"Avail of," "conduct," and "trouble" require a reflexive pronoun after them. "Avail of" and "conduct" without the pronoun are more common in America than in Great Britain. "Trouble" without the pronoun is more common in Great Britain than in America.

Beware of omitting necessary pronouns.

Redundant Pronouns. — Sometimes pronouns repeat an idea already expressed in the sentence.

I.	II.
Celia wishes to accompany Rosalind, and they set out together.	Celia wishes to accompany Rosalind, and they *both* set out together.
Louis and the tutor got as far as Berlin, with what mutual satisfaction need not be specially imagined.	Louis and the tutor got as far as Berlin, with what mutual satisfaction *to each other* need not be specially imagined.

Beware of REDUNDANT PRONOUNS.

Chapter V.

OF VERBS

Vulgarisms. — Some blunders in the use of verbs are, or should be, confined to the illiterate.

I.	II.
I should be delighted to go to the World's Fair.	I should *admire* to go to the World's Fair.

Admire in this sense is sometimes heard in the United States, but is not in good use.

I.	II.
The detectives admit (or, declare) that the safe was unlocked.	The detectives *allow* that the safe was unlocked.
A circular row of seats was taken possession of (or, occupied) by smokers.	A circular row of seats was *availed of* by smokers.
I don't call those who board in your house company.	I don't call people what *boards* in your house company.
Lady Lufton had besought him to be gentle with her.	Lady Lufton had *beseeched* him to be gentle with her.
He did it.	He *done* it.
All were expert divers, and John always dived to the bottom.	All were expert divers, and John always *dove* to the bottom.
Silver has flowed into the treasury.	Silver has *flown* into the treasury.
I have n't hung the clothes out yet.	I have n't *hanged* the clothes out yet.
The prisoner was sentenced to be hanged.	The prisoner was sentenced to be *hung*.

Clothes are "hung" on the line; men are "hanged" on the gallows.

I.	II.
I 'll teach a man the river.	I 'll *learn* a man the river.

"Teach," says Mark Twain, "is not in the river [the Mississippi] vocabulary."

I.	II.
He would n't let me go.	He would n't *leave* me go.
At the gate I alighted from my horse.	At the gate I *lit* from my horse.
I shall lend you one hundred dollars only.	I shall *loan* you only one hundred dollars.
Detectives, after months of searching, found out that the daughter and her husband were in Jane County.	Detectives, after months of searching, *located* the daughter and her husband in Jane County.
The old man pleaded so hard that I let him off.	The old man *plead* so hard that I let him off.
She showed me the road to town.	She *shew* me the road to town.
Darcy had been used to having every attention shown him.	Darcy had been used to having every attention *showed* him.
It snowed yesterday.	It *snew* yesterday.
They passed through the old rickety gate which swung at the entrance of the place.	They passed through the old rickety gate which *swang* at the entrance of the place.
It is said privately that the road will declare a dividend.	It is *talked* privately that the road will declare a dividend.
You looked as if you had taken root there.	You looked as if you had *took* root there.
If it had been a hard case, I would have gone.	If it had been a hard case, I would have *went*.
As the storm was increasing, I lay down in the corner and fell asleep.	As the storm was increasing, I *lied* down in the corner and fell asleep.
As Gulliver could not see his way, he lay down and fell into a heavy sleep.	As Gulliver could not see his way, he *laid* down and fell into a heavy sleep.

I.	II.
I recalled all the times I had lain awake.	I recalled all the times I had *laid* awake.
Orlando laid Adam down carefully, and told him that he would soon return with food.	Orlando *lay* Adam down carefully, and told him that he would soon return with food.
Scott often gives us a picture of some old ruined abbey, lying cold and deserted in the moonlight.	Scott often gives us a picture of some old ruined abbey, *laying* cold and deserted in the moonlight.

"There let him *lay*" deforms Byron's magnificent apostrophe to the ocean in "Childe Harold."

I.	II.
If you had a strong fire, and your steam were inclined to rise, what should you do?	If you had a strong fire, and your steam was inclined to *raise*, what would you do?
How values have risen on Boylston Street!	How values have *raised* on Boylston Street!

The distinction between "raise" and "rise" is well brought out by Goldsmith in "The Deserted Village," —

"More skilled to raise the wretched than to rise."

I.	II.
Papa seated her in a big chair.	Papa *sat* her in a big chair.
She sat down before the fire.	She *set* down before the fire.
Why don't you sit still?	Why don't you *set* still?
You are n't so fleshy as you used to be, are you?	You *ain't* so fleshy as you used to be, *be* you?
As it does n't suit you to call, send me ten dollars.	As it *don't* suit you to call, send me ten dollars.

It may seem needless to record a vulgarism so gross as *ain't;* but the expression is sometimes on the lips of boys and girls who ought to know better, of men and women who have had a good education, and even of teachers in their

unguarded moments. *Don't* for "does n't" is still more common.

I.	II.
He ought not to talk as he does.	He *had n't ought* to talk as he does.

The better class of those who say *ain't* or *he don't* have no patience with those who say *had n't ought;* but even this vulgarism is not confined to the illiterate.

I.	II.
You were well then, were n't you?	You *was* well then, *was n't* you?

"You *was*," which is now a badge of vulgarity, was once good English. Horace Walpole, for instance, writes, "How infinitely good you was to poor Mrs. Goldsworthy!" and again: "'Sir,' said the king, 'was it not when you was opposing me?'"[1]

Avoid VULGARISMS.

May or **Can.** — "Can" is often used in place of "may," and "may" sometimes in place of "can."

I.	II.
May I give you a slice of beef?	*Can* I give you a slice of beef?
If an author's ideas are original, he may safely fail in all other respects.	If an author's ideas are original he *can* safely fail in all other requirements.

"Can" signifies that a thing is possible; "may," that it is permitted. The distinction is well brought out in the following quotations: the first from a recent English novel, the second from an American newspaper: —

[1] Other examples from various authors (from Henry More, 1651, to Dugald Stewart, 1819) are given by Mr. Fitzedward Hall (in "The Nation," March 10, 1892).

You will all like him. I shall bring him over to the manor if I can. I don't say, if I may.

LITTLE TOMMY. Can I eat another piece of pie?
MAMMA (who is something of a purist). I suppose you can.
TOMMY. Well, may I?
MAMMA. No, dear, you may not.

Few of those who observe the distinction between "may" and "can" would say, with Tommy's mamma, "may not;" for, important as the distinction is, it usually disappears when "may" or "can" is coupled with "not" in a declarative sentence.

Use CAN *in speaking of what is possible,* MAY *in speaking of what is permissible.*

Must. — "Must" presents a troublesome question.

I.	II.
In this law, Mr. Adonis encountered a new obstacle which had to be overcome.	In this law Mr. Adonis encountered a new obstacle which *must be* overcome.
Their ammunition ran low, and one of them was obliged to return to the settlements to replenish the stock.	Their ammunition ran low, and one of them *must* return to the settlements to replenish the stock.

It cannot be said that "must" should never be used to refer to past time; but in sentences like the foregoing it is objectionable, because it creates a temporary obscurity.

Be cautious about using MUST *to refer to past time.*

Will or Shall. — A person who has not been trained to observe the proper distinctions between "will" and "shall," can never be sure of using them correctly; but he will make few mistakes if he fixes firmly in his mind that "I (or we) shall," "you will," "he (or they) will" express simple

futurity, and that "I (or we) will," "you shall," "he (or they) shall" imply volition on the part of the speaker.

"Will" and "shall" in the first person are properly used in the following quotations from "The Absentee," — one of Miss Edgeworth's novels: —

"Gone! forever gone from me," said Lord Colambre, as the carriage drove away. "Never shall I see her more — never will I see her more, till she is married."

We will do our best to make you happy, and hope we shall succeed.

In "Never shall I see her more," "We hope we shall succeed," "shall" simply points to the future: in "Never will I see her more," "We will do our best," "will" implies the exercise of volition on the part of the speaker.

I.

I shall be drowned.

We shall be smothered together.

We shall have to go.

I leave for the West this evening, and, accordingly, shall be unable to be present.

Is the time coming when we shall desert Thackeray?

I am expecting a few young people to dance Saturday, January ninth, at half-past eight o'clock, and shall be happy to see you on that evening.

If we go to the country on the issue of tariff reform alone, we shall succeed. If we press the issue of free coinage of silver, we shall, in my judgment, lose every Eastern State, and gain nothing in the West. We shall lose the Presidency, the Senate, the House, free-coinage, tariff-reform, and everything.

II.

I *will* be drowned.

We *will* be smothered together.

We *will* have to go.

I leave for the West this evening, and accordingly *will* be unable to be present.

Is the time coming when we *will* desert Thackeray?

I am expecting a few young people to dance Saturday, January ninth, at half-past eight o'clock and *will* be happy to see you on that evening.

If we go to the country on the issue of tariff reform alone, we *will* succeed. If we press the issue of free coinage of silver, in my judgment we *will* lose every Eastern State and gain nothing in the West. We *will* lose the Presidency, the Senate, the House, free coinage, tariff-reform, and everything.

Tested by the examples of good use given above, the sentences under I. are correct, those under II. incorrect.

"Will" and "shall" in the second person are properly used in the following sentence from Defoe's "Colonel Jack": —

"Not pay it!" says he, "but you shall pay it! ay, ay, you will pay it!"

In this example, "shall" is used with "you" where "will" would be used with "I," and "will" is used with "you" where "shall" would be used with "I." Were "I" in place of the first "you," the clause should read, "I will pay it." In "I will pay it," it is "I" who determine my own action; in "You shall pay it," it is a will not your own which determines your action. Were "I" in place of the second "you," the clause should read, "I shall pay it." "Shall" in "I shall pay it" and "will" in "You will pay it" say nothing about the exercise of volition by anybody, but simply point to the future.

If — to give another example — I say "You will be elected, whoever may be your opponent," I do not suggest the exercise of volition by anybody; but if I say "You shall be elected, whoever may be your opponent," I imply that some person or persons are resolved to elect you.

The imperative quality of "shall" in the second person appears in the Ten Commandments.

The imperative quality of "shall" in the third person appears in the following passage from Shakspere's "Coriolanus": —

SICINIUS. It is a mind
That shall remain a poison where it is,
Not poison any further.
CORIOLANUS. Shall remain! —
Hear you this Triton of the minnows? Mark you
His absolute "shall"?

Some writers hold that "shall" was the original form of the future, that on grounds of courtesy it was changed to "will" in the second and third persons, and that whenever courtesy permits it should be preferred to "will." This may not be the true history of the distinction between "will" and "shall;" but the doctrine of courtesy furnishes a rough-and-ready rule for choice between the two.

As in the second and third persons "will" is the proper word to express simple futurity, and as the common error is the use of *will* where "shall" is the proper word, there is little danger that anybody whose native tongue is English will, in these persons, mistake "will" and "shall" for each other.

If, in a sentence consisting of a principal and a dependent clause, the verb in the principal clause is in the first person, the future of the verb in the dependent clause is formed as usual: *e. g.*, "I am afraid that I shall, that you will, that he will, die."

If the principal verb is in the second person, the form of the future in the dependent clause is as usual in the first or in the third person: *e. g.*, "You are afraid that I shall, that he will, die." In the second person, "shall" may sometimes be used where "will" would be used in a simple declarative sentence: *e. g.*, "You are afraid that you shall die."

If the principal verb is in the third person, the form of the future in the dependent clause is as usual in the first or the second person: *e. g.*, "He is afraid that I shall, that you will die." It is as usual also in the third person if the subject of the principal verb is different from that of the dependent verb: *e. g.*, "It is certain that he will die," "She hopes that he will live." If, however, the subject of the dependent clause is the same as that of the principal clause, "shall" is the proper auxiliary in the third person: *e. g.*, "He is afraid that he shall die."

I.	II.
If I look out of my window, the chances are that I shall see boys playing marbles.	If I look out of my window the chances are that I *will* see boys playing marbles.
He is afraid that he shall not pass his examination.	He is afraid that he *will* not pass his examination.
While he is wondering how long he shall live in this way, a great wagon arrives.	While he is wondering how long he *will* live in this way, a great wagon arrives.

Tested by the examples of good use given above, the sentences under I. are correct, those under II. incorrect.

There is one use of "shall" which is frequently found in old writers, but which is comparatively infrequent in modern English: —

> Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

"'Shall follow me'" — to borrow Sir Edmund Head's words[1] — "means 'are destined to follow me by the divine ordinance,' and 'will dwell' expresses the intention or voluntary devotion of the speaker."

Other examples are —

> A work that, so long as even the memory of the Christian faith shall last, will bear to men messages of pardon and of peace.
>
> The English language is spreading more and more, and many of the great travellers and writers of the day tell us that the time is coming when it shall be the language of the globe.

In the last example, "will" might have been used. "Will" means that English is going to be, "shall" that it is destined to be, "the language of the globe." If the writer had meant simply to state a future fact, he would have said "will": meaning to play the prophet, he said "shall."

[1] In his excellent little book on "Shall and Will." John Murray: London.

The correct use of "will" and "shall" in interrogative sentences is shown in the following quotations: —

"Will you do it? Or shall I?"

"Shall I speak to your mother? Or will you?"

"Shall you remain long?"
"Shall I, aunt?"

In an interrogative sentence, the forms of the future in the first and the third person are the same as in a declarative sentence: *e. g.*, "Shall I go to New York next week?" "Will he live a week longer?" In the second person, "shall" — *e. g.*, "Shall you go to New York next week?" — simply points to the future; "will" — *e. g.*, "Will you go?" — suggests the exercise of volition by "you." "Shall you go?" is answered by "I shall" or "I shall not;" "Will you go?" is answered by "I will" or "I will not." "Shall you?" raises no question of courtesy. "Shall he?" on the contrary, is answered by "He shall," "He shall not;" and is therefore forbidden by courtesy.

I.	II.
Where shall I find that book?	Where *will* I find that book?
How long shall we have to wait?	How long *will* we have to wait?

Tested by the examples of good use given above, the sentences under I. are correct, those under II. incorrect.

Would or **Should.** — To say that the choice between "would" and "should" is governed by the same rules as those which govern the choice between "will" and "shall," and to say nothing more, might mislead.

"Would" is sometimes used to signify habitual action: *e. g.*, "When our visitors would say, 'Well, upon my word, Mrs. Primrose, you have the finest children in the whole country,' — 'Ay, neighbor,' she would answer, 'they are as Heaven made them.'"

"Should" is sometimes used in the sense of "ought": *e. g.*, "He should make better time than he does;" and sometimes in a conditional sense as the equivalent of "were to": *e. g.*, "If it should rain, he would not come." In this conditional sense the present subjunctive was common in Early English.

One who bears in mind these other senses of "would" and "should" may safely accept the rule that the choice between "would" and "should" is usually determined by considerations similar to those that determine the choice between "will" and "shall."

"Would" and "should" are correctly used in the following quotations: —

We should never recognize our noses, if Cruikshank drew them, though our friends would.

You would not wish me so to guard you that you should have no power of sending a letter but by permission?

She did all that I wanted. I knew she would. I knew that we should either go to the bottom together or that she would be the making of me.

Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.

All unanimously answered that they would fight it out to death, and should be happy to die in defence of their religion.

In the sentences quoted above, "would" and "should" are used as "will" and "shall" would have been, had they been the proper forms to express the writer's meaning.

I.	II.
If I had expected to stay at home, I should not have needed a ticket.	If I had expected to stay at home, I *would* not have needed a ticket.
I should be interested to know how much that experience cost.	I *would* be interested to know how much that experience cost.
On this hypothesis, we should expect to find trout in the Charles.	On this hypothesis we *would* expect to find trout in the Charles.

I.	II.
I should say that we should be apt to admire La Fontaine more than ever before.	I should say that we *would* be apt to admire La Fontaine more than ever before.
Thackeray says that he should have been proud to be Shakspere's boot-black or Addison's errand-boy.	Thackeray says that he *would* have been proud of being Shakspere's boot-black, or Addison's errand boy.
They were led to suppose that in stopping at Mr. Hardcastle's house they should be at an inn.	They were led to suppose that in stopping at Mr. Hardcastle's house they *would* be at an inn.
Mr. Collins said that he hoped she would soon come to her senses.	Mr. Collins said that he hoped she *should* soon come to her senses.

Tested by the examples of good use given above, the sentences under I. are correct, those under II. incorrect.

I.	II.
As a friend, I should like to make a suggestion.	As a friend, I *would* like to make a suggestion.
I should be willing to hazard a guess that Professor Blo cannot read my writing.	I *would* be willing to hazard a guess that Professor Blo cannot read my writing.
If we had to see it again, we should wish to choose a brighter day.	If we had to see it again, we *would* wish to choose a brighter day.
He had always thought he should like to be a minister.	He had always thought he *would* like to be a minister.

Volition is so fully expressed in the verbs "to like," "to be willing," "to wish," as not to need expression by the auxiliary verb. "I would like" means "It is my wish to like," "I should like to like."

The established distinctions between WILL *and* SHALL, WOULD *and* SHOULD *should be carefully observed.*

Correct and **Incorrect Forms.** — Some incorrect forms of verbs stray into print.

I.	II.
So many times had her heart beat quicker at the sound of the door-bell.	So many times her heart had *beaten* quicker at the sound of the door-bell.
She scolded them, and at last bade them good-night.	She scolded them and finally *bid* them good-night.
He called his servants and bade them procure fire-arms.	He called his servants and *bid* them procure fire-arms.
Uncertain, even at that epoch, of Austria's fidelity, Prussia bid high for German leadership.	Uncertain, even at that epoch, of Austria's fidelity, Prussia *bade* high for German leadership.

The correct preterite of "bid" with expressions like "good-night" or in the sense of "ordered" is "bade;" that of "bid" in the sense of "bidding at an auction" is "bid." In Scotland, "bade" is still used as the preterite of "bid" in the latter sense, as it was by Dr. Johnson.

I.	II.
Lemonade is not much drunk among the French in winter.	Lemonade is not much *drank* among the French in winter.
John drank all that he could.	John *drunk* all that he could.

"Drank" and "drunk" are sometimes used indiscriminately, even by good authors; but it seems better to confine "drank" to the preterite tense, *e. g.*, "I drank," and "drunk" to the participle, *e. g.*, "You have drunk." A similar remark may be made about "sang" and "sung," "sprang" and "sprung," "shrank" and "shrunk."

I.	II.
He gave each a large piece of gingerbread, which the poor fellows ate very heartily.	He gave each a large piece of gingerbread which the poor fellows *eat* very heartily.

It is an exaggeration to say, as an American newspaper recently did, that "ate" has almost disappeared from printed books; but it is certain that *eat* is often substituted for "ate." One cannot positively affirm that good use pro-

nounces "ate" to be the only proper form of the preterite, but in that tense it is certainly preferable to *eat*.

I.	II.
Before I had got half-way across the yard, men came swarming out of the building.	Before I had *gotten* half way across the yard, men came swarming out of the building.

Gotten is an old form, but it is not sanctioned by the best modern use. In some parts of the United States it is, however, often heard and written.

I.	II.
Yesterday he led me a wild-goose chase.	Yesterday he *lead* me on a wild-goose chase.

Lead is sometimes used for "led," either because the writer does not know how the word is spelled, or because he has "rēad," "rĕad" in mind.

I.	II.
The front room was lighted and warmed by a wood-fire.	The front room was *lit* and warmed by a wood-fire.

"Lighted" seems preferable to *lit;* but *lit* is used in this sense by some writers of reputation.

I.	II.
It is proved that his account of European society is accurate.	It is *proven* that his account of European society is accurate.

Proven is borrowed from the Scotch legal dialect. In the case of Madeline Smith, who was tried for murder in Edinburgh in 1857, the verdict of the jury was "not proven." Since that time the word has often appeared in newspapers, in magazines, and even in books, in place of "proved," which is the correct form of the participle.

I.	II.
I had not ridden ten miles when the sun rose.	I had not *rode* ten miles when the sun rose.

"Had *rode*" instead of "had ridden," was once, but is not now, in good use.

I.	II.
On Washington's birthday, I was waked at sunrise by the bells.	On Washington's birthday, I was *woke* at sunrise by the bells.
I have awaked at seven these ten years.	I have *awoke* at seven this ten years.

Woke and *awoke* as forms of the past participle, though not without authority, are not sanctioned by the best use.

Questions of **Tense.** — Among the most perplexing questions connected with verbs are those which concern the choice between this and that tense.

I.	II.
How much is there now?	How much *will* there *be* now?
Mr. Johns regrets that a previous engagement prevents him from accepting Mrs. Smith's invitation to dinner on Monday.	Mr. Johns regrets that a previous engagement *will prevent* him from accepting Mrs. Smith's invitation to dinner on Monday.

It is difficult to see how a "previous engagement" which does not exist at the time when Mr. Johns writes his note, can furnish a reason for declining Mrs. Smith's invitation. If the "previous engagement" does exist at that time, it prevents him at that time from accepting the invitation.

I.	II.
Mr. Robinson regrets that he is unable to accept the kind invitation of Mrs. Hollis, as he will be absent from the city on Friday.	Mr. Robinson regrets that absence from the city *will prevent* him from accepting the kind invitation of Mrs. Hollis for Friday.

Mr. Robinson means to say that absence from the city at the time of Mrs. Hollis's entertainment will prevent him from being present at it, and that therefore he is unable at the time of writing to accept the invitation. His absence from the city is a fact (or probability) of the future, in consequence of which he decides not to accept the invitation; but his decision not to accept is a fact of the present.

I.	II.
Mr. Curron accepts with pleasure Mrs. Hollis's kind invitation for Tuesday evening.	Mr. Curron *will be* happy to accept Mrs. Hollis's kind invitation for Tuesday evening.

When will Mr. Curron be happy to accept? Does he write a note now to say that he means to accept at some future time, and that when he does accept his happiness will begin? Or is this note his answer to the invitation? If it is, he is happy while writing his acceptance.

This use of the future tense is common in answers to notes of invitation; but it is not supported by the best usage.

I.	II.
It is the duty of history to record inventions as well as wars.	It *was* the duty of history to record inventions as well as wars.

As the author of this sentence is speaking of the duty of history in general, the present tense is correct.

I.	II.
It has always been a question with me whether scientific tastes denote a higher type of mind than æsthetic tastes.	It has always been a question with me whether scientific tastes *denoted* a higher type of mind than æsthetic tastes.

The question "has always been" whether "scientific tastes," wherever and whenever they exist, denote a "higher type of mind;" not whether they did at a given time denote it.

I.	II.
Dear Sir, — I did not attend school on Friday as I had to go to New York on important business. Will you kindly excuse my absence? This is the second time I have been absent this term.	Dear Sir, — I did not attend school on Friday, as I had to go to New York on important business. Will you kindly excuse my absence? This *was* the second time I *had* been absent this term.

In the last sentence, "is" and "have been" are preferable to *was* and *had been*. The meaning is, "This makes my second absence." The act referred to is in past time, but the assertion about the act belongs to the present.

I.	II.
Nothing is more interesting than the attempt to trace the fortunes of men who died long ago.	Nothing is more interesting than the attempt to trace the fortunes of men who *have died* long ago.

"Died" is correct; for the writer is speaking of the act of dying, not of the condition of death.

I.	II.
This case still awaits evidence as to the origin of the injury to the left hand, as you were informed by letters from this office, dated June 6, 1887, and Feb. 5, 1888.	This case still awaits evidence as to the origin of injury to left hand, as you *have been* informed by letters from this office dated June 6, 1887, and Feb. 5, 1888.

Had the sentence ended at "informed," *have been* would have been proper. The additional words make "were" proper, because they confine the writer's assertion to definite points of past time.

I.	II.
Every time we relieve ourselves of a disagreeable task by a slight prevarication, we yield to temptation and make deceit a part of our nature.	Every time we relieve ourselves of a disagreeable task by a slight prevarication, we *have yielded* to temptation and *have made* deceit a part of our nature.

The three verbs "relieve," "yield," and "make" refer to the same point of time, and should therefore be in the same tense.

Other examples are —

I.	II.
Gulliver manages by swimming to reach the shore. Worn out by his exertion, he crawls up the beach, lies down, and falls asleep.	Gulliver *managed* by swimming to reach the shore. Worn out by his exertion, he crawls up the beach; lies down, and falls asleep.
Darcy, seeing that he has made a mistake, hastens the very next day to repair the mischief.	Darcy, seeing that he *had* made a mistake, hastens the very next day to repair the mischief.
Thackeray was of a quiet disposition, and could not bring himself to scoff at Swift.	Thackeray was of a quiet disposition and *can* not bring himself to scoff at Swift.
The driver volunteered no information about any object of interest that we passed.	The driver volunteered no information about any object of interest we *might* pass.
Samuel would have been contented, if the condition of his father's health had not troubled him so much.	Samuel would have been contented, if the condition of his father's health *did* not trouble him so.
At this point, Elizabeth could keep silent no longer, and answered (or, unable to keep silent longer, answered) him.	At this point, Elizabeth could keep silent no longer and *answers* him.
The proposition was unanimously adopted, and off we hurried to consult the "Elders." They demurred somewhat, but the boys carried the day.	The proposition was unanimously carried, and off we *hurry* to consult the "Elders." The latter *demur* somewhat, but the boys *carry* the day.
The proposition is unanimously adopted, and off we hurry to consult the "Elders." They demur somewhat, but the boys carry the day.	
Under this inspiration we made up some of the distance	Under this inspiration we made up some of the distance

I.	II.
we had lost. The shouting on the shore became deafening, showing us that we were nearly home. "Now, then," cried the captain, "one more spurt and we win!" But only two men could answer to the captain's call, — the stroke oar and the giant of the crew.	we had lost. The shouting on the shore *becomes* deafening, showing us that we *are* almost through. "Now then," *cries* the captain, "one more spurt and we win." But only two men could answer to the captain's call, — the stroke, and the giant of the crew.

In the last passage in its original form, the writer, without apparent cause, goes from the past to the present tense and back again.

I.	II.
At last appeared the long-looked-for spring, which we hailed with joy after the tedious, cold winter. We gladly gave up theatre-going and other winter amusements for out-of-door sports. Again we glided in our swift shells along the sinuous course of the Charles; again we played ball on Jarvis Field, and took long evening strolls, and sat by the open window to study.	At last the long looked for spring appeared, which we hailed with joy after the tedious cold winter; and we gladly gave up theatre-going, and other winter amusements, for our out-of-door sports. Again we *glide* in our swift shells along the sinuous course of the Charles; again we *play* ball on Jarvis Field, and *take* long evening strolls, and *sit* by the open window to study.

This appears to be an attempt to slip from the past tense into what is called the historical present; but the historical present should be used sparingly. It is only justified by the fact that the writer's interest in the narrative is so intense that the past becomes present to his imagination.

I.	II.
It was the business of Harvard to be on the lookout, and to secure all the glory it could.	It was Harvard's business *to have been* on the lookout and *to have secured* all the glory it could.

In this example, "was" fixes the time at which certain duties rested upon Harvard. Relatively to that time, those duties were present; "to be," not *to have been*, "on the lookout," "to secure," not *to have secured*, "glory," was the business of Harvard.

I.	II.
And this at a time, it may be added, when a single disaster would have led the British Government to withdraw its troops from the Peninsula.	And this at a time, it may be added, when a single disaster would have led the British Government *to have withdrawn* their troops from the Peninsula.[1]

"Major Henderson does not mean," says "The Saturday Review," "that the British Government would have withdrawn its troops before the disaster, but that is what he says; and thus you will see how easy it is, even for a writer who is well acquainted with his subject, to say the contrary of what he means when he does not pay sufficient attention to accuracy of grammar."

It is (or, was) a pleasure to pass my examinations so well.
It is (or, was) a pleasure to have passed my examinations so well.

These sentences are both correct; but they differ in meaning, as becomes apparent when we change the form of the sentence. "To pass my examinations so well is (or, was) a pleasure," means that my pleasure lies (or, lay) in the fact that I am (or, was) passing my examinations so well. "To have passed my examinations so well is (or, was) a pleasure," means that my pleasure lies (or, lay) in the fact that I have (or, had) passed my examinations so well: my examinations are over.

Indicative or **Subjunctive.** — The subjunctive mood is a less important part of the English language than it used to

[1] Quoted from a notice in "The Saturday Review" (Jan. 23, 1892) of "The Battle of Spicheren," etc., by Brevet-Major G. F. Q. Henderson.

be; but it is by no means extinct. Examples of its correct use in the present tense are given in the following citations from recent writers: —

Every bill shall be presented to the governor; if he approve, he shall sign it.

Whether the encounter alienate friends or raise up enemies, whether it be fraught with physical risk or moral danger, whether it lead to defeat or to total ruin, the editor who is worthy of the name will not shrink from the contest.

In these examples, the subjunctive forms "approve," "alienate," etc., express more doubt or uncertainty than the corresponding indicative forms would do. In the sentence "No one will wonder that they raise a protest, though it be like the helpless cry of an untaught child," the clause beginning "though it be" is equivalent to "though it be, perhaps, like the helpless cry," etc.; it expresses a doubtful proposition. Had the author used the indicative "is" instead of the subjunctive "be," there would be no doubt in the reader's mind that the protest was like an infant's cry.

Examples of the correct use of the subjunctive in the preterite tense are given in the following citations from recent writers: —

How terrible it would be if you were a saint!
If your home were not in Italy, you would feel as I do.
If she were to be taken away, I should marry again.
My wife is apt to look as if she were going to cry.
She wears an air of melancholy, as though [if] she were disappointed in you.

The subjunctive of the verb "to be" is still common, especially in the preterite tense.

I.	II.
If I were you, I should stay at home to-day.	If I *was* you I should stay at home to-day.