

promoted to the fourth form, and is perfectly familiar with the Indicative Mood in simple and compound sentences. The Subjunctive Mood comes up for explanation.

Experience confirms me in the belief that the use of the past tense, as explained by Mason, pp. 433 and 434, is the most advantageous, for that contains the best test of the Subjunctive Mood: viz., to determine whether the supposition corresponds with or is contrary to what is the fact; and I think this needs no great power of discrimination.

Mason has made this point so clear that it would be not only useless but presumptuous to attempt any further explanation. Yet the anomalous use of the past tense, in reference to present time, demands some attention.

I think you will agree with me when I say that all present conditions of things were brought about in past times, either near or remote. Take then an example: "If Noah were here, I should speak to him." Noah's being present would have to be a fact before the speaker, under the circumstances, could speak to him. Hence, in the hypothetical clause the past tense is properly employed to make a distinction between the real and supposed condition of things. In the consequent clause the use of the past tense secures the same end, showing "the want of congruity between the supposition and the fact."

Experience tells us that a serious difficulty with beginners is the use of the Present Indicative in hypothetical clauses. They fail to comprehend the reason for the supposition or what was in the mind of the speaker—to denote which is the office of moods.

Here many who have tried to investigate the matter have experienced a difficulty, and with many investigation has ceased, because they could not tell when to use, and when not to use, the Present Indicative in hypo-

thetical clauses. For this reason I have given this point a somewhat lengthy consideration, and to make the matter perfectly clear we shall take an example in which the present indicative is used in the hypothetical clause. "If the boy is guilty he deserves to be punished." In dealing with this sentence before my class, I was asked by one of my senior pupils, "Why does the speaker put his opinion in the form of a supposition if there is no doubt on his mind?" It may seem strange that, although students daily meet with this use of the Indicative, they are hopelessly bewildered when they attempt to define what was in the mind of the speaker in such cases; nevertheless this is a fact. In clearing the path of investigation for my pupils, I require them first to recite the two views of suppositions, so fully illustrated in Mason's *Advanced Grammar*, pp. 429 and 433. Then taking an example like the previous one, we pursue the matter in the following way. We shall suppose that the boy mentioned, while in the playground, was guilty of a misdemeanor, deserving corporal punishment, and another boy who witnessed the crime, having informed the teacher of the fact, he sends for the boy, who comes in, and the other boys follow to the ante-room to know the result. After a thorough investigation of the matter, the boy acknowledges the fault, and the teacher is in the act of inflicting the punishment, when a stranger enters the ante-room where the boys are assembled, and asks the cause of the boy's being punished; he is informed of the circumstance, and says, "Well, if he is guilty he deserves to be punished."

Of the boy's guilt there is no doubt, and consequently he uses the Indicative Mood. It may appear to you that I have magnified this difficulty, but I have invariably found