

ISSN 0910-500X

英文學思潮

THOUGHT CURRENTS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

VOLUME LXVII

1994

THE ENGLISH LITERARY SOCIETY
OF

AOYAMA GAKUIN UNIVERSITY

青山学院大学英文学会

A Brief Historical Survey of *Shall* and *Will* (XI)

Hugh E. Wilkinson

(Continued from Vol. LXVI)

We have now brought our researches down to the early modern period, and all that remains is to match up the findings with the analysis I first made of the present-day uses of *shall* and *will*, in which I already included some of the archaic uses found in Shakespeare and the A.V. The simplest way to proceed will be to follow my established practice and make an item-by-item comparison with sections 14 and 15, and find which points do or do not need further comment. As I said last time, most of my examples from the intervening period have been taken from *Chambers's Cyclopaedia of English Literature*.

Firstly, the use of *should* as in 14.1 to introduce a statement for which the speaker takes no responsibility is, as stated there, now confined to dialect. The *OED* gives two examples, which are also cited by Wright, and another one, quoted by Wright from Devon, is: "Mr. X come to me and zaid how you should zay how I hadn' a-got no right there".

The next use, as found in 14.2a and 1.1, 1.2, the use of *shall* to express a religious or moral obligation, is an archaic one, familiar to us only from the Ten Commandments and the Mosaic law as contained in the A.V. But the next use, that of the modal *should* in the sense of 'ought to', as in 14.2b, is very much alive. I described various of the modern uses in 1.3a-c and 1.4a-b.

In 14.3a we have *shall* or *should* use to express a legal obligation, and this use still survives in legal documents such as contracts or articles

of association; I gave modern examples under 1.5 and 1.6.

14.3b deals with the use of *shall* to express commands, intentions or wishes. This use in a main clause is archaic, and the *OED* quotes no examples after the early modern period, but we still find *should* used in subordinate clauses, examples of which I gave in 2.6a and 2.6b ("he ordered that he should" and the like); as I said there, this is now basically a literary usage, which has been rivalled at all times by the plain subjunctive and is now replaceable by other locutions in the spoken language. I also made a separate category 3.2b for those cases where I felt that *should* might also commonly be replaced by *would* ("It was decided that I should/would . . ."). An example from an earlier period of the use of *shall* rather than *should* is Congreve's "I intend you shall marry, Ben", and I have still found similar constructions in use today, as in "Some Ugandans are determined that the present government shall succeed."

14.3c deals with the use of *shall* to express a general arrangement without its author being specified; basically this is an archaic use not outlasting the early modern period, with *shall* replaced today by *is to*, *are to*, *be supposed to*, though there are somewhat similar modern instances given under 2.1 where *shall* is used in the 2nd and 3rd persons in questions asking for instructions ("Shall the driver wait?"). On the other hand, the use of *should* in a clause introduced by "on condition that", as in 14.3d, is still very much alive, and has its modern counterpart in 2.6a.

In 14.3e we have the use of *shall* in a final or consecutive clause; in general this survives in modern literary usage, as in 2.7, though its use in clauses introduced by a relative pronoun is archaic. An 18th-century example from Addison is "I will daily instil into them such sound and wholesome sentiments as shall have a good effect on their conversation for the ensuing twelve hours." The other uses given in 14.3f and 14.3g are now obsolete.

In 14.4a we have the familiar use of "Shall I?" or "Shall we?" asking for instructions regarding immediate action, as in 2.1 to 2.4. But I noted in 2.2 that in earlier days this *shall* could be used in questions asking for general instructions, where *should*, *am to* or *must* are appropriate today. 14.4b gives the similar use of "Shall we?" to make a suggestion, as in 2.5; this may also be combined with the answer "We will", as in 15.9c.

We come now, in 14.5, to the use of *shall* to form the "prophetic future", which I foreshadowed in 3.4a. In the first person we can say that this is one of the uses which forms the foundation of the plain future, as in 4.1; true to its origin as a means of expressing external causation, it denotes an action in which the speaker's will is not involved. The use in 2nd person questions, as in 4.2, also seems to go back to the same source, and owed its survival, as long as it lasted, to the fact that it required the answer "I shall". The use in the 2nd person (affirmative) and 3rd person, as in "Unto dust shalt thou return", "Behold, a virgin shall conceive", is still found in modern times as a conscious archaism, as in Kipling's "East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet", Laurence Binyon's "They shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old: Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn", or Martin Luther King's "I have dreamed a great dream, that Thy love shall rule our land", but the problem remains as to when it dropped out of the spoken idiom. As far as I can discover from my researches it seems to be true to say that by the 18th century this use of *shall* is confined to the elevated style, as in Pope's "Where'er you walk cool gales shall fan the glade", Thomson's "Still more majestic shalt thou rise . . . thy cities shall with commerce shine" (from *Rule Britannia*; but "Britons never *will* be slaves", that is, 'will never consent to be', not *shall*, as is always sung at the Promenade concerts), Gray's "The cock's shrill clarion, or the echoing horn, No more shall rouse them from their lowly bed", or

Cowper's "But he (they knew) nor ship nor shore, Whate'er they gave, should visit more." What I suspect happened is this. In certain cases this prophetic future is hardly to be distinguished from the future containing the speaker's own assurance, as in 14.6b; thus Jesus could be giving his own assurance when he says "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it" or "Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven." A similar example, likewise from the 17th century, is found in Locke: "There [= In history] he shall see a picture of the world and the nature of mankind, and so learn to think of men as they are." (This could also be a kind of apodosis, cf. 14.6c.) By the 18th century the kind of prose that was being written was the kind in which *shall* would convey the speaker's promise or declaration of intent rather than a prophetic assertion, and so the prophetic *shall* became either subsumed under this latter or relegated to poetry or other "notable utterances" (to use Bloomfield's phrase), among which we may perhaps include Johnson's "The writer shall often in vain trace his memory . . . for that which yesterday he knew with intuitive readiness." (But see also 14.6c, 6e and 6f.)

In 14.6a we have the use of *shall* in the 1st person to express the speaker's determination. This has evidently provided another source for the modern plain future, as in 4.1, and actually the sense of determination can still sometimes be felt. One example is the disobedient child's "Shan't!" quoted by the Fowlers as an example of the plain future being stronger than the volitional "Won't!"; another is Churchill's statement of defiance, "We shall fight on the beaches, . . . we shall never surrender", and yet another MacArthur's "I shall return." A further example in an everyday context can be seen in "I shall write to the company and complain." The older use of this "I shall" to express a promise or declaration of intent has now given way to "I will", but was certainly prevalent at least down to the 18th century, thus Swift, "I shall conclude with . . .", Pope, "I shall begin with . . .",

Addison, "I shall endeavour . . .", Johnson, "We shall now endeavour . . ." and so on. (I had already noted this use of "I shall" by Shakespeare in 4.2, but had no idea at that point that this was a usage that went right back to Old English.) The main point I was dealing with in 4.2 was the use of *should* in reported speech to represent the plain future use of "I shall", and I noted there that Jespersen quoted an example taken from Caxton's frequent use of *should* to report a promise or expression of determination, and added examples from Chaucer. (I have yet to find examples of the kind "He vowed that he should be revenged" from after the early modern period, but it may well be that they exist.) I also noted that the next example that Jespersen quoted after Caxton was from Fielding, "He knew he shouldn't be beyond the reach of her voice", and by this time we have *should* used to report the plain future "I shall"; it is difficult to trace the stages of this development, but we can clearly suppose that when "I shall" became a plain future "you/he etc. should" followed suit (and *should* held out against *would* for a long time because of the association with *I shall*). Early examples are from John Aubrey (1626–1697), "He asked her when he should see her again", and Steele, "The voyager communicated to his mistress, how happy he should be to have her in his country", and, in a question, Johnson, "How should you like . . . to be tried before a jury for a capital crime once a week?"

By contrast, 14.6b gives the use of *shall* in the 2nd and 3rd persons to express a promise or threat on the part of the speaker, and this has survived as the coloured future, see 3.1, 3.2a and cf. "They shall not pass", the standard translation of Pétain's "Ils ne passeront pas." This usage has been very frequent in all periods, right up to modern times, so that the examples given in 3.1 and 3.2a will suffice, but, as I said there, the tendency in recent times seems to be to replace this construction with a different locution, thus "I will give you" for "You shall have". The construction in the next paragraph, 14.6c, which is

"you shall find", I also included in 3.1 as an archaic idiom, still listed in *COD*⁶, perhaps on the strength of an 1882 quotation given in the *OED*; other such examples are Steele's "You shall hardly find one man of any consideration, but you shall observe one of less consequence form himself after him", or Cowper's "And I will tell you what you shall find at your first entrance", or Beckford's "There . . . shall you find sufficient objects to gratify it. You shall possess the exclusive privilege of . . ." The same *COD*⁶ also lists (s.v. *hard*) "it shall go hard but", the archaic idiom for which I made a special entry in 14.6d, though I did not refer to it when dealing with modern English.

14.6e is a special section devoted to the use of *shall/should* in an apodosis in all the senses found in 14.5 and 14.6; in dealing with the modern language I put the examples of "I should" (and *should* in the other persons in questions and reported speech) in 4.4, with the special idioms "I should think", "I should hope" in 4.5, and "I should . . . (if I were you)" in 4.6, and made a special category, 3.3, for cases of the coloured future, while other examples were scattered among 3.2a (a promise) and 3.4a (the prophetic future). The 18th century provides a variety of examples of the use of *shall/should* ranging from plain to coloured future, thus, from Addison, "He owned he should have been very glad to have seen the little boy", from Steele, "The officer . . . told her that he . . . should be glad to end his warfare in the service of her or her fair daughter", ". . . to have her in his country, where she should be clothed in such silks as his waistcoat was made of" (i.e. "if he had her . . ."), "There is not a girl in the town, but let her have her will . . . and she shall dress as a shepherdess", "if they had not told him . . . he should have guessed", "You shall hardly find one man of any consideration, but you shall observe one of less consequence form himself after him", from Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (1689–1762), "being what we should call Scripture language", from Goldsmith, "Were it not for the busy disposition of some of

your correspondents, the public should never have known that . . .", and from Cowper, "If you cast a look on either side of you, you shall see on the right hand a box of my making . . . On the left hand . . . you will find the door . . ." (note the contrast between *shall* and *will*). In the remaining 14.6f we have another archaic idiom likewise included in the *COD*⁶, "it should seem" (also found in Cowper), which I listed earlier in 1.16, with an inadequate analysis.

14.7a–7d deal with sentences in which *shall* is used to express some feeling, 7a dealing with feelings of sadness, 7b with feelings of "it is natural/strange etc.", 7c with feelings of "it is good/necessary etc.", and 7d with questions in the form "Who should . . . but . . . ?" The first three of these find their modern counterparts listed in 1.11, and the last one in 1.8; I have also included examples of "It is better/important that . . ." under 2.6a, as expressing a wish or command.

In 14.8a we have *shall* in temporal and concessive clauses serving as an auxiliary of the subjunctive mood; many of the examples given here I had already quoted in 1.12 and 2.9–2.11, together with a few others of later provenance, but this construction is now basically archaic. In 14.8b we have a similar use in a conditional clause; here the use of *shall*, which I referred to previously in 2.9, is archaic, but *should* is still used, as in 1.12, though in the limited sense of 'should happen to' in contrast to the wider sense of 'were to' found in early modern English, and so also in Congreve, "If you should give such language at sea, you'd have a cat-o'-nine-tails laid across your shoulders" (a similar construction can be seen in Boswell's "careless of what should be the event"). 14.8c is a special category for the archaic "as who should say", likewise listed in *COD*⁶ (s.v. *who*), which I gave in 1.12 as meaning 'as if he were to say' rather than the correct 'as if one were to say'. In 14.8d we have a similar use in a relative clause, previously listed in 2.9 and 2.10; this use is also basically archaic, though I gave an example in 1.12 of "anyone who should be tempted

to doubt this statement", which was taken from recent times. Examples of 18th-century uses are "to do that which to right and justice shall appertain" from Steele, "the hardy wight that should undertake to put an end to it" from Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, and, from Johnson (apud Boswell), "I'll take you five children from London, who shall cuff five Highland children."

In 14.9a we have various types of rhetorical questions, such as "Why should . . . ?", as in 1.9 and 1.10, "How should . . . ?", as in 1.14b, or "How shall . . . ?", as in 3.4b. A similar type of question, "Who am I that I should . . . ?", is given in 14.9b, but I forgot to include it in the section on the modern usage, and in fact it did not occur to me until I came across the passage from Maugham that I quoted in 14.9b. An earlier example comes from Sheridan: "What has Sir Benjamin done that you should avoid him so?" 14.9c is reserved for "Is it possible that . . . should . . . ?", which I had also not listed before; we may say that it is now highly literary, if not archaic. 14.9d deals with similar questions which are not rhetorical but contain either an idea of puzzlement, or of "How can I . . . ?" or of "Let's see who can . . ." The first type, that of "What should this mean?", which I first quoted in 1.7, is archaic (I have found a parallel in Goldsmith, "Why, whose should it be?"), and so is the second as seen in the example from Pope, "Who shall decide when doctors disagree?", which I gave in 2.8, calling it rhetorical, which it is in a sense though it is the idea of "Who can . . . ?" that is uppermost (cf. 'Junius' (1769-72), "Whither shall this unhappy old man retire?"). But "How shall I . . . ?" in the sense of 'How shall I be able to . . . ?' is perfectly modern, as in the examples "How shall I know which is your house?" and the rhetorical "How shall I ever repay you?", which I gave in 4.9. These echo Shakespeare's "How shall I know thee again?", which I quoted in 14.9d; similarly "But shall you on your knowledge find this way?", which I listed in 14.5, might perhaps be better placed here (I

in fact noted its sense of potentiality in 7.7). The third type, found in Shakespeare, can also be seen in "Envious who first should catch and first applaud The stuff or royal nonsense" from Dryden, and "struggling who should be first" from Hannah More (1745–1833). Another sentence containing a sense of potentiality is R. L. Stevenson's "Of what should a man be proud, if he is not proud of his friends?"

In 14.10a we have the use of *should* to mean "can be expected to", as in 1.13 and 1.14a, a use which goes back to Shakespeare, though it was not listed in the original *OED*, owing to a printing error, and the examples in the present edition do not go back so far. 14.10b and 10c show kindred meanings of 'must', 'surely (I) ought to', which are now obsolete; other examples from the 17th century are "Wha's yon? A sud be me contremon by's scratin an scrubbin" from John Tatham (fl. 1641–60), and "Thou shouldst be Alonzo.—So you should be Sebastian" from Dryden.

Finally, in 14.11 I gave examples of *shall* used after verbs of supposing, hoping, doubting and fearing. Today *shall* is only used in the 1st person in these cases, and other uses are archaic. The example I gave there, "They supposed that they should have received more", I wrongly analysed as representing an original "We should receive more", when it actually represents "We shall receive more"; in this case a sentence like "They supposed that they should receive more" could illustrate a type that has only recently died out, that is, the 3rd person with *should* representing the 1st person with *shall* in reported speech. How long *shall* survived in other cases is open to question, but the *OED* quotes "I trust in God your labour shall not be in vain" from Southey, as well as "I hope his visits shall not be intruded upon me" from Fielding. Other examples I have found are "One would think a silent man . . . should be very little liable to misinterpretation", and "If Mr. Bickerstaff marries a child of any of his old companions, I hope mine shall have the preference" from Steele (though this last may be a

reported promise).

Looking now at my analysis of the modern uses of *shall*, to see if there are any that have arisen more recently, I find there are only certain idioms that have sprung out of these categories, such as "I should say" in 4.4, "I should think" and "I should hope" in 4.5, and "I should . . . (if I were you)" in 4.6, besides other minor variations in 4.7 and 4.8. I conclude in 4.10 by noting various erroneous modern uses of *shall* where *will* is more appropriate, uses that have probably arisen from a misapplication of the strictures of grammarians, though we might also see in them a continuation of the *shall* of 14.6a. I have found a highly reprehensible example of this in the Revised English Bible, which has consistently changed the "I will" of the New English Bible (and the A.V.) to "I shall"!

When we come to *will*, the first usage we find in 15.1a is that of *will* as a full verb with an object (not always expressed), meaning 'want'. This we may say is now obsolete, except for certain fixed phrases like "if you will", "as you will", "God willing"; others like "whether he would or no", given in 5.1, might equally be considered as having the ellipsis of a following infinitive and belonging to the next class. The second use, given in 15.1b, of *will* followed by a *that*-clause is likewise obsolete, and I did not refer to it in discussing the modern uses, except to list the archaic example "I would to God I were dead!" in 5.5, though this belongs rather to 15.7.

In 15.2 we come to the first use of *will* with the infinitive, in the original sense of 'want to', 'try to'. In declarative sentences this is either archaic, as in 5.4 ("Whosoever will save his life . . ."), or confined to fixed idioms like "I'll have you know", "try as he would", "as luck would have it", "call it what you will" and so on, which are listed in 5.1 (and cf. "cost what it will", from Sterne). But interrogatively it is still used in invitations, as in 5.2. 15.3a is a similar use of the modal *would* or *would have* (which in some cases might simply be the past

tense) in the sense of 'would like to', 'would want to', 'would have liked to'. Here we have several modern uses, especially "would rather", which are listed under 5.5 (with a similar example in 5.4). From an earlier age I have turned up a number of typical examples: from Dryden we find (quoting Montaigne), "But if I were to choose where I would have been born, it should have been in a Commonwealth", and "He would have lived more free", from Vanbrugh, "Mr. Justice, he would have been uncivil!", from Sterne, "a rood and a half of ground to do what they would with" (past tense in reported speech), from Sheridan, "I wouldn't have it otherwise" (i.e. I wouldn't want to), and "by which these bold invaders would delude you", from Mrs. Elizabeth Inchbald (1753–1821), "She would have hung upon the present word for ever", from William Godwin (1756–1836), "How long has the jargon imposed upon the world, which would persuade us that . . .", and from Dickens, "Forgo all idle forms, unless you would see me a blighted corse at your feet", of which the majority are clearly archaic now. 15.3b is an obsolete use of *will* to mean 'claim to', to which the *OED* compares "will have it", as in Addison's "Some will have it that I often write to myself".

15.4 deals with the use of *will* in the sense of 'choose to', often in the form of the modal *would*, especially in an apodosis. In the modern language we may say that *will* is no longer used in this way (unless we include the "call it what you will" that I just listed in connection with 15.2, and other phrases with "what you will"), but *would* is used more frequently, as in 6.6. Here I quoted a lot of Shakespearean examples, but the modern use is seen typically in sentences like "What would you do if you had the chance?" I also quoted there Johnson's "I would injure no man, and should provoke no resentment; I would relieve every distress, and should enjoy the benedictions of gratitude", which I had previously quoted in 4.4, pointing out the difference (self-consciously made?) between "would (choose to)" and "should

(as a consequence)". A similar example comes from Boswell: "B: If, Sir, you were shut up in a castle, and a new-born child with you, what would you do? J: Why, Sir, I should not much like my company. B: But would you take the trouble of rearing it? J: Why yes, Sir, I would . . . but I would not coddle the child." A late example of *will*, which perhaps belongs rather under 15.2, is from John Hookham Frere (1769–1846): "Will you be sold abroad, or starve at home?"

In 15.5a we have *will* in the sense of 'be willing to' or, negatively, 'refuse to', which is still one of the common modern uses, exemplified in 5.7–5.9, and seen in Dryden's "For who would die to gratify a foe?" Well into the modern stage "I hope you will" was distinguished from "I hope you shall", as in Pope's "I hope you will think less of the time past than of the future", and I listed the early examples separately in 15.5b, but now no difference is felt between this "you will" and that expressing the plain future, and the same is true of clauses introduced by "I fear". Similarly, in contrast to the sentences with *shall* that I quoted in connection with 14.11, by the intervening period we also find *will* being used without any sense of volition (as it was already in early modern English, cf. 15.11b), so "This one, I fear, will be the last" from Pope, "I hope she will recover, but I fear the child will die" from Defoe (cf., in the 1st person, also from Defoe, "No, I told him, I had not lost it yet, but was afraid I should"), "I will hope the best, that they will not be condemned" from Dryden, "I hope your honour will soon be well enough to get down to your country seat" from Sterne, "I feared that what I was so confident I had secured would yet be frustrated" from Boswell, and "So she hopes her death will be a warning to all young persons of her own sex" from Mrs. Inchbald. On the other hand, we find an archaic use of *will* in a volitional sense in the constructions "I entreat/beg/desire you will", examples of which I have found in Pope, Swift, Gray, Smollett, Goldsmith and Jane Austen. In 15.5c I also listed separately

the examples of *will* with an inanimate subject, as in the modern "The lid won't come off", which is included under 5.7, with parallel examples of *would* in 5.8 and 5.9. An example from Dryden is "I have as far imitated as the poverty of our language . . . would allow", and from Pope "Take all the best qualities you can find . . . ; if they will not be reduced to a consistency, lay them all in a heap upon him."

In 15.6a we have the same *will* in a conditional clause, and this is paralleled today in the examples given in 5.10. In 15.6b I classed together the use of *will* to make a request and that to issue an invitation, neglecting the necessary distinction which I had made in the case of the modern language by classing the requests under 'be willing' in 5.7 along with all the other examples of this usage, and listing the invitations under 5.2 because the sense of 'wishing' is still apparent.

In 15.7 I likewise put together the two archaic uses of *would* found in introducing a wish, "I would that" and "Would God that", although "I would that" is a form of "I would wish that" (see 15.1b), and "Would God that" is itself a wish—"If only God would wish that". In describing the modern language I gave an example of "I would that" in 5.5, as I said just now, and of "Would God that" in 5.11, along with other examples of *would* in a subordinate clause expressing the thing wished for. "I would that" is already a conscious archaism in Tennyson's "I would that wars should cease."

In 15.8 we have an extension of the meaning of *will* to 'intend to', as preserved in the "I will" of the wedding service, see 5.3, where I also included one of the examples from the A.V. given here. Apart from this, we find a use, with a reduced sense of volition, in questions asking a person what his plans are, and the corresponding answers, which I listed in 6.4 and 6.5, giving an example from Defoe, "What will you do with it [the money] now, Jack?—I'll go into Rag Fair and buy me a pair of shoes and stockings", with the observation that this construction was now regarded as a plain future (cf. "What time will

you be back?—I'll be back around 6.30.") and rivalled by the use of "be going to". Some of the examples in 15.8 have the stronger sense of 'be determined to', 'insist on', as in 5.12, and examples of this from the intervening period are Richardson's "The Colonel, against the surgeon's advice, would mount on horseback", William Cobbett's "If you will go that way, by G—, you must go down Hawkley Hanger", and Wordsworth's "Buttercups, that will be seen, whether we will see or not", while Shakespeare's "an thou wilt needs thrust thy head into a yoke" has its counterpart in Locke's "But if the mother will needs have an allowance for frost and snow", and Steele's "If thou wilt needs utter thy follies" (a Quaker is speaking).

In 15.9a we have another familiar usage, that of *will* in the first person to express a promise or announce an intended action, as in 6.1 and 6.3 (the similar use of modal *would*), this being the most frequent example of the "coloured future". It will be remembered that in Middle English "I will", expressing a promise, was rivalled by "I shall", expressing determination and also used in promises, but that by early modern English times "I will" seemed to be more frequent, though "I shall" lingered on, as I noted in connection with 14.6a (and the Fowlers give "I shall execute your orders" as an example of this use subsumed under the plain future). 15.9b illustrates the same use of *will* in reported speech, likewise continued today, see 6.2. A broadly similar use of "we will" to mean 'let's' is given in 15.9c, and this has its modern counterpart in sentences included in 6.1 and 6.2. In Thomas Holcroft (1745–1809) I have found examples of "I'll not be long", "I won't be long away", which in modern usage are probably taken as examples of the use of "I will" to replace "I shall" in the plain future, though in fact they contain the speaker's assurance to the listener. In Cowper we find *will* contrasted with *shall*: "I will endeavour to say something now, and shall hope for something in return."

In 15.10a we have the "habitual will", frequent in all periods and

still used today, as in 5.14 and 5.15 (I could also have included there a modal use, as in "In such cases we would say . . ."). 15.10b was devoted to the idiom "will still be doing", in the sense of 'be always doing', which appeared in the early modern period, and could still be found in the 18th century either with *still* or with another phrase expressing frequency, but has now died out; I have found another example of what appears to be the same use in Wordsworth's "The winds that will be howling at all hours." (In 15.10b I also corrected the misstatements I had made about this in 5.12.) 15.10c treats the same habitual *will* with an inanimate subject, as in "Business . . . will find us out, even in the stillest retreat", from Cowper. In this case some of the modern examples are included under 5.14, but there is also another use that I subjoined here which expresses a general potentiality, as in the modern "Iron will expand when it gets hot", "7 into 5 won't go." From the intervening period I have noted a number of examples, such as "Content will never dwell but in a meek and quiet soul" from Izaak Walton, "This sword . . . will split a hair" from Congreve, "None of the properties of matter will apply to the operations of the mind" from Edward Gibbon, and "The coarser animal oils will come very cheap . . . and about six pounds of grease will dip a pound of rushes . . . Thus a poor family will enjoy five and a half hours of comfortable light for a farthing" from Gilbert White (1720-93; the last sentence is found with an animate subject, as also in the modern usage, belonging, as it does, rather under 15.11f, see below). In 15.10d we have the use of *will* to express a natural tendency that cannot be prevented, and modern examples, like "Accidents will happen", are given under 5.13.

In 15.11a we come to the use of *will* to express an action springing from an inner instinct or propensity, with the sense of 'be likely to'. This, as we have now seen, was found from earliest times in the 2nd and 3rd persons, and is clearly the origin of the modern plain future

in these persons, as given in 7.1–7.7, though in my ignorance I speculated there on other possible origins for this. But we also found last time that in early modern English there were instances of “I will” and “we will” which were analysable in the same way, so that it seems as if the use of “I will” rather than “I shall” to express the plain future in the 1st person, as is usual in America (see 7.2 sqq.), had its origin in this early modern usage, and the same argument applies to the use of *will/would* for *shall/should* in the 2nd and 3rd persons in questions and reported speech (cf. 4.2). In the latter case I suspect that *will/would* may have been as commonly used as *shall/should* (cf. 14.6e), as in the following examples: “And my tutor told me they would expect so much of me, being a scholar” from John Strype (1643–1737), and “The ambitious man flatters himself that. . . he will be enabled to act with such superiority and grace, that the lustre of his future conduct will entirely cover or efface the foulness of the steps by which he arrived at that elevation” from Adam Smith. As for examples of *will/would* in the first person, we shall find some in apodoses (see below), but apart from that the *OED* gives no examples from the intervening period, and I have only been able to turn up “where I will introduce you to Mrs. Unwin . . . , and where we will be happy as the day is long” from Cowper, though even here it looks as if the “we will” was attracted to the coloured “I will”. In 15.11b I separated out the use of this *will* after verbs of knowing, fearing and expecting—verbs which could also be followed by *shall*—noting that there was little appreciable difference in meaning between the two; *will* has completely replaced *shall* in modern English, and was evidently well on the way to doing so by the 18th century, judging from the number of examples I quoted just now in connection with 15.5a.

In 15.11c I gave what I called *will* with a reduced future sense, such as ‘probably is’, which arose out of the previous use of “I think it will be” to mean ‘I think it is likely to be’. I gave a number of modern

instances in 7.19, such as "That'll be the postman" and, from Conan Doyle, "That would be in the year 1878", which would be more likely to come out as "That would have been . . ." in present-day usage. A good earlier example, from Scott, is "I am Dandie Dinmont . . . ye'll mind me?" I also included in 7.19 "That'll do" and "That'll never do", which I have also found used earlier by Sterne and Scott, though these might perhaps be better classed as examples of *will* used in the sense of 'can' (see below).

15.11d gives examples of *will* meaning 'be likely to' in an apodosis, modern examples of which are given in the various sections dealing with the plain future, beginning with 7.1. This is used in all persons, examples of "I'd be glad to" being common from early modern English times, and in 7.7 I quoted examples from Defoe and other examples of "Would you . . ." from Sheridan, while the *OED* gives, from Johnson, "I would be glad to know when we are to meet", and I have found an earlier example of the same thing from Sir George Mackenzie (1636–91), "Yet if I were discoursing of my nation abroad, I would be glad of that merit in him which now displeases me." Other examples of early use in the 1st person are, from Thomas Otway (1652–85), "If love be treasure, we'll be wondrous rich: I have so much my heart will surely break with it", from George Farquhar (1678–1707), "Strong! It must be so, or how would we be strong that drink it?" (though perhaps this belongs with 15.11f), from Scott, "But I suppose, if you were possessed of such a secret, you would . . . keep it to yourself?—I would pray to be directed and guided what was the line of duty, madam", and from Coleridge (in the *OED*), "He makes everything turn out exactly as we would wish it." (There is another doubtful instance from Thackeray: "Had we houses of religion . . . I often think I would retire to one . . . But I would love you still.") As an example of *would* in the 2nd person in a question the *OED* quotes, from Johnson, "Tell me what you would be most willing to spare", and

says that *would* is always used in "Would you believe it?" and "Who would have thought it?" I quoted these in 7.6 with the Fowlers' comment that *would* was used because the sentences were rhetorical, whereas "Should you . . . ?" would be used if an answer was required. But in 15.11d I made it clear that this usage originated here. In 7.6 I included other modern examples, including "You'd better", which has come from "You would better", though it is now expanded as "You had better"; I have found an early example of this in Fanny Burney, "'You'd better find the way.' . . . 'You had better make some inquiry,' said I . . . 'We had best go straight on.' " 15.11d also gave examples of a "clause within a clause", two of which I had quoted earlier in 7.21, together with modern examples. In 15.11e I separated out phrases like "it would seem", "one would think", modern examples of which were included in 7.6-7.8; I also listed here "The play would be of Harry the *iiii*th", which is parallel to "That would be in the year 1878", given in 7.19.

15.11f deals with cases of *will* used as the equivalent of *can* to express potentiality in case of need, in a particular circumstance, etc., often found in a relative clause to indicate the kind of object required (where, as I said, French uses the subjunctive); I classed the modern examples in 7.20. When the subject is inanimate, the usage is close to that of the habitual *will*, from which it must have sprung; thus we can see the sense of 'used to be able to' in a sentence like "In the old days £1 would buy a high-class dinner for two people." Earlier examples are, from Samuel Butler, "When he . . . has found out some sturdy hard word that will but rhyme, he will hammer the sense upon it . . . into what form he pleases", from Congreve, "That simile won't do in wet weather", from Sterne, "Eugenius said it would not do", from Gilbert White, "Some trees were wanted . . . that would measure twelve inches diameter at the little end" and "Thus a poor family will enjoy five and a half hours of comfortable light for a farthing", from Frere, "This

pig won't do for sacrifice", and, from Scott, "How many sheep will it feed?"

Finally I listed two obsolete uses; in 15.12, that of *will* in the sense of 'be on the point of', somewhat comparable to the modern "It's trying to rain", and in 15.13 that of *will* meaning 'need to' in the same way that "want to" is used today in "The sleeves want to be a little longer."

Looking now at my modern examples I find firstly a usage that has come into the language since the original *OED* was compiled, as in "You *would* go and do a thing like that!" or "He's forgotten the tickets again.—He *would*!", for which I made a special category 5.16. I analysed this as an offshoot of the habitual *will*, comparing it with "My children are always arguing with me, as young people will", but I am not satisfied with this. This *would* is always accented, but perhaps the location, and the accent, have come from sentences like "That's just the sort of thing he would do in such a case", which is simply a use of the plain future in an apodosis, with *would* accented as it always is in "would do".

Another even more modern use, which I have only recently noted and so did not include in my original analysis, is that of *would* in a narrative to mean 'was destined to', 'was going to', which I suspect has had its origin in America. Examples are "It was there he met the girl he would later marry", "In a week this would all be gone", or "It would be many years before we would meet again." This last sentence might have been phrased "Little did we know then that it would . . .", and the present usage has probably sprung from one such as this.

In the case of the plain future, I note first the use of *will* to express a command, as in "You will report here at 7.30" and the judge's "You will be taken from here . . .", given in 7.1, or the teacher's "You will write out 100 times 'I must not cheat.'" The *OED* gives no examples of this before Scott's "You will permit me to say . . ." and "You will

take care to give no offence . . ." The use of *will/would* in place of *shall/should* in the first person, labelled Scottish, Irish or American by the *OED*, is becoming common in standard British usage, especially that of "I/we would" and its offshoot "If I were you, I'd . . .", and I gave various examples in section 7. Similarly *would* is often used in place of *should* in Britain also, in clauses introduced by "so that", as in 7.16a, or by "agree/decide, etc. that", as in 7.17. There might be historical grounds for some of these uses, but there are others that strike me as untraditional, such as the American "What will I do without you?" (7.2a) or the Irish "Will I make you a cup of tea?", "Will we just take a quick look?" (7.2b, 2c), where to me *shall* is the only correct form. Similar modern developments to my mind are the Irish "Her mother suggested that Ella wouldn't wear the ring in public yet awhile" (7.16b), or the American "Why would I want to do a thing like that?", "It's quite natural that he would think the way he does", etc. (7.13).

In 7.18 I spoke of the substandard use of "If I'd have been there . . .", "If you'd have known . . ." as representing *would have*, I suspect now that they actually represent *had have*, but in any case the impulse for this use has come from the *would have* of the apodosis.

Finally, in 7.22, I listed the examples given by the Fowlers of the irregular-seeming use of *will* in a conditional clause, which they very properly attribute to the ellipsis of a verb of saying. The literary nature of the examples they give obscures the fact that such ellipses are quite common, at least in the apodosis. In 7.19 I gave two examples of "you would" meaning "I should/would find that you were", and a similar instance is "I think he'll know if you ask him", that is, "I think you'll find he knows." Another example of the ellipsis of a verb of saying, in the apodosis, is seen in a sentence like "If you ask me, there wouldn't be much point in doing that", meaning "... I should/would say there isn't . . ."

This as last completes my analysis of *shall* and *will*, and brings my "brief survey" to a long-awaited conclusion! We have seen how both words originally started out with their own distinct areas of meaning, obligation in the case of *shall*, and volition in the case of *will*. They then came also to be used as auxiliaries of the future, each in its own way, *shall* because of its added sense of expressing something that is externally ordained, and because of its use in the first person to express one's determination, and *will* because it was used from earliest times to express an inner propensity and also to inquire about future plans. Finally we have seen that *shall* is now on its way out as a future auxiliary and is becoming limited, in the form *should*, to its original meaning of obligation, as well as to a later use to express an event that can be expected in the natural course of things, while *will*, in addition to keeping a broad range of its original uses, has virtually become the sole auxiliary of the future, though even here it is rivalled by "be going to".

(concluded)