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The present paper is an attempt at presenting and analyzing the structure
magan + infinitive as it alternated with the inflectional subjunctive in Old
English.

I. In present-day English we encounter the alternation of such structures
as the two italicized in the following examples taken from Quirk et al. (1972:
76):

It is necessary that every member should inform himself of these rules.
It is necessary that every member inform himself of these rules.

There is not much difference between the two structures as far as meaning
is concerned. The style of the second sentence is more formal than that of
the first and is characteristic of the written language, especially in American
English.

The two verb phrase structures indicated above signal modality. The form
should inform is modally marked by its having the auxiliary verb should,
whereas inform is modally marked in that it has no -a suffix.

The extensive use of to-infinitive constructions in present-day English,
as in the following example, renders the modally marked verbal forms, especially
the inflectional subjunctive, marginal.

It is necessary for every member to inform himself of these rules.

In earlier periods of English, however, the modally marked verbal forms
occupied a more prominent position.

II. I shall use the term modality to refer to “the speaker’s commitment with
respect to the factual status of what he is saying” (Lyons 1968: 307). The
term mood, on the other hand, will refer to the grammatical devices, or more
precisely, to the structures of the verb phrase, that a language uses to signal
modality in sentences. Lyons does not make an overt distinction between these two concepts, and I follow Palmer (1977) in this respect.

In OE sentences, when modality was that of fact, it was the indicative mood that was used. In the case of non-fact modality the verb phrase could assume one of these three forms: 1) the imperative mood was associated with command, prayer, etc., 2) the subjunctive mood (infinitival or periphrastical) was associated with wish, imagination, contingency, doubt, uncertainty, potentiality, etc., and 3) the indicative mood also appeared in some of the contexts in which the subjunctive was used, but this indicative did not signal non-fact modality overtly. One of the uses of the indicative in non-fact modal contexts, however, did signal non-fact modality overtly; in such cases it had the preterite form (the so-called modal preterite) and was used without relation to any time sphere; for example:

Gif god were cœwre fæder, witodlice ge hæfde ne me.

(O.E. Gosp., John: 8, 42)

McLaughlin (1970: 197) observes that it is “difficult to formulate precise rules that will automatically generate the subjunctive under appropriate conditions”.

The subjunctive mood was represented by a verbal inflection (the infinitival subjunctive) or by the use of certain verbs construed with the infinitive (the periphrastical subjunctive). The verbs which appeared in the periphrastical subjunctive were sculan, willian, magan, motan, farfan, and a few more.

III. The alternation of the periphrastical subjunctive with the infinitival subjunctive in Old English, as well as in the subsequent periods, can be accounted for from the diachronic point of view. At least since the beginning of recorded English the infinitival subjunctive has been on the decline. One of the factors causing the deterioration of the infinitival subjunctive in Old English and later was the levelling and gradual loss of infinitival suffixes with evident results in Middle English. Thus, when only inflections are taken into consideration, the process resulted finally in the neutralization of the formal opposition indicative v. subjunctive in the majority of grammatical contexts. However, there were other grammatical devices which continued to signal non-fact modality. Those were, for instance, the typical modal con-

juctions, the introductory formulae I desire that ..., I wish that ..., and so on, the use of the modal preterite, word order, and the periphrastical subjunctive. The importance of the periphrastical subjunctive in marking non-fact modality increased as the infinitival subjunctive decayed. Mustanoja (1960) observes that by the fifteenth century the periphrastical subjunctive outnumbered the infinitival subjunctive by nine to one.

Jespersen (1924) restricts the term mood to the form of the verb. He refrains from attaching any specific meaning to the subjunctive mood exclusively. Thus his approach, as to the semantic function of this mood, is in accord with the position assumed in this paper: there is no one to one correspondence between non-fact modality and the subjunctive (infinitival and periphrastical), as has already been mentioned in II. It would not be possible to find one formula that should cover all the various uses of the subjunctive in any one Aryan language” (Jespersen 1924: 317). Jespersen suggests that the disappearance of the infinitival subjunctive was a result of its undecided function in marking non-fact modality.

IV. The OE verb magan, when construed with the infinitive, expressed either ability which was not dependent on outward conditions, or objective possibility, or, perhaps, permission. Of these, the use of objective possibility seems to have been the one employed in the periphrastical subjunctive. The meaning of magan in this use can be defined as that of nihil obstat. Thus magan + infinitive meant that the event expressed by the infinitive was free to take place. Consequently, there was no truth value with respect to the occurrence of the event. In other words, this meaning of magan + infinitive expressed one of the aspects of non-fact modality. From now on, I shall use the term possibility to refer to the meaning ‘nihil obstat’ of magan.

On the other hand, the infinitival subjunctive expressed general or unqualified non-fact modality. Magan itself, as used in the periphrastical subjunctive, also appeared in the subjunctive inflected form, and, as such, it was more noticeable in the present tense, where the infinitival contrast indicative v. subjunctive existed for all the grammatical persons. When magan was used in the subjunctive infinitival form, the general non-fact modality was ‘superimposed’ on the narrower meaning of possibility. When magan was used in the preterite form but did not refer to any time sphere, it expressed hypothetical or unlikely possibility.

V. The following two examples are OE renditions of the same text, the first signalling non-fact modality by means of the structure magan + infinitive

---

1 Quoted after Visser (1946: 783).

2 McLaughlin refers to the infinitival subjunctive at this point.


4 The morphological characteristics of the infinitival subjunctive in Old English can be found, for example, in Kispert (1971: 60).
(the periphrastic subjunctive) and the second signalling non-fact modality by means of the inflectional subjunctive.

Folgie me nu pin mildheortnes ... past ic mægen wesan on pinum huse swipe lange tid.
(Paris Ps.: 22, 8/9)

... mildheortnes pin afterlyfgeð me ... past ic inceardige on huse dryhtnes on lenge dayas.
(Junius Ps.: 22, 6)*

The subsequent paragraphs will deal with the alternation of these two forms of the verb phrase in Old English. Then I shall mention the units in which the inflectional subjunctive did not alternate with mægan + infinitive. When dealing with the subject I shall follow a simplified version of Visser’s (1969: 786–941) classification of the uses of the inflectional subjunctive. He discusses this verbal form in independent and dependent clauses, subdividing the two groups into subtypes. Visser prefers this classification to those which start off with a list of kinds of modality and then show how they are overtly expressed. It is impossible to specify all the different kinds of modality inherent in speech, but it is possible to specify the syntactic units with the verb in the subjunctive mood.

Independent clauses

1. The periphrastic subjunctive + mægan in the preterite indicative form alternates with the inflectional subjunctive in the preterite form of the verb in clauses expressing wishes which were impossible to realize; in other words, they were idle wishes. Examples:

Eala ðast ure tida nu ne mīhtan wcordan swilce! (Alfred, Boeth. (Sedgefield): 34, 6)*

Eala, wære he aunder, ðode hat, ðode ceald.[d]. (Alfred, P. O.: 445, 36)

The periphrastic subjunctive as well as the inflectional subjunctive expressed hypothesis or unlikelihood as to the occurrence of the event wished for. Mægan, in addition, had a sense of possibility, so the resultant meaning was a hypothetical possibility or an unlikely possibility of the occurrence of the event wished for. The inflectional subjunctive tended to be limited to the form wære, whereas mægan appeared with various verbs and was, in this way, more productive than the inflectional subjunctive.

Other signals of non-fact modality in expressing an idle wish were interjections such as eala and the inversion of subject and object, except when past preceded.

2. The periphrastic subjunctive with mægan in the preterite indicative form and the inflectional subjunctive in the preterite form of the verb were used to express the speaker’s uncertainty or hesitation as to the statement he was making.

Manega ping we mihhton of peodwitan geasenynce herto geiscen; ac ... nu wille we ure spræce awendan to pæm lūnym muneom ... (Byrhtferth’s manual: 132, 4)

... him soelest where past his fripes to Romanum wilhaden.
(Alfred, Orosius: 202, 18)

The use of the preterite in both cases signalled hypothesis, which made the uncertainty or hesitation of the speaker apparent. In the case of the inflectional subjunctive it was the occurrence of the event that was hypothetical, and in the case of the periphrastic subjunctive with mægan it was the possibility of the occurrence of the event that was hypothetical.

The periphrastic subjunctive with mægan and the inflectional subjunctive were not wholly interchangeable because the inflectional subjunctive was practically limited to the form wære. Thus the periphrastic subjunctive had a more diverse use than the inflectional subjunctive.

The use of the indicative in comparable clauses indicates an obvious change in modality; in such instances the speaker expressed bare facts, that is, fact modality. So here there was a one to one correspondence between fact modality and the indicative (with the exception of the preterite indicative used as the modal preterite).

3. The periphrastic subjunctive with mægan in the preterite indicative form or the inflectional subjunctive in the preterite form of the verb appeared in the apodosis of a hypothetical condition; the event in the condition was looked upon as unrealizable or unreal. Examples:

... like wel meakton ribban on pam lande, gif his woden lares godes foreward frawman.

(Genesis: 786)*

Gif Þæm gifran ungemetlic sceap ne æglæde, bonne ne burne se welifa ...
(Alfred, P. C.: 309, 3)

The preterite forms of the inflectional subjunctive and magan expressed
hypothetical. In this way the apodosis of the hypothetical condition was also
rendered hypothetical. Magan in the periphrastic subjunctive expressed
hypothetical possibility as to the occurrence of the event expressed by the
infinite in the apodosis, and the inflectional subjunctive expressed hypo-
thetical occurrence of the event.

There were no comparable clauses with the verb in the indicative.

Dependent clauses

A. Object clauses

1. The periphrastic subjunctive with magan alternated with the inflectional
subjunctive in object clauses which depended on expressions of volition,
that is, on verbs such as wiling, willan, and hidden. Examples:

Nis hæn gescaef ³ara ða æ ne wiligo þest hit þíde cuman magan.
(Alfred, Beoth. (Fox): 88, 20)³

... uton bidden þæs æðelæn Dauides sunu þæs he geopenige ure gealde ...
(Byrhtferth’s manual: 60, 27)

Magan in the periphrastic subjunctive appeared in the subjunctive form.
The verb in the inflectional subjunctive and magan in the periphrastic sub-
junctive were either in the present or in the preterite tense form, according
to the rules of the sequence of tenses.³⁰

The meaning of the inflectional subjunctive was that of general non-fact
modality with respect to the occurrence of the event which was desired, and
the meaning of magan in the periphrastic subjunctive was that of non-factual
possibility as to the occurrence of the event expressed by the infinite. Thus
in the periphrastic subjunctive, it was the possibility of the occurrence of the
event that was desired rather than the event itself.

There were also numerous instances of the indicative in clauses depending
on expressions of volition, for example:

... [he] bebed Titus his suna þæt he towarp þæt templ on Hierusalem ...
(Alfred, Orosius: 282, 29)

³⁰ As a rule, a present tense form in the clause corresponded to a present tense form
in the introductory expression, and a preterite tense form in the clause corresponded
to a preterite tense form in the introductory expression.

In examples like this one, however, the object clauses can be treated as clauses
of result, i.e. expressing the result of a wish. In this case the modality would
be that of fact. Consequently, the periphrastic subjunctive with magan can be
considered as an additional and more prominent signal of non-fact modality
than the inflectional subjunctive.

2. The periphrastic subjunctive with magan alternated with the inflectional
subjunctive in indirect questions used as object clauses. The reporting verbs
were secan, ascian, fenecan, and the like. Examples:

Ac Isaias, ða-Dryhten ascode hwone he sendan mæhte, ða eowæþ Isaias ...
(Alfred, P. C.: 48, 9)

Gif hwam gelasstfullæ þo witanne hwæt sy quadrans, ...
(Byrhtferth’s manual: 4, 18)

The verb in the inflectional subjunctive and magan in the periphrastic sub-
junctive were either in the present or preterite tense form, as the rules of the
sequence of tenses determined. Since magan quite often appeared in the third
person singular preterite form, its inflectional form with respect to the formal
opposition indicative v. subjunctive was often unmarked.

The meaning of the inflectional subjunctive was general non-fact modality,
and the meaning of magan in the periphrastic subjunctive was possibility.
The preterite form of magan could, besides being a result of the sequence of
tense rules, express hypnosis; thus magan in the preterite form could ex-
press a hypothetical possibility with respect to the occurrence of the event
in the indirect question. These various forms of the subjunctive mood
expressed the speaker’s reserve or uncertainty as to the reported question.

The indicative form of the verb was also used in indirect questions. For
example:

Men æ wunon seogan to sóðe ... hwæ þæm hlæste onfæng.
(Beowulf: 30)

The indicative mood in indirect questions was an expression of fact modality;
in other words, the speaker did not express any uncertainty as to the reported
question. Magan + infinitive, on the other hand, was used to emphasize the
speaker’s uncertainty and served as a more prominent means than the in-
flectional subjunctive in signalling non-fact modality.

B. Attributive clauses

The periphrastic subjunctive with magan in the subjunctive or indicative
inflectional form and the inflectional subjunctive alternated in attributive
the occurrence of the event in the attributive clause. Examples:

...ic geomor seolc secan operne ellenleoeran under cumbol-hagen hampan seaman pe ic onbyrdan mege beormman mine agelan et gupe ...

(Juliana: 393)

... past was para pinga pe her peoda cynn gefugmen ...

(Christ: 224)

The inflectional subjunctive expressed general non-fact modality. *Magan* in the periphrastic subjunctive expressed possibility. The preterite form of *magan* expressed a hypothetical possibility if used in a present tense context. In a preterite tense context, the preterite form of *magan* meant either possibility in the past or a hypothetical possibility. The speaker's reserve could be coloured by these meanings of non-fact modality.

The indicative mood of the verb phrase in attributive clauses expressed fact modality; the speaker's reserve was no longer present. For example:

... pu fordydest alone men se pe hamf frame pe ...

(Lamb. Pa.: 72, 27)

As the inflectional subjunctive morphologically merged with the indicative, *magan* + infinitive served as an additional means of indicating non-fact modality.

C. Adverbial clauses

1. The periphrastic subjunctive with *magan* in the indicative or subjunctive inflectional form and the inflectional subjunctive alternated in clauses of purpose or contemplated result. These clauses were used to indicate the purpose or contemplated result of an activity expressed in the main clause. Examples:

Ealle pas ping we wyliad ha ameakian, past so iunge preost mege beon pe wisna, pe he pas ping geaisa.

(Byrhtferth's manual: 86, 16)

... lef us cene gesean wulderes pinas past pec weordian ... pa pu geworhte ...

(Christ: 159)

The inflectional subjunctive expressed general non-fact modality, and

magan in the periphrastic subjunctive expressed possibility. *Magan* in the preterite form could denote a hypothetical possibility unless it was used to indicate the past.

When the result in the subordinate clause was not intended but automatic, the indicative mood was used, and it signalled fact modality. For example:

... ic past gefremme per se freeond wunia ... past ge min onsym oft sceawiai.

(Guthlac: 715)

In sentences like this one, *past* should be interpreted as “with the consequence that”.

2. The periphrastic subjunctive with *magan*, as well as the inflectional subjunctive, appeared in clauses of condition. Such clauses were introduced by *gif*, on *pas gered*, *swa*, and *per*, or by no conjunction at all. *Magan* in the periphrastic subjunctive was in the preterite form and, therefore, in a number of grammatical contexts the inflectional opposition indicative v. subjunctive was neutralized. Examples:

*Gif* enig meden wite beon ofandian...


*Gif* per beon ma bonne seofon, do aweg pa per ofer beodu, ...  

(Byrhtferth's manual: 54, 18)

*Magan* in the periphrastic subjunctive expressed hypothetical possibility, and the inflectional subjunctive expressed general non-fact modality.

The indicative form of the verb also occurred frequently in clauses of condition. For example:

... *gif* hine god scileth ...

(Christ: 781)

Attempts have been made to correlate the formal distinction between the inflectional subjunctive and the indicative with the semantic distinction between non-fact modality and fact modality. Thus it has been stated that the indicative implies actuality of the state, etc. expressed in the clause. On the other hand, the subjunctive form of the verb, from this point of view, is considered as expressing uncertainty as to the actualization of the event. The same writers admit, however, that there are exceptions to this rule.

---


13 For instance, Bosworth and Toller in *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary. Supplement*, e.v. *gif*.
before it is more correct to say that in many OE writings, when the verb phrase is concerned, non-fact modality was expressed by the subjunctive mood (inflectional or periphrastic) or was left unexpressed when the indicative mood was used. There were always other grammatical devices which signalled non-fact modality, e.g. *gif*. In some instances, when *gif* meant “granting that”, the indicative mood expressed fact modality, as the case may be in:

... *gif* pu geowised swa wile deor ane from epele niis past onginn wile.

(Guthlac: 276)

In such a situation the role of the periphrastic subjunctive with *magan* may have been that of signalling non-fact modality more prominently, since the inflectional subjunctive and indicative alternated in non-fact modality contexts.

VI. In this section I shall briefly mention those types of clause in which the inflectional subjunctive did not alternate with the periphrastic subjunctive with *magan* in the OE period.

**Independent clauses**

1. Clauses expressing a wish whose realization depended on conditions beyond the control of the speaker

... *sic pe* in heannesseum eoe helo...

(Christ: 410)

2. Clauses expressing an exhortation, command, regulation, request, advice, encouragement, etc.¹⁴

... *Gebide* ge on berge...

(Beowulf: 2229)

3. Explanatory clauses preceded by *dat is* (donne) *dat*, ‘that is (then) to say’ in King Alfred’s *Pastoral Care*.

*Dat is* donne sweale mon mid foreweardere orde stinge, *dat* mon openlice & unforwondodlice on obern ræse mid telinge & mid frængia.

(Alfred, P. C.: 269, 11)

4. Independent questions introduced by *hwæter*, *hwæt*, *hwí, and forhwí

... *Hwæster* Edmene hit wifin na anegum men to secganne, hwet hiera folces on Ispanium on fæwum gearum forwurde!

(Alfred, Orosius: 220, 8)

The indicative could also appear in such clauses.

¹⁴ Command was also expressed in the imperative mood.

**Dependent clauses**

**Object clauses**

1. Clauses after expressions of emotion (fear, grief, shame, joy, etc.) and other mental activities (doubt, hope, marvelling, etc.)

He ondredan secal ðat he unnedome sie.

(Alfred, P. C.: 73, 21)

The indicative was also used in this type of clause.

2. Clauses after verbs of believing, trusting, and understanding.

...no ðeer gelydum in hira lihfrumang... past he God were...

(Andreas: 562)

The use of the indicative in these clauses expressed fact modality.

3. Clauses after verbs of saying, declaring, lying and denying.

... cristes pogan swealæ and ingæ past pu sde hlafinga...

(Christ: 283)

The use of the indicative in such clauses meant that the speaker had no reserve as to the truth of what he was saying.

**Adverbial clauses**

1. Temporal clauses introduced by *ær* and the like

Loornien hie ne pa mandwæran & hufnen, öddet hi hie hebben.

(Alfred, P. C.: 290, 1)

The indicative also occurred in clauses of this type.

2. Clauses of exception introduced by *buton* and *numga

... pises geres ne milt pu gemstan pæs embolismus mondes epactas buton

pu numga pæs obres gæres epactas.

(Byrhtferth’s manual: 108, 18)

3. Clauses of concession introduced by *Þeah* (*pe*) or not introduced by a conjunction and clauses of concession and indefiniteness as to the person, thing, place, time, etc. referred to in those clauses.

Donne wene ic to pe wyresan gapinges, Þeah pu heðoræsa gehwar dohte...

(Beowulf: 525)
piaes circules gewyna ys, oðde ryne, pæt locahwyole concurrentes boon on pam geare...

(Byrhtferth’s manual: 46, 18)

The indicative also occurred in such clauses.

4. Clauses of manner or degree

...doð nu swa ge willen...

(Alfred, Orosius: 296, 13)

The indicative can also be found in this type of clause.

5. Clauses of comparison

Das ping we williað openlicor gecydan ponne pæt Lydon do.

(Byrhtferth’s manual: 6, 6)

The indicative was also used in this type of clause.

6. Clauses of hypothetical similarity

...pu pa word spricest swa pu syfæ sie synne gehwylere fiéna gefylledd...

(Christ: 179)

The indicative also occurred in clauses of hypothetical similarity.

7. Resultative clauses

...ond swa lære da oðre caðmeta, swa he ðone ege to swibe ðæm oðrum ne geicee...

(Alfred, P. C.: 463, 19)

When the indicative mood was used, the activity expressed in the clause was not looked upon as contingent.

8. Clauses of cause, motive or reason

Ne spree he hit no forgyðe his mod auht genierwed weare...

(Alfred, P. C.: 304, 16)

Normally those clauses appeared with the indicative form of the verb.

9. Clauses of place

Hæfa bleuteunge offer middenaegard mine þær bæ ferre.

(Andreas: 223)

The subjunctive expressed doubt as to the finding or existence of the place.

The indicative expressed mere facts.

Subjunctive with magan in OE

Subject clauses:

1. Clauses which complement impersonal verbal constructions as him gerisæ, fahle him, etc.

...wel pe gerised þæt þu heafod þæc healle mære...

(Christ: 3)

When the indicative appeared in such clauses, it denoted fact modality.

2. Clauses which depended on introductory phrases of the type is alyfed, is to geliyene, and the like with verbs of mental activities and verbs of saying.

...þæt eow æfor ne bið úftan alyfed leohwes lissum þæt ge lof moten dryhtene seogan...

(Guthlac: 612)

The indicative denoted fact modality when it appeared in these clauses.

3. Clauses introduced by a phrase consisting of boon+adjective or noun.

þæt is þæs werðre þæste wer-peode secep dryhtene pone...

(Christ: 600)

The indicative also appeared in these clauses.

VII. The presentation of the periphrastic subjunctive with magan shows that this type of subjunctive mood alternated with the inflectional subjunctive only in certain types of clause in Old English: among independent clauses they were those which expressed an idle wish, hesitant statement, and apodosis of hypothetical condition; among dependent clauses they were those which depended on expressions of volition, indirect questions, attributive clauses, clauses of purpose, and clauses of condition. In these units magan+infinitive, like the inflectional subjunctive, denoted non-fact modality; however, magan also introduced its individual meaning of nihil obstat possibility, whereas the inflectional subjunctive expressed general non-fact modality. When magan was in the preterite form and was used without reference to any time sphere, it expressed a hypothetical possibility; when the preterite form of magan appeared in a past time context, it was ambiguous as it could express possibility in the past or a hypothetical possibility.

Although magan+infinitive and the inflectional subjunctive appeared in identical syntactic units, they were not wholly semantically interchangeable. The use of one or the other form of the subjunctive mood was determined by this difference in meaning.

11 The classification of subject clauses is based on syntactic criteria.
When used in the present tense form, magan tended to appear in the subjunctive inflectional form; in the preterite, however, the formal distinction indicative v. subjunctive existed only for the second person singular, and for the plural, so in many instances the preterite form of magan may be said to have been unmarked for mood. When magan was in the subjunctive inflectional form, it expressed the meaning of (hypothetical) possibility coloured with general non-fact modality.

In all the clauses in which the two types of subjunctive mood alternated, these shades of non-fact modality were compatible with the rest of the semantic environment. For example, there would have been no such semantic compatibility between magan in the periphrastic subjunctive and the illocutionary act occurring in clauses employing the inflectional subjunctive to express exhortation or command: an exhortation or command is concerned with having the addressee perform the event and not with the possibility of performing it.

For the clauses where the alternation discussed took place, except clauses expressing an idle wish and apodosis of hypothetical condition, there existed comparable clauses of the verb in the indicative form. The difference between the indicative and the subjunctive was almost always parallel with the semantic difference between fact modality and non-fact modality; clauses of condition could be an exception. Considering the diminishing formal opposition between the inflectional subjunctive and the indicative, it can be assumed that one of the functions of magan+infinitive was to serve as a more distinctive and productive means of signalling non-fact modality than the inflectional subjunctive.

The periphrastic subjunctive with magan was not connected in any semantically exclusive way with the group of clauses in which it appeared in Old English. This periphrastic subjunctive widened its range of occurrence to other clauses in the subsequent periods. For instance, it appeared later in clauses expressing a wish.

Some of the facts concerning the use of the periphrastic subjunctive with magan are summarized in the table.

---

**SOURCES**


---

⁴⁴ With the exception of the preterite indicative when it was used without reference to any time sphere (the so-called modal preterite).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of clause</th>
<th>magan in OE</th>
<th>indicative in compound clauses</th>
<th>indicative in simple clauses</th>
<th>indicative as a verbal of fact modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle wish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitant statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apodosis of hypothetical condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhortation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions introduced by <em>hine</em>, <em>hine</em>, <em>hence</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent clauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Object clauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of volition + clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb of asking + clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of emotion + clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of believing, trusting, etc. + clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of saying, declaring, lying + clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Attributive clauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adverbial clauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses of purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses of condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal clauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses of exception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses of concession and indefiniteness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses of manner or degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses of comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses of hypothetical similarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses of result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses of cause, motive or reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses of place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Subject clauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hine gena</em>+clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>is aliyft</em>+clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>is (wae)+adjective</em>+clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The periphrastic subjunctive with magan versus the inflectional subjunctive and the indicative in various types of clause in Old English.
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