Click Here

\>\>_>_No intention on the speaker's part: objective future. But when I say: "What will I do?" that means: "What do I intend to do?"Subjective volition now for a future action after now, When I say: "One day I'll die", if I were to express the modal fully, I should say: "One day I shall die" because I am obliged to die - I have no choice over the matter. But if I were to say: "I will die tomorrow", that means I intend to die tomorrow. For example, if I were a samurai general who had just lost a battle, I should say: I have failed my liege lord: I must die. (must = absolute necessity/moral duty) I will disembowel myself tomorrow morning. (will = intention at the moment of speaking)I will die at nine o'clock prompt and my aide-de-camps shall assist me. (will = intention, shall = obliging my aides to assist me, giving them an order) Last edited by a moderator: Jun 22, 2010 If you refuse to read my posts, I'll not read yours. And that " 'll " in "...I'll not read.." above is "will" because the speaker is refusing to read, is not willing to read his correspondent's post.If I should die, think only this of me;That there's some corner of a foreign fieldThat is forever England.So wrote Rupert Brooke, and he was not willing to die, neither hypothetically nor in reality. He used should to indicate his hypothetical obligation to die, which obligation would be the pre-condition for the rendering of a corner of a foreign field forever England. Last edited: Jun 22, 2010 The higher the pedestal, the less wind it takes to knock one off. "I should be happy to " is horribly stilted and would only be said by an officious person or indeed the queen. Most everyone else avoids the should/would and shall/will by using 'd and 'll. In spoken English, "I'd/I'll be happy to answer them" is what would be said without betraying any social standing. Do you use this often this kind of phrasing?Is it in place of "almost everyone else?"Sorry to break in, and sorry for the asking something not strictly related to the topic. Lux, you'll have to open a new thread about that. Moscowexile, I'm now actually referring to you as pompous for putting people into the categories of educated/not educated. Language changes. Use of language changes. Your "shall" example from President Woodrow Wilson must be more than 60 years old. Things change. This does not mean that those who do not use the word "shall" are uneducated simpletons as you seem to imply. Different usages have been well enough explained here and elsewhere.This thread has wandered rather, and has become polemical.WordReference does not offer a platform for polemics.The thread has therefore been closed. \>\>_