Well, don't you see, you provide the users with the alternative "voren" and <u>not</u> with the alternative "voro" for 2nd pers. plur. Now this has been a very risky thing to do for considerably longer than a century.

Why? Because the -en forms of 2nd pers plur can only be used with the antique pronoun I (capitalisation compulsory). "I haven, I ären, I kunnen". However, the standard normal 2nd person plural personal pronoun is "ni" in written language since, like, two hundred years (although "I" has lived on in some dialects). "Ni" has never been used with the "-en" forms, among other reasons because "ni" arose from an inaccurate dissolution of constructions like "kunnen I" into "kunne ni".

Instead, at the time when the plural forms or the verbs were still used, it was written "ni hava, ni äro, ni kunna", with a universal plural form, irrespective of person. These forms are not rentioned at all in your conjugation table, which would make an ignorant reader suspect that they are incorrect, although they have been used, particularly in Finland, as late as in seventies, if not longer.

And it is even worse with the purported imperfect conjunctive form "voren". For one thing, I'm even not sure that this form has ever existed at all, in conjunctive mode. For another, the form "vore", that you give for all the other persons and numeri, is not obsolete, or even obsolescent, in any way whatsoever. "Vore" is the only imperfect conjunctive form that is still in full and vigorous use in all possible kinds of styles and registers in Sweden. In all persons and numeri.

To give people the impression, which your conjugation table <u>very</u> clearly does, that "voren" is used in 2nd pers plur. <u>in situations where "vore" would have been used in other persons and numeri</u> is simply completely factually incorrect. I stand by my original statement that any kind of conjugation table which is misleading up to this point cannot be qualified with more condoning qualifications than "complete and utter crap".

I took a further look at your conjugations, and found several more things. You claim that 2nd pers plur of verbs of the first conjugation, those with a present ending of "-ar", and a past ending of "-ade" take the form "-an" in 2nd pers plur. This is incorrect. Such a form has never been in use; it is entirely contrafactual. It was "I handlen", "I blomstren" etc, not "I \*handlan", "I \*blomstran".

Furthermore, I must say that I am a little surprised to see an conjugation program so hell-bent on displaying antiquated forms, which still only recongises the weak conjugation simma-simmade-simmat and not the strong version simma-sam-summit. The latter conjugation is mostly used by older people now, I admit, but it is currently used, which is a lot more than one can say about "voren" and its ilk.

- > It was not crap 90 years ago, but obligatory to know for
- > everybody who wanted to write correctly. Yet, these old
- > forms were a very hot issue in Sweden during several
- > decades (1920-1960) according to Ebba Lindberg's
- > book 'När voro blev var'. It seems, that these verb forms
- > still upset people :-)

You don't understand. I <u>like</u> plural verb forms. It is only that your conjugation table gives an <u>entirely</u> inaccurate notion of <u>which</u> plural forms that were used together with "ni", which has been the standard 2nd pers plur pronoun for two hundred years. I have nothing against <u>ebsolete conjugations</u>, I think they are quite cute. But the impression of their usage should be <u>correct</u>. I have <u>everything</u> against a program that teaches people to say "ni voren" instead of "ni vore". Or, for that matter, "ni handlan" instead of either "I handlen" or "ni handla".

Becuase that is nothing else but wrong, and that's all there is to it.



Verbix: Swedish notes

I'll be constructive and tell you what to do, if you really want to keep the "-en" forms:

1) Introduce <u>two</u> kinds of "antiquated" colour, and two columns for antiquated forms and have it like this:

Present indicative:	Past conjunctive:		
håller håller håller håller hålla håller hålla hållen håller hålla	höll hölle höll hölle höll hölle höll hölle höll hölle höllen höll hölle		
Hallet Halla			

And so on, for the other modes and tempora. And explain that there really are whiskers growing on the forms in the rightmost column, and that they only can be used with a special antiquated personal pronoun. (If at all for the conjuctive forms)

2) REMOVE the forms "handlan" etc, because those are plain old WRONG, and replace them with the correct "handlen".

OK 3) DON'T give <u>any</u> suggestion that the conjunctive form "vore" is old-fashioned, because that one alone amongst the conjunctives most surely is NOT.

4) Include alternative conjugations for verbs like "simma", which have two possible conjugations in written Swedish.

kalla ställa dyka må bli dricka stå lära rå byta	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
glömma känna ha förnimma ge skära stjäla svära sjunka skjuta flyga ta fara slå falla	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26
hålla låta äta komma be få dö le ligga se vara böra	27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37
dölja sälja glädja göra sätta välja lägga säga kunna måsta skola idas sova skilja heta	39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53
mala veta vilja	54 55 56

April 5+ 5	Lat.	spoint		15 & / lydde fingelse
- Lespo-holpit - Lopp-lupit - ros - ryst	0	Spridde	S (gode	dowen 15d
khinge hyitpa 18pa 19sa	duga	Speeda	Taga	

Sinder as som rscumit stypa rstöp rstypit teller telle menen mente skapa rsparte spara rsparte spela rsparte fela - betalte