

The Mood Marker *Should* and its Historical Development

Mitsuhiro OHMURA

In this article, I deal with the putative *should* in Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) sense. What interests me is the semantic conditions under which the putative *should* is permitted. As (1)-(3) shows, it seems that the distribution of the putative *should* cannot be captured uniformly in synchronic terms. For example, the embedded clauses in (1)-(3) cannot fall under one and only one semantic function.

- (1) Cristie, *The Secret Adversary*, p.41

It is absolutely essential that we should without delay map out a plan of campaign.

- (2) Cristie, *The Secret Adversary*, p.98

I'm surprised you should have been gulped so easily.

- (3) Doyle, 'The Boscombe Valley Mystery,' p.97

One was the fact that his father should, according to his account, cry 'Cooee!' before seeing him.

I demonstrate that the distribution and various functions of the putative *should* can be best analyzed in diachronic terms (*i.e.*, grammaticalization). The development of the putative *should* will be described as follows:

Stage 1: The premodal *sculan*, which had the obligation and necessity meanings, was used in the embedded clauses whose matrix predicates were harmonic in meaning with it.

Stage 2: The premodal in question changed through grammaticalization to a functional element which marked the mood of the embedd-

ed clauses (a 'mood marker' in our terms).

Stage 3: The mood marker *should* expanded over various types of embedded clauses when certain conditions were met.

Stage 4: The rhetorical effects of the mood marker *should* came into use in the complement clauses of emotive predicates, and then also in certain other clauses.