DESERET EVENING NEWS: FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 1904.



Why call anything what ent mings. Why call anything what s not? Look at the subjunctive mode, w many tenses has it? Two, three six? "If I be," and "were" are two ses, the present denoting future time the basis of the set of the set of the set. and the past denoting present time, There are only these two in which it is ossible to make any error. But is this future to say, "If he be at home," or if he should be at home?" This time If he should be at home, the What is the same, it is future in both. What mode have these predicates? In one facts indicative. In use they state facts-indicative. use they state hypothesis or on-subjunctive. This shows upposition-subjunctive. This shows hat the modes are wholly insufficient rinclude the commonest forms of expression, and the whole subject is in hopeless confusion. Why not simply look to the meaning in the first place and name each assertion by some term that actually fits or describes it? The resent method of calling one form of tatement a certain mode, say the poential, and then adding that sometimes be potential form has the indicative "subjunctive meaning, shows at once that the mode form is useless and that the meaning controls. If you say, howthat the form controls the mode ever, that the form controls the mode (this is the position taken by the text books), then all these contradictions come to the surface, and the student must strangle reason, as Luther ad-vised, as if it were a wild beast, in or-der that he may memorize blindly and fulsely the second prodes falsely the so-called modes.

university.

Prof.

correctly

in part as follows:

THE ASSERTING WORD.

The grammarians say that the first disiliary is always the asserting work. shall prove that this is not true. The uxillary "do" and its past form "did hough they once performed the func-bough they once performed the func-lon of asserting words, and were pre-fixed to infinitives, no longer have that use or meaning. Thus in "He did the work," did is a real verb, making an assertion. So in old English, "I do (to) assortion. So in old English, "I do (to) come," "do" performs the function of an assorting word before the infinitive. Bat this is no longer true. We now say, "I do come," meaning that I certainly come. Here "do" is no longer an as-serting word, but a mere qualifier of the asserting word "come," and "come," in splite of the doctrine of "rammarians is not any longer on inmmarlans, is not any longer an in-tive, but a true finite verb, which offive, but a true finite verb, which made more emphatic by the use of the particle "do," So "will" and "shall" wood" and "should," ordinarily make assertion mode by some other real th. Thus, "I shall write," once sant "I shall to write" or "I shall "form the action of writing." But the the action of writing." But the the action of writing as-ring word as well as the thing as-ring word as well as the thing as-ring word as well as the thing as-ried, and "shall" is used only to Indi-the time of the action. If I say, write now," or "I write comorrow," the time of the action. So, in hall write," "shall" is merely ad-ribial, showing the time of the writ-S. In the sentences, "Did he succeed?" should think he did succeed?" ob-rve that the particle "did." In each semakes no assertion, but simply makes no assertion, but simply sizes the assertion made by ed;" and that "should" makes "tion whatever, but has a cer-uplication that modifies the verb "think" indeed, the assertion made "think" would be just as much of assertion if we leave "should" out section if we leave "should" out sether. It is true that "should" or-ally meant obligation, and that "I hid go," was equivalent to "I ought o," where "ought" is the asserting d. But it only occasionally has meaning today, for we say, "I under obligation to go," or, "I am hid to go," etc., when we specifically in to imply obligation. And when mean to imply obligation. And when





