The Omission of "Have" before a Past Participle

Author(s): G. C. Moore Smith

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Jul., 1910), pp. 346-347

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713369>

Accessed: 25/06/2014 03:05

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

in question were substituted for those originally occupying their place (Tovey, p. 216, and p. 205; Gray to Mason, in a letter written in June: 'the six last lines of the fifth stanza are new; tell me if they will do,' Gosse's edition, vol. II, p. 317).

With regard to the question of Gray's indebtedness elsewhere to any Latin poet of the renaissance, Mr Gosse suggests (I, 137) that the *Amatory Lines*:

With beauty, with pleasure surrounded, to languish,

are 'a paraphrase of an epigram in the sixth book of the *Erotikon* of Hercules Strozius the Elder, *Ad Carolum*.' By this is meant the tenth poem in lib. VI of the *Erotica* of Titus Vespasianus Stroza (Hercules was the son). Mr Gosse's index seems at the first blush to indicate a further obligation on Gray's part to a neo-Latin versifier, as we read 'Scaliger, Julius Caesar, *The Propertius* of Gray influenced by the writings of, II, 112.' The words prove to be these (letter to Richard West, May 8, 1742): 'Now, as to myself and my translation, pray do not call names. I never saw Broukhusius in my life. It is Scaliger who attempted to range Propertius in order; who was, and still is, in sad condition.' The reference here is fairly obvious and has nothing to do with Julius Caesar Scaliger. Gray had sent West in the previous month his translation of Propertius, II, 1, and speaks of Joseph Scaliger's contribution to the textual criticism of the poet in his edition of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius.

EDWARD BENSLY.

ABERYSTWYTH.

THE OMISSION OF 'HAVE' BEFORE A PAST PARTICIPLE.

In the first number of the *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* (January 1909) Professor Bang of Louvain remarks in his review of Mr Tucker Brooke's *Shakespeare Apocrypha*: 'Schlimm ist's schliesslich, wenn T. B. in der Anmerkung zu *The Puritaine Widdow*, III, 2. 40: "O goodly godly sister, would you had me lost more?" ein Fragezeichen benutzen muss¹, denn der Ausfall von *have* im Inf. Perf. gehört doch zu den bekannteren Tatsachen—wennschon die Grammatiker ihn nicht aufzuführen scheinen. Vergl. nur: "I *would* not *thought* it possible" in Heinrichs Brief zu Anne Bullen in *Harl. Misc.* I, p. 198, no xvi; Nashe (ed. McKerrow), I, p. 271, 26: "thou *shouldst* so vnarteficially and odiously *libeld* against him as thou hast done"; Heywood *Proverbs*

¹ Mr Tucker Brooke's note is: 'had] ? have had.'

(ed. Sharman), p. 37: "and his heire had I bin, had not this chaunced, | Of lands and goods which *should* me much *avaunced*"; *Queen Hester* (ed. Greg, *Materialien*, v), l. 426: "And they that *should assisted*.""

I had intended to draw attention to this little-noted peculiarity of Elizabethan syntax before I saw Professor Bang's note. In my edition of *Club Law* I illustrated l. 115, 'that wee *might* but *had* the villaine to the pumpe,' by Kyd, *Spanish Tragedy*, III, 3. 41: 'Come Sir you *had* been *better kept* your bed.' Since then I have collected the following instances which may be added to those given by Professor Bang: *Coriolanus*, IV, 6. 33, 34: 'We *should* by this...if he had gone forth consul, *found* it so'; *London Prodigal*, IV, 3. 44: 'Flowerdale *had like* to *peppord* us'; Dekker, *Shoemaker's Holiday*, III, 3: 'I would have sworn the puling girl | *Would* willingly *accepted* Hammon's love'; Phillips, *Patient Grissell* (Malone Society), l. 47: 'he...*had lyke* to *broke* my nose'; S. Briggs (?) *On a sophister of Caius College* (Rawl. MS. Poet. 147): 'he *might outrode* his witt.'

I was inclined to suggest as the explanation of this phenomenon the sinking of 'have' to 'a'—which then disappeared, just as 'on,' having sunk to 'a,' disappeared before a verbal noun in phrases like 'he went a hunting.' I have since, however, been referred to Prof. Jespersen's *Growth and Structure of English Lang.*, p. 83, where the author remarks: 'The Scotch idiom "He wad na wrang'd the vera Deil" (Burns), "ye wad thought Sir Arthur had a pleasure in it" (Scott), where an Englishman cannot omit *have*, has an exact parallel in Danish "vilde gjort," etc.' This Danish use perhaps militates against my explanation. I gather, however, that Prof. Jespersen looks on the Scotch examples as rather a parallel development to the Scandinavian than as due to special Scandinavian influence; and he seems unaware of the existence of English examples of the idiom.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

OLD ENGLISH 'GEFYRHPE' AND 'FRIÐ' AND THE LATIN SUFFIX '-ĒTUM.'

O.E. *gefyrhpe* and *frið* in *deorfrið* may be explained as 'a collection of fir trees,' 'forest.' The element is preserved in several Modern English Place Names, e.g., *Chapel-en-le-Frith* in Derbyshire, and Lancashire *Firbank* which appears in Lancs. Inquests (Farrer), p. 258, 1283, as *Frithebancke*, and in 1301, Lancs. Fines (Farrer), Vol. I, p. 215, as *Frithebank*. The Lancs. name *ffrythbroke* 1287, Farrer's Lancs. Pipe Roll, Charter III, Series II, p. 298, of which I have not