UNIVERSITEIT GENT

Engels: Taalstructuren B (A703032)

Bachelor in de toegepaste taalkunde 1

English Grammar (E1SB)
(theory + exercises)

Uitgave 2019-2020

FACULTEIT LETTEREN EN WIJSBEGEERTE   Vakgroep Vertalen, Tolken en Communicatie

Table of Contents - THEORY

Table of Contents - EXERCISES

Yesterday is history, tomorrow is a mystery. Today is a gift.

That's why we call it the present.

5.1 Introduction

In general, future events are 'uncertain'. Hence, we normally refer to them as probabilities, plans, intentions, predictions or educated guesses, etc. rather than as certain facts. However, people have different ways of looking at future events about which they may entertain different degrees of certainty. These different ways are reflected in different expressions of future time, as will be discussed below.

Expressing the future, however, is not only a matter of tense use, but also of textual (and situational) context. One and the same form can have two different meanings depending on the discourse, which will normally disambiguate the sentence:

(1)   Hey, what <u>are</u> you <u>singing</u>? It sounds familiar but I can't put my finger on it. => PRES

cf.   Wat <u>ben</u> je <u>aan het zingen</u>? Het klinkt vertrouwd in de oren, maar ik kan het niet thuisbrengen.

(1´)   It's your first gig tonight. What <u>are</u> you <u>singing</u>? => FUT

cf.   Vanavond je eerste optreden. Wat <u>zing</u> je?

The most explicit FUTURE TIME markers are *time adverbials:* adverbs, prepositional phrases and clauses of time, cf.

(2)   *Tomorrow* I <u>shall be</u> twenty.   cf. Morgen <u>word</u> ik twintig.

(3)   The train <u>leaves</u> *at 6.30.*   cf. De trein <u>vertrekt</u> om 6u30.

(4)   *When they arrive,* I <u>will be checking</u> in.   cf. Wanneer zij aankomen, <u>zal</u> ik <u>aan het inchecken zijn</u>.

Note also that the Dutch equivalent need not be the same verb form, as in (2) (see also below). Sentences (1) – (4) also illustrate some of the variety of verb forms that can refer to the future. The table below offers a more complete survey of forms, which will be discussed in more detail in the next sections.

---

[1] Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 are part of the E1SA course.

5.2-3	**WILL/SHALL + infinitive**	**WILL/SHALL + perf. infinitive**
	He will leave early.	He will have left by then.
5.4-5	**WILL/SHALL + prog. infinitve**	**WILL/SHALL + perf. prog. infinitive**
	He will be leaving early again, I think.	He will have been teaching for ten years by then.
5.6	**BE GOING TO + infinitive**	
	He is going to leave soon.	
5.7	**PRESENT PROGRESSIVE or CONTINUOUS**	
	He is leaving in ten minutes.	
5.8	**PRESENT SIMPLE or SIMPLE PRESENT**	
	The train leaves at 6.30.	
5.9	**ALTERNATIVES**	
	He is to leave on Monday; He is about to leave; He is bound to leave, etc.	

5.2 Will/shall + Infinitive (= Future Simple)

5.2.1 Form

1st	person:	I/we will (BrE, neutral; AmE)
		I/we shall (BrE, neutral/more formal)
2nd	person:	you will + bare infinitive
3rd	person:	he/she/it/they will

Positive form:	frequently contracted to: ´ll
Negative form:	will not/won´t – shall not/shan´t
Interrogative form:	will/shall I
	will you
	will he/she/it

The form *'ll* is not possible when the infinitive is ellipted, though *won't* and *shan't* are:

(5)   Who'll win this year's Champions League?

They <u>won't</u>, that's for sure.

They <u>will</u> (*They'll), that's for sure.

Notes:

1) *Shall/will* is not used in temporal subclauses (with *when, once, until, before*, etc.)

– You'll understand, once you (*<u>will</u>) <u>have reached</u> maturity.

– When she (*<u>will arrive</u>) <u>arrives</u> and sees the surprise, I'm sure she'll cry.

2) Auxiliary *will* is only used in temporal subclauses when they express a situation that the speaker thinks is **unreal**:

– He'd rather shoot himself before he<u>'ll share</u> classified information.

5.2.2   Use

The auxiliaries *will* and *shall* are used for so called 'pure future' reference as well as with modal meanings, as is shown in (6) and (8):

(6) I think he'll pass, although you never know. (pure future)
(8) You will do as you are told, young man! (modal meaning)

The discussion will be restricted to their 'pure future' meaning (for modal uses see 10.8 and notes). The basic meaning *of shall/will* + infinitive is **prediction**. Typical contexts for this form are: weather forecasts, speculations in general, statements of cause and effect, based on guesswork, experience or expertise. In many cases *shall/will* will be accompanied by Disjuncts expressing degrees of certainty (e.g. *probably, presumably*) or expressions as *I wonder, I think, I assume, I'm sure*, etc.

(9)   Tomorrow's weather will be cold and cloudy. There will be sunny spells, though, in the
         afternoon.
(10)   *I wonder* whether they'll make it.
(11)   Test results will *probably* be negative.
(12)   You will feel better after this medicine.
         (= a doctor´s PREDICTION)
cf.   Met dit medicijn zul je je beter voelen.

A second use of *shall/will* with future time reference expresses **'unpremeditated intention'**. On the basis of a trigger in the present, the speaker decides to carry out a future action, as such expressing his or her volition to do something. This use is typical of short responses (normally with a speaker-subject) following a verbal or non-verbal stimulus:

(the doorbell rings)
(13)   I´ll answer it.
cf.   Ik zal *(wel)* opendoen.

Notes:
1) In interrogative sentences with a 2ⁿᵈ person Subject, *will* usually expresses volition, i.e. the interrogative expresses a request. In this way *Will you leave soon?* can be interpreted in two ways: 1) as a purely informative enquiry about the addressee's future plans or 2) as a request by the speaker to be carried out by the addressee (which may be felt to be impolite in some cases). If a 'pure future' (i.e. purely informative) is the intended meaning, *will* + progressive infinitive rules

out the ambiguity (*Will you be leaving soon*?). Obviously, requests normally refer to the future actions that are still to be performed when the request is made. The problem, then, is that futurity is difficult to separate from modality and no more so than in the case of *will*. Even ´prediction´, which is normally thought of as being more or less synonymous with the notion of ´pure future´, carries modal overtones.

2) Note that in some contexts, the predictive force of *will* is weakened in a sentence like (14). The Dutch translation does not have *zullen* at all!

(14)   I´<u>ll be</u> twenty tomorrow.

cf.   Ik <u>word</u> morgen twintig.

3) In a number of cases *will* does not refer to the future at all, but predicts that something may be the case in the present. As a strong assumption it presents a near-certain prediction about a current state of affairs.

(15)   You'<u>ll</u> probably already <u>know</u>.

cf.   Je <u>zult</u> het wellicht *wel* al <u>weten</u>.

4) W*ill/shall* is also used in type 1 conditional clauses (see unit 6).

(16)   If you drop that bottle, it´<u>ll break</u>.
            (a)   (b)

cf.   Als je die fles laat vallen, <u>zal</u> ze <u>breken</u>. (OTkT)
           = open condition (hypothetical and probable)

5) For the sake of completeness, some of the modal meanings of *shall/will* are illustrated below (see 10.8 on modal uses). (17) expresses a timeless prediction or general truth, whereas (18) expresses habitual prediction or a characteristic that is ascribed to someone.

(17)   Oil <u>will float</u> on water.
cf.   Olie <u>drijft</u> op water. (OTT)
(18)   He <u>will sit</u> there for hours doing nothing.
cf.   Hij <u>zit</u> daar *soms* uren zonder iets te doen. (OTT)

This use of *will* is replaceable by *can* (*He can sit there for hours doing nothing*).

5.3 Will/shall + Perfect Infinitive (= Future Perfect)

5.3.1 Form

| Will/shall + have | + BASE + -ed | (regular verbs) |
| | + past participle | (irregular verbs) |

5.3.2 Use

Perfective Aspect indicates that a certain event/action/state will have been completed before or continue up to (possibly overlapping with) a certain POINT IN TIME. That ´point in time´ will tend to be in the future, as in:

(19)   I expect Uncle Harry <u>will have received</u> my postcard   (a)

         before/when I get home.   (b)

         (by then).

cf.   Ik denk dat oom Harry mijn kaartje <u>zal hebben ontvangen</u>

         voor/wanneer ik thuiskom.

         (tegen die tijd).

         i.e. **before** A FUTURE point in time.

(20)   He <u>will have spent</u> 40 years in jail by the time he gets out. Imagine how the world <u>will have changed</u> by then.

Note:

In some cases, the ´point in time´ can also be the moment of speaking (compare with note 3 in 5.2.2):

(21)   Let´s call on him. He <u>will have received</u> our message *(by now).*

cf.   Laten we even langslopen. Hij <u>zal</u> ons bericht (nu wel) <u>hebben ontvangen</u>.

         i.e. **before** the present moment of speaking

In these cases the future perfect also expresses a strong assumption about the outcome of an earlier activity that has already been completed at the time of speaking. If we remove the modal meaning of strong assumption in (22), we are left with an ordinary present perfect:

(22)   He <u>has received</u> our message. (= an established fact)

5.4 Will/shall + Progressive Infinitive (= Future Progressive)

5.4.1 Form

> will/shall + be + BASE + -ing

5.4.2 Use

The future progressive indicates that an action/event or state will be taking place at a certain moment in the future and focuses on duration.

(23) This time next week I <u>shall</u> <u>be sailing</u> across the Pacific.

The progressive element again carries the usual semantic features mentioned earlier (see the expression of present time): **limited duration and/or incompleteness.**

Additionally, the future progressive has increasingly come to indicate that the speaker wants to avoid showing involvement, commitment or personal intentions. It could be called the **non-commitment future.** There are several specific uses, which gradually shade off into each other.

As such, the future progressive can be used to express what will be happening **as a matter of course**, i.e. in the normal course of events (because things have been planned that way or follow almost automatically from a procedure that has been started).

(24)   - I´ve bought a new house.
         - Congratulations. When <u>will</u> you <u>be moving</u>?
cf.   Gefeliciteerd. Wanneer verhuis je?

(25)   (a salesman demonstrating an electric tool)
         What we <u>shall</u> <u>be doing</u> next is check whether …
cf.   Wat we daarna <u>zullen (gaan) doen</u> is (na)kijken of …

(26)   (captain to passengers)
         In a few minutes, we <u>shall</u> <u>be climbing</u> to an altitude of 33,000 feet
         (= as part of the flight scheme)
cf.   Over enkele ogenblikken <u>klimmen</u> we tot/<u>bereiken</u> we (…) 33.000 voet.
                          <u>zullen</u> we (…) <u>bereiken</u>.

The future progressive can also be used to underscore **non-commitment** on the part of the speaker. A future event/state or action is announced and the implication is that this event/state is not so much the result of the speaker's volition, but rather part of what will happen **in the normal course of events**, as a matter of routine:

(27)   (announcement by the management in a department store)
         This shop <u>will</u> <u>be closing</u> in 10 minutes. (vs. I <u>will</u> close the shop in 10 minutes)
cf.   Over tien minuten <u>is</u> het sluitingstijd.
(28)   I <u>will</u> <u>be needing</u> your passport, ID and full tax report as well, I'm afraid.
(29)   You <u>´ll</u> <u>be hearing</u> from us. (personnel manager to applicant)
cf.   U <u>hoort</u> *nog (wel)* van ons.
         (Note the ´evasiveness´ conveyed by the Dutch discourse particles).

Thirdly, the future progressive can also be resorted to as the more **polite** alternative to the non-progressive form (see note 1 above) as it lacks speaker's volition or commitment.

(30)   <u>Will</u> you <u>be staying</u> long? (vs. Will you stay long?)
cf.   *Denkt* u lang te <u>zullen blijven</u>? (vs. Ga je (nog) lang blijven?)

It is worth noting the difference between (31) and (32) below, which may be stated in terms of [± putting PRESSURE on the addressee]:

(31)   <u>Will</u> you <u>be putting</u> on another record soon? [- PRESSURE]
(32)   <u>Will</u> you <u>put on</u> another record soon? [+ PRESSURE]

Finally, the future progressive can be used as the **colloquial** equivalent of Dutch *... zal nog eens ... straks nog ....* This is the most ´coloured´ or modal use of the future progressive, although it still has the same basic undertone of ´matter-of-course-ness´ observed above. What makes it different is the very speculative nature of the events projected into the future, as in:

(33)   You <u>will</u> <u>be losing</u> your head one of these days.
cf.   Je <u>zult</u> *nog eens* je hoofd verliezen. *Straks* <u>verlies</u> je je hoofd *nog.*
(34)   He´ll be buying himself an island in the Bahamas *next.*
cf.   *Straks* <u>koopt</u> hij *nog* een eiland in de Bahama´s.

5.5   Will/shall + Perfect Progressive Infinitive (= Future Perfect Progressive)

5.5.1   Form

will/shall +   have +   been + BASE + -ing

5.5.2   Use

Progressive and Perfective Aspect can be used simultaneously, as in:

(35)   By eight o´clock tonight the competitors <u>will have been driving</u> their cars continuously for
          48 hours.

The combined presence of *will,* PROG and PERF means that by a precise moment in the future
(cf. *eight o´clock tonight)* something *will have been going on* uninterruptedly for a certain period.

The next example illustrates the same combination of forms, in which a **strong ASSUMPTION,**
about the indefinite **past** (lasting into the present) is present. In these cases, *will* does not refer to
the future, but expresses modal meaning (cf. note 3 in 5.2.2).

(36)   He <u>will have</u> <u>been sleeping</u> late again.
cf.   Hij <u>zal</u> *wel* weer te lang <u>hebben geslapen</u>.

5.6   Be going to + infinitive

5.6.1   Form

(PRESENT)   be + going + to   + BASE => am/are/is going to + inf

The form *going to* is often replaced by *gonna* in spoken English, but it is still considered informal
and more frequent in American English (cf. *want to => wanna, got to => gotta,* which are similar in
this respect).

5.6.2   Use

This form expresses a connection between the present and the future, in two possible ways. It
may denote:

1) a present premeditated intention to carry out a future action [+human subject]

The *going to* form expresses a fairly strong degree of certainty (on the subject's part) in:

(37)   I <u>am going to ask</u> her to marry me next weekend, but I haven't bought an engagement ring yet.

(38)   Looks like a nice day; I'm <u>going to mow</u> the lawn this afternoon.

(39)   I <u>am going to be</u> a fireman when I grow up.

cf.   Ik <u>word</u> later brandweerman.(<u>wil worden</u>; <u>ga worden</u>)

This should be compared with *intend to*, which suggests less certainty:

(40)   I <u>intend</u> <u>to leave</u> tomorrow.

cf.   Ik <u>ben</u> van plan morgen <u>te vertrekken</u>.

The *going to* form should also be contrasted with the *will* form as both are used by the speaker-subject to state an intention, cf.

(41)   (The phone rings)

          I'm going to answer it.

                   (= premeditated intention)

(42)   (The phone rings)

          I'll get it.

                   (= unpremeditated intention)

The latter is a spontaneous response (cf. intentional *will* above) and more likely to be used in this context.

2) a future event which is suggested by present signs/cause

(43)   He looks terribly pale. He's <u>going to be</u> sick.

(44)   Look at his face. He's <u>going to start</u> laughing any second now.

(45)   What a strong wind. It <u>isn't</u> exactly <u>going to be</u> smooth sailing.

(46)   Watch it! That bomb <u>is going to explode</u>.

cf.   Pas op! Die bom <u>ontploft (nog) / gaat ontploffen</u>.

A distinction should be made again between the *going to* form and the *will* form, cf.

(47)   Joan <u>is going to have</u> another baby. (= ± She's pregnant, or at least that is her intention)

(48)   Joan <u>will have</u> another baby (if she doesn't take precautions; predictive).

Notes:

1) Combined with a past form of *be*, the *going to* form acts as a future resulting from a past intention (see also 5.10), as in:

(49)   The shopkeeper <u>was going to sue</u> me, but I persuaded him it was pointless.

2) The *going to* form is hardly compatible with certain verbs, e.g. **stative** verbs, because they have a feature [- CONTROL]:

(50)   I <u>will know</u> soon. (= predictive)

It is not normally possible to have an intention of knowing something. However, it cannot be entirely ruled out in informal language:

(51)   It's <u>gonna be</u> all right.

3) The difference between a 'premeditated' and an 'unpremeditated' intention is illustrated in the following sentences:

(52)   A: Oh dear! I forgot to invite Peter to the party tonight.
          B: Don't worry. I'<u>ll</u> give him a ring.
               (= unpremeditated intention)
(53)   A: Why do you want to buy all that booze?
          B: I'<u>m going</u> to throw a party.
               (= premeditated intention)

5.7   Present Progressive

5.7.1   Form

Be + BASE+ ing

5.7.2   Use

The present progressive is used to refer to future events resulting from a present plan, programme or arrangement, as in:

(54)   Liz <u>is getting</u> married this spring.
cf.   Liz trouwt in de lente.

(55)   What <u>are</u> you <u>doing</u> tonight?

cf.   Wat zijn je plannen voor vanavond?

The underlying idea of **'plan' or 'arrangement'** largely restricts the use of the present progressive having FUTURE time reference to 'doing' verbs involving conscious **human agency**:

(56)   John <u>is rising</u> (= <u>is getting up</u>) at 5 o'clock tomorrow.

vs.

(57)   The sun <u>rises</u> at 5 o'clock tomorrow.

(58)   *It <u>is raining</u> tomorrow.

(59)   *He'<u>s surviving</u> the bypass surgery.

(56) suggests more personal involvement (i.e. human arrangement, which can be altered), while (57) refers to a fixed, scheduled event (cf. The use of the Simple Present below).

In addition, the progressive can also be used to refer to an arranged future that is **imminent** or **near**:

(60)   The Smiths <u>are leaving</u> soon.

Notes:

1) The difference between the *going to* form and the Present Progressive for future time reference can be very small at times:

(61)   I <u>am taking</u> Mary out to dinner tonight. (= ARRANGEMENT: Mary knows.)

(62)   I <u>am going to take</u> Mary out to dinner tonight. (= premeditated INTENTION: Mary may not know yet.)

2) Stative verbs (except in dynamic uses) do not take a progressive form and hence have *shall/will* instead, even when talking about arranged future:

(63)   I *am being/' <u>ll be</u> in the office all day tomorrow.

(64)   I'<u>m seeing</u> my doctor tomorrow. (= dynamic use)

3) The difference between a 'present arrangement' (i.e. the meaning of the Present Progressive) and a 'present intention' (i.e. the meaning of going to) is illustrated in the following examples:

(65a)   I'm terribly sorry I can't come to the meeting this afternoon. <u>I'm taking</u> Jill to the new Cirque de Soleil show. (= present arrangement)

(65b)   I have made up my mind. <u>I'm going to take</u> Jill to the new Cirque de Soleil show and I'm going to phone the secretary of the association that I can't come to the meeting. (= present intention)

Whereas (65a) may express regret, (65b) does not.

5.8   Present Simple / Simple Present

5.8.1   Form (see 3.1.1)

5.8.2   Use

The FUTURE is **presented as a FACT**: the speaker attributes the same degree of certainty to future events as is normally accorded to PRESENT or PAST. There is no personal involvement on the speaker's part. Dutch always has OTT here.

(66)   The academic year <u>starts</u> on October, 2nd.

(67)   The train <u>leaves</u> at 6.30.

(68)   Christmas <u>falls</u> on a Saturday this year.

As such, it can also be used to underscore the immutability of certain plans or arrangements. A future plan/arrangement is regarded as unalterable, the arrangement is thus turned into a future fact in the speaker's mind:

(69)   We <u>leave</u> London at 6.15. (= according to a fixed schedule)

vs.

(70)   We <u>are leaving</u> London tonight. (= the speaker's plan)

(71)   I <u>start</u> work tomorrow (= according to my contract)

vs.

(72)   I <u>am starting</u> work tomorrow (= I have arranged this)

Depending on the discourse, (73) below can carry various time references:

(73)   The plane <u>takes off</u> at 5.15 a.m.

This is either a future (once, e.g. today, according to schedule) or a **habitual present**
(it always takes off then).

Note:

The present simple is the usual tense in **subclauses** of

- **time** relating to the future (74)
- **condition** (75)

(74)   When the President <u>arrives</u>, the band <u>will play</u> the Stars and Stripes.
                                     (a)   (b)

(75)   If they <u>ask</u> me, I '<u>ll tell</u> them.
                    (a)   (b)

5.9   Alternative Expressions of the Future

5.9.1   Be + to - infinitive

This **formal** form is used to express an **'official' arrangement in the FUTURE**.

(76)   The German Chancellor <u>is to visit</u> France.

cf.   De Duitse kanselier <u>bezoekt</u> Frankrijk/<u>zal</u> Frankrijk <u>bezoeken</u>.

A reduced form often appears in newspaper headlines:

(76')   German Chancellor <u>to visit</u> France.

It is also used for formal commands and instructions (esp. negative):

(77)   You <u>are not to disturb</u> the head teacher while the inspectors are here next week.

(78)   These pills <u>are not to be taken</u> with any other form of medicine.

5.9.2   Be about to + infinitive
           Be on the point / verge of + -ing

Both expressions refer to an **IMMEDIATE FUTURE event/state**. They indicate the NEARNESS of future events, even more so than the present progressive discussed above.

(79)   Iran <u>is about</u> <u>to become</u> a nuclear power.

cf.   Iran <u>staat op het punt</u> een kernmogendheid <u>te worden</u>.

(80)   Mr Soames <u>is on the point</u> <u>of selling</u> his farm.

Notes:

1) It is possible to refer to this type of FUTURE in retrospect as well (see 5.10), i.e. viewed from the PAST:

(81)   Jane <u>was about</u> <u>to tell</u> me, when someone walked in.

cf.   Ze wou het me net vertellen, toen ...

         Ze stond op het punt het me te vertellen, toen ...

2) It is not possible to have time Adverbials in the same sentence:

(82)   *Dinner <u>is about to be served</u> in two minutes.

5.9.3   Be due to + infinitive

Be due to is a fairly formal way to refer to an event that is not totally fixed, but one that will happen in the normal course of events:

(83)   Carriageway repairs on this stretch of the motorway <u>are due to start</u> on 26th May.

(84)   Much will depend on what happens between the two rounds of voting. The second round <u>is due to take</u> place on 28 March.

It differs from *WILL+* PROG infinitive in that it expresses a stronger sense of obligation to a person or an organization.

5.9.4   Be destined / bound / sure to + infinitive

Like its Dutch equivalent *bestemd zijn om te*, this is one of the many so-called **semi-auxiliaries** referring to the future together with *be bound to*, *be sure to*, etc. Obviously, it is impossible to consider all such expressions of FUTURE time as 'verb tenses' (for a more complete list of semi-auxiliaries see section 8.2 below).

(85)   They <u>are bound to succeed</u> after all the effort they put into it.

(86)   It seems awful to say before he is even officially introduced, but Bill O'Brien <u>is destined to fail</u> as head coach of the Penn State football team.

5.10   The Expression of Future in the Past

Various forms are used to refer to 'future in the past':

5.10.1   Should/would

These forms are used in formal, literary style to express past predictions.

(87)   They met in summer, but she <u>would</u> die just half a year later.
(88)   We did not realise at that point that we <u>should</u> never see them again.

With a perfect infinitive *would* expresses that the action referred to was not realised before a certain moment in the past:

(89)   I <u>would have met</u> your friends, we <u>would have had</u> a drink or two, they <u>would have liked</u> me, 'cause sometimes I'm funny.

5.10.2   Be going + to-infinitive

This is the least formal expression to refer to future in the past. The form frequently has the meaning of 'unfulfilled intention':

(90)   I <u>was going to go </u>to school, but then I got sick.
(91)   I <u>was going to propose</u> but she beat me to it!

5.10.3   Past Progressive

The past progressive can be used to express 'an arranged future' in the past:

(92)   She was very nervous because she <u>was taking</u> her driving test for the fifth time that afternoon.
(93)   He put on his best suit and loads of perfume as he <u>was going</u> on a blind date that evening.

5.10.4   Be+ to-infinitive

For the expression of future in the past by means of *be* + *to* infinitive, there are two forms:

     a) *be* + *to* + simple infinitive

     b) *be* + *to* + perfect infinitive

Construction b) indicates that the plan was not realized. Compare:

(94a)   They <u>were to take</u> part in the demonstration the next day, and were busy getting everything ready.

(94b)   They <u>were to have taken </u>part in the demonstration the next day, but all of a sudden they had to change their plans.

In sentence a) we do not know whether they actually took part in the demonstration or not, whereas in b) the perfect infinitive already announces that the plan was not carried out.

5.10.5   Be about + to-infinitive

This form is used to express an imminent future in the past.

(95)   They were about to surrender, but then somebody accidentally fired their gun and the whole thing got out of hand.

Conditionals basically occur in **hypothetical environments**. The proposition in the main clause is linked up with a hypothesis in the subclause, often an if-clause. Conditional forms have been described in terms of the FULFILMENT of the conditions stated, which results in a basic three-way division:

(1)   If   X   is the case,   then   Y   will happen.

                   was the case,   then   Y   would happen.

                   had been the case,   then   Y   would have happened.

(1')   If   X   SIMPLE PRESENT,   Y   WILL + INFINITIVE

                   SIMPLE PAST,   Y   WOULD + INFINITIVE

                   PAST PERFECT   Y   WOULD + HAVE+ PAST PARTICIPLE

type 1	type 2	type 3
NON-PAST		PAST
PROBABLE	LESS PROBABLE ... IMPROBABLE (but POSSIBLE in the HYPOTHETICAL WORLD)	IMPOSSIBLE

Note:

Sometimes the if-clause is understood, as in (2):

(2)   Would you have told us?   (i.e. if we had asked you)

cf.   Zou jij het ons hebben verteld?   (d.w.z. als ...)

6.1   Probable Fulfilment

A type 1 conditional sentence refers to NON-PAST time. The condition is sometimes described as **open** or **real**, which means that its fulfilment is (more or less) probable. What is said in the main clause depends on something that may or may not happen, though this 'something' is assumed by the speaker to be really possible, probable or even likely.

(3)   If you ask him (now/tomorrow), he will help you.

                   (a)   (b)

(4)   If I can make it there, I'll make it anywhere. (Frank Sinatra)

                   (a)   (b)

The same basic type is used when the conjunction *unless* introduces the conditional subclause:

(5)   I'll stay at home unless I get an invitation.

                    (= **if** I do**n't** get an invitation)

cf.   Ik blijf thuis tenzij ik een uitnodiging krijg.

(6)   Your life won't change, unless you change it.

Note:

Will with pure future reference does not occur in the subclause of type 1 conditionals. However, see 6.4.1 for modal uses.

(7)   *If the weather will be good tomorrow, we'll have a picnic.

6.2   Less Probable, Improbable Fulfilment or Unreality

A type 2 conditional likewise refers to NON-PAST time. However, there are constraints on the condition, i.e. fulfilment is less probable, improbable or unreal, depending on the context. In this type, a *simple past* tense is used in the conditional subclause and *would + simple infinitive* in the main clause. (For the 1st p. should is also possible).

As compared with type 1, type 2 presents the fulfilment of the condition as less probable, unlikely or impossible. In other words, it is used both for improbable and for unreal states of affairs. In the latter case the supposition is contrary to known facts.

(8)   If you asked him (now/tomorrow), he would help you.

                (a)   (b)

cf.   Als je het hem vroeg, zou hij helpen.

(9)   If I was/were a powerful man, I would be living in a palace. (but I'm not => unreal)

            (a)   (b)

The TIME referred to in (8a) and (9a) is by no means PAST but clearly NON-PAST (i.e. PRESENT or FUTURE). This is only conceivable in a hypothetical world of the speaker's. Note that *would*, too, is to the right of the PRES moment of speaking, which means it is definitely NON-PAST. The past tense forms used in type 2 conditionals are similar to those discussed in 4.1.2.6.

6.3 Impossible Fulfilment (Past Time)

Unlike the first two types, a type 3 conditional refers to PAST time:

(10)   <u>Would</u> you <u>have told</u> me, if I <u>had asked</u> you yesterday?

cf.   Zou je het mij hebben verteld als ik het je gisteren had gevraagd?

(11)   I am terribly sorry. If I <u>had known</u> she was that ill, I <u>would have come </u>to visit her. May
          she rest in peace.

The 'facts' belong to the PAST, even in the speaker's hypothesis. Hence they cannot be experienced any more and FULFILMENT is IMPOSSIBLE at the time of speaking. The past perfect tense forms used in type 3 conditionals are similar to those discussed in 4.3.2.3.

6.4 Variation in Conditional Clauses

Our brief survey in terms of three basic types - [1] *probable* / [2] *less probable ... improbable, but possible in the hypothetical world or unreal* (NON-PAST time) // [3] *impossible (PAST time)* - does not account for all 'conditionals'. This points to their **semantic/pragmatic complexity**, which will now be dealt with in some detail by focussing on variation in conditional sentences. This variation is situated on three levels:
1) variation in the subclause
2) variation in the main clause
3) variation in the use of conjunctions

6.4.1 Variation in Subclauses

A) Modality can be expressed in *if*-clauses in the following ways:

<u>1) *'Will/would'* instead of simple present</u>

Will and *would* can be used in conditional subclauses to express (un)willingness of the Subject:

(12)   If he <u>won't</u> do, I will. (vs. If he doesn't do it, I will)

(13)   If you <u>will/would</u> kindly wait here a moment, Sir, I'll ask the manager to come down.

(14)   I will be very grateful if you <u>would</u> be so kind as to send me further details about the
          conference.

(15)   I'll be yours forever, if you<u>'ll</u> have me.

(16)   If you would write me a letter, I should be most grateful.

cf.   Als u mij een brief *zou willen* schrijven, zou ik u zeer dankbaar zijn.

         (would = WILLINGNESS, not PREDICTION)

2) '*Can/could'* instead of the simple present

(17)   If you <u>could</u> help me out a minute, I'll be able to make huge progress.

         (vs. If you help me out a minute, …)

Cf.   *Mocht* je me een minuutje *kunnen* helpen,

3) *Should* instead of the simple present (type 1) or the simple past (type 2)

It indicates that the condition, though possible, is **unlikely.** The main clause verb has either *will* or
an imperative (type 1) or *would* (type 2). (For the 1st p. *shall/should* are also possible).
Realisation without *if* is also possible, with inversion of subject and *should* (see b-examples):

(18a)   If this machine <u>should</u> fail to give satisfaction, we shall refund the money.

(18b)   <u>Should</u> this machine fail to give satisfaction, we shall refund the money.

cf.   Indien deze machine niet naar behoren werkt, …

         Mocht deze machine niet naar behoren werken, ….

(19a)   If unexpected problems <u>should</u> arise, we would of course have to revise the budget.

(19b)   <u>Should</u> unexpected problems arise, we would of course have to revise the budget.

(20)   If I <u>should</u> stay, I would only be in your way. (Whitney Houston – *I will always love you*)

4) *Would like/would care*

These expressions are also possible in type 1:

(21)   If you <u>would like/care</u> to see the exhibition, I will get the tickets.

When *like* is not followed by a *to*-infinitive, *would* is omitted:

(22)   I'll get the tickets, if <u>you like</u>.

B) Past subjunctive 'were' without meaning implications

The subjunctive *were* may replace the simple past forms of *be* in type 2 conditions. Realisation
with inversion of subject and *were* + *to*-infinitive is also possible.

(23)   If he <u>were</u>/was here, he would be furious by now.

(24)   If I <u>were</u>/was a rich man, I would not be sitting here.

(25)   If I <u>were</u> a fuzzy wuzzy bear, I'd thank you Lord for my fuzzy, wuzzy hair.

The subjunctive is always optional, except in the idiomatic expression *If I were you:*

(26)   If I were you, I should have no qualms about it.

The structure *'were + to + infinitive'* is a formal alternative to the past tense in type 2:

(27)   If they offered/<u>were</u> to offer me that job, I would be extremely happy.

(28)   If you *were* to touch that wire, you would be killed instantly.

cf.   *Mocht* u die draad aanraken, dan was u op slag dood.

(29)   <u>Were</u> the dead to reveal their secrets, the magistrates would probably cringe with shame. (= If the dead were to reveal...)

C) Progressive and perfective aspects

Instead of the simple present or past forms, perfective and/or progressive aspects are also possible:

(30)   If he <u>is staying</u> for another night, I'll ask the manager to give him a better room.

(31)   If you <u>have been locked out</u>, just come back and we'll share a bed.

(32)   If you <u>have forgotten</u> to bring a calculator, you won't be able to do the exam.

(33)   If the fax machine <u>had been working</u>, I would have sent you a message.

6.4.2   Variation in Main Clauses

A) In type 1 conditions: Simple Present (instead of *shall/will*)

<u>1) in statements of cause and effect (such as natural laws) or habitual reactions</u>, which are called zero-conditionals or general conditionals

(34)   If you heat ice, it <u>turns</u> into water.

(35)   If I say 'yes', he <u>says</u> 'no'.

(36)   If you don't look after tomato plants, they <u>die</u> very easily.

(37)   Prawns <u>are</u> very risky to eat if they haven't been kept at the right temperature.

In these cases *If* is equivalent to *when(ever).*

Note:

Zero conditionals can also be used as general instructions/advice by means of an imperative in the result clause:

(38)   If a chip pan sets alight, <u>throw</u> a fire blanket, not water, on it.

(39)   If at first you don't succeed, <u>destroy</u> all evidence that you tried.

(40)   If at first you do succeed, <u>try</u> to hide your astonishment.

<u>2) in cases where *if* is equivalent to *since, seeing that*</u>

(41)   If you get so tired in the afternoon, why <u>don't you go</u> and see a doctor?

(42)   If she really is that smart, why <u>doesn't she go</u> to college?

B) In type 2 conditions

<u>1) To refer to EVENTS that did in fact occur in the PAST</u>

(43)   Well, if you <u>parked</u> there yesterday,   you <u>were</u> (instead of *would + inf*) foolish.
                 (a)   (b)
                 [+ PAST]   [+ PAST]
                 [+ FACT]   [+ FACT]

(44)   Well, if you <u>parked</u> there yesterday,   you must <u>have been fined </u>(instead of *would + inf*).
                 (a)   (b)
cf.   Als je daar gisteren geparkeerd hebt, moet je op de bon zijn gegaan.
                 [+ PAST]   [+ PAST]
                 [+ FACT]   [+ MODALITY]

The conjunction *if* in (43) and (44) can be paraphrased as *if/assuming/since it is true that*, which suggests a high degree of probability or near factuality. The propositions in the if-clauses are FACTS in the speaker's mind, the FULFILMENT of the conditions being taken for granted. The emphasis is thus on the claims made in the main clause, i.e.

(43b)   you were foolish

(44b)   you must have been fined

An even clearer case is (45), which refers to a HABIT in the past:

(45)	If you <u>parked</u> there	you <u>were</u> always fined. (Police were very
	(a)	(b) strict in those days!)

Als je daar parkeerde, ging je steeds op de bon.

[+ PAST]   [+ PAST]

[+ FACT]   [+ FACT]

[+ HABIT]   [+ HABIT]

This 'conditional' sentence is virtually synonymous with:

(46)   When you parked there you were always fined.

(47)   Whenever you parked there you were fined.

cf.   (Telkens) als / Wanneer je daar parkeerde, ging je op de bon.

<u>2) Simple past tense instead of *would*</u>

When *if* is equivalent to *seeing that*, *since*:

(49)   If he knew he didn't stand a chance, why <u>did</u> he <u>try</u> at all?

<u>3) *Will*+infinitive instead of *would*</u>

When the effect of a **past** condition still affects the current situation.

(50)   If you didn't do much maths at school, you<u>'ll find</u> economics difficult to understand.

C) In type 3 conditions: w*ould* + infinitive instead of *would* + perfect infinitive

If the effect of the non-realisation in type 3 conditionals still affects the present, would + infinitive is also allowed for (instead of would + perfect infinitive)

(51)   If I had been able to catch my plane, I <u>would be/would have been</u> in Paris now.

(52)   If you had been more careful, you <u>wouldn't be/wouldn't have been</u> in this mess.

D) Modal auxiliaries

Modal auxiliaries can be used in all 3 types of conditionals to express various modalities:

(53)   If you come tomorrow, we <u>could</u> go window-shopping.

(54)   If he mentions it to you, you <u>should</u> try to persuade him.

(55)   If you had done your best, you <u>might</u> have won the championship.

6.4.3.   Variation in the Use of Conjunctions

Apart from *if* the following conjunctions can introduce conditional clauses:

1) *Unless* = 'if not'

(56)   Unless you tell me the truth immediately, I won't speak to you again.

(57)   Age is something that doesn't matter, unless you are a cheese.

2) *Provided (that), so/as long as, on condition (that)* express a rather strong idea of restriction
(= 'if and only if'):

(58)   I don't care how you do'll it, so long as it is done quickly!

(59)   I'll let you borrow my car, on condition (that) you promise to drive safely.

(60)   "I'm extraordinarily patient provided I get my own way in the end". (Margaret Thatcher)

3) *In case* expresses a condition ('if it should happen that' or 'because of a possibility').

(61)   In case I forget, please remind me of my promise.

(62)   It may rain; you'd better take an umbrella (Just) in case.

4) *Suppose/supposing (that), what if* introduce imaginary conditions:

(63)   Suppose (that) he does arrive late. What will you do?

(64)   Supposing (that) you won the lottery, what would you do?

(65)   What if we stayed at home for a change?

5) *Whether … or not* expresses alternative conditions:

(66)   They'll deliver the furniture, whether there's someone to receive it or not.

Note:

Does *when* also express a condition? Not really, whereas *if* expresses a (hypothetical) condition,
when expresses (factual) time. Compare:

(67a)   If the president wins the referendum, many people will be disappointed.

(67b)   When the president arrives, the schoolchildren will start singing and waving flags.

In a) it is by no means certain that the president will win the referendum. In b), the president's visit and arrival are taken for granted.

6) The **subordinate** conjunction *if* can also be replaced by a **coordinate** one: the conditional sentence pattern which involves subordination is then replaced by a compound sentence which involves coordination and expresses 'CAUSE and EFFECT':

(68)   <u>Park (a)</u> here and you (will) get (b) fined.

(69)   <u>Don't park (a)</u> here or you (will) get (b) fined.

(70)   <u>Join</u> (a) the army and <u>see</u> (b) the world.   (coordination)
        cf. If you join the army, you'll see the world   (subordination)
        [CAUSE]   →   [EFFECT]
        [HYPOTHESIS]

(68a) and (69a) are in the IMPERATIVE mood, whereas the (68b) and (69b) clauses have PREDICTIVE WILL, although this element is optional in both sentences. In (70) both clauses contain an imperative. Dutch behaves in exactly the same way.

7. The Passive

7.1   Form and Meaning

English sentences/clauses are either in the **active** or in the **passive VOICE**. Passivization of an active sentence is only possible with transitive EVENT verbs, cf.

(1)   Hungry wolves <u>devoured</u> three innocent children. (SVO) =>

(1')   Three innocent children <u>were devoured</u> by hungry wolves. (SVAg)

In the absence of an AGENT (Ag) ambiguity may arise: the alternative interpretation would consist in recognizing three clause elements instead of two, as shown in (2).

(2)   Several soldiers <u>were hurt</u>. (SV or SVCs?)

cf.   a) Verscheidene soldaten *werden* gewond. (SV)

           b) Verscheidene soldaten *waren* gewond. (vs. ongedeerd) (SVCs)

The translation in b) expresses a STATE resulting from the EVENT referred to in a). In other words, b) is comparable in form to (3) below, where the copula verb ***to be*** is followed by an **adjective phrase**, functioning as subject complement:

(3)   Susan <u>was</u> very excited/glad.   (SVC)

Similar contrastive pairs are:

(4)   The house <u>has been sold</u>.   (SV: passive EVENT)

(5)   The house <u>is</u> already sold.   (SVCs: STATAL passive)

(6)   Paul and Mary <u>were married</u> last spring.   (SV: passive EVENT)

(7)   Paul and Mary <u>were</u> already married when they left for Kenya.

                                    (SVCs: STATAL passive)

STATAL passives like (5) and (7) allow the adverb *already* in simple present and simple past contexts. The contrast between EVENT and STATE thus tends to be blurred and only the discourse will help to determine which of the two 'readings' makes more sense:

(8)   The door <u>is closed</u> (by the caretaker) every night.   => passive EVENT

(9)   The door <u>is</u> closed, (vs *open*)   = > BE + ADJ

| (10) | Tim <u>was</u> much <u>interested</u> (by what I told him) | => passive EVENT |
| (11) | Tim <u>was</u> very interested in chess. | => BE + ADJ |

It should be noted that the Dutch b) version of (2) is an ambiguous sentence as it can also be read as a true passive:

| (12) | Verscheidene soldaten <u>waren gewond</u> (door sluipschutters). | (SV) |
| cf. | Several soldiers <u>had been hurt</u> (by snipers). | (SV) |

Dutch has VVT in (12), the equivalent of the English Past Perfect. The main difference between the two languages is that Dutch deletes the past participle form *geworden* in the perfect while English does not (cf. The table below for more examples). This means that both the contrast between EVENT and STATE and the distinction between PERFECT and NON-PERFECT are crucial to a proper understanding of the various forms and meanings entered below. We start from the active sentence *Spies all over the world inform the CIA* as the event and *The CIA is well-informed* as the resulting state.

EVENT	STATE
- The goings-on are considered as a process, an activity, etc. - The **by-AGENT** is present when relevant,	- The goings-on describe a resulting state or condition. - There is no **by-AGENT.**

[A]   **BE**   + past participle
      (= passive auxiliary + past participle)
      WORDEN + **voltooid deelwoord**
	[B] **BE** + complement
	      (= copula + complement)
	      ZIJN + **gezegde**

NON-PERFECT	

Simple Present
(13)   The CIA <u>is informed</u> by spies all over
         the world.
Present Progressive
(14)   The CIA <u>is being informed</u> by spies ...
  = OTT
cf. De CIA <u>wordt ingelicht</u> door spionnen ...	

Simple Past (15) The CIA <u>was informed</u> by spies ... **Past Progressive** (16) The CIA <u>was being informed</u> by spies ... **= OVT** cf. De CIA <u>werd ingelicht</u> door spionnen ...	
PERFECT **The "perfective result" of the EVENT** - As the CIA <u>has been informed</u> by spies all over the world in the past few years	**NON-PERFECT** **… can be reconsidered as a non-perfective state, e.g.** … it <u>is</u> (now) well-informed.

Present Perfect
 (17)   The CIA <u>has been informed</u> by spies ...
Present Perfect Progressive
Ø
= **VTT**
cf.   De CIA <u>is</u> door spionnen <u>ingelicht</u> /
         op de hoogte <u>gebracht</u>.
	Simple Present
	(19) So the CIA <u>is</u> well-informed
	         about subversive activities.
	
	= OTT
	cf. De CIA <u>is</u> dus goed ingelicht /
	         op de hoogte.

Past Perfect
 (18)   The CIA <u>had been informed</u> by spies ...
Past Perfect Progressive   Ø
= **VVT**
cf.   De CIA <u>was</u> door spionnen <u>ingelicht</u> /
         op de hoogte gebracht.
	Simple Past
	(20) So the CIA <u>was</u> well-informed
	         about ...
	= **OVT**
	cf. De CIA <u>was</u> goed ingelicht /
	         op de hoogte.

Further combinations with other auxiliaries are possible, e.g.
 	
- The CIA *will/must/may/can/could/might* <u>have been</u> ...
	PERFECT
	Present Perfect
	(21) The CIA <u>has been</u> well-informed
	         all the time / since 1990.
	= VTT
	cf. De CIA <u>is</u> altijd (al) goed in-
	         gelicht / op de hoogte <u>geweest</u>.
	Past Perfect
	(22) The CIA <u>had been</u> well-informed
	         all the time / since 1985.
	= VVT
	cf. De CIA <u>was</u> altijd (al) goed in-
	         gelicht / op de hoogte <u>geweest</u>.

[C] *worden / become (as change of state)*

Speakers of Dutch often mix up the auxiliary of the passive (*worden, werd* ,Ø) with the copula *worden, werd, geworden*. There is no such confusion in English, the equivalent of the Dutch copula *worden* being a different verb altogether, cf. *become*

(23)   Oliver <u>had become</u> a CIA agent.   (Past Perfect)

cf.   Oliver <u>was</u> CIA-agent <u>geworden</u>.   (VVT)

Compare with the PASSIVE:

(24)   Oliver <u>had been accused</u> of murder   (Past Perfect)

Cf.   Oliver <u>was beschuldigd</u> (Ø) van moord.   (VVT)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4" align="center">SUMMARY</td></tr>
<tr><td>[A] EVENT
(passive event)</td><td>auxiliary</td><td>'passive'
BE</td><td>*worden/werden* (OTT/OVT)
zijn/waren   (VTT/VVT)</td></tr>
<tr><td>[B] STATE
(statal passive)</td><td>copula</td><td>linking
verb
BE</td><td>*zijn/waren*   (OTT/OVT)
zijn geweest/ (VTT/
waren geweest   VVT)</td></tr>
<tr><td>[C] CHANGE of STATE</td><td>Copula</td><td>'resultative'
BECOME</td><td>*worden/werden* (OTT/OVT)
zijn geworden/ (VTT/
waren geworden   VVT)</td></tr>
</table>

Note:

Both 'passive' BE and ' resultative' BECOME can be replaced by the informal verb GET:

(25)   Several soldiers <u>got hurt / got killed</u>.

cf.   Verscheidene soldaten <u>raakten gewond / werden gedood</u>.

(26)   The sailor's legs <u>got entangled</u> with the ropes.

cf.   De benen van de zeeman <u>raakten</u> in de touwen <u>verstrengeld</u>.

(27)   I <u>got</u> interested in fossils after reading a book about it.

cf.   Ik <u>kreeg</u> belangstelling voor fossielen nadat ik er een boek over gelezen had.

(28)   As I <u>got</u> older, I learnt to control my bad temper.

cf.   Naarmate ik ouder <u>werd</u>, leerde ik mijn slechte luim beter bedwingen.

In all these sentences, GET clearly expresses the meaning of **change of state**. The line between 'true passive' and 'copula + adjective' is hard to draw at times (cf. especially (26) and (27)).

7.2   General Use

The passive is used less frequently than the active. It can be used in different contexts:

1) to adhere to the end focus principle

New information tends to come at the end of the sentence. Consider the following discourse:

(29)   - Q: Do you know THE MINI ROCKETMAN?   (ACTIVE)

                                                (= DO)

         - A: Yes, it has been designed **BY BMW**, hasn't it? (PASSIVE)

                                                (= Agent)

The object of the question in (29) (= THE MINI ROCKETMAN) is focused on as NEW INFORMATION at the end of the question. In the reply sentence (29A) the Mini Rocketman is presented as given information and becomes the subject (= it) of the passive sentence. By using the passive, the new information, in this case the by-agent, can be put at the end of the sentence again.

2) when the by-agent is deemed irrelevant or unknown

The reply sentence in (29) could also have focused on the event itself, in a different discourse, cf.

(29')   - A: Yes, but it <u>HASN'T BEEN TAKEN INTO PRODUCTION YET</u>, has it?

The reply merely states that:

(29")   - A: It is IS NOT AVAILABLE at the moment.

Note that by-agents may be concealed on purpose, e.g. to avoid responsibility as in (30):

(30)   We had hoped to report on this problem but the data <u>was</u> inadvertently <u>deleted</u> from our files.

In fact, according to the *Communicative Grammar of English* (CoG 616), only one out of five English passive clauses contains a by-phrase denoting the agent, cf.

(31)   A contractor is pulling down the old hospital. =>

(31')   The old hospital is being <u>PULLED DOWN</u> [by Ø] .

cf.   Het oude ziekenhuis <u>wordt AFGEBROKEN</u>.

(32)   The question will <u>be discussed</u> at the meeting tomorrow [by Ø].

cf.   De vraag zal op de vergadering van morgen <u>worden besproken</u>.

(33)   My watch <u>was stolen</u> [by Ø] last Tuesday.

cf.   Mijn horloge <u>werd/is</u> vorige dinsdag <u>gestolen</u>.

but

(34)   Comedy is the second oldest profession but like the first it <u>is being ruined</u> BY
         AMATEURS. (A comedian on BBC television)

cf.   ... maar het <u>wordt verknald</u> DOOR AMATEURS.

3) A passive construction (rather than an active one) is also used with an impersonal subject,
such as *one, you, they, someone, a man, people*, cf.

(35)   It <u>was discovered</u> that the growth of cancer cells could be retarded by injecting
         vitamin C. (=? They/scientists discovered ...)

cf.   *Men* heeft ontdekt dat …

(36)   English <u>is spoken</u> all over the world. (=? People speak ...)

cf.   Overal ter wereld <u>wordt</u> Engels <u>gesproken</u>.

4) The Dutch impersonal subject *men* is best translated by a passive in English:

(37)   *Men* weet al enige tijd dat het klimaat aan het veranderen is.

cf.   It <u>has been known</u> for some time that the climate is changing.

(38)   *Men* kon er weinig aan doen.

cf.   Little could <u>be done</u> (about it).

5) In scientific writing it is often used to create a tone of detachment and impersonality and hence,
objectivity:

(39)   One by one, the rats <u>were put</u> into a box and <u>given</u> a mild electric shock. Also, when
         the rats <u>were exposed</u> to a sudden, loud noise, the ones that ate mostly fat and sugar
         <u>were</u> more easily <u>startled</u> – they jumped higher – than rats in both other groups.

6) As a more indirect way of asking something:

(40)   Passengers <u>are requested</u> to refrain from smoking.

7.3   Specific Constructions

1) If the verb is **ditransitive**, i.e. when it has both a **direct** and an **indirect** object, then either object can become subject of the passive clause, depending on the discourse:

(41)	My father gave me this watch. =>
(41')	**This watch** <u>was given</u> to me by my father.
cf.	Dit horloge <u>werd</u> me <u>gegeven/geschonken</u> door mijn vader.
(41")	I <u>was given</u> this watch by my father.
cf.(?)	Mij <u>werd</u> dit horloge <u>gegeven/geschonken</u> door mijn vader.
	=> Ik heb dit horloge van mijn vader gekregen.

The second type of English passive is probably more common than the first.

2) With **prepositional verbs** it is possible for the prepositional object to become the subject of a passive clause. In Dutch, these verbs are usually translated as regular transitive verbs:

(42)	We cannot cater *for* student parties at weekends. =>
(42')	Student parties cannot <u>be catered</u> *for* at weekends.
cf.	Groepen studenten kunnen tijdens het weekend niet <u>bediend worden</u>.
(43)	Has the patient <u>been attended</u> *to* yet?
cf.	<u>Is</u> de patiënt al <u>verzorgd</u>? (* Is de patiënt al gezorgd voor?)
(44)	Uncle Sam can always <u>be relied</u> *on* for help.
cf.	Op Uncle Sam kun je steeds rekenen voor hulp.
	(* Uncle Sam kan steeds op gerekend worden voor hulp)

Note that passivization is often a useful criterion for determining whether a Prep Phrase is a prepositional object or just an adverbial:

(45)	They arrived at a solution earlier than expected.
	A solution <u>was arrived</u> *at* earlier than expected. (Prep. Phrase as PO)
cf.	Er <u>werd</u> vlugger een oplossing <u>bereikt</u> dan verwacht.
	(Men ...)
(46)	They arrived at the park earlier than expected.
	*The park was arrived *at* earlier than expected. (Prep.Phrase as Adjunct)
cf.	Het park <u>werd</u> vlugger <u>bereikt</u> dan verwacht.

Dutch has a DIRECT OBJECT in the active clause (*het park bereiken)*. In English, *at the park* is a PLACE ADJUNCT, which cannot become subject in the corresponding passive clause.

3) With STATE verbs like *believe, consider, feel, know, think, understand*, and the EVENT verbs *report* and *say*, a special kind of passive construction is frequently used, and a [+ animate] subject is preferred, as in (47"):

(47)   The police believe that the murderer entered the house via the roof. =>

(47')   It <u>is believed</u> that the murderer entered ...

(47")   The murderer <u>is believed</u> to have entered ...

cf.   Er <u>wordt aangenomen</u> dat ...

(48)   The Minister <u>is alleged</u> to have abused his power.

cf.   Er <u>wordt beweerd</u> dat de minister zijn macht misbruikt heeft.

=>   De minister *zou* zijn macht misbruikt hebben. (see also "would")

(49)   No passengers <u>are reported</u> to have survived the crash.

cf.   Geen enkele passagier heeft naar verluidt het ongeval overleefd.

(50)   Max <u>is considered</u> (to be) the best surgeon in town.

cf.   Max <u>wordt</u> als de beste chirurg van de stad <u>beschouwd</u>.

The PERF INFINITIVE is required after these verbs to render the PASTNESS of the event/state. Compare, for example:

(51)   The President <u>is believed</u> to give his consent to this unique project.

cf.   Men neemt aan dat de president met dit unieke project instemt.

vs.

(52)   The President <u>is believed</u> to have given his consent to this unique project.

cf.   Men neemt aan dat de president heeft ingestemd ...

4) The passive construction also applies to **INFINITIVES** and **-ING CLAUSES**:

(53)   You ought to tell him the truth. =>

(53')   He ought <u>to be told</u> the truth.

cf.   Hij zou de waarheid te horen moeten krijgen.

(54)   Without <u>being asked</u>, Joan did the job herself. (CoG 618)

cf.   Zonder dat iemand het haar hoefde te vragen, klaarde ze de klus zelf.

(55)   Your shoes need <u>to be mended</u> / mending.

cf.   Je schoenen moeten (dringend) <u>hersteld worden</u>.

        Je schoenen zijn aan herstelling toe.

Extra exercise:

Suggest Dutch equivalents of the following PASSIVE sentences, which are derived from three different types of active construction. These **underlying constructions** appear in square brackets:

A.   [Verb +   Direct Object (= NP or clause)]

- Have all the goods been sold yet?
- You are supposed to know the rules, (no ACTIVE equivalent we suppose you know the rules)
- You are expected to attend the meeting.
- We were kept waiting all day.
- The commander is reported missing.
- It is to be doubted whether the talks will be resumed.

B.   [Verb +   Indirect Object   + Direct Object

   +   Direct Object   + Prepositional Object]

- Have all the goods been paid for yet?
- The referee was given a push.
- The police were not informed about the case.
- I was granted a 10% discount.
- Our firm has been dealt a heavy blow by this measure.
- We were not even asked if we liked it.

C.   [Verb +   Direct Object   + Object Complement / Adverbial]

- The defendant was found guilty by the jury.
- He is considered (to be) a fool.
- He is known to be reliable.
- I was taken for a Welshman.
- Roger is regarded as a genius.
- We were being treated like kings.

8.1   Introduction

The verb phrase often consists of several verbal elements, as in

(1)   He <u>will have been telling</u> everyone by now.

The VP in (1) contains, from left to right:

a.   three AUXILIARIES or <u>'helping'</u> verbs (= *will, have, be*):
-    AUX 1: a <u>modal auxiliary</u> (or MODAL for short) (= will);
-    AUX 2: the <u>perfective auxiliary</u> (= have);
-    AUX 3: the <u>progressive auxiliary</u> (= be).

The first auxiliary (AUX 1) is finite and is called the OPERATOR: it carries the features of tense, number and person, and agrees with the subject. The other auxiliaries (AUX 2 and AUX 3) do not carry these features as they are both non-finite. AUX 2 and AUX 3 are so-called <u>primary auxiliaries</u>: they can be operators if they are not preceded by another auxiliary.

b.   a LEXICAL verb (*tell*), which is the <u>main</u> verb, also called 'full' verb or 'ordinary' verb. When the main verb is the copula *be*, it can act like an operator (e.g. *He <u>is</u> the one and only*).

will	have	been	telling
		auxiliaries	main verb
MODAL		PRIMARY	
OPERATOR			

8.2   Classification

For our overall classification we draw on R. QUIRK et al. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (= CGEL) (Longman: 1985).

VERBS:

A) Lexical Verbs (= 'main' verbs, 'full' verbs)

Event	State
walk	own, know
play, have (a drink)	have (a car)
use (a knife)	need (money)
etc.	be (tall)

B) Semi-auxiliaries

be about to, appear to, be apt to, come to (= ± begin to), *be bound to*, fail to

be certain to, get to, *be liable to*, happen to, *be (un)likely to*, seem to, *be sure to*

tend to, *be going to*, turn out to, be to, etc.

----

have to, have got to, had/'d better, had/'d best

C) Auxiliaries

Primary auxiliaries

periphrastic ➔ DO

aspectual (perfective) ➔ HAVE

aspectual (continuous), passive ➔ BE

Modal auxiliaries

(*will, would, may, might, can, could*, etc.)

8.2.1   Lexical Verbs (Main Verbs, Full Verbs)

They describe (basically) EVENTS and STATES, but the distinction is based not so much on the world itself, as on the way our minds look at the world. Yet it remains a useful device in the discussion of some of the characteristics of the verbs. Thus EVENT verbs only will normally have the feature [+ Progressive] . Hence:

(2)   I am drinking a Coke.   (EVENT)

cf.   Ik zit cola te drinken.

but not:

(3)   *I am knowing your name.   (STATE)

cf.   *Ik ben je naam aan het kennen.

SUBCATEGORIES

EVENT	1. **activities** (swim, walk, drink, eat, ...)
	     atelic activities: swim, walk, eat, dance, etc.
	     telic accomplishments: run a marathon, eat a 10 pound turkey
	2. **processes** (change, deteriorate, grow, ...) = (involuntary) change of state
	3. **momentary** events: telic achievements (jump, fall, nod, break, recognise, spot ...)

STATE	1. verbs of **involuntary perception** (feel, hear, see, smell, ...) 2. verbs referring to a **state of mind** or **feeling** (believe, adore, detest, ...) 3. verbs referring to a **relationship** or a **state of being** (be, belong to, concern, consist of, contain, cost, ...) 4. verbs of **possession/having** (own, possess, have, …)

Occasionally, however, verbs will shift from one class to another, depending on the discourse:

(4)   What ARE you thinking about?   (EVENT)

cf.   Waar zit je aan te denken?

(5)   What do you think of it?   (STATE)

cf.   Wat denk je ervan?

Semi-auxiliaries are a bit of a 'mixed bag' really. Some of the semi-auxiliaries serve as substitutes for the modals, cf. the ones in italics in the list above. While the other look like ordinary lexical verbs, they are like auxiliaries in that they form a unit with the infinitive (i.e. their head) which is sufficiently close to admit of the transformation from *active* to *passive* in the head (cf. R. QUIRK et al. 1985, see also Biber et al. 1999 and Hudleston and Pullum 2002):

(6)   The play happened <u>to be seen</u> by the boy.
cf. (7)   The play ought <u>to be seen</u> by the boy.

The semi-auxiliaries themselves, on the other hand, cannot be made passive:
(6') *   The play <u>was happened</u> <u>to be seen</u> by the boy.

This makes them different from ordinary lexical verbs, where the distribution of passives is rather different:
(8) *   The play expected <u>to be seen</u> by the boy.
(8')   The play <u>was expected</u> <u>to be seen</u> by the boy.

Thus *happen to* is a semi-auxiliary in R. QUIRK et al.'s analysis, while *expect to* is not.

8.2.3   Auxiliaries

Auxiliaries differ even more from lexical verbs, which have primarily semantic functions (i.e. convey most of the meaning). Auxiliaries are basically 'helping verbs'.
There are also important formal differences (the NICE – Negation, Inversion, Code and Emphasis – properties) as they:
1.   form a negative by adding NOT (you are *not* paying attention vs. I *don't* pay attention to details)
2.   form a question just by inversion (*Are you* paying attention to the little details? *Must you* really be so unkind?)
3.   have contracted forms (*isn't, can't , won't*, ...)
4.   can be used in short answers and tags such as *he does so*, *couldn't he*?, etc.
5.   are used to express emphasis (*You're wrong. I did NOT/DIDN'T do it. He never DID understand how she felt*).
6.   cannot be used in the progressive form (except 'passive be')

A) Primary Auxiliaries (*do, have, be*)

These are truly 'helping' verbs, which are used for a variety of purposes: expression of negation, aspect, passive, etc. When they adopt a clearly modal meaning, as in the case of *have to* and *be to*, they are normally classified as semi-auxiliaries (cf. list above). The primary auxiliaries are discussed in more detail in section 8.3.

B) Modal Auxiliaries (or: modals)

NON-NEGATIVE	UNCONTRACTED NEGATIVE	CONTRACTED NEGATIVE
can	cannot	can't
could	could not	couldn't
may	may not	(mayn't) (BrE + rare)
might	might not	mightn't
will, 'll	will not, 'll not	won't
would, 'd	would not, 'd not	wouldn't
shall	shall not	shan't
should	should not	shouldn't
must	must not	mustn't /'mʌsnt/
ought to	ought not to	oughtn't to
used to	used not to	usedn't to /'ju:snt/, didn't use(d) to
need	need not	needn't
dare	dare not	daren't

Modal auxiliaries do not have *-s* forms, *-ing* forms or *-ed* participles. But they all have contracted forms. Some of them have no past tense forms, e.g. the present form *must* has *had to* as a past substitute:

(9)   He must leave early.
          He had to leave early.
cf.   He moet vroeg vertrekken.
          Hij moest vroeg vertrekken.

The **semantic** characteristics of the modals will be discussed in section 10.

8.3   The Primary Auxiliaries: DO, BE and HAVE

We shall first deal with the primary auxiliaries *DO, BE* and HAVE.
Under *HAVE* a section will be devoted to CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS.

8.3.1   DO
8.3.1.1 Form

Note the pronunciation of:

does	/dʌz/	<u>Does</u> he come at eight?
	/dez/	When <u>does</u> the train leave?
don't	/deunt/	I <u>don't</u> smoke.

8.3.1.2 Uses

Preliminary remark: *DO* is a lexical verb when it means 'perform an action':

(10)   What are you <u>doing</u> tonight?
cf.   Wat doe je vanavond?
(11)   I didn't <u>do</u> it!   (note: didn't ís an auxiliary)

Note also the use of DO in '*do* repairs', 'do one's best', 'do a favour', 'do a programme',
'do a report', 'do a job', 'do a thesis', 'do exercises', 'do a translation', etc.

The primary auxiliary *DO* is used in NEGATIONS, QUESTIONS and EMPHATIC
AFFIRMATIONS when no <u>other</u> auxiliary (e.g. progressive or passive *be*, perfective
have or a modal) is available as an operator.

1) Negation

(12)   It works. => It doesn't work.
(13)   He does not like mojitos, can you believe that?
        Hij houdt niet van mojito's, stel je voor!
(14)   Don't be afraid (? Be not afraid).

Note:
DO is not used in non-finite clauses or after negating adverbs.

(15)   Not willing to betray his friends, he endured another night of excruciating pain

         and torture. (*don't willing to)

(16)   To be or not to be, that's the question. (*To be or don't to be)

(17)   I never knew that would be the last time I saw him. (*I never didn't know)

2) Interrogatives/Inversion

<u>A) In questions</u>

(18)   It works. => Does it work?

(19)   Do I make you proud, daddy, do I?

(20)   Did you order the Code Red?

Note:

Inversion only occurs when wh-word has Object or Adverbial function.

(21)   What do you call an alligator wearing a vest? An in-vest-igator.

         (What= Object Complement, inversion)

vs.

(22)   What happened next?

         (What= Subject, no inversion)

(23)   Why don't sharks attack lawyers? ...Professional courtesy.

         (Why= Adverbial, inversion)

<u>B) After negating or restrictive Adverbials</u>

(24)   Only/Not once did he show any interest in what she did.

(25)   Never in all my life did I feel so humiliated.

(26)   Only then did he understand what she had meant.

(27)   At no time did the referee take sides.

(28)   He denied to have been there, neither did he admit to have known the victim.

Note:

If there already is an auxiliary, *do* is not needed (*Never before have I been so
humiliated*).

3) Emphasis

(29)   A: "Why didn't you tell me?"
         B: "But I DID tell you!"

4) Tag Questions and Short Replies

(30)   A: "It works, doesn't it?"
         B: "Yes, it does."
(31)   You love me, don't you?
cf.   Je houdt toch van me,   niet?
                                    hè? (colloquial)

To express agreement, additions, etc.

(32)   I just adore Dior. Oh my god, so do I!
(33)   I don't like experimental jazz. Neither do I.

It can also be used in short responses expressing surprise or disbelief

(34)   Paris gave me her phone number.
         Did she now/really?/ She didn't! You must be so proud.
Cf.   Echt? / Je meent het!

The expression DO SO is used in more formal English to avoid repeating an EVENT verb (and its object), especially when the same subject and the same action are involved, cf.

(35)   Eventually, Barbara divorced Stephen. It was a pity she had not <u>done so</u> before.
(36)   I promised to get the tickets, and I will <u>do so</u> as soon as possible.

A note on POLARITY in TAGS:
As a rule tags serve to tone down the force of a statement. Hence the most frequent combinations are:
         POS (clause 1) + NEG (clause 2)
and   NEG (clause 1) + POS (clause 2)

Depending on the type of combination the speaker makes a POSITIVE or a NEGATIVE statement, while offering the hearer the opportunity to disagree by adding 'or is this not the case in your opinion?'.

But there is more to it. The speaker also indicates his expectations with respect to the hearer's potential answer. For that purpose he will rely on INTONATION patterns such as the FALL and the RISE (see Phonetics).

The RISE indicates that the statement is non-final. The FALL indicates that it is final, as far as the speaker is concerned. When applying these general principles to tags, we could sum up the situation as follows:

* The RISE suggests an open yes-no question:

(37)   He likes his \job, /doesn't he?
(37')   He doesn't like his \job, /does he?

The RISE in the tag suggests that the speaker's expectation is more or less 'neutral', so that the hearer can either agree or disagree as far as the speaker is concerned.

* When the same tag as in (37) is uttered with a **FALL** "(...) it has the force of an exclamation rather than a genuine question" (CGEL):

(38)   He likes his \job, \doesn't he?
(38')   He doesn't like his \job, \does he?

In other words, the hearer is expected to **agree** with the speaker.

* There is also a less common type of tag QUESTION in which both statement and question are positive, conveying the speaker's irony:
        POS (clause 1) + POS (clause 2)

(39)   So \THAT'S your little game, /IS it!

On the whole, one should not exaggerate the importance of tags: people in Britain do not use them as often as some language courses would have us believe.

8.3.2   BE

8.3.2.1   Form

To be, am, is, are, was, were, being, etc. (+ abbreviations)

Note:

In negative questions /a:nt aI/ is preferred in BrE. The only possible orthographic form
of this is *aren't I*?, but in formal style this is avoided, *am I not*? being used in its place.
Ain't I is colloquial AmE and substandard BrE.

(1)   Am I not merciful? Are you not entertained? (taken from 'Gladiator')

(2)   Gee baby, ain't I good to you? (Ella Fitzgerald)

The *ain't* form can also be extended to other persons and other sentences in AmE and
colloquial BrE:

(3)   Ain't she sweet? (The Beatles)

(4)   Ain't no sunshine when she's gone. (Bill Withers)

8.3.2.2   Uses

The verb BE is used in at least three different ways:
-       as a **main verb** or **lexical verb**
-       as an **auxiliary** expressing progressive aspect / passive voice
-       as a **semi-auxiliary** expressing a number of modal meanings

A) Main (or Lexical) Verb

The main verb BE belongs to the subclass of **linking verbs** or **copulas**. This means
that it normally occurs in SVC and SVA patterns, cf.

(5)   Sandra is   a student. (SVC)
                     slim. (SVC)
                     at the door. (SVA)

BE + complement is 'stative' here: it describes a STATE of being. However, sometimes
BE + complement is ´dynamic', in which case it refers to an EVENT rather than a state:

(6)   Sandra <u>is being</u> foolish again.

(6´)   Sandra, <u>don't be</u> foolish!

BE in (6) and (6') behaves much more like an ordinary lexical verb, as is shown by the Dutch translations:

(7)   Sandra <u>doet</u> weer gek.

(7´)   Sandra <u>doe</u> niet gek!

vs.

(7)   *Sandra <u>doet</u> slank.

Only when BE is thus 'lexically marked' (Quirk's term) can it carry the features [+ Prog] and [+ Imperative]. Note that even pro-forms, such as question tags, are affected in such cases:

(8)   Do be careful, <u>will you</u>? (*<u>are you</u>? is impossible)

Compare with an ordinary event verb like forget in:

(9)   Don't forget to write that letter, <u>will you</u>?

cf.   Vergeet niet die brief te schrijven, alstublieft.

B) Primary Auxiliary of the Progressive Aspect & the Passive Voice

PROGRESSIVE ASPECT: -   They <u>were towing</u> away the old car.

PASSIVE VOICE: -   The old car <u>was towed</u> away.

PROGRESSIVE + PASSIVE: -   The old car <u>was being towed</u> away.

For these uses, check the discussion of the Progressive Tense forms and the Passive.

ALTERNATIVES

Besides the regular auxiliary BE for PROGRESSIVE ASPECT there are a number of verbs that reflect similar progressivity: KEEP (ON), GO ON

(10)   John <u>goes on / keeps (on)</u> asking questions.

Again, Dutch has a number of equivalents:

cf.   Jan <u>gaat (maar) door met</u> / <u>blijft (maar)</u> vragen stellen.

C) Semi-auxiliary BE TO, Used as a MODAL

Grammarians often suggest that *BE* + *to* + infinitive denotes the future with certain secondary meanings. These 'meanings' are no doubt of a modal kind, as can be seen in the Dutch translations of the uses of BE TO, as shown in the examples below:

POS (11)   We <u>are to</u> be there at six.

cf.   Je <u>moet</u> daar om zes uur zijn.

NEG (12)   I <u>am not to</u> tell you this.

cf.   Ik <u>mag</u> je dit niet vertellen.

These uses will be elaborated on in the discussion of modals and semi-modals in chapter 10.

8.3.3   HAVE

8.3.3.1 Form

Note the contracted form *'d* for PAST, which can also stand for WOULD, cf.

(1)   You'd better not tell him.   (= *had*)

(2)   I'd rather not tell him.   (= *would*, sometimes *had*, although the latter is not normally considered correct)

8.3.3.2 Uses

HAVE can be used in at least four different ways:

- as a **main verb** or **lexical verb**, when it means 'possess', 'experience', etc.

(3)   <u>Have</u> a cup of tea.

(4)   We were <u>having</u> serious problems.

- as a **primary auxiliary** of ASPECT (see PERFECTIVE ASPECT)

(5)   I <u>have</u> already met George.

- as a **causative semi-auxiliary**   (= 'cause to happen')

(6)   We <u>had</u> our car washed.

- as a **modal semi-auxiliary**   (= HAVE TO as a substitute for MUST)

(7)   I'll <u>have to</u> stop here.

A) Main (or Lexical) Verb

A.1 For PRESENT Possession (in a broad sense)

(8)

	BrE	AmE
POS	- I <u>have</u> a cold. - I'<u>ve got</u> a cold (= colloquial)	- I <u>have</u> a cold. - I('<u>ve) got</u> a cold. (= coll.)
Q	- <u>Do</u> you <u>have</u> a cold? - <u>Have</u> you <u>got</u> a cold? - <u>Have</u> you a cold? (= formal)	- <u>Do</u> you <u>have</u> a cold? - <u>Have</u> you <u>got</u> a cold?
NEG	- I <u>don't have</u> a cold. - I <u>haven't got</u> a cold. - I <u>have</u> no cold.	- I <u>don't have</u> a cold. - I <u>haven't got</u> a cold.
NOT: BUT:	- *I haven't a cold. - I <u>haven't</u> a bad cold. (= formal)	

Notes:

1) Colloquial BrE prefers HAVE GOT for present possession.

2) *Haven't* requires another part of speech between itself and the noun.

3) In PAST Q the auxiliary DO is now commonly preferred even when HAVE means 'hold' or 'possess' as in:

(9)   <u>Did</u> you <u>have</u> enough money?

A.2   Possession as a HABIT (BrE = AmE)

(10)   POS - We <u>have</u> pineapples in summer only.

         Q   - <u>Do</u> you <u>have</u> them regularly, madam?

         NEG - Yes, but we <u>don't have</u> them during the holidays.

Compare possession as a habit with habitual EXTERNAL OBLIGATION (cf. discussion on modal *have to*). Both require DO for Q & NEG.

A.3 Possession as a CHARACTERISTIC ('as a *quality*' in LDELC)

(11)

	BrE	AmE
POS	- A cube <u>has</u> 8 corners.	- A cube <u>has</u> 8 corners.
Q	- How many corners <u>does</u> a cube <u>have</u>? - How many corners <u>has</u> a cube?	- How many corners <u>does</u> a cube <u>have</u>?
NEG	- I <u>don't have</u> a very good temper. - I <u>haven't</u> a very good temper.	- I <u>don't have</u> a very good temper.

A.4 When HAVE has the dynamic connotation of an EVENT verb like TAKE, GIVE, EXPERIENCE, etc. both BrE & AmE HAVE are fully lexical, i.e.

a.   GOT is impossible (cf. 1.1 above)
b.   Q and NEG require DO
c.   PROGRESSIVE forms are possible

(12)   We <u>are having</u> a party tomorrow.
cf.   We geven morgen een fuif.

(13)   I <u>don't have</u> eggs for breakfast.
cf.   Ik eet geen eieren bij het ontbijt.

B) Aspectual HAVE   (see E1SA 'perfective aspect': 2.3.2)

C) Causative Constructions

CAUSE is a **semantic** concept that is realized through a variety of **formal** means:
-        lexical verbs like *cause, lead, induce*, etc. (+ NP + to-infinitive)
-        semi-auxiliaries like *have, get, make, let* (+ NP + non-finite)

In general, causative constructions lead to translation problems because of the ambiguity of the Dutch verb *laten*, cf.

(1)   Moeder <u>liet</u> de kinderen buiten spelen.

(1')   Mum <u>let</u> the children play outside.

(1")   Mum <u>had</u> the children play outside.

In (1') she **permitted** or **allowed** them to play outside, whereas in (1") she caused them to play outside, which means that in the latter case the initiative was hers. Another example of this second type is:

(2)   Ze <u>liet</u> de kinderen onderzoeken.

(2")   She <u>had</u> the children examined.

In (2") she **caused** them *to he examined* (= passive form). Note that Dutch uses the same *laten + INF* construction each time, versus three equivalents in English.

Let us discuss the various HAVE constructions first, before considering the main alternatives as well.

C.1 HAVE + NP + past participle (-ed)

This construction can be paraphrased as to cause something to be done. The object of have is a **reduced passive** consisting of 'NP + -ed participle', in which the NP undergoes the action and the agent is not mentioned.

(3)   - Do you wash your car yourself?
          - No, I usually have it washed.

cf.   - Nee, meestal laat ik hem wassen.

Have has lexical properties here, since it can be used in all tense and mood forms:

(4)   He <u>has</u> NP <u>done</u>. (Pres Simple)

(4')   He <u>has had</u> NP <u>done</u>. (Pres Perf)

(4")   <u>Do</u> you <u>have</u> NP <u>done</u> or do you do it yourself? (INT)

In a colloquial style *GET* can be used instead of *HAVE* (see below):

(5)   <u>Get</u> your hair <u>cut</u>!

cf.   <u>Laat</u> je haar <u>knippen</u>!

The have + NP + Past Part construction can be ambiguous though, cf.

(6)   I had my bicycle stolen last week.

cf.   Ik heb vorige week mijn fiets laten stelen.

OR: Ik ben vorige week van mijn fiets beroofd. (formal)

        Ze hebben vorige week mijn fiets gestolen. (informal)

The second reading makes more sense: something unpleasant happened to me, in other words *HAVE* is unintentional here. A similar interpretation suggests itself in

(7)   Thousands of Londoners <u>had</u> already <u>had</u> their homes <u>reduced</u> to rubble by October 1940.

cf.   Duizenden Londenaars <u>hadden</u> in oktober 1940 hun woning al in een puinhoop *zien* <u>veranderen</u>.

C.2 HAVE + NP + bare infinitive

This can be paraphrased as to cause *someone to do something*. The pattern is an **active** one: the NP performs the action (i.e. functions as the 'actor') and receives the nuclear stress:

(8)   Last time I <u>had</u> my 'little \brother <u>wash</u> the car.

cf.   De vorige keer heb ik mijn kleine broer de wagen <u>laten wassen</u>.

The bare infinitive refers to a **complete event**, comparable to what we have in similar constructions involving verbs of the senses, cf.

(9)   I saw Brian leave the office.

C.3 HAVE + NP + Present Participle (-ing)

The third causative construction can be reworded as *to cause someone TO BEGIN to do something*, i.e. 'bring to the point where NP is doing something' as in:

(10)   He <u>had</u> them all <u>singing</u>.

cf.   Hij <u>liet</u> ze allemaal <u>zingen</u>.

        Hij <u>kreeg</u> ze allemaal <u>aan het zingen</u>.

GET is also used in this sense (see 'alternatives' below):

(11)   It's hard to <u>get</u> the students talking.

cf.   Het is moeilijk om de studenten <u>aan het praten</u> te <u>krijgen</u>.

The -ing form is a kind of progressive form here, as is also borne out by the Dutch equivalents *aan het praten, aan het zingen*. Also note the similarity between this type of causative and constructions involving verbs of the senses such as:

(12)   I saw Brian leaving the office.

(13)   I heard them talking.

All these -ing forms express **incompleteness** of one sort or another.

In a number of cases there is potential ambiguity again, cf.

(14)   Tom was behaving so funnily that he <u>had</u> us all <u>laughing</u> in no time.

cf.   Tom deed zo grappig dat hij ons in een mum van tijd <u>aan het lachen</u> <u>kreeg</u>.

OR: Tom deed zo grappig dat we er in een mum van tijd bij <u>zaten te lachen</u> / om *moesten* <u>lachen</u>.

According to the second reading, *HAVE* is 'unintentional' again (cf. (6) above in this respect). No such ambiguity is present in:

(15)   John's story was so tragic that he <u>had</u> us all <u>crying.</u>

cf.   Jans verhaal was zo tragisch dat we er allemaal bij <u>zaten te huilen</u> / om *moesten* <u>huilen</u>.

C.4 ALTERNATIVE CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

GET

GET (laten) is a colloquial alternative which would not normally be used in formal (written) language at all. It enters into the same patterns as causative HAVE.

1.   GET + NP + past participle (-ed)

(16)   I <u>got</u> my camera <u>repaired</u> in a local shop.

cf.   Ik <u>heb</u> mijn fototoestel in een buurtwinkel <u>laten herstellen</u>.

Note the difference with *GET* (raken), which is also a **colloquial** alternative to **passive** *BE*, as discussed in chapter 7.

(17)   He <u>got</u> (himself) badly involved (= he got into a mess).

cf.   Hij <u>raakte</u> lelijk bij de zaak betrokken.

2.   GET + NP + to-infinitive

This construction can be paraphrased as '*bring, persuade, cause somebody to do something'* (= Dutch 'iemand ertoe *bewegen, krijgen, brengen iets te doen'*). The intervening NP normally carries the feature [+ animate]):

(18)   I couldn't <u>get</u> anyone <u>to do</u> the work.

cf.   Ik kon niemand ertoe <u>bewegen/brengen</u> / zover <u>krijgen</u> het werk <u>uit te voeren</u>.

(19)   I can't <u>get</u> this old radio <u>to work</u>.

cf.   Ik <u>krijg</u> geen geluid uit die ouwe radio.

3.   GET + NP + present participle (-ing)

Here the paraphrase would be '*bring somebody*/something to the point where he/it is doing something'. Dutch would often use a collocation with the verb *krijgen* again, cf.

(20)   It is hard to <u>get</u> them <u>talking</u>.

cf.   Het is moeilijk ze <u>aan het praten</u> te <u>krijgen</u>.

(21)   Can you <u>get</u> that old car going?

cf.   Kun jij die oude wagen <u>in beweging</u> / <u>aan de praat</u> <u>krijgen</u>?

MAKE

1.   MAKE + NP + past participle (-ed)

MAKE is equivalent to *cause to be/become* and can often be translated into Dutch as *laten/doen*, cf.

(22)   He <u>made</u> himself <u>respected</u>.

cf.   Hij <u>liet/deed</u> zich (**door** iedereen) <u>respecteren</u>.   (EVENT)

OR: Hij <u>maakte</u> zich (**bij** iedereen) <u>gerespecteerd</u>.   (STATE)

The second reading is the less intentional one as it points to a possibly unintended result. Most of the time there will be an underlying intention, however, even if the Dutch version suggests a state rather than an event:

(23)   He <u>made</u> himself <u>understood</u> in English.

cf.   Hij <u>maakte</u> zich *verstaanbaar* in het Engels.

2.   MAKE + NP + bare infinitive

MAKE, like *HAVE*, requires a **bare** infinitive after the intervening NP, at least when used as an active verb. It is different in this respect from *GET* and other more or less synonymous verbs like *cause, compel, force and persuade*, all of which are followed by NP + to-infinitive.

The closest Dutch equivalent might well be *DOEN*, particularly when used emphatically, but *MAKEN* is also possible and even *LATEN* cannot be ruled out in a number of cases, cf.

(24)   He <u>made</u> us <u>laugh</u>.

cf.   Hij <u>deed</u> ons lachen.

          Hij <u>maakte/bracht</u> ons <u>aan het lachen</u>.

(25)   Don't <u>make</u> me <u>laugh</u>.

cf.   <u>Laat</u> me niet <u>lachen</u>.

Note that it is possible to passivize (24) into (24') by making the intervening NP the subject of MAKE:

(24')   We <u>were made</u> <u>TO laugh</u>.

cf.   We werden <u>aan het lachen gebracht</u>.

         Ze <u>deden</u> ons <u>lachen</u>.

The passive pattern always requires a to-infinitive!

LET'S and **LET US**

1.   **LET'S + bare infinitive (LATEN WE)**

This contracted form is used to express a suggestion, as in:

(26)   <u>Let's</u> assume that this is true.

cf.   <u>Laten we</u> aannemen dat dit zo is.

Dutch requires *we/wij* as subject of the following infinitive. Only in archaic expressions
like *laat ons bidden* do we find the OBJECTIVE case. English, too, has a more formal
alternative, cf.

(26')   <u>Let us</u> assume that this is true.

There are three negative forms corresponding to (26):

(26")   <u>Let's</u> <u>not</u> assume that this is true.

         <u>Don't let's</u> assume that this is true. (= informal BrE)

         <u>Let's don't</u> assume that this is true. (= informal AmE)

2.   **LET US + bare infinitive (LAAT ONS)**

This is an expression used to ask for permission. It is thus equivalent in meaning to
allow us + to-infinitive:

(27)   <u>Let</u> us <u>go</u>, please.

(27')   <u>Allow</u> us <u>to go</u>, please.

cf.   <u>Laat</u> ons gaan, alstublieft.

The contracted form let's would be ungrammatical in this sense. The negative form is like that of any other imperative, cf.

(28)   <u>Don't let</u> us <u>suffer</u> like this, please.
(28')   <u>Don't allow</u> us <u>to suffer</u> like this, please.

The difference between LET'S and LET US can best be seen in the corresponding Dutch equivalents. In *LATEN WIJ aannemen*, *WIJ* is both the **subject** of *LATEN* and an **actor** participating in the **event** *aannemen*. In *LAAT ONS*, *ONS* is both the **(indirect) object** of the imperative *LAAT* and an actor participating in the **event** *gaan*.

The difference also appears from the question tags normally appearing after *LET'S* and *LET US*:

(29)   <u>Let's</u> go, ... we?
(30)   <u>Let us</u> go, ... you?

D) HAVE TO as a Modal

As a modal semi-auxiliary *have to / had to* supplements *must*. There are some subtle differences, though, but these will discussed in the next chapter on modal auxiliaries

8.4   A Note on Concord

R. QUIRK et al. (1985: 755) suggest that:

> CONCORD (also termed 'agreement') can be defined as the relationship between two grammatical units such that one of them displays a particular feature (e.g. plurality) that accords with a displayed (or semantically implicit) feature in the other.

The types of concord we will be concerned with are:

This is basically grammatical, i.e. a singular subject requires a singular verb, a plural subject requires a plural verb, taking into account the overall tendency for a 'subject which is not definitely marked for plural' to require a singular verb, cf.

(1)   There <u>is</u> / <u>are</u> hundreds of people on the waiting list.
(2)   There <u>are</u>/<u>is</u> hundreds of languages in the world, but a smile speaks them all.

This sentence can have singular *is* on account of its singular pseudo-subject *there* (= colloquial).

There are three principles at work here:

A) The Principle of Grammatical Concord

This is the most frequent type in English. The verb matches the subject in number, as in:

(3)   The public <u>consists</u> of you and me. (= a unit)
(4)   The crowd <u>is</u> moving.
(5)   The audience <u>was</u> listening.

The subject is singular, hence the verb is singular too. Dutch is virtually restricted to this possibility only.

B) The Principle of Notional Concord

The verb agrees with the subject according to the idea (**notion**) of number rather than the actual presence of the grammatical marker of that idea, e.g. *the public*. In other words, the verb (or other elements) agree with the semantic notion of number (pl/sg):

(6)   The public <u>are</u> tired of demonstrations. (= a number of individuals)
(7)   If you use too much jargon to a 'lay' audience you will lose <u>them</u>.
(8)   A small crowd stood in the square, presenting <u>their</u> final messages to the passengers.

Here slight differences between AmE and BrE are possible, cf.

(9)   The Government <u>have</u> broken all <u>their</u> promises. (BrE)

(9')   The Government <u>has</u> broken all <u>its</u> promises. (AmE/BrE)

Names of sports teams and companies pattern in the same way:

(10)   Australia <u>have</u> beaten New Zealand in the World Cup. (BrE)

(10')   Australia <u>has</u> beaten New Zealand in the World Cup. (AmE)

Country names, including those ending in -s, always require the singular verb form if the country itself is referred to:

(11)   The Netherlands / The United States / The United Nations <u>is</u> to blame.

C) The Principle of Proximity

This principle denotes "agreement of the verb with a closely preceding noun phrase in preference to agreement with the head of the noun phrase that functions as subject," (R. QUIRK 1985: 757). Put differently, this principle is the tendency, especially in speech, for the verb to agree with the closest (pro)noun, even when that (pro)noun is not the head of the subject noun phrase. For example:

(12)   One in ten <u>take</u> drugs, (pl.)

cf.   Eén op tien slikt. (sg.)

(13)   No one except his own supporters <u>agree</u> with him.

cf.   Behalve zijn medestanders <u>geeft</u> niemand hem gelijk.

Also to be included here is the phrase *a number of + plural noun*, which invariably takes a plural verb form:

(14)   A number of participants <u>disagree</u>.

(15)   A number of missing persons <u>have</u> not been found yet.

"On the whole, the plural is more popular in speech, whereas in the more inhibited medium of writing the singular is probably preferred." (R. QUIRK 1985: 758). "It is generally safer in BrE to use the singular verb where there is doubt, in obedience to grammatical concord".

D) Further Discussion on Concord of Number between Subject - Verb

1) Invariable nouns in –s taking singular (see basics course)

- **Nouns in –ics referring to sciences, branches of study or professional activities**:

  mathematics, physics, economics, linguistics, etc.

(16)   'Linguistics is a very interesting discipline', he said totally unbiased.

Some of them also take plural when they do not refer to the science as such:

(17)   The acoustics in the AB are pretty good.

(18)   These statistics are totally wrong.

- **Names of games**:

  billiards, cards, checkers, darts, dominoes, draughts, skittles.

(19)   Draughts is mentally challenging.

(20)   Cards is played at many a bar on Sunday mornings.

BUT: Hearts are trumps. (Harten is troef)

- **Some names of diseases and ailments**:

  measles, German measles, mumps, rabies, shingles, etc.

(21)   Shingles is an eruptive disease (Herpes zoster) often extending round the middle of the body like a girdle (whence the name); usually accompanied by violent neuralgic pain.

2) Invariable nouns taking plural

people, cattle, livestock, police, poultry, vermin, etc.

(22)   People are people so why should it be you and I should get along so awfully. (Depeche Mode)

(23)   His livestock are worth a fortune.

3) *Each, everyone, every one, everybody, anyone, anybody, someone* and *somebody.*

The pronouns *each, everyone, every one, everybody, anyone, anybody, someone* and *somebody* are singular and require singular verbs. Do not be misled by what follows.

(24)   Each of the girls <u>sings</u> well.

(25)   Everybody <u>plays</u> the fool sometimes.

(26)   Each of the divers <u>has</u> an oxygen tank.

4) A clause demands a sg. predicator:

(27)   [How you got there] <u>doesn't</u> concern me.

(28)   [To treat them as hostages] <u>is</u> criminal.

(29)   [Smoking cigarettes] <u>is</u> dangerous to your health.

5) Plural phrases

Plural phrases (including coordinate phrases) – get a sg. if they act as names, titles, quotations single concepts, etc.:

(30)   *Crime and Punishment* <u>is</u> a good book, but *The Brothers Karamazov* <u>is</u>
         undoubtedly a masterpiece. (subj.= a single novel)

(31)   Fish and chips <u>is</u> a classic British dish which includes battered deep fried fish
         and fried potatoes. (subj.= a single meal)

(32)   The hammer and sickle <u>was</u> flying from the flagpole.
         (subj. = a flag)

(33)   Danish bacon and eggs <u>makes</u> a good English breakfast.
         (subj. = a single meal)

6) Conjoins

Conjoins expressing a mutual relationship take a plural verb.

(34)   Your problem and mine <u>are</u> similar.

7) Preposed *each* and *every*

Preposed *each* and *every* with a distributive effect get a singular predicator.

(35)   Every adult and every child <u>was</u> holding a flag.

(36)   Each senator and congressman <u>was</u> allocated two seats.

8) Coordination with *or* and *nor*.

(37)   Either the Mayor or her deputy <u>is</u>/*are bound to come.
         (gram. concord)

(38)   What I think or what I say <u>is</u>/*are no business of yours.
         (gram. concord)

(39)   Either the strikers or the bosses *has/<u>have</u> misunderstood the claim
         (gram. concord)

(40)   Either your brakes or your eyesight <u>is</u>/?are at fault.
         (proximity)

(41)   Either your eyesight or your brakes <u>are</u>/?is at fault.
         (proximity)

9) Neither … nor

(42)   Neither he nor his wife <u>has</u> arrived. (formal)

When either and neither are subjects, they take singular verbs.

(43)   Neither of them is available to speak right now.

(44)   Either of us is capable of doing the job.

10) Inserts

Sometimes the subject is separated from the verb by words such as *along with, as well as, besides, or not.* Ignore these expressions when determining whether to use a singular or plural verb.

(45)   The politician, along with the newsmen, <u>is</u> expected shortly.

(46)   Excitement, as well as nervousness, <u>is</u> the cause of her shaking.

With words that indicate portions— *percent, fraction, part, majority, some, all, none, remainder*, and so forth – look at the noun in your of-phrase to determine whether to use a singular or plural verb. If the object of the preposition is singular, use a singular verb. If the object of the preposition is plural, use a plural verb.

(47)   Fifty percent of the pie <u>has</u> disappeared.

(48)   Fifty percent of the pies <u>have</u> disappeared.

(49)   One-third of the city <u>is</u> unemployed.

(50)   One-third of the people <u>are</u> unemployed.

(51)   All of the pie <u>is</u> gone.

(52)   All of the pies <u>are</u> gone.

(53)   None of the garbage <u>was</u> picked up.

12) Sums of money and periods of time

Use a singular verb with sums of money or periods of time.

(54)   Ten dollars is a high price to pay.

(55)   Five years is the maximum sentence for that offense.

8.4.2   Subject - Verb Concord of Person

As well as concord of number, there is concord of PERSON, as in Dutch. One particularity worth mentioning is this:

(56)   It is <u>I</u> who <u>am</u> to blame, (agreement with the antecedent)

cf.   Ik ben het die fout   ben geweest.

                              geweest ben.

(56')   It's <u>me</u> who/that <u>is</u> to blame. (= informal English)

(57)   The Emperor: Oh no, my young Jedi. You will find that it is <u>you</u> who <u>are</u> mistaken, about a great many things.

8.4.3   Subject - Complement Concord

This operates as in Dutch, i.e. it is a concord of number between subject and complement, cf.

(58)   That man <u>was</u> a *thief* - those men <u>were</u> *thieves*.

cf.   Die man <u>was</u> een *dief* - die mannen <u>waren</u> *dieven*.

The rule is also observed where Dutch departs from it:

(59)   They both <u>want</u> to be *actors*.

cf.   Ze <u>willen</u> allebei *acteur* worden.

On the other hand, when the subject complement is more like an adjective (but nominal in form) the rule may be ignored:

(60)   That man <u>is</u> nuts! (= slang)

(61)   Children <u>are</u> *fun* / *an investment in the future*.

When it + to be refers to a plural NP complement there is concord between the verb and the singular subject *it*:

(62)   - What killed these plants? - It <u>was</u> the *slugs*.

cf.   - Het <u>zijn</u> de *slakken* geweest.

(63)   It <u>is</u> the *Americans* who want to intervene.

cf.   Het <u>zijn</u> de *Amerikanen* die tussenbeide willen komen.

8.4.4   Subject - Object Concord

English tends to prefer a plural object form in sentences like:

(64)   Several *employees* lost *their jobs / their lives*.

cf.   Verscheidene *werknemers* verloren *hun* baan / het leven.

(65)   We haven't made up *our minds* yet.

cf.   We hebben *ons standpunt* nog niet bepaald.

      We zijn nog niet tot *een besluit* gekomen.

Two Dutch sentences for translation:

(66)   Zet jullie *pet* maar op!

cf.   Put your bonnets on.

(67)   Ze vlogen elkaar weer naar *de keel*.

cf.   They flew at each other's throats.

9.1   Introduction

This discussion is based on See Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 172ff).

The distinction between mood and modality is like that between tense and time, or aspect and aspectuality: mood is a category of grammar, modality a category of meaning. Mood is the grammaticalization of modality within the verbal system. The term 'mood' is most usually applied to inflectional systems of the verb, as in the contrast between indicative, subjunctive, and imperative in such languages as Latin, French and German. As far as English is concerned, historical change has more or less eliminated mood from the inflectional system, with irrealis mood confined to 1st/3rd person singular *were*, which is moreover usually replaceable by the ordinary simple past *was*. The main mood system, therefore, is analytic rather than inflectional, marked by the presence or absence of special words, the modal auxiliaries.

Outside the verbal system, the area of meaning referred to as modality is rather broad and finds its expression in many areas of languages besides mood. We will just provide a brief account of the central area covered by modality and of its linguistics manifestations.

9.2   The Domain of Modality

Modality is centrally concerned with the speaker's attitude towards the **factuality** or **actualisation** of the situation expressed by the rest of the clause.

A declarative main clause like (1) can be regarded as unmodalised: in normal use the speaker is committed, without qualification or special emphasis, to the factuality of the proposition expressed.

(1)   He wrote it himself.

Example (2) by contrast, is modalised: although I still commit myself to the factuality of his having written it himself, my commitment is qualified in the sense that the truth of the proposition is not presented as something that is directly known but as something that is inferred.

(2)   He must have written it himself.

A somewhat different kind of modality is found in (the most salient interpretation of) (3) which is concerned not so much with factuality as with the actualisation of a future situation, your helping him: I impose on you the obligation to bring this situation about.

(3)   You must help him.

Although the two examples just given involve different kinds of modality, they are united by the fact that they both express the concept of **necessity**. This and the related concept of **possibility** are core concepts in modality. Modal possibility is illustrated in examples corresponding to the above with *may* substituted for *must,* as in (4).

(4)   He may have written it himself.

It expresses the possibility of his having written it himself: it indicates an open attitude to the truth of the proposition. Similarly (5) expresses the possibility of your helping her: I give permission and thus remove a potenial barrier to the actualisation of that situation: it is a possibility now, but not a necessity.

(5)   You may help her.

Note:

Modality is in the first instance a matter of the speaker's attitude, but it applies by extension to the attitude of persons referred to in the sentence. In (6), for example, *must* indicates Kim's attitude, not mine, but we shall of course still regard it as expressing modal necessity. Furthermore, the concept of modality also extends to cases where it is not a matter of subjective attitude on the part of the speaker (or others), but of something more objective, as in (7), which is likely to be interpreted as expressing not the speaker's subjective attitude to the truth of *"x is 97"* but objective, mathematical necessity.

(6)   Kim thinks he must have written it himself.
(7)   If x is a prime number between 90 and 100 it must be 97.

9.3   The Linguistic Expression of Modality

Major areas of the language, other than the analytic mood system, where modality may be expressed include:

a) Lexical modals

We use this term for items expressing the same kind of meaning as the modal auxiliaries, but which do not belong to the syntactic class of auxiliary verbs. It covers

adjectives: *possible, necessary, likely, probable, bound, supposed,*
adverbs: *perhaps, possibly, necessarily, probably, certainly, surely,*
verbs: *insist, permit, require,*
nouns: *possibility, necessity, permission,* and similar derivatives.

b) Past tense

The past tense is commonly used to express modal remoteness, and the perfect is occasionally used in this way too. The difference in modal meaning between present tense in (8) and past tense in (9) is that of open possibility vs remote possibility and is in many languages expressed by means of an inflectional mood system.

(8)   If you <u>do</u> that again you will be fired.
(9)   If you <u>did</u> that again you would be fired

c) Other verb inflection

The residual irrealis *were* has only the modal remoteness meaning just illustrated for the past tense; it represents the remnant of an inflectional mood system in English. In addition, the plain form of the verb is commonly used with a modal sense. In finite clauses, it is used mainly in the imperative and mandative constructions, which are covered respectively in (d) and (e) below. In non-finite clauses, the plain form is used in the infinitival construction, where it is often associated with non-actuality in contrast with the gerund-participial construction. Compare:

(10)   a. He's the one <u>to do</u> the job.   b. He's the one <u>doing</u> the job.
(11)   a. I want <u>to talk</u> to her.   b. I enjoy <u>talking</u> to her.

In (10)b the doing is actual, whereas in (10)a it is not: the meaning is comparable to that of *the one who should do the job* or *the one whom we should get to do the job,* with modal *should.* Similarly (11)b conveys that I actually do talk to her, whereas the talking in (11)a is non-actualised, merely potential. It is not fortuitous that the modal auxiliaries themselves take infinitival complements, not gerund-participials.

d) Clause type

The default clause type, the declarative, is associated with **factual** statements and, as suggested above, can (in the absence of any other relevant marking) be regarded as unmodalised. The other major types, however, are closely associated with modality. Imperatives are characteristically used as directives, with the speaker typically wanting the **actualisation** of some future situation. The interrogative types are characteristically used to express questions to which the speaker doesn't know the answer - and in the case of a polar question the speaker will usually regard both positive and negative answers as possibly true.

e) Subordination

While the use of a declarative main clause typically conveys the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition expressed, such a commitment is often lost under subordination - compare main (12) with subordínate (13):

(12)   He is ill.
(13)   I/They think <u>he is ill</u>.

This is not to say that subordination necessarily involves modalisation: this will depend on the properties of the construction, for in

(14)   I/They know <u>he is ill</u>.

for example, my commitment to the truth of "He is ill" remains. Nevertheless, there is a significant association between subordination and markers of modality. In languages with an inflectional subjunctive, for example, this mood characteristically indicates non-factuality (e.g. think of Spanish *no creo que esté enfermo*) in subordinate clauses. In English the modal remoteness use of the past tense is in general restricted to

subordinate clauses, and certain uses of some of the modal auxiliaries are characteristic of subordinate clauses too (e.g. the 'emotive' use of *should* in examples like (15).

(15)   It's strange that he should be so quiet.

The mandative construction is a subordinate one, and the modal meaning (involving the necessity or desirability of actualisation) is often marked by a plain form or by *should,* as in (16)

(16)   It's essential that he be/should be told.

One construction involving subordination that is particularly important in connection with the modal auxiliaries is the conditional: the remote conditional construction requires a modal auxiliary in the matrix clause and has a modal use of the past tense in both subordinate and matrix clauses, and even the open conditional very often has a modalised matrix clause too.

f) Modal particles

Examples of modal particles include: *well*, *in fact*, *so*, *now*.

g) Parentheticals

These contain lexical modals such as *think, seem,* etc.:

(17)   He is, I think/it seems, almost bankrupt.

They are also relatable to subordinate constructions (I *think/it seems he is almost bankrupt)*.

In this chapter we focus on the modal auxiliaries - we shall not, for example, be dealing systematically with the lexical modals. The modal auxiliaries have a considerable range of uses: in the next subsection we consider three major dimensions along which these uses may be compared. We then deal with the individual auxiliaries, focussing on the present and past tense forms.

9.4   Dimensions of Modality

In describing the meanings and use of the modal auxiliaries distinctions can be made on three major dimensions, which we refer to as **strength, kind** and **degree.**

9.4.1   Strength of Modality

a) Necessity vs Possibility: Strong vs Weak Modality

The first dimension concerns the **strength** of commitment (prototypically the speaker's commitment) to the factuality or actualisation of the situation. This is where we distinguish the core modal concepts of necessity and possibility: necessity involves a strong commitment, possibility a weak one.

b) Internal Negation vs External Negation

In order to describe the logical relation between necessity and possibility we need to consider their interaction with negation, and here we must distinguish between **internal negation** and **external negation**:

(18)   He may <u>not</u> have read it.   [internal negation]

(19)   He can<u>'t</u> have read it.   [external negation]

(20)   He can<u>'t not </u>have read it.   [external + internal negation]

In (19) the negation applies semantically to the complement of *may:* "It is possible that he didn't read it". We say in such cases that the modal has **scope over** the negative, or that the negation falls within the scope of the modal: it is in this sense that the negation is 'internal'. In (19), by contrast, the negative applies to the modal itself: "It is not possible that he read it". Here then the negative **has scope over** the modal auxiliary rather than falling within its scope, i.e. the negation is external to the scope of the modal. The two kinds of negation can combine, as in (20): "It is not possible that he didn't read it". A second example is seen in:

(21)   You <u>mustn't</u> eat it all   [internal negation]

(22)   You <u>needn't </u>eat it all.   [external negation]

In (21) the negative applies to the eating, not the modal obligation: "It is necessary that you not eat it all"; it is thus internal, within the scope of the modal. In (22) the negative applies to the obligation: "It isn't necessary for you to eat it all"; here then it is external, outside the scope of the modal.

The scope of the negation is generally transparent when the modality is expressed by lexical modals in constructions where there is a clear syntactic distinction between a matrix clause containing the lexical modal and a subordinate clause, as in the glosses given for the examples above. In such cases a *not* in the subordinate clause marks internal negation, while a *not* in the matrix clause marks external negation. When we have negation with a modal auxiliary we can therefore test whether it is internal or external negation by finding a paraphrase with a lexical modal, and seeing whether the negative is in the subordinate clause (as in *It is necessary that you not eat it all)* or the matrix one (as in *It isn't necessary for you to eat it all).* It should be borne in mind, however, that such paraphrases will often be much less idiomatic than the versions with modal auxiliaries.

c) Semantic Strength vs Pragmatic Strength

When considering the strength of the modality expressed in a clause it is important to bear in mind the distinction between semantics and pragmatics. Compare, for example:

(23)   a. *You <u>must</u> come in immediately.*

        b. *You <u>must</u> have one of these cakes.*

(24)   a. *You <u>may</u> take your ties off now.*

        b. *You <u>may</u> leave now.*

Example (23)a is likely to be used as an instruction to come in: it is strong in that it doesn't countenance your not doing so. Example (23)b contains the same modal *must,* but, as used at an afternoon tea-party or the like, the modality would be considerably less strong - it will be taken as an offer rather than an order. We will talk of this as <u>pragmatic weakening</u>: *must* is a semantically strong modal, but in this context its strength is reduced. The opposite case is illustrated in (24). Here (24)a has weak modality: the salient interpretation is as giving permission, allowing you a choice as to whether or not to take your tie off. But (24)b, as used in the context of a boss talking to a secretary, will be construed as an instruction, not mere permission: here we have <u>pragmatic strengthening</u>.

d) Medium Modality

There is a third category on the scale of strength which we call medium modality, though intuitively it is closer to the strong end than to the weak. It is expressed by *should, ought,* and comparable lexical modals such as *probable, likely, appear, seem:*

(25) a. The meeting <u>must</u> be over by now.   [strong]
      b. The meeting <u>should</u> be over by now.   [medium]
      c. The meeting <u>may</u> be over by now.   [weak]

With (25)b we confine our attention at this stage to the interpretation "The meeting is probably over by now" (ignoring, for example, its use in a context where I know the meeting is still going on and am saying that this state of affairs is not right). In the "probably" interpretation, (25)b is weaker than (25)a in that it allows for the possibility that the meeting is not over: with (25)b, unlike (25)a, I could add *but it may not be.* At the same time, (25)b is stronger than (25)c in that it presents the likelihood of the meeting being over as greater. Thus (25)c is consistent with such continuations as *but it's unlikely to be,* whereas (25)b, in its "probably" interpretation, is not. Note, moreover, that the common formula *may or may not* (e.g. *You may or may not believe this)* presents "P" and"not-P" as equally likely, but we do not similarly say *should or should not.*

- Medium Modality and Negation

A significant feature of medium strength modality is that there is little difference, pragmatically, between external and internal negation:

(26) a. He <u>isn't</u> likely to be ready.   [external negation]
      b. He is likely <u>not</u> to be ready.   [internal negation]

Construction (26)a is the more frequent but it tends to be interpreted pragmatically as (26)b. Semantically (26)a allows that the likelihood of his being ready may be around 50% as well as low, but in the 50% case one would generally say, more simply and clearly, *He may be ready,* so that (26)a tends to be used only in the low probability case, "He is unlikely to be ready", and this is equivalent to (26)b.

Note that in a simple clause construction with *probably* the negation is normally semantically as well as pragmatically internal. For example, *He is probably not ready,* with not following *probably* and inside its scope, is normal while *'He isn't probably ready'* is very marginal. Similarly, it is internal negation that we have with *should* and *ought.*

9.4.2   Kind of Modality

It is a difficult matter to decide how many different senses should be recognised for a given modal auxiliary, but certain broad categories can be motivated by clear cases of ambiguity and by differences with respect to such matters as the scope of negation. We begin here with the distinction between **epistemic** and **deontic** modality, and then introduce a third category of **dynamic** modality; these distinctions cut across those of strength, and we will restrict the term kind of modality to this dimension of differentiation.

a) Epistemic vs Deontic Modality

The contrast between the two major categories is seen in the sharply different interpretations of *must* and *may* in (27) and (28) and the ambiguity of (29):

(27)   a. He <u>must</u> have been delayed.   (epistemic)
        b. He <u>may</u> have been delayed.   (epistemic)
(28)   a. You <u>must</u> pull your socks up.   (deontic)
        b. You <u>may</u> stay if you wish.   (deontic)
(29)   a. You <u>must</u> be very tactful.   (ambiguous)
        b. He <u>may</u> sleep downstairs   (ambiguous)

The ambiguity in (29) is very clear, with (29)a interpretable as either "I am forced to conclude (from the evidence) that you are very tactful" (epistemic) or "Be very tactful" (deontic), and (29)b as either "Perhaps he sleeps downstairs" (epistemic) or "He can sleep downstairs" (deontic). Strictly speaking, (28)a and b are ambiguous too, but the interpretations that we have ignored here are unlikely and need fairly elaborate contextualisation.

Prototypically, epistemic modality concerns the speaker's attitude to the factuality of past or present time situations while deontic modality concerns the speaker's attitude to the actualisation of future situations.

'**Epistemic**' is derived from the Greek for "knowledge": this kind of modality involves qualifications concerning the speaker's knowledge. The unmodalised *He has been delayed* presents the truth of the proposition as something I know, whereas (27)a presents it as something I arrive at by inference and in (27)b I merely put it forward as a possibility.

'**Deontic**' is derived from the Greek for "binding", so that here it is a matter of imposing obligation or prohibition, granting permission, and the like. In (28)a, for example, I am telling you to pull your socks up and in (28)b I give you permission to stay. The person, authority, convention, or whatever from whom the obligation, etc., is understood to emanate we refer to as the deontic source.

There are numerous expressions that are used both deontically and epistemically, and the same phenomenon is found in many other languages too. In general it is plausible to regard the deontic uses as more basic, with the epistemic ones arising by extension to the domain of reasoning of concepts primarily applicable in the domain of human interaction, such as compelling and permitting.

b) Dynamic Modality

The clearest cases of dynamic modality are concerned with properties and dispositions of persons, etc., referred to in the clause, especially by the subject NP. Again, the category can be justified by the existence of very clear cases of ambiguity:

(30)   a. She <u>can</u> stay as long as she likes.(deontic)
       b. She <u>can</u> easily beat everyone else in the club.(dynamic)
       c. She <u>can</u> speak French.(ambiguous)

Example (30)a gives (or reports) permission, while (30)b is concerned with her ability, and (30)c can be interpreted in either way, deontically as authorising her to speak French or dynamically as reporting her ability to do so.

The boundary between dynamic and deontic modality is, however, somewhat fuzzy.

Examples like *The most we can expect is a slight cut in the sales-tax* do not belong clearly with either (30)a or (30)b. We put them in the dynamic category on the grounds that no person or institution is identifiable as a deontic source - they might be glossed with "permissible", but not with "permission" (e.g. "the most it is permissible to expect", but not "the most we have permission to expect").

Dynamic ability is less central to modality than deontic permission in that it does not involve the speaker's attitude to the factuality or actualisation of the situation. It does not apply as generally to the modal auxiliaries as do deontic and epistemic modality, and the clear ambiguities illustrated above for *can* are not found with the other auxiliaries.

9.4.3   Degree of Modality and Modal Harmony

Degree of modality has to do with the extent to which there is a clearly identifiable and separable element of modal meaning.

a) Contrast between Unmodalised and Modalised Clauses

The difference between high and low degree modality is most easily seen by comparing pairs of clauses where one member is unmodalised, the other modalised:

UNMODALISED	HIGH DEGREE MODALITY
(31) a. They know her.	b. They <u>may</u> know her.
(32) a. Your passport is in the drawer.	b. Your passport <u>should</u> be in the drawer.
(33) a. The letter arrived yesterday.	b. The letter <u>will</u> have arrived yesterday.

UNMODALISED	LOW DEGREE MODALITY
(35) a. Strange as it seems, I believe you.	b. Strange as it <u>may</u> seem, I believe you.
(36) a. It's odd that he is so late.	b. It's odd that he <u>should</u> be so late.
(37) a. She is one year old tomorrow.	b. She <u>will</u> be one year old tomorrow.

In (31) to (33) the (b) examples differ very sharply and obviously in meaning from their unmodalised counterparts: the introduction of a modal auxiliary into the structure therefore adds a high degree of modal meaning. In (35) to (37), on the other hand, it is difficult to detect any meaning difference at all between the (a) and (b) examples: here, then, we have a low degree of modality. Degree, in this sense, is quite a different matter from strength. Our examples cover the scale of strength from weak *may* through medium *should* to strong *will* - but low degree modality is most often found at the upper end of the scale of strength, especially with *will* and, in the first person, *shall*.

b) Modal Harmony

The low degree of modality in (35)-(37)b can be attributed to the fact that it repeats, or is in harmony with, the modality expressed in the larger construction. *Strange as it seems/may seem* functions as a concessive adjunct: the meaning of 'strange as it seems' is "although it seems strange". *May* can be used concessively on its own (as in *It may be expensive, but it's worth every penny*), but in (35)b it is reinforcing, not adding, concessive meaning. Compare, similarly, the optional use of *may* in the exhaustive conditional construction, *I'm going to appoint her whatever you say/may say*. Something comparable to modal harmony can be seen in (36)b where the optional use of *should* is dependent on the presence of an emotive word such as odd, surprising, remarkable in the matrix clause.

The most common and central cases of modal harmony are found with verb-adverb combinations as in:

(38)   The meeting <u>must</u> <u>surely</u> be over by now.   (strong)

(39)   The meeting <u>should</u> <u>probably</u> be over by now.   (medium)

(40)   The meeting <u>may</u> <u>possibly</u> be over by now.   (weak)

The verb and adverb are of the same strength and combine to express a single feature of modal meaning rather than two independent ones. They are very different from examples like It may surely have been an accident, where may (weak) and surely (strong) express independent modal meanings. The meaning of this non-harmonic combination is "Surely it is possible that it was an accident", with possible inside the scope of *surely*.

We will examine what these modal auxiliaries (or 'modals') do to the meaning of the sentence (or clause) and how they can be translated into Dutch. In doing so, we will proceed as follows:

1   We will adopt a set of **BASIC MEANINGS** (IN CAPITALS) and offer near-equivalent **Dutch translations**. Thus, **CAN** carries ABILITY, PERMISSION, POSSIBILITY and is basically translated as *kunnen*.

2   At the same time, **pragmatic meanings** will be considered. The problem with pragmatic meanings, such as "request", is that they involve rather complex "speech acts" which cannot be pinned down on the BASIC MEANINGS of modals alone. "Request" in *Can you do this for me*?, for example, combines the BASIC MEANING of ABILITY with Questioning, which means that it **requires a specific situation**.

But there is more to it. The same "request" can be realized **in many alternative ways**, such as: *Give me a hand, Please,* etc. Besides, the very utterance *Can you do this for me*? itself can have **many different pragmatic meanings in different situations**, ranging from *That would be nice of you* to *Make it snappy*!, or *I don't accept 'no' for an answer*.

Consequently, it is impossible to list **all** these "pragmatic situations" including **all** the possible ways of expressing modality accordingly. Hence our decision to start off with a traditional formal description of the modal auxiliaries, which will be expanded with "alternatives" and "pragmatic meanings ".

3   For all these reasons, alternative **non-modal and even non-verbal** equivalents will also be referred to.

4   Furthermore, we will constantly underpin our formal approach by referring to three sets of important notions:
        *   TIME (PAST versus NON-PAST) and TENSE
        *   ASSERTIVE (POS) versus NON-ASSERTIVE (NEG and Q)
        *   STATE versus EVENT

GENERAL OUTLINE

A. Form

B. Use

BASIC MEANING 1

1.1   NON-PAST (TIME)

THE   PRESENT-TENSE FORM
- POS, NEG, Q (if the distinction is relevant)
- Specific Expressions of the FUTURE (if relevant)
- 'Pragmatic Meanings' of the MODAL under discussion

THE   PAST-TENSE FORM
                (including the reported present tense)

1.2   PAST (TIME)

THE PAST-TENSE FORM
- for PAST as a STATE (if relevant)
- for PAST as an EVENT

1.3   PERFECT FORMS
- for PAST as a STATE (if relevant)
- for PAST as an EVENT

1.4   ALTERNATIVES

BASIC MEANING 2
…etc.

10.1 CAN / COULD

A. Form

can   could

cannot - can't   could not - couldn't

How can I help?

B. Use

	CAN	MAY
1	ABILITY	///
2	**General** PERMISSION	**Speaker's** PERMISSION
3	(**Theoretical**) POSSIBILITY	**Factual** POSSIBILITY

10.1.1. ABILITY

10.1.1.1 NON-PAST

A. CAN (*kunnen*)

1) POS, NEG

(1)   Alice <u>can</u> read Russian.

cf.   Alice <u>kan</u> Russisch lezen.

CAN for ABILITY usually requires an **animate subject**. PASSIVIZATION turns ABILITY into POSSIBILITY, as in (2')

(2)   Children <u>cannot</u> play this game. (ABIL)

(2')   This game <u>cannot</u> be played by children. (POSS)

cf.   Dit spel kan niet door kinderen worden gespeeld.

(3)   You never <u>can</u> tell. (= idiom)

cf.   Zo zie je maar. Je kunt het nooit (zeker) weten ...

2) FUTURE

Reference to the future is made explicit by using the semi-auxiliary **WILL BE ABLE TO** (*in staat zijn te*):

(4)   I <u>will not be able to</u> attend your lecture tomorrow.

cf.   Ik <u>zal</u> morgen niet naar uw college <u>kunnen</u> komen.

B. COULD (*zouden kunnen*)

1) Remote ability. This COULD also conveys NON-PAST TIME and differs from CAN in that it grants ABILITY a more <u>remote character</u>. It is a fairly general property of past-tense forms that are complementary to present-tense forms. The same is true of Dutch.

(5)   Sorry, I <u>couldn't</u> (possibly) tell you.

cf.   Sorry, dat <u>zou</u> ik (<u>on</u>mogelijk) <u>kunnen</u> zeggen.

In other words, ABILITY is more HYPOTHETICAL, as in (6):

(6)   <u>Could</u> you run the business yourself? (i.e. if this was/were necessary)

cf.   <u>Zou</u> u (desnoods) zelf het bedrijf <u>kunnen</u> leiden?

2) A Case of Pragmatic Meaning: Polite Request

(7)   <u>Could</u> you show me the way?

cf.   <u>Zou</u> u me de weg <u>kunnen</u> tonen?

COULD you is generally felt to be <more polite> than the past tense modal *WOULD you*. The reason is subtle: *COULD you* asks about the hearer's ABIL to do something, offering him the opportunity to reply: *Sorry, I CANNOT do it* (= I'm unable to). *WOULD you* asks for his WILLINGNESS, where NO means a refusal.

3) COULD = reported CAN

(8)   He said he <u>could</u> read Russian. Ask him tonight.

cf.   Hij zei dat hij Russisch <u>kon</u> lezen. Vraag het hem vanavond eens.

10.1.1.2 PAST

1) Past ABILITY as a **STATE: COULD**

(9)   He <u>could</u> swim very well at the age of six.

cf.   Op zesjarige leeftijd <u>kon</u> hij uitstekend zwemmen.

It would be less usual, though possible, to use WAS ABLE TO here,

2) Past ABILITY as an **EVENT**: only **WAS ABLE TO / MANAGED TO**

(10)   My father had a car accident last year. He drove into the lake. Fortunately he
        is an excellent swimmer, and <u>was able to</u> swim ashore. (No COULD here!!)

cf.   Gelukkig is hij een uitstekend zwemmer en <u>kon</u> hij naar de oever zwemmen /
        <u>slaagde</u> hij <u>erin</u> naar de oever te zwemmen.

TWO EXCEPTIONS

a. NEG: allows both **COULD not** and **WAS not ABLE TO**:

(11)   In spite of the fact that he was an excellent swimmer he <u>could not / was not</u>
        <u>able to</u> reach the shore.

cf.   ... <u>kon</u> hij de oever <u>niet</u> bereiken.

        … <u>was</u> hij <u>niet in staat</u> de oever te bereiken.

b. VERBS of PERCEIVING (like *hear*, *see*, etc.): both forms are acceptable again:

(12)   He <u>could / was able to</u> HEAR every word of our conversation.

cf.   Hij <u>kon</u> alles horen wat we zeiden,

cf.   Hij <u>was in staat</u> alles te horen wat we zeiden.

Note:

Dutch learners of EFL tend to make errors in cases like (10), particularly when the
PASTNESS of the ABILITY as an EVENT is not stated explicitly by means of PAST
TIME markers, but has to be inferred from the DISCOURSE, as in (13)-(14):

(13)   I ran fast and *was able to* catch the bus.   vs

(13')   I ran fast but I <u>was unable to / couldn't</u> catch the bus,

(14)   The only advantage was that I <u>managed to</u> finish reading my detective story.

(15)   I was plenty scared. In the state she was in she <u>could</u> actually kill.

cf.   Ik was echt bang. In zo'n toestand <u>kon</u> ze wel iemand vermoorden.

Reading my detective story isolates (14) as an EVENT. Unlike (14), sample (15) is the description of a PAST STATE. Incidentally, the key word itself occurs in the discourse.

10.1.1.3 PERFECT FORMS

1) Past ABILITY as a **STATE**: **COULD HAVE**

ABILITY as a STATE in itself does not imply that a particular action was actually undertaken. Neither does the combination of PAST ABILITY as a STATE with a PERFECT INFINITIVE. We have to rely on the discourse to find out whether there was PERFORMANCE or not.

(16)   They <u>could have</u> stopped the train by sitting on the tracks, but they didn't.
         (= no performance)

cf.   Ze <u>hadden</u> de trein tegen <u>kunnen</u> houden door op de sporen te gaan zitten, maar dat hebben ze niet gedaan.

(17)   With the information we had, we actually <u>could have</u> calculated this.

cf.   Met de gegevens waarover we beschikten, hadden we dat feitelijk kunnen berekenen.

2) Past ABILITY as an **EVENT**: **HAD BEEN ABLE TO**

(18)   He <u>was able to</u> leave the country.

cf.   Hij <u>kon</u> het land verlaten.
         is turned into =>

(18')   He <u>had been able to</u> leave the country, he said, because he had a valid passport.

cf.   Hij <u>had</u> het land <u>kunnen</u> verlaten, zei hij, omdat ...

(19)   John <u>had been able to </u>answer three questions before that.

cf.   John <u>had</u> voordien al op drie vragen <u>kunnen</u> antwoorden.

(20)   You <u>are</u> better <u>able to</u> do it than I am / than me <colloq.>.

cf.   Je <u>kunt</u> dat beter dan ik. (lit. *in staat zijn te*)

(21)   Show your teacher what you *are capable* of doing.

cf.   Toon je leraar wat je <u>kunt</u>, (lit. *bekwaam zijn te*)

(22)   I <u>managed to</u> finish the job in one hour.

cf.   Ik <u>slaagde erin</u> die klus in een uur te klaren.

(23)   He <u>knows how to</u> cook!

cf.   Hij kan een aardig potje koken.

(24)   I <u>fail to</u> see how anyone can set out to maim or kill.

cf.   Het <u>ontgaat</u> me gewoon hoe iemand kan gaan verminken of doden.

cf.   Ik <u>zie niet in</u> hoe iemand ...

10.1.2   General PERMISSION

10.1.2.1 NON-PAST

A) CAN (*kunnen*)

1) Strictly speaking, *can* implies 'have PERMISSION' whereas *may* is SPEAKER/HEARER'S PERMISSION, G, LEECH, however, suggests that "**can** is more widely used as an auxiliary of PERMISSION than ***may*** in colloquial English", *May* is the <more respectable> form, which makes sense when taking into account that the speaker/hearer is usually in authority and 'grants' PERMISSION. **Spoken** English will often use CAN/COULD even in the sense of speaker/hearer's PERMISSION.

(25)   We <u>can</u> park our car here, (= we have PERM)

cf.   We <u>kunnen</u> hier parkeren.

(26)   <u>Can</u> I park here, sir? (I am a stranger in town.)

cf.   <u>Kan</u> ik hier parkeren, mijnheer?

Q (26) would be an informative Q, meaning "Do you think parking is PERMITTED in this area?" It is also used informally instead of ' 'May I park here?'', however, in which case the hearer's PERMISSION is clearly involved. A typical answer is: "I'm afraid you can't".

2) Pragmatic Meaning: Suggestion

The BASIC MEANING of PERMISSION can shade off into that of suggestion, as in:

(27)   You can read these two chapters before tomorrow (if you like).
cf.   Je kunt vóór morgen die twee hoofdstukken lezen (als je wilt),

B) COULD (*zouden kunnen (mogen), konden*)

1) Again the past-tense form does not convey PAST TIME, but is a <**tentative**>, or <**more remote**> variant of CAN, or a reported CAN.

(28)   Could I borrow this book please?
cf.   Zou ik dit boek kunnen lenen?
(29)   Could I ask you a question?
cf.   Zou ik u iets mogen vragen?

2) Pragmatic Meanings Compared

COULD = a <polite> request for PERM

(30)   Could I use the phone, please? <more formal> than (30')
cf.   Zou ik hier even kunnen bellen, a.u.b.?
(30')   Can I use the phone (please)? <informal>
cf.   Kan ik hier even bellen (a.u.b.)?

It is hard to tell whether there is a one-to-one equivalence with the Dutch translations at all.

However, as soon as the English DISCOURSE conveys the impression that the addressee is in charge (e.g. it's *your* telephone), the <polite> speaker is likely to select <formal> MAY to indicate that he is asking *you*, *the addressee*, for PERMISSION.

<Polite> speakers of English will therefore interpret the use of CAN here as an inquiry whether strangers can use the telephone, as if it were a public telephone, i.e. as a Q about **general** PERMISSION.

Compare with (30")

(30")   <u>May</u> I use your telephone, please? <formal>
cf.   <u>Mag</u> ik even telefoneren, a.u.b.? (= Mag ik **van u**?)

The Dutch (30") version also sounds more <polite> than (30) and (30'). But there is even a Dutch version (30''') "zou ik mogen". It sounds <more polite> than the Dutch (30") version. The literal English equivalent (MIGHT), however, is <very formal> and <rare>. If it does occur at all, it requires conditional undertones in the DISCOURSE. Therefore, foreign students of English may want to disregard (30" ') altogether.

(30"')   In that case, sir, <u>might</u> I use your telephone?
cf.   <u>Zou</u> ik in dat geval even <u>mogen</u> telefoneren, a.u.b.?

3) COULD = reported **CAN**

(31)   - Why is your car in this private drive?
           - Well, the owner said we <u>could / can</u> always park here.
cf.   - Wel, de eigenaar zei dat we hier altijd <u>konden / kunnen</u> parkeren.

Either **could** or **can** is acceptable in (31) . Since we are PERMITTED to park there at the time of speaking, COULD is also NON-PAST, and owes its past-tense form to the 'pastness' of the main (or higher, dominating) verb SAID. This phenomenon is called *'Sequence of the Tenses´* or SOT for short. COULD is a 'reported' CAN.

FUTURE

For explicit reference to the FUTURE it is possible to use
WILL + BE ALLOWED/PERMITTED TO

(32)   You <u>will be allowed to</u> visit St Paul's later this week.
cf.   Je <u>zult</u> later op de week St Paul's <u>mogen</u> bezoeken.

1) Past PERMISSION as a **STATE**: **COULD** (*konden*)

(33)   When I worked in Brussels, I never had any problems with traffic jams, because I <u>could</u> park in my friend's garage and continue by underground.

cf.   ... omdat ik in de garage van mijn vriend <u>kon</u> parkeren ...

2) Past PERMISSION as an **EVENT**: **WERE ALLOWED/PERMITTED TO** (*konden, mochten*)

(34)   Last Friday we couldn't get rid of our car in Brussels. Fortunately, we <u>were allowed to</u> park on the pavement.

cf.   ... Gelukkig <u>mochten</u> we op het trottoir parkeren.

In (33) the subject has permanent PERMISSION (= STATE), whereas in (34) the subject was given PERMISSION on that occasion (= EVENT), e.g. by a police constable on duty. Sample (34) carries no ambiguity about PERMISSION, but COULD for PERMISSION in (33) is less 'protected' against interference from another BASIC MEANING like THEORETICAL POSSIBILITY, e.g. '... because it **was possible** for me to park in my friend's garage'. This is no surprise, since they have identical surface forms. Hence the importance of the **discourse**.

A few more examples:

(35)   His wife <u>was</u> already <u>allowed</u> to leave hospital after a week.

cf.   Zijn vrouw <u>mocht</u> na één week al het ziekenhuis verlaten.

(36)   Friends <u>could</u> always count on him.

cf.   De vrienden <u>konden/mochten</u> altijd op hem rekenen.

Again, in (38) it is not all that obvious whether the friends 'had standing PERMISSION´ to rely on him, or that there was a 'POSSIBILITY´ of this being so (STATE). This is where BASIC MEANINGS overlap and where only the discourse can help out.

10.1.2.3 PERFECT FORMS

1) Past PERMISSION as a STATE: COULD HAVE (hadden kunnen)

(37)   We <u>could have</u> parked there any time. (= we had been given standing PERM)

cf.   We <u>hadden</u> daar op elk ogenblik <u>kunnen</u> parkeren.

2) Past PERMISSION as an EVENT: HAD BEEN ALLOWED/PERMITTED TO (hadden mogen)

(38)   There was no reason for him to worry about his car, since he <u>had been allowed to</u> park it on the pavement. (= specific PERM granted by a PC on duty)

cf.   ... daar hij hem toch op het trottoir <u>had mogen</u> parkeren.

10.1.2.4 ALTERNATIVES

(39)   <u>Is it all right</u> if we smoke in here? <informal>

cf.   <u>Stoort het</u> als we hier roken?

(40)   Are we <u>permitted/allowed</u> to smoke in here? <formal>

cf.   <u>Hebben</u> we de <u>toestemming</u> hier te roken?

(41)   Is smoking <u>permitted/allowed</u> in here?

cf.   Is het <u>toegestaan</u> hier te roken?

(42)   They <u>let</u> him do what he wants.

cf.   Ze <u>laten</u> hem doen wat hij wil.

(43)   <u>Would you mind</u>   if I opened the window?

                    me/my opening the window?

cf.   <u>Vindt</u> u het <u>goed / (niet) erg</u> dat ik het raam open?

(44)   <u>Would you object</u>   if I took a copy of your article?

                    to my having ...

cf.   <u>Enig bezwaar</u> dat ik een exemplaar van uw artikel neem?

10.1.3. (Theoretical) POSSIBILITY

"The use of CAN is not particularly frequent in POS statements, where it is in competition with MAY; but it is common in NEG and Q clauses, CAN (for POSS) can be roughly paraphrased by the use of the adverb SOMETIMES". (G. LEECH)

10.1.3.1 NON-PAST

A) CAN (*kunnen*)

1) POS

(45)   The bridge <u>can</u> be blocked (very easily).

cf.   De brug <u>kan</u> (gemakkelijk) worden versperd.

 ALTERNATIVES

= <u>It is possible for</u> the bridge **to** be blocked.

= <u>It is possible</u> **to** block the bridge.

=> <u>Sometimes</u> the bridge is blocked by heavy traffic.

(45) is a case of **theoretical POSSIBILITY**.

Compare with MAY for **factual POSSIBILITY** in (46):

(46)   The bridge <u>may</u> be blocked (now).

cf.   De brug <u>kan</u> (nu) versperd zijn,

ALTERNATIVES

= <u>It is possible</u> **that** the bridge is blocked (now).

=> <u>Perhaps/Maybe</u> the bridge is blocked right now.

This is a case of factual POSSIBILITY existing at the moment of speaking; there are facts (e.g. a traffic jam) indicating this POSSIBILITY right now.

Compare POSSIBILITY in (47)-(48). Translate both, using a **Dutch adverb** each time:

(47)   Highlanders <u>can</u> be very tall. I have seen some.

cf.   Highlanders kunnen <u>soms</u> erg groot zijn. Ik heb er al sommige gezien.

(48)   Highlanders <u>may</u> be very tall. I don't know.

cf.   Highlanders zijn <u>misschien</u> erg groot. Ik zou het niet weten.

A Note on the Scope of NEGATION:

Knowing which part of the clause is negated is very important. Check (45)-(46) again to find that they both consist of:

| a MODAL OPERATOR | + | a PROPOSITION |
| [it is POSSIBLE] | | [THE ROAD BE BLOCKED] |

Either the OPERATOR can be negated, as in (45neg):

(45neg)	It is **NOT** POSSIBLE	/	for the road to be blocked.
	It is **NOT** POSSIBLE	/	to block the road.
= >	The road can**NOT**	/	be blocked.
cf.	De weg kan **NIET**	/	versperd worden/zijn.

... or the PROPOSITION can be negated, as in (46neg):

(46neg)	It is POSSIBLE	/	that the road is **NOT** blocked.
=>	The road <u>may</u>	/	**NOT** be blocked.
cf.	De weg <u>kan</u> (ook)	/	**NIET** versperd zijn.
	De weg is misschien	/	**NIET** versperd.

NEGating the MODAL OPERATOR is called *EXTERNAL NEG* (45neg). NEGating the PROPOSITION is called *INTERNAL NEG* (46neg).

2) QUESTIONS

In Q, the difference between theoretical and factual POSSIBILITY is irrelevant. CAN is used for **factual** POSSIBILITY as well:

(49)   <u>Can</u> it be true?   (vs It <u>may</u> be true.)

cf.   <u>Kan</u> het waar zijn?

3) Pragmatic Meanings with CAN for POSSIBILITY: characteristic behaviour

(50)   Deborah <u>can</u> be very sweet.

cf.   Ze <u>kan</u> heel lief zijn.

B) COULD (*zouden kunnen, konden*)

1) NON-PAST POSSIBILITY is more HYPOTHETICAL with COULD, hence <tentative>, (evasive), etc. Again the difference between theoretical and factual POSSIBILITY is irrelevant, which means that COULD is used for **factual** POSSIBILITY as well:

(51)   It <u>could</u> be true.   (vs It <u>may</u> be true.)

cf.   Het <u>zou</u> waar <u>kunnen</u> zijn.   (vs Het <u>kan</u> waar zijn.)

As a result some sentences are ambiguous:

(52)   The bridge <u>could</u> be blocked.

cf.   De brug <u>zou</u> (gemakkelijk) versperd <u>kunnen</u> worden.   (theoretical)

cf.   De brug <u>zou</u> (nu) versperd <u>kunnen</u> zijn.   (factual)

2) Pragmatic Meanings: <Tentative> POSSIBILITY as a <polite> Request

(53)   <u>Could</u> the right honourable gentleman be asked to reconsider his views?

cf.   <u>Zou</u> het achtbare lid kunnen worden gevraagd zijn mening te herzien?

Depending on the discourse the above Request could sound <very formal + polite> or <ironic>.

(54)   <u>Could</u> this car be repaired now, please?

cf.   <u>Zou</u> deze auto nu hersteld kunnen worden, a.u.b.?

This type of Request occurs very frequently and is similar to that related to the BASIC MEANING of ABIL, as in the active version of (54) :

(54')   <u>Could</u> you repair this car now, please?

3) COULD = reported **CAN**

(55)　　Who said this house <u>could</u> be pulled down in one day?

cf.　　Wie zei daar dat dit huis op één dag <u>kon</u> worden afgebroken?

This PAST form occurs as a result of SOT, the Sequence of Tenses.

ALTERNATIVES

See MAY 2, NON-PAST, Alternatives

10.1.3.2 PAST

COULD (*konden*)

(56)　　In those days voyages <u>could</u> be dangerous.

cf.　　In die tijd <u>konden</u> zeereizen gevaarlijk zijn.

"The expression of PAST POSSIBILITY by means of COULD is rather unusual" (G. LEECH), owing to the meaning of POSSIBILITY itself, which basically carries NON-PASTness.

10.1.3.3 PERFECT FORMS

1) COULD HAVE (*hadden kunnen, zouden hebben kunnen*)

(57)　　All right, it <u>could have</u> been mentioned, but no one thought of it.
　　　　(It was THEORETICALLY POSSIBLE for it to be mentioned).

cf.　　Inderdaad, het <u>had</u> vermeld <u>kunnen</u> worden, maar niemand heeft eraan gedacht.

2) COULD HAVE for POSSIBILITY overlaps with **MIGHT HAVE**:

(58)　　He <u>could/might</u> at least <u>have</u> disregarded a number of unimportant details! It's not nice of him!

cf.   Hij <u>had</u> een paar onbelangrijke details door de vingers <u>kunnen</u> zien!

            Da's niet aardig van 'm!

cf.   Hij zou een paar onbelangrijke details door de vingers <u>hebben kunnen</u> zien!

The reason for this blending of MIGHT HAVE and COULD HAVE for PAST POSSIBILITY seems to be that the 'goings-on' pertain to a speculative, PAST 'hypothetical' world of the speaker's, where modality is blurred.

10.2   MAY / MIGHT

A. Form

may	might
may not - mayn't (rare!)	might not - mightn't
May I come in now?	

B. Use

10.2.1   There is no MAY for ABILITY

10.2.2   Speaker / Hearer's PERMISSION
10.2.2.1 NON-PAST

A) MAY (*mogen*)

1) As stated in section CAN 2, MAY is the more <respectable> and <formal> alternative to CAN. MAY implies that the **speaker** is <in authority> and grants the **hearer** PERMISSION. In Q sentences these roles are reversed, hence the term speaker/hearer's PERMISSION.

POS, Q

(1)   You <u>may</u> stay here as long as you want, of course.
cf.   U <u>mag</u> hier uiteraard zo lang blijven als u wilt.

The SPEAKER'S involvement when granting PERMISSION must not be taken too literally, of course. It is quite possible to extend 'speaker's PERMISSION' to formal statements, such as:

(2)   Residents <u>may</u> use the car park without a ticket.
cf.   De bewoners <u>mogen</u> het parkeerterrein zonder kaart gebruiken.

The speaker appears to be 'anonymous', but a person in authority, or a board of trustees, must have granted formal PERMISSION at one point in time, which is different from a 'general' PERMISSION with CAN at all times.

Asking for PERMISSION involves the hearer (or addressee), who is felt to be in authority to grant or refuse PERMISSION:

(3)   May I leave my telephone number?

cf.   Mag ik u mijn telefoonnummer geven?

Remember the discussion of <polite> request at CAN 2.

2) Pragmatic Meanings

< Polite > Request for PERM

(4)   <u>May</u> I ask you not to step on the flowers? <formal, polite>

cf.   <u>Mag</u> ik u vragen niet op de bloemen te trappen?

With a RISE on /flowers it sounds <polite> and <friendly>. With a FALL \ it would sound like an 'order'.

Invitation

(5)   <u>May</u> I invite you to dinner next Saturday? <formal, polite>

cf.   <u>Mag</u> ik u uitnodigen om zaterdag bij ons te dineren?

NEGATION

All depends on the scope of the negation: see the discussion at CAN 3 for POSS. Applying the same principle here means:

-       either the <modal operator> is NEGATED, as in (6) (EXTERNAL NEG)

(6)   You <u>may</u> <u>not</u> // smoke in a crowded room like this.

cf.   U <u>mag</u> (van mij) <u>niet</u> roken in zo'n overvolle zaal.

=> = NON-PERMISSION

NON-PERMISSION is the refusal to grant PERMISSION and is less forceful than PROHIBITION.

-     or the <proposition> itself is NEGATED, as in (7) (*INTERNAL* NEG)

(7)   You <u>must</u> // <u>not</u> smoke in here!

cf.   U <u>mag</u> hier (beslist) <u>niet</u> roken! (= Ik verbied het u)

=> = PROHIBITION

Consequently, PROHIBITION is an OBLIG **not to do** something. English NEGates the <proposition>, saying that you MUST <not smoke> (= are OBLIGed <not to smoke>). PROHIB sounds far more peremptory than NON-PERM.

B) MIGHT *(zouden mogen)*

This is 'rare' and had better be disregarded for PERMISSION by students of EFL (see the discussion of CAN 2, Pragmatic Meanings):

(8)   <u>Might</u> I interrupt you for a moment, sir? <very polite>

ALTERNATIVES (see also CAN 2)

There are vast numbers of them, many so-called 'DOWN-TONERS´, which are used to make less straightforward statements. As a result the utterances sound more <polite>.

POS

(9)   I <u>don't mind</u> your smoking. Go ahead.

cf.   Ik heb er geen bezwaar tegen dat u rookt. Ga uw gang.

(10)   <u>It's all right</u> with me! <informal>

cf.   Van mij mag het best!

cf.   Voor mij is het goed!

NEG

(11)   You are <u>not allowed/permitted</u> to smoke in here.

cf.   U mag hier niet roken.

(12)   <u>Would you mind not</u> smoking?

cf.   Zou u het erg vinden om niet te roken aub?

(13)   I'm afraid I can't allow you to smoke in here.   <polite>

cf.   Ik vrees dat ik u niet mag toestaan hier te roken.

(14)   I wonder if you would kindly stop smoking.   <very polite>

 cf.   Mag ik u vriendelijk verzoeken op te houden met roken?

(15)   Permit me to inform you that ...   <formal>

cf.   Mag ik u mededelen dat ...?

Note that NEG PERMISSION is sometimes put in Q form!

Q

(*16)   Is it all right if we smoke in here?   <informal>

 cf.   Geen bezwaar dat we een sigaret opsteken?   <less formal>

         Is het in orde dat/als we …?   <formal/more literal>

10.2.2.2 PAST

1) Past PERMISSION as a **STATE**: **COULD** (*konden, mochten*)

Owing to the deficiencies of MIGHT, English relies on COULD and some periphrastic
auxiliaries referred to above (see CAN 2: Past PERMISSION as a STATE).

(17) does not necessarily imply performance:

(17)   I could always park in my friend's garage.

cf.   Ik kon/mocht altijd …

2) Past PERMISSION as an **EVENT**: **WERE ALLOWED/PERMITTED TO** (*konden,
mochten*)

(18)   Fortunately, we were allowed to park on the pavement,

cf.   Gelukkig mochten we op het trottoir parkeren.

ALTERNATIVES (see CAN 2 as well)

(19)   They didn't <u>allow me/permit me</u> to … (see (9))

cf.   Ze <u>lieten</u> me niet ...

(20)   They <u>wouldn't</u> *let* me enter.

cf.   Ze wilden me niet binnen laten.

10.2.2.3 PERFECT FORMS

1) Past PERMISSION as a **STATE**: **COULD HAVE**

(*hadden kunnen/mogen* + infinitief, *konden hebben* + voltooid deelwoord)

2) Past PERMISSION as an **EVENT**: **HAD BEEN ALLOWED/PERMITTED TO**
(*hadden mogen*)

10.2.3   Factual POSSIBILITY

MAY 3 =   It is POSSIBLE **that** ...

                Perhaps / Maybe / Possibly ...

Compare with CAN 3 for theoretical POSSIBILITY.

10.2.3.1 NON-PAST

A) MAY (*kunnen*)

1) POS

(21)   The road <u>may</u> be blocked.

        <u>It is</u> **possible** that the road is blocked. (I saw an accident).

        <u>Perhaps/maybe/possibly</u> the road is blocked.

cf.   De weg <u>kan</u> versperd zijn.

        <u>Misschien</u> is de weg versperd.

There is a Factual POSSIBILITY that the road is blocked **right now**.

2) NEG, Q

If the <PROPOSITION> is to be NEGated, MAY NOT should be used:

(22)   It <u>may</u> // <u>not</u> be true.

(22')   <u>Maybe</u> it's <u>not</u> true.

cf.   Het is <u>misschien</u> // <u>niet</u> waar.

If MAY itself is to be negated or questioned, it should be replaced by CAN:

(23)   It simply <u>cannot</u> // be true.   (= IMPOSSIBILITY)

cf.   Dat <u>kan</u> gewoon <u>niet</u>.

(23')   It <u>cannot</u> **possibly** // be true.

cf.   Het <u>kan</u> on**mogelijk** waar zijn.

(24)   **Can** it be true?

B) MIGHT (*zouden kunnen, konden*)

1) POS

MIGHT describes <more remote) POSS, but does NOT carry PAST-TIME reference.

(25)   The road <u>might</u> be blocked tonight.

cf.   De weg <u>zou</u> vanavond versperd <u>kunnen</u> zijn.

          De weg <u>kon</u> vanavond wel eens versperd zijn.

(see CAN 3 again)

2) NEG, Q

The same distinction should be made as in (22)-(24) above:

(26)   It <u>might</u> <u>not</u> be Helen.

cf.   Het <u>zou</u> (eventueel) Helen <u>NIET</u> kunnen zijn (maar iemand anders).

(27)   It <u>couldn't</u> be Helen. She is in Spain.

cf.   Het <u>zou</u> Helen (helemaal) <u>niet kunnen</u> zijn. Ze zit in Spanje.

(28)   <u>Could</u> it be Helen?

cf.   <u>Zou</u> het Helen <u>kunnen</u> zijn?

3) MIGHT = reported MAY

(29)   He said they <u>might</u> be late tomorrow.

cf.   Hij zei dat ze morgen <u>misschien</u> te laat <u>zouden</u> zijn.

C) Pragmatic Meanings

Request, Invitation, Suggestion, Rebuke

The same statement (30) may be called a 'request', an 'invitation' or a 'suggestion', depending on the context. Even the term 'rebuke' is conceivable.

(30)   You <u>may/might</u> <u>as well</u> tell everybody now.

cf.   U <u>kunt</u> het <u>net zo goed</u> aan iedereen vertellen.

Wish

(31)   <u>May</u> there never be war again!

cf.   <u>Moge</u> er nooit meer oorlog komen!   <formal Dutch>

cf.   <u>Mocht</u> het maar nooit meer oorlog worden!   <less formal>

Intention, Purpose, Result

(32)   Sit here, so that I <u>may</u> see your face.

         (a)   (b)

cf.   Ga hier zitten, zodat ik je gezicht <u>kan</u> zien.

cf.   … opdat ik uw gezicht <u>zou (kunnen)</u> zien»   <formal Dutch>

Concession

(33)   However frightened you <u>may</u> be at the exam, don't show it.

                              (a)   (b)

cf.   Hoe bang je op het examen ook <u>mag</u> zijn, laat het niet merken.

(34)   Sheila <u>may</u> be a good actress but <u>she</u> is a poor singer.

             (a)   (b)

cf.   Sheila is <u>misschien</u> (<u>wel</u>) een goede actrice, maar een povere zangeres.

Clearly, all these uses of MAY owe their differences in meaning to the DISCOURSE, e.g. (30), or to the syntactic structure of the sentence: (32b), for instance, is a clause of purpose/result while (33a) and (34a) express concession. In other words, they are all relatable to the BASIC MEANING of MAY for Factual POSSIBILITY, but owe their pragmatic 'overtones' to the discourse (cf. CoG for more examples).

D) ALTERNATIVES

ADJECTIVES

(35)   It is <u>possible/conceivable</u> … that he will be late.
 cf.   Het is best mogelijk dat hij te laat zal zijn.

ADVERBS

(36)   <u>Possibly/Maybe/Perhaps</u> the media are to blame for this.
cf.   <u>Mogelijk/Misschien/Wellicht</u> is het de schuld van de media.

NOUNS

(37)   There is a (bare) <u>possibility/chance</u>   that ...
                                                              of …ing …
cf.   De kans/mogelijkheid bestaat dat...

(38)   It's on the cards that …   <informal>
cf.   Het zit erin dat...

Q about POSSIBILITY

(39)   Are we <u>likely</u> to meet snakes?
cf.   Zit de kans erin dat...

(40)   <u>Do you think</u> it will rain?
cf.   Denk je dat het zal regenen?

10.2.3.2 PAST

see PAST of CAN 3: COULD

MIGHT (*konden*)

MIGHT is extremely rare and mostly 'triggered´ by a PAST verb saying or thinking in the main clause (cf. (29)):

(41)   We all knew that they <u>might</u> be late.
cf.   We wisten allemaal dat ze te laat <u>konden</u> zijn.
cf.   We wisten allemaal dat ze <u>misschien</u> te laat <u>zouden</u> komen,

10.2.3.3 PERFECT FORMS

1) MAY HAVE (*kunnen hebben + voltooid deelwoord*)

(42)   (- They should have been here two hours ago.)
        - They <u>may have</u> had an accident.
cf.   - Ze <u>kunnen</u> een ongeval <u>hebben</u> gehad.

At the moment of speaking there is still a FACTUAL POSSIBILITY that they actually (*have*) had an accident.

2) MIGHT HAVE   (*konden hebben + voltooid deelwoord*)
                       (*hadden kunnen + infinitief*)

(43)   He <u>might have</u> had an accident, but he is safe now.
cf.   Hij <u>kon</u> een ongeval <u>hebben</u> gehad, maar nu is hij in veiligheid.
cf.   Hij <u>had</u> een ongeval *kunnen* <u>hebben</u>, …

At the moment of speaking the FACTUAL POSSIBILITY is PAST and HYPOTHETICAL, hence IMPOSSIBLE.

In other contexts, however, MIGHT HAVE expresses 'a remote possibility of something having happened in the past':

(44)   (- What was that noise?)

       - It <u>might have</u> been Aunt Sally dropping her umbrella,

cf.   Misschien was het /Het zou tante Sally wel eens geweest kunnen zijn…

10.3   MUST

A. Form

must:	/mʌst/ =	strong form	
	/məst/ =	weak form	
must not - mustn't	/'mʌsnt/		

B. Use

	1. OBLIGATION	2. LOGICAL NECESSITY
MUST	INTERNAL OBLIGATION (= speaker's/hearer's obligation)	FACTUAL LOGICAL NECESSITY (= supported by FACTS)
HAVE TO/ HAVE GOT TO (see 9.4)	EXTERNAL OBLIGATION (= owing to circumstances)	THEORETICAL LOGICAL NECESSITY (= THEORETICALLY sure to be the case)

10.3.1   Speaker / Hearer's OBLIGATION
10.3.1.1 NON-PAST

Possibly the least currently used modal in that sense. It reflects the speaker/hearer's involvement in the OBLIGATION, unlike HAVE TO. MUST has come to sound rather peremptory today. Hence an increasing disuse, except perhaps in self-OBLIGATION by the speaker (CoG 326).

MUST (*moeten*)

<u>POS</u>

(1)   I <u>must</u> phone my parents tonight. (They'll be worrying about me.)

cf.   Ik <u>moet</u> (*absoluut*) eens naar huis bellen, (Mijn ouders zullen ongerust zijn).

It is not always clear that the speaker is obliging himself or others to behave or act in a given way. This requires 'authority' and in (2) the SPEAKER does not have any authority over the Government. In a sense he adopts someone else's. Note the occurrence of **adverbs** expressing the idea of 'urgency' in Dutch.

(2)   The Government <u>must</u> act now.

cf.   De regering <u>moet</u> *dringend* iets ondernemen.

With a second person subject, MUST sounds like a command in English in which case it is similar to an imperative:

(3)   You <u>must</u> be careful.

(3')   Be careful.

cf.   Je <u>moet</u> opletten.

Depending on the context, the idea of 'command' will tend to shade off into that of 'strong advice':

(4)   You <u>must</u> read *1984.*

(4')   *1984* is a must.   <informal>

<u>Q about OBLIG:</u>

(a) MUST I/you? (*Moet ik/jij*?)

Asking questions about OBLIG implies that you expect an answer from a HEARER, who is granted the 'authority' to tell you what to do. There seem to be few instances where this is actually the case:

(5)   <u>Must</u> I do all these exercises?   <BrE>

In one particular *pragmatic sense* MUST conveys the SPK's irony, and sounds like a <rebuke> :

(6)   <u>Must</u> you make that dreadful noise?

cf.   <u>Moet</u> je nu echt zo'n vreselijk lawaai maken?

(b) NEED I? <esp. BrE> (*hoef ik (wel)?)*

(7)   <u>Need</u> I answer all these letters?

    (= Do you really want me to answer all these letters?)

cf.   <u>Hoef</u> ik (wel) op al die brieven te antwoorden?

NEED is mainly restricted to BrE and suggests that the addressee is expected to agree to the speaker's non-assertive suggestion:

(7')   No, you <u>needn't</u> (as far as I am concerned).

cf.   Nee, je <u>hoeft niet</u> (wat mij betreft).

(c) DO I HAVE TO? / HAVE I GOT TO? (*Moet ik?*)

At this point the speaker is asking about the external circumstances that have forced an EXTERNAL OBLIG on him:

(8)   <u>Do I have to</u> write all the letters myself?

    (= Do you think there are compelling circumstances?)

cf.   Moet ik zelf al die brieven schrijven (denk je)?

(d) DO I NEED TO? (*Is het nodig dat ik ...* ?)

(9)   <u>Do I need to</u> type all the letters?

    (= Do you think it is necessary that all the letters are typed?)

cf.   <u>Is het nodig dat</u> ik al die brieven tik?

Here the emphasis is shifted to NECESSITY. But the distinction between (c) and (d) is hard to make, HAVE TO is by far more frequent than any other form.

For further translation and discussion:

(10)   <u>Have</u> you <u>got to</u> go?   <BrE colloquial>

cf.   Moet je er vandoor?

(11)   <u>Do</u> you <u>have to</u> go now?   <AmE = frequent, also BrE>

cf.   Moet je nu al weg?

(12)   <u>Do</u> you <u>have to</u> work on Saturdays?   <AmE & BrE, habitual EXT OBLIG>

cf.   Moet je werken op zaterdag?

(13)   <u>Must</u> you leave right now? We were just going to show the slides.

         (= Why do you decide to leave us right now?)

cf.   Moet je nu echt weg? We wilden net de dia's projecteren.

(14)   <u>Must</u> children then not obey their parents anymore?

cf.   <u>Moeten</u> de kinderen dan niet meer hun ouders gehoorzamen?

Sample (14) also has this **pragmatic sense** of <rebuke> since the speaker is not really asking a question.

<u>NEG</u>

Again (as in the case of MAY) the scope of NEG is important.

A) PROHIBITION   =   I OBLIGE you <NOT to act>

(a) MUST NOT (*niet mogen*)

(15)   You <u>mustn't</u> touch that parcel! It may be a time bomb.

cf.   Je <u>mag</u> dat pakje niet aanraken!

B) NON-OBLIGATION   =   I do <NOT OBLIGE you> to act

(b) NEEDN'T <esp. BrE> (*niet hoeven*)

(16)   (Lecturer to students) You <u>needn't</u> hand it in,

cf.   Jullie <u>hoeven</u> het <u>niet</u> in te leveren (wat mij betreft).

(c) DON'T HAVE TO / HAVEN'T GOT TO (*niet hoeven*)

This is far more frequently used, particularly in AmE.

(17)   We <u>don't have to</u> hand in our essay tomorrow.
cf.   We <u>hoeven</u> ons opstel niet morgen in te leveren.

d) DON'T NEED TO (*niet hoeven, niet nodig zijn*)

(18)   I <u>don't need</u> to write it down. I'll remember.
cf.   Ik hoef het niet … / <u>Het is niet nodig</u> dat ik het opschrijf...

 => Pragmatic Meanings:

<Ironical> Rebuke

(19)   <u>Must</u> you shout like that?
cf.   <u>Moet</u> je (nu) echt zo staan te gillen?

ALTERNATIVES

Speaker's OBLIGATION referring to the NON-PAST can also be expressed in the following ways:

- Command in the Imperative

(20)   <u>Don't be</u> a fool!
cf.   <u>Doe niet</u> dom!

- BE TO + INFINITIVE

This can convey a command given by the speaker or, more usually, by some official authority:

(21)   You <u>are to</u> stay here until I return.
cf.   Je <u>moet</u> hier blijven tot ik terug ben.

- BE REQUESTED TO (*verzocht worden, dienen te*)

- SHALL <more formal> (*zullen*)

(22)   Members <u>are requested to</u> / <u>shall</u> enter the names of their guests in the visitors's book.

cf.   De leden <u>worden verzocht</u> / <u>dienen</u> ... <u>te</u> …

Note:

Dutch DIENEN for MOETEN is only possible "als het betekent dat, of hoe iets hoort te zijn, of te geschieden, ingevolge een plicht, verplichting, voorschrift, logische of redelijke voorwaarde, een aanbeveling of betamelijkheid" (cf. Coursebook Dutch Grammar).

- WILL (*zullen*)

In military contexts this future WILL can "sometimes be used with the force of a severe command":

(23)   Officers will report for duty at 0600 hours.

cf.   De officieren <u>zullen</u> zich om 6 uur aanmelden. => <u>dienen</u> zich om 6 uur aan te melden.

10.3.1.2 PAST

Just as PAST Imperative is impossible, a PAST SPK'S OBLIG is not likely to occur either, since SPEAKER'S OBLIG always refers to some PRESENT/FUTURE Event. Hence there is no MUST for OBLIG in the PAST in English. If the SPK wants to refer to earlier (= PAST) obligations, he will refer to them as EXTERNAL OBLIGs, or as his own earlier INSTRUCTIONS...

<u>POS</u>

HAD TO (*moesten*) (see HAVE 4: PAST)

(24)   Mary, you <u>had to</u> be home at 2! Where have you been?

cf.   Mary, je <u>moest</u> om 2 uur thuis zijn! Waar kom je vandaan?

NEG

A) PROHIBITION (*mochten niet*)

WAS/MERE NOT TO + INF

(25)   Visitors <u>were not to</u> feed the animals.

cf.   De bezoekers <u>mochten</u> de dieren <u>niet</u> voeren.

This is obviously the BE TO for **orders** and **instructions**

B) NON-OBLIGATION (*hoefden niet*)

DID NOT HAVE TO + INF (see HAVE TO, see 9.4)
DID NOT NEED TO + INF (see NEED, see 9.5)

ALTERNATIVES

Since the SPK's involvement is blurred in PAST OBLIG, many lexical verbs will refer to PAST OBLIGs as Reported Commands.

(26)   He <u>told / ordered / commanded / instructed</u> them to put on their spacesuits.

cf.   Hij <u>beval</u> ze / <u>gaf</u> ze <u>het bevel / de opdracht</u> / <u>gebood</u> ze hun ruimtepak aan te trekken.

'Tell' and 'say' should not be confused in passives like:

(27)   Lizzie <u>was told</u> to be honest. (report of a **command**)

(27')   Lizzie <u>was said</u> to be honest. (report of a **statement**)

Translate the following sentences:

(28)   He <u>advised</u> me to read this book.

cf.   …

(29)   He <u>asked/begged</u> me to help him with his homework.

cf.   …

(30)   She didn't <u>allow</u> him to kiss her.

cf.   ...

(31)   They <u>compelled</u> him to answer their questions.

cf.   ...

(32)   Mary has <u>persuaded</u> me to resign.

cf.   ...

(33)   We were <u>invited</u> to attend the performance.

cf.   ...

(34)   They <u>recommended</u> us to stay at the hotel.

cf.   ...

Notice that reported Commands are put in the form of a to-infinitive clause.

10.3.1.3   *PERFECT FORMS*

WAS/WERE TO HAVE (*hadden moeten*)

(35)   We <u>were to have</u> arrived before midnight but the car broke down on the
         motorway.

cf.   We <u>hadden</u> voor middernacht <u>moeten</u> aankomen, maar ...

The prevailing idea is that of an unfulfilled plan or arrangement, which implies a weak
form of obligation.

10.3.2 Factual LOGICAL NECESSITY

(See also HAVE TO)

There are **facts** indicating that it is **logically necessary** to conclude that ... Some grammarians will call this 'SPK'S CERTAINTY' (CoG 288). It is close to PREDICTIVE WILL in this sense.

10.3.2.1 NON-PAST

MUST (*moeten*)

POS

(36)   There <u>must</u> be a mistake somewhere.
cf.   Er <u>moet</u> ergens een vergissing zijn.
cf.   Er is <u>blijkbaar</u> een vergissing.

Q, NEG

MUST is rarely Q-ed and not normally NEGated:

(37)   <u>Must</u> there be another reason for his behaviour?
cf.   <u>Moet</u> er **nu echt** een andere reden voor zijn gedrag worden gezocht?

NEGative logical NECESSITY based on facts is expressed by CANNOT (= IMPOSSIBILITY)!

(38)   There <u>cannot</u> be a mistake.
cf.   Dat <u>kan geen</u> vergissing zijn.

10.3.2.2 PAST

HAD TO (*moesten*)

(39)   (People realized) there <u>had to</u> be a mistake somewhere.
cf.   De mensen beseften dat er ergens een vergissing in het spel <u>moest</u> zijn. / Er <u>moest</u> ergens ...

10.3.2.3 PERFECT FORMS

MUST HAVE (*moeten hebben*)

It reflects the PRES logical conclusion concerning PAST facts.

(40)   Obviously, there <u>must have</u> been a mistake somewhere.

cf.   Er <u>moet</u> duidelijk iets fout <u>zijn</u> gegaan.

cf.   Het is duidelijk dat ergens een vergissing <u>moet zijn</u> begaan.

Note that MUST as in (40) is not necessarily related to definite PAST, unlike HAVE TO in (39).

ALTERNATIVES

BE BOUND TO + INF

(41)   <u>It is/was bound to</u> happen.

cf.   Het is/was onvermijdelijk.

BE BOUND TO + INF is a very convenient replacement for MUST, when the latter is ambiguous, i.e. when the distinction between OBLIG and LOG NEC is blurred. HAVE (GOT) TO in this sense is rare.

(42)   All police forces <u>are bound to</u> be on standby now.

cf.   Alle politiekorpsen kunnen niet anders dan paraat staan.

(42')   ALL police forces must be on standby now.
           (SPK OBLIG? LOG NEC?)

cf.   Alle politiekorpsen moeten nu (wel) paraat staan.

Note also that MUST cannot be modified by the ADVERB **'almost**':

(43)   *John **almost** must be at his office.

111

Again, the obvious alternative is:

(43')   John <u>is</u> **almost** <u>bound to</u> be in his office.

cf.   John <u>moet</u> **nagenoeg** <u>zeker</u> in zijn kantoor zijn,

CANNOT FAIL TO + INF (= a double negative)

(44)   She <u>cannot fail to</u> notice his indifference.

cf.   Ze <u>moet wel</u> / <u>kan niet anders dan</u> zijn onverschilligheid merken,

10.4   HAVE TO

Both MUST and HAVE TO have the same two basic meanings, viz. OBLIGATION and LOGICAL NECESSITY. However, in the OBLIGATION sense *must* commits the speaker (or hearer in questions) more than *have to*. When expressing a LOGICAL NECESSITY *must* suggests that this is supported by facts rather than by theoretical considerations.

These various uses are entered in the following survey, repeated from 10.3:

	OBLIGATION	LOGICAL NECESSITY
MUST (see 9.3)	INTERNAL OBLIGATION (= speaker's/hearer's obligation)	FACTUAL LOGICAL NECESSITY (= supported by FACTS)
HAVE TO/ HAVE GOT TO	EXTERNAL OBLGIATION (= owing to circumstances)	THEORETICAL LOGICAL NECESSITY (= THEORETICALLY sure to be the case)

Some examples:

OBLIG	Speaker's	(1)	You <u>must</u> stop speaking evil of me!
			(= <u>I</u> OBLIGE you to stop it.)
		cf.	Je moet ophouden met je kwaadsprekerij!
OBLIG	External	(2)	We <u>have (got) to</u> read *Lucky Jim*.
			(= EXTERNAL circumstances OBLIGE the subject
			(= we) to read *Lucky Jim*.)
		cf.	We moeten *Lucky Jim* lezen.
LOG NEC	Factual	(3)	He must be mad to sell his dog.
			(= It is LOGICALLY NECESSARY that he is mad
			to do a thing like that, and the FACTS support my
			conclusion: he DID sell it!)
		cf.	Hij moet gek zijn om zijn hond te verkopen.

LOG NEC	Theoretical	(4)	One has (got) to be mad to even consider selling one's dog.

(= THEORETICALLY speaking, madness would be a LOG NEC if anybody were to ...)

cf.   Men kan niet anders dan gek zijn om er zelfs maar aan TE DENKEN.

10.4.1   EXTERNAL OBLIGATION: HAVE (GOT) TO

The difference between MUST and HAVE TO rests on the fact that MUST involves the SPEAKER/HEARER's OBLIG, including SELF-OBLIG, whereas HAVE (GOT) TO refers to EXTERNAL OBLIG. Which of the two is more appropriate will largely depend on the discourse:

(5)   - Madam, I <u>MUST</u> see the doctor!

- Do you know what time it is?

- I'm sorry, but there has been an accident, and one person has been hurt very badly.

cf.   - Mevrouw, ik <u>MOET</u> de dokter spreken!

(6)   Foreign motorists <u>have to</u> be careful when driving in Britain for the first time.

cf.   Buitenlandse automobilisten <u>moeten</u> voorzichtig zijn als ze voor het eerst in Groot-Brittannië rijden.

In (5) the SPEAKER tries to OBLIGE the doctor's wife to act, whereas in (6) it is not the speaker, but EXTERNAL circumstances that impose an OBLIGATION on foreign drivers. No need to say that, for pragmatic reasons, DISCOURSES involving SPK's OBLIGATION (MUST) are increasingly less frequent than DISCOURSES implying EXTERNAL OBLIGATION (HAVE (GOT) TO).

There are two types of EXTERNAL OBLIGATION:
1. Specific
2. Habitual

10.4.1.1 SPECIFIC EXTERNAL OBLIGATION: HAVE (GOT) TO (= moeten)

NON-PAST		BrE	AmE
POS	(7) (7')	I <u>have to</u> go now. I'<u>ve got to</u> go now. (= spoken/colloquial)	I <u>have to</u> go now. I'<u>ve got to</u> go now. (= spoken/colloquial)
Q	(8) (8') (8'')	<u>Do</u> you <u>have to</u> go now? <u>Have</u> you <u>got to</u> go now? (= most common in coll. BrE) <u>Have</u> you <u>to</u> go now? (= formal usage only)	<u>Do</u> you <u>have to</u> go?
NEG	(9) (9') (9'')	I <u>don't have to</u> go. I <u>haven't got to</u> go. (= most common in coll. BrE) I <u>haven't to</u> go yet. (= formal usage only)	I <u>don't have to</u> go.

Note:

HAVE TO vs HAVE GOT TO

The main differences between HAVE TO and HAVE GOT TO are as follows:

a) *HAVE TO* is more formal; *HAVE GOT TO* belongs to the more colloquial style and generally appears only in spoken texts.

b) *HAVE GOT TO* has no non-finite forms. There is no **will have got to, *to have got to, *having got to*. Instead the forms of *HAVE TO* must be used.

c) *HAVE GOT TO* is much rarer in the past tenses.

PAST: HAD TO is practically the only form used today.

10.4.1.2 HABITUAL EXTERNAL OBLIGATION: HAVE TO (= moeten)

There seems to be no distinction between BrE and AmE here, in that both use DO for Q and NEG, including spoken, colloquial BrE.

(10)   <u>Do</u> you <u>have to</u> work on Saturdays? (= habitual)

cf.   Moet jij 's zaterdags werken?

Plural -s in *Saturdays* indicates that the EXTERN OBLIG is a habit.

Compare this instance with a similar Q about a specific Saturday in spoken colloquial BrE (10'):

(10')   <u>Have</u> you <u>got to</u> work *next* Saturday? (= specific)

cf.   <u>Moet</u> jij volgende zaterdag werken?

10.4.2 THEORETICAL LOGICAL NECESSITY: HAVE (GOT) TO
      (wel) MOETEN, niet anders KUNNEN NON-PAST

This use of HAVE (GOT) TO is far less frequent than the alternative with MUST:

(11)   You must be very tired.

cf.   Je moet erg vermoeid zijn.

MUST refers to FACTUAL LOG NEC, i.e. a logical deduction from FACTS that can be perceived by the speaker.

The HAVE TO alternative makes a THEORETICAL logical deduction, as e.g. in hypothetical statements like:

(12)   If you keep drinking so much, your liver <u>HAS / HAS GOT</u> to be affected
          eventually.   (more/less formal)

cf.   Als je zo blijft drinken, <u>MOET</u> je lever uiteindelijk wel aangetast worden.
          (... <u>KAN</u> het (gewoon) niet anders of ... / dan dat ...)

Note that HAVE \GOT TO carries nuclear stress. Very rarely is there a case where MUST and HAVE (GOT) TO can be distinguished as neatly as in this statement in a detective story by Agatha Christie:

(13)   "It \MUST be, it has \GOT to be him".
cf.   "Hij \MOET het zijn, het \KAN niet anders."

For further discussion:
(14)   No one smoking? I can see the smoke in the back of the room. Someone must be \lying.
cf.
(14')   Someone lying? That's quite conceivable. After all, in a group of fifty, someone has \GOT to be lying.
(15)   The arms race has \GOT to stop sometime.
         (= said during the Cold War)
cf.   Eens MOET de bewapeningswedloop noodgedwongen ophouden.

Dutch often relies on adverbs to express theoretical LOG NEC.

PAST: HAD TO

(16)   Someone had to lose the game.
cf.   Er moest tenslotte iemand verliezen.

Notes:
1. Had Better + Infinitive
         (speaker-oriented: Du. zou beter)

This very controversial combination of HAVE + BETTER + INF often eludes classification and is sometimes mixed up with WOULD RATHER + INF by students of EFL. In normal conversation the distinction of *had* and *would* is lost since both are merely *'d*.

It could be argued that HAD BETTER is **speaker-oriented** whereas WOULD RATHER is **subject-oriented**. HAD BETTER indicates what the speaker (or hearer in corresponding questions) regards as desirable, cf.

117

(1)   Joe'<u>d better</u> go home.

-        Joe <u>had better</u> go home.

cf.   Joe zou beter naar huis gaan.

In negative structures *better* comes before *not*:

(2)   You'<u>d better </u>not listen to him.

2. Would Rather + Infinitive
         (subject-oriented: Du. *zou liever*)

This expression indicates what the subject regards as desirable.

(3)   Joe <u>'d rather</u> go home.

         = Joe <u>would rather</u> go home.

cf.   Joe zou liever naar huis gaan.

A few more combinations for discussion and translation:

(4)   <u>Hadn't</u> you <u>better</u> ask him first?

cf.   Zou je het hem niet beter eerst vragen?

(5)   I <u>would rather</u> not!

cf.   Liever niet!

(6)   He'<u>d better</u> read /ri:d/ the text himself.

cf.   Hij zou de tekst beter zelf lezen.

(7)   Well, he'<u>d better have</u> it read /red/ by an actor.

cf.   Wel, hij zou hem beter door een acteur laten lezen hebben.

(8)   I think I'<u>d rather have</u> an actress read /ri:d/ it.

cf.   Ik denk dat ik liever zou hebben dat een actrice hem leest.

10.5   NEED / NEED TO

A. Form

POS	-	he NEEDS TO
Q	NEED he?	DOES he NEED TO?
NEG	He NEEDN´T	He DOESN´T NEED TO

NEED is a fully modal auxiliary: it has no 3rd p.sg. ending -s, it does not require DO support in Q and NEG, and is followed by a bare infinitive. It has no past tense or past participle form.

NEED TO is a semi-auxiliary like HAVE TO, with which it has everything in common, both in terms of form and use.

B. Use

NEED as a fully modal auxiliary is only used in **NON-ASSERTIVE** environments (Q, NEG), while the semi-auxiliary NEED TO can be used in both **ASSERTIVE** and **NON-ASSERTIVE** ones. However, even in Q and NEG contexts NEED TO is the more common form these days.

10.5.1   (NON-)OBLIGATION

NON-OBLIGATION is 'requested from' the HEARER (1) or 'granted' by the SPEAKER (2):

10.5.1.1 NON-PAST

Q
(1)   <u>Need</u> I tell you how glad he was?
cf.   <u>Hoef</u> ik jullie te vertellen hoe blij hij was?

NEG

(2)   You <u>needn't</u> write more than 200 words on the topic.

        (a lecturer´s statement)

cf.   Jullie <u>hoeven niet</u> meer dan 200 woorden over dit onderwerp te schrijven.

The SPEAKER, who is in a position of authority, 'grants' NON-OBLIG.

Many speakers of English no longer make a distinction between NEEDN´T (2), DON'T NEED TO (2') and DON´T HAVE TO (2")

(2')   You <u>don't need to</u> write more than 200 words!

        (The lecturer decides that it is **not necessary**.)

cf.   Jullie <u>hoeven niet</u> meer dan ...

(2")   Great, we <u>don't have to</u> write more than 200 words!

        (There are NO **external** circumstances obliging us…)

cf.   Leuk, we <u>hoeven niet</u> meer dan 200 woorden te schrijven!

Note that the fully modal NEED involves the speaker more explicitly than NEED TO and HAVE TO.

A further informal NON-OBLIG can be stated with **HAVEN'T GOT TO**:

(3)   No, he <u>hasn't got to</u> be there before Friday.

cf.   Nee, hij <u>hoeft</u> ... <u>niet</u> ...

An alternative consists in realizing NON-OBLIG as a noun phrase following an introductory 'there is' construction. Dutch uses a corresponding adjective phrase:

(4)   There is <u>no need</u> to hurry.

cf.   Het is <u>niet nodig</u> haast te maken.

FUTURE

Explicit reference to the future is made by using WILL NEED TO:

(5)   You <u>will need to</u> type it.

Pragmatic Meaning: suggestions and advice

The action expressed in the to-infinitive is often one that benefits the Subject:

(6)   You may need to see an eye specialist.

(7)   I think they need to consult another lawyer.

SURVEY

		Fully MODAL auxiliary		Semi-auxiliaries
NON-PAST		**NEED** <more SPK/HEARER oriented>		**NEED TO** **HAVE TO** <frequent in AmE> **HAVE GOT TO** <BrE informal>
ASSERTIVE POS		-	(8) cf.	I <u>need to</u> think it over. Daar <u>moet</u> ik eens over nadenken.
NON-ASSERT. Q AND NEG	(9) cf. (10) cf. (11)	<u>Need</u> you work so hard? <u>Hoef</u> je wel zo hard te werken? OK, you <u>needn´t</u> answer. Je <u>hoeft niet</u> te … <u>Needn´t</u> you tell her?	(12) cf. (13) cf. (14)	<u>Does</u> he <u>need to</u> …? <u>Hoeft</u> hij … te …? I <u>don´t need to</u> think it over. Daar <u>hoef</u> ik <u>niet</u> over <u>te</u> … <u>Don´t</u> you <u>need to</u> type it up?

10.5.1.2 PAST

Only the semi-auxiliary NEED TO (or HAVE TO) is used:

	Fully MODAL auxiliary		Semi-auxiliaries
PAST	**NEED**		**NEED TO** **HAVE TO**
ASSERTIVE POS	-	(15) cf.	He <u>needed to</u> practise more. Hij <u>moest</u> meer oefenen.
NON-ASSERT. Q AND NEG	-	(16) cf.	We <u>didn´t need to</u> repeat it. We <u>hoefden</u> het <u>niet te</u> herhalen.

10.5.1.3 PERFECT FORMS

The fully modal auxiliary NEED can only be used in non-assertive contexts:

		Fully MODAL auxiliary		Semi-auxiliary
PERFECTIVE ASPECT		**NEED**		**NEED TO**
ASSERTIVE POS		-	(18) cf.	A man <u>needs to have</u> lost a game. Een mens <u>moet</u> ooit eens hebben verloren.
NON-ASSERT. Q AND NEG	(17) cf.	You <u>needn´t have</u> told him. Dat <u>had</u> je hem <u>niet hoeven te</u> vertellen.	(19) cf. cf.	You <u>don't need to have</u> lived in Ulster for years to grasp some of the issues at stake. Je <u>hoeft</u> er geen jaren <u>te hebben</u> gewoond om inzicht te krijgen in … <u>Het is niet nodig dat</u> je …

Discuss a few more samples of NON-PAST / PAST / PERF Aspect:

(20)   You <u>needn't</u> bring any books tomorrow. There will be no lectures.
         (lecturer's statement)
cf.   Jullie <u>hoeven</u> morgen geen boeken mee <u>te</u> brengen ...

(21)   We <u>don't need to</u> take books. There will be no lectures,
         (student's statement)
cf.   We <u>hoeven</u> geen boeken mee <u>te</u> brengen ...
cf.   <u>Het is niet nodig</u> dat we morgen boeken meebrengen.

(22)   We <u>haven't got to</u> take any books tomorrow.
         = (21) <BrE, colloquial>

(23)   We <u>don't have to</u> take any books tomorrow.
         = (21) <AmE and BrE>
(24)   You <u>needn't</u> light a match, thank you. I can see enough.

(25)   We <u>didn't need to</u> light our torches. It was not dark in there.

Compare and discuss performance in (26)-(27). Note the difference in meaning.

(26)   Fortunately, we <u>didn't need to</u> come early.
cf.   Gelukkig <u>hoefden</u> we daar niet vroeg <u>te</u> zijn.

(27)   We <u>needn't have</u> come so early.
cf.   We <u>hadden</u> niet zo vroeg <u>hoeven te</u> komen.

10.5.2   LOGICAL NECESSITY

10.5.2.1 NON-PAST

POS

See MUST 2.

Q, NEG

NEED(N'T) can be used especially in BrE instead of MUST:

(28)   <u>Need</u> there be a motive for the crime? <BrE>
cf.   <u>Moet</u> er dan zo nodig een motief zijn voor het misdrijf?

Alternatively, one of the semi-auxiliaries can be used:

(28')   <u>Does</u> there <u>have to</u> be a motive for the crime?

10.5.2.2 PAST

Only semi-auxiliaries are possible:

POS

(29)   Someone <u>had to</u> lose the game.
cf.   Er <u>moest</u> wel iemand verliezen.

Q, NEG

(30)   He <u>didn't have to</u> lose the game, did he?
cf.   Hij <u>moest</u> daarom toch niet verliezen, wel?

10.5.2.3 PERFECT FORMS

POS

MUST HAVE (*moeten hebben*)
         (cf. also 7.4.3 MUST: 2.3)

(31)   John must have missed the train.
cf.   John zal de trein gemist hebben.

Q, NEG

NEEDN'T HAVE (*niet hoeven te hebben*)

(32)   John <u>needn't have</u> missed the train!

cf.   John <u>hoeft</u> (daarom) zijn trein <u>niet te hebben</u> gemist!

ALTERNATIVES

(33)   Is there **necessarily** a motive for the crime?

cf.   <u>Moet</u> er **zonodig** een motief voor het misdrijf zijn?

10.6   DARE / DARE TO

A. Form

	DARE	DARE TO
POS	-	he DARES TO
Q	DARE he?	DOES he DARE TO?
NEG	he DARE NOT DAREN´T /deənt/	He DOESN´T DARE TO

B. Use

The fully modal auxiliary DARE has a number of characteristics in common with NEED.

- It occurs in non-assertive environments (Q, NEG) only.
- It has an equivalent replacement DARE TO, which operates like NEED TO and HAVE TO.
- The DARE TO form is the more common one nowadays, esp. in AmE.

10.6.1 NON-PAST

POS

The modal auxiliary DARE is not normally used except in the idiomatic phrase I DARE SAY / I DARESAY (= I think … probably, I suppose):

(1)   I dare say / daresay you've spent all your money by now.
cf.   Ik veronderstel dat …

Q, NEG

DARE is especially common in the phrase HOW DARE YOU:

(2)   How dare you use such foul language in my presence! <rebuke>
cf.   Hoe durf je zulke gemene taal te spreken!

In most contexts the two forms occur interchangeably:

(3)   I <u>daren't</u> ask her for a rise.

(3')   I <u>don't dare to</u> ask her for a rise.

cf.   …

(4)   I hardly <u>dare (to)</u> think of it!

cf.   Ik <u>durf</u> er nauwelijks aan <u>te</u> denken!

Even so-called mixed forms are possible:

(5)   <u>Don't</u> you <u>dare</u> touch me!

          (= Keep your hands off me / Leave me alone!)

cf.   …

SURVEY

	DARE	**DARE TO**
ASSERTIVE POS	- (I daresay …)	(6) He <u>dares to</u> call me a fool
NON-ASSERTIVE Q & NEG	(7) (How) <u>dare</u> you interrupt me? (8) She <u>dare not</u> ask for a rise.	(9) <u>Do</u> you <u>dare to</u> interrupt me? (10) He <u>doesn't dare to</u> call me a fool.

10.6.2 PAST

NEG

The modal auxiliary DARE is occasionally used in negative contexts, although DARE TO is more common again:

(11)   He dared not show that he was pleased.

(11')   He didn't dare to show that he was pleased.

cf.   Hij durfde niet tonen dat hij blij was.

SURVEY

	DARE	DARE TO
ASSERTIVE POS	-	(12) He <u>dared to</u> call me a thief.
NON-ASSERTIVE Q & NEG	- (13) He <u>dared not</u> call me a thief.	(14) <u>Did</u> he <u>dare to</u> call you a thief? (15) He <u>didn't dare to</u> call me a thief.

10.7   OUGHT TO

A. Form

ought to
ought not to - oughtn't to

B. Use

1 OBLIGATION	2 LOGICAL NECESSITY
1.1 'Moral' OBLIGATION DUTY	PROBABILITY
1.2 ADVICE	

Grammarians seem to agree that OUGHT TO and SHOULD are largely interchangeable. "The only point to arise from the Survey (of the English Language) is that SHOULD is more common than OUGHT TO." (F.R. PALMER, 1979: p. 100)

10.7.1   OBLIGATION

OBLIG with OUGHT TO / SHOULD sounds more 'tentative', hence more 'tactful' or 'polite', by virtue of the fact that the speaker decreases or tones down the degree of assertiveness. Compare with the effect of hypothetical past-tense forms* Grammarians used to call this kind of OBLIG 'moral' OBLIG, since it is well-suited in cases where the speaker has no authority over the addressee, but appeals to his 'moral' sense of duty instead.

(1)   Sheila <u>ought to</u> look after her children herself.
cf.   Sheila zou beter zelf op haar kinderen passen.

However, the same utterance (1) would sound like a case of giving advice if stated by a psychiatrist treating the subject of (1) . Again all depends on the pragmatics of the **discourse**.

10.7.1.1 'Moral' OBLIG, DUTY

       (*zouden moeten, moesten, horen te*)

NON-PAST

POS

(2)   You <u>ought to</u> (= should) be ashamed (of yourself).

cf.   Je <u>zou</u> beschaamd <u>moeten</u> zijn,

cf.   Je <u>moest</u> je schamen.

Q, NEG

OUGHT TO is far less common than SHOULD:

(3)   You <u>oughtn't to</u> (= shouldn't) drink so much.

cf.   Je <u>zou</u> minder <u>moeten</u> drinken.   (POS)

cf.   Je <u>zou</u> <u>niet</u> zoveel <u>mogen</u> drinken.   (NEG)

cf.   Het <u>hoort</u> <u>niet</u> dat je zoveel drinkt!   (NEG, <formal>)

Notice that the scope of NEG differs in the Dutch translations, in other instances (e.g. MUST NOT vs MAY NOT).

Tags vary between OUGHTN'T TO and SHOULDN'T:

(4)   He <u>ought to</u> tell us, <u>oughtn't</u> he?   <esp, BrE>

                            <u>shouldn't</u> he?   <esp. AmE>

cf.   Hij <u>zou</u> het ons <u>moeten</u> vertellen, <u>niet</u>? / vind je <u>niet?</u>

PAST

Historically, OUGHT TO / SHOULD are past-tense forms but they normally used to express hypothetical and tentative OBLIG in NON-PAST (see above) . When they do refer to the PAST, it because they are dominated by another verb in the PAST, as in (5):

(5)   I told him he <u>ought to</u> be more careful.

cf.   Ik zei hem nog dat hij voorzichtiger <u>moest</u> zijn.

PERFECT FORMS

     (*hadden moeten, zouden hebben moeten*)

(6)   You <u>ought to have</u> (= should have) been more careful!

cf.   Je <u>had</u> voorzichtiger <u>moeten</u> zijn.

cf.   Je <u>zou</u> voorzichtiger <u>hebben moeten</u> zijn.

Depending on the discourse, the 'tentative', 'hypothetical' character of OUGHT TO in combination with Perfective Aspect suggests that (6) is now IMPOSSIBLE for you to realize. Compare with COULD HAVE and MIGHT HAVE elsewhere,

10.7.1.2 ADVICE

     (*moesten, zouden moeten, er goed aan doen* …)

OBLIG as in (1) can be perceived as 'advice' , whereas some might refer to it as 'suggestion' all depending on the DISCOURSE.

NON-PAST

POS

(7)   You <u>ought to</u> read that book. It's a knockout! (= should)

cf.   Je <u>zou</u> dat boek eens <u>moeten</u> lezen. Het is fantastisch.

cf.   Je <u>moest</u> … maar eens lezen …

Q

Especially in Qs SHOULD is much more frequent than OUGHT TO. SHOULD or BE TO for <advice> in Qs can be translated in several ways:

(8)   How <u>should</u> I manage / <u>am</u> I <u>to</u> manage?

cf.   Hoe <u>zou</u> ik dat klaarspelen?

cf.   Hoe <u>zou</u> ik dat klaar <u>moeten</u> spelen?

cf.   Hoe <u>moet</u> ik dat klaarspelen?

One of the rare instances of a Q with OUGHT TO is to be found in a detective story by Agatha Christie:

(9)   <u>Ought</u> I <u>to tell</u> the inspector?
cf.   <u>Zou</u> ik dat allemaal aan de inspecteur vertellen?
cf.   <u>Zou</u> ik dat allemaal ... <u>moeten</u> vertellen?
cf.   <u>Moet</u> ik dat allemaal … vertellen?

A. Christie's translator selected the third equivalent.

ALTERNATIVES

Giving <advice> and making <suggestions>, or <suggestions involving the speaker> can be done in many ways (see CoG 335):

(10)   You <u>had better</u> take your medicine.
cf.   …

(11)   I <u>'d advise</u> you to see a doctor.
cf.   Ik zou je aanraden naar een dokter te gaan.

(12)   <u>If I were you</u>, I'd sell my car.
cf.   …

<informal, familiar>:
(13)   <u>How about</u> a game of football?
cf.   …

(14)   <u>Why don't you</u> call on me tomorrow?
cf.   …

NEG

(15)   He <u>ought not to</u> underestimate his opponents.
cf.   Hij zou zijn tegenstanders niet mogen onderschatten.

PAST

as in (1.1) above

PERFECT FORMS

as in (1.1) above

(16)   You <u>ought to have</u> told the inspector.

cf.   Je <u>had</u> het aan de inspecteur <u>moeten</u> vertellen.

10.7.2   LOGICAL NECESSITY: PROBABILITY

This OUGHT TO / SHOULD has been given many other labels, e.g. <less confident assumptions <speaker's near-certainty>, etc. It is weaker than MUST and HAVE TO. Again "SHOULD is more frequent than OUGHT TO" (CoG 292).

10.7.2.1 NON-PAST
       (*zouden moeten, wel moeten*)

POS

(17)   Our guests <u>ought to</u> be home by now.   (= should)

cf.   Onze gasten <u>zouden</u> al thuis <u>moeten</u> zijn.

CoG 292, Note: "People have a natural tendency to overstate their convictions. Therefore must and will are sometimes used in a weakened sense that one feels is nearer to 'probability' than to 'certainty'."

(18)   They must have spent years and years building this cathedral.

cf.   ...

10.7.2.2 PAST

OUGHT TO does not normally have past time reference.

10.7.2.3 PERFECT FORMS

OUGHT TO HAVE expresses (present) PROBABILITY about an event occurring in the (recent) past:

(19)   He <u>ought to have</u> finished last night / by now.

cf.   Hij <u>zou</u> (normaal) gisteravond / nu ongeveer klaar <u>moeten zijn</u> gekomen.

ALTERNATIVES

Some sentences for translation:

(20)   It is quite <u>likely/probable (= adj.)</u> he didn't receive the letter.

cf.   <u>Waarschijnlijk/vermoedelijk</u> ...

(21)   The film <u>is</u> very <u>likely (= adj.) to</u> finish before 11 p.m.

cf.   De film zal wellicht...

(22)   They have very <u>likely (= adv.)</u> lost their way home.

cf.   Naar alle waarschijnlijkheid

(23)   He is <u>probably (= adv.)</u> the best chess-player in town.

cf.   wellicht

(24)   It<u>'s unlikely that</u> there will be any difficulties.

cf.   ...

(25)   They <u>are unlikely to</u> accept our invitation.

cf.   ...

10.8   WILL

A. Form

Strong forms: will - will not

Weak forms:

- 'll /l/ after *I, you, he, she, we, they*:   He'<u>ll</u> go.
- 'syllabic l' /l/ after consonants except /l/:   Sid'<u>ll</u> go.
- /ɜl/ after vowels and /l/:   Linda'<u>ll</u> go.

          Cyril'<u>ll</u> go.

- won't /wəunt/:   They <u>won't</u> go.

Using a strong form rather than a weak one may entail a difference in meaning:

(1)   I \WILL be there (and no one shall stop me)!   (cf. 1.2)

(2)   I'<u>ll</u> be \THERE (don't you worry).   (cf. 1.3 or 2.1)

B. Use

1 VOLITION (animate subject)	**2 PREDICTION** (any subject)
1.1 WILLINGNESS (*willen*)	2.1 SPECIFIC (*zullen*)
1.2 INSISTENCE (*absoluut willen*)	2.2 TIMELESS (*OTT in Dutch*)
1.3 INTENTION (*zullen*)	2.3 HABITUAL (*OTT + bijwoorden*)

The distinction between VOLITIONAL and PREDICTIVE uses of WILL can be accounted for on several grounds:

a) VOLITION requires an animate subject, unlike PREDICTION.

b) VOLITIONAL WILL can be derived from Old English *willan* in its strongest forms.

c) Along the same lines VOLITIONAL WILL can be related to Dutch *willen*, unlike PREDICTIVE WILL, which is closer to Dutch *zullen*.

d) On the other hand, PREDICTION is closer to LOG NEC.

(3)   <u>Will</u> you help me?   (1 VOL: 1.1 willingness)
cf.   <u>Wil</u> je me helpen?
(4)   <u>Will</u> he be there?   (2 PRED: 2.1 specific)
cf.   <u>Zal</u> hij er zijn?

The distinction *willen/zullen* for VOL/PRED is not contradicted by the fact that VOL, 1.3 INTENTION is also translated as *zullen*.

Remember that SHALL and WILL are interchangeable in the 1st person. Hence the 1st person's INTENTION (1.3) is also the 1st person's PREDICTable action (2.1):

(5)   I <u>will/shall/'ll</u> write as soon as I can.
cf.   Ik zal zo vlug mogelijk schrijven.

10.8.1   WILLINGNESS

"Like Dutch *willen*, WILL may express the will, wish or consent of the subject." (ZANDVOORT 1977: § 180).

10.8.1.1. NON-PAST

WILL   (*willen*)

POS

(6)   All right, I <u>will</u> play tennis with you, provided you do your homework first.
cf.   Goed, ik <u>wil</u> wel met je tennissen, als je eerst je huiswerk maakt.

Q, NEG

(7)   <u>Will</u> you do me a favour?
cf.   <u>Wil</u> je me eens een dienst bewijzen?
(8)   I <u>won't</u> have you walk home by yourself.
cf.   Ik <u>wil</u> je <u>niet</u> alleen naar huis laten lopen/gaan.

Notice the difference in meaning between (9) and (10) below, de-pending on the intonation. Compare the use of *willen* and *zullen*.

(9)   Sorry, I /won't \tell him, because you should do it yourself.
            (subject's **non-willingness** to act)

cf.   Sorry, ik …….. het hem niet vertellen, want je moet dat zelf doen. (1.1)

(10)   I won't /tell your \friend, because he might be cross with you.
            (subject's **intention not to act**)

cf.   Ik … niets zeggen tegen je vriend, want hij zou boos kunnen worden. (1.3)

Note:

The alternatives with WOULD mark no temporal difference, but differ in that they are more 'remote' or 'tentative', as we shall see when discussing WOULD (10.11):

(7')   <u>Would</u> you do me a favour?

cf.   <u>Zou</u> je me eens een dienst <u>willen</u> bewijzen?

(7') is perceived as a <**polite** request>. Compare with the discussions of COULD for NON-PAST ABILITY, PERMISSION and POSSIBILITY, and WOULD further on.

10.8.1.2 PAST

WOULD (*wilden*)
=> to be discussed under WOULD, for PAST

ALTERNATIVES

CoG 319 lists four subcategories under VOLITION listed in order of increasing 'strength': **willingness** (320), **wish** (321-22), intention (323) and insistence (324).

(11)   I'<u>m willing</u> to help, but how?

cf.   Ik <u>wil wel</u> helpen, maar hoe?

(12)   I <u>should</u> very much <u>like</u> to come.

cf.   Ik zou heel graag (<u>willen</u>) komen.

(13)   I <u>want/wish</u> to see the manager.

cf.   Ik <u>wil/wens</u> de directeur (te) spreken.

Want is less <formal> than *wish*: compare *willen* and *wensen*.

(14)   He *willingly/readily* gave me the money.

cf.   …

10.8.2   INSISTENCE

This WILL is always stressed (= strong VOLITION) but it is "not very common in modern English" (LEECH 1971: 123B).

10.8.2.1 NON-PAST

WILL (*absoluut willen*)

(15)   He <u>WILL</u> go on smoking, in spite of his heart disease.

cf.   Hij <u>wil maar</u> blijven roken, ondanks zijn hartziekte.

(15')   He just <u>WON'T</u> listen!

cf.   Hij <u>wil absoluut niet</u> luisteren!

cf.   Hij <u>wil maar niet</u> luisteren!

Pragmatic meanings are frequent: promises, threats, commands, etc.

In (16), which has a 2nd person subject, WILL suggests <exasperation>:

(16)   Why WILL you keep on making jokes about him?

cf.   Waarom <u>wil</u> je <u>toch</u> altijd grapjes over hem blijven maken?

10.8.3 INTENTION (*zullen*)

This use occurs with 1st person subjects only:

(17)   I <u>will/shall/'ll</u> write as soon as I can.

cf.   Ik <u>zal</u> zo vlug mogelik schrijven.

It has also been labelled 'spontaneous (or **un**premeditated) intention´ as opposed to 'premeditated intention', which requires **be going to**. WILL expressing **un**premeditated intention typically occurs in spontaneous responses:

(18)   - There's someone at the door.

              - OK, I'<u>ll</u> answer it.

cf.   - OK, ik <u>zal</u> (<u>wel</u>) opendoen.

2nd and 3rd persons always require **be going to** for intentions because WILL is ambiguous. "He will come", for instance, is read as a PREDICTION about the subject's actions, instead of the subject's intention.

Intentional WILL is never stressed, which reflects its weakness. The result is an increasing blending of basic meanings like 'intention´ and 'prediction' with notions of FUTURITY. Depending on the discourse one or the other will be granted priority over the rest. Nuclear stress is of the utmost importance in these cases, of course: check the discussion of (1) and (2) again.

(19)   Hang on a minute and I'<u>ll</u> try to find it.

cf.   Blijf even aan de   lijn, dan <u>zoek</u> ik het even op.

                                … , dan <u>zal</u> ik het even opzoeken.

"The notion of VOLITION may be very weak" (F.R. PALMER 1979: 109). In the following examples WILL (weak form 'll) simply signals (a) a 'future action', although it is relatable to (b) 'intention':

(20)   I'<u>ll</u> put on my glasses.

cf.   …

(21)   <u>Won't</u> you be there?

cf.   …

(22)   I <u>won't</u> be long.

cf.   Ik <u>zal niet</u> lang wegblijven.

cf.   Ik ben <u>zo</u> terug.

=> Pragmatic Meanings

There is a <formal> infrequent use of VOLITIONAL WILL with 2nd person subjects for 'requirements', 'instructions' or 'commands' that are **SPK-oriented rather than SUBJ-oriented**. Compare (23) for strong 'command' and (24) for 'matter-of-course future' (see 5.4):

(23)   You <u>will</u> stay here till you are relieved.

         (= an officer giving an order)

cf.   Jij/U <u>zult</u> hier blijven tot je/u wordt afgelost.

(24)   You <u>will be staying</u> here till you are relieved.

cf.   Jij/U <u>blijft dus/dan</u> hier tot je/u wordt afgelost.

PROG ASPECT in (24) removes the VOLITIONAL connotations. Dutch often combines OTT with adverbs like *dus, dan*, etc. The reported forms of (23) and (24) reflect that difference even more. For example, both English WOULD and Dutch ZOU are too 'weak' to report the command in (23)* This requires WERE TO and MOEST:

(23')   He said that you <u>were to</u> stay there till you were ...

cf.   Hij zei dat je daar <u>moest</u> blijven tot ...

(24')   He said that you <u>would be staying</u> there ...

cf.   Hij zei dat je daar <u>zou</u> blijven tot …

10.8.4   PREDICTION

This meaning is "more closely related to the future meaning of WILL/SHALL" than the preceding VOLITIONAL meanings (LEECH 1971: 123D). It is also the BASIC MEANING that is closer to LOG NEC (MUST, etc.). This WILL is compatible with any subject.

10.8.4.1 Specific PREDICTION (zullen)

NON-PAST

(25)   That <u>will</u> be the milkman.

cf.   Dat zal de melkboer zijn.   (= 'weaker´ than MUST)

(26)   John <u>will</u> be in his office. Yes, the lights are on. So, he must be there.

         (F.R. PALMER 1979 : 47)

cf.   John <u>zal</u> op kantoor zijn. Zie je wel, de lichten branden. Dus moet hij er zijn.

According to F.R. PALMER, WILL ''would be used to explain (from previous knowledge) why the lights were on, rather than to draw a conclusion from this observation'' as with MUST above.

Specific PRED means that 'specific FACTS' indicate 'that it can be predicted that ...'. Of course, PREDICTING the HEARER'S own actions, attitudes etc. seems less evident.

(27)   You <u>will</u> understand that this is strictly confidential.

cf.   U <u>zult</u> wel begrijpen dat dit strikt vertrouwelijk is.

Samples (25)-(27) all refer to PRESENT rather than to FUTURE time, which makes them different from a case like:

(28)   Next month I/he/she <u>will</u> be twenty.

cf.   Volgende maand <u>word</u> ik / <u>wordt</u> ze/hij twintig.

Dutch *zal (wel)* would sound very unusual here. The idea of PREDICTION has given way here to that of (non-modal) 'pure future', perceived in Dutch as virtually equivalent to a present fact.

PERFECT FORMS

WILL is used in combination with Perfective Aspect (cf. 'Expressions of the FUTURE': 5) to express PRES 'speculation' about PAST events or states, as in:

(29)   The first participants <u>will have</u> arrived by now.

cf.   De eerste deelnemers <u>zullen</u> al <u>zijn</u> aangekomen.

10.8.4.2 Timeless PREDICTION (OTT in Dutch)

WILL occurs in so-called 'universal, generic or eternal truths', referring to something that, predictably, occurs **at all times**:

(30)   Oil <u>will</u> float on water.

cf.   Olie <u>drijft</u> op het water.

Dutch *zullen* would turn (30) into a **specific** PRED:

(31)   **This** oil will float, if I pour it into **this** glass of water.

cf.   **Deze** olie <u>zal</u> bovendrijven, als ik ze in **dit** glas water giet.

Many timeless PREDs sound like stock phrases. Do not translate them too literally:

(32)   Boys <u>will</u> be boys.

cf.   Jongens <u>zijn nu eenmaal</u> jongens.

(33)   Accidents <u>will</u> happen. (ZANDVOORT: § 182)

cf.   Ongelukken <u>zijn nu eenmaal</u> niet te vermijden.

10.8.4.3 Habitual PREDICTION (OTT + bijwoorden)

This WILL is the NON-PAST equivalent of WOULD for 'habits, customs, characteristic behaviour' (see WOULD 2.3). It seems to be a combination of 2.1 and 2.2 in that it states what can always (2.2) be predicted about something **specific** (2.1), cf.

(34)   He <u>will</u> (<u>'ll</u>) watch TV for hours on end.

cf.   Hij <u>kijkt vaak</u> urenlang tv.

(35)   She <u>will ('ll)</u> sit there for hours, waiting for her son to come home.
          (ZANDVOORT: § 182)

cf.   Ze <u>zit</u> daar <u>vaak</u> urenlang te wachten tot haar zoon thuiskomt.

10.9   SHALL

A. Form

Strong forms: shall - shall not
Weak forms: 'll - shan't

B. Use

1 VOLITION	2 PREDICTION
1.1 WILLINGNESS	blended with FUTURITY rare, formal (1st person only)
1.2 INSISTENCE	
1.3 INTENTION	

VOLITIONAL SHALL is speaker/hearer-oriented.

In its PREDICTIVE sense SHALL is basically restricted to the 1st person and to BrE (where it is used in less than 30% of cases). In AmE it only occurs in stock phrases like 'We shall overcome some day'. AmE will as a rule replace SHALL by WILL.

10.9.1   VOLITION

10.9.1.1 WILLINGNESS   (*zullen*)

POS, NEG

With 2nd and 3rd person subjects SHALL is rare in most contexts, "especially among young speakers of English" (LEECH 1971: 124A), possibly owing to the **speaker's involvement**, e.g.

(1) You <u>shall</u> suffer for this.

cf. Ge <u>zult</u> hiervoor boeten.

(2) Thou <u>shalt</u> not kill! <biblical, archaic>

cf. Gij <u>zult</u> niet doden!

(3) Rule Britannia, Britannia rule the waves, Britons never never never <u>shall</u> be slaves.

SHALL has mainly survived in laws, official regulations or directives (i.e. **formal documents**) to express what is mandatory:

(4) The Parties <u>shall</u> encourage youth exchange programmes and direct contact between youth organisations.

cf. De Partijen <u>zullen</u> uitwisselingsprogramma's voor jongeren en rechtstreekse contacten tussen jongeren-organisaties aanmoedigen.

Q

SHALL occurs mainly in Qs , when the speaker is offering to execute the **hearer's commands**. It is, in other words, a <polite> device to ask the hearer what he/she wants you to do. Hence it is relatable to WILLINGNESS in the sense of Dutch "Wilt u dat ik …?"

(5) <u>Shall</u> I carry your luggage?

cf. <u>Zal</u> ik uw bagage dragen?

=> Pragmatic Meanings

There is a set of 'pragmatic' meanings, including <suggestion>, <wish>, <offer>, etc. depending on the DISCOURSE. We shall/will restrict the discussion to the instances referred to in CoG:

suggestions involving both SPEAKER and HEARER

(6) <u>Shall</u> we listen to some music?

cf. <u>Zullen</u> we wat muziek beluisteren?

(7) Let's go there at once, <u>shall</u> we?

offer, i.e. consulting the HEARER'S wishes

(8)   <u>Shall</u> I get you a chair? (= Would you like me to?)

cf.   <u>Zal</u> ik een stoel voor u halen? (= Wilt u dat ik)

10.9.1.2 INSISTENCE   ((*zeker) zullen*)

This is the stressed variant of SHALL:

(9)   I <u>SHAN'T</u> <BrE> / <u>WON'T</u> give in! (= I am determined not to.)

cf.   En ik <u>zal niet</u> toegeven! (= Ik ben vastbesloten niet toe te geven.)

10.9.1.3 INTENTION   (*zullen*)

SHALL expresses weak volition and is restricted to the 1st person. It is interchangeable with WILL and reducible to 'll:

(10)   I <u>shall</u> write to you as soon as I can.

cf.   Ik <u>zal</u> je zo vlug mogelijk schrijven.

(11)   I'<u>ll</u> meet her at the station (= shall/will)

cf.   Ik <u>zal</u> haar aan het station afhalen.

In order to delete the connotation of intention in (11) the speaker could introduce PROG ASPECT, which would turn (11) into "a pure future":

(11')   I'<u>ll be meeting</u> her at the station.

cf.   Ik <u>zal</u> haar (<u>dan toch</u>) aan het station afhalen/zien.

Dutch equivalents may require lexical changes (e.g. through adding adverbs, alternative lexical verbs, etc.).

ALTERNATIVES

(12)   I <u>intend/mean to</u> catch the last train.

cf.   Ik <u>ben van plan / heb de bedoeling</u> ... de laatste trein <u>te</u> nemen.

Forms like BrE (10), says Leech, "have an element of PRED, and so are more definite about the fulfilment of the intention than (12)" . This blending of 'intention´ and PRED is confirmed by the fact that Dutch renders both as *zullen*.

10.9.2   PREDICTION   (*zullen*)

PREDICTIVE SHALL is restricted to 1st person subjects and, unlike PREDICTIVE WILL, always refers to the FUTURE (cf. Expressions of the Future: 4.1 and 4*2). As is pointed out in CoG 141: "With personal subjects, WILL/SHALL can also suggest an element of intention''. The clearest cases of purely PREDICTIVE SHALL (i.e. 'pure future') are sentences in which the speaker/subject has no control over what 'will happen':

(13)   We <u>shall</u> all be dead by the end of the next century.

cf.   We <u>zijn</u> / <u>zullen</u> tegen het eind van de volgende eeuw allemaal dood zijn.

and main clauses in type 1 conditionals:

(14)   If we don't hurry, we <u>shall</u> be late.

cf.   Als we ons niet haasten,   komen we (nog) te laat. (OTT)

                                                <u>zullen</u> we (nog) te laat komen.

10.10   SHOULD

A. Form

should - 'd
should not - shouldn't

B. Use

SURVEY OF THE BASIC MEANINGS:

	1 OBLIGATION	2 LOGICAL NECESSITY	3 INTENTION / PREDICTION
	´strong´ SHOULD = /ʃud/ (1st, 2nd, 3rd persons)	**OUGHT TO**	´weak´ SHOULD /ʃəd/ = **WOULD** (cf. 7.4.11) (1st person only)
1.1	´Moral´ OBLIGATION DUTY (*zouden moeten, horen te)*	PROBABILITY (*zouden moeten, moesten*)	TENTATIVENESS (*zouden*)
1.2	ADVICE (*zouden moeten, moesten*)		

´Strong' SHOULD **is often stressed** and is a synonym of OUGHT TO for Dutch *zou(den) moeten.* 'Weak´ SHOULD **is never stressed** and is interchangeable with WOULD/´D for Dutch *zou(den).* Notice the difference in meaning between:

(1)   If you ask me again tomorrow I <u>should</u> (= ought to) be able to give you an
          answer.   /ʃud/

cf.   Als je het me morgen vraagt, <u>zou</u> ik in staat <u>moeten</u> zijn te antwoorden.
          (= 2 LOG NEC, for 'Probability´ = OUGHT TO)

(2)   If you ask<u>ed</u> me tomorrow, I <u>should</u> (= would / ' d) be able to give you an
        answer.   /ʃəd/
        cf. Als je het me morgen vroeg, <u>zou</u> ik kunnen antwoorden.
        (= 3 'tentative' PRED = WOULD)

10.10.1 OBLIGATION

10.10.1.1 ´Moral` OBLIGATION   (*zouden moeten, horen te*)

On the whole SHOULD is more frequently used than OUGHT TO, particularly in Qs
(including **tags**) and NEG (see OUGHT TO 1.1)

NON-PAST

(3)   He <u>should</u> visit his brother in hospital, <u>shouldn't</u> he?
cf.   Hij zou zijn broer toch moeten bezoeken in het ziekenhuis, vind je niet?

PAST

SHOULD can have past time reference in reported speech, i.e. when the verb of saying
in the main clause refers to the past:

(4)   He told me I should visit my brother.
cf.   Hij zei me dat ik mijn broer zou moeten bezoeken.

=> Pragmatic Meanings
REPORTING VOLITION (*zouden*)
The underlying verb here might well be archaic SHALL 1:

(5)   He ordered that Catherine <u>should</u> drive.
        (< He ordered: "Catherine shall drive.")
cf.   Hij gaf opdracht dat Catherine <u>zou</u> sturen.

Note the difference with (5´):

(5´)   He ordered Catherine to drive.
        (< He ordered: "Catherine, drive!")
cf.   Hij gaf Catherine opdracht te sturen.

148

A similar difference can be seen between (6) and (6´):

(6) He urged that the site <u>should</u> be bought.

cf. Hij drong erop aan dat de grond <u>zou</u> worden gekocht.

(6') He urged the committee to buy the site.

cf. Hij drong er bij de commissie op aan de grond te kopen.

Purpose (relatable to SPK's VOL or, alternatively, LOG NEC)

SHOULD can also occur in past contexts in subclauses of purpose introduced by **so that**. Again, there may be an underlying SHALL 1 (= speaker's VOLITION):

(7) He wore a mask, so that no one <u>should</u> recognize him.

cf. Hij droeg een masker, opdat niemand hem <u>zou</u> herkennen.

Alternatively, WOULD/COULD can be used here (Dutch: *zou kunnen*).

PERFECT FORMS

(8) Fred <u>should have</u> / <u>shouldn't have</u> stayed at home.

cf. Fred had niet thuis mogen blijven.

10.10.1.2 ADVICE   (*zouden moeten, moesten, er goed aan doen*)

Depending on the context, 'moral' OBLIGATION / DUTY can shade off into the weaker MEANING of ADVICE:

POS

(9) You <u>should</u> stay in bed.

cf.   …

NEG

(10) You <u>shouldn't</u> be impatient.

cf. Je <u>zou niet</u> zo ongeduldig <u>mogen</u> zijn.

This is "a weakened prohibition, more like negative advice"

10.10.2 LOGICAL NECESSITY

´PROBABILITY´ (*zouden moeten*)

10.10.2.1 NOST-PAST

This is equivalent to OUGHT TO 2, SHOULD being the more frequent of the two forms.

POS

(11)   Our guests should be home by now.

cf.   Onze gasten zouden omstreeks deze tijd normaal gezien thuis moeten zijn.

NEG

NEG results in 'Improbability´:

(12)   There <u>shouldn't</u> be any difficulties.

cf.   Er zouden zich normaal gezien geen moeilijkheden mogen voordoen.

10.10.2.2 PERFECT FORMS

(11')   Our guests <u>should have</u> arrived home by now.

cf.

(12´)   There <u>shouldn't have</u> been any difficulties.

cf.

=> Pragmatic Meanings

Tentative Condition (*mochten*)

(13)   If a serious crisis <u>should</u> arise, the government will take immediate action.
          <rather formal>

cf.   <u>Mocht</u> er een ernstige crisis komen, dan zal de regering onmiddellijk
          maatregelen treffen.

(14)   He dared not spend the money in case someone <u>should</u> ask where he had got it from.

cf.   Hij durfde het geld niet uitgeven, ingeval iemand <u>mocht</u> vragen waar hij het vandaan had.

This meaning can be related to LOGICAL NECESSITY (cf. OUGHT TO 2), i.e. ´Probability', which is more remote here. SHOULD in conditional clauses is normally translated by the Dutch equivalent *mocht(en)*. CoG adds that (13) is "slightly <formal or literary> and suggests a <tentative> condition".

In relative clauses SHOULD expresses <contingency>:

(15)   Anyone **who** <u>should</u> wish to come will be welcome.

cf.   Iedereen die <u>mocht</u> willen komen, is welkom. (ZANDVOORT: § 177)

'Putative' SHOULD (bijwoorden + OTT / *moeten / kunnen***)**

Putative SHOULD occurs in that-clauses after expressions of feelings or opinions (sometimes called 'emotive predicates') such as: *How strange that ..., I am surprised that ..., We are amazed that ...,* etc. It is close to 2 LOG NEC with OUGHT TO.

(16)   She was amazed that Paul <u>should</u> notice her at all.
         (Iris Murdoch, The Bell, p. 8)

cf.   Het vervulde haar met ongelovige verbazing dat Paul haar <u>überhaupt</u> zag.
         (Hella S. Haasse, De Klok, p.8)

The *that*-clause does not refer to the STATE/EVENT as a 'fact' but rather as a 'putative idea' (cf. Dutch *vermeend*). There has been some doubt.

(17)   I am astonished that /HE <u>should</u> blame the others.
         He was the one who conceived the plan ...

cf.   Het verwondert me dat HIJ de anderen de schuld <u>moet</u> geven. Hij heeft zelf het plan opgevat en ... / Het verbaast me dat **net** HIJ de anderen de schuld geeft, als hij zelf het plan heeft opgevat.

(18)   I am surprised that you <u>should have</u> been so foolish.

cf.   Het verbaast me dat je zo dwaas <u>hebt kunnen</u> zijn. (ZANDVOORT: § 174)

Now complete the following sentences using a *that*-NP-SHOULD-clause

(19)   It's a good thing that ……………… recognize his faults.

cf.   Het is **maar** goed dat hij zijn fouten toegeeft.

(20)   I am amazed ....

cf.   Het verbaast me dat **uitgerekend/net** UW vrouw bezwaren heeft!

Notes:

1) In contemporary English putative SHOULD in subclauses is often left out altogether.

2) Putative SHOULD can also occur in questions and exclamations:

(21)   Why <u>should</u> he say such a foolish thing?

cf.   Waarom <u>moet</u> hij nu zo iets stoms zeggen?

(22)   Who <u>should</u> come in but the mayor himself.

cf.   Niemand minder dan…

10.10.3 INTENTION / PREDICTION

'Tentativeness' (*zou* 1st person only)

10.10.3.1 NON-PAST

This unstressed SHOULD can be related to unstressed underlying 1st person SHALL of INTENTION (1.3) and PREDICTION (2). That is why it is interchangeable with WOULD. Being unstressed, it often carries a blend of these two MEANINGS. Remember also that past-tense forms such as *should, would might, could* for NON-PAST usually imply more 'tentativeness', 'remoteness', etc. Consequently, their changes in meaning will be basically discourse-related, i.e. 'pragmatic'. Compare (23) and (23'), where a distinction can best be made on pragmatic grounds:

(23)   I <u>should/would / 'd</u> tell them everything, but they won't listen to me.
         (= my INTENTION: cf. SHALL 1.3)

cf.   Ik <u>zou</u> ze (wel) alles vertellen, maar ze willen niet luisteren.

(23') I <u>should/would / 'd</u> ALSO tell them everything, if I was tortured.

    (= PREDICTing my own behaviour: cf. SHALL 2)

cf.   Ik <u>zou</u> OOK alles vertellen, als ze me folterden.

=> Pragmatic Meaning

Wish

(24)   I <u>should/would</u> like to stay at an inexpensive hotel.

cf.   Ik <u>zou</u> in een goedkoop hotel willen logeren.

The pragmatic meaning of 'Wish' in (24) is carried by the lexical verb *like*. Unstressed SHOULD is only an alternative to unstressed WOULD with BASIC MEANING 3 for INTENTION in the 1st person.

10.10.3.2 PAST

SHOULD can be the reported (past-tense) form of SHALL for 1st person INTENTION/PREDICTION. This has been referred to as the so-called PAST FUTURE by some grammarians (ZANDVOORT: § 186). It is interchangeable with WOULD.

(25)   I told you I <u>should</u> (= would) not be in for dinner.

    (underlying: I <u>shall/will/'ll</u> not be in ...)

cf.   Ik heb je gezegd dat ik voor het diner niet thuis <u>zou</u> zijn.

Note that SHOULD is dominated by another past tense (*told*) , whose tense it has 'copied'. This phenomenon is called 'sequence of the tenses', as we have seen before.

10.10.3.3 PERFECT FORMS

Real PASTness with SHOULD is hard to find, since it is essentially a NON-PAST 'tentative' tense-form. Therefore, when the goings-on (Events or States) carry PASTNESS they are often referred to with the PERFECTIVE:

(26)   I <u>should/would</u> have stepped on the brake without hitting anyone (if ...).

cf.   Ik <u>zou hebben</u> geremd ...

         (3 INTENTION: **om** niemand aan te rijden)

         (3 PRED: **zonder** iemand aan te rijden)

Notice the importance of the discourse in (26) . This SHOULD with Perfective Aspect typically occurs in type 3 conditionals (cf. 5.3, pp.68-69).

Compare this type of SHOULD with the other two in the examples below:

(27)   She <u>should have</u> stayed at home with two small children.

cf.   ...

         (1.1 Moral OBLIGATION or 1.2 Advice)

(28)   As a matter of fact, she <u>should have</u> seen my car coming

         (but she didn't notice me and hit me).

cf.   ...

         (2 LOG NEC)

Also compare the reasons for non-performance in (27) and (28): the subject of (27) failed to perform **as expected from her**, whereas the subject of (28) failed to perform **for lack of opportunity**. In (29), however, non-performance is NOT implied:

(29)   Wilma <u>should have</u> arrived by now.

cf.   ...

         (2 LOG NEC)

10.11   WOULD

A. Form

would - 'd

would not - wouldn't

B. Use

	1 VOLITION	2 PREDICTION
	1.1 Willingness	2.1 Specific
NON-PAST	WOULD ´tentative´ (*zou willen*)	WOULD (/d/) unstressed, all persons = 1st person SHOULD (*zou*)
PAST: POS	(=> WAS WILLING TO / WANTED TO)	WOULD ´past of the future´ (*zou*) (WAS/WERE TO ´destiny´ (*zou*))
NEG	WOULDN´T (NEG) stressed (see 1.2 PAST) (*wou niet*)	WOULD NOT (*zou niet*) (WAS/WERE NOT TO *zou niet*))
	1.2 Insistence	2.2 Timeless
NON-PAST	(=> ´Insistence´ cannot be ´tentative´)	(´Timelessness´ cannot be ´tentative´)
PAST	WOULD (/wud/) stressed (*wou absoluut*)	(´Timelessness´ cannot be PAST alone)
	1.3 Intention	2.3 Habitual
NON-PAST	WOULD (/d/) unstressed = 1st p. SHOULD (*zou*)	(WILL 2.3 only)
PAST	(=> WAS / WERE GOING TO (*was van plan, wou, ging*))	(a) WOULD (= usually in the PAST) (*gewoonlijk, vaak, … + OVT*) (b) USED TO (= PAST **HABIT** and **OVER** now) (*vroeger … + OVT*)

Notes:

1) The label 'tentative´ is again meant to cover all forms of 'evasiveness´, 'remoteness', 'contingency', including 'hypothetical´ or 'conditional´ discourses.

2) WOULD for PAST of the FUTURE and CONDITIONAL is formally a reported WILL of 1.3 Intentional VOLITION or of 2 PRED:

(1)   He said that he <u>would</u> come. (< "I will come.")

cf.   Hij zei dat hij <u>zou</u> komen. (< "Ik zal komen.")

10.11.1 VOLITION

10.11.1.1 WILLINGNESS

NON-PAST

WOULD   (*zou willen*)

Q

'Tentative´ WOULD is **used very frequently** in 2nd person Qs. These are in effect uttered as 'requests':

(2)   <u>Would</u> you please lend me two pounds?

cf.   <u>Zou</u> u me twee pond willen lenen, a.u.b.?

Underlying WILLINGNESS can also be inferred from the Dutch near-equivalent WILLEN, Besides, the expected response to (1) is:

(2')   Yes, I <u>will</u>. Here you are,

cf.   …

Another clear case of WILLINGNESS in a Q is (3) , where WOULD acts as a polite 'down-toner':

(3)   <u>Would</u> you keep quiet, please?

cf.   <u>Zou</u> je stil willen zitten, alsjeblieft?

Note the difference with WILL, which gives (4) a pragmatic force which is close to that of an IMPERATIVE:

(4)   <u>Will</u> you keep quiet, please.
cf.   <u>Wil</u> je alsjeblieft stilzitten.

In some contexts the idea of WILLINGNESS is less obvious. For instance, in 2nd person questions WOULD may lose its full MEANING, and Qs may acquire the pragmatic force of POS statements:

(5)   <u>Would</u> you believe it or not, but I am tired!
cf.   <u>Zou</u> je willen geloven dat ik moe ben!
cf.   <u>Wil</u> je geloven dat ik moe ben!

=> Pragmatic Meanings

There is a host of 'tentative' Qs about someone else's WILLINGNESS to do something, because speakers try to make 'polite' Requests for obvious reasons.

Requests

(6)   <u>Would</u> you please pass the salt? (= COULD)
cf.   <u>Zou</u> …

WOULD and COULD are more <tactful> than WILL and CAN. Samples (6) and (7) have a WOULD of WILLINGNESS (1.1):

(7)   <u>Would</u> you be so kind as to switch the light on?
                    … kind enough to ...
cf.   <u>Wilt</u> u / <u>Zou</u> u zo vriendelijk <u>willen </u>zijn ...

Alternative Forms of Requests

<'Polite' request>
(8)   I wonder if you would mind giving me his address?
cf.   …

(9)   I <u>would</u> be extremely grateful if you <u>would</u> write a reference for me.

cf.   Ik zou ...

PAST

WOULD   (*wou, wilde*)

NEG
= quite frequently used

(10)   I felt tired, but they <u>wouldn't</u> believe me.

cf.   Ik was moe, maar ze <u>wilden</u> me <u>niet</u> geloven.

POS, Q
= often WANTED TO, WAS WILLING TO (*wou, was bereid te*)

ALTERNATIVES

(11)   He <u>wanted to</u> let us down. (= the subject's desire)

cf.   Hij <u>wou</u> ons in de steek laten.

(12)   He <u>was willing to</u> let his friend down to come with us.
        (= they had asked him to)

cf.   Hij <u>wou</u> zijn vriend (wel) …

cf.   Hij <u>was bereid</u> …

Note that Dutch seems to allow of WILLEN in all these cases!

10.11.1.2 INSISTENCE

NON-PAST

'Tentative' WOULD is not compatible with Insistence.

PAST

WOULD (*wou/wilde absoluut*)

(13)   He <u>WOULD</u> go on smoking, in spite of his heart disease.
cf.   Hij bleef maar roken, ondanks zijn hartziekte.

In a different discourse (13) might refer to a PAST habit (3.3) as well. NEG sentences tend to be less ambiguous in this respect:

(14)   He just <u>WOULD not</u> listen!
cf.   Hij <u>wou maar niet</u> luisteren!

Summing up, we should note that this use of WOULD is not very common in modern English. Unambiguous alternatives are often preferred, especially though not exclusively in POS contexts.

ALTERNATIVE

(15)   He <u>refused</u> to listen.
cf.   …

10.11.1.3 INTENTION

NON-PAST

WOULD (*zou*)
= 1st person SHOULD (often weak /d/)

POS, Q

(16)   I <u>would/´d</u> come early. What <u>would</u> you do?
cf.   Ik <u>zou</u> vroeg komen. Wat <u>zou</u> jij doen?

NEG

(17)   I <u>wouldn't</u> help a thief to escape!
cf.   Ik <u>zou geen</u> dief helpen ontsnappen!

NEG Q
(18)   <u>Wouldn't</u> you inform them at all?
cf.   <u>Zou</u> je hen helemaal <u>niets</u> zeggen?

Speakers of Dutch are fortunate to be able to distinguish WILLINGNESS and INTENTION in their own language as *zou willen* and *zou.*

PAST

PAST INTENTIONS require alternatives, because they cannot be rendered by WOULD, which is ambiguous.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives are WAS GOING T0, INTENDED TO, etc.

(19)   Well, I <u>was going to</u> / <u>intended to</u> tell them anyway.
cf.   Wel, ik <u>was van plan</u> het ze in elk geval te zeggen.
cf.   Wel, ik <u>wou</u> het ze in elk geval zeggen.
cf.   Wel, ik <u>ging</u> het ...

10.11.2 PREDICTION
10.11.2.1 Specific PREDICTION

NON-PAST

WOULD   (*zou*)

(1st person WOULD = SHOULD, often weak /d/)

The most commonly used WOULD form here is that which has been called the **conditional** (French: 'le conditionnel) in traditional grammars, as in (22) :

(20)   (I'm sure) he <u>would</u> like it.

cf.   …

Such conditionals (cf. type 2 conditionals, see 6.2) can be completed with a hypothetical if-clause: ... if we offered it to him.

POS, Q

(21)   That <u>would</u> be wonderful!

cf.   Dat zou fantastisch zijn!

(22)   <u>Would</u> that be better?

cf.   …

NEG

(23)   I´m afraid he <u>wouldn´t</u> like that.

cf.   Ik vrees dat hem dat <u>niet zou</u> bevallen.

=> Pragmatic meanings

This WOULD seems to cover a host of secondary pragmatic meanings, including 'evasiveness´, 'remoteness´, etc.

(24)   It <u>would</u> seem that nobody knew about it.

cf.   Naar het schijnt <u>zou</u> niemand dat hebben geweten.

WOULD = reported **WILL**

WOULD can also be based on underlying WILL:

(25)   I knew that he <u>would</u> be there. (< He <u>will</u> be there.)

cf.   Ik wist dat hij daar <u>zou</u> zijn. (< Hij <u>zal</u> er zijn.)

Sample (25) is a **PAST report** of the sentence in brackets, which unambiguously points to the FUTURE. It is thus a case of **Past of the Future** (OVTkT).

PAST

WOULD (*zou*)

The **Past of the Future** can also occur in main clauses and is common in story-telling. The 'omniscient' narrator can see the FUTURE from a PAST point of view, hence WILL becomes WOULD:

(26)   In Berlin, he first met the woman whom he <u>would</u> one day marry.

cf.   In Berlijn ...

    (see SWAN § 604.4, where the term 'future in the past' is used instead)

ALTERNATIVE

Alternatively, **WAS /WERE TO** (*zou*) is used, stressing the idea that a particular event was **destined to happen** (see BE TO, p.105):

(27)   He became world famous, but he <u>was</u> to die young.

cf.   Hij werd wereldberoemd, maar hij <u>zou</u> jong sterven.

PERFECT FORMS

WOULD HAVE (*zou hebben*): is typically used in type 3 conditionals (see 6.3):

(28)   If I had known the truth I <u>would have</u> told you.

cf.   Als ik ... , dan <u>zou</u> ik het je verteld <u>hebben</u>.

A so-called pragmatic use:

(29)   There <u>would have </u>been a mistake.

cf.   Er <u>zou </u>een vergissing <u>zijn</u> begaan.

10.11.2.2 Timeless PREDICTION

=> cannot be made with WOULD.

NON-PAST

'Tentativeness' is incompatible with 'universal timelessness'.

PAST

'Timelessness' is incompatible with definite PAST alone.

10.11.2.3 Habitual PREDICTION

WILL and WOULD can predict an Event as a Habit in the NON-PAST and in the PAST respectively.

NON-PAST

Habitual PREDICTION in the NON-PAST requires present-tense WILL. (see WILL 2.3)

PAST

As we will see at 10.12 (USED TO), habits in the PAST are referred to in two ways:
  1) as a PAST Event (WOULD)
  2) as a PAST Event or State that is **felt to be over** at the time of speaking (USED TO)

WOULD

WOULD refers to 'a characteristic, a custom, behaviour ...' in the PAST. It can best be paraphrased as 'usually in the PAST' for Dutch adverbs ' *gewoonlijk, vaak, soms. . . + OVT* ' .

(30)   She <u>would</u> sit there for hours reading,
cf.   Ze zat daar <u>vaak/soms</u> uren te lezen.

10.12   USED TO

A. Form

used to

| usedn't to | /'ju:snt / | - | didn't use(d) to |
| used he to (= rare)? | | - | did he use(d) to? |

B. Use

SURVEY

1	USED TO	2	WOULD
PAST HABIT			
	EVENT OR STATE		EVENT only
1.1	The HABIT has **ceased**	2	What **could be predicted** as a habit, a custom, or characteristic behaviour … (see WOULD)
1.2	The time for it is **over**		

The BASIC MEANING of USED TO is that of PAST HABIT. It is often replaceable by WOULD, but not always.

WOULD cannot replace USED TO when it is being suggested that the PAST HABIT itself, or the TIME for it, is **definitely over**. It is the period of time that Dutch refers to with the adverb *vroeger*, implying 'not any more'. *Vroeger* in itself carries PASTNESS, as in (1)-(2) below.

Gewoonlijk can also refer to a PAST HABIT but it requires a PAST TIME discourse as in (4) below. But even then *gewoonlijk* does not imply that the HABIT has actually ceased. It seems reasonably safe to relate the same distinction to USED TO and WOULD.

PAST only!

10.12.1 USED TO

This is used when the HABIT has **ceased**, or the time for it is **over**. Dutch will translate this meaning by means of adverbs, such as *vroeger:*

(1)   I <u>used to</u> smoke pipes. (HABIT 1.1)

cf.   Vroeger rookte ik pijpen.

It can be inferred from (1) that I quit smoking pipes, i.e. I gave up the HABIT (1.1). This is somewhat different from (2), where a discontinued STATE is referred to:

(2)   Cigarettes <u>used to</u> be less expensive when I was a student. (STATE 1.2)

cf.   Toen ik nog student was, waren de sigaretten veel minder duur.

The period in which I knew them to be cheap is **over** (1.2).

Check the discourse at all times. In the next sample Dutch might well translate USED TO by the adverb *altijd*, but somewhere in the discourse there is an indication that the subject has ceased to be in the same situation. Speakers of Dutch often add *toen*.

(3)   He <u>used to</u> say that one place was as good as another. (1.1 or 1.2)

cf.   Hij zei <u>(toen) altijd</u> dat elke plek geschikt was.

Some more examples:

(4)   He used to take flowers to his girlfriend twice a week. Before he got married, that is!

cf.   Hij <u>had de gewoonte</u> ...

(5)   used to think that all Belgians spoke French, but I know better now.

cf.   Vroeger dacht ik dat alle Belgen Frans spraken, maar nu weet ik beter.

10.12.2 WOULD

Compare (1) with (4):

(6)   After dinner he <u>would</u> smoke a pipe and watch the box.

cf.   Na het eten rookte hij <u>meestal/gewoonlijk</u> een pijp en keek hij tv.

There is an explicit PRES vs PAST contrast in (1), hence USED TO. In (4), on the other hand, it is NOT stressed that the habit has ceased (1.1), nor that the time for it is definitely over (1.2), hence WOULD.

USED TO is not always interchangeable with WOULD and does not allow of adverbials stating the actual duration of the habit or state in the PAST. This is not surprising since the notion of 'duration' seems incompatible with the notion of 'having ceased at one point in time´. The combination does not make sense in Dutch either:

(7)   * He <u>used to</u> live here for 25 years.

cf.   * <u>Vroeger</u> woonde hij hier 25 jaar.

<u>NEG</u>

- USED NOT is usually pronounced /'ju:snt/ and is sometimes written without a **D: USEN'T**.

(8)   He <u>used not /use(d)n't</u> <u>to</u> answer.

cf.   Hij antwoordde <u>nooit</u>. / <u>Vroeger</u> antwoordde hij <u>niet</u>.

- DIDN'T USE TO (sometimes spelt **DIDN´T USED TO**) is the periphrastic and less formal BrE variant, which is by far the most frequent form in both AmE and BrE.

(9)   He <u>didn't use</u> to answer.

cf.   Hij antwoordde <u>nooit</u>.

<u>Q</u>

The same is even more true of Questions, the **periphrastic form** with DO having become increasingly popular:

- **USED he**? is typical of old-fashioned BrE.

- **DID he USE(D) TO** is now preferred in both AmE and BrE, as in:

(10)   <u>Did</u> he <u>use(d) to</u> come here regularly? Yes, he did.

cf.   Kwam hij hier <u>vroeger</u> geregeld?

DUTCH EQUIVALENTS for PAST HABIT

1)   *gewend zijn, gewoon zijn te, de gewoonte hebben te*, …

2)   Adverbs: *altijd, meestal, gewoonlijk, vroeger*

         (+ NEG: *nooit*)

3)   *placht*, which is perceived as archaic, especially in spoken Dutch.

Some of them translate both USED TO and WOULD, but there is no one-to-one correspondence. Much depends on the discourse.

A final note on USE / USED TO:

Do not mix up the following forms:

1 **Lexical verb USE** (*gebruiken*)	(11) cf.	My father always <u>used</u> matches. Mijn vader <u>gebruikte</u> altijd lucifers.
2 **Adjective USED TO + -ing form** (prepositional gerund) (*gewend/gewoon* aan …)	(12) cf.	He <u>wasn't used to</u> carry<u>ing</u> sophisticated lighters. Hij <u>was niet gewend</u> met hypermoderne aanstekers om te gaan.
3 **Modal auxiliary USED TO + infinitive** (as discussed above) (*vroeger …*)	(13) cf.	He <u>used to </u>say: 'I don't like them'. Hij zei dan <u>altijd</u>: 'Ik mag ze niet'.

Sample (13) does not require *vroeger* to render USED TO because the pastness of my father's habit has already been established earlier in the discourse, cf. (11)-(12).

It corroborates the importance of the discourse at all times and the need for students to gain insight into both semantic and pragmatic meanings, which should enable them to select the most appropriate equivalents in English.

10.13   Modal Meanings of BE + To-infinitive as a Semi-modal

10.13.1 To convey ORDERS, INSTRUCTIONS, or a COMMAND by a third party

POS (1)   We <u>are to</u> be there at six.

　　cf.   Je <u>moet</u> daar om zes uur zijn.

NEG (2)   I <u>am not to</u> tell you this.

　　cf.   Ik <u>mag</u> je dit niet vertellen.

The Dutch equivalents clearly indicate that BE TO carries modality. TIME is basically PAST/NON-PAST:

(3)   We <u>were to</u> be there at six.

(4)   I <u>was not to</u> tell you this.

PERFECTIVE ASPECT can be added by means of the aux HAVE. It gives the sentence a notion of 'non-fulfilment´ in the past:

(5)   We <u>were to</u> <u>have been</u> there at six.

cf.   We <u>hadden</u> daar om zes uur <u>moeten zijn</u>.

10.13.2 To convey a(n official) PLAN or ARRANGEMENT

This use has already been mentioned: cf. the description of alternative expressions of the Future, 5.9.1.

(6)   President Bush <u>is to</u> visit Mexico shortly.

cf.   President Bush <u>bezoekt</u> binnenkort Mexico.

(7)   We <u>were to</u> be met at the station.

cf.   We <u>zouden/moesten</u> aan het station afgehaald worden.

10.13.3 To convey what was ´DESTINED´ TO HAPPEN

WAS/WERE TO is a so-called 'future in the past' here, or refers to an earlier 'prediction', as some have called it, cf.

(8)   He became world-famous, but he <u>was to</u> die young.

cf.   Hij werd wereldberoemd, maar hij <u>zou</u> jong sterven.

10.13.4 The idea of 'a sense of duty' close to MUST or OUGHT TO

(9)   He <u>is to</u> be congratulated.

cf.   Hij <u>moet/dient/behoort</u> geluk (te) worden gewenst.

        Hij <u>verdient</u> onze gelukwensen.

10.13.5 BE TO + passive infinitive can also express POSSIBILITY

This use is fairly frequently found in formal texts. There is a near equivalent in Dutch as well, cf.

(10)   The article <u>is to</u> be found in the Proceedings.

cf.   Dat artikel <u>is</u> in de Verslagen <u>te vinden</u>.

Dutch can also render the notion of POSSIBILITY more explicitly:

(10')   Dat artikel <u>kan</u> men / <u>kun</u> je in de Verslagen vinden.

10.13.6 BE TO in CONDITIONAL subclauses

BE TO is also common in some types of conditional subclause. Type 1 conditionals (= open conditions in the NON-PAST) often combine AM/ARE/IS TO in the if-clause with WILL HAVE TO in the main clause, cf.

(11)   If Ann <u>is to</u> succeed, she will have to work harder.

cf.   Als Ann <u>wil</u> slagen, zal ze harder moeten werken.

The (subjunctive) form WERE TO is used in type 2, i.e. unreal or hypothetical conditions in the NON-PAST:

(12)   If I <u>were to</u> do that, what would you say?

cf.   Als ik dat (nu) eens <u>deed</u>, wat zou je dan zeggen?

         <u>Mocht</u> ik dat doen, ...

10.13.7 Some more or less idiomatic uses for further discussion:

(13)   <u>Am</u> I <u>to</u> understand that you are coming?

cf.   Mag/kan ik daaruit afleiden dat je komt?

(14)   They <u>are to</u> be married next week.

cf.   Ze worden volgende week in de echt verbonden.

(15)   This <u>is to </u>inform you that due to unforeseen …

cf.   Dit schrijven dient om u te berichten dat …

10.14 Synoptic Table

MODAL	DEONTIC MODALITY	EPISTEMIC MODALITY	DYNAMIC MODALITY	Pragmatic uses
CAN/COULD	**General permission** *Members can enter at all times.* (Specific permission: be allowed to, be permitted to, etc.) **! also for speaker permission in informal contexts.** *Mom, can I throw a party?* <u>Neg</u>: Lack of permission *Non-members can't enter.*	**Theoretical possibility** (it is possible for x to) *These trousers can be washed* Neg: Factual/Theoretical impossibility *This paint can't be washed off.* *That can't be true.*	**General ability** (specific ability: be able to/manage to/succeed in, etc.) *He can swim very well.*	**Polite request** *Could you lend me a hand?* **Polite request for permission** *Could I have a look too?* **Suggestion** *Maybe you could give her a call?* **Characteristic behaviour** *He can be really stubborn.*
MAY/MIGHT	**Speaker/Hearer permission** *You may leave now.* <u>Past permission state:</u> COULD *I could always give him a ring, 24/7.* <u>Past permission event:</u> Be allowed to	**Factual possibility** (it is possible that..) !Might: more remote (but not past possibility *That might be true.* <u>Neg</u>: Factual possibility: it is possible that x is not the case (⇔ cannot: it is not possible	/	**Request for permission** *May I go now?* **Invitation** *May I have this dance?* **Might: very polite request** *Might I ask you a favour?* **Rebuke**

	Neg: lack of permission	that. *It cannot be true* vs. *It may not be true*		*You might help for a change.* **Wish**: *May the best win.* **Intention, purpose, result** **Concession**: *he may be rich, but he isn't happy.*

MODAL	DEONTIC MODALITY	EPISTEMIC MODALITY	Pragmatic uses
MUST (moeten)	**Internal (speaker, hearer) obligation** *You must do as you're told.* *Must I do it all by myself? (obligation)* *Vs. Need I (*expected answer=no) Past: Had to Neg: *mustn't* prohibition (⇔ needn't: absence of obligation) Past prohibition: *was/were not to*	**Factual logical necessity** *This can't be right. I must have made a mistake.* NEG: cannot (and not mustn't)	**Strong advice** *You must see this film.* **Rebuke** *Must you really make that noise?* **Pragmatic weakening** *I must say/confess/*
HAVE (GOT) TO (moeten)	**External obligation**: *We have (got) to write three term papers.* **Habitual obligation**: *Do you have (*got) to work on Saturdays?*	**Theoretical logical necessity**. *If you keep drinking so much, your liver has to be affected eventually.* *Well the fun has to end eventually, I have to work*	

	NEG: absence of obligation. *We don't have to wear a uniform.*	*in the morning so I am off.*	
NEED (hoeven)	**NON-OBLIG by SPEAKER-HEARER in NON-ASSERTIVE environments** *You needn't write more than 200 words (as far as I am concerned).*	**NON-ASSERTIVE LOG NEG** (hoeven) *Need(n't) there be a motive for the crime?*	
NEED TO (hoeven moeten, nodig zijn)	**(NON)-OBLIG in ASSERTIVE and NON-ASSERTIVE environments** *I need to think it over.* *I don't need to think it over.*	**LOGICAL NECESSITY** *There needs to be a logical explanation for this.* *He needn't be a snob, just because he drives an Aston Martin.* Pos. past: *had to (It had to happen one day)*	**Advice, suggestion** *You may need to see an eye specialist.*

MODAL	DEONTIC MODALITY	EPISTEMIC MODALITY	Pragmatic uses
SHALL	**(strong) speaker volition: Willingness, determination, etc.** *We shall never surrender!* **2nd, 3rd p subject: command, threat,...** *You shall not pass!* Also used in **legal** documents and regulations	**Prediction** *We shall all be dead by 2150.*	**Suggestion, offer**. *Shall I turn the light off?*
SHOULD	**Moral obligation, propriety,**	**1. Logical necessity, assumption**	**1. Tentative condition**

173

	advisability *You shouldn't smoke so much, dear.* *His suggestion is that we should stop the procedure.* (main clause contains element that refers to advice) Similar uses for *ought to*	*That should do the trick.* (see *ought to*) **2. intention/prediction** *I should (would) have the same response, so don't apologise.*	If it *should* fail, contact us on this number. **2. Putative should** When the main clause expresses emotions or attitudes towards proposition: *(It's) funny you should mention that.* **3. Surprise, lack of understanding** *How should I know?* **4. Softened affirmation** *I should think he did it on purpose*
OUGHT TO	**Moral obligation, advisability** *You ought to know better than that.*	**Assumption, logical necessity** *There ought to be enough for everyone, so help yourself*	

MODAL	DEONTIC MODALITY	EPISTEMIC MODALITY	Pragmatic uses
WILL	**Volition of the Subject** (willingness, determination, insistence) *Will you take Ann to be your wedded wife?* *I won't tell anyone, don't worry.* *He simply won't confess.* Would: deference (*Would you be so*	**Assumption, prediction** (specific, timeless, prediction) *Who's next? That'll be me.* *Boys will be boys.* *She will sit there for hours, staring and thinking about her sons who died in war.*	**exasperation, promises, threats, commands** *You will do as you are told.* *I will strike down upon thee with great vengeance.* *Why will you keep on saying that?*

	kind...) **Unpremeditated intention** *No worries, I'll do it.*		
WOULD	**Volition of the Subject** (willingness, determination, insistence) More tentative Past uses with strong volition (not weak with intention or willingness) *He simply wouldn't give up* (insistence) *He was prepared to do it.*(willingness) *He meant to do it.* (intention) Willingness in subclause *He said that he would contact him if we insisted.*	**Prediction** Specific*: It would take ages, (if you were to do it like that).* 'narrator' style *They would never see each other again.* Habitual: *In those days people would still nod to anyone they passed in the street.* *Would ⇔ used to* *Would: 'characteristic, typical behaviour'* *used to: objective description*	*Would you know it.* *Would you believe it; I said this was going to happen, and look...* **Remoteness, evasiveness, opinion, advice** *It would appear that I was wrong.* *I wouldn't do it.* **Derogatory** *They would say that now, wouldn't they, knowing their political background.*
USED TO		***Past habit (event + state)*** *I used to smoke. (habit is over)* *Cigarettes used to be less expensive when I was a student (time is over)* *⇔ would (event only)* *He used to/*would be a lawyer.*	

175

E1SB

EXERCISES

THE EXPRESSION OF FUTURE TIME
SET A

1.   Supply a suitable tense for the verbs in brackets

1.   You had better wait until the police (come).

2.   You (be) amazed when you (see) this view.

3.   I (have) a suit made as soon as I (arrive) in London.

4.   I (not play) cards with you until you (stop) cheating.

5.   I (come) and see you before I (leave) for England.

6.   I can't express an opinion until I (know) all the facts.

7.   I (expect) it to be ready as soon as I (come) in.

8.   I don't think he (phone) before he (arrive).

9.   I (not move) from here until he (get) back.

10.   You (know) him when you (see) him.

2.   PRESENT PROGRESSIVE / GOING TO

1.   I (play) bridge tonight with Tom and Ann.

2.   He (have) an operation next week.

3.   It's very cold. I (light) a fire.

4.   We (have) some friends to lunch tomorrow.

5.   The weather forecast says it (rain) tomorrow.

6.   You (go) to the auction tomorrow?

        Yes, I (go) but I (not buy) anything.

7.   I (have) my hair cut this afternoon.

8.   I (spend) a few days in London next week.

9.   The Town Council (build) a new school here.

10.   The Prime Minister (speak) on television tonight.

11.   We (take) the children to the seaside this summer.

12.   I (give) him a football for his next birthday.

13.   He (wash) the car?

14.   She (see) a specialist next week.

15.   When you (have) your next lesson?

        I (have) it on Monday.

3.   PRESENT PROGRESSIVE / SIMPLE FUTURE

1.   I'm sure that I (recognize) him.

2.   I (see) her tomorrow.

3.   He (play) tennis on Friday.

4.   She (come) back on Monday.

5.   I (go) again next year.

6.   I (believe) it when I see it.

7.   I (have) my car repainted next week.

8.   I hope you (have) a good time tomorrow.

9.   His speech (be) broadcast tonight.

10.   He (not forget) to come.

11.   He (leave) in a couple of days.

12.   If you drop that bottle it (break).

13.   I (never forgive) him.

14.   They (lay) the foundations next week.

15.   She (go) on a cruise next summer.

16.   Tom (catch) the 7.40 train.

17.   I (remember) your good advice.

18.   If he doesn't work hard he (not pass) his exam.

19.   I am sure you (like) him.

20.   You (see) a signpost at the end of the road.

4.   SIMPLE FUTURE / GOING TO

1.   The fire has gone out.

    So it has. I (go) and get some sticks.

2.   Did you remember to book seats?

    No, I forgot. I (telephone) for them now.

3.   I've just bought a typewriter: I finally (learn) to type.

4.   He has just been taken to hospital with a broken leg.

    I'm sorry to hear that. I (send) him some grapes.

5.   I see you're wearing your gardening gloves. You (do) some weeding?

6.   I can't understand this letter.

    No problem, I (call) my son. He (translate) it for you.

7.   Now that there's a slump, things (get) much dearer.

8.   A lot of paint was delivered here today. You (redecorate) the kitchen?

9.   Why are you getting out the jack?

       We have a puncture and I (change) the wheel.

       I (help) you.

10.   Look what I've just bought at an auction!

       What an extraordinary thing. Where you (put) it?

11.   Why are you peeling that bit of garlic?

       I (put) it in the stew.

12.   What you (do) when you grow up?

       I (be) a pavement artist.

13.   Why are you taking out all your dresses?

       I (shorten) the skirts.

14.   Will you lend me your season ticket?

       No, I (not lend) it to you. It's against the law.

15.   That tree makes the house very dark.

       Very well, I (cut) it down.

5.   SIMPLE FUTURE / FUTURE PROGRESSIVE

1.   There's going to be a bus strike. Everyone (walk) to work next week.

2.   You've just missed the last train.

       Never mind, I (walk).

3.   I'll ring you tomorrow at six.

       No, don't ring at six; I (bath) the baby then.

4.   Your face is dirty!

       All right, I (wash) it.

5.   You (have) lunch with me on the 24th?

       I'd love to, but I'm afraid I (do) my exam then.

6.   I (work) for Mr Lloyd next week as his own secretary (be) away.

7.   Why did you take his razor? He (look) for it everywhere tomorrow.

8.   I hope you'll do well in the race tomorrow. I (think) of you.

9.   Notice on board ship: In the event of an emergency all passengers
       (assemble) on the boat deck.

10.   I don't feel well enough to go to the station to meet him.

I (meet) him for you. Tell me how I (recognize) him.

He (wear) a black and white school cap.

11. I (leave) these flowers at the hospital for you. I (go) there anyway.

12. You ought to try to get a ticket for the Spectators' Gallery next week; they (discuss) capital punishment.

13. You've left the light on.

Oh, so I have. I (go) and turn it off.

14. I've just been appointed assistant at the local library.

Then you (work) under my sister. She's head librarian there.

15. I should post this letter but I don't feel like going out into the rain.

I (post) it for you; I (go) out anyway to take the dog for" a walk.

16. Today is Guy Fawkes' Day; this evening people (let) off fireworks and (make) bonfires in the streets.

17. Military order: Sentries (remain) on duty until they are relieved.

18. This time next Monday I (sit) in a Paris café reading Le Figaro.

You (not read). You (watch) the people.

19. Wages have gone up so I suppose prices (go up) too.

20. It's nearly autumn. Soon the leaves (change) colour.

6. NEGATIVE SIMPLE FUTURE / NEGATIVE FUTURE PROGRESSIVE

1. I don't like that man and I (help) him.

2. He (meet) her because they'll be in different places.

3. The gardener (cut) down the tree; he says it's perfectly all right as it is.

4. The gardener (cut) the grass for some time because I've got a lot of other jobs for him to do first.

5. Tom (come) to our party because he'll be away on that date.

6. Peter says he (come) to our party. He doesn't approve of parties.

7. She says that she (lend) me the book because I never give books back.

8. Mr Owen (speak) at the meeting tonight because he unexpectedly had to go to hospital.

9. I'll work under anyone except my brother. I (work) for him.

10. We'll be in the same firm but we (work) together; we'll be in different departments.

11. I (have) that pupil in my class. She's too noisy.

12.   I (teach) next week, as I have to go to Paris.

13.   He's so angry with his sister that he (speak) to her.

14.   They were very rude to me. I never (go) there again.

15.   There's something on his mind but he (tell) me what it is.

7.   THE FUTURE OF ASSUMPTION

Recast the following sentences, omitting the introductory remark in bold type and using FUTURE TENSES.

1.   **I suppose** you understand why I can't come.

2.   **I take it** you appreciate my difficulty.

3.   **I expect** you wonder why I haven't told you before.

4.   **I take it** your friends have got to London by now.

5.   **I imagine** you've been wondering all the time how this invention works.

6.   **I expect** he knows what I mean.

7.   **I imagine** you don't mind, of course.

8.   **I don't suppose** you've forgotten old Jimmy.

9.   **I take it for granted** you've come on foot.

10.   **Am I not right in supposing** this is the one you want?

SET B

1. Put the verbs into the correct tense.

1.   Tom: Where (you + go)_____ for your next holiday? (where have you arranged to go?)
       Ann: I don't know yet but we (probably go)_____ to Spain.

2.   We (have)_____ a drink with Peter tonight (he has invited us).
       It's his last night; he (leave)_____ tomorrow.

3.   Ann: Do you think we (see)_____ Bill tomorrow?
       Mary: I hope so. He (probably look)_____ in on his way to the airport.

4.   I (see)_____ my bank manager tomorrow (I have arranged this).
       I'm going to ask him for a loan but I expect he (refuse)_____.

5.   I (know)_____ the result tomorrow. As soon as I hear, I

(tell)_____ you.

6.   Jack's mother: Jack (be)_____ ready in a moment. He is just finishing breakfast.

Jack's father: If I wait for him any longer I (miss)_____ my train. I think I (walk)_____ on; he (probably catch)_____me up.

7.   I very likely (come)_____ to London some time next month.

I (give)_____ you a ring nearer the time and tell you when I (come)_____. (when I have decided/arranged to come).

2. Put the verbs into the correct tense.

1.   Ann: I've scorched Bill's shirt. What (he + say)_____?

Mary: Oh, he (not mind)_____. He (just +buy)_____ another shirt. He has plenty of money.

2.   Peter: We'd better leave a message for Jack. Otherwise he (not know)_____ where we've gone.

George: All right. I (leave)_____ a note on his table.

3.   Jack: I don't want to get married. I never (get)_____ married.

Mother: You think that now. But one day you (meet)_____ a girl and you (fall)_____ in love.

4.   Tom: I (go)_____ to York tomorrow. (have arranged to go).

Ann: (You + come)_____ back the same day? (have arranged to come back)

Tom: No, I (probably have)_____ to spend the night there.

5.   Peter: (You + walk)_____ home? (have you decided to walk?)

Andrew: Yes. It's too late for a bus.

Peter: But it's pouring. You (get)_____ soaked ! Here, take this umbrella.

Andrew: Thanks very much. I (bring)_____ it back tomorrow.

6.   Jack: I (have)_____ another window put in. (I have arranged this). They (start)_____ work on it tomorrow.

Ann: That (make)_____ the room much brighter.

7.   Jon: (You + take)_____ any exams this term? (have you decided to take an exam?)

Matt: Yes, I (take)_____ an English exam at the end of the month.

Jon: Do you think you (pass)_____?

3. Put the verbs into the correct tense:

1. Where (you + meet)_____ Tom (where have you arranged to meet him?)

   We (meet)_____ at Covent Garden. He (take)_____me to see The Magic Flute.

2. What (you + do)_____ next weekend? (what plans have you made?)

   It depends on the weather. If it's fine we (go)_____ somewhere in the car, if it's wet we (probably stay)_____ at home.

3. When (Jack + arrive)_____ (when did he say he'd arrive?)

   Some time this evening.

   And how (he + get)_____ here? (how has he arranged to travel?)

   I don't know yet. I suppose he (come)_____ by car.

4. What (they + do)_____ for their holidays? (have they decided to do?)

   They (go)_____ camping.

   And what (happen)_____ to their dog? (what plans have they made for the dog?)

   They (take)_____ the dog with them. I think he (enjoy)_____ it more than they will.

5. Don't make a sound or you (wake)_____ the baby; and then he (not get)_____ to sleep again.

6. Mary: Don't forget that Tom's four boys (spend)_____the weekend here. I don't know how we (manage)_____ with four boys under our feet in this small house.

   Jack: I have an idea. We (turn)_____ the attic into a playroom. Then they (be able)_____ to play trains without tripping anyone up.

7. Tom: Peter's just phoned to say that he (catch)_____ (has

arranged to catch) the 8.10 train and (be)_____ here by 9.00. It (be)_____ nice to see him again!

4. Same exercise.

1. Tom to Jack, who has just helped him to change a wheel: I (have)_____ to leave this at the garage; I don't know how to mend a puncture in a tubeless tyre.
   Jack: But it's quite easy. I (come)_____ round this evening and show you if you like.

2. Later: Tom to wife: I (not take)_____ the tyre to the garage. I (mend)_____ it myself. Jack (help)_____me.

3. Why are you rolling up the carpets? (You + paint)_____ the ceiling?
   No, I (take)_____ _____ the carpet to the cleaner's.

4. Ann: Here's the letter to the landlord. If there's anything I should add, say so and I (add)_____.
   Peter: It's fine, but it's illegible. He (not be able)_____ to read it.
   Ann: Oh, I (type)_____ it ! (she had always intended to type it).
   Peter: Good, then we (have)_____ a copy.

5. Employer: But there are a lot of mistakes in this, Miss Jones.
   Miss Jones : Yes, I suppose there are. All right, I (type)_____ it again.

6. Mrs. Smith: Your cold's worse, Ann. Go back to bed and I (ring)_____ the school and tell them you can't come.

7. Mrs. Smith was just picking up the receiver when her husband came downstairs.
   'Ann's not well', she said. 'I (ring)_____ the school and say she can't come.

8. Ann: Why are you taking fishing rods? (You + not climb)_____ the mountain after all?
   Tom: We (climb)_____ and fish. There's a lake on top and we (try)_____ _____ to get some fish out of it.
   Ann: Well, if you catch any I (cook)_____ them; but I think I (buy)_____ _____ some all the same.

5. Fill in the correct verb forms.

1. Jack usually gives me a lift home, but we (both + come)_____ home by train tomorrow as his car is being repaired.

2. He says he (meet)_____ us at the bus stop, but I'm sure he (forget)_____ to turn up.

3. Don't ring now; she (watch)_____ her favourite TV programme. All right, I (ring)_____ at 8.30.

4. I wonder what I (do)_____ this time next year. I expect you still (work)_____ at the same office.

5. – I'd like to double-glaze the bedroom windows. – All right. I (get)_____ the materials at once and we (do)_____ it this weekend.

6. Wait a bit. Don't drink your tea without milk. The milkman (come)_____ in a minute.

7. What are you doing next weekend? Oh, I (work)_____ as usual. I'm always on duty at weekends.

8. Air hostess: We (take)_____ off in a few minutes. Please fasten your seat belts.

9. He (come)_____ if you ask him.

10. I arranged to play tennis with Tom at nine tonight. But you (play)_____ in semi-darkness. You won't be able to see the ball.

11. I (get)_____ you some aspirins if you like. The chemist's (still + be)_____ open. No don't bother. The office boy (go)_____ out in a minute to post the letters; I (ask)_____ him to buy me some.

12. It (be)_____ very late when she gets home and her parents (wonder)_____ what's happened.

6. Fill in the correct verb forms:

1. I never (be)_____ able to manage on my own. But you won't be on your own. Tom (help)_____ you. Look - his name is

bracketed with yours on the list.

2. I (not wear)_____ glasses when you see me next. I (wear) _____ contact lenses. You probably (not recognize)_____ me.

3. I'll tell him the truth of course. But it (not be)_____ any good. He (not believe)_____ me.

4. Customer: When (you +deliver)_____ my next order?
Shop assistant: We (not deliver)_____ any more orders, I'm afraid. This branch is closing down.

5. It'll be easy to pick her out in that bright red coat of hers. But she (not wear)_____ the red coat ! She's given it away.

6. No, I (not tell)_____ you the end ! Go on reading and find out for yourself

7. You (not use)_____ your car when you're on holiday, will you?
No, but don't ask me to lend it to you because I (not do)_____ it. Not after what happened last time.

8. I (have) _____to be a bit careful about money when I retire because I'll only be getting half my present salary. But of course I (not pay) _____supertax.

9. I hope they (repair) _____this road by the time we come back next summer.

10. By the end of next week my wife (do) _____her spring cleaning and we'll all be able to relax again.

11. Yes, I make jam every week. I (make) _____about 200 kilos by the end of the summer.

12. In two months' time he (finish) _____his preliminary training and will be starting work.

13. He spends all his spare time planting trees. He says that by the end of next year he (plant) _____2,000.

14. And Mark is one of the lucky ones — he at least has somewhere to sleep. Thousands of young people (spend) _____this Christmas on the streets because they have no home to go to, and once they have reached adulthood, over a third of them (spend) _____most of their childhood in care.

7. Fill in the most suitable verb form to refer to the future.

1.   Is there really no one prepared to go to the corner shop and get some milk? – All right, all right. I (do) …………………………………………do it.
2.   Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome aboard this Boeing 747 to Los Angeles. We (start) …………………………………………start our inflight beverage service in a moment.
3.   When I saw the doctor approaching with a big syringe I thought, "Yikes! This (hurt) …………………………………………!"
4.   Ticket sales for Robbie Williams's next concert (go) …………………………………………on sale this coming Wednesday.
5.   The H1N1 virus emerged in Britain last April but, despite predictions that swine flu could cause 65,000 deaths this winter, the illness has been much milder than feared and experts now suggest that there will not be a third wave of cases after peaks last summer and autumn. Figures from the Department of Health suggest that in total it …………………………………………(spend) more than £1 billion on drugs and vaccines for swine flu by the end of the pandemic, but Sir Liam Donaldson, the Chief Medical Officer for England, added that the full costs would not be calculated until a later date.
6.   …………………………………………(you use) the car this afternoon or can I have it?
7.   Would you like to hang out at the beach next weekend? – Sorry, I can't. …………………………………………(throw) a surprise party for my sister's 21st. I've invited all of her friends and booked a DJ.
8.   The World Cup …………………………………………(kick off) in exactly 10 days and as things stand today there are thousands of tickets left.
9.   I have hypoglycemia, and I know that every time I don't eat for a while and my blood sugar gets low I feel like …………………………………………(faint).

CONDITIONALS

1.   Rephrase, using CONDITIONAL clauses.

1.   We stayed up all night and that's why we're all so tired this morning.
       [If we…]

2.   She wasn't able to answer the questions and so she failed the exam.
       [If she…]

3.   The reason why I haven't been to America is that I can't afford it.
       [if I…]

4.   He hasn't studied English before and that's why he's in a beginner's
       class.
       [If he….]

5.   They didn't go to the seaside because the weather was so bad.
       [They…   ]

6.   One of the reasons why I didn't phone was that I was very busy.
       [I might …]

7.   They won the match because two of our players were injured.
       [if two...]

8.   The police towed my car away because I had not parked in the car park.
       [if I…]

9.   I did not lend you any money because I hadn't realised you were short of
       money.
       [If I…]

2.   Make CONDITIONAL sentences.

1.   Know -- I -- tell - you.   [type 3]
2.   I -- show - him -- he -- turn up.   [type 1]
3.   Be clever -- he -- pass -- the exam.   [type 2]
4.   I -- be born -- be here -- today -- two hundred years ago.   [type 3]
5.   Not be stupid -- they --not make -- those mistakes,   [type 2 or 3]

3.   Fill in the correct tenses in the following CONDITIONALS. Indicate the type of CONDITIONAL.

1.   If you (find) a skeleton in the cellar, don't mention it to anyone.

2.   If you pass your examination we (have) a celebration.

3.   If I press this button what (happen)?

4.   If you go to Paris where you (stay)?

5.   In case the fog (get) thick the flight may be cancelled.

6.   You would be a better bridge player if you (not talk) so much.

7.   If the milkman (come), tell him to leave two pints.

8.   Suppose I hear the burglar alarm, what I (do)?

9.   If you (read) the instructions carefully you wouldn't have answered the wrong question.

10.   I would be able to repair the roof myself if I (have) a long ladder.

11.   Unless they turn that radio off I (go) completely mad.

12.   If we (run) out of petrol we'll have a long way to walk.

13.   If you shake that bottle of old port it (not be) fit to drink.

14.   Unless he (come) with me I'll probably get lost.

15.   If you drove more slowly you (not have) so many accidents.

16.   If you (wear) a false beard nobody would have recognised you.

17.   If she (leave) the fish there the cat will get it.

18.   If I had known you didn't like octopus I (not buy) it.

19.   If you (not change) your wet clothes you'll get pneumonia.

20.   If they (hang) that picture lower people would be able to see it.

21.   If her shoes hadn't such high heels we (be able) to walk much faster.

22.   I (bring) some beer if I had known that you were thirsty.

23.   If you had touched that electric cable you (be) electrocuted.

24.   The newspaper (not print) the story if it hadn't been true.

25.   It anyone attacked me, my dog (jump) at this throat!

4.   Rewrite the following sentences as conditionals. Make sure that the meaning of the original is preserved.

1.   Fallon's horse didn't win the Coventry stakes, because they didn't feed it properly.

2.   I didn't ask for directions, so I got lost.

3.   Abbas broke off the negotiations because Netanyahu lost his temper.

5. **Fill in the right form of the verb in the following sentences. Do not add any extra words.**

1. If I (bind) ………………………………………my daughter's drawings into books I could give them a nice space on a bookshelf instead of just stacking them in a storage bin.

2. Tiger's appearance this year, during which he would have travelled along the Bobby Jones Expressway, has already made it a most unusual Masters, one of the most unusual ever. …………………………………… (he + to win) next Sunday, which is by no means out of the question, it …………………………………… (make) this an extraordinary Masters; perhaps even the most extraordinary of all.

3. The Tory analysis, based on figures for 2008-09, suggests that 6.8 million slots could have been made available to those without access to an NHS dentist …………………………………… (they be used) for excessive appointment-setting or needless splitting of courses of treatment into separate sessions.

4. My boss expects me to dress professionally. That's why I always wear suits to work. He …………………………………… (go) berserk if I …………………………………… (wear) jeans in a meeting.

THE PASSIVE

1.   Rewrite the following sentences in the PASSIVE.

1.   Someone has killed Lord Wessex.   (Lord Wessex ...)
2.   Someone found the body in the study.   (The body ...)
3.   The murderer committed the crime at around midnight.   (The crime ...)
4.   The butler saw two strangers near the house.   (Two strangers ...)
5.   The police are questioning the butler.   (The butler ...)
6.   They know that Lady Wessex was out of the country.   (Lady Wessex ...)
7.   No one has seen the younger son for three weeks. (The younger son ...)
8.   The family last saw the elder son two years ago.   (The elder son ...)
9.   Everyone will sadly miss Lord Wessex.   (Lord Wessex ...)

2.   Rewrite (Passive --> Active / Active — > Passive).

1.   Jimmy was punished by his father
2.   His leg was broken in a skiing accident.
3.   Someone has stolen my watch.
4.   The plants got damaged by the cold weather.
5.   The voters re-elected the President.
6.   Dozens of trees were blown down in the wind.
7   The police are interviewing all the witnesses.
8.   She was awarded the prize by the judges.
9.   We're going to give him a big surprise!
10.   The chambermaid hasn't cleaned my room.
11.   He was thrown out of the class for cheating.
12.   My secretary will tell you the results.

3.   Rewrite in the PASSIVE.

1.   I think someone is following me.
2.   They've decided on a new strategy.
3.   When we push in the handle, increased air pressure inside the cylinder
         closes the valve.

4. American fighter planes attacked Panama.   (+ to report).

5. It's unpleasant if someone laughs at you.

6. Julius Caesar had an affair with Cleopatra.   (+ to say).

7. Most people believe former American President Bush lied about the arms deliveries to Afghanistan.   (Bush ...)

4. Rewrite the following passage, using PASSIVES wherever possible.

Belcombe used to be an unspoilt village on the south coast of England, but you wouldn't recognise it now. They've developed it as a tourist resort - and they've completely destroyed its old atmosphere. They've - pulled down the picturesque old cottages by the harbour, and they've built a hideous luxury hotel there instead. They've widened and resurfaced all the old cobbled streets and they've cut down the trees in the village square and put a car park there. Even the old village shop isn't there anymore -they've turned it into one of those awful cafés where everything seems to be made of plastic, and they've put a big sign outside saying 'Ye Olde Tea Shoppe'.

5. Rewrite the following active clauses as passives. Use animate subjects where possible. By-agents are optional.

1. Everyone had always questioned her reliability and the mess she had made proved them right.

    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………

2. Some scientists believe that aliens built the Gizeh pyramids.

    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………

3. A local journalist reports that huge explosions at an arms dump in Congo Brazzaville have killed at least 150 people.

    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………

4. Meteorologists have forecast 10 cyclones. They expect six of them to reach the level of hurricanes. (turn into one sentence)

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

5. My parents always told me that the villagers believed a giant grizzly bear had eaten my grandfather. Turns out it was the other way round and that he died of indigestion.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

6.   **Put the following active sentences into perfective passive sentences. Translate the passive sentence into Dutch.**

1. Research results <u>show</u> that the colour red reduces sleep, but enhances performance in the bedroom.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

2. The government <u>will grant</u> asylum to the Roma family by the end of the month.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………..

3. People <u>were</u> always <u>poking</u> fun at him for being poor.

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

7.   **Translate, using a PASSIVE construction + ANIMATE SUBJECTS wherever possible.**

1.   De wagen werd ernstig beschadigd in het ongeval.
2.   Ze hebben me gisteren pas het boek gegeven.
3.   Men zegt dat hij al een tijdje ziek is.

4.   Jim werd door iedereen uitgelachen.

5.   Men verwacht dat hij vóór vijf uur terug is.

6.   Hij is zijn boek weer kwijtgeraakt.

7.   Men heeft gisteren een Van Gogh gestolen uit het museum.

8.   Er was hen toch gevraagd zo vlug mogelijk te antwoorden?

9.   Het ontwapeningsverdrag is door beide presidenten ondertekend.

10.   Drie kinderen zijn in de aanval van gisteren op Damascus gedood.

11.   Men verwacht dat hij wel weer te laat zal zijn.

12.   Het Greenpeace-schip werd door de Fransen tot zinken gebracht.

13.   Men vermoedt dat zelfs de Franse President daarover ingelicht was.

14.   Ze zegden dat ik weg moest gaan.

15.   Er was ons niet eens gevraagd of we wilden meedoen!

16.   Men gelooft niet dat zij erbij betrokken was.

8.   Translate the following sentences from Dutch into English or from English into Dutch.

1. Hij werd een beroemdheid nadat hij ontdekt werd tijdens een zangwedstrijd.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Ze is verrast door het plotse geweld en wordt nu gedwongen het land te verlaten.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Hij was nog niet ondervraagd door de politie maar werd wel al beschuldigd door het volk.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Als je ontslagen bent op je 50^e, is er weinig kans om ergens anders aanvaard te worden.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

5. They have been misled by the prospect of earning easy money.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

6. She was married off to someone she had never been introduced to.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

AUXILIARIES: DO/BE/HAVE

1. **INVERSION after initial negative words.**

Rephrase the following sentences, beginning them with the words in italics

1. We have *never* heard a more convincing argumentation.
2. We *seldom* receive such generous praise.
3. This nation has *scarcely ever* faced such a great danger.
4. We were *never before* asked to make such a sacrifice.
5. We *rarely* have an opportunity to serve our country in this way.
6. We will *only then* begin to realise the appalling danger before us.
7. I had *hardly* left before the trouble started.
8. They realised *only later* what a terrible thing had happened.
9. He *little* knows how much suffering he has caused.
10. I understand *only now* what they were trying to tell me.

2. **NEGATION**

Negate the following sentences

1. We have enough evidence already.
2. This applies to some of the people here.
3. It helps us in our daily work, too.
4. Robertson is still living at this address.
5. Cancer of the lung has something to do with smoking.
6. I can understand all of these ten words.
7. There are a lot of people on the platform already.
8. Someone is doing research in this field.
9. I can understand both of these sentences.
10. He has been away from home a long time.

3. QUESTION TAGS

Supply an appropriate QUESTION TAG for each sentence below, using auxiliaries

1. We're not late, ...?
2. I'm coming with you, ...?
3. You understand what I'm saying, ...?
4. He's doing his best, ...?
5. He's done his best, ...?
6. There's not enough bread, ...?
7. There's not been a mistake, ...?
8. You can see what's happening, ...?
9. You saw what happened, ...?
10. We all had a good time, ...?
11. You'll be quite alright, ... ?
12. There won't be any damage, ... ?
13. They'd rather go by air, ...?
14. You'd been up since five o'clock, ... ?
15. You'd set out tomorrow if you could, ... ?
16. You'd set out too late and missed the train, . .
17. Let's investigate this matter, ...?
18. None of your colleagues like the film, ...?
19. You'd better plead guilty, ...?
20. Let us go, ...?

4. CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

1. Reword the following sentences with the HAVE + - NP structure

1. Order someone to deliver it to your house.
2. Someone washed my car for me yesterday.
3. The knives want sharpening.   [You must ...]
4. I'm going to tell someone to add an extra room.
5. He succeeded in making them all sing.

6. Someone sends me my books from London. [I ...]

7. Aren't you going to ask someone to paint your gate?

8. You shouldn't leave the solution of your problem to others.

9. His funny stories made everyone laugh. [He ...]

10. Somebody will have to see to it for you. [You ...]

11. Your hair wants cutting. [You ...]

12. Tell someone to translate it into English.

13. Someone tuned her piano for her yesterday.

14. He asked his tailor to lengthen his trousers.

15. Our season tickets need renewing. [We ...]

2. *Turn the following sequences of words into sentences with causative HAVE. Make sure you choose the right type of causative.*

1. Kevin – knock out – his teeth – in a baseball accident.

……………………………………………………………………………

2. John didn't write that essay; he – his sister – write – it.

……………………………………………………………………………

3. From the first note of the first movement to the last note of the finale, Ricardo Chailly – his audience – sit – on the edge of their seats.

……………………………………………………………………………

4. Every woman over 50 – need – examine – her breasts – on a regular basis.

……………………………………………………………………………

5. Patrick didn't change that light bulb; he – change – his wife.

……………………………………………………………………………

3.   *Translate, using the HAVE + NP structure*

1. Ik kan het niet hebben dat ze zoiets van ons zeggen.
2. Laat hem maar eens terugkeren.
3. Misschien kan jij hem aan het praten krijgen.
4. Ik zal niet langer dulden dat ze zo onbeleefd zijn.
5. Hij zou beter de betrokkenen laten aanhouden.
6. De directeur liet de secretaresse de brieven tikken.
7. Hij deed zich overal respecteren.   [use MAKE]
8. Laat je wagen eens nakijken [overhaul] voor je vertrekt.
9. Hij zou liever de moeilijkheden door anderen laten oplossen.
10. Het is moeilijk zo'n publiek aan het lachen te krijgen.
11. Hij zou zijn huis beter laten bouwen door een aannemer.
12. Je zou je plan beter door een architect laten tekenen.
13. Kan je deze brief zo vlug mogelijk laten vertalen?
14. We moeten dringend onze computer laten herstellen.
15. Laat jij nooit eens je jas stomen?
16. Ik kan niet verdragen dat je zo schreeuwt tegen mij.
17. We wassen onze wagen niet zelf, we laten het doen.
18. Doe die twee daar eens zwijgen.
19. Hij liet ze één voor één een liedje zingen.
20. Ze heeft gisteren d'r haar laten verven.

CONCORD

1. Make the right CONCORD.

1. There *is / are* people waiting to see you.
2. The people wholeheartedly *support / supports* you.
3. Ours *is / are* a great people, *isn't it / aren't they?*
4. The police *has / have* an unenviable task.
5. Splendid cattle *was / were* grazing on the hillside.
6. Mumps *is / are* an unpleasant ailment.
7. Linguistics *has / have* developed rapidly in recent times.
8. The acoustics of this concert hall *is / are* excellent.
9. Bacteria of the harmful kind *cause / causes* disease.
10. The United States *are / is* one of the major economic powers.
11. Everyone of us *has / have* his own burden to shoulder.
12. It is on each individual effort that the safety and happiness of the whole *depends / depend.*
13. War and Peace *is / are* a constant theme in history.
14. War and peace *is / are* alternatives between which we must constantly choose.
15. 'War and Peace' *is / are* a fascinating novel.
16. The people outside *is / are* getting impatient
17. The public *is / are* demanding an official inquiry.
18. It *was / were* the Germans who started World War II.
19. The Philippines *is / are* a large group of islands.
20. Neither John nor Mary *has / have* replied to my letter.
21. The Committee *wishes / wish* to reconsider *its / their* decision.
22. Everybody *knows / know* what they have to do.
23. How is it that your answer and your neighbour's *is / are* identical.
24. Every passenger had to carry *his / their* own luggage.
25. You have always been *such good friends / such a good friend*

2. Fill in.

1. Either the physicians in this hospital or the chief administrator _____ is/are going to have to make a decision.

2. _____ Is/are my boss or my sisters in the union going to win this grievance?

3. Some of the votes _____ seem/seems to have been miscounted.

4. The tornadoes that tear through this county every spring _____ is/are more than just a nuisance.

5. Everyone selected to serve on this jury _____ have/has to be willing to give up a lot of time.

6. Kara Wolters, together with her teammates, _____ presents/present a formidable opponent on the basketball court.

7. He seems to forget that there _____ is/are things to be done before he can graduate.

8. There _____ has/have to be some people left in that town after yesterday's flood.

9. Some of the grain _____ appear/appears to be contaminated.

10. Three-quarters of the students _____ is/are against the tuition fee.

11. Three-quarters of the student body _____ is/are against the tuition hike.

12. A high percentage of the population _____ is/are voting for the new school.

13. A high percentage of the people _____ was/were voting for the new school.

14. The cracked windshield, in addition to the torn upholstery and rusted body, _____ has/have made Ruth's old car difficult to sell.

15. Great quantities of fish _____ (catch) in this river in the past few years.

16. When and where to build the school _____ (decided) yet.

17. What we need _____(be) bicycles.

18. What he says and what he does _____(not agree).

20. Half of the books _____ (be) novels.

21. More than one student _____ (be) late for class this morning.

22. Twenty years _____ (pass) since I left school.

23. One hundred years _____ (be not)a long time in human history.

24. A pair of broken glasses _____ (lie) on the desk.

25. My sunglasses _____ (wear out).

26. The United Nations _____ (to found) in 1945.

27. The number of people who own cars _____ (be) increasing.

28. Neither his brother nor his sister _____ (work) in the hospital.

29. Each man and woman _____ (have) the same rights.

30. Mary is one of the girls who _____ (be) always on time.

REVISION

I. Tenses (present, past, future)

Fill in the most suitable verb form to refer to the present, past or future. Pay attention to aspect and voice!

1. He …………………………………………………….. (undergo + just) a heart triple bypass when he announced plans from his sickbed to wed a former Bond girl. Romance Smart-suited Jonathan said he had " absolutely no comment. "

2. Mary Anne Gerchas was taken off the witness list after being charged with felony fraud so it's very likely that she ……………………………………………………. (not + testify) on this trial next week. Another alibi witness the defense promised to produce, is Rosa Lopez, who worked as a maid at the house next to Simpson's estate. I am not sure whether that ……………………………………………………. (be) a huge success in terms of credibility. She is a convicted felon herself.

3. Retired school secretary Anne Stern, 73, was on her way to spend Thanksgiving with relatives when two shabbily-dressed youths pulled in front of her and ……………………………………………………. (begin) trying to force her off the road. The two cars ……………………………………………………. (slam) into each other as they ……………………………………………………. (speed) along a quiet tree-lined avenue before the youths finally forced her into a garden. As she ……………………………………………………. (wind down) her window to scream for help, one of the youths then tried to drag her from her car."

4. Younger generations need a facility they can identify with and which is adequate for their needs in terms of space and standards. "By the time the mosque opens, the project ……………………………………………………. (cost) $6 million to $7

million", said Mohammad Tomeh, chairman of the board of directors at Al-Farooq.

5. First, we should understand that the political hacks were peeved when he won the overwhelming support of his colleagues to represent them on Labour's shadow cabinet and they …………………………………………………….. (gut) when John Smith gave him the Scottish Office to shadow. It was unthinkable that a miner's son should be given such a high office in front of a number of so-called " acceptable people, " whose political careers …………………………………………………….. (tread) the well-known track through privilege and patronage for many years.

6. Just to give you an idea, by the time you've finished reading this article more than 1000 sharks …………………………………………………….. (slay) around the globe.

7. Driving a Rolls-Royce into a swimming pool was Crawford's death-defying contribution to his next film, Hello-Goodbye. It was his third picture for Twentieth Century-Fox and his biggest screen disappointment, partly because he …………………………………………………….. (miscast) in the romantic lead.

8. Plenty of time remains for the White Sox to make the playoffs, team captain Paul Konerko believes, even if the Sox don't do well on a much-anticipated 11-game road trip that …………………………………………………….. (start) in Boston tonight.

9. I …………………………………………………….. (wait) until April 7th to start reading – at least that's my intention – since I …………………………………………………….. (go) on a 1 week cruise and there's nothing better than sitting on a boat reading a good book. I have no doubt that I…………………………………………………….. (catch) up with the rest of you by the time I

………………………………………………………….. (get) back from my trip so I'll have plenty of comments to add when I return.

10. This was the site of Fair Rosamund's Bower, once a rose garden, Japanese garden, maze, hermitage and Folly, a trysting place for young people who thought the days of dancing and fox-hunting would never end. A small roofless house nearby now played host to a large tree growing out of the middle of the floor. Another tree, recently felled, ………………………………………………………….. (lie – do not use the progressive-) by its side.

11. He opened his eyes and was instantly aware of utter, spine-chilling silence. Everything was dark except for a single patch where the moon ………………………………………………….. (shine – do not use the progressive-) through the skylight on to the wall. A single pale, bright patch, from which two black skeletons leered down at him. He ………………………………………………….. (catch) his breath. At once, away to the side of the skeletons, a dark hump …………………………………………………….. (rear). A shadow moved across the brightness, coming towards his bed.

12. Thai social activist and political professor Giles Ji Ungpakorn …………………………………………………… (present) himself at a Thai police station yesterday to answer charges of insulting Thai royalty, but he didn't show up.

13. She felt better than she had for months. " Thank you, Mrs Ryan. You've been so good to me. "Her voice was trembling with emotion. Sarah waved her hand impatiently. "Don't you think it's about time you ………………………………………………… (call) me Sarah? As for thanking me... for what? I should have been here for you a long time ago.

14. It is not intended to be an April fool, but it may seem so to many Cubans. By April 1st next year some 500,000 of them …………………………………………………. (lay off) from the state jobs which they …………………………………………………… (hold)

for decades now, whether or not the jobs were necessary or whether they even did any work.

15. A six year old boy has become one of the youngest people to win the All British Scrambling Championship. Ben Hunt ………………………………………………… (ride) motorbikes since he ………………………………………………… (be) three. Now he plans to make a career of it.

16. On the sixth anniversary of their engagement, the Palace announced they were to separate. Then came the scandal of Fergie being photographed while she ………………………………………………… (frolic) topless with her "financial adviser " John Bryan (aka 'den John', Astrid Bryan's current husband) in the south of France.

17. In a famous, lofty quote Dr. Samuel Johnson once said: "When a man knows he ………………………………………………… (hang) in a fortnight, it concentrates his mind wonderfully.

18. At the end this course, you ………………………………………………… (dye) your own Indie Artisan colourways for knitting, crocheting, rug hooking, spinning, and weaving.

19. We completed the interview while my shoes .... (shine).

20. A sad fact of life is that the more prudent .... (outbid) by the less prudent. Point out to your broker, that you have no intention of entering into a bidding type situation, and that until inventory levels return to acceptable levels, your plans to buy a home .... (postpone).

21. The rules which posit that these people .... (not + allocate) proper housing are downright abolitions of human rights.

II. Conditionals

1) Rewrite the following sentences as conditionals. Make sure that the meaning of the original is preserved.

1. She didn't shine the silverware, because he had already done it himself.

   ……………………………………………………………………………..

   ……………………………………………………………………………

2. As we didn't have money, we couldn't bear the extra costs.

   ……………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………

3. The pills were working and she didn't slide back into depression.

   ……………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………

2) Fill in the right form of the verb in the following sentences. Add negatives whenever relevant. Pay attention to voice. Translate the conditional sentences into Dutch.

1. The Rangers fans …………………………………………(do) a lot more to head off what has happened if they …………………………………………(inform) properly.

   ……………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………

2. Poor guy. Dead at the age of 36. If only he …………………………………………(have) the courage to tell us about his depression, we …………………………………………(seek) professional help for him.

   ……………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………

3. Unless they ………………………………………(dig) in the wrong place, he knew they………………………………………….(find) the treasure any minute now.

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………

4. We joked about skipping lunch for a baguette and more cheese - perhaps if it ……………………………………………… (not + be) so cold we ……………………………………………… (picnic) in the Guadarrama, but just stayed inside instead.

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………

III. The passive

1) Rewrite the following active clauses as passives. Use animate subjects <u>where possible</u> and leave out the *by*-agent.

1. According to the latest news reports the Assad regime has notoriously massacred tens of thousands of people, effectively bringing armed resistance to a halt.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Today, more and more people suspect that Protestant churches collaborated with the communists and domesticated East Germans who, based on the common belief in official sources, sought and found refuge within the church at one point. (2 passives)

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……

3. They knew that governments all over the world carried out illegal executions.

……

2) Translate into English or Dutch, using passives wherever possible.

1. Hem werd altijd veel beloofd en niks gegeven.

……

2. Omdat het vee gebrandmerkt was, konden we bevestigen dat het gestolen was.

……

3. On 28 July Japanese papers reported that the declaration had been rejected by the Japanese government.

……

4. De politie heeft net gemeld dat de dief gearresteerd is.

……

5. De jongens hebben het goed gedaan, maar het waren de meisjes die beloond werden.

……

6. De speech van de nieuwe paus is zonet live uitgezonden.

……

7. Lokale bewoners zeggen dat Chen-Li het monster van Lochness gevangen heeft.

……

IV. Causatives

Turn into sentences with causative *HAVE*. Choose the right type of causative.

1. After the operation she was wondering if a woman who – enlarge - her breasts - with silicone implants can have a mammogram.

    ....

    ....

2. The combination of the train's gentle rocking motion and satiation - soon – doze - us in our seats. What seemed like moments later, Jean-Marc was back, tapping on our door to remind us that it was time to dress for dinner.

    ....

    ....

3. This is the first time I – have – my sheep - shear - and they are looking all fresh and fruity.

    ....

    ....

4. Football is definitely a trait that's been passed on generation after generation. He didn't start lifting weights until late in his high school career, but his father – him - do - plenty of push-ups and sit-ups before that.

    ....

    ....

MODALS

Try-out exercises

1. Use the correct modal verb or alternative form expressing modality. Use negation if necessary.

1) He wasn't the brightest kid in town, but he .... beat anyone at 'Finding Waldo'.

2) Only two prisoners .... escape from the Tuol Sleng prison in Cambodia between 1975 and 1979. The rest of them, more than 15,000 in total, were tortured and killed.

3) However stressful the situation he got himself into, he ……………………………….. always control always his temper.

4) That's probably why Vanderbilt's made such a dramatic turnaround on the baseball field, Obstinate as he was, he simply .... accept anything but his teams very best.

5) Once these men reached maturity and married and wanted to establish homes of their own, my grandfather .... always set each of them up on a tract of forty acres or more, assist them in getting started, and accept a payment contract over a period of forty years. That's just the kind of man he was.

6) Hot news (and a great relief for many): Hot news: new tattoo ink means "4ever" .... be permanent.

7) Did you really have to say that? Why .... you just be a little more considerate?

8) As required for good hygiene practice within agriculture, food and healthcare, the importance of the role that good hand and environmental hygiene plays with infection control .... be overstated. While still recognised as one of the single most important features within basic hygiene, it is also proven to be more effective than such things as using antiseptic wipes and alcohol rub for the removal of Clostridium.

9) If ever there was a right restaurant in which to eat on Turkey Day, it is the Strongbow Inn. Opened in 1940 as a small cafe on a poultry farm, its year-round gobblecentric menu features turkey soup and turkey pate, smoked wings and drumsticks, turkey crepes and turkey schnitzel. .... we say that Thanksgiving is huge at this

place?

10) After deciding to have a transgender operation, Jin approached a female cosmetic surgeon, Yang Peiying in 2002. It .... be the first sex-change operation in mainland China. "I was willing to be her experiment," Jin tells NEWSWEEK. The doctor, now retired, calls it " a historical event. " Although the operation .... proceed - contrary to expectations - Chinese authorities initially pretended Jin didn't exist. "

2. Translate into English, using modals:

1. Het lijkt erop dat Benny misschien toch gelijk had.

   ....

2. Je zou dit vertaald moeten kunnen hebben.

   ....

3. Achteraf gezien hadden we ons niet zo hoeven te haasten om er te geraken.

   ....

4. Dat meen je niet!

   ....

MODALS

1. **Examine the following sentences. Do the modals in bold express deontic, epistemic or dynamic modality? Do they express strong, medium or weak strength? (if applicable).**

2. "Pamela, step hither". Pamela enters and is shown off to the visiting aristocrats.
   LADY JONES: See that shape!
   VISITING LADY: I 've never seen such a face and shape in my life.
   L. DARNFORD: Why, she **must** be better descended than you have told me!

3. I have bought a plant called Impatiens congolensis, but **can't** find out anything about it. A This Busy Lizzy **must** be grown in a temperature that never drops below 55F.

4. Such a report **would** seem to be unnecessarily pessimistic and **may** be a conclusion laid at the door of present organisational configurations in our schools.

5. Well, no more of this silly girl. You **may** only advise her as you are her friend not to give herself too much licence upon the favours she meets with, if she stays here. I tell you she is a subtle artful gypsy and time **will** show it.

6. "OK," I said. "But don't take it to heart if I don't follow your advice. I **can** be a bit awkward about things like this. You're the one who **would** end up getting wet."

7. "You **can't** possibly do more than an hour, not after a full day's rehearsal. You**'ll** be exhausted tomorrow". "We **could** always come back in about a couple of hours."

8. "There's not a lot of heart in that, is there?" There wasn't a lot of heart in our marriage, Sam." "You **might** have told me that." "Well," Karen put her back to the window, leaning against it, and folded her arms. "It was the fact that you needed to be told that made telling you impossible."

9. And did he really believe that they were all wrong? Or all trying to trick him? Was the whole world mad? **Could** he be the only one who had got

it right? The questions had chased each other round and round, finding terrible answers.

10. I reminded her how fragile it was. She will send her best men down. It **may** not be ready in time, I told her, there's still a long way to go.

11. She makes me discover things in myself I didn't know were there. That **can't** be all bad, can it? It **must** mean something, mustn't it? So he thinks of himself as a warm-hearted, caring human being.

2. CAN/COULD/Alternative forms. Fill in the right form. Pay attention to specific and general uses of ability and permission.

1. He was very strong: he …………………………….. ski all day and dance all night.
2. The car plunged into the river; the driver ………………………….. get out but the passengers were drowned.
3. I was a very long way from the stage. I …………………………... see all right but I   …………………………... [not] hear very well.
4. We ………………………….. borrow umbrellas, so we didn't get wet.
5 ………………………….. you walk or did they have to carry you?
6. I had no key so I …………………………... [not] lock the door.
7. When the garage had repaired our car we …………………………... continue our journey.
8. He …………………………... read quite well at the age of five.
9. When I arrived everyone was asleep. Fortunately I…………………………..   wake my sister and she let me in.
10. The police were suspicious at first but I …………………………... convince them that we were innocent.
11. I remember the strange feeling I had when I left the square that night, a feeling of finality. Looking back, that square was my gateway to the real world. I spent that night in a straitjacket of fear. In fact, such was my dread of returning home, I …………………………...   (nearly + to miss) my plane, but somehow the clockwork motor inside me brought me back in   one piece.
12. By grossly exaggerating the victim's treatment of the accused in order to

gain sympathy for   the latter he had instead made it seem all the more likely that he had meant to kill. The only   time   little   Cipolla ………………………... (to speak) was when they had asked him:' Did you   intend to fire the gun when you picked it up?'' Yes... but...'' Just answer the question.'   Without   that   damned   barrister   there ………………………... (to be) a verdict of accidental   death.

13. So we start today's meeting with apologies, does anyone have any apologies to give to Ann?   Yeah, Nicki and Saria. Yeah, Mike, but he told me he ………………………... (to attend) future   meetings.

14. Seven-year-old Michael had written in his diary,' On Saturday I helped my mum bake a cake   and I made a dress for my doll'. The teacher replied,' ………………………... (not play) you   football   or something?' She justifies her response by saying that she is merely'... trying to   protect him from the rest of the class; you know, children ………………………...   be so cruel'.

3.   MAY / MIGHT / COULD

Replace the words in italics with a clause using MAY, MIGHT or COULD (referring to PRESENT or FUTURE POSSIBILITY)

1. Perhaps you will find you've made a mistake.
2. It is just conceivable that we'll get an answer tomorrow.
3. Accept his offer now. It is just possible that he will change his mind later.
4. Owing to the strike, trains will possibly be subject to delays.
5. It is possible that parents will find they can't understand the new teaching methods being introduced in primary schools.
6. We shall possibly find we can't get accommodation, as we haven't booked rooms yet.
7. Your bank manager will perhaps be able to advise you better than I can.
8. Let's not wait any longer. It's possible that he won't turn up at all.

4. Use the right modal. Choose between *can* and *may* (present or past) or one of the alternative forms.

1. Once more, the implications of infancy for the child's future life and happiness …………………….. (not + be overstated): this applies to sexual happiness no less than any other, and …………………….. (very well + apply) particularly to this area of life.

2. He looked into the mirror to see a pair of brown eyes looking at him levelly, appreciative of and amused by his scrutiny. "You were about to tell me some bad news." "Yes, mademoiselle. How very kind of you to remind me. …………………….. I ask whether you were acquainted with a friend of ours, a Lieutenant Daniel, of the Grand Army?'

3. The Muckrakers, a teenage disco which occupied, on Friday nights only, premises in Charing Cross Road, was the Mecca of that young teenage set which those who had reached seventeen called' the squeakies' and who were prepared, according to their older critics, to take over the world. On the rare occasion when Henrietta …………………….. (to go) there, Molly had insisted on collecting her.

4. The brightness of the yellow would be a function of the magnitude of the reflectance. Cyan is formed by the addition of green and blue, while magenta (pink) is the result of combining red and blue. Virtually any colour …………………….. (to form + passive) by mixing red, green and blue light in different amounts and with different levels or magnitudes.

5. The Palace spokesman insisted:' Everyone was happy. There were no tears or sadness.' And a royal aide tried to put Charles's gaffe in focus.' That photo …………………….. (not + to show) that the prince was there,' he said,' but everyone knows that he was.'

6. Oh Rose, please, please be my friend. Please take the ring, please!' For one awful moment, she thought she had persuaded her, then, with a cry of triumph, Rose hurled the ring as far as she …………………….. into the surrounding darkness. She fell back

and pulled the blanket over her face, cackling and wheezing with delight.' Nobody makes friends with me! Nobody!' she crowed.' So you …………………….... cry all night for all I care! And put the flaming candle out!' Evelyn obeyed.

7. "*Oh boy! Au pair stays*". A SWEDISH male au pair …………………….... (to stay)in Britain yesterday after an 11th-hour reprieve by Home Secretary Kenneth Clarke. Johan Egelstedt, 19, faced deportation because immigration rules say an au pair must be a girl. He …………………….... (now + remain) another month as a visitor.

8. I will leave discussion of the functions (or supposed functions) of tones until later, except for the fall-rise. It seems to be generally agreed that this is in some way' special', and peculiar to English. This …………………….... (not + be) true, but certainly in listening to conversational English one does encounter a very large number of these and they do seem to the native speaker to have some perhaps indefinable' feel' of something negative present in the background, as suggested above, on p. 139).

9. She was restless, moving uneasily about the hut as once before, curious but preoccupied, and slow to come to what had brought her on this errand.' Bnezet is saying that Tutilo is taken for murder. He says Tutilo killed the man he tricked into helping him to steal away your saint. That …………………….... (not+ be) true,' she said with assured authority.' There is no harm and no violence in Tutilo.

10. When Joe told his story of making love in a cold doorway with his backside exposed to the street, Lou told him he was a fool.' You …………………….... (to catch) double pneumonia.' Lou, at this time, was very keen on that sort of talk herself. When one of Ken's friends told her he had just bought a new television set -- a 17-inch console -- she commented:' Seventeen inches? That should console anyone.'

5. MUST/HAVE TO [Obligation]

1. She……………………….. leave home at eight every morning at present.

2. He sees very badly: he …………………………... wear glasses all the time.

3. I …………………………... do all the typing at my office.

4. She felt ill and …………………………. leave early.

5. My neighbour's child……………………….. practise the piano for three hours a day.

6. (Doctor) - I can't come now.

   (Caller) - You ……………………….. come, he's terribly ill!

7. English children ……………………….. stay at school till the age of six.

8. The buses were all full, so I ………………………….. get a taxi.

9. Tell her that she……………………….be here by six. I insist on it.

10. If you buy that television set you…………………………..get a licence for it.

11. (Railway notice): Passengers…………………………. be in possession of a ticket.

12. I didn't have enough money and …………………………. pay by cheque.

13. (Employer): You………………………...come to work in time.

14. The shops here don't deliver. We…………………………..carry everything home ourselves.

15. I just can't remember his address, I always…………………………..look it up.

6. MUST NOT / NEED NOT   *[Prohibition I Non-Obligation]*

1. You .... ring the bell; I have a key.
2. [Notice in cinema] Exit doors .... be locked during performances.
3. We .... drive fast; we have plenty of time.
4. You .... drive fast; there is a speed limit here.
5. You .... do the complete exercise; ten sentences will be enough.
6. You ....smoke in a non-smoking compartment.
7. Candidates............bring books into the examination room.
8. I want this letter typed but you ....do it today; tomorrow will do.

9. We .... climb any higher; we can see very well from here.
10. You .... put salt in any of his dishes. Salt is very bad for him.

7. **Choose the right modal (present and past forms of *can, may, must, have, need to*) or an alternative form**

1. "Get two servants, and carry my trunk up here. We're leaving" " My lady, you
……………………….. (not mean) to do this! ", said Stephen. "
……………………….. (I + repeat) my order, Stephen!? You're still my servant!"
"No, my lady. "

2. When Daphne travelled to Nairobi to prepare for a daughter's wedding, she left baby elephant Aisha, then six months old, in the care of an assistant. In the two weeks she was away, Aisha stopped eating and died, apparently overcome with grief at the loss of another mother." When Aisha died, I realized the mistake I'd made, " says Daphne, still pained by the memory. " She missed me too much. You ……………………….. (not +let) an elephant get too attached to one person. It was stupid of me to think I ……………………….. (do) it without substituting a larger family.

3. King Malik dismissed this comment with a wave of his short, heavily ringed fingers and a contemptuous snort. 'You should have told me!', he said. 'But I was told you……………………….. (not + be disturbed). I just obeyed orders'.

4. I don't mean to be cruel, my dear, but this carpet is not cooperating. It represents a large portion of my fee, and I see no way that I'll ever get to put it to proper use." " With a little cleaning and patching it would look nice in front of the fireplace in the great room. It would be happy there, too." "I suppose so. But if all I wanted was a carpet for the great room, I (not + go) ……………………….. all the way to Grunjak's for it."

5. Her gun jammed, which frustrated her to no end since she had to leave early. Trainer Nate Kern put down his assault rifle and went over to help. She wanted him to clear the jam. He decided that if she was grown up enough to shoot it, she ……………………….. be grown up enough to clear it. Not the right time to start crying for help.

6. In 1861, Major General Nelson A. Miles, a commanding officer in the U.S. Army, was cheering on cyclists from the sidelines of a six-day race in New York City when it hit him: Why not arm America's military with bikes, too? " Unlike a horse, " he wrote, " a bicycle …………………… (not + feed – use a passive) and watered and rested, and would be less likely to collapse. "

7. Today, there are several variants of health plans on offer, some exclusively for women. Read the fine print! Buying a plan is not as simple and there are many pitfalls you …………………… (be) aware of. For instance, many insurers advertise that their policies don't require you to submit a medical report. It …………………… (sound) convenient, but your reluctance to take out time for such a medical test, …………………… (cost) you dearly in the long run: such plans ……………………(not necessarily be) as customer-friendly as they sound. For one, an exemption from medical tests does not mean you …………………… (sweep) your health problems under the carpet. You still need to make a declaration about your health in the application form and the premium rates will be fixed on the basis of your disclosure. Remember, if you have a health problem, it …………………… (have) severe repercussions on your insurance cover.

8.   MUST / SHOULD / WILL *[Logical Necessity]*

Gladys: Your shoes are wet. It (1 - rain).
Joyce: Yes it is. It (2 - start) when I was at the hairdresser's, because when I came out it was pouring. However, it was only a small cloud, so the rain (3 - finish) by lunch.
Gladys: I hope so. Peter (4 - be) here very soon to take me out to lunch.
J: Yes, it (5 - be) half past twelve now.
G: Half past twelve? Then Peter's late. He (6 - delay) by something at his office.
J: Yes, but he (7 - be) on his way here now.
G: I'll phone his office. *[She dials]* No answer. They (8 - go) to lunch.
J: Well, then Peter (9 - arrive) at any moment.
G: Yes, here he is! We thought you (10 - delay) at the office, Peter.
Peter: No. I (11 - be) here ten minutes ago, but I got into a traffic jam. There (12 - be) a mile of cars in front of mine!
G: And it (13 - rain) all the time too.
P: Yes it was. Well, you (14 - be) hungry. Let's walk. We (15 - get) there quicker that way.
G: Oh, you (16 - decide) where to take me, then.
P: Yes, Giuseppe's.
G: We (17 - can) get Italian food there.
P: Of course we can. We (18 - get) a good meal there. Dick recommended it, so it (19 - be) good.
G: Yes, they (20 - give) him really good Italian food for him to recommend it.

9.   PUTATIVE SHOULD

Rephrase the sentences below, using/adding PUTATIVE SHOULD
wherever possible.

1.   I gather you are worried about the expense.
2.   I'm sorry that you have doubts about our good will.
3.   We deeply regret we must take this action.
4.   It's quite right for you to speak in your defence.
5.   It's quite right that Jones stole the key.
6.   I'm surprised at your saying such a thing.
7.   I can't imagine why you insist on his innocence.
8.   Isn't it possible that somebody else stole it?
9.   What I can't understand is why he refused to answer my question.
10. That stories of this kind are published in the press is a disgrace to our society.

MIXED MODALS

1. MODAL AUXILIARIES with similar meaning

Indicate which of the modal auxiliaries could replace the one in italics without basically changing the meaning of the sentence.

1. *Can* I borrow your pen, please?
2. I *may* be home late tonight.
3. I *could* never play the guitar properly.
4. We *might* go to the concert if there is time.
5. The General Assembly *shall* consist of all members of the UN.
6. *Shall* I come with you?
7. *Will* you close the door, please?
8. *Would* you mind shutting the door?
9. You *should* do as he says.
10. It's odd that you *should* say that.
11. We *should* love to go abroad.
12. If you *should* change your mind, please let us know.
13. You *ought* to see him act.
14. There *may* have been an accident.
15. You really *must* be more careful!

2. WILL / SHALL

Select either WILL or SHALL in the following sentences. If both are acceptable, explain the difference in meaning, if any.

1. *Shall/Will* I carry you bag for you, madam?
2. *Shall/Will* you open the window, please?
3. They *will/shall* open the window.
4. *Shall/Will* I hear from you soon?
5. You *shall/will* have it tomorrow, I promise.
6. He *shall/will* be there before us, I think.

3. MODAL AUXILIARIES paraphrased

Replace each of the passages in italics by the appropriate modal auxiliary.

1. John *is capable of* typing very fast.
2. *It is just possible that* what you say is true.
3. *Do you want me* to open a window?
4. I *know how to* answer this question now.
5. If you *are willing to* come with us, we will be delighted.
6. I *was* never *able* to understand a word he said.
7. *Would* you *like* to have a chocolate?
8. No one *was able to* solve the problem.
9. You *keep* forgetting things!
10. He's weird - he *has the habit of* sitting for hours without saying anything.
11. I *had a habit of* hitting the wrong key of the typewriter.
12. He was very secretive; he *had the habit of* never letting anybody know what he was doing.
13. I *advise* you to read this novel.
14. *It is obligatory for us* to read this book.
15. You *are prohibited from* smoking here.
16. *Are* you *able to* do this without help?
17. *Is it advisable for* us to wait?
18. *It is not compulsory for* us to attend.
19. That, *presumably,* is the house we're looking for.
20. Actually, *I'm quite sure that* this is the one.

4. Ambiguity of MODAL AUXILIARIES

Each of the following sentences is ambiguous. Resolve the ambiguity by giving two different paraphrases.

1. Henry can drive my car now.
2. They can make reasonable suggestions.
3. We could go to the theatre.
4. I may be out late this evening.
5. They should be home by now.

5. MODAL AUXILIARIES - PAST TIME

Change TODAY in each of the following sentences into YESTERDAY; change the rest of the sentence accordingly. ACTION UNFULFILLED is implied in sentences 5, 6, 7 and 10.

1. You can pronounce this word perfectly today.
2. You may stay at home today.
3. The Minister must speak on the subject today.
4. No one dare go out in the streets today.
5. I can let you have the money today.
6. You should read this book today.
7. I could go with you today.
8. It must be very hot in town today.
9. There might be too much traffic on the roads today.
10. You will do anything for me today.

6. Fill in the appropriate MODALS or SEMI-AUXILIARIES, following the instructions given in brackets.

1. She ..... be in London or Paris - nobody knows, [theor poss - remote]
2. She . wash the glasses - it's part of her job. [ext oblig]
3. I...come tomorrow if I ....[fact poss] [abil]
4. You ..... read it again, [speaker's oblig - future]
5. You .... me Frances was ill.   [fact poss - unfulfilled]
6. What .. (do) if you .... (have) a free year?   [cond, type 2]
7. I think I .... (consult) a doctor earlier, [moral oblig - unfulfilled]
8. You.. use the green pencil!   [prohibition]
9. He .. here by nine o'clock,   [log nec - neg]
10. He ..... be here by nine o'clock,   [factual log neg]
11. You ..... be so pessimistic,   [advice - neg]
12. You ..... put those crystal glasses in the dishwasher, [prohibition]
13. You ..... help me with my work tonight since everything is perfectly clear now. [non-obligation]
14. You............ be tired. You've been walking for hours, [fact log nee]
15. Things .... be all right,   [prediction]
16. Fortunately, I .... . open the door with my neighbour's key. [abil - past]
17. You............ practise if you want to succeed, [external obligation]
18. I knew it ..... be John, as he was away on a business trip when it happened, [log nee - past - neg]
19. You ..... be back before midnight, is that understood?   [order]
20. You............ be more careful, really,   [advice]
    21. You ..... take off your shoes,   [non-oblig]   I (still) .... clean the floor anyway,   [ext oblig]
22. You............ eat the whole cake!   [prohibition]
23. Whatever people ..... say, I know you did your utmost,   [concession]
24. You .... bothered to come,   [non-oblig - past]

I ..... do the exercise on my own.   [abil - past]

25. People realised there ..... be a mistake somewhere,   [fact log neg -past]
26. I know I ....(tell) you, but I simply forgot,   [moral oblig -past]
27. She said I ..... lay the table before twelve,   [prohibition - past]
28............I ask you not to step on the flowers?   [polite request - formal]
29. I've broken the teapot. I suppose I .... . give her a new one.   [oblig -future]
30. If you ..... (listen), I .... repeat it. [cond type 3 + oblig]

7.   SEMI-AUXILIARIES

Choose one or more of the following SEMI-AUXILIARIES to paraphrase the parts in italics.

BE CERTAIN TO	HAD BETTER	WOULD RATHER
TURN OUT TO	COME TO	FAIL TO
BE BOUND TO	BE LIABLE TO	GROW TO
HAPPEN TO	TEND TO	BE LIKELY TO

1.   I *accidentally* saw Mr Brown in the park.
2.   After years of spiritual struggle he *ended up* believing in God.
3.   He *did not* send in the form in time.
4.   China cups *have a tendency to* break.
5.   If you provoke a lion it will *certainly* attack you.
6.   If you have a toothache, it's *advisable to* see a dentist.
7.   This snake will *probably* shed its skin in the dry season.
8.   I'd *prefer to* play football if it's all the same for you.
9.   It *appeared that* Shakespeare's plays had been written by Bacon.
10. One *gradually* begins to like what one is accustomed to.

8.   Translate using the correct MODALS.

1.   Ik moet zeggen, ik was wel graag nog wat gebleven, maar ik moest echt naar huis.
2.   Ze zijn misschien al aangekomen; zou jij het eens kunnen vragen?
3.   Ik herinner me dat hij wel uren aan een stuk kon zitten praten over de oorlog.
4.   Zou je daarop nu eens een duidelijk antwoord willen geven?
5.   Mocht je hem zien, zou je hem dan willen zeggen dat ik hem vorige week geschreven heb?
6.   Ze was vroeger veel opgewekter.
7.   Je mag het in geen geval aan iemand vertellen.
     - Moet mijn eigen familie het dan van vreemden vernemen?
8.   Ik laat deze week nog mijn huis schilderen.
9.   Ze zouden elkaar ontmoeten in London, maar ...

10. Mag je hier roken?

   - Ik geloof van niet, maar je kan het altijd eens vragen. Misschien mag je wel van hem.
   - Mijnheer, mag ik hier roken?
   - Het is wel niet verboden, maar ik zou toch liever hebben van niet.
11. Nu ga je toch een beetje te ver; je zou net zo goed kunnen zeggen dat hij gek is!
12. Hij is gisteren ziek gevallen; hij zal misschien volgende week niet kunnen spelen.
13. De dief kon de politie verschalken *[outwit]* door zelf een uniform aan te trekken, maar hij kon toch niet ontkomen.
14. Hij wist dat hij harder moest werken.
15. Hij wist dat hij harder moest gaan werken.
16. Ga toch zitten, je hoeft niet bang te zijn.
17. Vlug, er moet een ongeval gebeurd zijn. We zullen de politie moeten verwittigen.
18. We hadden net zo goed kunnen thuis blijven.
19. Hij wilde gewoon niet antwoorden op mijn vraag.
20. Hij zei dat het niet nodig was dat we onze woordenboeken meebrachten.
21. Ze konden haar gelukkig op tijd verwittigen.
22. Moeten we dit nu echt doen?
23. Dat hij nu net zo iets moet gaan beweren!
24. Wat moet ik met al doe papieren beginnen?
25. Hij durfde het niet te vertellen.
26. Het gras moet dringen gemaaid worden.
27. Je zou beter wat meewerken.
28. Ik veronderstel dat je nu liever thuis zou zitten?
29. Hij is weer dwaas aan het doen!
30. Ik had het moeten weten, maar ik wilde niet luisteren.

9.   Explain / Discuss the meaning of:

   1. Would you mind opening the door?
   2. Could you open the door, please?
   3. Would you mind if I opened the door?
   4. Do you mind if I open the door?
   5. You ought to fill in this form.
   6. You needn't write in capitals.

7. Should I invite him to the party?
8. I think you ought to see a doctor.
9. I wouldn't advise you to invite her.
10. I don't think you ought to invite her.
11. If I were you I'd see a doctor.
12. You have to fill in this form.
13. You should stop smoking.
14. Would you like to come?
15. I ought not to eat so many sweets.

10.   Fill in the correct TENSES and MODALS when required.

Waitress: Hurry up, chef. The customers (wait) for ten minutes.
            They (be) hungry and they (get) angry.
Chef: I know ... but I (get) only one pair of hands! You (help) me.
W: Help you? That (be) not my job. I (be) a waitress, not a cook.
C: Well, both of my assistants (be) off work.
W: Oh, all right. What I (do) first?
C: Well, (start) (put) the meat on the plates and I (prepare) the vegetables.
W: OK. (Be) that enough meat?
C: Hm ... that (be) a bit too much. (Take) a bit off.
W: What about potatoes?
C: Oh, (put) plenty of potatoes ... they (be) cheap ... and lots of peas.
W: All right, all right. (........) I take them now?
C: (Put) you the sauce on yet?
W: Oh no, I (......) not. Where (be) it?
C: Here it (be).
W: Oh, there (not be) quite enough sauce here.
C: There (be) plenty in that pan over there.
W: Ah, yes ... I (have) got it.
C: Fine, now you (.....) begin taking the plates to the customers.
W: Ow!   They (be) hot!
C: Well, (use) a cloth ... and (not carry) too many plates. You (...........) drop
            them.
W: Oh, I (not drop) them. I (not drop) a plate in my life!

11.   *[Paul and Judy are planning a weekend holiday]*

P: You know, why………….. we (not go) to Scotland?
J: It's a very long way.
P: Oh, it isn't too far. Anyway, the motorway is very good, so we ....get
      there quickly.
J: But Scotland's often cold at this time of the year. It................... snow!
P: Well, yes, it..........., but I don't think it.........................

J: I'm not sure. It is February and I'm frightened of driving in snow. And we ……….. not be able to find a hotel. They .... be closed.

P: Oh, that's no problem. I……. book a hotel by phone.

J: Well, perhaps it's not a bad idea after all. We.................have beautiful weather.

P: Oh, we ....enjoy ourselves anyway. Let's watch the weather forecast on television. We ..... not go to Scotland, we .... go to Wales or London.
    We ....….. decide after the forecast.

12.   Fill in the appropriate TENSES and MODALS.

Annie: What …….(be) the matter, Jenny? You look worried.

Jenny: Yes ……..   I (try) to lose weight.

A: Oh, you ....(not lose) weight.

J: Yes, I do!   I (buy) some new jeans and I...................... (not get) them on.
     They're too tight.

A: Well, then you .... go on a diet.

J: I know, but what kind of diet?

A: You ....eat lots of salad and fruit.

J: Yes, but I (not like) salad. I prefer meat.

A: Well, you...............eat meat but you (not eat) too much. You .... (not eat) bread or potatoes, either.

J: What about alcohol?..... you drink wine?

A: Oh, no, you ....never drink alcohol if you want to lose weight.

13.   Same exercise.

Wendy: Hello, Charles. You look tired today. Charles: Yes, I …………(work) too hard.

W: You ………….take a holiday.

C: Yes, I know I………….   But we're just too busy. I ……..(work) twelve hours a day.

W: Twelve hours a day!   You ……….. (kill) yourself.

C: Well, what……….I do?

W: Perhaps you   ………….change your job.

C: I……….. . I need the money!

14.   Same exercise.

Marion: Good afternoon.
Travel Agent: Good afternoon, madam.
M: I (be) ……..interested in your holiday in Saint Cuthbert.
TA: Ah yes ... The Caribbean! I .... recommend it highly.
M: …….you tell me a little bit about it?
TA: Of course, madam. It (be) an excellent package holiday. You ……… (travel) on a scheduled flight. You ……… (meet *-passive)* at the airport and……… (take) to your hotel. You ……… (not pay) airport taxes, they ……… (include) in the price. The hotel ……… (be) very near the beach and it……… (have) a swimming pool and a discotheque. It ……… (be) very modern; it ……… (build) only last year. The restaurant ……… (be) superb and drinks……… (be) very cheap in Saint Cuthbert. Oh, and you ..... walk to the sea in two minute.
M: Hm ... it ……… (sounds) good. I ……… (like) to make a reservation.
TA: Certainly, madam. One moment and I (get) you a booking form.

[Marion paid a deposit and booked the holiday. Two months later she was in Saint Cuthbert. But she was disappointed. When she returned to England, she went to see the travel agent]

TA: Ah, it ……… (be) Mrs Ward. You (have) a good holiday?
M: No, I certainly (not have) ……… a good holiday.
TA: Oh, I ……… (be) sorry to hear that. What (go) wrong?
M: Well, when I (arrive) in Saint Cuthbert, I ....spend four hours at the airport. You ……… (say) we ……… (meet) and we ……… (not be). You also ……… (say) that we……… (take) to the hotel. We (not be) and the taxi cost about £12. You ……… (tell) me that airport taxes (include). In fact I………
        pay £10.
TA: Oh dear ... you ……… (have) a very bad start. But the hotel ……… (be) nice, ... ?
M: No, it ……… (not be)! You……… (say) it……… (be) very modern. You……… (be) quite right. They ……… (not finish) building it! We ..... (not sleep) because the workmen (work) ………
all night on our balcony. You……… (say) it (have) a swimming pool. It (have) ……… but it (be) ……… empty. And the restaurant ... it……… (serve) fish every night.
TA: Oh dear ...
M: You ……… (say) that the hotel (be) ……… near the beach and that we ……… walk to the sea in two minutes.
TA: ……..   (neg) you?
M: Well, yes ... we .... But there ……… (be) an oil refinery between the hotel and the beach and it ……… (take) half an hour to walk round it!
TA: Oh, I (be) ……… really terribly sorry. We really……… (not know). I ………
(be) afraid we……… (be) unable to give you a refund, but we ……… (give)

you a ten per cent discount on next year's holiday.
M: Next year! Next year I ……. (stay) in England!

15.   Same exercise.

[Mr Black wishes to book a passage to Singapore. Complete the conversation]

Mr Black: Good morning.
Clerk: Good morning, sir.
B: I wish to make a voyage on one of your ships to Singapore. I ………..(prefer) to sail
in one of your smaller vessels. ....I have the sailing dates, please?
C: Yes sir. Here are the sailing schedules.
B: I………… (like) to go as soon as possible.
C: Well, sir, as you see the 'Pastoria'………. (sail) from Queen Victoria Dock on Thursday. We ………(have) a single berth left on her because of a last-minute cancellation. If that it too soon for you, there's the 'Indona'. She ……… (sail) in two weeks' time.
B: No. Please……… (make out) a ticket for the 'Pastoria'.
C: Certainly, sir .... I have your passport please?
B: Yes, here it is.
C: Thank you.
B: How…………. I (get) to the dock?
C: We …………(take) passengers down in our coach, sir. It ………(leave) here at two o'clock. I …………(make) arrangements to get your baggage picked up at your address. The estimated time of the 'Pastoria' departure is 6.30 pm, from no 3 Berth, Queen Victoria Dock.
B: I see.
C: Now,   you fill in this Information Form, please. I …………..(register) these documents and make out the tickets.
B: Yes. What……….. (be) the purpose of this Information Form?
C: A Passenger Manifest……… be made up, sir. Immigration officials………
(want) to see it to know who…………. (leave) or …………(enter) the country. The Information Form goes to make it up.

EXAM LEVEL EXERCISES

1) - Complete the following sentences, <u>using a modal verb whenever you can</u>! If not, use one of the alternative forms, expressing the same meaning.
- Pay attention to tense and aspect, use <u>negatives</u> and/or <u>passives</u> where necessary.
- Motivate your answer if requested.

1. *"A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms* _____ *(to infringe)."*
   -The 2nd Amendment, as ratified by the States and authenticated by Thomas Jefferson, then-Secretary of State.

2. "Oh really? It's very strange you _____ (to say) that". I kept telling myself it _____ (to be) some demon who had got into him - although I then thought what he has said was purely a figure of speech.
   Briefly **motivate** your answer for *to say*, using either your own words or terms used in the syllabus:

   _____

   _____

3. The problems of the world _____ (possibly + to solve) by sceptics or cynics whose horizons are limited by the obvious realities. We need men who _____ (to dream) of things that never were. John F. Kennedy.

4. The writing was formal but seemed vaguely familiar, but she did not guess the identity of the sender until she opened it and read, "Dear Mrs Markham,' _____ (I + to congratulate) you on the birth of Henry, or Harry as I notice he is to be called from the announcement in the papers? I do hope all is well with you both and that you _____ (to find) motherhood not quite as difficult a task as I suspect you were anticipating. It was a great pleasure meeting you a few months ago and I _____ (to like) to feel our paths _____ (to cross) again some time. One never knows.

5. She'd fancied him for ages and when he asked her out on that particular night she _____ (to keep) her cool even though she felt faint. She pretended to be mulling it over. Not bothered. Just a casual OK. Don't let him see you're really keen.

Briefly **motivate** your answer for _to keep_, using either your own words or terms used in the syllabus:

_____

_____

6. The women of North Korea _____ (now + to wear) trousers, platform shoes and earrings - all of which had been banned up until now for being too Western. The country's supreme leader Kim Jong Un is following in the footsteps of his grandfather by relaxing clothing rules for women. The only time women _____ (to wear) trousers was when they were working in the factories or during farming. Women caught wearing trousers in the street faced penalties or police warnings. Sometimes police _____ (even + to cut) women's trousers into a skirt in the street.

    Briefly **motivate** your answer for _to cut_, using either your own words or terms used in the syllabus:

    _____

    _____

7. He smiled as he said it, that careless smile she loved so much. But, though she tried, Ronni found she _____ (to smile) back. It was so obvious that he _____ (to care) in the slightest if she really had run off with the professor. On the contrary, he _____ (simply + to find) it amusing. She half turned away and stared at the horizon and said "You really _____ (to trouble) yourself to come looking for me." "_____ _(use ellipsis)_ I?" he said. "I disagree. I wanted to find you."

Same exercise

1. What an odd woman Margaret Thatcher was. She blubbed over her beloved dead father, but barely mentioned her mother. She adored her son, but didn't seem to care much for her daughter. And where were the women in her cabinet? Only one _____ (to get in), briefly. Margaret seemed to prefer men, especially handsome ones like Cecil Parkinson, or others with whom she _____ (to flirt) vaguely, or boss about.

2. While we _____ (not + to know) the theory of everything yet I am sure we _____ (to find) one.

   Briefly **motivate** your answer for *to know*, using either your own words or terms used in the syllabus:

   _____

   _____

3. They _____ (to prevent) it, but they didn't. And that's a real shame. The party still rules, and the state continues to call itself secular. I am not surprised then that the question it poses _____ (to repress + so widely) in India.

   Briefly **motivate** your answer for *to repress*, using either your own words or terms used in the syllabus:

   _____

   _____

4. In fact, according to the Oxford Dictionary, the Word of the Year _____ (to coin + not) within the past twelve months and it actually _____ (to be + not) a word that will stick around for a good length of time.

5. Her mum treated me like gold. She always invited me over (even when my girlfriend wasn't there) and when I was there she _____ (to chat) and have a laugh with me and go on and on about her husband and what a jerk he was. I _____ (to say), it did feel kind of strange, but 'cougar' was not part of my vocabulary yet.

6. Although Hassan has made a decent life for himself and his family as a telecom engineer in Somalia, he wondered if he too _____ (to achieve) his brother's greatness if he _____ (to board) the plane to Heathrow as a boy on that specific day in 1991.

7. Flushed with success Reyburn went on to write a quasi sequel: Bust-up -- the story of Otto Titzling, inventor of the bra. (Do you see what he did there?). "_____ (we + to add) that despite the inclusion of factual material relating to underwear history, Bust-up is complete fiction? :)."

   Briefly **motivate** your answer for *to add*, using either your own words or terms used in the syllabus:

   _____

   _____

8. According to Julian Assange, the whistleblowing site Wikileaks is facing what he calls a "financial blockade ", as the likes of Visa, MasterCard, PayPal and the Western

Union have prevented WikiLeaks followers from donating to the site. "If Wikileaks does not find a way to remove this blockade, we _____ (to continue) doing what we're doing".

9. "Is something wrong, my dear? You're not ill, are you?" Gibbs shook his head swiftly and hastened to reassure Ducky. "Nah, Duck, nothing like that." "Then why, _____ (I + to ask), have you poured me such a large drink?"

10. The law is very clear on this: "parties, counsels or employees involved in the lawsuit _____ (not + to disclose) the trade secrets to others that are not under the protective order, or use the trade secrets for purposes other than for the lawsuit".

2) Translate, using modals or semi-auxiliaries expressing modal meaning. The use of modals or semi-auxiliaries is more important than providing a literal translation.

1. Ik ben erg teleurgesteld dat je het zelfs zou overwegen om naar het buitenland te verhuizen.

   _____

   _____

2. Hoeft het nog gezegd dat er dringend iets gedaan moet worden aan de klimaatsverandering?

   _____

   _____

3. Moet je nu echt besluiten dat er iets verkeerd moet gegaan zijn tijdens hun vakantie?

   _____

   _____

4. Stel je voor, eerst mocht ik niet en nu moet ik. (three modals)

   _____

   _____