THE SUBJUNCTIVE, *SHOULD* AND THE INDICATIVE IN DEPENDENT IMPERATIVE CLAUSES – THE CHANGES IN BRITISH ENGLISH BETWEEN THE 1960s AND 2008

BARBORA VLČKOVÁ

1. Introduction

The influence of American English (AmE) on other varieties of the language has been a subject of intense discussion. Many assumptions about its impact on the grammar, lexicon and pronunciation of other varieties of English have been made, most of which turned out to be overemphasized or merely temporary (Mair, 2006: 193–195). There are, however, instances of linguistic Americanization, long-term and systematic. One of them is the development of the dependent imperative clause in British English (BrE).

In present-day English, three different forms of the verb phrase can be found in the dependent imperative clause: the mandative subjunctive, the construction with *should* and the indicative, e.g. *I demand that he go/should go/goes with us.* The first of the variants, the subjunctive, has been generally considered a specific feature of AmE, occurring rarely in BrE, in which the construction with *should* is commonly preferred. However, standard grammars of the second half of the 20th century state that the mandative subjunctive, although it is somewhat marked and largely limited to formal contexts, seems to be increasing in use in BrE, presumably due to the influence of AmE (cf. Quirk et al., 1985: 156–157). The use of the indicative in this environment, on the other hand, is confined to BrE (*ibid.*: 1180).

According to Övergaard's corpus-based research (1995), there was a prominent redistribution of the paradigmatic variants in question in BrE over the last century: while in the first half of the 20th century the subjunctive appeared infrequently, and was even claimed to be nearly extinct, the post-war decades saw a dramatic revival of its use.[1] From the 1960s to the 1990s, a gradual rise of the mandative subjunctive can be traced.

A similar analysis of the distribution of different variants in dependent imperative clauses was carried out by Serpollet (2001), which confirmed the results given by Övergaard: the use of the mandative subjunctive in BrE increased significantly during the second half of the 20th century, whereas the construction with *should* declined. More

---

[1] This substantial change could be accounted for as a result of the vast development of the mass media after the Second World War, and the consequent availability of various American texts in Europe. The impact of the language of these texts on BrE may have been so great as to initiate the re-establishment of the mandative subjunctive in this regional variety (Övergaard, 1995: 51).

specifically, the BrE of 1991 showed twice as many instances of the subjunctive in this environment than the BrE of 1961[2] (2001: 538).

The aim of the present paper is to re-examine the dependent imperative clause and the different forms of the verb phrase used in it in BrE, with special attention to the mandative subjunctive and the construction with *should*. Using three diachronically comparable corpora (including the most recent BE06, which documents BrE in the early 21st century), the paper extends previous studies (Övergaard, 1995; Serpollet, 2001), and focuses on the development of the distribution of these variants from the 1960s, through the rest of the 20th century, to the first decade of the present century.

2. Background

2.1 Dependent imperative clause

The dependent imperative clause is described by Dušková et al. (2006: 594) as a subtype of the content clause; that is, a subordinate clause which conveys the content of what is implied in the main clause. The specific type of the dependent clause (i.e., declarative, interrogative, exclamative, optative or imperative), as well as its form, is governed by the expression in the superordinate clause they depend on. The imperative content clause is a reported directive, which typically occurs in the form of the infinitive (ex. 1), but can be also expressed by a finite clause with the *should*-construction (ex. 2) or the subjunctive (ex. 3).

(1) She entreated him *to be* patient. (Dušková et al., 2006: 606)
(2) I suggest that we *should consult* a lawyer. (*ibid.*)
(3) I demand that my complaint *be* dealt with at once. (*ibid.*: 599)

In the Anglo-American tradition, content clauses are referred to as complement clauses (cf. Biber et al., 2000) or nominal clauses (cf. Quirk et al., 1985). Further subclassification of the nominal *that*-clauses relies on the category of the governing expression in the superordinate clause. The dependent clauses in which the mandative subjunctive occurs in variation with the *should*-construction and the indicative are governed by 'suasive' expressions, i.e. verbs, nouns or adjectives which imply "intentions to bring about some change in the future, whether or not these are verbally formulated as commands, suggestions, etc." (Quirk et al., 1985: 1180), e.g. *demand*, *suggest*, *require*, *request*, *important*, *order*, etc.[3]

Although some grammarians have gone as far as suggesting that there are in fact no dependent imperative clauses,[4] the terminology employed in the present paper follows

---

[2]   Like Övergaard, Serpollet ascribes this change – among other things – to Americanization (2002: 541).
[3]   Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 999) refer to this semantic class as mandative expressions.
[4]   Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 943) state: "Imperatives normally occur as main clauses: there is no grammatically distinct construction that can properly be regarded as the subordinate counterpart of a main clause imperative […] Imperatives are generally used as directives and directives can of course be reported. But they are reported by means of constructions where the subordinate clauses are syntactically and semantically very different from imperative clauses."

Dušková et al.: the term dependent imperative clause will be used here to refer to a subordinate *that*-clause whose predicate is realized by the mandative subjunctive, the construction with *should*, or the indicative, following a suasive expression in the main clause.

2.2 Mandative construction

Mandative constructions[5] are understood as the predicative verb forms occurring in dependent imperative clauses. Following Serpollet, we can distinguish four formal types of mandative constructions: the mandative subjunctive, realized by the base form of the verb (ex. 4), mandative *should* followed by an infinitive, in the present paper referred to as the *should*-construction (ex. 5), the indicative (ex. 6), and what she refers to as 'the non-distinctive form' (ex. 7), where the subjunctive and the indicative are not formally distinguishable.

(4) She insisted that he *leave* early.
(5) I insisted that he *should take part* in the concert.
(6) She was eager that he *left* early.
(7) He suggests that we *leave* early (Serpollet, 2001: 532–533).

Example (7), the non-distinctive form of the mandative construction, shows the subjunctive formally identical with the indicative, which is often the case. The subjunctive in present-day English[6] is clearly distinguishable from the indicative only in specific environments: firstly, the verb *be* has, unlike other verbs, indicative forms distinct from its base form in all persons and both numbers, and thus they always overtly differ from the subjunctive (ex. 8). Secondly, the subjunctive and the indicative contrast in all verbs in the third person singular of the present tense (ex. 9). Thirdly, the subjunctive is represented by the base form of the verb irrespective of the sequence of tenses. Hence, while the indicative forms are liable to backshifting, the subjunctive does not change its form and is easily detectable in non-present tenses (ex. 10). Finally, unlike the indicative, the subjunctive does not take the *do*-operator in negative sentences; instead, the word *not* preceding the verb is used to express negation (ex. 11).

(8)   It is important that the burden *be* shared (Övergaard, 1995: 93).
(9)   I demand that *he hand in* a formal complaint (*ibid.*).
(10) He *insisted* that she *leave* the premises (*ibid.*).
(11) Her demand that we *not reveal* her identity was only to be expected (*ibid.*).

---

[5]   Mandative constructions are to be distinguished from mandative expressions, which refer to the verbs, adjectives and nouns expressing a demand, request, proposal, suggestion, recommendation, etc., which may appear in main clauses, termed suasive by Quirk et al. (1985: 1180).
[6]   The subjunctive as a verbal mood has undergone great development in the history of English. In Old English it had a special form, distinct from the indicative. However, as the inflectional endings were generally reduced phonetically or entirely lost in the Middle English period, the subjunctive and the indicative became formally indistinct (Vachek, Firbas, 1994: 222–223).

2.2.1 Ambiguity between mandative
and non-mandative constructions

2.2.1.1 Subjunctive versus indicative

As mentioned above, the distinction between the subjunctive and the indicative in dependent imperative clauses can be neutralized. If this happens in constructions which follow expressions allowing both mandative and non-mandative complements (e.g. *insist*, *suggest*), ambiguity may arise. The verb *insist* has two different meanings: it can be interpreted either as suasive, meaning 'to demand' (ex. 12), and its clausal complementation is then mandative, realized by the dependent imperative clause; or it can be understood rather as a factual[7] verb, synonymous with 'to declare firmly' (ex. 13), in which case its complementation is non-mandative, the following subordinate clause being declarative.[8] The same applies to the verb *suggest*, which can be semantically suasive, meaning 'to propose' (ex. 14), or factual, meaning 'to mention as a possibility' (ex. 15) (Övergaard, 1995: 63). Without knowing the context, we may not be able to determine whether the construction occurring in a *that*-clause after these verbs is mandative or non-mandative (ex. 16).

(12) She *insists* that he *take* the eight o'clock train (Huddleston, Pullum, 2002: 996).
(13) She *insists* that he took the eight o'clock train (*ibid.*).
(14) He *suggested* that John *lie* about their destination (Övergaard, 1995: 63).
(15) He *suggested* that John *lied* about their destination (*ibid.*).
(16) She *insists* that he *takes* / they *take* the eight o'clock train (Huddleston, Pullum, 2002: 996).

Insist in example (12) is clearly suasive, as it is followed by a dependent imperative clause containing a mandative construction with an overt subjunctive. Example (13), on the other hand, shows the factual meaning of the verb, expressing no volition and thus eliciting non-mandative complementation with the indicative. The *that*-clause following the factual *insist* is not to be understood as a dependent imperative clause, but as a dependent declarative one. Example (16) is ambiguous: *he takes* could be a covert mandative construction realized by the indicative, meaning "she insists on his taking this train, either on some particular occasion or habitually" (Huddleston, Pullum, 2002: 996). The more likely interpretation, however, is that *he takes* represents a non-mandative construction and that the whole sentence means that "she emphatically asserts it to be the case that he takes this train – most probably a matter of his habitually doing so, but it could be a single future occurrence with a futurate interpretation ('She emphatically

---

[7] Besides suasive expressions, Quirk et al. (1985: 1180) distinguish other semantic classes of superordinate verbs – or possibly nouns and adjectives – factual, emotional and hypothesis expressions. While suasive expressions are associated with directives, factual expressions are "associated with the expression of speech acts concerned with statements". They introduce 'factual' or propositional information, and if complemented by a subordinate finite clause, the verb phrase constituting it is always realized by the indicative.

[8] Unlike the dependent imperative clause, which is a reported directive, the dependent declarative clause represents a reported statement, that is, a fact asserted or refuted by the speaker. If it is expressed by a finite clause, the verb is generally in the form of the indicative, although the conditional is also possible (Dušková et al., 2006: 311).

maintains that he is scheduled to take the eight o'clock train.')" (*ibid*.: 996). The version with *they take*, in addition to displaying the same ambiguity, is in the mandative sense also morphologically ambiguous, as we cannot decide whether the form is the subjunctive or the indicative (*ibid*.).

2.2.1.2 Mandative versus modal should

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 998), the construction with *should* following *insist* and *suggest* can also be understood as ambiguous (exx. 17, 18).

(17) They insisted that all murderers *should be* hanged.
(18) They suggested that we *should engage* a lawyer (*ibid*.).

Due to the two-fold semantics of the verbs *suggest* and *insist*, we can interpret the dependent clauses in both examples (17, 18) either as imperative or declarative. In the former case, the use of *should* is mandative, equivalent to the subjunctive in this environment; in the latter case, however, the verbal construction is to be understood as consisting of an intrinsic modal (i.e. non-mandative) *should* and the infinitive. Accordingly, example (17) can be interpreted in two slightly different ways: if the sentence is to be understood as "they insisted on having all murderers hanged", then *should* in the dependent clause is mandative, as the intention of the speakers referred to as 'they' can be likewise expressed by an imperative (e.g. "Hang them!"). If, on the other hand, the sentence is interpreted as "they forcefully expressed their view as to the right punishment for murderers" (*ibid*.), then *should* represents a means of deontic modality within the dependent declarative clause, the intention being to state an opinion (e.g. "They should be hanged."). The same holds for example (18).

3. Research

3.1 Material and method

The paper employs corpus linguistic tools and methods, complemented by manual analysis. To obtain the required data, three diachronically comparable corpora of written BrE, matching roughly in size and composition,[9] were used:

- LOB (Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen corpus) – containing texts published in 1961
- FLOB (Freiburg-LOB corpus) – containing texts published in 1991
- BE06 (British English 2006) – containing texts published between the years 2003 and 2008

Twenty suasive expressions were selected for the research:[10] *ask, command, demand, dictate, insist, order, prefer, propose, recommend, request, require, stipulate, suggest, urge,*

---

[9] Each corpus contains 500 files (each one consisting of approximately 2,000 words) subdivided into 15 genre categories, altogether making about 1 million words.
[10] In selecting these expressions, the BE06 corpus was searched for left collocates of the construction consisting of *that* as a conjunction, followed – not necessarily immediately – by *should*. The most

anxious, *crucial*, *essential*, *imperative*, *important*, *necessary*. Where possible, the corresponding nouns and adjectives of the selected verbs were added to the analysis (e.g. *suggestion*, *recommendation*, etc.). These expressions were then searched for individually in all their morphological forms in the BE06, LOB and FLOB corpora; the concordance lines were checked manually to exclude sentences which did not contain a dependent imperative clause.[11]

The relevant sentences were described according to the following five criteria:

- The corpus from which the item was extracted, i.e. from which period of time it comes (LOB, FLOB, BE06).
- The type of mandative construction in the dependent imperative clause (the mandative subjunctive, the construction with *should*, the indicative[12] and the non-distinct, or ambiguous, form).
- The mandative expression eliciting the dependent imperative clause (*demand*, *suggest*, *recommend*, etc.).
- The type of verb constituting the mandative construction (the verb *be*, lexical verb,[13] or modal verb).
- The type of text from which the example comes (learned prose, general prose, press and fiction[14]).

3.2 Data analysis

3.2.1 Overall results

As has been already mentioned, previous studies and secondary literature suggest that there has been a growing tendency to use the mandative subjunctive at the expense of its periphrastic variant, the construction with *should*, in BrE since the beginning of the latter half of the 20th century. The following table shows the frequencies of individual types of mandative constructions in dependent imperative clauses in 1961 (LOB), 1991 (FLOB) and the years from 2003 to 2008 (BE06).

---

frequent suasive expressions which governed the *that*-clause were selected for further analysis. Their occurrences in BE06 were examined in detail, and they were used to formulate comparable queries in LOB and FLOB.

[11] A careful analysis was required in the case of instances with the expressions *suggest* and *insist* in the superordinate clause, which can be followed by dependent imperative as well as dependent declarative clauses. It was not always possible to ultimately decide the type of the dependent clause, as both the mandative and non-mandative interpretation was usually possible (see 2.2.1). The ambiguous examples were nevertheless included in the research.

[12] Among the indicative forms, instances where the verb form in the dependent clause is represented by a modal verb other than *should* were included.

[13] The few examples with the copular verb *become* were added to the category of lexical verbs because it behaves as such with respect to indicative and subjunctive forms.

[14] These categories follow Serpollet's classification of genres (2001: 535).

Table 1. Frequency of the types of mandative constructions and their relative representation in LOB, FLOB and BE06

	subjunctive		*should*		ambiguous		indicative		Total	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
LOB 1961	16	12.0	93	69.9	10	7.5	14	10.5	**133**	**100**
FLOB 1991	33	27.7	51	42.9	22	18.5	13	10.9	**119**	**100**
BE06 2003–8	24	22.9	26	24.8	36	34.3	19	18.1	**105**	**100**

The results document a striking decrease in the representation of the *should*-construction between the 1960s and 2000s: the ratio of occurrences of *should* in dependent imperative clauses in the LOB corpus makes up 69.9%, a majority of all possible constructions; in the FLOB corpus it drops to 42.9% and finally in the BE06 corpus it represents only 24.8%, no longer ranking first in representation.

Regarding the mandative subjunctive, the data somewhat surprisingly indicate that although its use has clearly increased since 1961, the number of instances in BE06 is not higher than in FLOB, nor does it surpass the instances with *should*. From this it may seem that the subjunctive is again declining in BrE; yet a closer look at the data reveals that it is not so: it should be noted that the number of instances of the ambiguous, non-distinct form – which cannot be clearly identified as either the subjunctive or the indicative, but may represent the mandative subjunctive – has substantially increased. Particularly from 1991 to 2000s, its frequency almost doubled.

Also, it is important to realize which suasive expressions elicit the respective constructions. The verb *suggest* is unique in that it clearly prefers the construction with *should*: the ratio of *should*-constructions following *suggest* (27% of mandative constructions governed by *suggest*) is considerably higher than the representation of these constructions following other expressions (4% on the average), and the majority of all *should*-constructions in the BE06 corpus is indeed found in dependent imperative clauses governed by *suggest*. In fact, had the particular expression not been included in the research, the results would be quite different.[15] This specific feature of *suggest* might be associated with its complex semantics and the indeterminacy between mandative and modal intrinsic *should* in the dependent clauses (see 2.2.1.2), in which case the data would appear to be inconclusive due to a number of indeterminate clauses, which may not in fact be imperative but rather declarative.

The quantitative results also suggest an increase in the use of the indicative (the ratio of its occurrences being 10.5 in LOB, 10.9 in FLOB and 18.1 in BE06). A more detailed qualitative analysis of the collected data shows, however, that this increase is significant merely in instances with the suasive expression *important*. While the indicative in examples from LOB and FLOB is distributed more or less evenly – with no suasive expression

---

[15] If we exclude the instances with the verb *suggest* (and the corresponding noun *suggestion*) from the research material, the overall results for the BE06 corpus will change in favour of the subjunctive, with the ratio of mandative subjunctives higher than the ratio of *should*-constructions by 3.5%.

showing a particular preference for it, in BE06 there is a clear bias: of all the indicative forms occurring in the corpus, 42% – a great preponderance – are governed by *important*.[16] Therefore, the quantitative increase should not be interpreted as a general phenomenon, but rather ascribed to the growing tendency of the suasive expression *important* to be followed by the indicative in dependent imperative clauses.[17]

3.2.2 The type of verb constituting the mandative construction

The type of the verb constituting the mandative construction was examined in this study mainly to confirm or disprove the assumption offered by Quirk et al. that "there is a tendency in BrE to choose the [mandative] subjunctive more especially when the finite verb is BE" (1985: 157). The results are presented in Tables 2, 3 and 4.

Table 2. Frequency of different types of verbs constituting the respective mandative constructions in LOB (1961)

	BE		lexical verb		modal verb		Total	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
subjunctive	11	69	5	31	0	0	**16**	**100**
should	42	45	51	55	0	0	**93**	**100**
ambiguous	0	0	10	100	0	0	**10**	**100**
indicative	4	29	2	14	8	57	**14**	**100**

Table 3. Frequency of different types of verbs constituting the respective mandative constructions in FLOB (1991)

	BE		lexical verb		modal verb		Total	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
subjunctive	24	73	9	27	0	0	**33**	**100**
should	26	51	25	49	0	0	**51**	**100**
ambiguous	0	0	22	100	0	0	**22**	**100**
indicative	7	54	1	8	5	38	**13**	**100**

---

[16] In FLOB, only 15% of all indicative forms are governed by *important*. In LOB, there is no occurrence of the indicative following this expression.

[17] This tendency has been verified in a larger corpus, the British National Corpus (BNC). 161 random instances of the suasive expression *important* followed by a dependent imperative clause were recorded, out of which 48% were realized by the indicative. Compared to the representation of the indicative in dependent imperative clauses governed by other expressions, viz. *suggest*, *recommend*, *demand*, and *require* (elicited from comparable excerptions from the BNC), which are 6, 9, 16 and 30% respectively, the ratio of indicative forms following *important* is significantly high. It can thus be concluded that there is a strong tendency to use the indicative in dependent imperative clauses after the expression *important*.

Table 4. Frequency of different types of verbs constituting the respective mandative constructions in BE06 (2003–8)

	BE		lexical verb		modal verb		Total	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
subjunctive	11	46	13	54	0	0	**24**	**100**
should	12	46	14	54	0	0	**26**	**100**
ambiguous	0	0	36	100	0	0	**36**	**100**
indicative	10	53	6	32	3	16	**19**	**100**

If we look at the results obtained from the corpora representing BrE of the late 20th century, we can conclude, in support of Quirk et al., that a majority of verbs forming the mandative subjunctive in the 1960s (LOB), and even more so in the 1990s (FLOB), is represented by the verb *be*.[18] Various lexical verbs used to express the subjunctive in the dependent imperative clause make up only about one third of the total. Nevertheless, the data from the early 21st century (BE06) show an interesting change: of all the verbs in the form of the mandative subjunctive, the majority are lexical, i.e. other than *be*, with the overall percentage being 54 – twice as high as in the preceding decade (FLOB). Hence, it seems that the special preference for the mandative subjunctive when the verb in the dependent clause is *be* – rather than some other verb – is no longer the case.

The assumption suggested by Quirk et al. can thus be confirmed only with the temporal restriction to the period of the late 20th century. It should, however, be noted that the relation between *be* and other verbs in the subjunctive construction may not be an ideal point to be examined in the research of dependent imperative clauses: the verb *be* cannot occur in the ambiguous, non-distinct form because, unlike any other verb, it has a special base form, different from all its indicative forms, and therefore its subjunctive can be clearly identified and distinguished from the indicative in any environment. Because of this, it cannot be directly compared with other verbs, the results of whose frequencies of the mandative subjunctive are less conclusive due to a certain number of ambiguous forms.

3.2.3 Genre

According to Serpollet (2001: 535), the trend of the decreasing mandative *should* in BrE between the years 1961 to 1991 cannot be generalized to all genres of texts. The results of the current research are shown in the following tables.

---

[18] Irrespective of whether it is part of the passive construction or some other use of the verb.

Table 5. Frequency of the types of mandative constructions in different genres in LOB (1961)

	subjunctive		should		ambiguous		indicative		Total	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
fiction	3	21	7	50	3	21	1	7	14	100
general prose	3	7	33	79	2	5	4	10	42	100
learned prose	5	12	27	64	2	5	8	19	42	100
press	5	14	26	74	3	9	1	3	35	100

Table 6. Frequency of the types of mandative constructions in different genres in FLOB (1991)

	subjunctive		should		ambiguous		indicative		Total	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
fiction	6	38	6	38	4	25	0	0	16	100
general prose	9	23	18	46	10	26	2	5	39	100
learned prose	14	31	17	38	6	13	8	18	45	100
press	4	21	10	53	2	11	3	16	19	100

Table 7. Frequency of the types of mandative constructions in different genres in BE06 (2003–8)

	subjunctive		should		ambiguous		indicative		Total	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
fiction	3	19	3	19	7	44	3	19	16	100
general prose	4	10	12	29	18	43	8	19	42	100
learned prose	9	32	9	32	6	21	4	14	28	100
press	8	42	2	11	5	26	4	21	19	100

These data show the *should*-construction in dependent imperative clauses in BrE to have declined since 1961 (LOB) irrespective of the genre category. Nevertheless, it seems that in each genre, the decrease of *should* has a different scope. The category which appears to have experienced the greatest change in the representation of the construction with *should* is the category of press: in 1961 (LOB), *should* makes up 74% of all mandative constructions in press texts; in 1991 (FLOB), it is no more than 53%, and in the 2000s (BE06), it is only 11%, thus becoming the least frequent construction in the category. Correspondingly, press is the only category in which the use of the mandative subjunctive strikingly increases. This could be accounted for by the fact that journalists usually have limited space for their articles, which often need to be quite succinct. As the subjunctive form is the shortest of the variants, it seems to be the optimal choice in journalistic writing.

In other categories, the increase of the subjunctive from 1991 to the 2000s (FLOB, BE06) is either negligible (learned prose), or there is – rather than an increase – a decrease in the numbers (general prose). However, it is important to bear in mind the difficulty in drawing conclusions – regarding the increase or decrease of the mandative subjunctive – caused by the ambiguous forms discussed in 3.2.1.

4. Conclusion

Drawing on the data obtained from three corpora of BrE, covering the 1960s, 1990s and 2000s respectively, the research shows that in BrE the distribution of mandative constructions constituting dependent imperative clauses has significantly changed during this period. The construction with *should* decreased markedly between the 1960s and the 2000s, most prominently so in the category of press. However, the assumption of the corresponding general increase in the occurrence of the mandative subjunctive – or its possible predominance over other constructions – cannot be safely confirmed, mainly due to the inevitable presence of ambiguous, non-distinct forms, which correspond to both the subjunctive and the indicative. Although these forms may in fact represent the subjunctive in the registered examples, they cannot be unambiguously treated as subjunctives, because BrE allows the possibility of the indicative in dependent imperative clauses as an alternative to the subjunctive and the *should*-construction.

Regarding the mandative subjunctive itself, the research has shown that the tendency to use it specifically when the verb is *be*, as described by Quirk et al. (1985: 157), no longer applies to dependent imperative clauses in the 2000s. According to the findings of the research, the number of lexical verbs used in the mandative subjunctive has grown since the second half of the 20th century: a fact implying that this construction may be spreading to all kinds of uses in BrE. However, the validity of a comparison of the subjunctive in the case of the verb *be* and of other verbs is limited by the fact that *be* is, in this respect, morphologically unique in having distinct indicative and subjunctive forms.

An interesting secondary finding of this study is that certain suasive expressions seem to have preferences for specific mandative constructions. The verb *suggest* differs from other expressions in the high ratio of *should*-constructions governed by it. A plausible explanation is that these results are affected by the indeterminacy between mandative and intrinsic *should*, but it could also be argued that there is a general tendency to choose the *should*-construction rather than another variant when the governing verb is *suggest*. A clearer case is that of *important*, which shows an unambiguous preference for the indicative in its mandative complementation. This strong tendency, however, is only a recent development.

REFERENCES

Biber, D. et al. (2000) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow, Longman.
Dušková, L. et al. (2006) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha, Academia.
Huddleston, R., Pullum, G. K. (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge, University Press.

Mair, C. (2006) *Twentieth-Century English: History, Variation and Standardization*. Cambridge, University Press.

Övergaard, G. (1995) *The Mandative Subjunctive in American and British English in the 20th Century*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia 94. Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, Longman.

Serpollet, N. (2001), The *mandative subjunctive* in British English seems to be alive and kicking … Is this due to the influence of American English? In P. Rayson et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2001 Conference*. Lancaster University, UCREL Technical Papers 13: 531–542.

Vachek, J., Firbas, J. (1994) *Historický vývoj angličtiny*. Brno: Vydavatelství Masarykovy Univerzity.

Sources and tools
Leech, G. et al. (1961) *Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus: 1 million words, 1961.*
Mair, C. et al. (1991) *Freiburg-LOB Corpus: 1 million words, 1991–1996.*
Baker, P. (2006) *British English 2006 Corpus: 1 million words, 2003–2008.* Accessed through http://cqpweb.lancs.ac.uk/be2006/index.php.
British National Corpus: 100 million words. Online service managed by Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium. Accessed through http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk/cgibinbncXML/BNCquery.pl?theQuery=search&urlTest=yes.
Anthony, L. *AntConc*, version 3.2.2.w (windows). Freeware downloaded from http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/software.html.

**KONJUNKTIV, *SHOULD* A INDIKATIV
V ZÁVISLÝCH VĚTÁCH ROZKAZOVACÍCH:
ZMĚNY V BRITSKÉ ANGLIČTINĚ
V OBDOBÍ 1960–2008**

Resumé

V anglické závislé rozkazovací větě se pro realizaci přísudku nabízejí tři různé formy: konjunktiv, konstrukce se *should* a indikativ. Článek se zabývá těmito paradigmatickými variantami a vývojem jejich distribuce od druhé poloviny 20. století do současnosti. Výzkumný materiál byl získán ze tří korpusů britské angličtiny, mapujících situaci v šedesátých a devadesátých letech a od počátku tohoto století. Hlavním zjištěním práce je, že mezi 60. lety minulého století a začátkem 21. století v britské angličtině výrazně pokleslo užití konstrukce se *should* v poměru k jeho variantám, a to nejvýrazněji v žánru tisku. Výsledky dále potvrdily předpokládaný vzestup konjunktivu v daných vedlejších větách, avšak jen v rámci druhé poloviny 20. století. Od 90. let do současnosti pak nárůst konjunktivu sledovat nelze, nicméně práce upozorňuje na zvýšený počet případů s konstrukcemi, u kterých nelze formálně rozlišit, zda jde o konjunktiv nebo indikativ, a které jsou zaznamenány zvlášť. Výsledná frekvence užití konjunktivu by jimi mohla být oslabena.