CHAPTER II

CONDITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH

2.1 Introduction:

Conditional sentences are important in all languages. Grammarians have done their part in the description of these constructions. Besides, philosophers have tried to investigate the 'logic' of conditional sentences. However, our knowledge and understanding of conditional constructions in the languages of the world is very limited. Even in English, according to Palmer (1986) there is no wholly satisfactory account of the reasons for the choice between a, b and c in the following:

1. a) If John comes, I shall leave.
   b) If John should come, I shall leave.
   c) Should John come, I shall leave.

2. a) If John came, I should leave.
   b) If John were to come, I should leave.
   c) Were John to come, I should leave.

This suggests that conditional sentences in English present a variety of problems. Undoubtedly, it is difficult for anyone but a native speaker to understand and explain in full the intricacies of these conditional constructions as this has not been really well attended to even in pedagogical grammars. This fact has been noted by Greenbaum (1987: 196). He observes that he would expect "pedagogical grammars to give disproportionate attention to those aspects of grammar that are specific to English and are known to cause problems for foreign learners. They include phrasal and prepositional verbs, the uses of the modal auxiliaries, the selection
Bell (1974: 129) states that as far as he was able to discover, not much was available in the literature on this topic, and so he offers in 'a note on conditional sentences in English' a few suggestions which, if acceptable, may serve as a start in remedying this deficiency.

Conditional sentences are unlike all others in that both the subordinate clause (the protasis) and the main clause (the apodosis) are nonfactual. Neither indicates that an event has occurred or is occurring or will occur; the sentence merely indicates the dependence of the truth, of one proposition upon the truth of another (Palmer 1986: 189).

There is one distinction that is undoubtedly important typologically, that between real and unreal conditions, the latter being used to refer to events about which the speaker expresses some kind of negative belief.

e.g. If John comes, I shall leave.
    If John came, I should leave.

(Palmer 1986: 189)

Here the first leaves open the possibility of John's coming, the second indicates that the speaker thinks unlikely that he will come.

Collins (1987: 291) defines a conditional sentence as "a sentence in which the subordinate clause, usually begins with if or other conditional markers, gives a condition that must be fulfilled before what the main clause says can be true, possible or done".

Generally, a conditional sentence is a complex sentence consisting
of a main clause and a subordinate clause. The subordinate clause is an adverbial clause; and it may be a finite, nonfinite or a verbless clause. The subordinate clause can only be used with a main clause and is often introduced by a subordinating conjunction or a sentence adverbial. Sometimes, the conditional sentence does not have an overt adverbial clause at all. In such a case, the condition is called as suppressed condition.

Adverbial clauses, like adverbials in general are capable of occurring in a final, initial, or medial position rarely within (Quirk et al. 1972: 743) the main clause (generally in that order of frequency).

Adverbial clauses are divided into classes corresponding to those of adverbial elements—clauses of place, time, manner, degree, cause, condition and exception, concession, purpose or end and means. Thus, adverbial clauses indicate many different shades of thought. The conjunctions introducing the clause express these meanings, so that they play an important role. (Curme 1947: 176).

Conditional sentences may consist of a single clause, two clauses wherein both are main clauses or a main clause and a subordinate clause.

e.g. If I had only known! (single clause)
(Jespersen 1931: 125)

Take this medicine and you'll feel better.

You better put your overcoat on or (else) you'll catch a cold.
<Informal> (both main clause)
(Leech and Svartvik 1975: 159-60)

If you'd loved me, I might have married you.
(one main and one subordinate clause)
(Leech 1971: 119)

Moreover, conditions are also expressed by inversion of verbs and subject—when the conditional clause contains one of the auxiliary verbs were, had, or should.
In conditional sentences, the proposition expressed by the main clause is qualified by a condition expressed by an if-clause or some equivalent construction like unless, on condition that, provided that, so long as, as long as etc. However, if is the major marker of conditional sentences. It is the most obvious marker of conditional clauses. All the monumental works on grammar and the grammarians from Poutsma to Quirk have discussed the form of if conditional in great detail. Yet there is a long-standing dispute within philosophy and linguistics and even logic about the interpretation of sentences of English containing if. Recently, Bell (1974), Close (1980), Dudaan (1984), Declerck (1984), Takami (1988) have discussed the problem in a new light in their research papers.

As has already been stated, most conditional sentences consist of a main clause and a subordinate clause. The main clause may be an assertive or interrogative or imperative or exclamatory clause.

e.g. If it rains, the match will be cancelled. (Assertive) (Wood 1965: 101)

If the train should be late, what will you do? (Interrogative)

If the ground is very dry, don’t forget to water those plants. (Impressive)

(Eckersley & Eckersley 1960: 347)

What a set back it is in expression-work of any sort, if the child on transfer is overawed or ill at ease in the new atmosphere! (LOB E24: 53) (Exclamatory)

In this chapter, we shall review the formal and functional aspects of conditional constructions in some detail.
One of the objectives of considering the formal aspect will be to identify the specific items such as the conditional markers, forms of the verb phrase in terms of the items they contain auxiliaries/modals and their tense forms, the tense forms of the other verbs etc. We are doing this in order to arrive at inventories of items and sequences of items which would be used for locating conditional constructions. We propose to use the three million-word corpora of British, American and Indian English which are in machine readable form. Formal items and their sequences are indispensable for automatic location of the required occurrences of conditional constructions from the data bases.

After extracting the occurrences of conditional constructions, we shall have to classify them on the basis of their function. Hence, we shall also discuss the function of different forms of conditionals in some detail.

2.2 Markers of Conditionals:

The various markers of conditionals that occur in English have been discussed in Reference Grammars as well as Pedagogical Grammars. "If" is noted as the most common and versatile marker of conditional sentences by all. Besides, the negative subordinator "unless" is the next most common conditional subordinator. At this stage, it may be useful to bring together all the conditional markers discussed in the literature. Reference Grammars have noted and discussed the following markers. To start with Poutsma (1928: 694-702) mentions if, unless, and, in case (that), on condition (that), provided (that), providing, supposing (that), suppose, without, except, saving. Besides, he draws attention to the adverbial clauses of condition which sometimes occur in the shape of operative sentences notably
expressing an idle wish and normally beginning with Had, Should and Were.

Curme (1947: 189) notes if, unless, if not, on condition (that), were it not that, except for the fact that, without (in colloquial or popular speech); except (in archaic language—if not or unless); provided (that), provided, providing (that); so long as, in the event (that), in case that, suppose, supposing, or etc. while discussing the clauses of condition or exception.

Jespersen (1954: 629) also lists various conjunctions if, unless, and (or), etc; prepositions except, save, without, and other introductory words suppose, provided, in case, and inversion as some of the frequent markers of conditionals illustrated with examples in vol.IV and V. Palmer (1965, 74, 79, 86) draws attention to and and or along with the other usual markers.

Leech (1971, Reprinted 1989: 116, 119) mentions if, unless, lest or whether, even though, if only, as though, suppose, imagine, and would rather.

Leech and Svartvik (1975: 96) discuss if, unless, in case, on condition that, provided that, so long as, but for, whether, suppose, as long as, in case etc. Quirk et al (1985: 1089) elaborate on if, unless, as long as, so long as, assuming (that), given (that), in case, in the event that, just so (that), on condition (that), provided (that), providing (that), supposing (that).

Pedagogical Grammars have also listed and discussed many of these markers of conditionals. Wood (1965: 101-103) discusses if at length. Close (1975: 58, 61-62) deals with if, unless, whether, on condition that,
provided (that), providing (that), so long as, as long as, suppose, supposing that, in case.

Hornby (1975: 228) discusses if (even if, if only) as/so long as, suppose, supposing (that), on condition (that), provided (that), unless and in case. Eckersley and Eckersley (1977: 347-51) mention if, unless and conditions expressed by inversion of verb and subject when the if clause contains one of the auxiliary verbs were, had or should.

So far as conditionals are concerned, it is necessary to take note of conditional markers commonly noted and discussed by all. The grammarians, even philosophers, logicians and researchers have paid special attention to if in particular and other markers in general. Mention may be made of Bell, Coates, Haegeman and Wekker, Dudman, Declerck, Smith, Takami.

The most commonly noted conditional markers are: if, unless, provided, provided (that), providing (that), so long as, as long as, without, except, suppose, supposing (that), on condition (that), in case (of), in the event (that) and conditions expressed by inversion of verb and subject when begins with an operator placed before the subject (inversion) are had, subjunctive were and putative should.

Besides, it is also necessary to make a mention of less common markers like imagine, even though, whether, although, assuming that, given that, but for, saving and sometimes and and or used as operators in the case of sentences containing two co-ordinate clauses, which express condition with different shades of thought i.e. concessive, universal etc.

As it has already been noted, reference and pedagogical grammarians and philosophers, logicians and researchers have discussed only the most
common markers in great detail especially the typical marker *if*. It is so because *if* and *unless* are by far the most frequent markers and they are also the most complex both in form and function. As such they will be dealt with in more detail in different sections of this thesis.

We have cited below examples of each of the markers indicating the sources. The following examples of conditional construction illustrate the occurrence of the various markers mentioned above.

1. *If*:
   
   a. If you put sugar in your coffee it will taste excellent.  
      (Smith 1988: 10)
   
   b. If I had money enough, I should pay you. (Jespersen 1931: 113)
   
   c. If the lava will come down as far as this, we must evacuate these houses immediately. (Close 1975: 256)
   
   d. I should like to try farming, Dad; if it won’t cost too much. (Poutsma 1926: 190)
   
   e. If you had answered/would have answered that question you would win a prize. (Declerck 1984: 283)
   
   f. If he arrives, the band will play the national anthem. (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 72)
   
   g. If only they were here now, we would be able to celebrate their wedding anniversary. (Quirk et al, 1985: 1093)
   
   h. I always enjoy sailing even if the weather is rough. (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 98)
   
   i. Even if he is a little slow, he is actually quite intelligent.
   
   j. Even if you drink just a little, your boss will fire you. (Konig 1985: 14)
   
   k. He behaved as if he owned the place. (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 14)
   
   l. If the slick will come as far as Stavanger, then of course I must take precautions on a massive scale. (Close 1980: 103)
   
   m. If I could afford it, I would buy a boat. (Collins COBUILD 1987: 719)
n. Even if you disagree with her, she is worth listening to. (Collins COBUILD 1987: 482)

o. If only somebody had told us, we could have warned you. (Quirk et al 1972: 325)

p. If the price of petrol goes up again, I shall sell my car. (Bell 1974: 129)

2. Unless:
   a) Unless the strike has been called off, there will be no trains tomorrow. (Quirk and Greenbaum 1973: 324)
   b) Goods will not be dispatched unless they are paid for in advance. (Close 1975: 61)
   c) Unless he has done the work to my satisfaction, I shall not pay him for it. (Hornby 1975: 229)
   d) I will not believe it unless I should see it. (Palmer 1988: 188)
   e) Unless I hear the contrary, I will be here. (Poutsma 1926: 704)
   f) I shall not go out, unless you come with me. (Zandvoort 1972: 218)
   g) Unless you wear boots you may get bitten by snakes. (Thomson and Martinet 1960: 136)

3. Provided:
   a) I will come provided, I have time. (Curme 1947: 190)
   b) Provided the weather keeps like this, the farmers have no need to worry about the crops. (Hornby 1975: 229)
   c) He says he'll accept the post provided the salary is satisfactory.
   d) We shall go provided the weather is fine. (Hornby 1975: 228)

4. provided that:
   a) The English landed gentry were always ready to pay, provided that they kept power. (Poutsma 1926: 702)
   b) I will let you drive provided that you have a valid licence. (Close 1975: 61)
   c) He declared himself willing to try, provided that he was given a free hand. (Zandvoort 1972: 218)

5. Providing:
   a) He would bind his apprentice to some honest tradesman, providing
b) It would be pleasant living in Glasgow providing you were living in a nice flat.

c) Providing they remained at a safe distance, we would be all right. (Collins COBUILD 1987: 1156)

6. Providing that:
   a) I will let you drive providing that you have a valid licence. (Close 1975: 61)

7. So long as:
   a) So long as you return the book by Saturday, I will lend it to you with pleasure. (Hornby 1975: 226)
   b) So long as it is done, it does not matter how. (Zandvoort 1972: 218)
   c) So long as they had plenty to eat and drink, the men were happy. (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 96)
   d) I do not care so long as you are happy. (Curme 1947: 191)

8. As long as:
   a) I will let you drive as long as you have a valid licence. (Close 1975: 61)
   b) She may go as long as he goes with her. (Quirk et al 1985: 1090)

9. Without:
   a) She never will have anything without, I have mine just like it.
   b) You must not accept invitations from gentlemen without you can say you’ve got to ask your mother first. (Poutsma 1926: 705)
   c) Without me to supplement your income, you wouldn’t be able to manage. (Quirk et al, 1985: 1090)

10. Except:
   a) Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above. (Poutsma 1926: 705)
   b) I’d tell you about it, except it would probably put you to sleep. (Collins COBUILD 1987: 488)
   c) I am not going except you go with me. (Quirk et al 1985: 1090)
11. Suppose:
   a) Suppose your friends knew how you’re behaving here, what would they think? (Hornby 1975: 228)
   b) Suppose my father saw me with you, what might he think? (Hornby 1975: 231)

12. Supposing:
   a) Supposing you were in his place, would you do it? (Curme 1947: 150)
   b) Supposing the enemy wins the war, what will happen to us? (Hornby 1975: 229)
   c) Supposing something should go wrong, what would you do then? (Collins COBUILD 1987: 1470)

13. Supposing (that):
   a) Supposing that I were to have an accident, who would have paid? (Close 1975: 62)
   b) Supposing that I had had an accident, who would have paid? (Close 1975: 62)

14. On condition:
   a) They could use the land for a year and a half on condition they handed it back cleared of weeds. (Collins COBUILD 1987: 291)

15. On condition (that):
   a) He says he’ll accept the post on condition that the salary is satisfactory. (Hornby 1975: 228)
   b) He was allowed to live in the house rent-free on condition that he kept it in repair. (Zandvoort 1972: 218)
   c) He has agreed to come on condition that there would not be any press or publicity. (Collins COBUILD 1987: 291)
   d) I will lend you the money on condition that you return it within six months. (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 96)

16. In case:
   a) Better take an umbrella, in case it rains. (Zandvoort 1972: 218)
   b) Take these pills in case you feel ill on the boat. (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 96)
   c) In case you want me, I’ll be in my office till lunch time. (Quirk et al 1985: 1090)
d) Make a note of my telephone number, in case you want to ring me up.

e) In case of fire, ring the alarm bell. (Close 1975: 62)

f) I'll be in my office all DAY, in case you have any PROBLEM at all. (Quirk et al. 1985: 1092)

g) I will let you know in case they come by here. (Quirk et al. 1985: 1093)

17. In the event that:

   a) In the event that he is at all interested, I'll speak to him. (Quirk et al. 1985: 1092)

   b) The government is determined to dissolve parliament in the event that the oppositional forces fail to grant it the required majority. (Curme 1947: 150)

18. Had:

   a) Had I known you were ill, I should have visited you. (Graver 1963: 177)

   b) Had I known I would have written before. (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 126)

   c) Had I known you were ill, I'd have called to see you. (Hornby 1975: 230)

   d) Had we not been delayed, the accident would never have happened. (Close 1975: 60)

19. Were:

   a) Were I in your place, I would be very worried. (Close 1975: 60)

   b) Were he to see you, he'd be surprised. (Hornby 1975: 230)

   c) Were a serious crisis to arise, the government would have to act swiftly. (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 126)

   d) Were John here now, he would explain the whole matter. (Eckersley & Eckersley 1960, Reprinted 1977: 351)

20. Should:

   a) Should you change your mind, no one would blame you. (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 126)

   b) Should you need help, please let me know at once. (Hornby 1975: 230)
21. Imagine:
   a) Imagine being married to a man who snored! (Imagine being married to a man if he snored) (Hornby 1975: 232)
   b) Imagine you and I were to find ourselves on a desert island. (Leech 1971: 118)

22. Even though:
   a) Even though he were my brother, I would cast him out. ('... but he is not') (archaic) (Leech 1971: 119, Reprinted 1989)

23. Assuming that:
   a) Assuming that the movie starts at eight, shouldn't we be leaving now? (Quirk et al 1985: 1090)

24. Given that:
   a) Given that Britain furnished the ships for a powerful Indian squadron, it would not be demanding too much of India, Ceylon, Singapore, and the Malay States, if we asked them. (Poutsma 1926: 703)

25. But for:
   a) But for him we would have been lost. (Sandved 1971: 208)
   b) But for the storm we should have arrived earlier. (Thomson and Martinet 1960: 137)
   c) But for my lifebelt I should have been drowned. (Thomson and Martinet 1960: 137)
   d) But for John, we would have lost the match (i.e. 'If it hadn't been for John'; If John hadn't played well', etc.) (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 97)

26. And:
   a) Spare the rod and spoil the child. (Hornby 1975: 232)
   b) Drop that, and I'll kill you. (Close 1975: 59)

27. Or:
   a) Drop that, or I'll kill you. (Close 1975: 59)
   b) Don't put anything plastic in the oven or it will probably start melting. (Collins COBUILD 1987)
   c) Set your alarm clock or you will sleep. (Graver 1971: 93)
2.3 Modals and Tense Forms in Conditional Constructions:

The use of the modals is one of the most problematic areas of English grammar, and one of the areas where many studies have been made. Although historically, most of the modals can be paired into past and non-past forms: can/could, may/might, will/would, shall/should, the 'past tense' forms are only in some respects usefully classified as such from the point of view of meaning. Besides, certain modals such as can and will are extremely common, whereas, others, such as shall, ought to, and need are relatively rare. Moreover, the use of the modals varies significantly from the one part of the English speaking world to another i.e., AE and BE and even IE (Katikar 1984: 291)

Modals may occur either in main or in subordinate or both clauses in conditional constructions. Recently, the complexity of the usage of the modals has attracted the attention of many scholars. Modals are the group of auxiliary verbs. The central modals are: 'shall-should', 'will-would', 'can-could', 'may-might' and 'must'. Modals determine the speaker's point of view. Many studies have stated that the tense form of a modal determines the type of conditionals. It is worth quoting Katikar (1984: 291) who has stated that in her "material there are cases of confusion in the use of modal forms in the conditional constructions and indirect speech in Indian English". According to her, "the most common slip seems to be a failure to conform to the rules of the sequence of tense".

It is observed that the important grammatical properties associated with conditional sentences are 'mood' and 'tense'. Both are complex properties as they are not always expressed by morphological changes or variations. However, the only surviving marker of mood is in the
subjunctive. But the subjunctive form of the verb is being replaced by modal auxiliaries.

However, it is to be noted that past and non-past are the only two tense forms of the verb in English. The Future tense has no morphological form. The future time is expressed with the help of auxiliaries and/or adverbials.

Moreover, in view of progressive and perfective aspects which are expressed with the help of a combination of auxiliaries and non-finite forms of the verb, Hornby (1954 2nd Edition 1975) states that the most striking feature of the verb system in English is that there is no necessary one to one equivalence between time and tense. Still, there are restrictions on the usage of the tense forms of the verbs in the clauses of compound and complex sentences. Likewise, there are also restrictions on the tense forms of verbs used in sentences that make a discourse. This restriction to follow certain rules is generally known as 'sequence of tense'.

Close (1975: 60) states that a conditional clause coming before or after the main, can be introduced by the conjunctions listed with the same sequence of tense as in 'if' sentences. It indicates that sequence of tense is to be strictly observed in conditional sentences. Even Leech (1971: 115-16 Reprinted 1989) has given in tabular form the grammatical markers of real and unreal conditionals in the light of the sequence of tense and close association with the modal forms.

In the previous section, we have quoted examples of conditional constructions for the purpose of simply enumerating their various formal markers. We have deliberately cited several examples containing each marker.
in question. A close look at these examples show that the formal structure of conditional constructions may contain modals in one or the other clause or both the clauses. Also there are constraints on the tense form of modals used in them. Moreover, in the case of sentences which do not contain any modals, there are also constraints on the tense forms of verbs in the two clauses.

So as to judge the correspondence between modals and tense forms in conditional sentences, we have classified these examples in the earlier section into four categories. They are:

1) sentences containing modals in both the clause;
2) sentences containing modals in main clause only;
3) sentences containing modals in subordinate clause only;
4) sentences not containing modals either in a main or subordinate clause.
List of sentences containing modals in both the subordinate and main clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>Modal in Subordinate Clause</th>
<th>Modal in Main Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>won't</td>
<td>should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>would have</td>
<td>would have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1l</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1m</td>
<td>could</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>were (subj.)</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>can</td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>were (subj.)</td>
<td>couldest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13c</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td>were (subj.)</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>were (subj.)</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b</td>
<td>were (subj.)</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18c</td>
<td>were (subj.)</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18d</td>
<td>were (subj.)</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>were (subj.)</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 20
(2) List of sentences containing modals in main clause and tense forms in subordinate clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Modal in Main clause</th>
<th>Tense in Subordinate clause</th>
<th>Modal in Main clause</th>
<th>Tense in Subordinate clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple Present</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>11b</td>
<td>might</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>Past perfect</td>
<td>12a</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>12b</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1j</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>13b</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1o</td>
<td>could</td>
<td>Past perfect</td>
<td>14a</td>
<td>could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>shall</td>
<td>Simple Present</td>
<td>14a1</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Present perfect</td>
<td>15c</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>15f</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>shall</td>
<td>Present perfect</td>
<td>15g</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>16a</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>shall</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td>should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g</td>
<td>may</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>17c</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>17d</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>shall</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>23a</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>24a</td>
<td>should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>24b</td>
<td>verbless (but for)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>24c</td>
<td>should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>24d</td>
<td>verbless (but for)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>25a</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>may</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>26a</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>26b</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>Verbless/non-fin.</td>
<td>26c</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 48
(3) List of sentences containing modals in the subordinate clause followed by tense and or modals in main clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Modal in subordinate Clause</th>
<th>Tense/Modal in Main Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1i</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1m</td>
<td>could</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14c</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>pres. perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20b</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 11
(4) List of sentences containing no modals in either the subordinate or the main clause but both of them contain tense forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Tense in Subordinate cl.</th>
<th>Tense in Main clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1h</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1i</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1k</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1n</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15e</td>
<td>Verbless</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 16
Table 2.3.1
Frequency of sentences containing modals in both 
the clauses: Main and Subordinate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal in Main clause</th>
<th>Modal in Subordinate clause</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>must</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should</td>
<td>won't</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must</td>
<td>can</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>could</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>were (subjunctive)</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 20

It appears from the above list that as a rule past tense modals in subordinate clauses are followed by past tense modals in main clauses. In the case of non-past modals occurring in subordinate clauses, we find that the modals in the main clause are also in the non-past, must in our examples. It is clear that the tense forms have something to do with the kind of conditional or its function which we shall discuss in the next section.

Similarly, even in sentences in which modals occur in the main clause only, there seems to be a correspondence between the tense form(s) of the verbs in both the clauses. The following is a list of these correspondences observed.
Table 2.3.2

Frequency of sentences containing modals in Main clause followed by tense forms in subordinate clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modals in Main clause</th>
<th>TENSE in Subordinate clause</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
<td>Present perfect</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall</td>
<td>Present perfect</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may</td>
<td>Present perfect</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>Past perfect</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>Verbless</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>Non-fin.</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should</td>
<td>Past perfect</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should</td>
<td>Verbless</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could</td>
<td>Past perfect</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only exception seems to be, in the case of sentences in which the subordinate clause is simple present and the main clause containing the modal is in an interrogative form with past form of the modal should.

e.g. 22a. Assuming that the movie starts at eight, shouldn’t we be leaving now? (Quirk et al., 1985: 1090)

Besides, the sentences containing modals in the subordinate clause also show a correspondence of tense/modal forms in the main clause. The following list of sentences clearly indicate it.
Table 2.3.3

Frequency of sentences containing modals in subordinate clause followed by tense and or modals in main clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modals in Subordinate clause</th>
<th>Tense/Modals in Main clauses</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
<td>must</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should</td>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>pre.perf.</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the sentences which do not contain any modals in either of the clauses also show a correspondence of tense forms in the two clauses.

The following is a list of sentences containing corresponding tense form.

Table 2.3.4

Frequency of sentences containing no modals in both the subordinate and main clauses: corresponding tense form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense in Subordinate clause</th>
<th>Tense in Main clause</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbless</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Shall and will in the main clause may convey simple futurity or some modality. The tense form of the subordinate clause is simple present or present perfect. However, in the case of two co-ordinate clauses joined by a co-ordinator, the clause implying condition is in the imperative.

Similarly, in the case of can and may in the main clause, they convey modality and the subordinate clause is either in simple present or present perfect tense. In the case of past form of modals: should, would, might and could in the main clause they correspond to the tense form in the subordinate clause.

These observations are based on the examples of the conditional sentences cited by various Reference and Pedagogical grammars. What we have done is to collect as many different examples as possible and classify them. The examples have been classified on the basis of the occurrence of various modals and tense forms in them. This exercise has yielded a rough taxonomy of conditional sentences purely on the basis of their form. The important question is of course, their function to which we shall now turn.

2.4 Functional Classification of Conditionals: Reference Grammars:

The main function of conditional sentences is obviously to express a 'condition', and the statement of event in or under the specified condition. Leech (1971/89: 116) states "that in conditional sentences, the proposition expressed by the main clause is qualified by a condition expressed by an if-clause or some equivalent construction (e.g. a clause introduced by unless, lest or whether)". A review of literature shows that grammarians have identified different kinds of conditions. They have also given different labels to these conditionals though they convey more or less the same meaning.
To start with, Jespersen, one of the greatest in the scholarly tradition, gave a good deal of attention to the question of linguistic universals. He vigorously denounced the kind of the philosophical grammar which was based on a "confusion of logic and Latin grammar". Jespersen (1931) is perhaps the most comprehensive and the most influential grammar of modern English. His analysis of if constructions is scattered over different volumes under different heads. Besides, conditional clauses have been treated in Vol. V, 21.53 ff, where examples are given with various conjunctions (if, unless), prepositions (except, save, without) and other introductory words (suppose, provided, in case). Similarly clauses without any conjunction or other introductory words but with the same word order as questions (inversion) have been treated in Vol. V, 21.6 ff. He has illustrated his grammatical analysis with examples from old English to modern English.

According to him, the distinction between the subjunctive and the indicative form of the verb has practically disappeared in modern English in regard to 'mood'. He points out that the only verb which still retains this distinction is the verb be. However, even in the case of this verb, the distinction gets neutralized in the case of past plural i.e; were. Besides, he has treated the use of was and were in conditional constructions extensively by citing examples from writers like Shakespeare, Hardy, Defoe, Kipling. Examples of were in conditional clauses are found so abundantly that it is hardly necessary to give any. According to him, "there is now a tendency towards an emphatic use of was referring to the actual past, while were refers to imaginative or unreal, generally with an implication of negation". (Jespersen, 1954: VII: 629). The present
subjunctive is also frequent in conditional clauses but they do not refer to conditions contrary to fact implying a negation. In all other cases the indicative mood is used in conditional clauses.

Jespersen (1931: 112-51) has discussed what he calls imaginative use of tenses in great detail. He states that verbal forms which are primarily used to indicate past time are often used without that temporal import to denote unreality, impossibility, improbability or non-fulfilment. He discusses it under imaginative tenses, or tenses of imagination. For example:

1. I wish I had money enough to pay you.
2. If I had money enough, I should pay you.
3. You speak as if I had money enough (p. 113).

In all these cases, we deny the reality or possibility of certain suppositions; the implication is "I have not money enough".

However, in the second and third examples we speak of a "rejected" or "better-rejected" or "condition contrary to fact", and in the main sentence of the second example we state what would be likely under the imagined condition. In other words, the proposition is imaginary. The meaning of time is blotted out or indistinct in the preterit/past tense form of imagination. It may refer to the present time or future time respectively (p.114). According to him, in the main sentence of rejected condition (expressed or implied) would and should is now the rule (p.118). Similarly, could is used to indicate rejected condition and to convey politeness, or as a preterit of unreality to make a request more modest (p.120). Might is also frequent in many sentences of imagination with reference to the present time.
He considers the imaginative use of the pluperfect, which in the first place refers to some event in the past, which is represented as not having taken place:

e.g. If he had not married her, he would have been happier. (p.125)

Jespersen casually notes a most interesting point that is: sometimes if, followed by was does not really mean a condition:

e.g. "If the offer was rejected, it was because people distrusted him" (p.134) (Rhetorical device)

It is according to him a rhetorical device of expressing the reason why the offer was rejected. Moreover, he draws attention to the fact that an -if clause may also serve to point out a contrast in two statements which are equally true.

For example:

(1) If I was a bad carpenter, I was a worse tailor. (=I really was bad as a carpenter and worse as a tailor).

(2) If Socrates was as innocent as this at the age of seventy, it may be imagined how innocent Joan was at the age of seventeen. (p.134)

This observation of Jespersen namely that sometimes if followed by was does not really mean a condition is a very important observation which has perhaps missed the attention of many grammarians.

2.4.2 Poutsma:

Poutsma (1926: 694) refers to adverbial clauses of condition or hypothesis and divides them into two groups: a) adverbial clauses that express an idea of mere condition or hypothesis, with if as the typical conjunctive; b) that express the ideas of condition and exception combined with unless as the typical conjunctive. Those of the first group are often subdivided into those of Open condition and those of rejected/
rejecting condition. Adverbial clauses of open condition 'do not imply anything as to the fulfilment of the condition, such as if you are right, I am wrong. Where the speaker does not let us know whether he thinks the other one to be in the right or not. Adverbial clauses of rejected condition express:

1) a supposition contrary to some fact known to the speaker as in:
   
   If he were present (which he is not), I would speak to him. or

2) a supposition regarding the future which is made merely for the sake of argument, as in:
   
   If it should rain, we had better stay in-doors.

Incidentally, Currie (1947: 176-93) while discussing adverbial clause has incidentally given the examples of all the markers as mentioned earlier under conditional sentences. However, he has not labelled the conditional sentences - though the examples highlight the major kinds of condition.

2.4.3 Leech:

Leech (1971/89: 116) discusses conditional sentences that express either a Real condition ('Open condition') or an Unreal condition.

  e.g. If you touch me, I'll scream (Real condition).
  .If you touched me, I'd scream (Unreal condition). (p.116)

While discussing real condition, he points out that both the main clause and the (subordinate) dependent clause are truth neutral in all real conditions.

  e.g. If he asks me, I'll marry him. (Real condition) (p.116).

He has further pointed out that there are no special restrictions on the time reference of conditions, or on the tense forms used to express them.
The variety and mixture of times and tense forms permitted are as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAST TIME</th>
<th>PRESENT TIME</th>
<th>FUTURE TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>Past Tense</td>
<td>Pres.Perf. Tense</td>
<td>Will/shall+infi. etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Reproduced from Leech 1989: 122)

However, it is normal, in contemporary English, to use the factual indicative form of the verb in both clauses. (For future conditions, the simple present tense is used rather than will+infinitive in the dependent clause.

The instances of real conditions covering the variety and mixture of times and tense forms permitted are expressive of factual meaning. Subsequently, he points out that the real conditions may express both factual and theoretical meaning. The theoretical meaning is expressed with the help of present subjunctive and should+infinitive in place of the simple present used in factual conditions.

**PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE:**

*e.g.* If the server serves a fault twice, he shall lose a point (archaic, legalistic).

**Should+INFINITIVE:**

*e.g.* If you should hear news of them, please let me know.

Leech (1989: 117)

He also draws attention to the fact that the effect of the theoretical should is to make the condition slightly more tentative and 'academic' than it would be with the ordinary Present Tense.
Leech has also indicated grammatical markers of unreal (hypothetical) conditionals as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNREAL</th>
<th>PAST TIME</th>
<th>PRESENT TIME</th>
<th>FUTURE TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Would/should+</td>
<td>(1) Would/should+</td>
<td>(1) Would/should+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf. Infin.</td>
<td>Infin.</td>
<td>Infin. etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Past Perf. Tense</td>
<td>(2) non-perf. Past Tense</td>
<td>(2) non-perf. Past Tense</td>
<td>(3) Was/were to+ Infin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Reproduced from Leech 1989: 122)

The above table shows that there is a little difference in unreal conditions, between the expression of present and of future time.

e.g. If it were my birthday, I'd be celebrating. (p.121)

The above sentence refers indifferently to the present or the future. However, the time-span is not explicit. So he suggests to insert either a future or a present adverbial to make the time-span explicit:

Examples:

(1) If it were my birthday today, I'd be celebrating.
(2) If it were my birthday tomorrow, I'd be celebrating. (p.122)

Leech further states that the distinguishing mark of hypothetical meaning is its implication of NEGATIVE TRUTH-COMMITMENT. However, the exact interpretation varies in accordance with past, present and future time.

He points out that in referring to imaginary past events, the hypothetical forms normally have the categorical sense of 'CONTRARY TO
FACT', since it is not difficult to have definite knowledge of past events:

e.g. If your father had caught us, he would have been furious ('... but in fact he didn't'). (p.123)

The above sentence has uncompromising implication as it refers to imaginary past event. Hence it is CONTRARY TO FACT in sense.

So as to make the distinction clear, further, he points out that non-past imaginary happenings do not usually have such uncompromising implications. In the present, the sense is not so much 'contrary to fact', as 'CONTRARY TO ASSUMPTION'; in the future, it is weakened further to 'CONTRARY TO EXPECTATION'.

e.g. If you really cared for your children, you'd look after them properly

= '... but I assume you don't care for them' = Present time reference.

Likewise, in the future, the sense is weakened further to 'CONTRARY TO EXPECTATION':

e.g. If it were to snow tomorrow, the match would have to be cancelled

= '... but I don't expect it will snow' = Future time reference

(p.123)

Thus, Leech's 'REAL' condition corresponds to 'OPEN' condition (subdivided into factual and theoretical) and his 'UNREAL' includes both past imaginary (contrary to fact) and non-past imaginary events and happenings (contrary to assumption and contrary to expectation) respectively.

Leech's classification of conditional constructions is presented in a diagrammatic form to further clarify his taxonomy of conditional constructions. Since Leech has used several parameters which crisscross each other and since his presentation is sequential, many points seem to get blurred. The diagram below is designed to present a comprehensive picture of this taxonomy as clearly as possible.
Past indicative/subjunctive in if-clauses and would+inf. in Main clauses.

Present subjunctive or should+infinitive in subordinate clause.

Simple Present in subordinate clause + will/shall+infinit. in Main clause.

No restriction on time indication and tense form.

Past Perfect in if-clauses and would+Perfect Infinit. in Main clause.

Past indicative/subjunctive or will/shall+infinit. in if-clauses and non-future.

FACTUAL (positive truth commitment).

THEORETICAL (Truth Neutral).

REAL (OPEN) Truth Neutral.

UNREAL (HYPOTHETICAL) (Truth-Negative).

Past Imaginary

Non-Past Imaginary

CONTRARY TO FACT.

PRESENT

FUTURE

(Note: Past imaginary and non-past imaginary are degrees of strong and weakened contrast to fact respectively. However, under non-past imaginary, future indicates still more weakened degree of contrast. Here, the contrast is too weak to be felt, so it could very well be understood as nearer to truth neutral.)
2.4.4 Palmer:

Palmer (1965: 132-137) states that he has already dealt briefly with conditions and wishes in the section on past tense with the primary patterns (4.4.3). He, however, asserts that more needs to be said about the conditions with the modals. He has given examples of both Real and Unreal conditions. He posits the point that the tentative forms would, should, could and might occur in real conditions.

In case of Unreal condition, the use of the past tense to make unreal conditions is illustrated quite clearly by the following pairs of examples.

If I come, he'll go
If I came, he'd go
If you can do that, so can I
If you could do that, so could I

But the difference between real and unreal conditions is not simply in terms of tense. Consider the following:

If you allow that, you are very foolish.
If he comes, I go.
If he's here, he's in the garden.

The corresponding past tense forms are:

If you allowed that, you were very foolish.
If he came, I went.
If he was here, he was in the garden.

Yet these are not unreal conditions, but past time real ones. The corresponding (but present time) unreal conditions contain would or should in:

If you allowed that, you would be very foolish.
If he was here, he would be in the garden.

Formally this point may be shown in terms of collocation with adverbials:

If he was here yesterday, he was in the garden (real, past).
If he was here now, he would be in the garden. (Unreal, present).
Thus, if the real condition has a verbal form with no modal, would or should occurs in the corresponding unreal condition. I should/will go, he will go.

According to his will and shall thus have two strikingly different patterns in conditional sentences. In the main clause of an unreal condition, would and should are required where there is no future reference. Unreal conditionals must always contain a modal i.e., past tense in the main clause. It follows therefore that there is no ambiguity in "If John came, he would work in the garden". This can only be a real past tense conditional. On the other hand, if the main clause contains a modal, ambiguity is possible. "If John came, he would work in the garden" is unreal. This requirement that an unreal conditional must contain a modal is not the only peculiarity of the modals. Even in real conditionals - modals in main clause occur to refer to future events i.e. will/shall/be going to in main clause.

Ambiguity is possible when would or should occur in the main clause and a past tense form in the subordinate. The sentences may, then, either be past real or present unreal:

If he went to the circus, he would enjoy himself.

If he practised, he could lift two hundred weight.

The usual interpretation would be that these are unreal (referring to unlikely future events), but they might refer to actual events in the past (and could be distinguished formally in terms of collocation with adverbials).

Then he speaks of Unreal conditions in Past time which are essentially 'past-past' -- past for unreality and past for past time. In
the main clause a past tense modal plus have occurs; in the subordinate clause either a past tense modal plus have or past perfect form is used.

Palmer (1974: 142) classifies kinds of conditional sentences on the basis of tense forms. According to him, present tense represents real condition whereas past tense represents unreal.

Palmer (1974) states that an analysis of conditional sentences deeply involves the modals. According to him, the key to understanding conditional in English lies in understanding the function of first, tense and secondly the modals.

He considers 'whenever', 'implication' and the 'relevance' types under real condition.

e.g. 1. If it rains I go by car = whenever (p.140)
2. If he acts like that he is a fool = implication (p.142)
3. If you want to know, I have not seen him = relevance (p.143)

He classifies kinds of conditional sentences into real and unreal. Firstly, he considers present tense real conditionals only. According to him, the most obvious kind of conditional (perhaps the only 'true' conditional) is the one that predicts that if one event takes place, another will follow:

e.g. If it rains, the match will be cancelled.

He calls such conditionals 'predictive' wherein the reference is to future time indicated in the main clause by a modal but in the subordinate clause by a simple present tense form of a verb and not by WILL or SHALL.

Secondly, he considers whenever type to link two habitual actions.

e.g. If it rains, I go by car.
Thirdly, the condition is a simple implication — the truth of the one clause following from the truth of the other:

*e.g.* If he acts like that, he's a fool. (p.142)

Fourthly, the *if*-clause may do no more than indicate the conditions under which the main clause has any *relevance* or news value:

*e.g.* If you're going out, it's raining. (p.143)

This last type is clearly of a special kind with semantically some kind of ellipsis — if it is relevant to say that ... But it is not at all clear that the other three types are essentially distinct. Admittedly one predicts, one states regular circumstances and the other states implication. According to him, these could be regarded as mere variations upon the notion of the truth of one statement depending on the truth of another; it could be argued that *if* does no more than state truth relations. However, it is usually possible to distinguish the three types and there is some difference in their function with relation to unreality and past tense. So he has handled them separately, dealing first with the most 'typical' type, the predictive.

**Predictive conditionals:**

He has stated that apart from some reservations with *BE GOING*, a modal must occur in the main clause of:

- (1) *all unreal conditionals*.
- (2) *Real present 'predictive' conditionals*.

The predictive conditionals are in fact essentially 'modal' in that they must contain a modal (though the presence of a modal does not, conversely, always indicate a predictive conditional).
There are in fact three possible kinds of predictive modal: real present, unreal present and unreal past:

**Real Present:**

*e.g.* If it rains, the match will be cancelled.

**Unreal Present:**

*e.g.* If it rained, the match would be cancelled.

**Unreal Past:**

*e.g.* If it had rained, the match would have been cancelled. (p.143)

He points out that one can predict what will happen (real present), what might happen (unreal present) and what would have happened under different circumstances (unreal past) but not what did actually happen (real past).

The other types of conditional seem rarely, if ever, to occur as unreal conditionals, but they have more freedom with regard to tense (and phrase):

(i) There is no problem with the 'whenever' type. We can freely change tense or phrase:

*e.g.* If it rained, I went by car.

There can even be a difference of phrase or tense in the two clauses.

*e.g.* If they ever won, they had always trained hard. (p.146)

(ii) There is no restriction whatever on any kind of tense or time marking with the *implication* type. A statement relating to any time can be made to imply a statement relating to any other time—not merely past and past or present and present:

*e.g.* 1. If he was here, he's now in the garden.
   2. If he said that, he is a fool. (p.146)

(iii) The *if-clause is likely to be present tense, with no tense/time restrictions in the main clause with the third type, the 'relevance' type.

*e.g.* If you want to know, I see/have seen/see/saw/had seen him. (p.147)
Palaer (1979) discusses real and unreal conditionals. However, Palaer (1974) distinguishes between predictive conditionals and three other types viz: whenever, implication and relevance which he himself has regarded a mistake. According to him, the predictive conditionals cover real and unreal as illustrated with will, would and would have in the apodosis. However, Palaer (1979) states that there is no essential difference between the three other types namely whenever, implication and relevance and predictive conditionals. The whenever type is no more than a habitual form of the conditional, while the relevance type simply involves some ellipsis in the semantic link ("It's relevant to say that..."). The implication type is no more than a conditional in which the time relations are not of the most common kind: events referred to in the apodosis are not subsequent to those of the protasis, but are previous or (as here) contemporary. There is no obvious distinction between prediction and implication beyond the fact that the former involves futurity. According to him, the real present conditional can be transformed into the unreal present by a simple change of tense (rain = rained, will = would); past unreal is generated by adding a further past tense marker with the help of HAVE (though in a different way in each of the two clauses: rained = had rained, would = would have). So Palaer (1979: 137) says that he now feels that he was more correct in saying (Palaer 1965: 132) that in a real conditional any one sentence can be made conditional on any other irrespective of the tense of either. Thus, Palaer (1979: 137) gives examples of direct open, hypothetical and counterfactual.

According to him, it is a very neat solution that permits us to handle unreal conditionals simply in terms of the occurrence of past tense (unreal) forms, with an extra past marker (HAVE) where the condition is
Palmer (1986) comments on the status of conditional sentences. He states that conditional sentences are unlike all others in that both the subordinate (the protasis) and the main (the apodosis) clauses are non-factual. Neither indicates that an event has occurred (or is occurring or will occur); the sentence merely indicates the dependence of the truth of one proposition upon the truth of another. He further makes it clear that there is one distinction undoubtedly important typologically between real and unreal conditions, that the latter being used to refer to events about which the speaker expresses some kind of negative belief.

e.g. If John came, I should leave. (p.189)

While discussing real conditions, he states that most real conditions refer to future events, and predict that if one takes place, some other one will follow, often with some kind of causal relationship between the two. Palmer (1986: 180) states that hypothetical are non-predictive and can be paraphrased 'If it is true that..., it is true that...' Still, he points out that there is potentially considerable freedom in the choice of tense in protasis and apodosis:

e.g. If John came yesterday, Mary will come. (p.190)

According to him, real conditionals have a declarative form in both protasis and apodosis. Whereas, in unreal conditions variety of devices can be used. They are: past tense, subjunctive, modal verbs and particles. It is noted that English uses a past tense form of a modal in unreal conditions. Ought and should function as either past or present and may occur with both real and unreal conditionals. He points out that although traditional grammars discuss unreal conditions, they often distinguish
between 'improbable' conditions in the future and 'impossible' or 'counterfactual' ones in the present or past. However, according to him, this is, no more than the issue concerning the future and truth. Future conditions cannot, by definition, be counterfactual if it is assumed that the future is unknown and that no statement about it can be true. There is, however, a future point that it is misleading to see all past time unreal conditions as counterfactual. Clearly they often are, as in:

e.g. If John had come, Mary would have left. (p.181)

He states that both types of unreal conditions ('improbable' and 'unknown') indicates a negative attitude to the proposition, but the distinction is (largely) dependent upon the tense.

He admits that there are other unreal forms whose precise status is difficult to establish, e.g. English.

For example:

If John were to come, I should leave.

This according to him is perhaps, slightly more unreal than:

'If John came .......

We have designed the following diagram to represent Palmer's taxonomy of conditionals.
Ellipsis in most the Seaasonal Events to link, referred to like... (It's in the apodosis are relevant not subsequent but to say are previous or (as that...) here) contemporary.

(Predictive condi.) Present Tense in both subordinate clause clauses and will in Main clause

Simple Past in sub. clause would in Main clause

(Present/Future time reference)

Would have in Main cl. Past. Past. Past tense is marked twice once for time and once for unreality.

Whenever

Habitual form of the conditional tense for same tense in both

Implication

Time relations Ellipsis in are not of the most the Semantic common kind: Events tic link. referred to like... (It's in the apodosis are relevant not subsequent but to say are previous or (as that...) here) contemporary.

Three Other Kinds
2.4.5 Quirk et al. 1972:

Quirk et al. (1972) has been recognized as the most influential grammar in recent times. To begin with in discussing conditional clauses, the authors recognize two classes of clauses mainly conditional and concessive like:

e.g. If you treat her kindly, she will do anything for you. (Conditional)

Although he had not eaten for days, he looked strong and healthy.

(Quirk et al. 1972: 745) (concessive)

However, there are instances of overlap of these two classes of clauses, which they call conditional-concessive clauses.

For example:

Even if he went down on bended knees, I would not forgive him.

(p.746)

They have classified conditional clauses into two broad categories: open and hypothetical. Further hypothetical conditionals have been classified on the basis of present and future time reference on the one hand and past time reference on the other. They consider past tense forms of the verb (including was/were+infinitive) as grammatical marker of hypothetical condition. The hypothetical conditions referring to past time are indicated by the past perfect tense of the verb as marker for counterfactual.

Thus, Quirk et al. (1972) discuss the three major types of condition viz: open, hypothetical and counterfactual in particular and conditional concessive clauses etc., in general.

2.4.6 Quirk et al. (1985):

Quirk et al. (1985) is one of the most recent comprehensive
monumental works in the field of grammar by the same authors. In this work also they recognize conditional and concessive clauses. However, they classify conditional clauses into Direct, Indirect and Rhetorical conditions. They point out that the central use of conditional clauses is to express a direct condition. According to them, Direct condition may be either an open or hypothetical condition. Open conditions are neutral. Whereas, hypothetical conditions convey the speaker's belief that the condition will not be fulfilled (for future, present and past conditions) hence the probable or certain falsity of the proposition expressed by the matrix clause.

**e.g.** If he changed his opinions, he'd be a more likeable person.

### Verb forms with Hypothetical conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present &amp; Future Ref.</th>
<th>Conditional clause</th>
<th>Matrix clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>If I were younger,</td>
<td>I would study classical Greek.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Reference</th>
<th>Past Perfective</th>
<th>Past Perfective Modal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I had seen you,</td>
<td>I would have invited you home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Reproduced from Quirk et al 1985: 1092)

They have also discussed two ways of expressing future hypothetical conditions: (1) Was to/were to+infinitive and should+infinitive. They have taken note of conditions by subject operator inversion also.

They also discuss Rhetorical conditional clauses for the first time. According to them, Rhetorical conditional clauses give the appearance of expressing an open condition, but (like rhetorical questions) they actually make a strong assertion. They have noted two types of rhetorical
conditional clauses:

a) If the proposition in the matrix clause is patently absurd, the proposition in the conditional clause is shown to be false.

  e.g. If you believe that, you will believe anything.

  = You certainly cannot believe that (p. 1094)

b) If the proposition in the conditional clause is patently true, the proposition in the matrix clause is shown to be true.

  e.g. He is ninety if he's a day old.

  = 'If you'll agree that he's at least a day old, perhaps you will take my word that he's ninety. (p. 1095)

As for indirect conditions, they state that they are open conditions dependent on an implicit speech act of utterance, and are therefore style disjuncts. They are mainly realized by if-clauses. They have distinguished four classes of such style disjuncts. They are summarized as follows.

a) The conditional clause is a conventional expression of politeness which makes the speaker's utterance seemingly dependent on the permission of the hearer.

  e.g. If you don't mind my saying so, your slip is showing.

  = 'If you don't mind my saying so, I'm telling you that...' (p. 1095)

b) The conditional clause is a metalinguistic comment which hedges the wording of the utterance, either suggesting that the wording is not quite precise or it should not be misunderstood in some sense not intended by the speaker. It explicitly or implicitly calls for the hearer's agreement.

  e.g. His style is florid, if that's the right word.

  = 'I'm not sure that florid is the right word'.

c) Thirdly, the conditional clause expresses uncertainty about the extralinguistic knowledge required for a correct interpretation of the utterance. The uncertainty may be of the speaker's or the
hearer's.

e.g. 1. The war was started by the other side, if you remember your history lessons. (hedges about the hearer's knowledge).

2. I met your girl friend Caroline last night, if Caroline is your girl friend. (hedges about speaker's own knowledge)

d) Fourthly, the conditional clause expresses the condition under which the speaker makes the utterance.

e.g. If you're going my way, I need a lift back.

= 'If you're going my way, will you please give me a lift back'. (p.1086)

The above utterance expresses indirect request and may cover under(d) indirect offer, direct question as well. Still, the clause expresses uncertainty.

It is noted that the uncertainty of the condition provides a tentativeness which adds politeness to utterances.

In addition to these, they have also discussed two types of adverbial clauses: alternative conditional-concessive and universal conditional concessive to illustrate the overlap between condition and concession.

e.g. Even if you dislike ancient monuments, Warwick Castle is worth a visit. (p.1089)

The alternative conditional concessive clause gives a choice between two or occasionally more conditions normally in sharp opposition.

e.g. Whether or not he finds a job, he's getting married. (p.1100)

The concessive meaning emerges from the unexpected implication that the same situation applies under two contrasting conditions. Thus, the above sentence may be paraphrased:
'Even if he finds a job or
Even if he doesn't find a job
he's getting married'.

However, the *universal conditional* concessive clause indicates a free choice from any number of conditions.

e.g. *Whatever I say to them, I can't keep them quiet.*
(any number of choices)

Thus, the above sentence has concessive implication which comes through the inference that:

*I can't keep them quiet even if I promise them a treat.* (p.1101)

We have designed a diagram to present Quirk *et al* (1985) taxonomy emerged out of the work which is the model accepted for our investigation. We have designed the following diagram to represent Quirk *et al*'s taxonomy of conditionals.
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2.5 Functional Classification of Conditionals: Pedagogical Grammars:

Pedagogical Grammars also describe conditionals in some detail. They classify and illustrate them with examples according to their function. More or less, everyone has classified the conditional into three broad types: open, hypothetical and counterfactual. However, the labels used by them differ to some extent. In this section, we shall review the treatment of conditionals in pedagogical grammars.

2.5.1 Eckersley and Eckersley:

Eckersley and Eckersley (1960 fifth edition, Reprinted 1977) consider two types of conditional clauses: open and hypothetical. They are distinguished by the form and meaning of the principal clause. They are illustrated with the following examples.

Open conditions:

1. If John works hard he will pass his examination.
2. I won't help him unless he asks me. (p.347)

Hypothetical conditions:

1. If Henry were here, he would know the answer.
2. If I had the money, I would buy a new car. (p.349)

They have mentioned that various tense forms of verbs may occur in open conditions. Also they have treated hypothetical conditions under three separate heads: Present time, future time and past time. Conforming to Reference Grammars, they have indicated that the same construction can be used both for present and future time indication and that the past time type corresponds to counterfactual usually with an implied negative meaning. The following examples illustrate the point.

(a) Present time:

  e.g. If the hat suited me, I would buy it. (p.350)
Future time:
The idea of futurity in hypothetical conditions is often expressed by the same construction as is used for the present. (sometimes with the time adverb or phrase)

(i) With a time adverb or phrase.
   e.g. If Richard worked hard next term, he would pass the examination. (p.350)

But futurity in the 'if' clause as frequently expressed by

(ii) 'were to' + infinitive:
   e.g. If our trains were to arrive punctually, we should have time to visit your sister. (p.350)

Past time:
There is usually an implied negative meaning in hypothetical conditions in the past time.

   e.g. 'If John had worked hard (in the PAST) he would have passed the examination'. (Implied Negative: ... but he didn't work hard)

They have summarized the verb forms in sentences of hypothetical condition as noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb forms with the hypothetical condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb in *if-*clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Reproduced from Eckersley and Eckersley 1977: 351)
They have described many combinations of tenses that may be used in open conditions. Still, subtleties of analysis like truth value, degrees of contrast etc. have not been dealt with fully. Their coverage is shown in a diagramatic form as follows:

**Diagram**

**Eckersley and Eckersley**

**Conditions**

- **Open**
- **Hypothetical**
  - Present Time
  - Future Time
  - Past Time

The verb forms in hypothetical conditions have already been given in the earlier table. It is not necessary to represent the combinations of tenses in open conditions as according to them, a great many combinations of tenses may be used.

2.5.2 Wood:

Wood (1965/1973) while discussing tenses in conditional sentences, describes three kinds of condition: open condition, rejected condition and imaginary condition. He has given the following examples to illustrate them.

1. **Open condition**:

   If the reference is to the present time, the present tense is used in both the conditional and the main clause.

   e.g. If water freezes, it turns to ice.
Besides, if the reference is to the future, the present tense is used in the conditional clause, and the future tense is used in the main clause.

  e.g. If I have time, I shall visit the exhibition.

He further explains that the future tense in the main clause is replaced by the imperative when the main clause gives an order or an instruction.

  e.g. If you get a chance to speak to him, ask him how his family are getting on. (p.101)

Besides, he has discussed two patterns possible in conditional sentences referring to the past under open condition.

(a) If the reference is to something that is general or habitual, then usually the past tense is used in both clauses.

  e.g. 1. If there was a rush of orders, we had to work overtime. (in the past)

  2. If the manager received any complaints, he investigated them personally. (in the past)

(b) If the reference is to a specific occurrence or situation which, though it may belong to the past now, was future when regarded from a particular point of time in the past, then the past tense is used in the conditional clause, and the future in the past (or conditional) tense in the main clause.

  e.g. We decided that, if it was fine, we would walk home.

  N.B.: Would (for all persons) is sometimes used also in sentences expressing repetition or a general practice.

  e.g. If he had a few hours to spare, he would spend them in the library. (Past habitual).

  This is the counterpart of a similar use of will in the present.
2. **Rejected condition:**

He describes rejected condition which might have been fulfilled, but is not. According to him, the past subjunctive is used in the conditional clause if the verb is to be, and the past indicative is used if it is any other verb. The main clause has the future in the past (or conditional) tense.

For example:

1. **We could** start dinner if only John were here.

2. **If I weren’t so tired, I would go** for a walk with you.

3. **If I had time, I should visit** the exhibition.

(The above sentences imply that John is not here, that I am tired, and that I have no time.)

He points out that the above examples can be converted or backshifted into past perfective, if the reference is to the past:

e.g. **We could have started dinner if only John had been there.**

3. **Imaginary condition:**

He describes it as one which could not be true (if I were you), or which, even if it is not impossible, is not seriously contemplated, but is advanced only for the sake of argument.

e.g. **If I were a millionaire I would give** generously to good causes.

He states that the use of the past subjunctive in the conditional clause is made if the verb is to be, and the past indicative of the other verbs, while the main clause has the future in the past (conditional) as in the above sentences respectively.

However, if the reference is to past time, were becomes had been, and would/should becomes would have/should have as in:

What would you have done if you had been attacked by a bandit?

(p.103)
PROPOSITIONS

Proposition could not be true/not impossible but not seriously contemplated.

Past subjunctive in conditional clause if the verb is to be or Past indicative if any other verb and the future tense in the Past (or conditional) clause.

Count/Past Time No Time Reference

Hypo Present/Future time reference

Past subjunctive in the conditional clause or Past Perfect in subordinate clause and Past Perf. modal in main clause. = Counter-factual

Neutral Time

Future Reference

Past Reference

Reference

Present tense in both the clauses.

Present tense in conditional clause and future tense in main clause (or Imperative in main clause if it is order/instruction and Present tense in subordinate clause.)

1. Reference to something habitual or general = Past tense in both the clauses.
2. Reference to situation though belong to Past now, was future when regarded from a particular point of time in the Past, then = Past tense in subordinate clause and future in the Past (or conditional) in main clause i.e. would etc.
We have represented Hood (1965) in a diagramatic form as above to classify his taxonomy of form and function in conditional sentences.

It appears from the examples that Hood (1965/1973) has discussed the tense forms permitted under OPEN condition in some detail. He refers to all the three - Present, Future and Past time under OPEN condition. It indicates that he is more formal in description than the other pedagogical grammars.

Likewise, under REJECTED condition, he refers to present time only and (backshift) indirect conversion leading to past time reference which is rather confusing though it really refers, among other things, to counterfactual type.

The form of the IMAGINARY condition appears confusing as he subsumes future time reference under it instead of REJECTED OR NON-IMAGINARY conditions discussed both by Reference and Pedagogical grammars. It seems quite identical in form with REJECTED (1) referring to present time. As we have classified, his imaginary (2) appears to refer to past-past or past time reference as illustrated with examples.

Thus, Hood appears quite formal in his description and particular in form of conditional sentences.

2.5.3 Close:

Close (1975) divides conditional clauses into five groups: a neutral type, three BASIC TYPES, and a mixed group according to the sequence of tenses that they attract. He gives examples of each type to explain its function.
I NEUTRAL: Same tense in both clauses:

e.g. If the wind blows from the north, this room is very cold. (p.58)

II BASIC TYPES:

TYPE 1: Present tense in the if-clause and will/imperative in the main clause assumed real possibility.

e.g. If you park your car there, the police will take it away. (p.59) (OPEN)

TYPE 2: Past in the if-clause, would in the main clause: What is said in the main clause is an imaginary consequence of a PRESENT NON-FACT. The if-clause states the non-fact and its verb is accordingly in the past tense.

e.g. If you parked your car there (now) they would tow it away. (p.59) (HYPOTHETICAL)

Close further points out that were is commonly used, even with 1st and 3rd person singular subjects, to emphasize non-fact.

e.g. If John were here now (but he isn’t), we could play tennis. (p.60)

TYPE 3: Past perfect in the if-clause, would+perfect in the main:

What is said in the main clause is now seen as an imaginary consequence of PAST NON-FACT—something that did not happen.

e.g. If you had parked your car there (but you didn’t), they would have towed it away.

III MIXED GROUP, USING ANY OTHER SEQUENCE OF TENSES AND ASPECTS:

Close has given four of the commonest combinations as follows:

1. If-clause with will, replaceable by ’ll, not shall, with 2nd or 3rd person subject, and containing a suggestion of willingness:

   e.g. If you will write a letter about it, I will attend to it at once.
Besides, would could be used in the if-clause, with will or would in the main, to produce a more hesitant or a politer effect:

(i) If you would write me a letter..., I will attend to it...
(ii) If you would write me a letter..., I would be most grateful.

The construction in (ii) is frequently used in business or official correspondence, where should is generally preferred with I or We, if only to prevent a repetition of would.

2. If-clause with will, 'll or would, with no suggestion of willingness:

   can     will
   I lend you five pounds, if that help.
   could   would

This is an exception to the rule followed by Type 1. It can be seen as meaning either

   can     will
   I lend you five pounds, if that help?
   could   would

   or

   'My loan depends on whether, at some time in the future, a loan will help'.

3. Past tense in the if-clause, not referring to present non-fact, as in TYPE 2, but assuming actual fact in the past:

   where is it now?
   If you parked your car there (then), you were very foolish.
   the police would have removed it.

4. Were to+INFINITIVE in the if-clause making a supposition about the future:

   I
   If were to touch that wire would be killed instantly.
   you

R.A. Close seems to be the first to suggest that will/would in the if-clause may sometimes occur with no suggestion of willingness. He does not however, seem to accept that 'will' may suggest futurity.
CLOSE (1975)
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2) Would, could in the if-clause with will or would in the main to produce more hesitant or a politer effect.

II If-clause with will or 'll or would with no suggestion of willingness.

III Past tense in if-clause assuming actual fact in the past.

IV Were to+infinitive in the if-clause making a supposition about the future.
Hornby (1975: 228-32) has two main divisions of conditional sentences. They are:

(a) Open/Factual condition: those with clauses that contain a condition that may or may not be fulfilled.

(b) Theoretical or hypothetical: those with clauses in which the condition is combined with improbability or unreality.

According to him, in clauses of open condition, in subordinate clause, any of the tenses of the indicative mood, except the future tense with will/shall, may be used. He has given examples of many possible combinations of tenses in the main and 'subsidiary' clause.

e.g. 1. Unless he has done the work to my satisfaction, I shall not pay him for it.
2. If she promised to be here, she'll certainly come (p.229).

Hornby labels the other type i.e., (b) as rejected/hypothetical condition. It can be contrary to fact or impossible or unfulfilled condition. The auxiliary verbs would, should, could, might and subjunctive were are used in this type of condition. The combinations permitted for (i) future time, (ii) present and future time combined and (iii) past time are illustrated with examples:

(i) Future time: Main clause contains would/should/might/could/ought. Conditional clause contains either should or were to.

   e.g. He wouldn't do it unless you were to specially ask him. (p.230)

(ii) Present or both Present and Future time Reference:

   e.g. If he heard of your marriage, he would be surprized. (p.230)

(iii) Past Reference: Main clause contains would/should/could/might — with a perfect infinitive. The conditional clause contains a past perfect tense.

   e.g. You could have done it if you had tried.
Moreover, like reference and pedagogical grammars, he has discussed the condition expressed without a conjunction merely by means of inversion of the subject and finite verb or operators were, should, had.

Besides, he considers conditions sometimes implied in a relative clause like:

*e.g.* A country that stopped working would quickly be bankrupt.

= 'If a country stopped working; it would quickly be bankrupt'.

(p.231)

and

Moreover, he considers conditions expressed by two co-ordinate clauses i.e. spare the rod and spoil the child

= 'If the child is spared punishment, it will be spoilt'.

He has also taken note of the future tense with *will* which is not used in conditional clauses.

Thus, the kinds of conditions have been classified and represented in a diagramatic form for clarity.
Hajn clause contains would/could/might with perfect infinitive (if the reference is to the consequence in the present). The conditional clause contains a past perfect tense.
Leech and Svartvik (1975) in their "A Communicative Grammar of English" (1975) take a thoroughly pedagogical view appropriate for their purpose. Therefore, their description of the so-called conditional constructions are scattered over the 'meanings' expressed by them such as open and hypothetical, condition contrary to fact, neutral etc. Their examples of open and unreal or hypothetical conditions are as follows:

**e.g.** I'll lend Peter the money if he needs it. (Open)

I'd lend Peter the money if he needed it. (Unreal or hypothetical)

(p.96)

They also state that a hypothesis or hypothetical meaning is usually expressed by the past tense in dependent clause and by would (or 'd)+infinitive in main clause. In the example: "If we **had** enough money, I **would** buy a radio today (tomorrow)". The past tense (had, would) has nothing to do with past time, as can be seen from the adverbials insertable. According to them, past-time when combined with hypothesis is expressed by the perfective construction have+ed participle:

**e.g.** If we **had had** enough money, I **would have bought** a tape-recorder last year.

They also state that would in the verb phrase of the main clause can be replaced by another past tense modal auxiliary:

**e.g.** If we **had** enough money, I **could** (= 'would be able to') buy a tape-recorder today. (p.125)

It appears that this substitution of 'could' for 'would' is possible even in the case of past perfect.

**e.g.** If we **had had** enough money, I **could have bought** a tape-recorder last year.

However, the authors don't explicitly make this clear. Besides, in addition
to the past tense, they have discussed three other less common ways of expressing hypothetical meaning in sub-clauses: (a) the were-subjunctive, (b) were to/was to+infinitive and (c) should+infinitive. Another type of hypothetical conditional clause has no subordinating conjunction if, but instead begins with an operator placed before the subject (inversions). The three operators occurring in this construction are had, subjunctive-were and putative should.

According to them, in addition to fact and hypothesis, there is a third type of situation, in which the speaker assumes neither the truth nor the falsehood of a statement. They call this situation Neutrality. They have already mentioned that should expresses a tentative condition in if-clauses. This is true not only for hypothetical conditions, but for OPEN conditions as well.

\[
\text{e.g. If you hear\ <tentative> the news, Jane please let me know. Should}
\]

Open conditions are, in fact, another case of a construction which is neutral with regard to truth and falsehood. From the above sentence, we do not know, whether or not Jane will hear the news and let me know.

In other dependent clauses, too, should is used neutrally, to represent something as a neutral 'idea' rather than as a 'fact'. They call this use of should PUTATIVE. Moreover, they discuss positive condition implied in using the conjunction and, but only in limited context such as commanding, advising, etc.

\[
\text{e.g. Take this medicine and (then) you'll feel better. (p.159)}
\]

Similarly, negative condition can be expressed by using or but again in limited contexts:
For example:

You'd better put your overcoat on or (else) you'll catch a cold <informal>.

Other ways of expressing negative conditions are:

(i) Unless you put on your overcoat, you'll catch a cold.

(ii) I should wear an overcoat if I were you; otherwise, you'll catch a cold.

Thus, there is more focus on communicative function in Lee and Svartvik whereas it is back and forth in Quirk et al. We prefer to represent Lee and Svartvik in a diagram form as follows:

**DIAGRAM**

Leech and Svartvik

1975

**CONDITION**

- **Real (Open)**
  - **FUTURE REFERENCE**
    - 1. Present Tense in Sub. Cl. should+infin shall/will+inf. in M.cl. Sub.cl. would+ inf. in M.cl.
    - 2. (Rare)
      - **POSITIVE**
        - two clauses coordinated by 'and'.
      - **NEGATIVE**
        - two clauses coordinated by 'or'.

- **Unreal (hypothetical)**
  - **FUTURE REF.**
    - 1. Past tense should+infin Sub.cl. would+ inf. in M.cl.
  - **PRESENT REF.**
  - **PAST REF. FACT**
    - (other ways) tive in M.cl.
    - a) the were subjunctive
    - b) the were to/ was to+infinite.
    - c) should+ infinitive.
Thomson and Martinet (1980) is the most recent revised pedagogical grammar in which conditional sentences have been treated in great detail. As the authors mention, the material has been rewritten and brought up-to-date in this edition of their earlier book (Thomson and Martinet: 1960). However, the approach is more formal than semantic.

The authors have presented what they call the basic forms followed by a number of variations thereof which they say are 'difficult'.

According to them, there are three basic types of conditional sentences. They are as follows:

TYPE 1: PROBABLE CONDITION:

In this type of conditional sentence, the verb in the if-clause is in present tense and the verb in the main clause is in the future tense. They can have present or future time reference. The fulfilment of the condition is probable.

For example:

The cat will scratch you if you pull her tail. (p.188)

TYPE 2: IMPROBABLE CONDITION:

In this type, the verb in the if-clause is in the past tense and the verb in the main clause is in the 'conditional tense' i.e., past forms of modal auxiliaries followed by infinitive. Like type 1, they can refer to present or future time and the fulfilment of the condition is improbable or unreal. The past tense in its if-clause is not a true past tense but a subjunctive which indicates improbability or unreality.
For example:

1. If I had a map, I would lend it to you.
   = 'But I haven't a map. The meaning here is present (Unreal).

2. If someone tried to blackmail me, I would tell the police.
   = But I don't expect that anyone will try to blackmail me.
   The meaning here is future = improbable (p.188).

**TYPE 3: IMPOSSIBLE CONDITION:**

In this type, the verb in the *if-clause* is in the past perfect tense and the verb in the *main clause* is in the 'perfect conditional tense'. Such sentences have past tense indication and therefore, the condition is unfulfilled or impossible of fulfilment.

For example:

1. If he had tried to leave the country he would have been stopped at the frontier but he didn't try (p.180).

The authors also mention the possibility of sentences combining type 2 and type 3 conditionals.

For example:

If I had caught that plane, I would be dead now. (p.180)

Under each of these basic types, the authors have discussed a number of variations. The basic types and their variations are indicated in a diagram given below.

The variations of type 1 include the occurrence of *will/would/should* in *if-clause* for conveying politeness, willingness, insistence, modal auxiliaries in the *main clause* for conveying the respective modal meanings etc. They have also indicated the possibility of the other present tense forms of the verb in the *if-clause* and the imperative in the *main clause* etc.
The variations of type 2 include the occurrence of were to+infinitive in the if-clause; modal auxiliaries in the main clause for conveying the respective meanings, other conditional tenses in the main clause and other past tense forms in the if-clause.

The variations of type 3 include the occurrence of other modal auxiliaries in the main clause for conveying the respective meanings; other perfective tense forms in both the if-clause and the main clause.

Finally, they have drawn attention to the inversion of Had in the conditional clause.

The authors have discussed the different markers of condition and drawn attention to certain if-clauses being clauses of reason rather than condition particularly those which can be paraphrased by substituting as/because etc.

They have also discussed clauses with if only expressing hope, wish or regret in various tense forms either as independent clauses or as part of conditional sentences.

It seems from the 1980 edition that this is by far the most exhaustive treatment of conditional sentences in any pedagogical grammar.
Thomson and Martinet 1980

**CONDITIONAL SENTENCES**

1. **Type 1: Probable**
   - Present tense in sub. clause
   - Future tense in Main clause

2. **Type 2: improbable/unreal**
   - Past tense form in sub. clause
   - Conditional tense (would etc.) in Main clause

3. **Type 3: Impossible**
   - Condition in the past
   - Therefore not fulfilled.

- Combination of 2 & 3
- Perf. in Sub.cl. and Conditional in M.cl.

1. **Will/would and should** in Sub.cl. for:
   - (a) politeness (request)
   - (b) willingness
   - (c) insistence (will stressed)

2. **Modal in the main clause** for appropriate meaning or main clause imperative overt or implied

3. **Other tenses in Sub. clause.**
2.6 Functions and Labels:

From the foregoing discussion of the functional classification of conditionals both in reference grammars and pedagogical grammars, it appears that there is complete agreement about the major types of conditional meanings. Everyone is agreed that there are three broad types which may be subsumed under the labels 'open', 'hypothetical' and 'counterfactual'. Unfortunately, there is a plethora of labels—more or less descriptive/indicative of the conditional meanings. In addition certain grammars have paid attention to conditional like constructions whose functions are far from being conditional.

Having said this, it may be useful to summarize the variety of labels used by different grammars to refer to the same phenomenon.

Jespersen (1931, 54) labels conditionals as: rejected or better rejected or condition contrary to fact under imaginative tenses. He also refers to rhetorical devices wherein, sometimes if followed by was doesn't really mean a condition. He also points out that an if-clause may also serve to highlight a contrast in two statements which are equally true. Similarly, Poutsma labels conditionals as: open, rejected/rejecting, contrary to fact. Leech (1971/89) has two main divisions: Real and unreal conditions. Both the divisions cover open, hypothetical and counterfactual conditions. Palmer (1965, 74, 79, 86) discusses Real and Unreal conditions under the label Predictive conditionals and three other kinds: 'whenever', 'implication' and 'relevance'. Quirk et al (1972) have two broad categories: open and hypothetical including counterfactual. Besides, Quirk et al (1985) later label conditionals as Direct and Indirect covering open, hypothetical and counterfactual conditions. They have Rhetorical...
conditional clauses. They extend their discussion to conditional-concessive clauses both alternative and universal types.

Thus, reference grammars have labelled the conditional sentences in different ways and discussed them at length with illustrative examples. From the examples, it is clear that they all have the three major types of conditionals at the back of their mind.

Pedagogical grammars have attempted to simplify this concept by focussing on some three common types. They have illustrated their functions with examples. However, like reference grammars, they also use several different labels for explicating the respective functions.

Eckersley and Eckersley (1960/1977) have only two types of conditional clauses: open and hypothetical. The counterfactual is subsumed under hypothetical. Wood (1965) recognizes three different types of conditional sentences: open, rejected and imaginary corresponding to open, hypothetical and counterfactual respectively. Leech and Svartvik (1975) have open and unreal or hypothetical conditions. Close (1975) divides conditional clauses into five groups: a neutral type, three basic types, and a mixed group. The neutral and basic type I, corresponds to open condition while the Basic type II and III correspond to hypothetical and counterfactual respectively. In the mixed group, however, he includes certain types which others have put under hypothetical like were to. Thomson and Martinet (1980) recognize three types: probable (TYPE1), improbable (TYPE2) and impossible (TYPE3) conditions corresponding to three basic types. Hornby (1975) has two main divisions: open/factual and theoretical or hypothetical conditions combined with improbability or unreality. Impossible conditionals or unfulfilled conditions are the labels
for counterfactual which is subsumed under hypothetical. Perhaps Hornby is the first among pedagogical grammars to draw attention to conditions implied by a relative clause.

2.7 Types of Conditional Constructions:

From the review of treatment of conditionals in the Reference and Pedagogical grammars, it is clear that there are certain constructions which can undisputedly be called conditional constructions. These can be classified into three broad categories: Open, hypothetical and counterfactual to use one set of labels. As we have seen, different grammarians have labelled these differently.

It is also clear that within these three types, a number of variations in the use of modals and tense forms occur. This seems to be one reason why conditional constructions in English are complex.

Besides these basic types, it was noticed that a number of other types of constructions have been recognized and discussed by grammars. However, no systematic effort seems to have been made to classify these rigorously. The only grammar that has attempted this is Quirk et al (1985) in which the authors have posited three categories: Direct, Indirect and Rhetorical conditionals.

2.7.1 Will in Subordinate Clause:

We have also noticed in the review earlier that one of the controversial issues connected with conditional constructions concern the use of 'WILL' for future time indication in the conditional clause. This is because the tense forms required in conditional sentences in English do not follow the general rules of English grammar. A present tense form of
the verb in the conditional clause generally has a future time reference. Therefore, many pedagogical grammars have gone to the extent of prohibiting the use of WILL in the conditional clause, noting that WILL can be used only to express WILLINGNESS etc. on the part of the subject.

This controversy took a significant turn with Close (1980) positing a rule that the difference between the 'normal' if-clause (not containing WILL) and the 'exceptional' if-clause containing WILL (not expressing WILLINGNESS, INSISTANCE etc.) is that the normal if-clause expresses 'assumed future actuality' and the 'exceptional' if-clause expresses 'assumed future predictability'.

2.8 Non-Standard Conditionals:

Declerck (1984) has argued at length that R.A. Close's solution is hopelessly inadequate as an explanation for the occurrence of WILL in if-clauses. So let us look at Declerck's argument in some detail.

In this article, Declerck (1984) deals with possible exceptions to the handbook rule that non-volitional (i.e. non-modal) will and hypothetical would cannot be used in conditional clauses. However, he has identified nine different kinds of exceptions and provided an explanation for the use of WILL/WOULD in such structures.

To begin with, it must be stated that he recognizes the 'normal' or 'standard' conditionals of the three basic types: Open, hypothetical and counterfactual. However, while dealing with the 'exceptional' conditionals, he has posited nine different types each with definite characteristic features. They are as follows:
TYPE I: This type represents a closed condition and the relationship between $P$ (conditional clause) and $Q$ (main clause) is deductive. That is to say if $P$ then $Q$. The main clause is a present conclusion drawn from the future event assumed to be a fact.

For example:

If the lava will come down as far as this, we must evacuate these houses immediately. (Close 1975: 256)

TYP II: This type of conditional is labelled as utterance conditional. It is non-deductive and is a condition for uttering the head-clause and not the occurrence of the event expressed in the if-clause.

For example:

If it'll make you feel any better, I'll take it back. (Tregidgo 1974: 105)

The interesting point is that, this type of conditional may not necessarily contain WILL in the if-clause.

For example:

If you are hungry, there are some biscuits on the table.

The condition in this type may be either Open or closed.

For example:

1. The new factory—if it will ever be built—will provide work for 150 people. (Open) (p: 288)

2. If you will see him tomorrow, why are you phoning him now? (Closed) (p:287)

TYPE III: In this type, 'P' is represented as a possibility and not a fact. Therefore, the condition is Open. The head clause expresses a promise, intention or decision. One more important characteristic is that this type of conditionals are 'Q' primary. That is to say, the head clause often comes first and that is the focus of attention.

For example:

1. If it'll be of any help, I'll come along (Palmer 1974: 148)
Declerck has argued that conditional sentences can be ambiguous between type II and type III (Utterance and 'q' Primary) conditionals.

**TYPE IV:** This type is like type III except that it is 'p' primary unlike III.

For example:

1. If you will be alone on Christmas Day, let us know now. (Close 1980: 104)
2. If you won't be with us for the late news, goodnight. (Haegeaan 1983: 153)

N.B: 'Goodnight' is interpreted as decision to take leave?

**TYPE V:** This type is 'q' primary and the head clause comes first. The if-clause is just appended as an after-thought and therefore there is a pause between the two-clauses. The if-clause is free and in fact non-conditional.

For example:

1. I'll come down to your office after one O'clock, if it will suit you. (Poutsma 1926: 190)
2. I should like to try farming, Dad: if it won't cost too much. (Poutsma 1926: 190)

**TYPE VI:** In this type of conditional the if-clause is relatively independent hence will is necessary for indicating futurity.

For example:

1. (A) They'll all listen to you with great interest.
   (B) If I'll be allowed to speak at all!
2. Hang it all! if that idiot won't be there as well! Who the hell sent him an invitation? (Reproduced from Declerck 1984: 299)

**TYPE VII:** This type of conditional is like type I deductive but not closed. The condition is open and more like a standard condition. The future fulfilment of P is not assumed to be a fact but a mere possibility. In this type, the verb in the if-clause is stative.
For example:

1. If, say, 500 gallons will be sufficient for me, I don't see why it should not be sufficient for you. (p:301)

2. If Jones is going to be the new Chairman, the annual meeting of the board will be no laughing matter. (Reproduced from Declerck 1984: 301)

**TYPE VIII:** This is the most complex type as far as the time references are concerned. The if-clause expresses the present expectation (assumption) that 'P' will occur in the future and the head clause expresses the present conclusion that 'Q' must therefore be done or that 'Q' is therefore true.

For example:

1. If as you say, the job will be given to John, there's no point in my applying for it any more.

2. If as you say, the lava will come down as far as this, all these lovely villas are doomed. (Reproduced from Declerck 1984: 303)

It is clear from the above examples that both P and Q lie in the future and the present conclusion i.e. 'q' is based on the assumption or expectation i.e. 'p'. It is therefore a closed condition.

**TYPE IX:** In this type, the if-clause itself implies another conditional clause. Therefore, this if-clause involves a verb form which is normally used in a head clause. TYPE IX overlaps with most other types of conditionals except type VI, VII and VIII and there is no close relationship between P and Q.

For example:

1. If a loan would have saved him, why didn't you give him one? = If it would have saved him if you had given him a loan.

2. I should not take this medicine if it would upset you = if you took it (Poutsma 1926: 193).

The above examples illustrate the use of would + infinitive/perfective in the if-clause which is normally not allowed. But since this if-clause has another implied if-clause, it has the status of a head clause and
therefore would+infinitive/perfective is perfectly allright.

Declerck has illustrated with examples how type IX sentences overlap with several other types from I to VI.

Finally, Declerck has considered the occurrence of will in if-clauses involving statements regarding the inherent capacity of certain objects in nature.

For example:

I know that if medicine will save him, he will be safe.
(Close 1980: 102)

Declerck, however, does not decide whether a separate category should be set up to explain this type or it may be put into type IX.

If it is to be put in type IX, the implied if-clause would be as shown in brackets below:

(= I know that if medicine will save him,
(if he takes some), he will be safe.

In this article, Declerck is preoccupied in justifying the occurrence of WILL/WOULD in if-clauses to indicate futurity. In this effort to do so, he has shown that WILL/WOULD can occur in various types of conditional sentences. In other words, he has produced a classification of such sentences, and incidentally other similar sentences not containing WILL/WOULD according to their semantic function or implication. It appears that his nine types fall into the two major types which we may call Standard and non-standard conditionals. He has initially alluded to the basic or normal conditional which are conventionally called standard conditionals. If this is acceptable, Quirk et al (1985) seems to be a viable model for classifying the so-called conditional constructions into three types - standard, non-standard and non-conditionals corresponding to Quirk et al’s Direct, Indirect and Rhetorical conditions respectively. We would like to represent Declerck (1984) in a Diagram form as follows:
Conditional sentences can be ambiguous between TYPE II & III (Utterance conditionals and Q. Primary conditionals). For 'Q' Primary 'P' is a necessary condition not merely sufficient.

K.B.: Conditional sentences can be ambiguous between TYPE II & III (Utterance conditionals and Q. Primary conditionals). For 'Q' Primary 'P' is a necessary condition not merely sufficient.
2.9 Conclusion:

In this chapter, we have summarized the most influential reference grammars beginning with Jespersen to Quirk et al. (1985). We have also summarized the most popular pedagogical grammars especially for second language or foreign language learners for the use all over the world. In addition, we have taken the note of certain important works of philosophers and logicians who have contributed on the conditional constructions in English. There are two important problems that emerge out of these discussions namely the problem of the form of these constructions which do not always match with functional constructions. Moreover, it is very often difficult to say clearly which types of constructions convey the same even in the case of native speakers.

Therefore, it becomes a matter of interpretation and there is a good deal of ambiguity. By nature, this stems from a use of modals and tense forms in English. Added to this, the ordinary rules of English grammar do not hold with the conditional constructions in English.

What we have attempted therefore is to develop a model based on Quirk et al. (1985) and tried to interpret the conditional constructions we have used by the grammarians both reference and pedagogical ones.

Finally a good deal of grammarians invented examples of conditional constructions have complicated the issue. Only when look at the actual corpus data will reveal the real nature of conditional constructions in the following chapters.