 11 2 _e_.  
Indirect questions (23 II 1, last par.): ‘I asked him _who_ did it.’ ‘I asked him _what_ he wanted.’ See Questions.  
Adjectives, used in:  
_Sentences_, 2; word-order in, 3 _a_ (2nd par.), 4 II _d_ (next to last par.), 35 2; _do-form_ in, 6 A _d_, (1), (2), 35 2.  
_In_—_to_, prep., 62 (4th par.), 62 1; prep. adv., 62 5.  
_In intoxicate_, reflex., 46 (4th par.).  
_Intransitive verbs_ with reflexive or passive force, 46 (4th and 7th par.).  
_Introduce_, with _dat._ and _acc._, 16 I 1.  
_Inverted order of words_, 35 1.  
_Irish English_, 4 II _C_ (3rd par. from end), 6 _B_ _a_ (last par.), 12 1 _B_ _b_ (2nd par.), 17 3 _B_ (2nd par.), 19 3 (5th par.), 21 _e_ (7th par.), 37 3 _c_, 37 5 _a_ (pp. 370, 371), 38 5, 56 _D_ (3rd par.), 57 5 _a_ (2nd par.).  
_Ironworks_, a, 59 2.  
_Iroquois_, pl. of, 58 (4th par.).  
_Irregular comparison_ of: adjectives, 54 1 _a_; adverbs, 16 5 _a aa_.  
_Irrespective of_, prep., 62 1.  
_I’se = I shall_, 37 5 _a_.  
_It_: situation _it_ as subject, 4 II _A_; as predicate, 7 _C_ (last par.), 21 _b_ (2nd par.), 21 _e_ (10th par.); = _point of perfection_, 7 _C_ (last par.); impersonal _it_ as subject, 4 II _B_; anticipatory _it_ as subject, introducing an emphatic subject, 4 II _C_; introducing an emphatic
predicate, 4 II C, 21 b, c, 22 a; used as a complement of transitive and intransitive verbs, 11 2 b, 38 2 b dd; after prepositions, 62 7 a, c, d; after prepositions often = itself, 11 2 c; introducing an object clause, 11 2 b; as an object pointing back to something preceding, 11 2 b (3rd par.); referring to persons, 60 1 d (3rd par.); an old genitive, 57 5 a.

Iterative aspect, 38 4.

Its, poss. adj. and pron., 57 5 a; it’s, 67 5 a.

Itself, its self, reflex. pron., 56 D (4th par.); intensifying adj., 56 D.

Jenny, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.

Jingle, causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).

Jolly, jollity, adv., 16 4.

Joseph, Josephine, 60 1 c.

Judging, absolute part., 31 2.

Jumping geraniums, interj., 17 1.

Just, distinguishing adv., 16 2 b.

Keep, copula, 6 B, 7 B a; with durative force, 38 1.

Keep on, with durative force, 38 1.

Kind, pl. of, 59 7.

Kind of, adj., 59 7 (2nd par.); adv., 59 7 (3rd par.); of a kind, 59 7 (3rd par.).

Kind of a, 59 7 (5th par.).

Kiss, syn., 15 III 1, 15 III 1 a; reciprocal or intrans., 46 (5th par.).

Know, syn., 15 III 2 B, 24 III, 24 III d.

Lady, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.

Lady Mayoress, 60 1 c.

Last, superl., 54 1 a, 16 5 a aa.

Late, adj., comparison of, 54 1 a; adv., late and lately, differentiated, 16 4.

Later, compar., 16 5 a aa, 54 1 a; coord. conj., 19 1 a.

Latermost, superl., 54 1 a.

Latter, compar., 54 1 a.

Lay, causative, 46 (4th par. from end); used absolutely, 46 (2nd par.).

Lay off, with effective force, 38 2 b aa.

Lazybones, 59 2.

-le, iterative suffix, 38 4.

Leap, causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).

Learn, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1 a.

Leave, modal auxiliary, 43 I A; with effective force, 38 2 b, cc; syn., 15 III 2 B.

Leave off, with effective force, 38 2 b cc.

Lenger, longest, old compar. and superl., 54 1 a aa.

Less and least, compar. and superl., 54 1 a; used in the comparison of adjectives and adverbs, 55, 16 5 a; less used as coord. conj., 19 1 a; prep., 8 I 2 e, 62 1.

Less than, adv., 8 I 5.

Lesser, double compar., 54 1 a, 54 1 a aa.

Lest, sub. conj. introducing subject clause, 21; an attributive substantive clause, 23 I (next to last par.); accusative clause, 24 III; clause of cause, 30; clause of purpose, 33.

Let, modal auxiliary, 43 I A, 43 II A, 43 II B a, 45 3; syn., 15 III 2 B; causative auxiliary, 46 (next to last par.); let blood, 15 I 2 a (2nd par.).

Let alone, coord. conj., 19 1 a.

Let us say, coord. conj., 19 1 f.

Lie, copula, 6 B.

Lie down, with reflex. dat., 12 1 B b (next to last par.).

Lief, liefer, adj., adv., 43 I B, 49 4 C (1) b.

Löft, intrans., 46 (4th par.).

Light in, with impressive force, 38 2 a dd.

Like, adj. governing the dat., 11 2 g; predicate appositive, 7 A b (3); had like to have forgotten, 49 3 a (7th par.); adv., 28 2 (5th par.); sentence adv., 16 2 a (6th par.); coord. conj., 19 1 f; sub. conj., 28 2 (5th par.); prep., 15 III 2 A (last par.), 24 II, 28 2 (last par.), 50 4 c bb, 62 1; qualitative determinative, 56 A (7th par.); verb, 12 1 A (last par.), 24 III d.

Like as, sub. conj., 28 2; = as if, 28 2 a.
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**Liked to have forgotten,** 49 3 a (7th par.).

Limiting adjectives: defined, 51 2; inflection of, 56; use of demonstrative and determinative adjectives, 56 A, B, 23 II 10 a; form and use of the indefinite article, 56 C; use of intensifying adjectives, 56 D.

**Linking verbs,** 6 B.

**Links,** 59 2.

**Listen to,** syn., 15 III 2 B.

**Little,** adj., comparison of, 54 1 a; adv. acc., 16 4 a; comparison of, 16 5 a aa.

**Live,** copula, 6 B, 7 A a (1), 7 B a; trans., 11 2 (3rd par.).

**Locative case,** 62 (7th par.), 16 4 a (7th par.).

**Lock,** with passive force, 46 (7th par.).

**Long,** noun, 58 (3rd par. from end); pred. adj., long (in) getting out of the room, 50 4 c dd (next to last par.).

**Look,** copula, 7 B a; trans. verb, 11 2, 7 A a (1); full intrans., 28 2 a.

**Look at,** syn., 15 III 2 B.

**Look-a-here,** 45 1 a.

**Looking at,** absolute part., 31 2.

**Loom,** copula, 6 B, 7 B a.

**Lord it over others,** 11 2 b.

**Lot,** a lot, lots, 16 4 a (4th par.).

**Loud,** loudly, adv., 16 4.

**Low,** lowly, adv., 16 4; comparison, 54 1 a.

**Lowest,** superl., 54 1 a.

-ly, adv. suffix, 16 4.

**Majesty,** your, his, 61 a.

**Make,** copula, 6 B; causative auxiliary, 46 (next to last par.); syn., 15 III 2 B; intrans., 46 (4th par.); with dat. and acc., 15 1 I.

**Man,** adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.

**Manner,** clause of, 28.

- Manner proper, 28 1; abridgment, 28 1 a.

- Comparison, 28 2; abridgment, 28 2 b.

- Attendant circumstance, 28 3; abridgment, 28 3 a.

- **Alternative agreement,** 28 4.

- Manner clause of modal result and clause of pure result, 28 5; abridgment, 28 5 d; result clause replaced by other constructions, 28 5 b, c.

- **Manner,** pl. of, 59 7; manner, manners, meaning, 59 5 b.

- **Manner of,** like kind of, 59 7 (last par.).

- **Many,** comparison of, 54 1 a.

- **March,** causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).

- **Masculine gender:** in nouns, 60 1 A a, b, c; in pronouns and possessive adjectives, 60 1 A d; in grammatical gender and the gender of animation, 60 2.

- **Master,** title, 59 8 a.

- **Material,** genitive of, 10 II 2 E.

- **Mathematics,** 59 2.

- **Matter:** ‘There’s something the matter with his spine.’ See 7 B a aa (next to last par.).

- **May,** modal auxiliary, 41 (3rd par.), 43 I A, B, 43 II A, B a, 44 I, 44 II 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 B (3rd par.), 7.

- **Me,** reflex. dat., 12 1 B b (3rd par.); nom., 7 C a; in exclamations, 17 2.

- **Me thinks,** 4 II B (last par.).

- **Means,** clause of, 34; abridgment, 34.

- **Means,** pl. used as sing., 59 2.

- **Meant to have written you a line,** 49 3 a (4th par.).

- **Meanwhile,** coörd. conj., 19 1 c.

- **Measles,** 59 2.

- **Measure,** genitive of, 10 II 2 F b.

- **Meet,** reciprocal verb used without reciprocal pronoun, 11 2 d, 46 (5th par.).

- **Mention,** with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

- **Merely,** distinguishing adv., 16 2 b.

- **Mest,** superl. suffix, 54 1 a aa (5th par.).

- **Metonymic object,** 11 2 a.

- **Mid,** midst, prep., 62 1.

- **Middle English,** period from A.D. 1150 to A.D. 1500.

- **Midmost of,** midmost, prep., 62 1.

- **Midmost of,** midmost, prep., 62 1.

- **Might,** see May.

- **Mine,** see My.

- **Minus,** prep., 8 I 2 e, 62 1.

- **Miss,** 16 1 (3rd par.).

- **Missed,** title, 59 8 b, c.
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Miss, verb, syn., 24 III d (next to last par.).
Mo or Moe, compar. adj., 54 1 a.
Modal: auxiliaries, 42; infinitive, 7 D 2.
Modern English, period from A.D. 1500 to the present day.
Modesty: plural of, 4 II E; in a series I for modesty's or politeness' sake stands last, 61 (2nd par.); myself used for I or me, 56 D (3rd par.).
Mood, 39; indicative, 40; subjunctive, 41-44; imperative, 45.
More, compar., 16 5 a aa, 64 1 a; compar. sign, 16 5 a, 54 1 a, b, d, f, h, 54 2 b.
More than, adv., 8 15.
Moreover, coord, conj., 19 1 a.
Moreover that, sub. conj., 28 3.
Most, superl., 16 5 aaaa, 64 1 a; superl. sign, 16 5 a, 54 1 a, b, d, f, h, 54 2 a.
-most, superl. suffix, 54 1 a aa.
Mr., title, 59 8 a.
Mrs., title, 69 8 a, b.
Much, comparison of, 16 5 aaaa, 64 1 a; adv. ace, 16 4 a.
Much less, coord, conj., 19 1 a.
Mumps, 59 2.
Must, modal auxiliary, 43 I A, 44 I a, 45 4 e.
Negatives, 16 3; double negation, 16 3 a; position of negative, 16 2 d; contractions of not, 16 2 e; origin of not, 16 2 d; negative statement often replaced by rhetorical question, 16 3 b.
Negro, or popular southern American English, Preface (p. vii), 6 A d, 8 I 1 h, Note, 16 2 e, 10 II 1 (8th par.), 37 3 b, d.
Neither, with sing. or pl. verb, 8 I 1 e.
Neither — nor, coord. conj., 19 1 a; with sing. or pl. verb after nor, 8 I 2 c, 8 II 3; neither sometimes felt here as a pronoun, 8 II 3 (last par.).
Nether, nethermost, 54 1 a, 54 1 a a.
Neuter: gender, 60 1; pronoun and possessive adjective it, its, 67 5 a; uses of it, see It.
News, 59 2.
Next, superl., 16 5 aaaa; governs the dative, 11 2 g; prep., 50 4 c bb, 62 1.
Next door to, prep., 62 1.
Next room to, prep., 62 1.
Nigh, comparison, 54 1 a, 54 1 a aa.
No, with the force of a sentence, 16 3; with the force of the sentence adverb not, 16 3; an attributive limiting adjective, 16 3; a noun, 16 3; no + gerund with the force of a negative command, 45 5.
No good, see No use.
No matter, 32 1 a bb.
No other = nothing else, 57 5 c.
No sooner — but, 29 1 B, 27 3 (last par.).
No sooner — than, 27, 27 3 (last par.).
No use, as in 'It's no use talking' is now felt as a compound adjective though once a predicate genitive. See 7 A e. In 'It's no good talking' no good has the same meaning, but historically good is a predicate nominative noun made from the adjective. See 58 (next to last par.).
Nobody, with sing. verb, 8 I 1 e, 61 a.
Nominative:
As subject, 3.
As case of direct address, 17 2.
Used absolutely:
In adverbial clauses, 17 3 A.
In subject clauses, 17 3 B.
In predicate clauses, 17 3 C.
In appositive clauses, 17 3 D.

None, sing. or pl., 8 I 1 e, 57 5 b (7th par.), 67 3; neuter pron., 57 5 b (last par.); with the force of an emphatic not, 57 5 b (last par.); adv. acc., 16 4 a (5th par.).

None other = no other, 57 5 c.

None the less, coord. conj., 19 1 c.

Nor, coord. conj., 19 1 a; sub. conj. = than, 29 1 B.

North, northern, comparison of, 64 1 a.

Not, originally an adverbial accusative (16 4 a) of nought, 57 5 b (last par.); now a sentence adverb of negation with the stress and position of a sentence adverb, 16 2 a; contractions of with a preceding auxiliary, 16 2 e.

Not a one, 57 5 b (8th par.).

Not . . . either — or, number of verb with, 8 I 2 c.

Not more than I can help, 16 3 a.

Not — no more, 19 1 a.

Not so soon, but, 27 (2nd par.).

Not that — but because (or simple but), 30.

Not that not (or not but that, or not but what) — but because (or simple but), 30.

Not to mention, coörd. conj., 19 1 a.

Not to say, 31 2 (5th par.).

Not to say anything of, coörd. conj., 19 1 a.

Not yet fully — that, 27 (2nd par.).

Not yet fully — when, 27 (2nd par.).

Note = couldn’t, 49 4 C (1) a.

Nothing — so much as that, 29 1 A d.

Notice, syn., 15 III 2 B.

Notwithstanding, prep., 62 I; origin, 17 3 A c; coörd. conj., 19 1 c.

Notwithstanding that, sub. conj., 32.

Noun clause, see Substantive clause.

Nouns: used as predicate adjectives, 7 B aa; adherent adjectives, 10 I 2; imperatives, 45 5; number in nouns, 59; gender in nouns, 60.

No(u)ther — nor, coörd. conj., 19 1 a.

Now or now that, sub. conj., 27, 27 3 (5th par.), 30.

Nowhere that, sub. conj., 26, 27 3 (5th par.).

Nowhere instead of nowhere, 16 4 a.

Number, in nouns, 59; in adjectives, 52, 57 1, 57 5 b, c; in pronouns, 57 3, 57 5 b; in verbs, 8 I; sing. used as pl., 8 I 1 h, Note.

Number of, a, 8 I 1 d.

O, interj., 17 1.

O' = of, 62 I.

Oats, sing. and pl., 59 2.

Object:

Direct, 11 I, 15 I 1, 2; metonymic, 11 2 a.

Indirect, 11 I, 15 I 1, 2.

Accusative object of: verbs, 11 I, 15 I 1, 2, 15 III 1, 2, 15 IV; adjectives, 11 2 g; prepositions, 14.

Dative object of: verbs, 12 I A, 15 I 1, 2; adjectives, 12 I A, 11 2 g; nouns, 12 I A; sentence, i.e., sentence dative, 12 I B a, b, c.

Genitive, 13 I, 2, 3.

Prepositional, 14; difference between prepositional object and adverbial phrase, 14 a, 24 IV, 24 IV a.

A noun clause, as object of: verbs, 24 I, II, III; prepositions, 24 IV, 24 IV a.

Object clause:

Genitive clause, 24 I.

Dative clause, 24 II.

Accusative clause, object of verbs, 24 III.

Prepositional clause, 24 IV.

Objective genitive, 10 II 2 D.

Objective predicate complement:

An accusative, 7 A a (1) (4th par.), 15 III 2.

A genitive, 7 A e (next to last par.), 15 III 2 A.

A prepositional phrase, 15 III 2 A.

An infinitive, 15 III 2 B.

Obliged, am — to, with subjunctive force, 43 I A (end of 2nd par.).

Observe, syn., 15 III 2 B.

Odds, 59 2; it is odds but or that, 21.

Of, prep., 62 I; in older English used
with a passive verb to denote the agent, 11 2 f; = have, see Had 'a.'

Of-genitive, 10 II 1.

Off, prep., 62 1; adv. with ingressive force, 38 2 a dd; adv. with effective force, 38 2 b aa.

Off and on, 38 1 c.

Off of, prep., 62 1.

Offspring, pi. of, 59 1.

Oh, interj., 17 1; Oh, my dear! 17 1.

Old, adj., comparison of, 54 1 a; noun, 58 (1st and 6th parr.).

Old English, period down to A.D. 1150.

Old Norse, 16 3 (6th par.).

Omission of: subject, 5; verb or part of verb-phrase, 6 A a; for omission of relative pronoun see Relative pronouns; omission of reflexive and reciprocal pronouns, 11 2 c, d; omission of preposition, 24 IV (4th par.), 23 I (4th par.), 62 3.

On, prep., 62 1; dative sign, 12 1 b; prep, adv., 62 5; adv. expressing duration, 38 1.

On account of, prep., 62 1.

On and on, expressing duration, 38 1 a.

On behalf of, prep., 62 1.

On condition that, sub. conj., 31.

On pain of, prep., 62 1.

On purpose to, 33 2.

On the contrary, coord. conj., 19 1 e.

On the ground that, sub. conj., 30.

On the occasion of, prep., 62 1.

On the one hand — on the other hand, coord. conj., 19 1 a.

On the other hand, coord. conj., 19 1 c.

On the part of, prep., 62 1.

On the point of, prep., 62 1.

On the pretense of, prep., 62 1.

On the score of, prep., 62 1.

On the (this, that, each) side of, prep., 62 1.

On the strength of, prep., 62 1.

On to, 62 1 a.

On top of, prep., 62 1.

Once, adv.: 'I met him once'; sub. conj. of time, 27 3; of cause, 30; of condition, 31.

One:

Numeral adjective, 57 5 b, 57 1 (6th par.).

Indefinite pronoun, 57 5 b, 7 C; corresponding possessive is one's, not his, 57 5 b; used as a qualitative determinative, 56 A (5th par.), 57 5 b (3rd par.); a one = one, 57 1 (7th par.), 57 5 b (8th par.).

With the force of I, 4 II D.

Often an adjective ending, 62, 57 1.

One another, reciprocal pron., 57 5 c.

One's self, oneself, 57 5 b.

Only, sentence adv. and distinguishing adv., 16 2 c; coord. conj., 19 1 c; sub. conj., 31.

Only that, sub. conj., 31.

Only too, 16 2 c.

Onto, prep., 62 1, 62 1 a.

Open, reflex. or intrans., 46 (5th par.).

Opposite to, adj., 11 2 g; prep., 62 1; adj. governing the dat., 11 2 g.

Optative subjunctive, 43.

In principal propositions, 43 I.

Volitive, 43 I A.

Subjunctive of wish, 43 I B.

Subjunctive of logical reasoning, 43 I C.

Subjunctive of plan, 43 I D.

In subordinate clauses, 43 II.

Action conceded, 43 II A.

Action desired, 43 II B.

Or, coord. conj., 19 1 b, f; = otherwise, 19 1 b, 31 1 d bb; or — or, coord. conj., 19 1 b.

Or whether — or, sub. conj., 32.

Order, verb, syn., 24 III d.

Order of words, see Word-order.

Origin, genitive of, 10 II 2 A.

Other, inflection, 57 5 c; used adverbially with the force of otherwise, 57 5 c.

Otherwise, adv. of manner: 'We could not have acted otherwise'; disjunctive adv., 19 1 b; adj., 7 F, Parts of Speech, 8 (next to last par.).

Ouch, interj., 17 1.

Ought, 43 I A (next to last par.), 44 I a, 49 4 C (1) a.

Our, ours, pron. and adj., 57 5 a.

Ourn, 57 5 a (3rd par.).
Ourself, ourselves, reflex. pron., 11 2 c, 56 D (next to last par.); reciprocal pron., 11 2 d; pers. pron., 56 D (3rd par.); intensifying adj., 56 D.

Out, ingressive particle, 38 2 a ad; effective particle, 38 2 b aa; prep. adv., 62 4 (next to last par.).

Out of, prep., 62 1.

Out of regard for, prep., 62 1.

Outer, compar., 54 1 a.

Outermost, superl., 54 1 a, 54 1 a aa.

Outside of, prep., 62 1.

Over, prep., 62 1; prep. adv., 62 4 (next to last par.), 62 5; effective particle, 38 2 b aa.

Over against, prep., 62 1.

Over and above, prep., 62 1.

Overeat, intrans. or reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Overhear, syn., 15 III 2 B.

Oversleep, intrans. or reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Overthwart, prep., 62 1.

Owe, with dat. and ace, 15 I 1.

Owing to, prep., 62 1; origin, 17 4 (4th par.).

Own, 57 5 a (last four parr.), 58 (2nd par.).

Pains, 59 2.

Paint, syn., 10 I 2 (end of 1st par.).

Pair, pl. of, 59 3.

Pale = paleness, 58 (6th par.).

Paratactic asyndetic relative construction, 23 II 10 b.

Parataxis, 19 3.

Parcel post, 10 I 2.

Pardon, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Participle:

Functions other than those with the force of a finite verb:

Adjective with some verbal force, 48 1 a.

Noun, 48 1 b.

Adverb, 48 1 c.

Pure adjective, 48 1 d.

Used with more verbal than adjective force, 48 1 e.

Functions with the force of a finite verb, 48 2.

Voices, 48 2 a.

Tenses, 48 2 b.

Subject of the participle, 48 2 c.

Complete outline of functions, 48 3.

Particularly, distinguishing adv., 16 2 b.

Partitive genitive, 10 II 2 H; nature, 10 II 2 H a; partitive genitive replaced by the appositional construction, 10 II 2 H b; blending in the partitive construction, 10 II 2 H c; genitive of gradation, 10 II 2 H d.

Partly — partly, coörd. conj., 19 1 a.

Passive voice:

Actional forms, 47 a, 15 I 2 a (last par.), 15 III 2 B (5th par.); older forms of present perfect tense, 37 3, 47 a (1st par.); different progressive forms, 47 a; active form with passive force, 46 (7th and 8th parr.), 15 III 2 B (6th par.), 38 2 b cc; uses of the passive voice, 11 2 f; uses of the cases of nouns in the passive form of statement, 11 2 f, 15 I 2 a, 15 II b, 15 III 1 a, 15 III 2 A a, 15 III 2 B a, 15 IV a, 15 V a.

Statal form, 47 b.

Past, prep., 62 1.

Past perfect tense: origin, 37 3; its present use, 37 3.

Past tense, use of, 37 2.

Pay, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Peel, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).

Pending, prep., 62 1; origin, 17 3 A c.

People, pl., 59 1.

Per, prep., 62 1.

Perceive, syn., 15 III 2 B.

Perch, pl., 69 3.

Perfect, more perfect, most perfect, 54 1 a aa.

Perfect participle, 48.

Periphrastic do-form, 6 A d.

Perjure, reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Permit, syn., 24 III d.

Permutation, 45 1 (2nd par.).

Person: use of the different pronominal forms for the second person, 4 II H; in a series the pronoun for the first person stands last, 61 (2nd par.); form of the verb where the subjects are of different persons, 8 II; with reference to antecedents of different persons the first person has the
precedence over the second and third, 61 a (2nd par.).

Personal pronouns: agreement with antecedent, 61 a; use of gender forms, 60 1 d.

Persuade, syn., 24 IV a.

Physics, 59 2.

Pig, pl., 59 3.

Pincers, 59 6.

Pique, reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Pitch in, with ingressive force, 38 2 a dd.

Place: clause of, 26; its abridgment, 26 a.

Play, with passive force, 46 (7th par.); with dat. and acc., 15 III 1.

Please, verb, syn., 12 1 A (last par.); sentence adv., 16 2 a (6th par.).

Pleonasm and excess of expression: in the comparison of adjectives and adverbs, 54 1 a aa; with negatives, 16 3 a.

Plume, reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Plural number in:
Nouns, 59; nouns made from adjectives and participles, 58; plural of the names of foreign peoples and our native Indian tribes, 58 (4th par.).

Pronouns: use of editorial we, 4 II E; plural of modesty, 4 II E; plural of majesty, 4 II F; we = you, 4 II G; indefinite singular forms with plural meaning but followed by the singular form of the verb, 8 I 1 e, 61 a.

Plus, prep., 62 1.

Point-action aspects, 38 2.

Ingressive aspect, 38 2 a.

Effective aspect, 38 2 b.

Politics, 59 2.

Pooh, interj., 17 1.

Popular English, Preface (p. vi); popular Southern American English, see Negro English.

Portuguese, pl. of, 58 (4th par.).

Position of:
Subject, 3 a, 4 II C, 35 1.
Verb, 4 II C (last two parr.), 6 A d (1), (2), 35 1, 2; position of verbs in questions, 4 II C (next to last par.), 6 A d (2), 35 2 (next to last par.).

Adverbs, 16 2, 35 1.

Objects, 11 1, 15 I 1, 2, 15 III 1, 2, 35 1.

Adjectives, 10 I 1.


Possessive adjectives, 57 5 a; noun modified by two possessive adjectives connected by and, 10 I 4.

Possessive genitive: meaning and use, 10 II 2 B; use where two persons are joined together in ownership, 10 II 2 B b; omission of governing noun, 10 II 2 B c; group genitive, 10 II 2 B d; unclear old genitive forms, 10 II 2 B e.

Potential subjunctive, 44.

In principal propositions, 44 I.

In subordinate clauses:
In subject clauses, 44 II 1.
In predicate clauses, 44 II 2.
In object clauses, 44 II 3.
In adjective clauses:
In relative clause, 44 II 4 a.
In attributive substantive clause, 44 II 4 b.

In conditional sentences:
In a practical condition, 44 II 5 A.
In a theoretical condition, 44 II 5 B.
In a condition contrary to fact, 44 II 5 C.
In elliptical conditional sentences, 44 II 5 D.

In clauses of manner, 44 II 6.
In clauses of modal and pure result, 44 II 7.
In comparative clauses, 44 II 8.
In clauses of extent, 44 II 9.
In causal clauses, 44 II 10.

Poultry, pl., 59 1.

Pound, pl., 59 3.

Precisely, distinguishing adv., 16 2 b.

Predicate:
A finite verb of complete predication, 6 A.
Part of predicate omitted, 6 A a.
Finite verb replaced by a noun, 6 A b.
Use of do to avoid the repetition of a verb, 6 A c.
Do-form, 6 A d.
Verb of incomplete predication + a complement, 6 B.
Predicate (cont.):

Appositional type of sentence, 6 B a.
Predicate appositive, 6 C.
Predicate clause, 22.
Predicate complement:

Noun or pronoun:
In the nominative, 7 A a; but in the accusative if predicated of an accusative, 7 A a (1) (4th par.).
Introduced by as, 7 A b.
Introduced by for, 7 A c.
After intransitive copulas containing the idea of growth, development, change, 7 A d.
A predicate genitive, 7 A e.
An adjective or participle, 7 B a; predicate adjective often used instead of a finite verb, 7 B a (4th par.); a predicate noun with the force of an adjective, 7 B a aa.
Pronoun or adverb so, 7 C.
Case of a predicate pronoun, 7 C a.

Infinitive:
Normal form, 7 D 1.
Modal form, 7 D 2.
Form to express purpose, 7 D 3.
Gerund, 7 E.
Adverb or prepositional phrase, 7 F.

Preferably to, prep., 62 1.
Prefixes, 16 1 (3rd par.), 62 4 (last par.).
Preliminary to, prep., 62 1.
Preparatory to, prep., 62 1.
Prepositional adverb, 62 5.
Prepositional clause:
Modifying verb or adjective: with the force of a prepositional object, 24 IV; with adverbial force, 16 1, 24 IV, 25 1, 62 7 d.
Attributive clause, 10 IV a, 23 I (4th par.).
Predicate clause, 7 F, 50 4 c dd.
Prepositional infinitive, see Infinitive.
Prepositional object, 14.
Prepositional phrase, 62 (3rd par.); with the force of:
A predicate adjective, 7 F, 62 7 a.
An attributive adherent adjective, 10 I 2, 62 7 b.

An attributive appositional adjective, 10 IV, 62 7 b.
An object of a verb or an adjective, 14.
An adverb, 16 1, 17 3 A b, c, d, e, f, 28 1 a, 28 3 a, 28 5 d, 29 1 A c aa, 29 2 a, 30 b, 31 2, 32 2, 33 2, 62 7 d.
A noun, 62 7 d.

Prepositions: nature of, 62; functions of, 62, 62 7; origin of, 62 (7th par.), 17 3 A c, 17 4; position of, 62 (6th par.), 62 4; list of, 62 1; onto, 62 1 a; contraction of on to a–, 62 2; omission of prepositions, 62 3, 24 IV (4th par.), 23 I (4th par.); forming a compound with verbs, 62 4 (last par.); used as nouns, 4 I f.

Present participle:
Functions other than those with the force of a finite verb:
Used as an adjective with more or less verbal force, 48 1 a.
Used as a noun, 48 1 b.
Used as an adverb, 48 1 c.
Used with more verbal than adjective force, 48 1 e; difficult to distinguish from the gerund, 48 1 e.

Functions with the force of a finite verb, 48 2; time relations expressed by present participle, 48 2 (next to last par.); sometimes with active form and passive force, 48 2 (3rd par.); subject of present participle, 48 2 c.

Present perfect tense: formation of, 37 3; uses of, 37 3 (last par.), 37 3 a; present perfect tense in popular Irish English, 37 3 c; use of present perfect to express a habitual act, 38 1 (3rd par. from end).

Present tense, uses of, 37 1.

Prevent, syn., 24 III d (next to last par.).

Previous(ly) to, prep., 62 1.

Pride, reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Principal, 9 3.

Printer's (or printers') errors, 10 II 2 F a.

Prior to, prep., 62 1.

Private = privacy, 58 (6th par.).
Progressive form of the verb, uses of, 38 1, 2 a ee, hh, 38 2 b hh; use of copula with, 38 1 (2nd par.); the two passive forms used at first without differentiation of meaning but now usually differentiated, 47 a. Prohibition, how expressed, 45 2 6.

Promise, with dat. and ace, 15 I 1. Pronouns: their use to indicate sex, 60 1 d; to denote lack of personality, 60 1 d (3rd par.); to denote state, rank, dignity, 60 1 d (last par.); use of certain pronouns as subject, 4 II; general meaning and use of pronouns, 61; agreement with their antecedent, 61 a; with reference to antecedents of different persons the first person has precedence over the second and third, 61 a (2nd par.); proper pronoun when the antecedent is the indefinite pronoun one, 61 a; antecedent not a noun or pronoun but the idea contained in a group of words or a single noun or adjective, 7 C, 23 II 6 (6th par.); case of the predicate pronoun, 7 C a; pronouns used adverbially, 16 4 a (4th par.); used as co-ordinating conjunctions, 19 2; relative pronouns used to introduce a subordinate adjective clause, 23 II 8, 23 II 5; reflexive pronouns, 11 2 c; omission of reflexive pronouns, 11 2 c; reciprocal pronouns, 11 2 d; omission of reciprocal pronouns, 11 2 d; relative pronouns, see Relative pronouns; indefinite relative pronouns, see Relative; difference of nature between a pure pronoun and the substantive form of an adjective, 57 2; limiting adjectives used as pronouns, 57 3.

Prop word, 57 1. Proportionate agreement: clause of, 29 1 A b; abridgment, 29 1 A b. Prove, copula, 6 B, 7 B a; reflex. or intrans., 46 (5th par.). Pro-verb, 6 A c. Provided (that), sub. conj., 31; origin, 17 3 A c. Provided only, sub. conj., 31. Providing (that), sub. conj., 31, 31 2. Provocative of, 7 B a (4th par.).

Pure = absolutely, 16 2 a, 54 2 a (last par.). Purpose clause, 33; replaced by other constructions, 33 1; abridgment, 33 2. Pursuant to, prep., 62 1.

Put up, intrans., 46 (4th par.).

Qua, 7 A b (3). Qualify, intrans. or reflex., 46 (5th par.). Quarter, 'The fleet did not have a quarter the number of boats it should have had,' 6 C (3rd par. from end).

Questions: nature of, 23 II 1 (last par.); indirect, 23 II 1 (last par.), 21 (2nd par.); deliberative, 23 II 1 (last par.), 23 I; indirect deliberative, 23 I; speculative, 23 II 1 (last par.), 23 I, 21 (3rd par.); indirect speculative, 23 I; rhetorical, 23 II 1 (last par.), 16 3 b; indirect rhetorical, 23 I; question form to present a topic for discussion, 24 III c; order of words in a question, 3 a (2nd par.), 4 II c (next to last par.), 35 2; do-form in questions, 6 A d (1), (2); questions with the force of a polite volitive subjunctive, 43 I A (last par.). Quit, verb with effective force, 38 2 b cc and dd.

Quite = entirely, 16 2 a; = truly, 16 2 a; = positively, 16 2 a. Quite a few, 16 2 b. Quite a little, 16 2 b. Quotation, 44 II 3 a (last par.).

Raise, causative, 46 (4th par. from end). Rank, copula, 6 B. Rank of words, 9 3. Rather, compar. of adv., 16 5 a aa; sentence adv. = somewhat, 16 2 a; with adversative force, serving at the same time as a sentence adverb and as an adversative coordinating conjunction, 16 2 a (6th par.), 19 2 c. Rather than, with simple infinitive, 29 1 B b (last par.), 49 E (5th par.). Re, prep., 62 1. Re-, 16 I (3rd par.).
Read, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).
Real, adverbs real and really differentiated, 16 4; adverb employed to form the absolute superlative of the adjective, 54 2 a (last par.).
Rear, causative, 46 (4th par. from end); intr. or reflex., 46 (4th par.); adj., comparison, 54 1 a.
Rearmost, superl., 54 1 a.
Reciprocal pronouns, 11 2 d; omission of, 11 2 d.
Recollect, with genitive object, 13 3 (2nd par.).
Reflexive pronouns, 11 2 c, 57 5 b (5th par.); omission of, 11 2 c.
Refund, with dat. and ace, 15 I 1.
Refuse, with dat. and ace, 15 I 1.
Regard, 7 A 6 (2), 15 III 2 A.
Regarding, prep., 62 1.
Regardless of, prep., 62 1.
Relative:
Adjectives:
A relative adjective in connection with a governing noun, the relative pointing back to a preceding definite antecedent: ‘We traveled together as far as Paris, at which place we parted company.’ See 23 II 3 (last par.).
An indefinite relative introducing a substantive clause and at the same time binding it to the principal proposition, hence called a relative adjective: ‘I told him which way he should go.’ ‘You may have whichever book you choose.’ ‘I gave him what money I had with me.’ ‘I shall give him whatever help I can.’ Compare 21, 23 I, 24 III. The substantive forms of these adjectives are used as pronouns. See 23 II 2 (6th par.) and 23 II 3 (3rd par.).
Pronouns:
The pronouns who, that, which, etc., which refer back to a definite antecedent: ‘The man who just came in is my brother.’ ‘The book which I hold in my hand is an English grammar.’ Origin and development of relative pronouns, 23 II; full list, 23 II 5; descriptive and restrictive relative clauses, 23 II 6; personality and form, 23 II 7; case of relative and its agreement with its antecedent, 23 II 8 a, b, c, d, 21 c; position and repetition of the relative pronoun, 23 II 9; personal pronoun instead of a relative, 23 II 9 a; independent proposition instead of relative clause, 23 II 9 b; abridgment of relative clause, 23 II 11. The relative clause introduced by a relative pronoun is often replaced by an asyndetic relative construction, i.e., a relative clause without a relative pronoun. There are two classes: hypothetic, 23 II 10 a; paratactic, 23 II 10 b.
The indefinite relative pronouns who, whoever, what, whatever, which do not refer back to an antecedent, but, like other relative pronouns, bind the clause in which they stand to the principal proposition: ‘I know who did it.’ ‘I saw what he did.’ Compare 21 (2nd, 3rd, 4th par.), 23 I, 24 III (3rd par.). Origin and development of indefinite relative pronouns, 23 II 1, 2, 3.
Adverbs, when, where, why, how, etc., introducing a subordinate clause and at the same time binding it to the principal proposition, hence called relative adverbs or conjunctions: ‘I was there when he came.’ ‘I know when he is coming.’ ‘I know why he did it.’ ‘I saw how he did it.’ Compare 21 (2nd, 3rd, and 4th par.), 23 I, 24 III (3rd par.), 26 (last par.), 27 1, 27 3 (5th par.). When these adverbial forms point to a preceding noun or pronoun in the manner of a relative pronoun they cease to be adverbs and become relative pronouns. See 23 II 5.
Clause, see Attributive relative clause under Adjective clauses.

Relative to, prep., 62 I.

Remain, copula, 6 B, 7 A a (1), 7 B a; with durative force, 38 I.

Remember, with dat. and acc., 15 I I; reflexive, 12 I B b (last par.); with genitive object, 13 3 (2nd par.).

Remit, with dat. and acc., 15 I I.

Rent, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).

Repent, reflex., 12 I B b (last par.); with dat., 12 I B b (last par.).

Report, syn., 24 III d.

Reported speech, see Indirect discourse.

Represent, syn., 24 III d.

Repute, syn., 15 III 2 A a.

Request, syn., 24 III d.

Respecting, prep., 62 I.

Rest, copula, 6 B, 7 B a; intrans. or reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Restriction, clause of, 29 I A c; abridgment, 29 I A c bb.

Restriction, double, 23 II 6, 56 A (4th par.).

Restrictive relative clause, 23 II 6.

Result clauses:
Manner clause of modal result and clause of pure result, 28 5; abridgment, 28 5 d; result clause replaced by other constructions, 28 5 a, b, c.

Degree clause of modal result, 29 2; abridgment, 29 2 a.

Retained: dative and accusative, 15 I 2 a; phrase, 15 III 2 A a.

Reveal, dat. and acc., 15 I 1; with accusative and infinitive, 24 III d.

Rhetorical question, 23 II 1 (last par.), 16 3 b.

Riches, 8 I 2 f.

Right, rightly, adv., 16 4.

Ring, copula, 6 B, 7 B a.

Rise, copula, 6 B, 7 A a (1); causative, 46 (10th and 11th par.).

Rough, verb, rough it, 11 2 b.

Round, prep., 62 I.

Round about, prep., 62 I.

Run, copula, 6 B, 7 B a; with ingressive force, 38 2 a bb; causative, 46 (3rd par. from end); ‘ran her fingers comb fashion through her hair,’ 16 4 a (next to last par.).

-s, used as verbal ending, 8 I 1 h, Note.

Sail, pl. of, 59 3.

Sail in, with ingressive force, 38 2 a dd.

Same age, same size, etc., compound adj., 7 A e.

Save, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Save, saving, saving that, sub. conj., 31.

Say, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1; first person of verb with subject suppressed, 5 b; an imperative often used instead of a conditional clause, 31 I d aa; coord. conj., 19 1 f; in indirect discourse followed by an infinitive that corresponds to an imperative in direct discourse, 44 II 3 a (next to last par.).

Scarce, scarcely, 16 4, 16 2 a (7th par.).

Scarcey — when, 27, 27 3 (last par.); scarcely (or scarce) — but, 27 3 (last par.).

Scissors, 59 6.

Score, pl. of, 59 3.

Scotch, 6 A d, 16 3, 16 4 a (5th par.), 37 5 a (pp. 370, 371), 38 5, 47 a (5th par.), 57 1 (5th par.).

See, syn., 16 III 2 B, 43 II B a.

Seed, pl. of, 59 4 b.

Seeing, absolute part., 17 4, 30 b (3rd par.).

Seem, copula, 6 B, 7 A a (1), 7 B a, 7 D 1 a; with subjunctive force, 44 1 (last par.); a full verb, 28 2 a.

Seen, part. in absolute nom. construction, 17 3 A c.

Self, noun, 56 D (last par.); used instead of himself, herself, 11 2 c (4th par.).

Sell, with passive force, 46 (7th par.); with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Send, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Sentence: defined, 2; essential elements of, 2; sentences lacking the one or the other or both of the essential elements, 2 a; kinds of sentences, 18; functions of the sentence, 2; sentence adverb, 16 2 a.

Separate, intrans. with reciprocal force, 46 (5th par.).

Sequence of tenses, 36,
Set, intrans., 46 (4th par.); causative, 46 (4th par. from end).

Set about, 38 2 a a a, 50 4 d d d.

Set in, 38 2 a a.

Shall, should: use in the future tense, 37 5 a; use in the indirect discourse in the third person, corresponding to shall in the first person in the direct discourse, 44 II 3 a; modal auxiliary, 37 5 a, 44 4 d.

Shares, adv. in "go shares," 16 4 a (next to last par.).

She, pers. pron., 61; determinative, 56 A (last par.); adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b; poss. adj., 57 5 a (3rd par.).

Shell, pi. of, 59 1.

Shine, copula, 6 B, 7 B a.

Short, noun, 58 (3rd par. from end).

Shot, pi. of, 59 1.

Should rather, 37 5 a (p. 368).

Show, copula, 6 B, 7 B a; with ingressive force, 38 2 a g g; with dat. and acc., 15 I 1; with objective genitive, 15 III, 2 A.

Show off, intrans. or reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Show up, intrans. or reflex., 46 (4th par.).

Side: on each (either, this, that) side of, prep., 62 1; side by side with, prep., 62 1.

Sight, a long (or darn) sight, 16 4 a (4th par.).

Simply, distinguishing adv., 16 2 b.

Sin, sub. conj., 27 3 (6th par.), 30.

Since, prep., 62 (3rd par.), 62 1; sub. conj. of: time, 10 IV a, 27, 27 3 (6th par.); cause, 30, 30 a (8th par.); introducing subject clause, 21, 21 c (last par.); adv.: 'The tree has since been cut down'; = ago: 'The Colonel was long since quite too old and feeble for command.'

Sing, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Sink, intrans. and causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).

Sit, copula, 6 B, 7 B a; intrans. and causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).

Sit down, with reflex. dat., 12 1 B b (next to last par.).

So: Coördinating conjunction, 19 1 e.

Subordinating conjunction of: pure result, 28 5 (6th par.); condition, 31; concession, 32; purpose, 33.

Used as a pronoun, 7 C, 11 2 b.

So as, sub. conj. of: comparison, 28 2; manner clause of pure result, 28 5 (next to last par.), 28 5 d (3rd par.); extent, 29 1 A d; degree clause of modal result, 29 2; condition, 31; purpose, 33, 33 2.

So as that, sub. conj., 28 5 (next to last par.).

So to, 28 5 d, 33 2.

So be as, sub. conj., 31.

So be it, sub. conj., 31.

So far as, sub. conj. 29, 1 A c; prep., 62 1, 29 1 A c b b.

So far as that, sub. conj., 29 1 A d.

So far from, prep., 62 1, 28 3 a (4th par.).

So far — that, 29 2 (11th Example).

So long as, sub. conj. of: condition, 31; restriction, 29 1 A c; time, 27.

So much, 16 4 b.

So much so that, sub. conj., 29 2.

So much the + comparative — by how much the + comparative, 29 1 A b.

So often as, sub. conj., 27.

So only, sub. conj. of condition, 31.

So that, sub. conj. of: manner clause of pure result, 28 5 (6th par.); clause of purpose, 33.

So to, 28 5 d, 33 2.

So to speak, 31 2.

Solely, distinguishing adv., 16 2 b.

Some, much used as an adverb, especially in American speech, 16 4 a (5th par.).
Someone = such a one, 23 II 5 (2nd par. of Examples).
Sometimes — sometimes, coörd. conj., 19 1 a.
Somewheres, instead of somewhere, 16 4 a.
Soon: as soon = as readily, 43 I B. Soon as, sub. conj., 25 2 (2nd par.), 27.
Sooner = rather, 43 I B.
Sort of, adj., 59 7.
South, southern, comparison of, 54 1 a.
South of, prep., 62 1.
Specification: adverbial phrase of, 13 3, 62 7 d, 28 1 a; closely related in meaning to the attributive genitive (10 II 2 D, 4th par.) and the partitive genitive (10 II 2 H a).
Speculative question, 23 II 1 (last par.), 21 (3rd par.), 23 I.
Split, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).
Split infinitive, 49 2 c.
Spread, intrans. or reflex., 46 (4th par.).
Spring, copula, 6 B, 7 A a (1), 7 B a.
Stag, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.
Stamina, 59 2.
Stand, copula, 6, 7 B a; with effective force, 38 2 b ee; passive auxiliary, 47 b; causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).
Start, with ingressive force, 38 2 a aa; with objective predicate, 15 III 2 A; start in, start out, 38 2 a aa.
Starve, intrans., trans., reflex., 46 (3rd par. from end).
Statal passive, 47 b.
Stay, copula, 6 B, 7 B a; causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).
Steer, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).
-ster, masc. and fem. suffix, 60 1 a.
Still, coörd. conj., 19 1 c.
Still less, coörd. conj., 19 1 a.
Still more, coörd. conj., 19 1 a.
Stone's throw, 10 II 2 F b.
Stop, with effective-durative force, 38 2 b aa; with effective force, 38 2 b cc; with objective predicate, 15 III 2 A.
Stress:
In groups containing an adjective, 10 I 1.
In groups containing a genitive, 10 II 1, 10 II 2 A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H.
In groups containing a dative and an accusative, 11 I, 15 I 2.
Of adverbs, 16 2, 16 2 a.
In verb-phrases 6 A d (1), (2).
Descriptive stress, 10 I 1, 10 II 1 (next to last par.).
Distinguishing stress, 10 I 1, 10 II 1 (next to last par.).
Classifying stress, 10 I 1, 10 II 1 (next to last par.).
Emphatic stress, 10 I 1.
In group-words, or compounds, 63.
Strike, copula, 6 B; full verb, syn., 15 III 1, 15 III 1 a.
Subject: case and position, 3, 35 1, 24 III d (4th par.); often incorrectly in the accusative instead of the nominative, 7 C a, 29 1 a a a, 29 1 B a, 31 (5th par.); complete subject, 4; forms of the subject, 4 I; use of pronominal subjects: situation it, 4 II A; impersonal it and there, 4 II B; anticipatory it, 4 II C; pronouns used as general or indefinite subject, 4 II D; editorial we, 4 II E; we, plural of majesty, 4 II F; we = you, 4 II G; omission of subject, 5.
Subject accusative, 7 A a (1) (4th par.), 15 III 2, 20 3 (last par.), 38 1 (2nd par.).
Subject clause, 21; position and stress, 21 b; emphasis and attraction, 21 c; abridgment, 27 e.
Subject to, prep., 62 1.
Subject word, 3.
Subjective genitive, 10 II 2 C.
Subjunct, 9 2.
Subjunctive mood: basic idea of, 41; differentiation of meaning between the present and the past tense, 41 (3rd par.); past tense now used to point to the present or the future, but once employed to refer to the past, 41 (4th par.); old and new
subjunctive forms, 42; classification of the meanings, 41, 43–44.

Optative subjunctive:
In principal propositions: volitive, 43 I A; subjunctive of wish, 43 I B; subjunctive of logical reasoning, 43 I C; subjunctive of plan, 43 I D.
In subordinate clauses: action conceded, 43 II A; action desired:
In object, subject, attributive substantive clauses after verbs or nouns of advising, beseeching, warning, wishing, demanding, etc., 43 II B a.
In adverbial clauses of purpose, 43 II B b.
In temporal clauses after until, till, when, whenever, before, ere, 43 II B c.
In formally independent clause with the force of a subordinate when-clause, 43 II B d.
In relative clauses, 43 II B e.
In adverbial clauses of modal result, 43 II B f.
In clauses of condition, 43 II B g, 44 II 5 A a, b, 44 II 5 C a.

Potential subjunctive:
In principal propositions, 44 I; adverbs often used with the force of the potential subjunctive, 44 I (last par.).
In subordinate clauses:
In subject clauses, 44 II 1.
In predicate clauses, 44 II 2.
In object clauses, 44 II 3.
In adjective clauses: relative clauses, 44 II 4 a; attributive substantive clauses, 44 II 4 b.
In conditional sentences: practical condition, 44 II 5 A; theoretical condition, 44 II 5 B; condition contrary to fact, 44 II 5 C.
In clauses of manner, 44 II 6.
In clauses of modal and pure result, 44 II 7.
In comparative clauses, 44 II 8.

In clauses of extent, 44 II 9.
In causal clauses, 44 II 10.

Subordinate clauses: function, 20 1, 28 5 d (8th par.); classes, 20 1; position, 20 2; abridgment, 20 3.
Subordinate elements of a sentence, 9.
Subordinating conjunctions, 21, 22, 23 I, 23 II 5, 24 I, 24 II, 24 III, 24 IV, 25, 26, 27, 27 1, 2, 3, 4, 28 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 29 1 A a, b, c, B, 2, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34.

Subsequently to, prep., 62 1.

Substantive (or noun) clauses:

Subject clause, 21; abridgment, 21 e.
Predicate clause, 22; abridgment, 22 b.
Attributive substantive clause, 23 I; abridgment, 23 I a.
Genitive clause, 24 I; abridgment, 24 I a.
Dative clause, 24 II; abridgment, 24 II a.
Accusative clause, 24 III; abridgment, 24 III d.
Appositive clause, 10 III 1 A b, 23 I.

Clause used as object of the preposition in prepositional clauses: ‘He believes in what he preaches.’ See Prepositional clause.

Substantive function of adjectives, 57 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.
Success, successes, meaning, 59 5 b.
Such, such a one, 23 II 5 (2nd par. of Examples), 56 A, 57 3 (2nd par.).
Such as, coord. conj., 19 1 f.
Suitably to, prep., 62 1.
Sultan, sultana, 60 1 c.

Superlative degree of:
Adjectives, relative superlative, 54 1; different form for different function, 54 1 c; adverbial accusative form, 54 1 c; superlative of compounds, 54 1 h; double superlative, 54 1 a aa; absolute superlative, 54 2 a.
Adverbs, 16 5 a; adverbial accusative form, 16 5 a bb; absolute superlative, 16 5 b.

Suppose, imperative of, with its object used instead of a conditional clause, 31 1 d aa; verb, syn., 7 A a (1) (4th par.), 24 III d (2nd par.).
Supposing, absolute part., 31 2 (4th par.), 46 3 (next to last par.).
Sure, adv. = surely, 16 4 (3rd par. from end).
Sure thing = surely, 16 4 a (next to last par.).
Swim, intrans. and trans., 46 (3rd par. from end).
Swiss, pl. of, 58 (4th par.).
Sym, sub. conj., 27 3 (6th par.), 30.
Synthetic form, 54 1.
Synth, see Sith.
Tabby, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.
Tactics, 59 2.
Take, copula, 6 B; full verb, syn., 15 III 1, 24 III d; with ingressive force, 38 2 a bb, cc.
Taste, copula, 6 B, 7 B a; with genitive object, 13 3.
Teach, with dat. and acc., infinitive, or clause, 16 I 1, 24 III d.
Telegraph, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.
Telephone, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.
Tell, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.
Temporal clause, see Clause of time.
Tenses, see Present tense, Past tense, etc.; sequence of tenses, 36.
Terminate aspect, 38 3.
-th, use as verbal ending, 8 I 1 h, Note.
Tha (old English þæ), 27 1.
Than, sub. conj. in compar. clauses, 29 1, 31; origin, 27 3 (last par.); ‘than whom,’ 23 II 5 (1st par. of Examples); ‘taller than me,’ 29 1 B a; sub. conj. of time, 27 1, 27 3 (last par.); adv., 27 3 (last par.).
Thanks to, prep., 62 1.
That, used as:
A demonstrative: inflection and use, 56, 56 A; used as an adjective, 56 A; used as a determinative, 56 A, 23 II, 23 II 10 a (last par.), 26 (last three par.). 27 1 (2nd par.); with the force of such, 28 5 (4th par.), 29 2 (3rd par.); charged with feeling, 56 A (2nd par.); used as a pronoun, 61, 57 3; used disparagingly of persons, 60 1 d; used as an adv., 16 4 b.
A relative pronoun, 23 II; used to refer to the thought contained in a preceding adjective,
Theirn, 57 5 a (3rd par.).

Them or them there = those, 56 A; them there ones, 57 1 (10th par.).

Themselves, reflex. pron., 11 2 c, 56 D (next to last par.); reciprocal pron., 11 2 d; pers. pron., 56 D (3rd par.); intensifying adj., 56 D.

Then, coord. conj., 19 1 a, e; sub. conj., 27 1, 27 3 (last par.), 29 1 B; adj., 10 1 2; pron., 62 (3rd par.).

Thence, coord. conj., 19 1 e.

Thence that, rel. pron., 23 II 5.

There, adv.: 'There is no one there'; with effective force, 38 2 b aa; compounds with there, 16 1 (next to last par.); anticipatory subject, 4 II C; sub. conj., 26; rel. pron., 23 II 5 (1st par. and near end of Examples).

There as, sub. conj. of place, 26; rel. pron., 23 II 5 (1st par. and near end of Examples).

There that, sub. conj., 26; rel. pron., 23 II 5.

Therefor, adv., 19 1 e.

Therefore, coord. conj., 19 1 e.

Thesen, 57 5 a (3rd par.).

They, pers. pron., 61; referring to an antecedent singular in form, 61 a (3rd par.); inclusive in gender, 60 1 d (2nd par.); indefinite pron., 4 II D; determinative, 56 A (last par.), 23 II 5 (2nd par. of Examples); poss. adj., 57 5 a (3rd par.).

They that, they who, 23 II 5 (2nd par. of Examples).

Thider as, sub. conj., 26 (3rd par. from end).

Thider that, sub. conj., 26 (3rd par. from end).

Thine, see Thy.

Thing, with adjective force, 7 B a aa (last par.); with adverbial force, 16 4 a (3rd par. from end and next to last par.).

Think, verb, syn., 24 III, 24 III d; I think, sentence adv., 16 2 a (6th par.).

Thirst for, 14.

Thirsty for, 14.

This, a demonstrative: inflection, 56; used as an adjective, 56 A; charged with feeling, 56 A (2nd par.); used as a pronoun, 61, 57 3; used as an adverb, 16 4 b.

This much, 16 4 b.

Thisn, 57 5 a (3rd par.).

Thô, sub. conj. of time, 27 1.

Thof = though, 32.

Thorough, adv., 16 4.

Those = some, 23 II 5 (Examples, p. 221, quotation from Hughes, Tom Brown's School-Days); = such or so great, 29 2 (3rd par.).

Those who, 23 II 5 (2nd par. of Examples).

Thosen, 57 5 a (3rd par.).

Thou, use of, 4 II H.

Though, coord. adversative conj., 19 1 c; sub. conj. of concession, 32; = if, 31, 28 2 a.

Thought to have written you a line, 49 3 a (4th par.).

Thousand, pl. of, 10 II 2 H b.

Through, prep., 62 1; prep. adv., 62 5; effective particle, 38 2 b aa; adv., 16 4; pred. adj.: 'Are you through asking questions?' see 28 1 a.

Through lack of, prep., 62 1.

Throughout, prep., 62 1.

Throw, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.

Thus much, 16 4 b.

Thy, thine, pron. and adj., 57 5 a.

Thyself, reflex. pron., 11 2 c, 56 D (next to last par.); pers. pron., 56 D (3rd par.); intensifying adj., 56 D.

Tidings, 59 2.

Till, prep., 62 1; sub. conj.: of time, 27, 27 3 (next to last and last parr.); introducing subject clause, 21, 21 c (last par.); introducing clause of result, 28 5 a; introducing clause of purpose, 33.

Tilt: 'ran full till,' 16 4 a (next to last par.).

Time, clause of, 27; abridgment, 27 5.

Titles, pl. of, 59 8.

To, prep., 62 1.

To, before the infinitive, 49 4 A, B, C (2), D, E, F; omitted before the infinitive, 3 d, 49 4 A, C (1) a, b, c, d.

To and fro, prep., 62 1.

To say nothing of, coord. conj., 19 1 a.
To such a degree that, sub. conj., 29 2.
To such an extent as, sub. conj., 29 1 A d.
To such an extent as, sub. conj., 29;
To the degree that, sub. conj., 29 1 A d.
To the end that, sub. conj., 33.
To the intent that, sub. conj., 33.
To the order of, prep., 62 1.
To wit, coörd. conj., 19 1 f.
To within, prep., 62 7 d.
Tom, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 d.
Tom,
Too, coord. conj., 19 1 a; distinguishing adv., 16 2 b; before participles, 16 5 b (last par.).
Too + adjective (or adverb) + to-infinitive, 29 2 a (next to last par.).
Top, topmost, 54 1 a.
Touch, reciprocal verb without use of reciprocal pronoun, 11 2 d.
Touching, prep., 62 1; origin, 17 4 (4th par.).
Toward, prep., 62 1.
Trace, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).
Transitive verbs: usually of the same form as intransitives but sometimes different, 46 (10th par.); the active form used absolutely or with reflexive, intransitive, or passive force, 46.
-trix, suffix indicating a female, 60 1 c.
Truth, truths, meaning, 59 5 b.
Turn, copula, 6 B, 7 A a (1), 7 A d, 7 B a, 7 B a aa; intrans., 46 (4th par.).
Turn out, copula, 6 B, 7 A a (1), 7 B a.
Tweezers, 59 6.
Twine, intrans. or reflex., 46 (4th par.).
Two-trouser suit, 10 I 2 (3rd par. from end).

Ultimately, adv. with subjunctive force, 43 I A (4th par. from end).
Un-, 16 1 (3rd par.).
Under, prep., 62 1; adj., comparison of, 54 1 a; effective particle, 38 2 b aa.
Under cover of, prep., 62 1.
Under pain of, prep., 62 1.
Undermost, superl., 54 1 a.
Underneath, prep., 62 1.

Unique, more unique, most unique, 54 1 a aa.
Unless, sub. conj., 31; = except when, 31 (5th par.).
Unless that, sub. conj., 33.
Until, prep., 62 1; sub. conj., 27; imparting the idea of a habitual act, 38 1 (3rd par. from end). See also Till.
Unto, prep., 62 1.
Up, prep., 62 1; ingressive and effective particle, 38 2 a dd, b aa; pred. adj., 7 F; comparison, 54 1 a.
Up against, prep., 62 1.
Up and down, prep., 62 1.
Up at, prep., 62 1.
Up till, prep., 62 1.
Up to, prep., 62 1, 7 F (2nd par.).
Upon, prep., 62 1.
Upper, uppermost, upmost, 54 1 a, 54 1 a aa.
Upset, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).
Us, used as nominative, 7 C a.
Use, verb, iterative, 38 4; noun, syn., 4 II C (3rd par.).
Utmost, superl., 54 1 a.
Uttersist, superl., 54 1 a, 54 1 a aa.

Varieties of apple, 59 7.
Verb:

Tenses and their uses, 36-38.
Aspects, 38.
Mood, 39; indicative, 40; subjunctive, 41-44; imperative, 45; voice, 46.
Personal ending s, history of, 8 I 1 h, Note; lacking in dialect, 8 I 1 h, Note (next to last par.).
Verb-phrase, 6 A.
Verbal phrase, 16 2 a (1st par.), 24 IV.
Vermin, 59 3.
Very, used to form the absolute superlative of adjectives and adverbs, 54 2 a (last par.), 16 5 b; before participles, 16 5 b (last par.).
Via, prep., 62 1.
Viz., coörd. conj., 19 1 f.
Vocative, 17 2.
Voice:

Active: intransitive, often with reflexive or passive force, 46 (4th-8th par.); a transitive
causative, sometimes differing in form from the corresponding intransitive, 46 (10th par.); causative and intransitive, usually with the same form, 46 (3rd par. from end).

Passive forms of expression: actional passive with a literary and a colloquial form, 47 a (1st and next to last parr.), 47 b; other passive forms, 47 a (last par.); two progressive actional passive forms, 47 a; statal passive, 47 b.

Volitive subjunctive, 43 I A, II B, 44 II 5 A a.

Wages, sing. or pl., 8 I 1 c, 2 f.
Wait, with genitive object, 13 3.
Walk, causative, 46 (3rd par. from end).
Walk forth, with a reflex. dat. object, 12 1 B b (next to last par.).
Want, syn., 24 III b, d; I want in, 6 A a (3rd par.); want = must, 43 I A (2nd par.).
Wanted to have seen you, 49 3 a (5th par.).
Was ready to have struck, 49 3 a (7th par.).
Was to have dined with us, 49 3 a (10th par.).
Wash, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).
Wax, copula, 6 B, 7 B a.
We, editorial, 4 II E; plural of majesty, 4 II F; we = you, 4 II G; we uns, 57 1 (4th par. from end).
Wear, with passive force, 46 (7th par.); copula, 6 B.
Well, adv.: 'He plays well,' 16 4; adj., 7 B a; comparison of adverbial and adjective well, 16 5 a aa, 54 1 a.
Weorpan, Old English, passive auxiliary, 47 b.
West, western, comparison of, 54 1 a.
West of, to the west (or westward) of, prep., 62 1.
What:
Indefinite:
Relative pronoun, usually without an antecedent, 23 II 2 (4th par.); much used in substantive clauses, 10 III 1 A b, 21, 24 III, 24 IV; origin and development, 23 II 2; omitted in the literary language but expressed in popular speech, 5 d; repeated, 24 IV (5th par.); used disparagingly of persons, 60 1 d (3rd par.).
Relative pronoun, sometimes with an indefinite antecedent, 23 II 2; in popular speech pointing back to a definite antecedent, 28 II 5.
Relative adjective, 23 II 2 (5th par.); much used in substantive clauses, 21, 24 III, 24 IV; difference of meaning here between what and which, 23 II 3 (2nd par.); what used in adverbial clauses of manner proper, 25 1; what time used as adverbial conjunction of time, 27, 27 3 (3rd par.); used as an indefinite relative pronoun, 23 II 2 (6th par.), 57 1 (4th par.), 57 3 (next to last par.).
Interrogative:
Pronoun: in direct questions, 23 II 2 (7th par.); in indirect questions, 23 II 2 (7th par.); much used here in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III.
Adjective, 23 II 2 (7th par.); much used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV; the substantive forms of the adjective used as pronouns, 57 3 (last par.).
Pronoun used in the accusative as an adverb, 16 4 a (4th par.).
Substantive forms — what one(s) — used as interrogative or indefinite relative pronouns, 23 II 2 (6th par.), 57 1 (4th par.), 57 3 (last two parr.).
What a, in exclamations: direct, 23 II 2 (7th par.); indirect, 23 II 2 (5th par.), 23 I (3rd par.); 24 IV (1st par.).
What between — and, 19 1 a.
What of — and, 19 1 a.
What with — and what with, 19 1 a.
Whatever:

Indefinite relative:

Pronoun, 23 II 2; much used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV; also in adverbial concessive clauses, 32 (8th par.).

Adjective, 23 II 2 (2nd par.); much used in substantive clauses, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV; in adverbial clauses of manner proper, 28 I; in attributive adjective clauses, 23 II 6 (5th and last par.).

Substantive (57 1) forms — whatever one(s) — used as indefinite relative pronouns, 23 II 2 (6th par.), 57 I (4th par.), 57 3 (next to last par.).

Adverb, 16 4 a (4th par.); = What in the world? 16 2 a (last par.).

Whatso, 23 II 2, 32 (8th par.).

Whatsoever, 23 II 2, 32 (8th par.).

When:

Subordinating conjunction of:

time, 20 1 (3rd par.), 27 I, 27 3 (last par.); cause, 30; condition, 31; concession, 32; with adversative force, 27 4.

Indefinite relative adverb: 'I do not know when he is coming.' Much used in substantive clauses, 21, 22, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV; = a case in which, 24 III (Examples, p. 245, quotation from Shakespeare's Measure for Measure).

Interrogative adverb, used in:

direct (23 II 1, last par.) questions: 'When will you return?' Much used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV; = a noun + in which, 24 III (Examples, p. 245, quotation from Shakespeare's Measure for Measure).

Indefinite relative adverb: 'I do not know where he lives.' Much used in substantive clauses, 21, 22, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV; = a noun + in which, 24 III (Examples, p. 245, quotation from Shakespeare's Measure for Measure). In older English used after to, see, behold where we now employ there or here: 'See where (now there or here) she comes' (Shakespeare, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, V, 1, 7).

Interrogative adverb m: direct (23 II 1, last par.) questions: 'Where do you live?' indirect (23 II 1, last par.) questions: 'He asked me where I live.' Much used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 23 III.

Relative pronoun, 23 II 5.

Compounds with where—, 16 1 (next to last par.).

Where — from, interrog. pron. governed by the preposition from: 'Where did you come from?' sub. conj. of time, 26.

Whereas, sub. conj. of place, 26 (last par.); with adversative force, 27 4; sub. conj. of cause, 30, 30 a (last par.); rel. pron., 23 II 5 (1st par. and near end of Examples).

Whereby, rel. pron., 23 II 5.

Whereupon, rel. pron., 23 II 6 (next to last par.).

Wherever, sub. conj. of place or concession, 26 (1st par. and 1st par after Examples).

Whether, indef. rel. adv., much used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV; interrog. rel. adv.,
much used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III; pronoun = which of the two, 19 1 b.

Whether — or, coord. conj., 19 1 b.

Whatever — or whether, indef. rel. adv., much used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV; interrog. rel. adv., much used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III; used in concessive clauses, 32.

Which:

With definite reference:
Relative pronoun with definite antecedent: ‘I have read the book which you gave me.’ Compare 23 II 3. Used referring to a preceding statement or adjective or to a following statement or adjective, 23 II 6 (5th par.); referring to persons, 23 II 3 (1st and 3rd parr.).

Relative adjective, standing before its governing noun, at the same time pointing back to a definite antecedent: ‘We traveled together as far as Paris, at which place we parted company.’ Compare 23 II 3 (last par.).

Indefinite relative adjective, without reference to an antecedent: ‘I do not know which book he took.’ See 23 II 3 (2nd par.). This indefinite relative adjective is much used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV; substantive (57 1) forms of this adjective often used as indefinite relative pronouns, 23 II 3 (3rd par.); referring to both persons and things, 23 II 3 (3rd par.).

Interrogative adjective:
In direct (23 II 1, last par.) questions: ‘Which road did you take?’ Used also as interrogative pronoun, 23 II 3 (3rd par.); referring to both persons and things, 23 II 3 (3rd par.).

In indirect (23 II 1, last par.) questions: ‘He asked me which road I took.’ Much used in substantive clauses, 21, 24 III, 24 IV; used as interrogative pronoun, 23 II 3 (3rd par.).

Substantive (57 1) forms — which one(s) — much used as interrogative or indefinite relative pronouns, 23 II 3 (3rd par.); referring to both persons or things, 23 II 3 (3rd par.).

Which . . . it, old relative construction = simple which, 23 II (5th par.).

Which that, rel. pron., 13 II 3.

Whichever, indef. rel. adj. and pron. with the same meaning as is found in which, only a little more indefinite; with the functions of which so far as described under Which; moreover, used in adverbial concessive clauses, 32 (8th par.).

While, sub. conj. of time, 27, 27 3 (4th par.); origin, 27 3; = until, 27 3 (4th par.); with adverative force, 27 4; attendant circumstance, 28 3; condition, 31; concession, 32; rel. pron., 23 II 5; = and, 20 1 (3rd par.).

While as, sub. conj. of time, 27 3 (4th par.); with adverative force, 27 4.

While that, sub. conj. of time, 27 3 (4th par.); with adverative force, 27 4.

Whilom, 16 4 a.

Whist, 27, 27 4, 28 3, 16 4 a.

White, noun, pl. of, 58 (3rd and next to last parr.).

Whither:

Subordinating conjunction of place, 26.

Indefinite relative adverb: ‘It is plain whither your argument tends.’ Much used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV.

Interrogative adverb in: direct (23 II 1, last par.) questions: ‘Whither are we drifting?’; indirect (23 II 1, last par.) questions: ‘He often asks me whither we are drifting.’ Used in substantive clauses, 21, 24 III 24 IV.

Relative pronoun, 23 II 5.
Who (whose, whom):

Definite relative pronoun with reference to a definite antecedent: ‘The boy who just came in is my brother’; now less commonly used than formerly when the antecedent is indefinite he, she, they, 23 II 1 (6th par.); referring to persons, 23 II 1 (3rd par.); in older English referring sometimes to things, 23 II 7 (3rd par.); origin and development of who, 23 II 1.

Indefinite relative pronoun, 23 II 1 (5th par.); much used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV.

Interrogative pronoun: in direct (23 II 1, last par.) questions: ‘Who did it?’; who = whose, 57 5 a (3rd par.); in indirect (23 II 1, last par.) questions: ‘He asked who did it.’

Determinative pronoun: whose = that one’s, 56 A (3rd par.).

Who . . . he, old relative construction = simple who, 23 II (5th par.).

Whoever, indef. rel. pron. with the meaning found in indefinite who, only more indefinite; used in substantive clauses, 21, 23 I, 24 III, 24 IV; frequent in adverbial concessive clauses, 32 (8th par.); sometimes employed in attributive adjective clauses, 23 II 6 (5th par.); = who in the world? 16 2 a (last par.).

Whosen, 57 5 a (3rd par.).

Whoso, whosoever, 23 II 1 (4th par.).

Why, indef. rel. and interrog. adv., with the functions described for when under When; rel. pron., 23 II 5.

Will, use in the future tense, 37 5 a; use in indirect discourse, 44 II 3 a; modal auxiliary, 37 5 a, 43 I A, II B a, 44 I; iterative auxiliary, 38 4 (next to last par.).

Winterkill, with passive force, 46 (7th par.).

Wish, verb, syn., 24 III d; with dat. and acc., 15 I 1; for the means of expressing wishing and willing in English see 43 I and II.

With, prep., 62 1.

With a view to, prep., 62 1.

With an eye to, prep., 62 1.

With reference (or respect) to, prep., 62 1.

With (or in) regard to, prep., 62 1.

With the exception of, prep., 62 1.

With the intention of, prep., 62 1.

With the purpose of, prep., 62 1.

With the view of, prep., 62 1.

Withal, coord. conj., 19 I a, c; prep., 62 1.

Within, prep., 62 1.

Within reach of, prep., 62 1.

Without, prep., 62 1, 28 3 a (3rd par.), 28 5 d (7th par.), 31 2 (next to last par.); sub. conj. of: attendant circumstance, 28 3; manner clause of pure result, 28 5 (7th par.); condition, 31.

Without regard to, prep., 62 1.

Without that, sub. conj., 28 3, 28 3 a, 28 5 (7th par.).

Woman, adj. indicating sex, 60 1 b.

Wonder, intrans.: ‘I shouldn’t wonder if he would come at any moment’; with prep. object: ‘I shall never cease to wonder at it’; with prep. suppressed when a clause follows, 24 IV (4th par.); trans. = I should like to know, with a clause as object, 24 III (Examples, p. 245).

Want, used to express the iterative idea, 38 4 (4th par.).

Won’t, 37 5 a.

Word-order:

Position of verb:

Verb in second place: normal order: ‘The boy loves his dog.’ Compare 35 1, 35 1 a. Inverted order: ‘Bitterly did we repent our decision.’ See 35 1 for fuller description.

Verb in the first place, 35 2.

See also Emphatic verb.

Position of adjective, 10 I 1.

Position of the genitive, 10 II 1, 10 II 1 c.

Position of the dative and the accusative object, 11 1, 15 I 2.

Position of adverbs, 16 2; of sentence adverbs, 16 2 a; of not, 16 2 d; of distinguishing adverbs, 16 2 b.
Word-order (cont.):
   Position of the subject of the
   infinitive, 24 III d (4th par.),
   15 III 2 B (3rd par.).
Work, copula, 6 B.
Work out, with passive force, 46 (7th
par.).
Works, a, a singular, 59 2.
Worse, compar. of adv. and adj.,
   16 5 a aa, 54 1 a; noun, 58 (3rd
   par. from end).
Worth, adj., syn., 11 2 g, 24 III d
   (last par.), 50 4 c aa.
Worth, copula, 6 B (last par.); in
   Old English in the form of wear an
   used as passive auxiliary, 47 b.
Worthy, adj., syn., 11 2 g.
Would, auxiliary to express future
   time, 37 5 a (12th par.); modal
   auxiliary, 37 5 a (12th and 15th
   parr.), 43 I B, 43 II B a, 44 I,
   44 II 3, 44 II 4 a, 44 II 5 B, C.
Would better, 43 I B (4th par.), 44 I
   (10th par.).
Would rather, 43 I B (4th par.).
Would sooner, would as soon, 43 I B
   (4th par.).
Write, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.
Wrong, wrongly, adv., 16 4.
Wunst = once, 16 4 a.
Ye, 4 II H.
Ye = the, 56 B c.
Yearn, syn., 13 3 (2nd and 5th parr.),
   14.
Yes, a complete sentence, 2 a.
Yet, coörd. conj., 19 1 c.
Yield, with dat. and acc., 15 I 1.
Yoke, pl. of, 59 3.
You, substitute for thou, 4 II H;
   indef. pron., 4 I D.
You all, used as pl. of you, 4 II H
   (4th par.).
You together, used as pl. of you, 4 II H
   (4th par.).
You uns, 4 II H (4th par.), 57 I (10th
   par.).
Young, noun, pl. of, 58 (3rd par.).
Your, yours, pron. and adj., 57 5 a.
Yourn, 57 5 a (3rd par.).
Yourself, yourselves, reflex. pron., 11
   2 c, 56 D (next to last par.); pers.
   pron., 56 D (3rd par.); intensify­
   ing adj., 56 D.
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