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PREFACE

The purpose of this volume is to present a systematic and rather full outline of English syntax based upon actual usage. The book contains the fruits of many years of earnest investigation. From the beginning of these studies the great *Oxford Dictionary* has been an unfailing source of inspiration and concrete help. The author owes much also to the large works of the foreign students of our language, the grammars of Jespersen, Poutsma, Kruisinga, Gustav Krüger, and Wendt, the first three written in English, the last two in German. Moreover, there is a considerable foreign literature in the form of monographs and articles in technical language journals. The author has learned much from the keen observations of these foreign scholars, who have sharp eyes for the peculiarities of our language. He has also made extensive use of the quotations gathered by them and the many other foreign workers in this field. In the same way he has availed himself of the materials gathered by English-speaking scholars. This book could not have been made without the aid of these great stores of fact. But to get a clear, independent view of present usage and its historical development the author found it necessary to read widely for himself, in older English and in the present period, in British literature and, especially, in American literature, which has not been studied so generally as it deserves. Almost the entire important literature of the early part of the Modern English period has been read, in critical editions where such have appeared. Everywhere attention has been called to the loose structure of the English sentence at that time and to the subsequent development of our simple, terse, differentiated forms of expression — an eloquent testimony to the growing intellectual life of the English-speaking people. In the best literature of his own time the author has read so extensively that he feels that his findings have independent value. With his eyes constantly upon present usage, he has read a large number of recent novels, dramas, lectures, orations, speeches, letters, essays, histories, scientific treatises, poems, etc., from all parts of the English-speaking
territory. It might seem at first glance that the novelists and
dramatists are more fully represented than writers on the events
of the day, politics, literature, history, science, etc., but in fact
this, the calm, composed form of English speech, representing the
higher unity of the language, has been very carefully studied and
illustrative examples are given everywhere throughout the book,
but usually without mention of the source since they represent
common normal usage. In the novel and the drama, however,
we find the irregular beat of changeful life, varying widely in dif­
ferent provinces and social strata, and, moreover, often disturbed
by the exciting influences of pressing events, changing moods, and
passionate feeling. An attempt has been made to give at least a
faint idea of this complex life so far as it has found an expression
in our language.

On the other hand, the more dignified forms of expression have
been carefully treated. Good English varies according to the oc­
casion, just as our dress varies according to the occasion. Evening
dress would be out of place in playing a football game. Loose
colloquial English, as often described in this book, is frequently as
appropriate as a loose-fitting garment in moments of relaxation.
The lesser grammarians, who so generally present only one form of
English, not only show their bad taste, but do a great deal of harm
in that they impart erroneous ideas of language. In this book also
the language of the common people is treated. It is here called
'popular speech' since the common grammatical term 'vulgar'
has a disparaging meaning which arouses false conceptions. Pop­
ular English is an interesting study. On the one hand, it has
retained characteristics of our greatest masters of English, which
the literary language has discarded. On the other hand, quite
forgetful of its old conservatism, it boldly faces the present with
its new needs and hesitates not to give an expression to them,
often, like our western pioneers, opening up paths to new and
better things, going forward with faith in the present and the
future. Those who always think of popular speech as ungram­
matical should recall that our present literary grammar was origi­
nally the grammar of the common people of England. Who today
would return to our older literary English? The common people
will also in the future make contributions to our language. The
author, however, does not desire to emphasize too much the
importance of the common people. The expressive power of our
language has for the most part come from the intellectual class. Left entirely to the common people the English language would soon deteriorate. On the other hand, intellectual struggles bring to language an undesirable abstractness and intricacy of expression, while the common people bring to it a refreshing concreteness and simplicity, which appeals also to people of culture and will influence them. Our American popular speech, in general, has not proved to be very productive. It has preserved in large measure the original British forms of expression. As, however, the various British dialects have been brought together on American soil, they have not been preserved intact, but have been curiously mingled. In sections where mountains, low swampy lands, and islands have isolated tracts of country the language is often peculiarly archaic. The Negroes as a result of social isolation have preserved many old forms of expression acquired in earlier days from the whites, who themselves often spoke archaic British dialect.

Diligent use has been made of every possible means to secure an accurate, reliable insight into existing conditions in all the different grades of English speech, both as to the actual fixed usage of today and as to present tendencies. Of course, the grades of our literary language have been put in the foreground. An earnest effort has been made to treat clearly the most difficult and most perplexing questions of literary English in order that those might receive practical help who are often in doubt as to how they should express themselves.

This book is not rich in details. It treats of the general principles of English expression. The attention is directed, not to words, but to the grammatical categories — the case forms, the nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, the prepositional phrase, the indicative, the subjunctive, the active, the passive, the word-order, the clause formations, clauses with finite verb, and the newer, terser participial, gerundival, and infinitival clauses, etc. These categories are the means by which we present our thought in orderly fashion and with precision, and are intimately associated with the expression of our inner feeling. The story of the development of these categories constitutes the oldest and most reliable chapters in the history of the inner life of the English people. Serious efforts have been made everywhere throughout this book to penetrate into the original concrete meaning of these categories,
in order to throw light upon the interesting early struggles of our
people for a fuller expression of their inner life and to gain sugges-
tions for their present struggles in this direction. In these excur-
sions into older English the author in his quotations from the
original sources always preserves the older form, usually in the
original spelling, but in the case of writings still widely read, as
the Bible and Shakespeare, the spelling has been modernized in
conformity to present usage.

The author has not for a moment forgotten that English is a
language without a central territory that regulates its use. It is
spoken in many centers, which are becoming more and more real
centers and are developing under peculiar circumstances. Hence,
usage cannot be fixed in accordance with the standards of any
particular center. In the erstwhile colonial centers, America,
Ireland, etc., English, no longer in direct touch with the language
of England, has not at all points developed in the same way. The
development has proceeded unevenly in the different territories.
There is no English colony or former colony that follows the
British standard in every respect, so that English is characterized
in every country by peculiarities of development; but as the
differences are not in essential things, English is still an entity,
a well-defined language with peculiar differences in the various
countries. Except where something is said to the contrary, all
descriptions of language in this book refer to the body of usage
common to England and America. Where British and American
English go different ways, each is described.

In early American English the prevailing type of expression
was southern British, the language of the southern half of England
and at the same time the literary language of the United Kingdom,
so that at first the literary language of England and that of America
had the same general character. In the eighteenth century came
Scotch-Irish immigrants in large numbers, also many from the
north of England. The speech of these newcomers was, of course,
northern British, a conservative form of English preserving older
sounds and expressions. The new settlers naturally went to the
newer parts of the country west of the old colonies. Their presence
there in large numbers influenced American English in certain
respects. While the younger, southern British form of English
remained intact for the most part on the Atlantic seaboard and
in large measure also in the south generally, the modified form
of it, characterized by older, northern British features, became established everywhere in the north except along the Atlantic seaboard.

On the other hand, the new things and the new needs of the New World called forth a large number of new words and new expressions. Moreover, the abounding, freer life of the New World created a new slang. Even conservative Scotch Irish had something new to offer — *will* in the first person of the future tense instead of literary *shall*. These differences in vocabulary and idiom will always distinguish the English-speaking peoples, but will not separate them. They have already stood a severe test. Between 1620 and 1800 important changes took place in the grammatical structure of English, both in Great Britain and America, but instead of drifting apart in this period of marked changes these two branches of English, at all important points, developed harmoniously together. This was the result of the universal tendency in colonial days among Americans of culture to follow in speech the usage of the mother country. The colonies had little literature of their own and were largely dependent in matters of culture upon the Old World. If it had not been for this general tendency of American culture, the language of the New World might have drifted away from that of England, for, as can be seen by American popular speech, there is a very strong tendency for English on American soil to cling to the older forms of the language. About 1800 the structure of literary English had virtually attained its present form in both territories and was in both essentially the same. That since that date no syntactical changes of consequence have taken place in either branch indicates a remarkable solidarity of structure. The English-speaking people are held together by their priceless common heritage — the English language in its higher forms in science and literature. Constant contact with these forces will keep the different peoples in touch with one another. The same English life pulsates everywhere, insuring in spite of the different conditions a similarity, if not a oneness, of evolution.

Definite unifying forces are now at work. We all feel that that is the best English which is most *expressive*, or most *simple*. These are the only principles that will be universally recognized. The drift towards simplicity is still strong and will continue strong. As many forms and concrete pictures have in the past disappeared,
yielding to simpler modes of expression, so also will they continue
to disappear in the future. We shall thus continue to lose and
gain, lose in concreteness and gain in directness. Present tenden­
cies point to the possible ultimate loss of several valuable forms,
as I, he, she, we, they in certain categories, since these forms are
exposed to the leveling influences of a powerful drift, as explained
in 7 C a; but there is now, on the other hand, in careful language a
strong tendency to express ourselves clearly, which prompts us
to use these expressive old forms. Indeed, at the present time
this tendency is, at this point, stronger than it has been for
centuries. The desire to speak clearly and accurately is even
leading us to create new forms for this purpose, as will be shown
in this book. The territory is wide, but thinking people every­
where, even though not in actual contact with one another, will
instinctively be guided by the same general principle, will choose
that which is most expressive. Hence the author defends in this
book the recommendations of conservative grammarians wherever
they contend against the tendencies of the masses to disregard fine
distinctions in the literary language already hallowed by long
usage. On the other hand, the author often takes a stand against
these conservative grammarians wherever they cling to the old
simply because it is old and thus fail to recognize that English
grammar is the stirring story of the English people's long and
constant struggle to create a fuller and more accurate expression
of their inner life.

This book has a good deal to say of these struggles, even the
latest much censured ones, which find so little favor with con­
servative grammarians because they are new and violate rules that
are sacred to them. In all ages, the things of long ago have found
zealous and fanatical defenders, who are at the same time foes of
the new and unhallowed. These new things of today, however,
need no organized defense, for they are born of universal needs
and will be supported by the resistless forces of life that created
them. To the conservative grammarian all change is decay. Although he knows well that an old house often has to be torn
down in part or as a whole in order that it may be rebuilt to suit
modern conditions, he never sees the constructive forces at work
in the destruction of old grammatical forms. He is fond of mourn­
ing over the loss of the subjunctive and the present slovenly use
of the indicative. He hasn't the slightest insight into the fine
constructive work of the last centuries in rebuilding the subjunctive. The present nicely differentiated use of the indicative and the newly created subjunctive, as presented in this book, is recommended for careful study to those who talk about the decay of our language. The English-speaking people will chase after fads and eagerly employ the latest slang as long as it lives, for play is as necessary as work, but as long as it remains a great people it will strive unceasingly to find more convenient and more perfect forms of expression. It will do that as naturally as it breathes, and will continue to do it, so that grammarians shall occasionally have to revise the school grammars. The fads will pass away, but the constructive work will remain and go on. The author has spent his life in studying the growth and development of Germanic expression and has been very happy in his work. It is his ardent hope that he has presented in this book the subject of English expression in such a way that the reader may realize that English grammar is not a body of set, unchangeable rules, but a description of English expression, bequeathed to us by our forefathers, not to be piously preserved, but to be constantly used and adapted to our needs as they adapted it to their needs.

Square brackets have been uniformly used throughout this book to inclose within quotations the omitted parts of an elliptical statement. Hence they were not available for use to inclose within quotations parenthetical remarks by the author of the Grammar. All parenthetical remarks made by the author of the Grammar within quotations are inclosed in parentheses as elsewhere.

In the few instances in Syntax where the pronunciation of words is indicated, use has been made of the well-known Websterian key, so that the means of indicating pronunciation here are quite different from those employed in Volume I, where English sounds are treated scientifically. The author of Syntax hesitated to assume on the part of his readers the knowledge of a scientific alphabet.

The author desires to express here his feeling of obligation to his colleague, Professor James Taft Hatfield, for much aid received from him from time to time. His wide knowledge of modern English literature and his notes containing quotations from modern writers illustrating characteristic forms of current English expression have been at the author's disposal, and, what is of great importance, his fine feeling for the English of our day has
many times guided the author in making final decisions. The author also desires to express here his gratitude for the large number of individual quotations that have been sent to him by other friends.

The author is deeply indebted also to the following scholars, who have read the manuscript and contributed valuable remarks which have been embodied in the text or have led to important changes: the late Professor O. F. Emerson of Western Reserve University; Professor W. F. Bryan of Northwestern University; Professor J. S. Kenyon of Hiram College. The author has had the advantage of discussing several vexing questions with Sir William Craigie, the editor of the *Oxford Dictionary*. He has also received from him some valuable quotations. This acknowledgment is made without any desire to hold these and other contributors responsible for views in the book which they do not share. For assistance in reading the proofs and for useful suggestions the author desires to thank Dr. Bert Emsley of the Ohio State University; Professors W. Leopold, J. W. Spargo, F. A. Bernstorff of Northwestern University; Professor Francis E. Moran of the University of Notre Dame. Finally, the author desires to express here his deep gratitude to Dr. F. W. Scott of D. C. Heath and Company for encouraging this enterprise and for his active cooperation in putting the book into its present form.

GEORGE O. CURME

Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois
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sentence or (exclamation)

The earth is热 a thing of a two dark
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY.

1. Syntax treats of the relations of words or groups of words to one another in sentences. Sentences are divided into three classes — simple, compound, and complex.

THE SIMPLE SENTENCE

DEFINITION, FORMS, FUNCTIONS, ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS

2. A sentence is an expression of a thought or feeling by means of a word or words used in such form and manner as to convey the meaning intended.

The form of the sentence may be: (1) exclamatory, uttering an outcry, or giving expression to a command, wish, or desire, often closing with an exclamation point — perhaps the oldest form of the sentence; (2) declarative, stating a fact, closing with a period; (3) interrogative, asking a question, closing with an interrogation point.

The sentence has two functions: (1) It is emotive, i.e., it is an expression of will, or is an expression of emotions, attitudes, intentions, and moods present in the speaker or to be evoked in the listener. (2) It makes a statement, or, in the case of a question, calls for a statement. The question belongs not only here but also to (1) since it contains an expression of will. Compare 43 I A (last par.).

It is usually considered that there are two essential elements in every sentence — the subject and the predicate: Lead sinks. The subject is that which is spoken of. The predicate is that which is said of the subject. In a normal sentence both subject and predicate are present, but sometimes the one or the other or both may be absent and yet the sentence may be a complete expression of thought. See a below.

a. Sentences Lacking the One or the Other or Both of the Essential Elements. In accurate thinking we often need a large vocabulary and intricate grammatical form; but language also adapts itself readily to the simpler needs of practical life, where action, tone, and the situation are often more expressive than words and grammatical form.
Still, as in primitive speech, a single word in connection with the proper tone or the situation conveys our meaning and thus constitutes a complete sentence: O! Ouch! Yes. No. 'Glass. Handle with care.' Beautiful! Hurry! If we call out 'Fred!' to indicate that he should come, we pronounce in loud prolonged tones Fred as a dissyllable. If we scold him we pronounce Fred as a monosyllable and raise the tone of the voice. Short terse expression was not only characteristic of primitive speech when language was undeveloped, but it is still widely used. In all such cases the expression of the thought is perfect. The sentences, though brief, are complete. In the setting in which they appear, not a word, not a syllable is lacking. A learned grammarian with mistaken enthusiasm might desire to expand these brief utterances into full sentences, but in spite of his grammatical skill the language would be bad, for it would violate good usage. We do not here usually employ full sentences, and for a good reason. Fuller expression would be incomplete expression, for it would mar the thought, take something vital away from it. Thus such brief sentences are as complete as those of exact scientific language, where, however, the speaker, removed from everyday life, must express himself fully if he would describe accurately the hidden forces he is studying.

In older languages there was often no verb and survivals of this older type of sentence are still common: Nobody here? Everybody gone? Compare 6 B a. In older speech there was sometimes no subject, expressed or understood. See 4 II B.

The oldest form of the sentence contained only one word, which, however, was a complete sentence, not a word in its modern sense, for a word is a later development in language growth than a sentence. This oldest type of sentence still survives in case of exclamations, as Ouch! and the simple imperative forms, as Go! In course of time successive sentences often stood in such close relation to each other that the different sentences developed into words: See! Fire! Yonder! becoming See the fire yonder!
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3. Case and Position of the Subject. In Old English, the subject and its article and modifying adjectives were in the nominative case. Today only certain pronouns, he, she, etc., have a distinctive nominative: 'He inspires.' Noun, article, and adjectives now have here the common form: 'A fine big mind inspires.' In Old English, the noun had a fuller inflection than now and its article and modifying adjectives had still more distinctive case forms, since in this early period they were needed to make clear the grammatical relations, for then the grammatical relations were not indicated as now by the word-order. In the course of the Old English period the tendency to indicate the grammatical relations by the word-order grew stronger and stronger. The subject was put into the first place, the verb was placed next or near the subject, then came the object and adverbial elements.

Later, after this new word-order had become established in the subject and object relations, noun, article, and modifying adjectives gradually lost their distinctive case forms, for in the new order of things form was slighted as not being a vital factor in expressing the thought. In the literary language the personal, relative, and interrogative pronouns have retained their old distinctive case forms better than nouns and adjectives, but also in these pronouns the tendency to level away the distinctive nominative and accusative forms to a common form for both these relations has become strong in our colloquial and popular speech, as described in 7 C a and 11 2 e.

a. Survivals of Older Word-order. The new word-order with the subject in the first place did not come into use at any particular date, but has been gradually gaining ground throughout the centuries. Even in our own day, however, it has not entirely supplanted the old Germanic principle of placing the emphatic or important word in the first place without
regard to its grammatical function. Hence, we still often find an emphatic or important word in the first place in a sentence or proposition: ‘Hand me that book!’ ‘Nowhere in the world is there such a place for an idle man as London.’ ‘He quickened his pace and so did I.’ ‘These mén! how I detest them!’ For fuller treatment see 35 1 and 2.

Also in a question, where a noun subject does not in normal usage introduce the sentence, the noun subject is in lively language often nevertheless put into the uncommon first place. Under the pressure of thought or feeling the subject here springs forth first as the most important thing before the usual grammatical structure occurs to the mind, and is later repeated in the usual position of the subject in the form of a personal pronoun: ‘Your fiénds, what will they say?’ (F. C. Philips, One Never Knows, I, 52). Similarly, in declarative sentences the subject thus often springs forth suddenly before it is felt as a subject and is then repeated in the form of a personal pronoun, especially earlier in the period, when the literary language was not so subject to logical and formal requirements as today, and still very commonly in popular and colloquial speech: ‘The Lord your God, which goes before you, he shall fight for you’ (Deut., I, 30). ‘Now, they ain’t many women that would just let a man stand up like that and give her daughter away under her nose, but my wife, she’s been well trained’ (William Allen White, A Certain Rich Man, Ch. VIII). If such a subject is a clause of any kind, it must be repeated in the form of the neuter pronoun it: ‘Getting to truth — it’s like warming cold hands at a fire; isn’t it?’ (Robert Hichens, Mrs. Marden, Ch. VI). Often the whole predicate thus suddenly springs forth with only a light pronominal subject, later followed by the logical subject: ‘It leaves a nasty taste in the mouth, this scheme’ (F. C. Philips, One Never Knows, II, 221).

On the other hand, in case of intransitives and passives the subject is often withheld for a time, sometimes even until the end of the sentence, in order to create the feeling of suspense and thus direct attention more forcibly to it: ‘Many years ago when I was a mere lad there lived in this house a lonely old man, of whom I desire to tell you an interesting story.’ ‘In the center of the room, under the chandelier, as became a host, stood the head of the family, old Jolyon’ (Galsworthy, The Man of Property, Ch. I). ‘Behind him had come in a tall woman, of full figure and fine presence, with hair still brown — Lady Valleys herself’ (id., The Patrician, Ch. I). ‘From mere cuttings have been grown some of the finest rosebushes I have.’ Similarly, sometimes in the subordinate clause: ‘No sooner was the last lodge of the Western drive left behind than there came into sudden view the most pagan bit of landscape in all England’ (Galsworthy, The Patrician, Ch. VII). ‘But more exactly and more boldly the real reaction of the press was indicated by Punch’s cartoon of a phoenix, bearing the grim and forceful face of Lincoln, rising from the ashes where lay the embers of all that of old time had gone to make up the liberties of America’ (Ephraim Douglass Adams, Great Britain and the American Civil War, II, p. 239).

As in these examples, the emphatic subject that stands at the end of a proposition or clause should be lengthy and heavy enough to form a proper balance to what precedes. In accordance with this principle a
short subject, even though stressed, does not usually follow a compound
tense, mood, or voice form of a verb. In an independent proposition a
short emphatic subject often follows a simple form of a verb: 'First comes
the music.' Compare 35 1 (6th par.). Not so commonly now as formerly
after a compound tense, mood, or voice form of a verb: 'Then was seen
a strange sight.' This is still less commonly found in a subordinate clause:
'As he spoke, he moved across to the sapling, where was fastened his horse'
(Mary Johnston, The Long Roll, Ch. II) (or more commonly where his
horse was fastened). After there (4 II c), however, a short, emphatic subject
usually stands at the end of the subordinate clause: 'Where there is a will
there is a way.' 'I do not believe that there has ever been a more lovely day.'

Usually it is not possible to place an emphatic subject after a transitive
verb since the subject could not be distinguished from the object, but
sometimes where the thought would not be endangered this old word-
order still survives: 'At last there reached his ear far down the woodland
path the sounds of voices and laughter' (James Lane Allen, The Choir
Invisible, Ch. XXI).

4. Forms of the Subject. The complete subject often consists
of a group of words: 'The stately ship dropped her anchor.' The
noun around which the other words are grouped is called the sub-
ject word, in this sentence ship. The subject word is always in the
nominative case.

I. Particulars as to the Form of the Subject. The form of the
subject may be that of:

a. A noun: 'The sun is shining.'
b. A pronoun: 'He is writing.' For peculiar uses of pronouns
as subject see II, p. 7.

c. An adjective or participle used as a noun: 'No good will come
of it.' 'Rich and poor rejoiced.' 'Ruler and ruled were alike dis-
contented with the turn of affairs.' 'The dying and the wounded
were cared for.' Compare 58.

d. The prepositional infinitive, in older English also the simple
infinitive: 'To err is human, to forgive divine.' 'To know my deed,
't were best not know myself' (Macbeth, II, ii, 73).

The use of the simple infinitive is still common in old saws:
'Better (=it is better) bend than break.' 'Better ask than go
astray.' After [it is] better it still lingers on even in common every-
day language: 'I mustn't be too hasty; it would be better wait a
few days, till the end of the term, or even till we come home from
the seaside, then pack her off' (Hubert Henry Davies, The Mollusc,
Act II).

In popular Irish English, the simple infinitive is here still well
preserved, so that it is still quite common: 'It would be best for us
follow after the rest of the army of the Whiteboys' (W. B. Yeats,
The Unicorn from the Stars, Act III). As here Irish English often preserves older English usage.

The preservation of the simple infinitive here in many cases probably results from our feeling the form to be an imperative, as can be seen by the tone or in the written language sometimes by the punctuation: ‘Kill or be killed, eat or be eaten, was the law’ (Jack London, The Call of the Wild, Ch. VI). ‘Better not say too much to the parents at present!’ (De Morgan, When Ghost Meets Ghost, Ch. III). In colloquial speech, however, the old simple infinitive is still often used where it cannot be interpreted as an imperative: ‘All she has to do is come here’ (George Ade, Hand-Made Fables, p. 29). ‘She’s awful. The only thing she hasn’t done is bob her hair’ (Tarkington, Napoleon Was a Little Man). ‘I’m not a general. All I can do is trust the men who are’ (S. V. Benét, John Brown’s Body, p. 220).

e. The gerund, usually as a parallel construction to the prepositional infinitive without an essential difference of meaning: ‘Seeing is believing,’ or ‘To see is to believe,’ ‘To see with one’s own eyes men and country is better than reading all the books of travel in the world’ (Thackeray) or ‘to read all the books of travel in the world.’ Compare 50 4 a.

f. Any other part of speech: ‘the ups and downs of life must be taken as they come.’ ‘Under is a preposition.’ ‘The pros and cons must be considered.’ ‘I is a pronoun.’

A pronoun may also be used as a noun in quite a different sense, namely, as a noun representing a person: ‘Even it was hinted that poor I had sent a hundred pounds to America’ (Thackeray, Samuel Titmarsh, Ch. XII). ‘There is none so sick as, brought to bed, that robust he that ever has scorned sickness’ (A. S. M. Hutchinson, This Freedom, p. 207).

Instead of the usual nominative of the pronoun to serve as the common form of the noun the accusative is often employed where the pronominal form used follows the verb, but also often elsewhere in accordance with the general tendency described in 7 C a: ‘There was little me, astride on his bare back’ (Hall Caine, The Christian, I, 334). ‘In his place, I (a young lady) might have been just as bad, if I had been a him, you know’ (De Morgan, The Old Madhouse, Ch. XXVIII). ‘He viewed it (i.e., the play) as an awful lark, especially when the Him and the Her of it eat their little diner-de-noce together’ (ib., Ch. XXX). The accusative is usually employed if an accusative to which it refers has preceded it: ‘Flat, stupid uninteresting people, every one of whom has, behind a personality which does not appeal to us — important us — a story of some sort’ (ib., Ch. V).
g. A group of words: 'Two times two is four.' 'Early to bed, early to rise makes man healthy, wealthy, and wise.' 'In my time, good in the saddle was good for everything.'

h. A whole clause: 'Whoever knows him well respects him.' For the different forms that a subject clause with a finite verb may have, see 21. Gerundial clauses are a common characteristic of English: 'My friend's (or simply his) deceiving me was a sad disappointment to me.' For the proper form of the subject of the gerund see 50 3. The subject may be also an infinitive clause with an expressed subject: 'For me to back out now would be to acknowledge that I am afraid.' Compare 21 e.

II. Peculiar Use and Meaning of Certain Pronominal Forms When Employed as Subject. Attention is directed here to the following points of English usage.

A. SITUATION 'IT' AS SUBJECT. It is much used as subject to point to a person or thing that is at first presented in only dim outlines by the situation, but is often later identified by a predicate noun: 'It's John, or Anna, or the boys,' or 'It's the boys, isn't it?' (uttered by someone upon hearing approaching steps). 'Somebody sat behind him. A little later I saw that it was his brother.' 'Somebody sat behind him, but I couldn't see who it was,' but 'There were several sitting behind him, but I couldn't see who they were.' 'Who is it (or he) ?' (referring to some gentleman who has just entered the room), but 'Who are they?' (referring to two or more). It is often a substitute for a noun obvious from the situation or the context: 'It is twenty miles to Chicago.'

B. IMPERSONAL 'IT.' We now say 'It rained yesterday,' but in Gothic, the oldest Germanic language, there was no it here. The verb had no subject at all. The original idea here was to call attention to an activity or a state without any reference whatever to a definite subject. In Gothic there were few such verbs, but in oldest English and German this group had become large, since the original idea of calling attention to an activity or state without any reference whatever to a definite subject had appealed more and more to English and German feeling as a convenient and valuable means of expression. Difficulties, however, arose in using this growing construction. These impersonal verbs in most cases introduced the sentence, a position which was beginning to be characteristic of questions requiring yes or no for an answer. To avoid the impression of a question and to comply with the established convention of associating a subject with the verb, it was early introduced as subject.

This it is related to situation it (A) in that it refers to a given situation, but it does not point to a definite or an indefinite person or
thing. As it does not indicate a definite or an indefinite person or thing, it is practically meaningless. This *it*, though containing no real meaning, serves the useful purpose of giving the statement the outward form of an ordinary declarative sentence with an expressed subject, thus making it possible to preserve under changed conditions a useful old construction perfectly intact, for the insertion of the meaningless *it* in no way impaired the spirit of the old construction. In older English, the original form of impersonal verbs without *it* lingered on for a long while wherever the verb would not stand in the first place and thus make the impression of a question: 'Now es day' (Hampole, early fourteenth century) = 'Now it is day.' It even lingers still, but is no longer understood: 'Today is the first of January.' The fact that we do not employ *it* after *today* here shows clearly that we do not feel *it* as subject of *is*, for we now regularly employ *it* as the formal subject of an impersonal verb. This usage became fixed in the course of the Middle English period. We here now construe *today* — once felt as an adverb — as a noun, the subject of *is*, so that the construction has ceased to be impersonal.

The *it*-form often competes here with the *there*-form (see C, p. 9), an entirely different construction in which *there* is an anticipatory subject pointing to the following real subject: 'It snowed heavily last night' or 'There was a heavy snow last night.' The words 'snowed heavily' have the same meaning as 'was a heavy snow,' although the construction of the expressions is quite different, *snowed* being a verbal predicate and *snow* a subject. The mind thus often employs two quite different means to express the same thought. There is often no difference of meaning between the two means of expressing a thought: 'The ship sails tomorrow' or 'The ship will sail tomorrow.' Even though the meaning is the same, there is sometimes a difference of coloring in the two means, as here in the *it*-form and the *there*-form. 'Was snow' with the concrete noun *snow* with its picture of the earth covered with a white mantle is a more lively expression than the abstract verb *snowed*. We still say 'It frosted heavily last night' alongside of 'There was a heavy frost last night,' but 'It dewed heavily' has been replaced by 'There was a heavy dew.' Instead of 'It is dewing' we now say 'Dew is falling.' This fondness for the concrete as shown by employing a concrete noun in preference to an abstract verb is one of the striking features of modern English, often found also in other categories, as in 6 A b.

Also in other meanings the old impersonal construction is not so common as it once was. We now often prefer a construction with a definite subject: 'It wanted but a very few days (object of
wanted) before that blissful one when Foker should call Blanche his own" (Thackeray, Pendennis, I, Ch. XXXVIII), but in Ch. XXXII 'There still wanted half an hour (subject of wanted) till dinner.' Where there is a reference to persons, there has long been a tendency to abandon the impersonal construction with certain verbs, since it is often desired to represent a definite person or thing as subject and thus indicate that the person is passing through an experience or that a definite person or thing is conceived as affecting the person. Thus older 'me hungreth' has become 'I hunger,' or more commonly 'I am hungry,' since the subject is conceived as suffering. 'Me (dative) thinks' (= it seems to me) and 'I think' seem to us today to be two constructions with the same verb. Originally the two verbs had different forms. After the two verbs had in Middle English become identical and were felt as one, the personal construction here as so often elsewhere gradually supplanted the impersonal. In archaic language, however, the impersonal construction survives in the form of me-thinks. In Shakespeare's 'Woe is me' woe was felt as a noun, subject of the verb, just as we now feel it, but in the older form of the construction — 'Me is [it] wo' — it was an adverb governing the dative me, and the verb is was impersonal with the subject it always suppressed as the dative introduced the sentence. Likewise in if [it] you please we now construe you as subject and say if you please. Of course, older usage often lives on in dialect and hence is often reflected in our realistic literature: 'Don't you say almost every day "This and that will happen, please (subjunctive = may it please) God"' (Adam Bede, Ch. II, 29). Sheridan's 'How is it with you?' (The Critic, I, 2, A.D. 1779) has been replaced by 'How are you?' Similarly, older 'How fares it with you?' though still used in poetic language, as in 'How fares it with the happy dead?' (Tennyson, In Memoriam, XLIV), is now usually replaced by the personal construction where the word still survives in this meaning: 'A man might go farther and fare worse.' 'We shall see hereafter how he fared on his errand' (Freeman, Norman Conquest, IV, XVII, 77). Although the personal construction is displacing the older it-form, the latter is still common in many set expressions: 'it is late,' 'it is twelve o'clock,' 'it is stormy, smoky,' etc.

C. ANTICIPATORY 'IT' AND 'THERE.' When we desire to call especial attention to the subject, we often withhold it for a time, causing the feeling of suspense.

Where the subject is an emphatic noun or important group of words, there is much used at or near the beginning of the sentence as anticipatory subject, pointing forward to the following real sub-
ject, the emphatic noun or important group of words: ‘There once lived in this house a very interesting old man.’ ‘At that moment there came a knock at the door.’ ‘There is always the possibility — the possibility, I say — of being All, or remaining a particle, in the universe’ (Thoreau, Journal, I, p. 486). Compare 3a (4th par.). For especial emphasis the subject word (4) is sometimes placed before there is (are), followed by the modifiers of the subject: ‘Some bodies there are that, being dead and buried, do not decay’ (Thoreau, Journal, V, p. 10). ‘Men there are yet living who have seen him, on many a day in the early seventies, riding his horse up Main Street, clad in the colorful garb of the past’ (Percival J. Cooney, The Dons of the Old Pueblo, Epilogue). Always so in a question: ‘What is there to do?’

When there is no predicate noun in the sentence, anticipatory there is used to point to a following gerund used as the real subject: ‘There is no getting along with him.’ ‘There is no telling what will happen.’ In older English, it was used here instead of there: ‘Cosin, it (now there) is no dealing with him’ (Marlowe, Edward the Second, I. 904, about A.D. 1591, ed. 1594). But when there is a predicate noun or adjective in the sentence, it is the usual anticipatory subject pointing to a following gerundial subject clause: ‘It is useless, of no use, no use, no good your saying anything’ (or with general indefinite reference saying anything). Compare 21e (5th par. from end).

Anticipatory it is also used to point to a following subject that-clause or a subject infinitive clause (21e): ‘It is necessary that you exert yourself’ (or to exert yourself). ‘It is useless, of no use, no use, no good for you to say anything’ (or your saying anything, or with general indefinite reference to say anything, or saying anything). Here use and good are predicate nouns. If anticipatory there is used here, use and good are subjects followed by a prepositional phrase of specification: ‘There is no use, no good in saying anything, in your saying anything,’ or sometimes, ‘There is no use of your saying anything.’ The there and it constructions are often blended: ‘There is no use your telling me that you are going to be good’ (Oscar Wilde, Dorian Gray, Ch. XIX), instead of the correct ‘There is no use in your telling me that you are going to be good.’ Compare 21e (5th par. from end).

Differing from impersonal it, anticipatory it has a little concrete force, since it points to a definite subject, namely, the following infinitive, gerund, or substantive clause. The concrete force was very slight in oldest English, for the it was often omitted, likewise situation it (A), which is still often omitted, as illustrated in 5d. The situation in both constructions made the thought
clear. Anticipatory it was early introduced where, as in the preceding examples, the verb would otherwise stand in the first place, for the verb in the first place was beginning to be felt as characteristic of a question. The older type of sentence without anticipatory it lingered for centuries where some word or words preceded the verb: ‘Of swich (such) thing [it] were goodly for to telle’ (Chaucer, Prologue of the Nonne Preestes Tale, 13). In course of time anticipatory it has become well established, as it has been found helpful in indicating the grammatical relations, but older usage without it still occurs occasionally, even when the omission of it brings the verb into the first place. Older usage without it is best preserved in quaint dialect: ‘[it] Used to be he couldn’t abide to eat a bite after the sun had set’ (Maristan Chapman, The Happy Mountain, Ch. I). This older usage sometimes occurs in the literary language: ‘One of his pistols, loaded, was already in his suitcase. [it] Remained only to be positively assured, on some occasion, that the Captain carried no gun’ (Red Book, April, 1922, p. 112). Similarly, anticipatory there is sometimes suppressed, as in older English: ‘From Texas came Pitzer, James, and Jeff Chisum, his brothers, to help him in his business. [there] Came, too, to reign over his household for years as chatelaine, Miss Sallie Chisum, his niece, daughter of James Chisum, as pretty a girl as ever set fluttering the hearts of the rough-riding cavaliers of the Pecos country’ (Walter Noble Burns, The Saga of Billy the Kid, Ch. I).

Anticipatory it is also used when it is desired to emphasize a predicate adjective or noun, provided, however, that the logical subject is a singular noun denoting a lifeless thing, or is a clause. The sentence is introduced by it, followed shortly by the predicate adjective or noun in accordance with the old Germanic principle of putting the emphatic word in or near the first place: ‘It is astonishing the amount of unadulterated sun a man can stand when he is making hay.’ ‘It is hard work keeping the grass green this time of year.’ ‘It is immatérial what names are assigned to them.’ ‘It is vilely unjust, men closing two-thirds of the respectable careers to women!’ (Sir Harry Johnston, Mrs. Warren’s Daughter, Ch. III). ‘It was my twó bróthers who did it.’ Where the emphatic predicate in a sentence containing a subject clause is a noun denoting a person, we always employ anticipatory it when the desire is to identify, as in the last example; but when the desire is to describe, we may say with Shakespeare ‘It is a gód divne that follows his own instructions’ (Merchant of Venice, I, ii, 15), or now more commonly we replace it by a personal pronoun that can indicate gender and number: ‘He is a gód divne who follows his own instructions.’ Compare 21 c.
On the other hand, if the logical subject is a noun denoting a person or is a plural noun or pronoun, we use an appropriate personal pronoun as anticipatory subject: 'He is a bright boy, that little brother of yours.' "They are very engaging people, the French Canadians!' 'They are no ordinary houses, those' (Dickens, Pickwick, Ch. XXI).

After the analogy of the emphatic predicate adjectives and nouns found in sentences which are introduced by anticipatory it and followed later by a formal subject in the form of a subject clause, as described on page 11, it has become common to make any noun, adverb, or adverbial phrase or clause emphatic by converting it into an emphatic predicate introduced by it is (or was) and followed by the subject of the sentence in the form of a subject clause. Thus an emphatic subject may become formally the predicate of the sentence: 'It is not I that am to blame,' instead of 'I am not to blame.' Compare 21 c and e. Similarly, emphatic adverbs, adverbial phrases, etc., may become formally the predicate of the sentence, as shown by the following examples and more fully in 21 c and 22 a: 'It is seldom that I ever see him any more,' instead of 'I seldom see him any more.' 'It was on this condition that I went,' instead of 'I went on this condition.' 'It was here that it happened,' instead of 'It happened here.' The common use of adverbs and adverbial phrases as a predicate, as described in 7 F, has facilitated the development of this curious but useful construction.

Though this construction with an emphatic word at the beginning of the sentence after the formal introduction it is, it was, etc., is not infrequent in the literary language, it is especially characteristic of popular Irish English, where it attracts attention not only by its exceedingly great frequency but also by the extremes to which the principle is carried. For instance, any element in a subordinate clause can be brought to the beginning of the sentence, although the subordinate clause itself less this element follows the principal proposition: 'It is yourself I am come here purposely to meet with' (Lady Gregory, The Bogie Men, p. 15). 'Is it to shoot me you are going?' (id., The Full Moon). The formal introduction it is sometimes drops out: 'A little shop they are saying she will take for to open a flour store' (ib.). In Irish English, it is is often placed before an emphatic predicate adjective which expresses an attribute of a person, where in the literary language the adjective itself must stand in the first place, in accordance with the old Germanic principle described in 35 1: 'It is pr¿ud she must be to get you' (Yeats, Cathleen ni Houlihan) = literary 'Pr¿ud she must be to get you.'
In accordance with the old Germanic principle described in 351, 2, a predicate verb is placed in the first place in the case of an imperative: 'Hand me that book!' In older English also in the case of a question requiring yes or no for an answer: 'Knows he the wickedness?' (Shakespeare, King Lear, IV, ii, 92). Today we prefer to secure emphasis in questions by the employment of another old Germanic principle. We introduce the sentence by an unstressed auxiliary, which contains the outward form of predication, and withhold for a time the real predicate, a predicate infinitive or participle, thus creating a feeling of suspense, which imparts emphasis: 'Does he know the wickedness?' 'Did he come?' corresponding to older 'Came he?' Compare 6 A d (2).

In oldest English it was still quite common in narrative to put the verb in or near the first place, since in narrative the idea of action often becomes prominent, or a form of the verb be was brought forward to call attention to a past state of things. Much later, Chaucer still uses this word-order with fine effect: 'Ran Colle our dogge, and Talbot, and Gerland, Ran cow and calf, and eek (also) the verray hogges' (The Nonne Preestes Tale, 563). This old usage survives in choice lively narrative style: 'Came Christmas by which, at the outset, everybody knew it (i.e., the war) would be over, and it was not over. Came June, 1915,' etc. (Hutchinson, If Winter Comes, p. 256). 'Came days of storm, days and nights of storm, when the ocean menaced us with its roaring whiteness, and the wind smote our struggling boat with a Titan’s buffets' (Jack London, The Sea-Wolf, Ch. XXVII).

Since, however, this word-order with the verb in the first place had even in Old English become intimately associated with the idea of a question, it gradually became normal usage to place an adverb before the verb to differentiate narrative from interrogation. Thus by a simple device we can still in narrative keep the verb near the beginning of the sentence. We now employ here there at the beginning of the narrative and later on then: 'There sailed a bold mariner over the sea. . . . Then came unfavorable winds.' 'There was once a king.' In older English, before the verb be we sometimes find it instead of there: 'It was an English lady bright. . . . And she would marry a Scottish knight' (Scott, Last Minstrel, VI, XI). There is used not only in narrative style to enable the verb to be brought near the beginning of the sentence, but it is employed also at the beginning of the sentence to announce the later appearance of an emphatic noun subject: 'There never was in all the history of the world a greater blunder.' See 3 a.

D. PRONOUNS USED AS GENERAL OR INDEFINITE SUBJECT. The pronouns one, we, you are much used here with the same
general or indefinite force: ‘As long as one is young, one easily acquires new friends.’ ‘We don’t like to be flatly contradicted.’ ‘You don’t like to be snubbed.’

We often use they here, but with a somewhat narrower meaning, since it usually refers to a smaller circle or one remote, always excluding the speaker and the person addressed, hence often used by the speaker to assert something modestly, representing it as coming from others: ‘In fashionable society they talk of the impending nuptials of the Duke of Clarence.’ ‘In that crowd they mostly play cards.’ ‘In Japan they generally marry without love.’ ‘They say best men are moulded out of faults’ (Shakespeare).

When a writer or speaker desires to refer to himself modestly, there is a tendency at present to employ the indefinite one instead of the sharply precise I or me: ‘One (or a person, a fellow) doesn’t (instead of I don’t) like to be treated that way.’ ‘Under such circumstances you might offer to help one’ (or a fellow instead of me).

E. EDITORIAL ‘WE.’ The first person plural is often used by authors and speakers instead of the first person singular, and the possessive our instead of my, the author or speaker thus modestly turning the attention away from himself by representing his readers or hearers as accompanying him in thought: ‘Thus far we have been considering only the outward condition of things at Luther’s birth, now we are to turn (or let us turn) our attention to his early home influences.’ A speaker or writer often modestly employs we since he speaks also for those associated with him: ‘We (the editor speaking for the editorial staff) owe an apology to the public for not noticing this work on its first appearance.’ In these examples we still has the original associative force, but it now often refers to only one: ‘We (the reviewer of the book) do not say that everything in these essays is as good as what we have quoted.’ ‘It will be easier to explain this later on, when we have said something about what is called the history of language’ (Wyld, The Growth of English, Ch. I, 8). The Plural of Modesty in its earliest forms is very old, for we find a quite similar usage in classical Latin.

Instead of we some authors employ here a noun with the third person of the verb: ‘The author would remark,’ etc.

F. PLURAL OF MAJESTY. Of later origin than editorial we is the associative we first used in the third century in imperial decrees; in that period of Roman history when two or three rulers reigned together and hence were associated in the official proclamations. Later, whenever the political power was centered in one emperor the old we was retained, so that although the associative force was present, since the ruler included his advisers, the associative we developed into royal we, the Plural of Majesty, since the ruler
spoke of himself in his official announcements in the plural instead of the singular, as ‘We decree’ instead of ‘I decree.’ This usage spread to the different European courts and was common in the Old English period.

G. *We* = *You*. *We* is often used with the force of *you*: ‘Are we downhearted today?’ Often sarcastically: ‘How touchy we are!’ ‘Oh, ain’t we select since we went to that hen college!’ (Sinclair Lewis, *Babbitt*, Ch. II, II) (retort of a boy to his sister, who has graduated from Bryn Mawr, and on the occasion in question has spoken to him sarcastically).

H. *Thou, Thee, Ye, You*. In Middle English, it was still possible to express the idea of number in the personal pronouns of the second person. In the singular, *thou* was used as subject and *thee* as dative and accusative object, while in the plural *ye* served as subject and *you* as dative and accusative object. These grammatical functions for *ye* and *you* were widely observed until the middle of the sixteenth century, and survive in the Biblical and higher poetical language of our time. In the fourteenth century, however, the form *you* — with reference to one or more — sometimes replaced *ye* in the subject relation in the usual intercourse of life, and later in the course of the sixteenth century became more common here than *ye*. Occasionally we find the opposite development in older English — *ye* was used instead of *you* in the object relation: ‘I do beseech *ye*’ (*Julius Caesar*, III, i, 157). In older English, *ye* is thus not infrequently used in both the subject and the object relation, often in the form of *ee*: ‘D’ee (do ee) know this crucifix?’ (Middleton and Rowley, *The Spanish Gipsie*, III, iii, 40, A.D. 1661). ‘I commend me t’ee, sir’ (Chapman, *The Gentleman Usher*, III, ii, 208, A.D. 1606). This usage survives in British dialect. The outcome of this development for the literary language is *you* for nominative, dative, and accusative. In Biblical language *ye* is now uniformly employed as nominative and *you* as dative and accusative, as can be seen in the present text of the King James Version of the Bible. In the original text of this version this usage was not so uniform, as there were in it a number of *you’s* where we now find *ye*. Both *ye* and *you* are here still always plural forms as originally.

The use of the plural forms *ye* and *you* for reference to one person is closely related to the use of the plural of majesty *we* described in F above. As a ruler often spoke of himself in the plural, others in addressing him felt that they should employ the plural form. After this model it became general in continental Europe to address by a plural form every individual of high rank in church and state. At last, plural form became a mark of politeness in general and was
used in speaking to an equal as well as to a superior. This new usage arose in England in the thirteenth century under the influence of French, which here followed the continental Latin usage. The new polite form of addressing one person by the plurals *ye* and *you* did not at once displace the older usage of employing *thou* and *thee* here. For a long while the old and the new forms often alternated with each other, but gradually the new form was distinctly felt as more polite. Thus, in older English, the forms were often differentiated. *Thou* was used in familiar intercourse, and *you* employed as a polite form in formal relations. In Pecock's *Donet* (about A.D. 1449) the father, throughout the book, addresses his son by *thou* and *thee*, while the son out of deference uses *ye* and *you* to his father. The British dialects of the South and South Midland still distinguish between *thou* or *thee* used in intimate relation and *you* or *ye* (often written *ee*) employed in polite language in more formal intercourse. In the eighteenth century, Richardson in his *Pamela* lets Lady Davers use *thou* to her brother in moments of strong emotions and employ *thou* to Pamela in moments of anger and tenderness. This usage survives in British dialects.

In the standard prose English of the eighteenth century, *thou* and *thee* were entirely replaced by *you*, so that the form of polite address became general in the common intercourse of life, the one form *you* serving without distinction of rank or feeling for one or more persons and for the nominative, dative, and accusative relations. The lack of clearness here has called forth in the popular speech of America, Australia, and Ireland a plural ending for this form to indicate more than one, *yous* (or *youse* and in Ireland also *ye, yes, yez, yiz*): 'He'll settle *yous* (= you kids), *yous guys.*' It is not unknown in British English. Horace Walpole in a letter to Miss Mary Berry, March 27, 1791, in speaking of her and her sister Agnes writes playfully: 'I have been at White Pussy's (i.e., Lady Amherst's) this evening. She asked much after *yous*.' This advantage, however, is sometimes lost through the popular tendency to simplify, i.e., to employ *yous* also as a singular: 'So! At last I found *youse*' (cartoon in *Chicago Tribune*, Sept. 16, 1923).

In the southern states, *yöu all* is used as the plural of *you*: 'He'll settle *yüöu all.*' The genitive *yöu all's* is also in use: 'yöu all's business.' *Yöu all* may be addressed to a single person provided the form is felt as a plural comprising a definite group of individuals: 'Do *yüöu all* (addressed to a clerk representing the different members of the firm) keep fresh eggs here?' (Alphonso Smith, *The Kit-Kat*, Vol. IX, p. 27). The *all* in *yüöu all* is often reduced to *'ll*, as it is only weakly stressed: 'Boys, I want *yüöu'll* to stop that noise'
In the literary language you all is used, but the stressed all indicates that the thought is different from the normal southern use of you all, which is simply a plural of you: ‘You all are wrong,’ or ‘You are all wrong.’ In popular speech you uns is often used as the plural of you. The genitive is you uns’. In certain British dialects you together is used as plural of you. In the literary language and in ordinary colloquial speech we bring out the plural idea here by placing some plural noun after you: ‘you gentlemen,’ ‘you boys,’ ‘you kids,’ etc.

The older universal use of thou and thee in the singular and ye and you in the plural to all persons has survived in the higher forms of poetry and elevated diction, where the thoughts soar, but in the realistic forms of poetry the actual language of everyday city and country life holds almost complete sway, even where the thoughts rise somewhat from earth, the poet forgetting that the language of earth keeps us on earth: ‘Oh, when I was in love with you, Then I was clean and brave, And miles around the wonder grew, How well did I behave’ (Housman, A Shropshire Lad, XVIII). Thus the old poetic forms, long used to elevate thought and feeling, are in our own time breaking down; it may be because the poetic elevation of thought and feeling that once gave them meaning is no longer present.

In older English, thee is sometimes seemingly used as a nominative subject, where in fact it may be an ethical dative (12 I B c): ‘Hear thee (possibly an ethical dative, but now felt as a nominative), Gratiano!’ (Merchant of Venice, II, ii, 189). This same form is also sometimes found in older English as a real nominative, perhaps after the analogy of you, which has one form for all the cases: ‘How agrees the devil and thee about thy soul?’ (Shakespeare, I Henry IV, I, ii, 127). ‘What hast thee done?’ (Marlowe, Jew, 1085, about A.D. 1590, ed. 1636). ‘If thee wilt walk with me, I’ll show thee a better’ (words of a young Quaker to Benjamin Franklin, as quoted in Franklin’s Autobiography, Writings, I, p. 255). This usage lingered much later in popular speech: ‘I know thee dost things as nobody ’ud do’ (George Eliot, Adam Bede, Ch. IV).

Thou and thee are still used by Quakers, often with the nominative form thee in connection with the third person of the verb, as explained in 8 I 1 h: ‘Thou art not (or now more commonly thee’s not) consistent.’ The Quaker address originally had a deep meaning in that it was used toward all men irrespective of rank, and hence emphasized their equality, but it has become a mere symbol of sect since society in general recognized this democratic principle by the employment of you without respect to social station.
5. Omission of the Subject. In general every sentence must have a subject expressed, but usage admits of certain irregularities. The subject is omitted:

a. As a rule in imperative sentences: ‘Hand me that book.’ Compare 45 1 a, b, c.

b. In the first person in a few set expressions: ‘Thank you,’ ‘Hope to see you again.’ In colloquial American the subject I is usually omitted in the expression ‘I say’ employed to call attention to what is about to be said: ‘Say, do you know who that is?’ It is omitted also when ‘I say’ is employed as an exclamation: ‘Say! won’t it be glorious?’ In British English, I is usually expressed in both uses of ‘I say.’

c. Grammarians usually say that a subject governing a preceding possessive genitive is suppressed if the same word is used shortly before or after: ‘Of the three autos William’s [auto] is the best.’ ‘John’s hair is darker than his sister’s [hair is].’ ‘So did his maiden sister, Miss Monica Thorne, than whose [heart] no kinder heart glowed through all Barsetshire’ (Trollope, Dr. Thorne, II, Ch. XXIV). The common impression that words are omitted here, as indicated above in brackets, is in a scientific sense erroneous. The genitive in all such cases, as here William’s, his sister’s, whose, has in English developed into a possessive pronoun. This can be clearly seen in such cases as ‘Yours is the greater treason, for yours is the treason of friendship.’ Here yours is a possessive pronoun, pointing forward to the governing noun treason. No noun can be supplied after yours, hence there is no omission here. In the other cases there is likewise in the exact sense no omission since the genitives have become possessive pronouns. For fuller information see 57 5 a.

d. As in oldest English, there is still often no subject expressed since it is suggested by the context. From a modern point of view we may supply as subject situation it (4 II A) or some other pronoun. This old construction is most common after as and than: ‘Come as soon as [it, i.e., the coming, is] possible.’ ‘He described the affair as [it, i.e., the description] follows.’ ‘The conditions are as [what] follows’ (or sometimes as [they here] follow). ‘As many as [they] came were caught.’ In older English, the subject was often omitted after an as which introduced a degree clause of modal result (29 2): ‘I was seized by a fever which grew so upon me as (now that it) forced me to a resolution of seeking my physician at London’ (John Donne, Letter to Mrs. Cokain, Aug. 24, 1628). The pronoun what is often omitted: ‘He never reads as much as [what] is required of the class.’ ‘He accomplished more than [what] was expected of him.’ Even though the subject is omitted, anticipatory
there (4 II C) is often employed after than and as to point forward, as it were, to the following omitted subject: ‘One would say that there were fewer flowers just now than there have been’ (Thoreau, Journal, II, p. 282).

Similarly, the pronominal object is often omitted here: ‘Bring as many of them as you can find.’ ‘He bought more of them than he needed.’ There is no object in the subordinate clause here since the meaning is made clear by the words many and more of the principal proposition.

The predicate is likewise often suppressed since it is implied in some word in the principal proposition, especially in a predicate adjective: ‘Out of this war (between the North and the South) we emerged more homogeneous as a people than we had ever been before’ (Henry Watterson, Editorial, May 11, 1909). ‘I am as well as I have ever been.’

Similarly, an adverb is often suppressed: ‘He works harder than he did as a young man.’

Earlier in the period, a what was sometimes inserted in all these grammatical relations to fill the vacancy that was felt: ‘On the twentieth of the last February there came on a snow, which, being added unto what had covered the ground a few days before, made a thicker mantle for our mother than what (subject) was usual’ (Thoreau, Journal, VIII, p. 163). ‘I think I laughed heartier then than what (adv. acc.) I do now’ (Scott, Heart of Midlothian, Ch. XXX). This what is a marked feature of current popular speech; ‘I’m more in earnest than what you are.’ ‘I hope you can walk quicker than what you eat.’ What is now never inserted here in the literary language.

In older English, omissions of pronouns were very common in the subordinate clause where a preceding word suggested the meaning of the sentence. This older usage survives only in set expressions, as here after as and then and in relative clauses: ‘The book I hold [it] in my hand is an English grammar.’ Compare 19 3 (3rd par.), 23 II.

There is sometimes a difference of meaning between the form of expression with the subject suppressed and that with the subject expressed: ‘The neighbors were kind as could be’ (Julia Peterkin, Scarlet Sister Mary, Ch. XXIX), but ‘On this occasion the gruff old fellow was as kind as he could be.’

e. Subject Omitted when Verb is Used Absolutely. In ‘For whoever hath, to him shall be given’ (Matthew, XIII, 12) the subject of the principal proposition is omitted as the verb is used absolutely (46, 2nd par.), i.e., without regard to a subject.
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FORMS OF THE PREDICATE

6. The predicate can be:

A. A Finite Verb of Complete Predication: 'Birds sing.' 'Dogs bark.' 'Riches pass away.' 'Mary writes neatly.' 'Mary writes beautiful letters.' Verbs of complete predication are often not complete of themselves and need some other word or words, as in the last two examples, to make the meaning complete, but the term 'verb of complete predication' is not entirely without inner justification. Such verbs stand in contrast to copulas (B, p. 26), which in a mere formal way perform the function of predication and do not in an actual sense predicate. Verbs of complete predication, on the other hand, predicate, say something of the subject; they present
a general line of thought which is basic even if it has to be often supplemented by details. The verb with all its modifiers constitutes the complete predicate.

The verb is not always a simple word, as in the preceding examples, but is often made up of an auxiliary and another verb-form, both together usually called the verb-phrase: ‘I have just finished my work.’ ‘I shall soon finish my work.’ ‘I cannot finish my work today.’ Though the auxiliary has finite form as far as possible and the verb proper is in a formal sense dependent, the verb proper contains the basic thought.

In oldest English, the verb usually stood at or near the end of the sentence. This withholding of the verb for a time created the feeling of suspense and thus made the verb prominent. Later, it often became desirable to make important modifiers of the verb prominent by suspending them for a time, so that the verb was gradually crowded out of the end position. See 35 1 a. We have, however, never lost all feeling for the old principle of rendering the verb emphatic by withholding it for a time: ‘Many things we gladly remeber, others we gladly forget.’

a. VERB OFTEN UNIMPORTANT. The verb often becomes quite an unimportant element in a sentence and on account of the overtowering importance of some other part of the predicate is so little felt that it may be omitted: ‘[take your] Hats off!’ ‘[sit] Down in front!’ A part of the verbal predicate is often suppressed since it is suggested by the context: ‘Have you done it?’—‘Of course, I have [done it].’ ‘Then, I take it, there had been — er — ?’—‘An estrangement. Yes, there had [been]’ (Pinero, The Thunderbolt, Act I). ‘They [have] been comin[g] here a long time’ (Meredith Nicholson, Blacksheep, p. 21). ‘[have] You seen Elmer again?’ (Edith Wharton, The Custom of the Country, Ch. IV). ‘[did you] Get my wire?’ (Edwin Balmer, Breath of Scandal, Ch. XIII). ‘[it would] Serve you right if Red (name) wouldn’t answer your old letter’ (J. P. McEvoy, The Potters). ‘[would you] Like to know him?’ (Pinero, Sweet Lavender, Act I). ‘But I guess I [had] better go in’ (Tarkington, Gentle Julia, Ch. XX).

In lively narrative the suppression of the verb often imparts to the description the idea of a brisk movement of events: ‘Down the gorge and over the bridge at the bottom of it’ (Wallace, Ben Hur, VIII, Ch. VIII). Similarly, in imperative sentences: ‘The horses—and quickly!’ (ib., VIII, Ch. IX).

In older English, the infinitive of a verb of motion was often thought unnecessary after an auxiliary, where according to present usage it must stand: ‘Thou shalt [go] to prison’ (Shakespeare). In Scotland, North Ireland, and in parts of America this old usage is still quite common after to want (= to wish): ‘I want [to get] off.’ ‘I want out.’ ‘I want in.’ ‘Belgium wants in this protective arrangement’ (from an editorial in Chicago
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**b. Finite Verb Replaced by Noun.** There is a marked tendency in English to clothe the chief idea of the predicate in the form of a noun instead of a finite verb: 'The matter is under consideration,' instead of 'The matter is being considered.' 'After dinner we had a quiet smoke,' instead of 'We smoked quietly.' 'I got a good shaking up,' instead of 'I was shaken up thoroughly.' 'We got a good snub.' Similarly, there is a strong tendency to clothe the chief idea of the predicate in the form of a noun instead of an infinitive which depends upon an auxiliary and hence contains the real verbal meaning: 'Let me have a try,' instead of 'Let me try it.' 'I'll make a try (instead of try) at least not to be a disgrace to my Alma Mater' (Mary R. S. Andrews, The Eternal Masculine, p. 381). 'Let's have a good swim!' All these cases indicate a reluctance in colloquial speech to predicate by means of a full verb, since this method is felt as too formal, too scientific, precise. In colloquial language there is here as elsewhere a tendency to more concrete forms of expression. A noun seems nearer to popular feeling than the more abstract verb. The verbs that are used here in colloquial speech are all of the nature of the copulas described in B. They merely serve to connect the predicate noun, the real predicate, with the subject.

c. Use of 'Do' to Avoid the Repetition of a Verb. In all the different periods of English a form of *do* has been employed as a pro-verb to avoid the repetition of a verb that has just been used: 'If competition advances as it has done for several years.' 'He has never acted as he should have done.' 'He behaves better than you do.'

In many cases this usage is more modern, coming from the omission of the infinitive in the periphrastic *do*-form (d) of the verb: 'Shall I ask him?' — 'Dô [ask him]!' or 'O please dô [ask him]!' 'Did you tell him?' — 'Of course I dîd [tell him]' or 'I surely dîd [tell him].'

d. Use of the Periphrastic Form with 'Do.' In the present and the past tense of verbs of complete predication the simple verb is often replaced by a periphrastic form made up of *do* and a dependent infinitive: 'Thus conscience *does make (= makes)* cowards of us all' (Shakespeare); originally according to 46 (next to last par.) 'causes a making of cowards out of us all.' At first, *do* was a full verb with an infinitive as object. Later, it lost its concrete force and became a mere periphrastic auxiliary. In older English, as in the example from Shakespeare, there was usually no clear difference of meaning between the simple and the
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periphrastic form. Sometimes the periphrastic form was chosen because it was a clearer past tense form, as in ‘For my vesture they did cast (instead of simple cast) lots’ (John, XIX, 24); sometimes for the sake of dignity, euphony, rhythm, emphasis, often from mere caprice. This older use of the periphrastic form without a clear differentiation from the simple form survives in poetry and in Biblical, liturgical, and legal language. The do-form of the verb is now used only in the present and the past tense, but in early Modern English it was sometimes employed also in the present perfect and the past perfect, especially in Scotland: ‘as I afore have done discus’ (Lauder, Tractate, 340, A.D. 1556) = have discussed. The infinitive following the past participle done was sometimes attracted into the form of the past participle: ‘Remember . . . How that my 30wth I [have] done forloir’ (past participle instead of the infinitive forleir ‘lose’) (Dunbar, XXII, 2) = ‘Remember that I have lost my youth.’ ‘Thay ar Wolfis and Toddis, quha . . . have violentlie done brokin (instead of break) the dyk of the Scheipfald’ (Burne, Disput., 78, V, A.D. 1581) = ‘They are wolves and foxes who have violently broken the wall of the sheepfold.’ Both forms of this construction are still found in popular southern American English: ‘I [have] done tell you ’bout Brer Rabbit makin’ ‘im a steeple’ (Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, p. 97). ‘I ’speck I [have] done tole (instead of tell) you ’bout dat’ (ib., p. 97). ‘I’ve done found (instead of find) it’ (Margaret Prescott Montague, Up Eel River, p. 182). The past participle resulting from attraction is now much more common than the older infinitive form. This attraction takes place also after the past tense done: ‘Tain’t so mighty long sence I done tole (instead of tell) you ’bout ole Mr. Benjermin Ram’ (Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, p. 297). Compare 49 4 C (1) a (last par.).

The periphrastic form with do was rare in Old English, but began to become common in the fourteenth century and was at its height between 1500 and 1700. After the periphrastic and the simple form had long been used interchangeably, a desire for more accurate expression led to a differentiation of their meaning. This had become possible since the periphrasis had come to be felt as an analytic form and, like other analytic forms, could assume different shades of meaning according to the stress, as explained on page 24. Present usage became fixed about 1750, but with certain verbs the old simple forms lingered on even in plain prose long after they had elsewhere passed away; indeed here and there linger still, especially in set expressions, as if I mistake not, I care not, I doubt not, I know not, what say you? what think you? etc. Of course, the poet makes still more liberal use of the old forms when it suits his purpose. In popular speech there is a tendency to employ the do-form with the copula be in declarative sentences, which is contrary to literary usage: ‘Some days she do be awful about her food’ (Dorothy Gerard, The Eternal Woman, Ch. XV).

In plain prose we now employ do:

(1) In the present and the past tense of a verb of complete predication when it stands in a question, a declarative statement, or an entreaty where there is a desire to emphasize the idea of actuality, the truthfulness
of a claim, realization or a desire of realization: ‘Didn’t he work?’ ‘Did he work?’ ‘Does he cheat?’ ‘I still maintain that you didn’t do it.’ — ‘But I did do it.’ ‘Why don’t you work?’ — ‘I do work.’ ‘I am so happy to learn that you do intend to come.’ ‘Do finish your work!’ (desire of realization). Compare (3), p. 25, 1st paragraph (end).

The employment of a stressed do to emphasize the idea of actuality is in accordance with the general tendency in English to emphasize the idea of actuality, realization, or modality by the use of a stressed auxiliary: ‘Why are you not studying?’ — ‘I am studying.’ ‘You have done that before.’ — ‘I haven’t.’ ‘Now I shall tell your mother. Mark my words, this time I shall tell your mother’ (Bennett, Old Wives’ Tale, II, Ch. IV). ‘He hasn’t come yet, but he will come.’ ‘Why don’t you do it?’ — ‘I can’t.’ ‘I haven’t done it yet, but I feel that I should do it.’ We have discovered the possibility of using our analytic verbal forms in such a way as to shade our thought. In these compound forms the auxiliary merely performs the formal function of predication, gives the time relations, or colors the thought. The verbal meaning lies in the participle or infinitive. If we desire to emphasize the verbal meaning, we stress the part of the verb that contains the verbal meaning, i.e., the participle or infinitive; but if we desire to emphasize the idea of actuality, truthfulness, realization, or modality, we stress the auxiliary: ‘Why aren’t you working?’ — ‘I am working.’ ‘Why don’t you work?’ — ‘I do work.’

This great advantage of our analytic forms has been the active factor in extending their use. Compare 37 3.

The copula and the auxiliaries, which in single propositions, like the preceding examples, are much used to emphasize the idea of actuality, truthfulness, are now also employed with the same force in double propositions, where the copula or auxiliary stands in the second shorter statement, reaffirming the truth of the preceding longer statement. The shorter proposition consists of only two words, a subject, repeating the preceding subject in the form of a pronoun or a more explicit noun, and a predicate, repeating the preceding verbal predicate in the form of a copula or an auxiliary, which is sometimes only moderately stressed, sometimes, in language charged with feeling, strongly stressed in connection with a strong stress upon the repeated subject, so that there results a double stress, as so often elsewhere in lively speech: ‘He was odd, was the Captain.’ ‘But it’s a cunning devil, is that machine (type machine)! — and knows more than any man that ever lived’ (Mark Twain, Letter to Orion Clemens, Jan. 5, 1889). ‘Dick had his Bible out and was praying volubly. He had been well brought up, had Dick’ (Stevenson, Treasure Island, Ch. XXXII). ‘He had a particular taste, Mr. Glenarm had’ (Meredith Nicholson, The House of a Thousand Candles, Ch. III, p. 43). ‘I did not know him. I really didn’t’ (Joseph Conrad, Chance, Ch. II). ‘The Shipping Master swung round on his stool and addressed me as “Charles.” He did’ (ib., Ch. I). ‘Alexandra! Can’t you see he’s just a tramp and he’s after your money? He wants to be taken care of, hé dés’ (W. S. Cather, O Pioneers! p. 167). ‘I love him, I do.’ Similarly, we repeat a modal auxiliary to emphasize the idea of modality: ‘John must do it,
he just must.' 'John can do it, I just know he can.' 'John can't do it, can't he?' 'John can't do it, can't he?'

(2) The do-form is used also in the present and the past tense of a verb of complete predication when it stands in an entreaty, or in a question, or in a declarative sentence with inverted word-order where there is a desire to stress the activity or to inquire after or to state simple facts without any intention of emphasizing the idea of actuality: 'Do finish your work!' 'Does he believe it?' 'How's (= how does) it strike you?' (Jack London, The Sea-Wolf, Ch. VII). 'Did you see him do it?' 'What's he say?' 'What did he answer?' 'Where did he come from?' 'When did he finally go?' 'Bitterly did we repent our decision.' 'Never did I see such a sight!' In such entreaties and questions and in such declarative statements with inverted word-order the verbal meaning is usually quite prominent and hence the verb is usually stressed. In contrast to older English, we now use the do-form here, so that by stressing the infinitive we can emphasize the verbal meaning pure and simple.

The do-form was so often used in questions for the sake of securing a pure verbal form to stress and emphasize that it has become associated with interrogative form and is now used in all questions, even where the verb is not emphatic: 'Where did you buy it?' 'Whom did you meet?' The old simple forms are now only used in questions when the subject is an interrogative pronoun: 'Who met you?' In older English, the simple forms could be used also when some other word was subject: 'Discern'st thou aught in that?' (Shakespeare, Othello, III, iii, 101). The old simple forms are still used for archaic effect in historical novels: 'Saw you ever the like?' (Wallace, Ben Hur, Ch. X). Also in certain dialects, as in Scotch English, the old simple forms are still used: 'What paid ye for't?' (George Macdonald, Robert Falconer, Ch. XXI). The older simple form survives widely in the literary language in the case of have, especially in England: 'Have you swordfish?' alongside of the more common do-form, 'Do you have swordfish?' In indirect questions the old simple form is preserved with all verbs: 'When did you come back?' but 'I asked him when he came back.'

(3) Do is employed also in the negative form of questions, declarative statements, and commands when simple not is the negative, only, however, in the present and past tense of verbs of complete predication, of course, therefore not in the case of the copula be, the tense auxiliaries, the modal auxiliaries can, must, etc., the auxiliary-like verb ought, often also the auxiliary-like verbs need and dare, both of which, however, may take do; usually also not in the case of have in unemphatic statements: 'He doesn't live here,' but 'He isn't here.' 'I do not often forget it,' but 'I must not forget it.' 'I do not go home till eight,' but either 'I need not go home till eight' or 'I do not need to go home till eight.' 'She dared not tell (or to tell) him,' or 'She did not dare tell (or to tell) him.' 'I haven't it with me,' but in emphatic statement 'I do not have it with me,' where, however, in colloquial speech we may employ also the form without do: 'You have it with you.' — 'I haven't.' In commands and entreaties: 'Don't touch me!' 'Don't have a thing to do with him!' 'Don't go yet!'
In negative commands and in positive and negative entreaties do is used also with the copula be, as do has become associated with negative commands and both positive and negative entreaties: 'Don't be late!' 'Don't you be late!' 'Dō be reasonable!' 'Dōn't be unreasonable!' In popular speech do is used also elsewhere with be: 'Now, boy, why don't you be polite and get up and give one of these young ladies a seat?' (Punch).

Thus in negative statements there is usually an auxiliary, do or some auxiliary of tense or mood or auxiliary-like verb. In all such cases, as explained more fully in 16 2d, the sentence adverb not, like other sentence adverbs, stands after the auxiliary immediately before the real verbal element, the infinitive or participle. The do-form is chosen in the case of verbs of complete predication in order that the sentence adverb not may stand in its natural place before the real verbal element. In case of the auxiliaries has, may, can, etc., the not follows the auxiliary regularly and thus comes into its natural position before the real verbal element.

Although in negative statements the old simple forms have disappeared from simple prose, the charm of the beautiful older simplicity often asserts itself in the language of our better moments: 'We cannot do wrong to others with impunity. Our conscience rests not until the wrong be righted.'

B. Predicate a Verb of Incomplete Predication + Complement. The predicate may be also a verb of incomplete predication in connection with a predicate complement, the verb assuming in a mere formal way the function of predication, the complement, noun or adjective, serving as the real predicate: 'The whale is a mammal.' 'Man is mortal.' A verb of incomplete predication is called a copula, or linking verb. The verb be, the oldest and most common of the copulas, has in most cases nothing whatever of its original concrete meaning, so that it for the most part is employed today not to convey sense but merely to perform a function, to indicate predication, connecting the subject with the real predicate. Concrete meaning, however, often enters into be, but it is usually inconspicuous, so that the form is felt as a copula, connecting a subject with the real predicate: 'The book is (= is lying) on the table.' 'He is (= is sitting) on the veranda.' 'He is (= is standing working) in his workshop.' Sometimes, however, the force is more concrete. For examples see 7 D 3.

There are at present a large number of copulas, or linking verbs, in English, verbs in various stages of development toward the copula state, all containing more or less of their original concrete meaning, so that, though all are copulas, they are all more or less differentiated in meaning from one another and from the copula be. A number of them are serving not only as copulas, but also as full verbs, preserving in certain meanings their original concrete force: 'The cow has run, or gone (full verbs), into the barn,' but 'The
cow has run, or gone (copulas = become), dry.' As copulas they indicate a state, continuance in a state, or entrance into a state. Simple state: 'He is sick.' 'He is a great master.' Continuance in a state: 'He continues obstinate.' 'He keeps still.' Entrance into a state may call attention to the first point or the final point in a development. First point: 'He became (or got) sick.' 'He (i.e., Keats) now also commenced poet' (J. R. Lowell, Literary Essays, I, p. 224). Final point: 'He became (or went) blind.' 'He became a great master.' As the predicate is often a verbal adjective, a past or present participle, the copulas are often employed as auxiliary verbs. As auxiliary of the passive voice: 'Our house is painted every year.' Here is has the force of gets, an old meaning that it has had for many centuries, hence the literal meaning is, 'Our house enters every year into the painted state.' In colloquial speech get is often used here: 'Our house gets painted every year.' Compare 47 b. As auxiliary of aspect (38 1) indicating duration: 'He is working.' 'He keeps on working.'

The most common copulas are: appear, bang (Door banged shut), become, blow (Door blew open), blush (She blushed red; see also 7 A d), break (He broke loose or free), break out, bulk, burn (Clay burns white), burst out, catch (7 F), chance, come, commence, continue, cut up (British Eng. = turn out to be: He cut up rough, i.e., showed resentment), eat (The cakes eat crisp, i.e., prove to be crisp when eaten), fall, feel, flame (His face flamed redder), flash (He flashed crimson with anger), flush (Her cheeks flushed red; see also 7 A d), fly (Door flew open), get, go, go on, happen, hold, keep, keep on, lie, live, look, loom, make (see (3) and (4), p. 28), prove, rank, remain, rest, ring, rise, run, seem, shine, show, sit, smell, sound, spring (7 B a), stand, stay, strike, take (colloquial American in 'take ill, sick'), taste, turn, turn out, wax, wear (Coat wears thin), work (Button works loose). Appear, seem, and often look, though copulas, differ from the others in that they have subjunctive force, casting more or less doubt upon the statement. See 44 I (last par.).

All these copulas are intransitive verbs and differ only in this respect from the copula-like verbs in A b, which are for the most part transitives.

There are four classes in these intransitives: (1) Those originally intransitive: 'He fell ill.' 'What I ate lies heavy on my stomach.' 'He stands high in the community.' (2) Verbs originally transitive which have become intransitive since their object is so often omitted that it is no longer felt: 'The room struck [one as] cold and cheerless' (Phillpotts, The Secret Woman, Ch. II). 'When George Herbert left off [being] courtier and took orders,
he burnt his earlier love-poetry' (G. H. Mair, *English Literature*, p. 84). (3) Somewhat different from the verbs in (2) are reflexive verbs which have dropped their reflexive object since they have developed intransitive meaning, as described in 46: 'He felt much depressed,' originally 'He felt himself much depressed.' 'I felt such a fool' (A. Marshall, *The Squire's Daughter*, Ch. VI). 'He is making (for making himself) merry over us.' 'Seen by the strong light of the window, her face showed [itself] sallow in tone' (Ellen Glasgow, *Life and Gabriella*, Ch. I). (4) On the other hand, the transitive make often retains its object but loses so much of its concrete force that it is felt as a copula with the meaning become, *turn out to be*: 'She will make him a good wife.' We here still dimly feel wife as an object, but we cannot put the sentence into the passive with wife as subject, which shows that wife is virtually a predicate noun after the copula make. Here the former object wife does not drop out, as the objects in (3), because it has received a new function, while in (3) the objects drop out since they no longer have a function and have become useless. In form, however, wife is still an object, as we can see by the simple dative object him before it. (5) As described in 46, intransitives often acquire passive force: 'This cloth feels (i.e., is felt as being) soft.' On the other hand, as passive force is often found in intransitive form we sometimes use intransitive form instead of passive: 'He took ill' instead of 'He was taken ill,' just as we often say 'The first consignment sold out in a week' instead of 'The first consignment was sold out in a week.' In the case of both feel and take, however, their concrete meaning and passive force are not as prominent as their function of copula to introduce a predicate adjective.

The old linking verb *worth* (= be, become) has passed out of common use, now usually replaced by other copulas: 'Woe *worth* the chase (dative), woe *worth* the day (dative), That costs thy life, my gray' (Scott, *Lady of the Lake*, I, ix, 166) = 'Woe be to the chase, woe be to the day,' etc.

a. **APPOSITIONAL TYPE OF SENTENCE OR CLAUSE.** The use of a copula represents an advanced stage of language development. Originally it was sufficient merely to place the predicate complement alongside the subject without any formal sign of predication. Colloquial speech teems with examples of the older type of sentences: 'Our sister dead?' 'Everybody gone?' 'Everything in good condition.' This primitive type of sentence, which simply consists in placing the predicate complement alongside the subject, is called the appositional type of sentence. The predicate adjective may not only follow the subject, but it very often precedes it: 'A sad experience!' 'Good work!' 'Poor fellow!' In many cases, as in the last example, for instance, this old appositional type of sentence is firmly
fixed in English usage, and can scarcely be changed into the later conventional form with an expressed copula. The old type is most common where there is a strong expression of feeling, as in the last example.

In the prehistoric period of Indo-European, before it split up into different languages, the finite verb of complete predication had become established to indicate that the subject is acting, acted upon, or resting in a certain condition. Where the predicate was a noun, adjective, adverb, or prepositional phrase, the old appositional type of sentence still in general remained in common use. But even in this prehistoric period the copula be was often used to connect the subject with a predicate noun, adjective, adverb, or prepositional phrase. This verb was chosen because in its historical development it had at this time lost a good deal of its original concrete meaning and yet retained its verbal form. The loss of concrete meaning and the retention of its verbal endings made it possible to employ it as a formal means to introduce the predicate noun, adjective, adverb, or prepositional phrase, for by virtue of its verbal form it possessed the power of predication as in its earlier days when it was a verb of complete predication, and moreover could indicate the relations of time and mood, two important features not found in the older appositional type of sentence.

From the very start the new type of sentence with the copula has been closely associated with formal accurate language, hence is employed in the calm flow of thought in declarative sentences and hasn't such exclusive sway in loose colloquial speech or where strong feeling is involved. Of course, the old type is common in old saws which often preserve faithfully older forms of expression. In many of these old saws we can see that this primitive type can in spite of its simple structure often indicate clearly the complicated grammatical relations of complex sentences: ‘[if something is] Out of sight, [it soon comes] out of mind.’

This old type of predication without a copula is still common in the headlines of our newspapers: SNOWDEN'S STAND CRITICIZED (The New York Times, Aug. 17, 1929). Still common also in advertisements: ‘Money back guarantee in every package.’

On the other hand, it is still common in choice poetic prose, where it often possesses a peculiar charm: ‘Blossom week in Maryland! The air steeped in perfume and soft as a caress: the sky a luminous gray interwoven with threads of silver, flakings of pearls and tiny scales of opal! All the hillsides smothered in bloom — of peach, cherry and pear!’ (F. Hopkinson Smith, The Romance of an Old-Fashioned Gentleman).

It is best preserved in the subordinate clause. In the predicate accusative (15 III 2) construction: ‘She boiled the egg hard’ = ‘She boiled the egg that it became hard.’ ‘The President made him a general’ = ‘The President disposed so that he became a general.’

But it is not at all confined to the cases where the predicate of the subordinate clause is an adjective or a noun. It is widely used also where the predicate of the clause has the force of a verb of complete predication: ‘I wrote to him to come’ = ‘I wrote to him that he should come.’ This terse old type of predication without a finite verb is described in detail in 20 3.
In popular Irish English it is employed more widely than in the literary language, the infinitive or participle here usually serving as predicate. It can be used in any kind of subordinate clause: (subject clause) 'It is not fitting McDonough's wife to travel without company' (Lady Gregory, McDonough's Wife). (conditional clause) 'I to have money or means in my hand, I would ask no help' (ib.). It is especially common here in the second of two propositions connected by and, where, according to 19 3, the second proposition is felt as logically subordinate: 'What way wouldn't it be warm and it (i.e., the sun) getting high up in the South' (causal clause) (J. M. Synge, The Well of the Saints, p. 1).

C. Predicate Appositive. The predicate may be also a verb of complete predication in connection with a predicate complement, usually called predicate appositive: 'He came home sick.' 'Tired and sleepy, I went to bed.' 'She asked him in tears to come again.' 'He came home very much depressed.' 'The two persons who had entered the house friends left it with feelings of alienation.' 'Leslie reached Edinburgh a general without an army.' 'He died the (or as the) richest man in the state.' 'This successful enterprise will go down in local history as representing the best that our town can do.' For the use of as here, see 7 A b (3) and 7 B c.

The predicate appositive often not only adds a remark about the subject but also has the force of an adverbial clause, thus sustaining relations to both the subject and the principal verb: 'She sat at the window sewing' (with the force of an adverbial clause of attendant circumstance). 'Being sick (= as I was sick), I stayed at home.' 'Having finished my work (= after I had finished my work), I went to bed.' The wide use of the predicate appositive in this category is one of the most characteristic features of our language. Compare 48 2 (5th par.).

The predicate appositive is also found with passives: 'Even as a young boy, he was regarded as very promising.'

The predicate appositive is, of course, also found after be when the verb is in fact not a copula but a verb of complete predication: 'He is (is lying) at home sick.'

The predicate complement is used not only with verbs of complete predication but also with a predicate noun or adjective: 'He is a good neighbor, always ready to lend a helping hand and do a good turn.' 'She was like a bird, full of joy and music.' 'Far from being kind, he was most cruel.'

Also limiting adjectives are used as predicate appositive: 'But there is a little redness, a kind of tendency to inflammation around them (i.e., the eyes), and she is likewise slightly marked with the small pox; both which blemishes were then imperceptible' (Mrs. Eliza Fay, Letter, April 24, 1779), now 'which blemishes were then
both imperceptible,' or 'both of which blemishes were then imperceptible.' 'There had ridden along with this old princess's cavalcade two gentlemen, who both were greeted with a great deal of cordiality' (Thackeray, Henry Esmond, I, Ch. XII), or 'who were both greeted with a great deal of cordiality,' or 'both of whom were greeted with a great deal of cordiality.' 'They were all, both, each, or themselves, wrong.' 'The others were all killed' or 'All the others were killed.' The word-order all the others in the last example shows clearly that all is developing toward the estate of an attributive adjective, but at the same time indicates its origin as a predicate appositive. We say his whole (attributive adj.) time, but all his time, half his time, all these books, half these books, since a predicate appositive cannot stand between a limiting adjective and the governing noun. Similarly, we say these two books, but both these books. After the analogy of two of these books we now say also both of these books, all of these books, half of these books, and 'He sent me some beautiful ties, all of which, however, were too small for me,' or with the old appositional construction, 'He sent me some beautiful ties, which, however, were all too small for me.' These limiting adjectives may be used also as predicate appositive to an object: 'I have the letters all together.' 'I have already paid Messrs. McCrea and Maire half their account' (George Mason, Letter to George Washington, Feb. 17, 1775). 'I've not said half what I've got to say.'

On the other hand, half is often used as a noun, preceded by a limiting adjective and followed by a partitive genitive: my half of the money. 'I've not said the half of what I've got to say.'

The nouns half, third, quarter, etc., are often used as predicate appositive to a subject or an object, standing before the subject or the object: 'My half the melon is good.' 'My half the money' (George Mason, Letter to George Washington, Feb. 17, 1775). 'Were I but capable of interpreting to the world one half the great thoughts and noble feelings which are buried in her grave!' (John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, I). 'The fleet did not have a quarter the number of boats it should have had' (Theodore Roosevelt, The Rough Riders, Ch. II).

Where the predicate is an adjective or a participle, we avoid the adjective half in the predicate appositive relation, since it would be felt here as an adverb: 'Half of them were dead,' not 'They were half dead,' for half is here felt as an adverb.

The peculiar word-order connected with many and some in older English shows that they were predicate appositives: 'as there be gods many and lords many' (I Cor., VIII, 5); 'the letters . . . Of many our contriving friends' (Shakespeare, Antony and Cleopatra, I, ii, 188); 'the fate of some your servants' (Ben Jonson, Sejanus,
We now say many of our contriving friends, some of your servants. For the further discussion of the predicate appositive see 10 II 2 H b.

7. Predicate Complement or Appositive. The predicate complement or appositive may be:

A. A NOUN:

a. In the nominative after verbs of incomplete predication and after passives:

(1) After the copulas enumerated in 6 B or after their infinitives and gerunds: ‘Socrates was the son of a sculptor.’ ‘They fell a prey to the angry waves.’ ‘He (Silas Marner) felt a reformed man, delivered from temptation’ (George Eliot). ‘What big girls you’re both getting’ (A. Marshall, The Eldest Son, Ch. II). ‘She looks a lady,’ but look is a transitive verb with an accusative object in ‘She looks compassion, daggers,’ ‘She would have said more; she looked the remainder,’ ‘Some women use their tongues — she look’d a lecture’ (Byron, Don Juan, I, xv). ‘Sir Leslie Stephen had the double advantage of both being and looking a man of letters.’ ‘The Scarlet Letter’ remains the greatest work of the kind in the English language.’ ‘I shrank from grateful words which would have sounded payment’ (Meredith). ‘They turned Catholics from sincere conviction.’ ‘The boy will turn out a marvelous man.’

In accordance with the old Germanic principle described in 3 a the predicate noun may for emphasis sometimes still stand in the first place: ‘Cantánkerous chap Roger always was!’ (Galsworthy, The Man of Property, p. 24). Compare 35 1 (7th par.).

The infinitive be is often added to the finite form of a number of these verbs which have considerable concrete force in order to mark them more clearly as copulas: ‘He seemed (or seemed to be) a happy man.’ ‘Young Pen looked to be a lad of much more consequence than he was really’ (Pendennis, I, Ch. XVIII). ‘He lived to be a very old man.’ ‘He rose to be president of the company.’

After the verbs let, bid, the simple infinitive of these copulas is used to connect the predicate noun or adjective with the accusative subject: ‘Let me be your friend.’ ‘I bade him be a good boy.’ ‘I bade him be quiet.’ After other verbs the copula in infinitive clauses usually has the prepositional form: ‘He never expected to become a criminal.’ ‘I want you to remain my friend.’ As he, the subject of the principal proposition in the first example, is a nominative, so the predicate of the infinitive clause, criminal, is also in the nominative. In the second example, as the subject of the infinitive clause is the accusative you, so the predicate of the clause, friend, is also in the accusative. Distinctive forms, of course, are found only in the case of pronouns, which are regularly in the
accusative in the predicate if the subject of the clause is an accusative: ‘He thought Richard to be me.’ ‘A boy whom I believed to be him just passed me.’ ‘I believed it to be her.’ ‘They supposed us to be them.’ ‘Whom do you suppose them to be?’ The predicate accusative becomes nominative after a passive: ‘It was at first thought to be he’ (or in loose colloquial speech usually him, as explained in 7 C a). In the active form of statement the infinitive clause is not so common here as a full clause with a finite verb: ‘He thought Richard was I’ (or in loose colloquial speech usually me, as explained in 7 C a).

On the other hand, if the complement is predicated of the genitive subject of a gerund, it is in the nominative: ‘I was sure of its being he’ (or in loose colloquial speech him, as explained in 7 C a).

A noun is often predicated of a direct accusative object without the aid of a copula — an objective predicate accusative: ‘The President made him a general.’ This is the appositional type of predication described in 15 III 2.

(2) After the passive forms of the transitives (see 15 III 2) which take a predicate accusative in the active, as in ‘The President made him a general’: ‘He was made a general.’ ‘He was appointed agent.’ ‘He was called John.’ ‘He was called bad names.’ ‘He was acclaimed king.’ ‘The Amsterdam Congress (of Socialists) must be written a failure’ (Times Correspondent).

b. The predicate nominative is introduced by as:

(1) After the intransitive appear: ‘This appears to me the (or as the) only way out of the difficulties.’

(2) After the passive forms of look upon, look at, consider, regard, greet, treat, and all others (for list see 15 III 2 A) which in the active take a predicate accusative introduced by as (see (3) below), as in ‘I look upon him as a worthy man’; ‘He is looked upon as a worthy man.’ ‘He is regarded as our (or considered our, or less commonly as our) most trustworthy man.’

(3) After a copula + complement and after intransitives of complete predication and after passives, as is often placed before a predicate appositive, although in accordance with older usage as is still often, especially in poetry, lacking here, as sometimes also in the two preceding categories: ‘As a teacher, he is a stern disciplinarian.’ ‘Methinks you breathe Another soul; your looks are more divine; You speak a hero (now in plain prose as a hero), and you move a god’ (now in plain prose as a god) (Dryden, All for Love, I, i, 435, a.d. 1678). ‘She acted hostess (more commonly as hostess) at the ducal parties’ (Elinor Glyn, The Reason Why, Ch. VII). ‘One of those robust natures and incisive constitutions to which doubt figures as a sickness’ (Morley, Voltaire, 11). ‘Lincoln was
born a (or as a) poor farmer's boy and died President (or as President) of the United States.' 'People are not born carpenters, but sometimes they are born painters.' 'He was detested as a Tory.' 'He was shunned as a man of doubtful character.'

Here as (from all so, i.e., quite so) as a determinative (27 2, last par.) points as with an index finger to the following noun which expresses the idea in mind, thus always indicating oneness with, identity. For more information about its origin see 15 III 2 A. This as stands in contrast to the predicate appositive adjective like that takes after it a dative object (11 2 g): 'As a true friend he stood by me to the end,' but 'Like a friend he came to me and exchanged a few words with me, but I knew that he was inwardly not friendly disposed toward me.' The as here expresses complete identity, oneness with, while like indicates mere similarity. Latin qua (ablative fem. sing. of the relative pronoun qui, hence = [in the way] in which, i.e., with the meaning of in the capacity of) is sometimes used with the force of an emphatic as: 'He does it, not qua father, but qua judge.'

c. Instead of introducing the predicate complement by as, as in b, we still after a few verbs in certain set expressions employ a prepositional phrase introduced by the preposition for, a usage once more common than now: 'He passes for an accurate scholar.' 'Analogy goes for very little in the pronunciation of English.' 'He was taken for his brother.' 'If thou losest the prize, thou shalt be scourged out of the fists for (or as) a wordy and insolent braggart' (Scott, Ivanhoe, Ch. XIII). The verbs which in 15 III 2 A sometimes take for in the active, of course, take it sometimes in the passive.

In older English, for was used here in connection with the predicate what and the verb be, where what and for have the force of what kind of, as was für in German: 'What is he for a fool that betroths himself to unquietness?' (Shakespeare, Much Ado About Nothing, I, III, 49). 'What is she for a woman?' (Dryden, Marriage à la Mode, I, 1). This older usage survives here and there in popular speech.

d. After an intransitive copula containing the idea of growth, development, or a change of position or condition, the predicate complement indicates the final stage of the development or the new position or state: 'I speculated how it would look when the youth grew a man' (Mrs. Craik, Domestic Stories, I, Ch. V, 251). 'He became a rich man.'

The simple predicate complement is common only after become. In a few expressions the nominative is used after turn, blush, flush: 'She turned a livid white.' 'She blushed, flushed, a deep rose color.'
Usually a preposition or, after certain verbs, the infinitive form to be stands before the predicate complement to indicate more clearly the idea of a final stage or a new position or state: ‘From a robust and vigorous infant I grew into a pale and slender boy.’ ‘When the boy grows to man, and is master of the house, he pulls down that wall and builds a new and bigger’ (R. W. Emerson, The Conduct of Life, p. 34). ‘You’ve suddenly turned into a woman and into a very clever one.’ ‘Something got into my throat,’ in contrast to ‘Something was in my throat.’ ‘The machine got to running (gerund) smoothly,’ in contrast to ‘The machine was running (predicate participle) smoothly,’ but sometimes, as explained in 50 4 c dd, we find simple get here instead of get to: ‘If I get lying (predicate participle) awake tonight, I shan’t,’ etc. (De Morgan, Joseph Vance, Ch. X, p. 74). ‘She grew up to be a lovely woman like her mother.’ ‘He rose to be inspector of police.’ ‘He lived to be a very old man.’ ‘A rumor does not always prove (or prove to be) a fact.’

e. Predicate Genitive. After the verbs be, become, seem, feel, a predicate genitive is used to express several ideas also found in the attributive genitive, namely, characteristic, origin, possession, material, and sometimes the partitive idea, now usually with the prepositional form of the genitive except in the case of the possessive genitive, although the old simple genitive was once common in most of these relations: ‘I am quite of your opinion.’ ‘This matter is of considerable importance.’ ‘We are of the same age.’ ‘Be of good cheer.’ ‘He seems (to be) of a sound mind.’ ‘I feel of no use to anybody.’ ‘He was not of the poor class.’ ‘Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and unto God the things which are God’s’ (Matthew, XXII, 21). ‘God’s is the quarrel’ (Shakespeare, Richard the Second, I, ii, 37). ‘Nature has denied him (i.e., Lord Curzon) the wit that is Lord Rosebery’s’ (Atheneum, 17/7, 1915). ‘Tis mine To speak’ (Wordsworth, The Prelude, XIII, 12). ‘It is not ours (or in simpler language for us, or in colloquial speech often our business) to criticize them.’ ‘The house is of stone.’ ‘But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep’ (John, X, 26).

The old simple genitive of possession is still very common when it points backward or forward to a preceding or following noun or pronoun, but here, as in 57 5 a, it is often to be construed as a possessive pronoun, like mine, hers, etc.: ‘The book is my brother’s, not mine.’ Compare 57 5 a. The prepositional genitive of characteristic often develops here into an adjective, as is indicated by the frequent dropping of of, which converts the group of words into a compound adjective, as in 10 I 2: ‘The plank is not [of] the right width.’ ‘The chimneys are [of] the same height.’ ‘The two boys
are \[\text{of}\] the same size, age.' ‘My face became \[\text{of}\] a very bad color.’ ‘The door was \[\text{of}\] a dark brown.’ ‘This ring is \[\text{of}\] a pretty shade.’ ‘It’s \[\text{of}\] no use.’ ‘I only wish I could do it again; then I should feel \[\text{of}\] some use’ (Galsworthy, *Saint’s Progress*, 205). ‘Don’t be \[\text{of}\] any trouble to him.’ ‘\[\text{of}\] What benefit are all these experiments?’ ‘What age is she?’ ‘What part of speech are these words?’ ‘What price is this article?’ ‘What are potatoes today?’ Similarly, in the appositional relation after a governing noun where the appositive has the force of a predicate: ‘She is a gawky, slipshod, untidy child, with hair \[\text{which is of}\] the color of tow.’

An objective predicate genitive of characteristic is used after show, make, represent, regard, etc.: ‘He showed himself \[\text{of}\] noble spirit,’ or ‘He showed himself \text{to be of noble spirit}.’ The \[\text{of}\] of the genitive here is often suppressed as in the predicate genitive and for the same reason: ‘He made the two planks \[\text{of}\] the same width.’ ‘He painted the door \[\text{of}\] a green color.’ ‘\[\text{of}\] What color shall I paint the door?’ After some verbs the objective predicate genitive is introduced by \text{as}: ‘I regard this \text{as of great importance}.’ See also 15 III 2 A. The objective predicate genitive here, as the objective predicate accusative in 15 III 2, is joined to its subject, the object of the principal verb, without the aid of a copula, since the statement is felt to be of the old appositional type of sentence described in 6 B a, where the predicate is placed alongside of the subject like an appositive without the aid of a finite verb.

The genitive — usually introduced by \text{as} — is often used as a predicate appositive after intransitives of complete predication: ‘This consideration ought to weigh \text{as of value to you}.’

B. PREDICATE ADJECTIVE AND PARTICIPLES. The predicate complement or appositive may be an adjective or a participle:

\text{a. Adjective or Participle as Complement.} The adjective or participle may be predicated of a noun or pronoun in the nominative, here usually standing after a copula (6 B) or after the passive forms of the transitives (15 III 2), which in the active take a noun or a pronoun as a direct object and an adjective or a participle as objective predicate, as in ‘He knocked \text{him crazy}’: ‘The verdict appears \[\text{to be}\] just.’ ‘He is rich.’ ‘He became happy.’ ‘He was not a man who bulked (or figured) \text{large in the thoughts of his contemporaries}.’ ‘It came \text{easy to me}.’ ‘She fell \text{ill}.’ ‘He feels \text{uneasy}.’ ‘He got quite \text{angry}.’ ‘Much of our best literature goes \text{virtually unread}.’ ‘The offer holds \text{good for a month}’ (Mildred E. Lambert, *American Speech*, Oct., 1928). ‘He kept \text{silent}.’ ‘The meat \text{keeps good}.’ ‘She \text{keeps well}.’ ‘He lived to be eighty years \text{old}.’ ‘He looks \text{healthy}.’ ‘The shadow of these things it was that had suddenly fallen upon her spirit, and loomed \text{thick and dark}'}
between her and the friend of her early years’ (Allen Raine). ‘The rumor proved [to be] true.’ ‘He ranks high as a general.’ ‘All services rank the same with God’ (Browning). ‘He remained silent.’ ‘He will not rest content with these victories.’ ‘It is only where he drops the grand style that his verse really rings true.’ ‘Our ammunition is running short.’ ‘Oldish gentlefolks run fat in general’ (George Eliot, Silas Marner, Ch. XI). ‘He seems to be contented.’ ‘The joy shone clear and warm on her face.’ ‘It shows white from here.’ ‘He sits tight’ (slang). ‘It smells bad’ (adj.) but ‘It smells (i.e., stinks) badly’ (or disgustingly) (adverbs). ‘I feel bad’ (not badly). ‘Your sentence sounds well (adj.), bad.’ ‘It sounds good to hear your voice again.’ ‘It sounded harsh to me.’ ‘But, then, evening came, and the stars sprang alight’ (Sarah Gertrude Millin, God’s Stepchildren, Ch. II, I). ‘On this question we two stand alone.’ ‘Stay quiet for a little while.’ ‘It tastes sour.’ It turned cold.’ ‘The rumor turned out false’ (or to be false). ‘My father waxed hotter and hotter.’ ‘He was knocked crazy.’ ‘The egg was boiled hard.’ ‘He was found dead.’

For the insertion of to be in a number of these sentences see A a (1).

We still often find here the old verbless appositional type of sentence described in 6 B a: The little rascal! The poor fellow! A beautiful sight! A sad fate! In narrating indirectly such direct outbursts of feeling we often give them in part narrative form by the use of the copula as formal predicate, but instead of converting the adjective into a predicate adjective we often under the influence of the original strong impression retain its original attributive form, so that we say ‘Indeed it was a beautiful sight!’ instead of ‘Indeed the sight was beautiful!’ and ‘Mary’s (or hers) was a sad fate!’ instead of ‘Mary’s (or her) fate was sad!’

The governing substantive does not always stand in the predicate, as in these examples, but often serves as the subject, standing in the first place, the adjective standing in the predicate, not as a simple predicate adjective, but in substantive form (67 1) with the suffix one referring back to its governing noun, so that the adjective is in reality not a predicate adjective, for we always feel its relation to its governing noun: ‘The sight is indeed a beautiful one!’

Though we thus often replace the simple predicate adjective by more expressive attributive and substantive forms, we are, on the other hand, fond of it in connection with a complementary prepositional phrase as a more forcible form of statement than a transitive verb with an accusative object: ‘You are forgetful of (= forget) the fact that,’ etc. ‘I was ignorant of (= didn’t know) these facts.’ ‘Inaccuracy is fruitful of (= produces) error.’ ‘His style is provocative of (= provokes) controversy.’ This usage is very common in
learned speech and often tends away from simplicity in the direction of bombast.

The adjective or participle may be predicated also of a direct accusative object: 'It made him angry.' 'She boiled the egg hard.' 'I saw him making a kite.' This is the so-called objective predicate adjective or participle. Compare 15 III 2 and 15 III 2 A. As can be seen by the last example, the participle here often has the force of a finite verb. Compare 48 2 (3rd par.).

The predicate adjective is often found in the infinitive and the gerundial construction without reference to a definite subject since the reference is general: 'To be cheerful is the habit of a truly pious mind.' 'The desire of being happy reigns in all hearts.'

aa. Predicate Noun with the Force of an Adjective. In the predicate a noun often loses its concrete force, representing no longer an individual person, but now a general abstract idea, often without an article: 'He was fool (= foolish) enough to marry her.' 'He was not blunderer enough to betray his thought.' 'He was more hero than scoundrel.' 'He was master of the situation.' 'The child is father of the man.' 'If I were sovereign, I would rule that,' etc. 'He looked at me and, heavy and strong man as he was, he thought it wiser to speak me fair.' 'Under such strokes a courageous heart may turn coward.' 'He turned traitor.' 'Even irreligious people don't feel week-day on Sundays' (Hichens). 'The highest genius is splendidly spendthrift; it is only the second order that needs to be niggardly' (A. Symonds, Browning, quoted from Wendt's Syntax, I, p. 115). 'that I may rest assur'd Whether yond troops are friend or enemy' (Julius Caesar, V, iii, 18).

Where, as in the last example, there is a reference to more than one, the idea of a number of individuals is usually present to our feeling, so that we more commonly put the noun in the plural in spite of its abstract nature: 'Whether yonder troops are friends or enemies.' 'They were masters of the situation.' 'Are we not men enough to face things as they are?' (John Burroughs, Accepting the Universe, p. 11). In 'I am friends with him' the plural idea is so strong that the predicate noun is plural although the formal subject is singular. In a few set expressions, however, as a survival of older usage, the abstract idea is still stronger than the conception of different individuals, so that the noun, like an adjective, keeps its singular form: 'They stood sentry.' 'Two girls sat sentinel beside her' (M. H. Hewlett, The Forest Lovers, 237). 'They turned Christian' (Kipling, Plain Tales, 11). Jespersen in his English Grammar, II, p. 166, cites two more examples after turn: 'Enthusiasts have tried the experiment of turning husbandman' (Gissing, Henry Ryecroft, 188). 'Young gallants with no intention to turn husband' (Walter A. Raleigh, Shakespeare, 161). The definite article imparts here abstract force, so that it is used with the singular even where the reference is to more than one: 'They were too much the lady to make up to a gentleman who so obviously did not want them' (J. M. Barrie, Tommy and Grizel, 23). Of course,
often used also where the reference is to one: ‘He (J. Ramsay MacDonald) looked the prime minister’ (Edward Price Bell, Why MacDonald Came to America, p. 25).

The predicate noun here does not usually agree with its subject in gender, but the masculine form, as the more abstract of the two genders, is employed with reference to both sexes: ‘The King’s wife was in reality king.’ ‘She was master of the situation.’ ‘She is Jew, through and through.’ ‘Nightfall saw her victor (objective predicate; see 15 III 2 A) in this domestic contest.’ In such sentences, however, as ‘As for Mary, she was mistress of herself enough to whisper to Elizabeth’ (Jane Austen, Pride and Prejudice), the feminine form mistress becomes natural since we are influenced in our feeling by the accompanying herself. Of course, the feminine form is regularly employed when the predicate noun refers to something specifically feminine: ‘She is more mother than wife.’ ‘Sheila was very woman, and one Paris gown and the prospect of more had lifted her from the depths to the heights’ (Rupert Hughes, Clipped Wings, Ch. XXXI).

In a few expressions the definite article is used with the noun to indicate a particular noticeable state of things: ‘I am not quite the thing (= well) today.’ ‘Blue socks are now the thing’ (= proper, in vogue). ‘What’s the matter (= amiss) with him?’ ‘She has something the matter (objective predicate = amiss) with her spine.’

On the other hand, modified nouns used as attributive adjectives, as described in 10 I 2, are often used in the predicate, and, as pure adjectives, are invariable: ‘He is high church.’ ‘I’m west country myself.’ ‘The Windfields felt hopelessly small town’ (Rupert Hughes, Clipped Wings, Ch. XXXI). ‘His evidence was too first hand’ (Galsworthy, Man of Property, II, Ch. X). ‘He is first rate as a cricketer’ (George Bernard Shaw). Compare 7 A e and 10 I 2.

b. Predicate Complement Introduced by ‘As’ or ‘For.’ Instead of the simple adjective or participle the predicate is in certain instances, as in the case of nouns, introduced by as or for: ‘He is generally regarded as honest, as defeated,’ etc. ‘He passes for rich.’ ‘He was left for dead.’ ‘He was taken up for dead,’ quite different in meaning from ‘He was taken up dead.’ ‘This should be taken for granted.’

c. Adjective or Participle as Predicate Appositive. The adjective or participle is associated as predicate appositive (6 C) with an intransitive or transitive verb of complete predication: ‘He died young.’ ‘Unfortified by philosophy and unconsoled by religion, he perceived the arrival of the end with tears and lamentations.’ Compare 6 C.

The predicate appositive is in certain cases introduced by as: ‘Those who vote for this measure go on record as being willing to further public interests at the expense of their own.’

C. Predicate Pronoun, or Adverb ‘So’ instead of Pro-
The predicate complement may be a pronoun: ‘It was he.’
‘It was they.’ ‘It was we.’ In colloquial speech the accusative is
often used here. See a, p. 41.

The predicate complement may be a pronoun, referring to some
preceding sentence or description, or to the idea contained in a
preceding noun, adjective, verb, or prepositional phrase: ‘Thát
(or such) was the close of a remarkable life.’ ‘The thing is to be free
all around in this world, and only the poor can be thát’ (Phillpotts,
Forest, Ch. III). ‘He is the author of the article, but he does not
desire to be known as such.’ ‘They must be curious creatures.’ —
“They are that,” said Humpty Dumpty’ (Lewis Carroll, Through
the Looking-Glass). ‘She is a queen, and looks it.’ ‘She is very
tired, and looks it’ (or so; see 3rd par. below). ‘But I call no
Man bad till such he’s found’ (Robert Rogers, Ponteach, I, iv,
A.D. 1776), but now more commonly, ‘till he’s found to be thát’
(or so; see 3rd par. below). ‘He is patient, which you never are.’
‘She did it without murmuring, like the brave girl which (or that)
she was.’ ‘I tried to stop him, madman as he was.’

That and sometimes such (now not so commonly as formerly)
can be used thus also as objective predicate (15 III 2): ‘His sister
is tactful, but I couldn’t call him that.’ ‘He is honest, and you will
always find him thát’ (or sometimes such, or so; see 2nd par. below).

If the indefinite pronoun one is used as predicate, it does not
refer back to an idea as do such, that, and it, but points indefinitely
to a person or thing: ‘He was a notorious miser, and looked one
generally’ (Reade, The Cloister and the Hearth, Ch. I). In older
English, such was used here, and is sometimes still so used. Com­
pare 57 5 b.

Instead of a predicate pronoun we often employ the adverb so
as predicate, especially in connection with if and why and in re-
erring with emphasis to the idea contained in a preceding adver-
tive, noun, or prepositional phrase: ‘John, I hope you have not
forgotten the butter. If [that is] só, you must go back and get
it.’ ‘I don’t like my teacher.’ — ‘Why [is that] só?’ ‘He is
poor, and só am I.’ ‘He is a Catholic, and só am I.’ ‘Is he a faith-
ful friend?’ — ‘He certainly has proved so.’ Although so is often
emphatic, that conveys still greater emphasis: ‘To feel with them,
we must be like them; and none of us can be thát without pains’
(Ruskin, Sesame, I).

Sometimes both it and so can be put to good use in the same sen-
tence: ‘She is shy, but it is a peculiarity of hers that she never
looks it and yet is intensely so.’

The form so is, in general, the more common of the two; but, in
contrast to older usage, now generally drops out when the copula
be, or in a compound tense its tense auxiliary, in accordance with 6 Ad (1), is strongly stressed, or not is stressed: 'Are you ready?' — 'I am.' 'He used to be rich, but isn't any more.' 'You are my true friend, and always have been.' 'He is willing, but I am not.' Similarly, in questions which merely express surprise: 'It is already done!' — 'Is it?' but in older English, as in the preceding cases, with so: 'Twas agreed betwixt us, before,' etc. — 'Was it so?' (Wycherley, The Gentleman Dancing-Master, V, i, 11, A.D. 1673). 'Just now you wished to talk.' — 'Ah, did I so?' (George H. Boker, Francesca da Rimini, V, i, A.D. 1856). 'I pray that it may be so, but I cannot think that it is so' (now usually omitted) (Miss Braddon, Lady Audley, Ch. XXIII, A.D. 1862).

The adverb so is used not only as an ordinary predicate but often also as an objective predicate: 'She made life interesting just because she found it so.' 'Things are in good shape, and I like to have (or keep) them so.' 'Is Beauty beautiful, or is it only our eyes that make it so?' 'No man is poor that does not think himself so.' 'The present scribe is no snob. He is a respectfully brought-up old Briton of the higher middle class — at least, he flatters himself so' (Du Maurier, Trilby, I, 196).

On the other hand, it is often in colloquial speech used in the predicate without reference to anything that has preceded — predicative situation it (4 II A). When in a difficult situation someone after much fruitless discussion makes a bright suggestion the others remark: 'That is it' (= the thing to do). If a wrong motive has been ascribed to one's act, one replies: 'No, that is not it' (= the right explanation). Predicate it here often has the meaning of superior, acme, point of perfection: 'Did he know his Greek?' — 'I should say so. He was it' (Dialect Notes, II, p. 42). Often in an unfavorable sense: 'He thinks he is it.' 'For barefaced lying you are really it' (Pocket Oxford Dictionary). Predicative it often precedes the copula so that the emphatic subject may stand at the end: 'In the dance it (= the important thing) is grace. In a cigarette it is taste' (advertisement). Compare 21 b (2nd par.), 21 e (10th par.).

a. Case of the Predicate Pronoun. Where there are distinctive case forms, the predicate pronoun should be in the nominative and in choice language usually is, but in popular and loose colloquial speech there has persisted since the sixteenth century a tendency to employ here the accusative of personal pronouns as the predicative complement after the copula: 'It wasn't them' (Tarkington, Penrod and Sam, Ch. IV). 'No, it's us' (E. Poole, The Harbor, p. 61). 'I say it is him or nobody for you' (Hardy, The Mayor of Casterbridge, Ch. XXX). 'Some one said, "That's him"'
(Hutchinson, *If Winter Comes*, p. 369). Under the influence of attraction we often find the accusative here in good authors in serious style: ‘It is not *me* [whom] he misjudges’ (Winston Churchill, *The Inside of the Cup*, p. 501), but ‘It is *I* who keep Mr. Hodder in the Church’ (*ib.*, p. 512). Here *me* has been attracted into accusative form under the influence of the suppressed accusative relative which should follow it. The use of the accusative in the literary language is not confined to cases of attraction, as in this example, but there is a tendency to use it elsewhere, as in colloquial speech.

The tendency here towards the accusative is in part explained by the position of the pronoun after the verb, a position which in general is closely associated with the accusative. We not infrequently find even the subject in the accusative when it follows the verb: ‘Here be *them* [that] haue beene amongst souldiers’ (Ben Jonson, *Every Man in His Humour*, V, II, 4, A.D. 1601, ed. 1616). ‘And damn’d be *him* that first cries, “Hold, enough!”’ (Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, V, VIII, 34). ‘Come and dine with us. There’ll only be *us* three’ (Sir Harry Johnston, *Mrs. Warren’s Daughter*, Ch. I).

In colloquial speech, where the verb precedes the subject, the pronominal subject is often in the accusative and the verb, as in *I* I *h*, is in the third person singular, whatever may be the person of the pronoun: ‘Here are you and Mr. Farr, both of you whole-time schoolmasters; here’s Sir Eliphaz toiling night and day to make cheap suitable homes for the masses; *here’s me* (instead of *here am I*) an overworked engineer’ (H. G. Wells, *The Undying Fire*, p. 87). ‘Now *there’s you* (instead of *there are you*), burning yourself out ’cos your high principles won’t let you,’ etc. (Sir Harry Johnston, *Mrs. Warren’s Daughter*, Ch. XIV).

Where an appositive noun stands between a pronominal subject and the verb and thus hides, as it were, the subject and weakens our feeling for its force, we sometimes employ the accusative for the subject instead of the correct nominative: ‘All *us* girls think it ever so romantic’ (Meredith Nicholson, *The House of a Thousand Candles*, Ch. IX, p. 127), instead of the correct ‘All (predicate appositive; see 6 C, 6th par.) *we* girls think,’ etc., or ‘*We* girls all think,’ etc., or ‘All of *us* girls think,’ etc.

Where there is no finite verb expressed, there is a widespread drift in colloquial speech, and sometimes even in the literary language, to employ the accusative without regard to the grammatical relations: ‘Those men have other feelings than *us* who have nothing suffered’ (Thomas Paine, *Common Sense*, p. 43, A.D. 1776). ‘I don’t know, Frank, what the world is coming to or *me* either’ (Thackeray, *The Newcomes*, I, Ch. XXIX), instead of what *I*
am coming to either. 'Who talked it over?' — 'Why, him and her and me, of course' (De Morgan, * Somehow Good*, Ch. IX, p. 85). ‘I guess you ain't a New Yorker, huh?’ Mike said. — ‘Me, no.’” (Edna Ferber, *Half Portions*, p. 64). 'There was that in the room as we entered which was stronger than us all' (Mrs. Gaskell, *Cranford*, 22) = than we all were. ‘There’s not a soul in my house but me (= but I) tonight’ (Hardy, *Far from the Madding Crowd*, Ch. XXXIV). Other examples are given in 27 2 a, 29 1 A a, aa, and 31 (5th par.).

The plain drift of our language is to use the accusative of personal pronouns as the common case form for the nominative and accusative relations; just as in nouns there is here no formal distinction. In the best grade of colloquial speech it is still firm usage, however, to employ the nominative as subject when it stands immediately before the verb, as in ‘I am tired.’ In popular speech the accusative is used even here when there are two or more subjects connected by a conjunction: ‘This is the last Sabbath-day that him and me will be under the same roof’ (Mrs. Oliphant, *The Laird of Norlaw*, I, 30). ‘You and him is nice falias, ’deed ye are’ (Manx dialect). ‘Him and me is friends, yes, we are’ (ib.). In popular speech in general the pronoun for the first person sometimes retains the nominative form: ‘Him and I (or I and him) were there.’ The accusative is sometimes used here even when there is but a single subject: ‘Her’ll be sixteen come Martinmas’ (M. E. Francis, *Honesty*, I, Ch. II). In Manx dialect it is common to say, ‘Them is good,’ but usually ‘They, we, ye, are good.’ Similarly, in the nominative absolute construction (17 3 A) the subject in popular speech usually has the form of the accusative: ‘It will be a very good match for me, m’m, me being an orphan girl’ (H. G. Wells, *The Country of the Blind*, p. 16). Irish English preserves the older nominative here. Compare 17 3 A.

The wide use of the accusative for the nominative, described in detail above, is unfortunate, for, as illustrated in 29 1 B a, it is sometimes ambiguous. The expressive power of our language should not become impaired. It is to be hoped that all who are interested in accurate expression will oppose this general drift by taking more pains to use a nominative where a nominative is in order. Compare 31 (5th par.). It is gratifying to observe that this careless usage, though still common in colloquial speech, is in general less common in our best literature than it once was.

Opposed to the general tendency to employ the accusative instead of the nominative is the use of the nominative instead of the accusative, especially where other words connected by a conjunction stand between the pronoun and the governing preposition or

D. Predicate Infinitive. There are three classes of infinitives here:

1. *Normal Prepositional Form.* There are two groups:
   a. The prepositional infinitive is used after the copulas: 'To be good is *to be* happy.' 'To represent him as a man of stainless virtue is *to make* him ridiculous.' 'He seems *to have* ability.' 'He *seems to want* to do it.' 'He appeared *to desire* it.' 'I happened (or chanced) *to look* in that direction and caught him in the act of doing it.' What is now a nominative subject of the verb happen or chance was in older English a dative of interest (12 1 B b): 'It hapned *me* fall in with an ugly Captain' (Thomas Nashe, *The Unfortvnte Traveller*, Works, II, p. 217, A.D. 1594), now 'I happened to fall in with an ugly captain.' This change from dative to nominative is in accordance with the modern tendency to represent the person standing in relation to an action as doing, passing through an experience, rather than as involved in the action or as affected by it. Compare 4 II B (4th par.). The word after happen is now a predicate infinitive linked to the subject by the copula happen, while in older English it is a subject infinitive, sometimes with its old simple form, as in the example from Nashe. Compare 4 d. The *to*-infinitive was more common.

Descriptive force is sometimes imparted here by employing as predicate a present participle or the progressive form of the infinitive: 'Her whole being seemed *hanging* (or *to be hanging*) on his words' (Galsworthy, *The Country House*, I, Ch. VII). 'Instead of offering any explanation, he seemed *waiting* (or *to be waiting*) for her to say something' (Christopher Morley, 'Thunder on the Left,' in *Harper's Magazine* for Sept., 1925, p. 400).

b. The prepositional infinitive is employed after the passive forms of two groups of verbs: (1) verbs of finding, making (= compelling), knowing, perceiving, and others with similar or related meanings; (2) verbs of believing, thinking, saying, reporting, teaching, recommending, allowing, advising, commanding, ordering, and the like. Examples: 'He was finally found *to be sleeping*’ (a fact), or 'He was found *sleeping*’ (with descriptive force).
'He was never found to neglect his work.' 'He was made to shut the door.' 'He was known to do it.' 'He was believed to be rich.' 'It was ordered sent (or to be sent) to my house.' 'He was ordered (asked, requested, or told) to do it.' These two passive groups correspond to the two active ones described in 15 III 2 b and 24 III d, except that the passive is not used with the verbs of wishing and desiring in 24 III d. Instead of the present tense of the progressive active infinitive a present participle with descriptive force is often used, and instead of the present passive infinitive a perfect participle without a difference of meaning, as illustrated above.

The use of the infinitive after passive form is characteristic of modern English. We can now usually convert active into passive form by merely putting the object of the person into the nominative, changing the active to the passive voice, and retaining the rest of the predicate without change, as if the words formed a compound or group-word (63): (active) 'He told me to do it'; (passive) 'I was told to do it.' Compare 15 I 2 a. If, however, we use a simple infinitive in the active, we employ the prepositional form in the passive, for this construction is modern, and in modern infinitival constructions we regularly use the prepositional form: 'I saw him do it,' but in the passive 'He was seen to do it.' Occasionally, however, the simple infinitive of the active is retained in the passive, as illustrated in 15 III 2 b a.

2. Modal Form. After the copulas be, remain, fall, and in a few expressions seem, the infinitive often assumes a peculiar modal force in the predicate, expressing the necessity, possibility, or fitness of an action: 'The letter is to be (i.e., must be) handed to him in person.' 'An account of the event is to be (i.e., can be) found in the evening papers.' 'Women are not easily to be read' (Hichens, Ambition, Ch. XXXIV) (cannot be easily read). 'Such women are to (i.e., ought to) be admired.' 'That remains to be seen.' 'Having placed so much to its (i.e., the motor omnibus's) credit, however, there falls to be considered a totally different aspect of the case' (II. London News, No. 3896, 1068 a). This same modal force is also found in attributive clauses where the infinitive has the force of a predicate: 'There are still serious difficulties to be overcome' (= which are to be overcome, must be overcome). 'He has given me much to think about' (= that I should think about). Compare 23 II 11 (2nd par.).

The idea of necessity, so often found here in the infinitive, has many shades of meaning. It indicates that something must take place in accordance with the will of a person or of Destiny, or as the outcome of events or a natural development, or in accordance with some plan or agreement: 'John, you are to (or must) be up by
six.’ ‘What am I (or do you want me) to do next?’ ‘We are to (or must, or are destined to) toil and toil here below.’ ‘I am to (or must) become a burden to you all.’ ‘He is at last to receive his merited reward.’ ‘He is yet to meet his equal.’ ‘We are all to meet next week to settle the question.’ ‘There is a circus to be here next week.’ There is often future force here, but it is mingled with the modal. The modal force is often found also in abridged attributive relative clauses (23 II 11), where the infinitive has the force of a predicate, although there is here, of course, no copula before it: ‘She dreamed impossibly of a spirituality never to be hers’ (= which was never to be hers). ‘She did not realize that she, now or about to be a social power (= who was now or about to be a social power), was to do,’ etc. (Hope, Intrusions of Peggy, 57). ‘She desires to flee from the wrath to come’ (= which is to come). There is often future force here in connection with the modal, as in the last example.

The modal force of the infinitive is often found also in abridged accusative (24 III d) and prepositional (24 IV a, 2nd par.) clauses where the to-infinitive is felt as predicated of some word in the principal proposition: ‘I don’t know what to do’ (= I am to do, or should do). ‘I’ll tell you how to do it’ (= you should do it). ‘I told him where to find it’ (= he could find it). ‘I showed him how to do it’ (= he should do it). ‘I shall tell him when to go’ (= he should go). ‘I am thinking of what to do (= I should do) next.’

In older English, the modal infinitive was sometimes employed after the present participle and gerund being in an abridged participial or gerundial clause, where present usage requires a full clause with a finite verb: ‘John being to go your way, I am willing to write, because he is so willing to carry anything for me’ (Richardson, Pamela, I, Letter V), now ‘Since John is to go your way, I am willing,’ etc. ‘This particular circumstance of her being to come so soon’ (Jane Austen, Emma, II, Ch. I), now ‘This particular circumstance that she is to come so soon.’

In Old English, the infinitive here usually had passive meaning, so that a number of the sentences given above in which the infinitive has active force represent modern usage and indicate that this construction has extended its boundaries. Originally the infinitive was a noun and could not express the idea of voice. In Old English, the infinitive here usually had clear passive meaning, but the form was active, although elsewhere passive form had come into use to express the passive idea. The infinitive here was still felt as a noun, object of the preposition to. In the fourteenth century the infinitive here began to be felt as a verb, and sometimes assumed passive form: ‘The menaces of Fortune ne ben nat for to dremen (active form with passive force), ne the flaterynges of hir to ben
desired' (passive form and force) (Chaucer, Boethius, II, I), now
‘The menaces of Fortune are not to be dreaded, nor are her flatteries
to be desired.’ The development of passive form for passive mean­ing was naturally facilitated by the fact that the infinitive here
sometimes had active force, so that passive form was needed to dis­tinctive passive from active meaning. The gradual development of
passive form for passive meaning made it possible to employ active
form freely for active meaning: ‘How am I to (can I) pay such a
debt?’ ‘He is to come back tonight.’ Other examples of infini­
tives with active form and meaning are given on page 46. There
are, however, a few survivals of older usage with active form and
passive meaning: ‘This house is to let.’ ‘He is to blame for it.’ ‘He
seems to blame for it’ with modal force, while in passive form ‘He
seems to be blamed for everything that goes wrong’ there is no
modal force at all. In abridged attributive relative clauses, active
form with passive meaning is still common: ‘He is not a man to
trifle with’ (= that can be trifled with). Compare 23 II 11. Some­
times, however, active and passive form here have a little different
meaning: ‘This is the man to send’ (= that should be sent), but
‘This is the man to be sent’ (= that in accordance with our plan will
be sent).

As in 4 II B (last par.), there has been a change of subject here
since the Old English period wherever there was in Old English a
dative of reference (12 I B a): ‘Ac us is to smeagenne þaet Drihten
on þaere costunge nolde þis þa myclan miht gecyban’ (Blickling
Homilies, p. 33, tenth century), now ‘But we are to consider that
the Lord in his temptation did not desire to reveal his great
power.’ The newer construction is a marked characteristic of
Modern English, but it began to appear in Middle English: ‘He
wist (knew) what he was to do’ (Wyclif, Selected Works, I, 120).

3. Form to Express Purpose. After a copula an infinitive to-
clause is sometimes used as a predicate to indicate purpose: ‘John
is now with us to help us with our work.’ ‘I have been down town to
buy a new hat.’ In all such cases the copula has considerable con­
crete meaning. In older English, be was used here as a pure copula
without any concrete force, where we now replace the to-infinitive
by a present participle, copula and to-infinitive in older English
being used much as the progressive form: ‘AMIENS. He hath been
all this day to look you (now has been looking for you). JAQUES.
And I have been all this day to avoid him’ (Shakespeare, As You
Like It, II, v, 33) (now have been avoiding him).

E. Predicate Gerund. The gerund is often used as a predi­
cate, usually as a parallel construction to the prepositional in­
finite without an essential difference of meaning: ‘To build
upon any other foundation (than religion) is building upon sand’ (Southey) (or ‘to build upon sand’). Compare 50 4 b.

F. PREDICATE ADVERB AND PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE. In general, adverbs and prepositional phrases modify adjectives, adverbs, and verbs of complete predication as adverbs proper, but a large number of adverbs and prepositional phrases are used as adjectives—as attributive adjectives, or as predicate complements standing after a linking verb, or as predicate appositives (7 C) following a verb of complete predication. The use of adverbs and prepositional phrases in the attributive relation is described in 10 I 2 and 10 VI. The following examples illustrate their use as predicate complement and predicate appositive.

**Predicate complement:** ‘The matter is quite otherwise.’ ‘Is Mr. Smith in?’ ‘My day’s work is over.’ ‘Don’t strike a man when he is down.’ ‘He is down and out.’ ‘He is out for a walk.’ ‘The sun is up.’ ‘He was up early this morning.’ ‘He is up in mathematics.’ ‘I am up with him now. I was behind him for a while, but I have caught (linking verb) up with him.’ ‘Smallpox is about.’ ‘He is about (adverb, not preposition, for the prepositional infinitive cannot now stand after a preposition) to take the step.’ ‘He seems about (adverb) to take the step.’ ‘The car is in good condition’ (predicate prepositional phrase). ‘The nation is at peace.’ ‘I must be about (preposition) my Father’s business’ (Luke, II, 49). ‘The trend is in this direction.’ ‘The trend of both statements was to the effect that in this critical hour friends of law and order should stand by the President’ (Chicago Tribune, Dec. 29, 1929). ‘The book is up to (compound preposition) date.’ ‘He is not up to his task.’ ‘I am up to his tricks.’ ‘He is up to some mischief.’ ‘It is up to you to do something.’ The predicate is often a prepositional gerundial clause: ‘He is about taking the step.’ ‘He seems about taking the step.’ ‘He is on the point of (compound preposition) taking the step.’ ‘He is above doing such things.’

**Predicate appositive:** ‘The fruit arrived in good condition.’ ‘He came home out of humor.’

In many compounds the preposition on is reduced to a, as in abreast, afoot, aglow, ashore, away, etc., all originally prepositional phrases, hence freely used as predicate complement or as predicate appositive. Predicate complement: ‘He is asleep, ashore, away,’ etc. Predicate appositive: ‘He is lying on the sofa asleep.’ ‘He came home all aglow with enthusiasm.’

An adverb or a prepositional phrase can be predicated also of an accusative object, i.e., can be an objective predicate (15 III 2 A): ‘I should not wish it otherwise.’ ‘I found everything in good condition.’ There is no copula here. For an explanation see 15 III 2.
CHAPTER IV

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SUBJECT AND PREDICATE

8. The predicate agrees — wherever the form will permit — with the subject in number, person, gender, and case. On account of the lack of distinctive forms the verb often cannot be brought into agreement with the subject; but, so far as the form will permit, present usage requires strict concord. Older usage was not so strict.

I. NUMBER

1. If the subject is singular, the verb is also singular: 'The tiniest hair casts a shadow.'
   a. The verb which follows situation it (4 II A) or an anticipatory subject it that points to a following clause is always singular, even though the reference is to more than two: 'Where does all that noise come from?' — 'It's the children playing upstairs.' 'It was my brothers who were struck.' 'Twas men I lack'd' (Shakespeare, II Henry VI, III, i, 345). Compare 4 II C.
   b. If a subject in the singular is associated by means of with, together with, as well as, no less than, like, but, except, with other words which logically though not formally constitute a part of the subject, the subject is now with our present strong feeling for form usually in the singular, although the plural is often found here in older English and is sometimes still used: 'But godliness with contentment is great gain' (I Timothy, VI, 6), but sometimes with a plural verb if the idea of number is prominent: 'Old Sir John with half-a-dozen more are at the door' (Onions, Syntax, p. 31), where, however, to most speakers and writers and is more natural than with, or is is more natural if with is employed. 'The island of Australia, with Tasmania, constitutes the Commonwealth of Australia.' 'The bat together with the balls was stolen.' 'Justice, as well as mercy, allows it.' 'The girl, as well as the boys, has learned to ride' and of course 'The girls, as well as the boy, have learned to
ride.' ‘Man, no less than the lower forms of life, is a product of the evolutionary process.’ ‘The conquest of the air, like all the conquests that man has made over the elements, is taking a costly toll of human life.’ ‘Nothing but dreary dikes occurs to break the monotony of the landscape.’ ‘Nobody but John and William was there.’ ‘Nobody, except his most intimate friends, knows of it.’

c. It is often very difficult, indeed, to determine whether the noun which precedes the copula is the subject or the predicate complement. Professor Jespersen has given us a good practical rule for use in perplexing cases: ‘The subject is comparatively definite and special, while the predicate is less definite, and thus applicable to a greater number of things’ (The Philosophy of Grammar, p. 150). In common practice, however, many find it difficult to distinguish subject and predicate here. The present tendency is to avoid a decision on this perplexing point by regulating the number of the copula by a mere formal principle — namely, as the nominative before the copula is often the subject, it has become the rule to place the copula in accord with it, whether it be a subject or a predicate. ‘Her children (subject) are her sole care.’ ‘Her principal anxiety (predicate, but felt as subject) was her children.’ ‘The chief curse (predicate, but felt as subject) is taxes.’ On the other hand, as the noun which follows the copula is often the subject, we frequently, especially in older English, find the copula in accord with it: ‘All that we found of the deer were the ragged hide, some patches of hair, cracked bones, and two long ears’ (Zane Grey, in Harper's Monthly, Aug., 1925). ‘What it (i.e., the air) unquestionably did contain were carbon monoxide gas and prussic acid gas’ (E. E. Free, ‘The Origin of Life,’ in Forum, Oct., 1925). ‘His pavilion round about him were dark waters and thick clouds of the skies’ (Psalms, XVIII, 11). ‘The wages of sin is death’ (Romans, VI, 23). As far as the form is concerned, we might interpret wages here as a singular, subject of is, for it is often used as a singular in older English, as illustrated in 2 f, p. 58. But, according to the rule given above, it is the predicate and death the subject.

d. Collective nouns take a singular verb or a plural verb, according as the idea of oneness or plurality is uppermost in the mind: ‘The multitude, unacquainted with the best models, are captivated by whatever stuns or dazzles them’ (Macaulay). ‘The assembly was dissolved.’ ‘Congress were (now was) pleased to order me an advance of two quarters' salary’ (Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Samuel Osgood, Oct. 5, 1785). ‘The Senior Class requests (i.e., as a unit) the pleasure of your company,’ but ‘The Senior Class are unable to agree upon a president.’ ‘The choir knelt and covered their faces’ (Bennett, Old Wives' Tale). The point of view sometimes shifts
within one and the same sentence, so that the verb is now singular, now plural, although the reference in the different cases is to the same noun: ‘There was a grand band hired from Rosseter, who, with their wonderful wind-instruments and puffed-out cheeks, were themselves a delightful show to the small boys’ (George Eliot, Adam Bede, 233). Aside from cases where the idea of oneness is quite pronounced, there is in general still a tendency in English — now, however, not so strong as formerly — to employ a plural verb with a collective noun. Of course, sometimes here formal forces counteract this general tendency. The singular is sometimes chosen for the sake of a contrast or a parallelism: ‘Although he himself presumably knows what are the thoughts and ideas which he is trying to express, his audience does not.’ ‘The Mary Rogers was strained, the crew was strained, and big Dan Cullen, master, was likewise strained’ (Jack London, When God Laughs). Compare 59 1.

Similarly, if a group of words, especially a partitive group, conveys the idea of plurality, a number of individuals, the verb is in the plural, even though the governing noun is singular, while the verb is singular if the group conveys the idea of oneness: ‘The greatest part of these years was spent in philosophic retirement,’ but ‘The greatest part of the Moguls and Tartars were as illiterate as their sovereigns.’ In ‘A large number of the garrison were prostrate with sickness’ and ‘There are a large number of things that I desire to say’ number is now felt not as a collective noun but as a component of a compound numeral, the indefinite pronoun a large number with plural force, so that the verb is in the plural. In older English, number was sometimes treated as a singular noun in accordance with its singular form: ‘In the Chirche above in heven is a noumbre of greete seintis’ (Wyclif, Selected Works, II, 309, A.D. 1380). This treatment of number as a singular noun is still found occasionally where a writer follows the outward form rather than the inner meaning: ‘Chicago has as many more (models) and besides these there is probably an equal number of occasional sitters, transients’ (Beecher Edwards, ‘Faces That Haunt You,’ in Liberty, May 22, 1926).

e. The singular is the regular form after the indefinite or general pronouns each one, everybody, everyone, anyone, either, nobody, neither, etc., since they are now usually felt as presenting the subject separately: ‘Each of us must live his or her (60 1 d) life.’ ‘Everyone has his hobby.’ ‘Either of the expressions is correct, but the former is more common than the latter.’ ‘Neither has a wife.’ In older English, the plural was common here, as the tendency was then strong to give expression to the plural idea logically contained in these words: ‘Everyone in the house were in
their beds’ (Fielding, *Tom Jones*, Book VII, Ch. XIV). This usage survives in loose colloquial and popular speech. Compare 61 I a. After *neither*, however, the plural verb is still found also in the literary language alongside of the singular. On account of the strong plural idea logically contained in it, the plural verb was common in older English and is still found in good authors: ‘Thersites’ body is as good as Ajax’, when *neither are alive* (Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, IV, ii, 252). ‘Neither of the sisters were very much deceived’ (Thackeray). ‘Neither of us are dukes’ (H. G. Wells, *The New Machiavelli*, p. 316). Compare 2 c, p. 56.

*None*, originally singular, may also be classed here when the reference is to one person: ‘*None has* more keenly felt them’ (Stevenson). It is common in older English, and is still used in choice language, but is now largely replaced by *no one* or *nobody*. It is now quite common, however, as a plural with a plural verb: ‘*None are* so deaf as those that will not hear.’

Just as the singular is usually found after the pronouns *each one, everyone, either, neither*, it is also usually employed after the adjectival forms *each, every, either, neither*, although the reference is to more than one: ‘*Every boy is taught* to read and write.’ ‘*Either expression is correct.*’ ‘*Neither speech is to exceed fifteen minutes.*’

f. For the number of the verb after *kind of, sort of*, see 59 7.

g. A plural personal pronoun, subject of a plural verb, often has for its antecedent a singular noun modified by *many a*: ‘But yesterday I saw *many a brave warrior*, in all the pomp and circumstance of war, marching to the battlefield. Where *are they now?’

h. The principle that the verb should agree with the subject is very often not recognized in popular speech. Here in the present indicative the third person singular is used for all persons and both numbers, in accordance with the tendency to level away the inequalities within a category, provided distinctive form is not absolutely necessary to the thought: *I says, you says, he says, we says*. In dialect *thou* (4 II H) likewise has a verb in the third person after it: ‘*Thou’s not acting right*’ (Stanley Houghton, *Hindle Wakes*, Act II). This usage is common also in the language of Quakers: ‘*Thee (4 II H) is wrong about that.*’ In older English, more commonly with *thou* as subject: ‘*How comes thou Into truth if thou hast not beene led by ye spirit of truth?’* (George Fox, *Journal*, p. 313, A.D. 1657).

Note. — This use of the verbal ending *s* for all persons and numbers was originally a dialectic feature of Northern English. In the Old English period the oldest ending for the second person singular of the verb was *s*. In this early period the *s* often spread to the second person plural, and then further spread to the other persons of the plural and to the third
8 I 1 h Note NUMBER AGREEMENT OF SUBJECT AND PREDICATE 53

person singular, so that in the Old English period s was often used in the North for all persons and numbers except the first person singular. In Middle English, the s spread in the North also to the first person singular, so that the s was sometimes used for all persons and numbers: ‘as I before you has talde’ (Cursor Mundi, 14135, a.d. 1300), now ‘as I have told you before.’ ‘O gode pertre comes god peres’ (ib., 37), now ‘From a good pear tree come good pears.’

This s was destined to play an important part in the literary language. In Middle English it spread to the northern part of the Midland, where it was used in the East in the third person singular and in the West in the third person singular and often also in the plural. In both sections, however, the old th continued to be used alongside of it in the third person singular. The s at this time had not yet reached London, and thus it did not affect Chaucer’s customary language. But he was well acquainted with it, and in his Reues Tale let the two Northern clerks employ their Northern s in characteristic manner, using it for all persons and numbers: ‘And forthy (therefore) is I come’ (111). ‘How fares thy faire doghter and thy wyf?’ (103). In one instance Chaucer used an s-form on his own account for the sake of the rime. Later, the s-ending became established in London and the South generally. Many people from the North and the northern Midland came to the growing national capital to live and, of course, brought with them their handy s-ending, which by reason of its marked superiority in ease of utterance appealed to the people there as it had appealed previously to the people of the North. It affected at first only colloquial speech, while in literary prose the older and more stately th maintained itself for a time. Shakespeare employed s in the prose of his dramas, where the tone is colloquial, while the translators of the Bible used th throughout as more appropriate for a serious style. The poets often employed s on account of its warmer tone or for the sake of rime or meter. After the time of Shakespeare s gradually became established in all styles of the literary language, but only in the third person singular, not in the other persons of the singular and throughout the plural as in northern English.

In older literary English, however, s was not entirely confined to the third person singular. Just as the s in the North spread from the second person singular to the plural and to the other persons of the singular, the literary s of the third person singular, from the late fifteenth to well into the eighteenth century, occasionally spread to other forms, especially to the second person singular and the third person plural: ‘Syker, thou’s (i.e., thou is) but a laesie loord’ (Spenser, The Shepheards Calender, July, 33, a.d. 1579) = ‘Surely, you are a lazy lubber.’ ‘Why bends thou thus thy minde to martir me?’ (Kyd, The Spanish Tragedie, III, ix, 6, a.d. 1585–1587). ‘What are they that comes here?’ (Richard Edwards, Damon and Pithias, 376, a.d. 1571). ‘Your commissionars telz me’ (Queen Elizabeth, Letters to James VI, 44). This usage survives in the literary language in jocular imitations of popular speech in the case of says I, says you instead of said I, said you, parenthetical insertions in a quotation to indicate the author of the language: ‘“It was folly and in-
gratitude, Mr. Brough," says I, "I see it all now"' (Thackeray, Samuel Tilmarsh, Ch. VI). It survives also in the second person singular after thee in the language of the Quakers, as described in h, p. 52.

In popular speech we find for all persons and numbers not only does but also do after the analogy of a number of other auxiliaries (may, can, etc.) which have no s in the third person singular: 'They always does it' (Dickens, Martin Chuzzlewit). 'It do seem hard' (Masefield, The Everlasting Mercy). In older English, this do occurs sometimes in the literary language: 'He do confess himself to speak of this third kind' (Philpot, Exam. and Writ., 335, a.d. 1553). 'He do' not hear me I hope' (Ben Jonson, Every Man out of His Humour, Inductio, 351, a.d. 1600). In loose colloquial speech, the negative form don't is still widely used as an auxiliary for all persons and numbers: 'I, you, he, we, they, don't believe it.' In the Isle of Man hev is used for all persons and numbers: 'I, thou, he, we, hev' (= have). For the peculiar use of the uninflected form of the verb in the east Midland of England for all numbers and persons of the present tense see Accidence, 56 4 b. This usage is common also in American Negro dialect: 'Dish yer chicken-nabber look lak (like) he dead' (Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, p. 20). 'Gawd always lub (for loves) de righteous' (Du Bose Heyward, Porgy, p. 32).

In the past tense there is also in the literary language, aside from the poetic second person singular, no ending for person or number, except that the plural of was is were: 'said, you said, he said, we said, etc., but: I was, you were, he was, we were, you were, etc. In older English, leveling took place even in the case of was, which was sometimes used for both singular and plural, and for all persons. Thus was was sometimes used with the subject thou instead of wast: 'Where was thou born?' (Marlowe, The Jew of Malta, 892, about a.d. 1590, ed. 1636). Was was most frequently employed for were with the subject you where the reference was to only one individual: 'Pray, Sir, how was you cured of your love?' (Fielding, Love in Several Masques, Act. IV, Scene II). Of this once very common construction Noah Webster says on page 92 of his Philosophical and Practical Grammar (a.d. 1807): 'The compilers of grammars condemn the use of was with you — but in vain. The practice is universal, except among men who learn their language by books. The best authors have given it their sanction, and the usage is too well established to be altered.' The use of was for reference to more than one was much less widespread, but it has become common in current popular speech: 'we, you, they, was.' But also the older literary usage of employing in the second person was for reference to one and were for more than one occurs here: you was (sing.), you were (pl.).

2. If the subject is plural, or if there are several subjects, the verb is plural: 'The boys in our class are more numerous than the girls.' 'A strong wind and a full sail bring joy to the sailor.'

a. When the verb precedes a number of subjects, it is often in the singular, especially in older English: 'And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three' (I Cor., XIII, 13). This usage lingers on
in poetry: ‘It is man’s age-long struggle to draw near His Maker, learn His thoughts, discern His law — A boundless task in whose infinitude, As in the unfolding light and law of love, Abides our hope and our eternal joy’ (Alfred Noyes, The Torch-Bearers, p. 230). Plain prose usage here today favors strict agreement of the verb with its subject, hence the plural is now the natural form of the verb. There is often a hesitation to use a plural verb because it does not harmonize with the nearest subject: ‘There is little illustration and no side-lights of suggestion’ (G. W. Lewes, Aristotle, Ch. I, p. 20), instead of ‘There is little illustration and there are no side-lights of suggestion.’

In older English, as illustrated on page 53, a singular verb was not infrequently used with a following plural subject, a usage which survives in popular speech. Survivals still occasionally occur also in the literary language after there is, there exists, etc.; i.e., in certain set expressions where the mind is not on the alert: ‘There exists, sometimes only in germ and potentially, sometimes more or less developed, the same tendencies and passions which have made our fellow-citizens of other classes what they are’ (M. Arnold, Culture and Anarchy, Ch. III). ‘Here there does seem to be, if not certainties, at least a few probabilities, that,’ etc. (H. G. Wells, Mankind in the Making, Ch. III).

When the subjects precede, the verb sometimes stands in the singular, agreeing with the last of a number of subjects, usually, however, only when this part of the subject serves as a climax to the whole of the subject or summarizes the different subjects: ‘Your interest, your honor, God himself bids you do it’ (Onions, An Advanced English Syntax, p. 31). ‘Her knights and dames — her court is there’ (Byron, Parisina).

In older English, a singular verb is often found after two or more singular subjects where we now employ a plural verb. The singular form of the verb here was defended on the ground that the verb agrees with one subject and is understood with the other or the others. Noah Webster in his Philosophical and Practical Grammar (A.D. 1807) defends thus the following sentence: ‘Nor were the young fellows so wholly lost to a sense of right as pride and conceit has (now have) since made them affect to be’ (Rambler, No. 97).

b. In case several coördinate singular subjects represent the same person, the verb is in the singular, often also when they are felt as forming a distinct collective idea, a close union or oneness of idea: ‘My colleague and dear friend (one person) is near death’s door.’ ‘Slow and steady (one person or animal that is slow and steady) wins the race.’ ‘To mumble over the past, to live on the classics, however splendidly, is senility’ (H. G. Wells). ‘To make
life worth living and to raise the standard of comfort sounds well’
(G. Peel). ‘A cart and horse (felt as a unit) was seen at a distance.’
‘The sum and substance of the matter is this,’ etc. ‘The long and
short of it is,’ etc. Aside from a few expressions, the singular is
not now so common as formerly where the different subjects form
a collective idea.

On the other hand, when each of a number of singular noun
subjects is considered separately, the verb is in the singular: ‘A
fever, a mutilation, a cruel disappointment, a loss of wealth, a loss
of friends, seems at the moment untold loss’ (Emerson). ‘The
author, the wit, the partisan, the fine gentleman, does not take the
place of the man’ (id.). ‘Not enjoyment, and not sorrow, Is our
destined end or way’ (Longfellow, Psalm of Life). ‘Either sex and
every age was engaged in the pursuits of industry’ (Gibbon, Roman
Empire, Ch. X). ‘Every boy and girl is taught to read and write.
‘Many an orator and essayist has pointed out the supreme value to
manhood of the hard grinding conditions under which such boys
grow up’ (Theodore Clarke Smith, James A. Garfield, I, p. 35).

C. In connection with the conjunctions not only — but (also),
either — or, neither — nor, partly — partly, etc., the different sub-
jects are considered singly, and hence the verb agrees with one of
them — the one next to it — and is understood with the others:
‘Not only the children are ill, but also the mother.’ ‘Not only
arms and arts, but man himself has yielded to it’ (i.e., the pen).
‘Either John or William is to blame.’ ‘Either the mayor or the
aldermen are to blame.’ ‘Neither the girls nor John is to blame.’
‘Neither she nor John is to blame.’

After neither — nor we still often find the plural verb after singu-
lar subjects since there has long been a tendency to give formal
expression to the plural idea which always lies in the negative form
of statement: ‘And neuer sithen nouther the kyng of Ermonyne ne
the countree weren neuer in pees’ (Mandeville, Travels, Ch. XVII,
about A.D. 1410–1420) = ‘Since that time neither the King of
Armenia nor the country have been at peace.’ ‘Neither search
nor labor are necessary’ (Johnson, Idler, No. 44, A.D. 1759).
‘Neither he nor his lady were at home’ (George Washington,
Diary, Dec. 2, 1789). ‘Neither Leopardi nor Wordsworth are
of the same order with the great poets who made such verses as . . .’
(Matthew Arnold). ‘Neither painting nor fighting feed
men’ (Ruskin). ‘It (i.e., Matthew Arnold’s Thyrsis) does not
carry the same conviction of distress that Lycidas does; neither
the friendship nor the sorrow seem so profound’ (Robert Bridges,
Compare these examples with those in I e, p. 51. Similarly, after
not . . . either — or, which has the force of neither — nor: ‘I do not think either Montaigne or Johnson were good judges’ (Lord Avebury). We sometimes find the plural after or since the speaker or writer feels that the statement, though at any one time applicable to only one of two or more things, holds good for them all: ‘My life or death are equal both to me’ (Dryden). ‘A drama or an epic fill the mind and one does not look beyond them’ (Matthew Arnold, Essays in Criticism, II, p. 135). ‘Acting, singing, or reciting are forbidden them’ (H. G. Wells). ‘What are honor or dishonor to her?’ (Henry James). ‘Language is the medium of literature as marble or bronze or clay are the materials of the sculptor’ (Sapir, Language, p. 237). The expression one or two always requires the plural: ‘There are one or two subjects on which you are bound to have but one opinion’ (Ruskin). After a word or two the singular is often used since we feel the collective force: ‘Only a word or two is (or are) needed here.’ Where the subjects are personal pronouns of different persons there is considerable fluctuation in present usage. See II, p. 60.

d. If the subject of the sentence is the name of a book, drama, newspaper, country, or in general any title, proper name, the verb is usually in the singular: ‘“The Virginians” is a good story.’ ‘“The Liars” was produced yesterday at the Criterion.’ ‘“The Times” reports,’ etc. ‘The United States is the paradise of the workman,’ but often also the plural: ‘The United States of America, which reckon 20,000,000 of people’ (Emerson, English Traits, 26). See also 59 2.

e. If a single plural subject or several singular or plural subjects are felt as forming the idea of a firm mass or fixed amount, the verb is in the singular: ‘Nearly thirty shillings was paid for a pound of tea in 1710.’ ‘Oh, there’s bushels of fun in that!’ (Eugene Field, Poems of Childhood, ‘The Drum’). ‘The fifty miles was (or were) covered by the winner in four hours, fourteen minutes, and forty-five seconds.’ ‘Thirty minutes is sufficient for a good sermon.’ ‘Four years has seemed a long time to you but a very short time to us’ (Woodrow Wilson, June 12, 1910). ‘Three times (adverbial element) 3 is (or are) 9.’ ‘Three times 3 quarts of water is 9 quarts.’ ‘Three times 3 oranges are 9 oranges.’ ‘2 and 2 is (or are) 4.’ ‘2 quarts of water and two more quarts is 4 quarts.’ ‘2 oranges and 2 oranges are 4 oranges.’ ‘4 from 6 (phrase used as subject) leaves (not leave) 2,’ but ‘6 less (or minus) 4 is (or are) 2,’ in which ‘less 4’ and ‘minus 4’ are prepositional phrases with adverbial force. ‘20 divided by 5 (phrase used as subject) equals (not equal) 4.’ ‘5 is contained in 15 three times,’ or ‘There are three 5’s in 15.’ ‘There was two hundred dollars in the purse,’
but 'There were two hundred-dollar bills in the purse.' 'Three-fourths of the surface of the earth is sea,' but 'Three fourths of our old college class are married.'

f. Nouns that are plural in form but singular in sense, such as gallows, news, measles, mumps, smallpox (for small pocks), usually take a verb in the singular: 'This sad news was brought to him at once.' 'Few diseases provide a more favorable chance for consumption to develop than does measles' (Thos. S. Blair, *Public Hygiene*, p. 307). Some nouns, such as amends, means, odds (now usually a plural, except in the meaning of difference), pains, tidings (more commonly a plural), are sometimes used as plurals, sometimes as singulars: 'What's the odds?' but 'The odds are against us.' 'Great pains have (or has) been taken,' or 'Much pains has been taken.' 'All possible means have been adopted,' or 'Every means has been tried.' 'Then come (less commonly comes) tidings that,' etc. Sciences in -ics, as mathematics, economics, physics, etc., are usually felt as singulars, but the names of practical matters, as athletics, gymnastics, tactics, politics, are usually felt as plurals: 'Mathematics is (sometimes are) not his strong point.' 'Physics is mainly the science of the transformation of energy.' 'Politics are my only pleasure' (Oscar Wilde, *An Ideal Husband*, Act I), but also the singular is used here where the idea of oneness is pronounced: 'Politics makes strange bedfellows.' In older English, wages was a plural form with singular force: 'Their daily wages is so small' (Sir Thomas More, *Utopia*). Wages is now a plural: 'But I shall be able to manage till my first quarter's wages come in' (George Moore, *Esther Waters*, Ch. III). The singular wage is often used: a living wage or living wages. Compare 59 2.

Alms, eaves, and riches (from Old French richesse), though in older English singular forms, are now felt and treated as plurals: 'Where riches are, some alms are due.' 'The eaves are not yet finished.'

Lots of or lots, heaps of or heaps, though originally plural nouns, are now felt as indefinite pronouns expressing an indefinite number or amount, so that, when used as subject expressing an indefinite amount, they take a singular verb: 'There is lots of fun and there's lots to follow.' 'There was heaps of fun' (Alec Waugh, *Loom of Youth*, III, Ch. VIII). Compare Parts of Speech, 7 5.

3. Where there are an affirmative and a negative subject, the verb agrees with the affirmative: 'Virtue, not rolling suns, the mind matures' (Young, *Night Thoughts*).

4. The verb is in the plural where a singular abstract subject is modified by two or more adjectives connected by and which
clearly indicate that two or more things are meant: ‘Sacred and profane wisdom agree in declaring that “pride goeth before a fall.”’ The abstract subject here retains its singular form since it cannot as an abstract noun take a plural. Similarly, we employ a singular subject and a plural verb when the subject is a mass word modified by two adjectives connected by and: ‘Good and bad butter are things quite different to our taste.’

Of course, the verb is in the plural where there is an article or other limiting adjective before each of the descriptive adjectives to indicate that two persons or things are described: ‘The red and the white rose are both beautiful.’ Similarly, the verb is in the plural after a singular noun modified by two possessive adjectives referring to different persons: ‘Your and my wife (or more commonly your wife and mine) are good friends.’ Compare 10 I 4 and 57 5 a.

5. After the group more than there is a difference of usage according to the meaning. The usual form of expression is the singular verb since more than is felt as an adverb, as equivalent to not merely; but others feel more as a plural indefinite pronoun and employ the plural verb: ‘More than one has (or have) found it so.’ Of course, the plural is used when the words are separated: ‘More have found it so than just he.’

Similarly, less than is often felt as an adverb: ‘There were less than (adverb) sixty (= sixty people) there,’ or ‘There were fewer (plural pronoun) than sixty there.’

6. The predicate noun agrees with the subject in number: ‘The Puritans (subject) were the King’s most exasperated enemies,’ or in order to emphasize the subject ‘The King’s most exasperated enemies were the Puritans.’ For the position of the subject see 3, p. 3.

a. The predicate noun does not agree with the subject if it is the name of a material or is a collective or an abstract noun: ‘Ye are the salt of the earth’ (Matthew, V, 13). ‘The Swedes are a Germanic people.’ ‘Good children are the joy of their parents.’ Concrete nouns in the predicate assume a general abstract force and then often do not agree with the subject, as illustrated in 7 B a aa.

7. The verb is in the singular if its subject is a clause: ‘That they were in error in these matters is now clear to us and probably also to their warmest friends.’ Similarly, a group of words containing a single thought or picture takes the singular form of the verb: ‘Early to bed and early to rise makes a man healthy, wealthy, and wise.’ ‘Three such rascals hanged in one day is good work for society.’ Compare 17 3 B.
II. PERSON

A few difficulties arise with regard to the form of the verb when pronouns of different persons are used as subjects:

1. When two or more subjects of different persons are in apposition, the verb agrees with the first of them since it is felt as containing the leading idea: ‘I, your master, command you.’

2. Where there are an affirmative and a negative subject, the verb agrees with the affirmative: ‘I, not you, am to blame,’ or ‘I am to blame, not you.’

3. Where there are subjects of different persons connected by or or nor, most grammarians prescribe that the verb should agree with the nearest subject: ‘Either he or I am in the wrong.’ ‘Either we or John is in the wrong.’ ‘Neither he nor I am in the wrong.’ ‘Neither we nor John is in the wrong.’ In our ordinary English, however, this construction is not now common, for most people desire to avoid the annoying necessity of making a choice between the two persons. Hence the most common usage now is to separate the sentence into two distinct propositions, each with a verb or one with a verb and one elliptical in form: ‘Either he is in the wrong or I am.’ ‘We are not in the wrong, nor [is] John either.’ The wide currency of this usage indicates that most people dodge the necessity of making a choice between the two persons as though it were an educational test which they dreaded to meet. This diffidence stands in marked contrast to the fearless directness which in similar cases elsewhere often urges us to express ourselves tersely at whatever cost, since we feel that it is better to speak by guess than to become systematically awkward in expression. In colloquial and popular speech many people, feeling this awkwardness, place the subjects together and employ a plural verb, which, though often incorrect, always avoids the clash of the different persons: ‘Either he or I are in the wrong.’ After nor, however, the plural occurs also in the literary language, for here it is logical, as often elsewhere after neither or neither — nor: ‘Neither Isabel nor I are timid people’ (H. G. Wells, The New Machiavelli, p. 436). ‘Neither you nor I are ever going to say a word about it’ (Marion Crawford, Katherine Lauderdale, I, Ch. XV).

In a number of cases the force of or is not really disjunctive, so that the rule does not apply at all and we must be guided by the sense: ‘There are one or two irregularities to be noted.’ Here one or two has the force of an indefinite number, hence the verb is in the plural. In ‘The scriptures, or Bible, are the only authentic source’ (Bishop Tomline) the words ‘or Bible’ are a mere explanation of ‘Scriptures,’ which is the real subject.
In the above examples *either* and *neither* are construed as conjunctions, so that they do not influence the form of the verb. But sometimes they are treated as pronouns employed as subject of the verb and followed by two appositives: ‘Either he or I *is* in the wrong.’ ‘Neither my dog nor I *is* for sale’ (Thomas Nelson Page, *John Marvel, Assistant*, Ch. XXVI). ‘Neither you nor I *is* necessary to the progress of that great Methodist Church’ (Sinclair Lewis, *Elmer Gantry*, Ch. XVIII, IV). Of course, the verb is here always in the third person, agreeing with its subject *either* or *neither*.

III. GENDER

The predicate noun can assume a form in accordance with the natural sex of the person or animal represented by the subject, provided such forms are elsewhere in common use for persons or animals: ‘He *is* a count.’ ‘The animal *is* a bull.’ ‘She *is* a countess.’ In general, we have few such special forms for males and females, and hence usually employ the same form for both males and females: ‘He *is* a teacher.’ ‘She *is* a teacher.’ ‘She *is* a good friend of mine.’ Sometimes we can put a word such as woman, lady, man, girl, boy, etc., before the predicate noun to indicate sex: ‘She is the only woman competitor.’ ‘She is the best lady (better woman) physician in the city.’ ‘It’s a woman friend of mine.’ ‘It’s a man friend of mine.’ ‘It’s a boy actor.’ ‘It’s a she goat, a he goat.’ For a fuller treatment see 60 1 b.

IV. CASE

The predicate noun or pronoun agrees with a nominative subject in case and thus both stand in the nominative: ‘It is *I,*’ but in colloquial speech we often hear the accusative here: ‘It is *me.*’ See 7 C a. ‘Who (predicate) are the men working on the roof?’ — ‘They are the tilers.’ Where there is a reference to a name already mentioned, a predicate pronoun is used: ‘Jesus therefore went forth, and said unto them, Whom seek ye? They answered, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus said unto them, I am *he*’ (John, XVIII, 4-5). Today we may still in such a case say ‘I am *he,*’ or perhaps more commonly ‘This is *he,*’ but in colloquial speech we sometimes replace the pronoun by a noun: ‘I am the man [you’re looking for],’ or ‘I am your man.’

A noun or pronoun predicated of an accusative is in the accusative. For examples see 7 A a (1), 4th par.

A noun or pronoun predicated of the genitive subject of a gerund is in the nominative. For an example see 7 A a (1), next to last par.

Also the genitive is used in the predicate. See 7 A e.
CHAPTER V

SUBORDINATE ELEMENTS OF A SENTENCE

9. The subordinate elements of a sentence are called modifiers. They are divided into the following general classes:

1. *Attributive Adjective Modifiers*, which modify a noun or a pronoun.

2. *Objective Modifiers*, which modify a verb, an adjective, or an adverb.

3. *Adverbial Modifiers*, which modify a verb, an adjective, or another adverb. It is often difficult to distinguish an adverbial from an objective modifier as both kinds of modifiers modify verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. In this book the term *object* is used where the relation to the modified word is close. The expression *adverbial modifier* is employed to indicate a less close relation. Compare 14 a, 24 IV, 24 IV a, 25 1.

Thus modifiers are classified according to their function. Recent grammarians under Jespersen's influence speak also of the 'rank' of the modifier. In 'exceedingly prompt action' *action* is called the principal, *prompt* the secondary word or adjunct, *exceedingly* the tertiary word or subjunct.

ATTRIBUTIVE ADJECTIVE MODIFIERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADHERENT AND APPOSITIVE ADJECTIVE AND PARTICIPLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position and stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns, adverbs, and phrases used as adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition of limiting adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun modified by two possessive adjectives connected by 'and'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical relations of the adjective to the governing noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthographical form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTRIBUTIVE GENITIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form, position, stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S</em>-genitive associated with the conception of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of genitive among other attributive modifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive of origin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. **Attributive adjective modifiers** are treated as follows:

**I. Adherent and Appositive Adjective and Participle**

The attributive adjective stands either before or after its governing noun; in the former position called *adherent*, in the latter position *appositive*, adjective. As will be shown on page 64, the appositive adjective is much nearer the nature of a predicate adjective than is the adherent adjective.

Adherent and appositive adjectives which modify verbal nouns are in a formal sense adjectives, but they have the force of adverbs: 'his *late* arrival,' 'his last visit *here*.'

The inflectional forms of the adjective and their use are treated in 52–56. Other matters are presented below.

1. **Position and Stress.** The adjective in the attributive relation usually precedes the governing noun, is a little less strongly stressed, and normally has descriptive force: 'this *little* boy.' This is descriptive stress. The adjective, when important to the thought, is often strongly stressed, but yet a little less strongly
than the governing noun: ‘This is blâck ingrâtitude!’ Here we have emphatic stress, usually indicated in this book by two marks of chief stress, although the second accent is a little stronger. If the adjective is more strongly stressed than the governing noun and precedes it, it usually has distinguishing or classifying force: ‘the little bûk, not the bîg one’ (distinguishing stress). ‘Little mînds (classifying stress) always think so.’ ‘Bîg wôrds seldom go with gôod dîëds’ (classifying stress).

A participle usually follows the governing noun as an appositive when its verbal force is marked, but of course stands before the noun when felt as an adherent adjective: ‘He dropt his chin like a mán shôt’ (H. G. Wells) (= like a man who has just been shot, or like a man after he has been shot). Adjectives in -ble are often treated as participles since they contain a good deal of verbal force: gûrges nêarly impâssable, sufferings unspêakable, the only pêrson visible, and after the analogy of such expressions also with all the solêmniy pôssible, the bêst style pôssible, etc. This word-order and stress has descriptive force, hence often is used when the participle is stressed, for the stressed participle before the noun would have classifying force, as in an unhêard of crime, while in fact attention is here usually directed toward an act: the result arrived at (with descriptive force = the result which has been arrived at). ‘The crowd round a couple of dôgs fighting is a crowd masculine mainly with an occasional active, compassionate woman.’ ‘In the world’s view a wôman sôïled is a wôman spôïled’ (Hall Caine). ‘Bôys negligèd were bôys lôst’ (Kipling). This word-order is sometimes used by good authors in the case of adjectives in the hope of securing a striking effect through the unusual position of the adjective, but the marked classifying force does not harmonize with the descriptive stress: ‘After Snôbs Military Snôbs Clérical suggest themselves’ (Thackeray), instead of the more natural and forceful ‘After Military Snôbs (classifying stress and force) Clérical Snôbs suggest themselves.’

On the other hand, it is both natural and common to place stressed adjectives after the noun when they have descriptive force: ‘a lâugh múscîlî but mâtîcîous’ (Mrs. H. Ward). ‘Calculâtîôns quîcît and ânâxîous passed through the young wife’s brai’n’ (id.). Such adjectives, like participles, are felt as descriptive appositives rather than as adherent adjectives, i.e., as explanatory additions with the force of a descriptive, subordinate, attributive clause, which always follows the governing noun. A single adjective frequently stands after an indefinite pronoun with this force: ‘Sômething [which is] nêw, nôthing [which is] extraôrînâry, êverything [which is] Ênglîsh.’ ‘I can’t believe anything [which is] múch can
happen.' ‘Let Jenny marry somebody [who is] rich.’ Similarly, nouns used as adjectives: ‘something silk.’ ‘Everything métal was intolerable to the touch.’ But a single adjective stands much less commonly with this force after a noun. A single adjective clings tenaciously to its place before the noun, and can in only comparatively few instances stand after the noun in native English expression; but when two adjectives are united by a conjunction, as in the first two examples in this paragraph, they often follow the governing noun. This position is also common when a single adjective is modified, or when there are a number of adjectives not connected by conjunctions, for in these cases, as in the case of two adjectives connected by a conjunction, the adjective or adjectives after the noun are felt as appositives: ‘It was a plan so stúpid that no one approved of it.’ ‘It was a beautiful deed worth remembering.’ ‘It was an army a hundred thousand strong.’ ‘He was a man very just in all his dealings with his fellows.’ ‘She is a woman inferior to none in unselfish service.’ ‘When observing this Chinese peasantry, you seem to be watching a community of ants, persistent, untiring, organized; only the ants are men, physically strong, assiduous, resourceful, adaptable, cheerful.’

The modified adjective or participle is often before the noun where we should upon first thought expect to find it after the noun: ‘a many times exploded érror,’ ‘too còstly a sácifice,’ or ‘a too còstly sácifice,’ ‘so hársh an ánswer.’ ‘I am as góod a sch Cólar as he.’ In these and many similar examples we prefer adherent form and thus put the noun after the adjective or participle in order to make the noun more prominent in accordance with the usual character of adherent descriptive groups. But to call attention to the adjective and yet give it descriptive force, we employ the appositional form: ‘in wèather as inclement as that on the day previous.’

On the other hand, we may say ‘a too còstly sácifice’ when we desire descriptive force and ‘a too còstly sácifice’ when we desire to convey classifying force. Notice the classifying force in the following example: ‘True, Wolf Larsen possessed intellect to an unusual degree, but it was directed solely to the exercise of his savage instincts and made him but the more fòrmidable a sávage’ (Jack London, The Sea-Wolf, Ch. XXIII). As so + a stressed adjective often has descriptive force; it is often found in the appositional construction when it is more strongly stressed than the governing noun: ‘a pòwer so stròng,’ ‘pòple so unèducated,’ etc. If, however, the adjective is not a descriptive (51 2) but a limiting (51 2) adjective the adherent form may be freely used without destroying the descriptive force: ‘so múch mòney,’ ‘so fòw pòple,’ ‘so mány bòoks.’
Sometimes an adjective must be placed after the noun to avoid a clash of different numbers: ‘one of the greatest export articles of Norway, perhaps the greatest’ (Fowler, Modern English Usage, p. 402), not ‘one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest, export articles of Norway.’ ‘One of the finest poems of an equal length produced of recent years, if not the finest’ (ib.), not ‘one of the finest, if not the finest, poem of an equal length produced of recent years.’

a. A Single Unmodified Adjective after the Noun. In a number of set expressions under French influence a single unmodified adjective has become established in the position after its governing noun: the Président élect; fée simple; the súm total; court martiaľ; the body political; Pőet Láureate; Pőstmaster Géneral; from tůme immemőrial; délůl incár­nate, etc. A few such groups have arisen under Latin influence: Gőd Almighty; third person plúral, etc. Not only the word-order in such groups but also the stress is in most cases foreign, for the accent upon the second member, i.e., the descriptive stress, is in marked contrast to its distinguishing or classifying force, as can be seen in comparing the Latin group Ásía Mínor with the native English Gréater New York. These foreign groups with a stressed adjective after the noun should not be confounded with native English groups with the same word-order and stress but with descriptive force: the amount dû ( = the amount which is due); the amount overcharged; the wreck of Fėbruary lást; Frédéric the Gréat; Châpter I (usually read and spoken One instead of The First under the influence of the written Roman character). ‘A mán défad is a mán déad, and there is an end of the matter’ (Macaulay) = ‘A man if he is once dead is a man who is dead for good.’

A few of these cases of post position of the adjective are very old: mother dear; Grace dear, etc. Originally the adjective was a substantive here and this original usage is still very common; of course in modern form with a limiting adjective before the descriptive: ‘Oliver, my dear’ (Dickens).

2. Nouns, Adverbs, Phrases, and Sentences Used as Adherent Adjectives. One of the marked features in English is the great freedom with which nouns, adverbs, phrases, and sentences can stand before a noun in adjective function: a sőne bridge; a bőy lóver; a báby bóy; the Smith résidence; the poët philósopher; foreign lánɡuage instruçion; a twělve-pound pάckage; a cłówkwork tóy; a lárge-scale máp; the United States gővernment; a cat and dőg life (compare similar example in 3rd par.); the down stróke; the abőve árgument; the thên sêtrety; his álmost impudènce; in álfter yérůs; an óut-and-out fáilůre; an up-tó-dáte dictionárý; that něver-to-be-fórğőtten lőok; these nőt-to-be-ávůdėd cůrřent exprénsės; my něxt-door něghórůr; a quarter-pást-sěven tráin; a wórld-wîde réputação; the underground rälroad; a pěn
and ink drawing; a matter-of-fact man; a money-back guarantee; in a free-and-easy, go-as-you-please sort of way; the most stay-at-home person that I ever heard of; a very go-ahead-looking little port; a dry-as-dust study; a pay-as-you-go policy. Similarly, if we drop the of in a predicate genitive it is because we feel the words following the of as a predicate adjective: ‘The children are exactly [of] the same age.’ ‘Do I look [to be of] my age?’ ‘[of] What color shall I paint your door?’ after the analogy of ‘Shall I paint your door white?’ (objective predicate). Compare 7 A e.

In all the groups in the preceding paragraph the second member, always a noun, is more heavily stressed than the first member, which is now felt as an adjective, i.e., descriptive stress prevails. These groups which normally have descriptive stress should not be confounded with groups that normally have distinguishing or classifying stress upon the first member, which is always a noun or has a noun as its basic element: headache; well water; cannon ball; artillery fire; insurance company; boy-lover (i.e., a lover of boys, in contrast to a boy lover, a youthful lover); a bargain counter; an army officer; a book review; a lively good roads agitation; a new dry-goods store, etc. The first member in these groups was originally always stressed, hence these rigid formations were compounds or group-words (63). But the marked feature in a large number of these formations as we now use them is that, in contrast to older usage, the stress is no longer rigid. While in many cases we usually stress the first member when the group has classifying force, we do not hesitate to shift the accent to the second member when we desire to impart descriptive force: ‘Good roads agitation will lead to good roads legislation.’ We today feel the first member of a large number of the formations as an adjective which modifies the second member, hence we treat the first member as an adjective, stressing it to impart classifying force, but stressing the following noun to impart descriptive force. Of course, the adjectives in the preceding paragraph may, like other adjectives, be stressed more heavily than their governing noun when the desire is to impart classifying force: boy singers; a pen-and-ink drawing; the productions of his after years; an up-to-date dictionary. The oldest groups in the preceding paragraph, such as stone bridge (in Old English stán-brýcg), were originally compounds or group-words and hence were rigid formations with stress upon the first member, but later the feeling that the first member describes rather than classifies broke up the old formation and led to the shifting of the stress upon the second member, so that we now feel the first member as an adjective. The groups described at the beginning of this paragraph had the same origin, but the peculiar oneness of meaning in some of
them has preserved their old rigidity of form. In general, however, most of them are developing in the same direction as the groups in the preceding paragraph.

Adjectives are often formed from the plural of nouns: the Niagara Falls post office; a lively good roads agitation; harbors legislation (Chicago Tribune, Jan. 10, 1930); the fierce Kiowa, Comanche and other plains tribes (Milo Milton Quaife in 'Historical Introduction' to Kendall's Narrative of the Texan Santa Fé Expedition); a big arms budget (Chicago Tribune, Dec. 29, 1929); a two-thirds majority; the customs officers; the five-powers parley (Chicago Herald-Examiner, Jan. 5, 1930); an auto-sales cabinet; the expenditures committee (Chicago Daily News, Feb. 3, 1930); the house rules committee (ib.); the Highways Committee (Review of Reviews), etc. In most cases the singular is more common here: the parcel (sometimes parcels) post; a ten-dollar bill; a fifty-dollar suit; a two-trouser suit; a two-cent stamp; a two-horse carriage; 22-carat gold; a two-volume novel; a five-act play; the five-power naval conference; the national rose show, etc. We often feel the genitive as an adjective: a this year's loon (Thoreau, Journal, XI, p. 309); a new beginner's Latin book; obvious printer's (also printers') errors; a cat and dog's life; a new old men's home; a pleasant five minutes' talk; a lovers' quarrel; a boys' school; a very good girls' school. 'No mere bankers' plan will meet the requirements, no matter how honestly conceived. It should be a merchants' and a farmers' plan as well' (Woodrow Wilson, August 7, 1912). Compare 10 II 2 F a, b.

In English there is one common restriction to placing attributive elements before the governing noun. If the attributive modifier is an infinitive phrase, it must follow the governing noun, aside from a few passive infinitive phrases, such as those given in 2, p. 66: 'all time to come,' 'the new measures to save coal,' etc.

Adverbs and prepositional phrases often modify nouns as appositive adjective elements (10 I 1): 'the tree yonder,' 'the book upon the table.' Compare 10 VI, 10 IV.

3. Repetition of Limiting Adjective. If the limiting adjective modifies two nouns, both representing the same person or thing, or parts of a whole, it should be used only once; while, on the other hand, if the nouns represent different persons or things that it is desired to contrast or to mark as distinct and separate, the limiting adjective should be repeated before each noun: 'He is the guardian and natural protector (one person) of the lad,' but 'The teacher and the guardian (two persons) of the lad were discussing his case together.' 'A German and English dictionary,' or 'a German-English dictionary' (one book), but 'a German and an English
dictionary' (two books); 'the red and white rose' (one rose with two colors), but 'the red and the white rose' (two roses, each with only one color); 'the red and white roses' (a number of roses, each of which is red and white), but 'the red and the white roses' (a number of roses, some of which are all red and others of which are all white); (felt as belonging together) 'the King and Queen,' 'my knife and fork,' 'this watch and chain,' 'the first and second verses of the song'; 'a horse and cart,' but 'I bought a horse and a cart' (the horse and the cart not belonging together) and 'A fair and a brunette woman were sitting inside the stagecoach."

However, even where the reference is to different individuals, the second limiting adjective is often, for convenience' sake, dropped, provided no ambiguity would arise: 'the old and new worlds,' 'the English and German languages' instead of 'the old and the new world,' 'the English and the German language.' 'A doctor and nurse were provided for them.' The omission of the limiting adjective becomes even necessary here to prevent awkwardness if there stands before both of the coordinated adjectives one or more adjectives which belong to them both: 'a peculiar neuter nominative and accusative singular in -d: id,' etc. (Lane, Latin Grammar, p. 86).

One advantage accrues to us from the non-inflection of the adjective; namely, that the same adjective may modify a singular and a plural, so that we need not repeat it: 'some particular chapter or chapters.'

On the other hand, the article is often repeated, not to make the thought clear, but to emphasize the individual words: 'Becky took an interest in everything appertaining to the estate, to the farm, the park, the gardens, and the stables' (Thackeray, Vanity Fair).

4. Noun Modified by Two Possessive Adjectives Connected by 'And.' On the one hand, the noun here often denotes a person or thing associated jointly with two or more different persons: 'I shall not cease to be their and your affectionate friend.' 'Let it be your and my gift.'

On the other hand, the noun here often denotes different persons or things: 'Your (or sometimes yours; see 57 5 a) and my wife (or more commonly and more clearly your wife and mine) are good friends.' 'Your (or sometimes yours) and my house (or more commonly and more clearly your house and mine) are the only ones where good music is cultivated.' The context usually makes the thought clear. Plural form is sometimes employed here to express the plural idea: 'Mine (or more commonly my) and her souls (or my and her soul, or more commonly my soul and hers) rushed to­gether' (Browning, Cristina, VI). We regularly say 'Your and
my favorite books' when we mean 'Your favorite books and mine.' Here again the latter expression is more common and also clearer. Compare 57 5 a.

5. Logical Relations of the Adjective to Its Governing Substantive. The attributive adjective has the force of a predicate, i.e., it is something predicated of the governing noun. The attributive adjective, however, as in 'the cruel man,' differs from the predicate adjective, as in 'The man is cruel,' in that it indicates that the thought is incomplete, while the predicate adjective indicates that the clause or sentence is complete. As explained in 6 C, the predicate appositive adjective sustains relations to both the subject and the principal verb, and thus often has the force of an adverbial clause: 'Cruel beyond belief (= as he was cruel beyond belief — adverbial clause of cause), he didn't listen to their pleadings.' The adherent and the appositive attributive adjective often have the same force as the predicate appositive adjective when they modify a subject: 'The cruel man, or the man, cruel beyond belief, didn't listen to their pleadings' = 'The man didn't listen to their pleadings, as he was cruel or cruel beyond belief' (adverbial clause of cause). 'This old woman still dolls herself up like a young lady' = 'This woman still dolls herself up like a young lady, although she is old' (adverbial clause of concession).

6. Orthographical Form. English orthography often does not distinguish between a simple attributive adjective in an ordinary syntactical group and an attributive adjective as a component of a group-word (63) or compound. Thus in practical joker the adjective practical does not modify joker but is a component of the derivative practical joker = practical jöker + -er. Nëw and sëcond-hand booksëller is a group-word = nëw and sëcond-hand böök + sëller. Dirty clöthes båsket is usually a compound = dirty clöthes + båsket, but it may also be an ordinary syntactical group = a dirty clöthes-båsket.

II. ATTRIBUTIVE GENITIVE

A noun or pronoun in the genitive may modify a noun.

1. Form, Position, and Stress. Oldest English had more genitive forms than the language of today. We now have only two distinctive forms, the prepositional genitive with of and the older form in -s. The genitive -s is now always written 's, but it is pronounced in two different ways: (1) After sibilants pronounced ez, i.e., with a pronounced e followed by a z-sound, as in Jones's. (2) Elsewhere pronounced as a simple s or z, as in Smith's, John's.

Originally, the s-genitive ending was always es (with pronounced
FORM OF ATTRIBUTIVE GENITIVE

(10 II) 
e), and even as late as Shakespeare's time the old ending es occurs, not only after sibilants, but also occasionally after non-sibilant sounds: 'as white as whatlēs bone' (Love's Labor's Lost, V, ii, 332). Where in present-day English the old long genitive in -es is used after other sounds than sibilants, it is a mere literary form employed in poetry for the sake of the meter: 'My eyes for beauty pine, My soul for Goddēs grace' (Bridges, Shorter Poems, Book IV, 9). In actual speech the old long genitive ending es with pronounced e survives only after sibilants; elsewhere it is reduced to a simple s.

About 1380 the e of the old genitive ending es began to disappear in written English, at first in words of more than one syllable: 'the Pardoners Tale' (Chaucer, Ellesmere MS.); 'Joseps son' (The Pepsian Gospel Harmony, 46, about A.D. 1400); 'resons dom' (Pecock, Folewer, p. 10, about A.D. 1454); 'the Emperours counsail' (Thomas Cromwell, Letter to Pate, May 11, 1540). At the close of the sixteenth century simple s is the usual genitive ending also in monosyllabic nouns: 'in Gods care' (Chettle, Kind-Hartes Dreame, p. 22, A.D. 1592).

As can be seen by the preceding examples, the apostrophe was not usually associated with the genitive ending in older English. This old genitive s without an apostrophe is preserved in its (57 5 a), his, hers, ours, yours, theirs. In the case of nouns singular 's began to appear about 1680, gaining ground at first only slowly. About a century later plural s' began to be used. The apostrophe in 's does not always indicate that a sound is suppressed, for we often pronounce 's as es, thus suppressing nothing, as in Jones's. The apostrophe came into use here at a time when the his-genitive, as in 'John his book,' was widely used, competing with the s-genitive. The s-genitive was doubtless felt by many as a contraction of the his-genitive, which strengthened the tendency to place an apostrophe before the genitive ending s. This theory does not explain the use of 's after a feminine or a plural noun. The 's spread by analogy from masculine nouns to feminines and plurals.

The his-genitive occurs occasionally in Old English: 'Enac his bearn' (Numbers, XIII, 29) = 'Anak's sons.' In older English alongside of the his-genitive were a her-genitive and a their-genitive: 'Mary her books,' 'the boys their books.' Also these genitive forms occur in Old English. The genitive with his, her, and their became common between 1500 and 1700: 'my lord his gracious letteres' (Thomas Cromwell, Letter to Thomas Arondell, June 30, 1528); 'Mars his true moving' (Shakespeare, I Henry VI, I, ii, 1); 'in those 12 years of Sr. Tho. Smith his government'
The genitive in 's is still, as in older English, often, especially in poetic language and in poetry, used with nouns designating lifeless things, but it is much more commonly employed with nouns designating living beings: 'the sun's rays,' 'John's hat,' 'the boy's hat,' etc. The 's is added also in the plural if the plural does not end in -s: 'men's shoes,' 'children's shoes.' The plural in -s takes only the apostrophe: 'the boys' hats,' etc. Names of persons and common nouns denoting persons which end in a sibilant usually in the written language take here in the genitive singular 's, which is spoken æ: 'Mrs. Adams's wrapper' (Tarkington, Alice Adams, Ch. IX). 'The Duke sat at his hostess's right' (Edith Wharton, The Age of Innocence, Ch. VIII). But the plural genitive takes only the apostrophe, which is added to the full plural form in -es: 'the Adamses' small veranda' (Alice Adams, Ch. VII). The genitive plural of words not ending in a sibilant adds the apostrophe to the plural in simple -s: 'the Gaunts' cottage' (Galsworthy, The Freeland, Ch. XXXVIII). Sometimes, however, we find a separate genitive ending, as in the singular, an 's added to the regular plural: 'I ran over to the Flemings's' (Meredith Nicholson, A Reversible Santa Claus, Ch. V). In dialect the genitive of the plural folks ends thus quite commonly in -es: 'bizzy wid udder fo'ks's doin's' (Joel Chandler Harris, Uncle Remus, p. 68). Often also in the case of other plurals in -s: 'the farmers's cows' (Wright, The English Dialect Grammar, p. 265).

The genitive singular of words ending in a sibilant not frequently still, as often in Middle English and early Modern English, has no ending, but now in the written language takes an apostrophe: 'Cards' pride' (Hugh Walpole, Fortitude, p. 80). This usage is general in the case of Jesus' and ancient names in -es, as Xerxes', Socrates', etc. Quite commonly so also in the case of designations of lifeless things in certain set expressions, especially
before a word beginning with s, as sake, to avoid bringing near together three s-sounds, as in ‘for old acquaintance sake,’ ‘for goodness’ sake,’ ‘for conscience’ sake.’ In older English, in these set expressions with sake the s was suppressed even in words not ending in a sibilant, which was an unconscious shortening of the long s resulting from such expressions as ‘for sport[s] sake’ (Shakespeare, Henry IV, I, ii, 77). It looks as though the long genitive ending -es had disappeared in Middle English and early Modern English after sibilants, but alongside of this shortened genitive was a his-genitive. As the his of the his-genitive was weakly stressed, it had about the same pronunciation as the old genitive ending -es and might often have been confounded with it, so that in many cases the form might have been a genitive in -es. However that may be, the genitive in -es is now the usual form here though it is written ‘s: Jones’s.

The forms with suppressed -s in all the cases described above are survivals of older usage. The dropping of the genitive ending was facilitated by analogies that existed in older inflection. In many Middle English nouns the genitive did not have a distinctive ending. Such a genitive survives in Lady, as in a Lady chapel, a Lady altar, etc., i.e., My Lady’s chapel, altar, etc., but it is today felt as an adjective. After the analogy of such old genitives without a distinctive genitive ending many nouns dropped their genitive ending, so that such endingless genitives are characteristic of older English. Later, under the influence of the general feeling that the grammatical relations here should be expressed clearly, the genitive s was not only restored to those nouns that once had it, but it was given also to the nouns that did not have a distinctive ending. Though this new development is at present strong, there are a number of fluctuations where older usage lingers on alongside of the new, as described above. In British dialect of the North Country the endingless genitive is still common: ‘my father’ brother.’ This genitive occurs often also in American Negro dialect: ‘King Deer’ daughter’ (Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, p. 69), ‘fer Gawd’ sake’ (Du Bose Heyward, Porgy, p. 168).

Also the prepositional genitive with of is often used with nouns denoting living beings and is moreover the usual form for nouns denoting lifeless things: John’s hat; Job’s patience and the patience of Job; a man’s leg, but only a leg of a table.

Originally, i.e., in primitive Indo-European, the genitive did not have a distinctive form, but was distinguished from its governing noun by placing it before the governing noun and by stressing it more heavily. This older type is still well preserved in numerous
compounds and group-words (63): *sún-rise* = the rising of the sun; *wátér-pówer* = power of water, etc. Even in the prehistoric period the inflected simple genitive had come into wide use and was of course very common in oldest English, but it was still as in the prehistoric period placed before the governing noun and in many cases was still stressed more heavily. Little by little the heavily stressed simple inflected genitive was removed in the Old English period from the position before the less heavily stressed governing noun to the place after it, and was later for the most part gradually replaced by the prepositional genitive, as explained below.

The less heavily stressed simple inflected genitive remained before the governing noun and is still there. Thus the inflected genitive that stands before the governing noun usually has a weaker stress than its governing noun, while the genitive after the governing noun has a heavier stress: *Mr. Smith's new house*, but *the new house of Mr. Smith*. This is the normal stress in genitive groups wherever the stress is descriptive. The old stressed simple inflected or uninflected genitive before the governing noun is still preserved wherever there is a strong desire to distinguish or classify; now pronounced with a little extra force to convey this meaning: (with distinguishing force) *Jóhn's hát*, not *William's*; *the tábľe-lég*, not *the cháir-lég*; (with classifying force) *a cháld's lángháuge*; *a cháld's vóice*; *a giŕl's hát*; *wátér-pówer*; *hórse-pówer*; *stéam-pówer*; *a cháir-lég*; *a tábľe-lég*. Of course, we can often put an extra strong stress upon the second member in order to distinguish it: *Jóhn's hát*, not *his bálł*. In the case of both persons and things we can distinguish and classify also by means of the prepositional genitive by placing, according to the meaning, a little stronger stress upon the first or the second member of the genitive group: (with distinguishing force) *the lég of the tábľe*, not *the lég of the cháir*; *the lég of the tábľe*, not *the tóp*; *the hélmets of the ófficers*, not *thóse of the common sóldiers*; (with classifying force) *the lángháuge of a cháld*, or *a cháld's lángháuge*; *the pátiénce of Jób*. But if in any of these cases the stress upon the second member is stronger than that upon the first member, yet not extra strong, the force is descriptive: 'The hélmet of this ófficer is broken.' 'The lángháuge of this cháld is quite undeveloped.'

In Old English, there were several simple genitive forms: *-es* for many masculines and neuters; *-e* for certain feminines; *-án* for certain masculines, feminines, and neuters, etc. Although in oldest English, the simple genitive was the usual form, the new prepositional genitive was in certain categories coming into use by reason of the strong concrete force of *of*, originally meaning *from*, which
indicated more graphically the ideas of separation, source, and origin than the simple genitive. Thus, people began to say ‘He walks in the strength of God’ instead of ‘He walks in God’s strength,’ since the words of God, i.e., from God, vividly brought out the idea of man walking and struggling on earth, at the same time drawing strength from a higher source. Later, when Old English inflection began to lose its distinctive case forms, the unclear simple genitives were, without regard to gender, replaced, on the one hand, by the clear simple genitive in ’s and, on the other hand, by the clear prepositional genitive with of. The tendency toward the prepositional genitive, which originally was the result of a strong desire for *concrete* expression, later became a formal trend toward *clearer* expression. Thus we feel the prepositional genitive with of today only as one of the two genitive forms without a vivid feeling for the origin of the preposition of.

a. *S-GENITIVE ASSOCIATED WITH THE CONCEPTION OF LIFE.* As the prepositional genitives after the governing noun were usually designations of things, the prepositional genitive has become associated with designations of things and the form in ~s with designations of living beings. This distinction between living and lifeless things is, however, not closely observed. We quite often in choice English still employ the genitive in ~s in cases of *unstressed* designations of things to impart descriptive force and at the same time stress the governing noun: ‘When I think of all the sorrow and the barrenness that has been wrought in my life by want of a few more pounds per annum than I was able to earn, I stand aghast at money’s significance’ (Gissing, *Henry Ryecroft*, V, p. 15). ‘It was apparently felt that, for the sake of the mind’s peace, one ought not to inquire into such things too closely’ (Arnold Bennett, *The Old Wives’ Tale*, IV, Ch. IV, p. 82). ‘A book’s chances depend more on its selling qualities than its worth.’ The old genitive in ~s cannot be freely used here. The thing must usually have some sort of individual life like a living being, but this idea of life may be very faint. It is faintest when the name of a thing is used as the subject of a gerund, where it is often not felt at all: ‘There is now no further danger of the house’s settling.’ Of course, the idea of life is often strong: ‘the ocean’s roar’; ‘Truth’s greatest victories,’ etc. On the other hand, under similar conditions, we often use the stressed genitive in ~s to impart distinguishing force: ‘for Heaven’s sake’; ‘at death’s door’; ‘Duty’s call,’ etc.

b. *DOUBLE GENITIVE.* The simple form in ~s is still widely used when the genitive stands before the governing noun, but in the position after the governing noun it has been entirely replaced by the form with of, for it would here not be felt as a genitive but as a plural. We may, however, quite often use the terminational genitive of personal pronouns after the governing noun provided we place the prepositional genitive sign of before the terminational genitive, so that it becomes clear that the form in question is a genitive: ‘bi neghbur wijd yerne noght at haue,
Ne agh of his, ne mai, ne knaue’ (Cursor Mundi, l. 6479, about A.D. 1300) = ‘Yearn not to have your neighbor’s wife, nor property of his (= that is his), nor his maiden, nor his servant.’ In this old example and similar ones in this same book the clear genitive sign of is put before his, since in this and all similar genitives, as yours, mine, etc., the genitive force is not felt, since these forms are also used as possessive pronouns in the nominative, dative, and accusative relations. The combination of of and the old genitive, his, hers, yours, theirs, etc., makes a clear genitive. This double genitive is usually preferred to the form with of + accusative, as of him, of her, etc., since there is usually a strong desire to express here after the governing noun the idea of personal possession that is so prominent in the old inflectional genitive found before the governing noun. Hence the double genitive is strictly limited to reference to a definite person or definite persons: ‘a friend of mine,’ ‘this friend of ours,’ ‘the friend of mine of whom I spoke yesterday,’ ‘these friends of mine,’ ‘a remark of hers,’ etc., not ‘a friend of me, of us,’ etc. But we say ‘a beautiful picture (i.e., likeness) of her’ in contrast to ‘a beautiful picture of hers’ (i.e., that belongs to her). The usual idea in the double genitive is that of possession, as in ‘that great weakness of his,’ or the closely related idea of origin, authorship, as in ‘this remark of his.’ But the partitive idea often mingles with that of possession: ‘a friend of mine,’ ‘an admirer of hers.’ In course of time there has become associated with the double genitive a marked liveliness of feeling, so that it now often implies praise or censure, pleasure or displeasure: ‘that dear little girl of yours,’ ‘that kind wife of yours,’ ‘this broad land of ours,’ ‘that ugly temper of hers,’ ‘that ugly nose of his.’ ‘Thus Professor Blackie, in that vituperative book of his, “The Natural History of Atheism” . . . says . . .’ (John Burroughs, The Light of Day, Ch. VI).

From the very start the double genitive has been in use also with nouns, for it is often desirable to employ here the old terminational genitive with its strongly pronounced personal force: ‘Sertes . . . Haue we noght þan (for tan) o þe kinges’ (Cursor Mundi, l. 4907) = ‘We surely have taken nothing of the King’s.’ It is also here absolutely necessary to insert the clear genitive sign of, or otherwise the genitive group would be felt as an appositional element, not as an attributive genitive. The double genitive here has come into wide use, but it is still strictly confined to definite reference and, differing from usage with pronouns, can be used of only a single definite person, for the plural form here is to the ear usually identical with the singular: ‘this remark of Carlyle’s,’ ‘a threat of my father’s,’ ‘the battered schoolbook of Tom’s.’ The plural form is quite rare: ‘in some old retreat of his or his friends’ (John Burroughs, Far and Near, p. 162). The apostrophe here makes clear the thought of the author, but in the spoken language the thought is usually ambiguous when the double genitive is a common class noun — unless the context makes the reference clear. The ear, unaided by the situation, cannot detect whether the form is singular or plural. Hence, the use of the double genitive with nouns is largely confined to proper names and such titles of relationship as have the force of proper names, as in the first
three examples. In many cases, however, the double genitive of titles or relationship, as 'the beauty of my sister's,' is not clear to the ear, unless the situation makes the reference clear. Although the double genitive with nouns is in general subject to ambiguity, many, desirous of its lively effect, take their chances with it, trusting to the situation to help them out: 'It was no fault of the doctor's' (Washington Irving). The of-genitive is here, as often elsewhere, a clearer form, and is often preferred.

The double genitive and the of-genitive of nouns are often used side by side without any differentiation of meaning: 'a play of Shakespeare's' (or of Shakespeare). But the forms are gradually becoming differentiated. The double genitive is associated with liveliness of feeling, expressing the idea of approbation, praise, censure, pleasure, displeasure: 'this appropriate remark of Mrs. Smith's,' 'that really beautiful speech of your wife's,' 'that ugly remark of her father's,' etc.

c. Position of Genitive Among Other Attributive Modifiers. The genitive usually stands first among the attributive modifiers which follow the governing word: 'The desire of my heart for peace.' The genitive precedes the other modifiers because it is least stressed, but it of course stands last when it is the most important element: 'this sudden appearance amid my corrupt, and heartless, and artificial life of so much innocence, and so much love, and so much simplicity — they fell upon my callous heart like the first rains upon a Syrian soil' (Disraeli, Contarini Fleming, 150). Another attributive element sometimes precedes the genitive because it contains a word which points back to something that precedes and hence comes as early as possible: 'the presence in such a spot of a crew of foreign adventurers' (R. L. Stevenson, The Merry Men, 47).

2. The Categories of the Attributive Genitive. The attributive genitive expresses different classes of ideas briefly described in the following articles. These categories are not all peculiar to the attributive use, but several of them are found also in the genitive which is used in connection with verbs, adjectives, and participles, and rests upon the same original genitive idea — the general idea of sphere described on page 78 and in 13 3. Thus D and H (pp. 81, 85) are often closely related to the genitive after verbs described in 13 3. See D and H a. Also the common genitive of origin and possession described in A and B and the genitive of characteristic described in F a are not only used as attributive forms but are employed also as the predicate complement of the verb be, as illustrated in 7 A e. In Old English, the genitive after verbs and adjectives was the simple genitive. The genitive here survives only in the form of the of-genitive. As we do not now feel the of-genitive here as a genitive, but construe it as a prepositional object, we no longer have a live feeling for the old, once common, genitive after verbs and adjectives. We now usually think of the genitive as an attributive adjective element modifying nouns or pronouns. Compare 13
The attributive genitive categories are treated below at considerable length.

A. GENITIVE OF ORIGIN, representing a person or thing as associated with another person or thing in the relation of source, cause, authorship: the son of the king, the king's son; this woman's children, the children of this woman; the devastations of the war; this warrior's deeds, the deeds of this warrior; Tacitus' Annals, the Annals of Tacitus; Dickens's works, the works of Dickens; Shakespeare's works, the works of Shakespeare; the Oxford Professor of Poetry's inaugural lecture. The same idea is found in the genitive used in the predicate with verbs. See 7 A e.

a. This one use of this case form has given to it the name of genitive (from Latin genitivus, pertaining to generation or birth), which has become a fixed name not only for this use but also for all the following relations expressed by the same case form.

b. If two names are connected by and and represent persons that are joined together in authorship, business, or a common activity the second name alone assumes the genitive ending: 'Steevens and Malone's Shakespeare,' 'in William and Mary's reign,' but of course Steele's and Addison's works when we are speaking of the separate sets of two different authors.

B. POSSESSIVE GENITIVE. This is a broad category that may have developed out of the general idea of 'sphere,' which in the prehistoric period and still in oldest English was a common meaning of the genitive employed with verbs, as described in 13 3, as well as the source of a number of the attributive possessive genitive meanings which have come down to us from this older period, namely, possession, inherence, a belonging to, association with, or relation to, indicating various relations between nouns much as prepositions indicate relations between nouns and verbs: my brother's house, the house of my brother (literally, the house in the sphere of my brother, i.e., the house owned by my brother); the hero's courage, the courage of the hero (literally, the courage in the sphere, the nature of the hero); life's deepest problems, the deepest problems of life (literally, the deepest problems in the sphere of life); Socrates' wisdom, the wisdom of Socrates; Mr. Jones's auto, the auto of Mr. Jones; the King of England's private property; What do you call him's son; the writer's mother's maiden name; last May's storms; the leaves of the trees; the streets of the city; the coolness of evening; the snows of winter; the sun's rays, the rays of the sun; the earth's mighty ones, the mighty ones of earth; the ship's side; the city's wealth; the nation's prosperity; the day's work; in The Times's opinion, in the opinion of 'The Times,' in the opinion of The Times; England's aristocracy, the
aristocracy of England; the dog's master, the master of the dog (literally, master in the sphere of the dog, not a master owned by the dog); the boy's father, the father of the boy (literally, father in the sphere of, with reference to the boy, not a father owned by the boy); the chief of police (literally, chief in the sphere of the police); the king of the land.

This is a very common category, to which A, C, F, G are closely related. The same idea is found in the genitive used with verbs. See 7 A e.

The possessive genitive is often closely related to the partitive genitive: 'the leg of the table' (possessive or partitive genitive). The two genitives here have the same form and practically the same meaning, but in case of personal pronouns there has long been a tendency to differentiate here form and meaning, namely, to employ his, her, etc., in the possessive relation and of him, of her, etc., in the partitive relation, stressing the idea of an integral part, as described more fully in H, p. 85: 'His hair, his eyes,' etc., but 'She was the daughter of a lumberjack and woodcraft was bred into the very fiber of her' (Saturday Evening Post, July 29, 1916). 'The man had something in the look of him' (Browning, An Epistle). 'I do it for the honor of it.' As this differentiation has not become thoroughly established, we still more commonly employ here the old undifferentiated forms his, her, etc., for either the possessive or the partitive relation: 'his eyes' and 'The man had something in his look.' But we now always use the form with of when the pronoun is modified by a relative clause: 'Then first I heard the voice of her to whom the Gods Rise up for reverence' (Tennyson, Ænone, l. 105). In older English, the simple possessive genitive, her, his, etc., could be used here. See 23 II 8 a.

In this category descriptive stress with the accent upon the second member prevails, but we not infrequently find distinguishing stress: nobody's book; somebody else's book; for peace's sake; for heaven's sake; for health's sake; for righteousness'sake; for Jesus' sake; at death's door; Fortune's tricks, the tricks of Fortune; William's auto, not John's. Also classifying stress is common, sometimes in connection with the genitive in -s, sometimes with the old uninflected form: bird's-nest; rat's tail or rat-tail; swan's neck; pigskin; goose-feather; horse-hide, etc. Compare 63.

The possessive genitive may be also a genitive clause, as illustrated in 24 I.

a. Adverbs Inflected Like Nouns. Adverbs, or adverbial expressions, are now often inflected like nouns: 'yesterday's mail,' 'this week's mail,'
'the heavy mail of last week'; 'tomorrow's dinner'; 'yesterday evening's newspaper.' Or, of course, to distinguish, 'yesterday evening's newspaper,' etc.

b. Inflection of Nouns Connected by 'And.' If two or more names connected by and represent persons that are joined together in possession, the second or last name alone assumes the genitive ending: 'John and William's uncle'; 'John, William, and Mary's uncle.' 'We paid a visit to Messrs. Pike and White's works.' 'My father and mother's Bible.'

But we must give each genitive its genitive -s if there is no joint possession: 'My father's and my mother's birthdays both fall in June, two days apart.' In older English, however, even where there was no joint possession the last genitive often alone took the ending, as a firm differentiation of usage had not yet taken place: 'Thou Must . . . bear the palm for having bravely shed Thy wife and children's blood' (Shakespeare, Coriolanus, V, iii, 113), now thy wife's and thy children's blood.

c. Omission of Governing Noun. The word for house or place of business is often omitted: 'I was at Smith's [house or place of business].' 'Go to the baker's.' 'Mary has written to say that she is going to spend all her Christmas holidays at her dear aunt (compare b) and uncle's.'

The governing noun is regularly omitted when the possessive genitive points forward or backward to a preceding or following governing noun, for the genitive here is now felt as a possessive pronoun, like mine, hers, etc., as explained in 575a: 'John's auto is larger than William's and mine.'

d. Group Genitive. It is usually taught that in such expressions as 'the King of England's private property' the inflectional genitive -s is placed at the end of the group King of England because these words are felt as a unit with the force of a single word. This conception, however, cannot here be the compelling force that has brought about this construction, for we never say 'The king of Englands now have less political power than formerly,' treating the group king of England as one word, adding the plural -s at the end. The real reason for placing the genitive -s at the end of the group the King of England is simply to avoid ambiguity, for if -s were added to King the form would be felt as a plural, since -s now always conveys a plural idea where it is not immediately followed by the governing noun. The oneness of idea in King of England made it possible to add the -s to the end of the group and the ambiguity that would otherwise arise suggested this course, but in this same group of words king, not England, has the plural sign in the nominative plural in the subject relation: 'The kings of England now have less political power than formerly.'

Until about 1500 it was common to say 'the King's property of England.' Here and there this old usage lingered on after that date for a time: 'the Archbishop’s grace of York' (Shakespeare, I Henry IV, III, ii, 119). In such expressions as 'the King's property of England' the later tendency to bring together the words that naturally belonged together, i.e., to say the King of England, separated King from the governing noun property, which made it necessary to add the
genitive ending to England, so that the -s might here as elsewhere stand immediately before the governing noun. In the plural in the subject relation it was not thus necessary to add the -s to England so that the old historic form of expression was here not disturbed. Where there is no ambiguity, the old historic genitive singular with the -s at the end of the proper word is still found in the language of children: ‘It ain’t either’s of us revolaver’ (Tarkington, Penrod and Sam, Ch. IV).

This compact genitive construction is much more forceful than the literary form of expression ‘The revolver doesn’t belong to either of us.’

e. Unclear Old Genitive Forms. There is a force in the compact simple genitive that appeals to us. The loss of distinctive genitive form here in a number of pronouns and limiting adjectives has weakened English expression. In older English, a natural fondness for the simple genitive often led to its use even where the genitives were uninflected pronouns and limiting adjectives that could not indicate the grammatical relations: ‘Both their (in Middle English bother their or their bother, hence with a clear genitive form) several talents were excessive’ (Fielding, Tom Jones, III, 45), now the several talents of both of them. This older usage is best preserved in the subjective genitive category in connection with the gerund: ‘Your mother will feel your both going away’ (Mrs. Gaskell, Wives and Daughters, Ch. XVI). ‘Isn’t it dreadful to think of their all being wrong!’ (Sir Harry Johnston, The Man Who Did the Right Thing, Ch. II).

It is also well preserved in the possessive category in such expressions as both our lives, both our minds, but we now feel the old genitives as plural limiting adjectives. This new interpretation early led to putting a following singular governing noun into the plural: ‘were you both our mothers’ (Shakespeare, All’s Well, I, iii, 169), now ‘were you the mother of both of us.’ This old usage survives in popular speech: ‘She is both their mothers,’ i.e., ‘the mother of both of them.’ ‘It is both their faults.’

In the literary language it lingers on in for both their sakes, for both our sakes. Similarly, when of is inserted after all, both, none, etc., to give expression to the partitive idea: ‘I’m taking the trouble of writing this true history for all of your benefits’ (Hughes, Tom Brown’s School-Days, I, VI), instead of the correct for the benefit of all of you. ‘A painful circumstance which is attributable to none of our faults’ (Thackeray, Pendennis, II, Ch. XXXV), instead of the correct the fault of none of us.

C. Subjective Genitive, which represents a living being as associated with an act in the relation of author: ‘Mother’s love for us children.’ ‘We have all heard duty’s call’ (or the call of duty). ‘From our house we can hear the ocean’s roar’ (choice prose or poetry; or more commonly the roar of the ocean). Compare 20 3 (6th, 7th, and 8th parr.).

The old uninflected genitive is common here: sun-rise, earthquake, heart-throb, snake-bite, etc. Compare 63.

D. Objective Genitive, which denotes the object toward
which the activity is directed: ‘devoting much time to the children’s education’ (or the education of the children); ‘the city’s capture by the Japanese,’ ‘the capture of the city by the Japanese’; ‘Cæsar’s murderers,’ ‘the murderers of Cæsar.’ ‘Old Lord Ancoat’s death, which followed within a month or two, was hastened on by the shock of his son’s loss’ (Mrs. H. Ward) = ‘the loss of his son.’ ‘The feeling of Emily’s loss does not diminish as time wears on’ (Mrs. Gaskell). ‘WOMAN IS HUNTED AS MAN’S SLAYER’ (headline in The Sun, New York, Aug. 7, 1929). ‘Costa Rica, Salvador, and Honduras stoutly objected to the treaty’s ratification’ (The Sun, New York, Sept. 5, 1929).

The objective genitive may be a full genitive clause or an abridged infinitival or gerundial clause, as illustrated in 24 I and a thereunder.

The prepositional genitive is the rule in this category, but, as can be seen by examples given above, the old simple genitive still lingers on. The prepositional form sometimes differentiates the objective from the subjective genitive: ‘I hate the sight of him’ (objective genitive), but ‘His sight is failing.’

This genitive is often closely related to the adverbial genitive of specification described in 13 3: ‘They counted on a complete destruction of the enemy’ = with reference, with regard to the enemy, literally, in the sphere of the enemy.

The old uninflected genitive is still common here in group-words (63): gate-keeper, money-maker, woman-hater, child-study. In the case of words not ending in s in the plural, there is a tendency here to give a formal expression to the plural idea: lice-exterminator, etc.

As the possessive adjectives are derived from the genitive of the personal pronouns they still often have various meanings of the genitive, hence also sometimes the force of an objective genitive: my (genitive of origin) son, my (a possessive genitive) book, my (a subjective genitive) love of God, my (an objective genitive) punishment.

E. Genitive of Material or Composition, denoting that of which something consists: a crown of thorns; an idol of gold; raiment of camel’s hair; a herd of cattle; a group of children; a flock of birds; a swarm of bees, etc. The old uninflected simple genitive is still in part preserved: stône-heap, or a heap of stones; sând-pile, or a pile of sand; thörn-hedge; dung-hill, etc. The old uninflected genitive was once much more common here. In most cases it has been construed as an adjective, as is indicated by its loss of stress: a stône bridge (in Old English stânbrycg); an iron pillar; a côpper kétte, etc. Compare 10 I 2 (2nd par.) and 63.
The old inflected s-genitive is now not used in this category. This genitive category is closely related to H.

F. DESCRIPTIVE GENITIVE. This genitive is closely related to the possessive genitive and some of the examples given below might be classed there. There are two groups:

a. Genitive of Characteristic. With classifying force and stress: a wōman’s voice, or the voice of a wōman; a child’s langue, or the langue of a child; a mān’s roughness, or the roughness of a mān; a lády’s glōve; a wōman’s college; a mān’s shōe; a gentlemān’s shōe; mēn’s shōes; children’s clōthing; a world’s fair. We often feel the classifying genitive that precedes its governing noun as an adjective, as can be seen by the fact that the preceding adjective modifies the governing noun, not the genitive: ‘obvious printer’s (or printers’) errors.’ Compare 10 I 2 (3rd par.).

With descriptive force and stress: a mān of stérling charactér; a newspaper of high ránk; things of this sort; a matér of consider­able impérónté; the God of love; a mān of action; a spirit of hate. Sometimes, however, in these descriptive groups the first member has such a strong logical force that it is stressed, regularly so after numerals: ‘A mān of action and a wōman of action proceed in quite different ways.’ ‘She is worth tén of hér dughter, tén of you.’

If we employ a prepositional genitive here with classifying force, we must stress the second member a little more than usual, or the group will be construed as having descriptive force: the pátience of Jōb; the langue of a child. Instead of a genitive here, we often use an adjective with classifying stress: a mān of high temper, or a high-tempered mān; a wōman of kind heart, or a kind­hearted wōman. The compound adjective has come into wide use here both to describe and to classify: ‘He lives in a beautiful four-hundred-dollar-a-month hōuse’ (descriptive), but ‘Every cavalry officer must be a good cross-country rider’ (classifying). Compare I 2, p. 66.

b. Quite similar is the Genitive of Measure: a five minutes’ tālk; an hōur or two’s délāy, or a délāy of an hōur or two; a three hōurs’ délai, or a délāy of three hōurs; a mōnth’s rēnt. Instead of the inflected genitive we often employ the old uninflected genitive, especially when the measure is other than that of time: a thūrè-hour délāy; a tēn-pound bāby; a tēn-foot pōle; a five-mile wālk; the tēn-mile rōw across the harbor (John Burroughs, Far and Near, p. 252), etc. We sometimes feel the inflected genitive here so strongly as an adjective that we treat it as an adjective, adding one in substantive function: ‘The higher course is a two years’
one' (London Times, Educational Supplement, 8/8, 1918). The old uninflected genitive is now usually felt as a compound adjective: 'A five-minute talk would be more appropriate than a thirty-minute one.'

A classifying genitive is used in units of measurement—a possessive or an objective genitive with classifying stress: (possessive genitive) 'a bōat’s lēngth'; 'at a distance of two shēp’s lēngths' (Sir C. P. Butt in Law Times Rep., LIII, 61/1); 'a hāir’s brēadth'; (objective genitive) 'a stōne’s throv'; 'within two stōnes’ throv of the club' (Galsworthy, The Country House, 263), or better 'within two stōne’s throws.' Apart from the genitive relation we usually employ compound or group-word (63) form with non-inflection of the first element in such units of measurement: ‘within three bowshōts’ (Kipling); i.e., ‘three shots with the bow’ (attributive prepositional phrase).

G. APPOSITIVE GENITIVE, explaining the preceding governing word: the vice of intemperance; the gift of song; the art of printing; the temple of the body; the period of the Reformaţion; the title of Duke; the Duchy of Lancaster; the Republic of France; the State of Illinois; the city of Chicago; the name of misanthropist; the cry of ‘Wōlf, wōlf'; a confused cry of ‘The King is bleeding!'; a verdict of 'death from natural causes.'

Except in proper names, as St. Pāul’s Cathēdrāl, St. Jāmes’s Pārks, St. Jāmes’s Square, often in elliptical form, St. Pāul’s [Cathedral], All Saints’ [Church], St. Jāmes’s [Theater], St. Bartholomew’s [Hospital], etc., the old simple genitive is now used here only in poetic language: trēason’s chārge (Scott, Marmion, II, VIII); life’s journy; life’s fitful fēver; Time’s fleeting river, etc. The simple genitive of certain proper names is used only in poetic language: Albion’s Isle; Brīn’s Isle; Zion’s City; Tweed’s fair river, or more commonly, according to the second paragraph below, the fair river Tweed, etc. Notice that the appositive genitive, whether it follows or precedes the governing noun, usually has the stress.

The possessive genitive is the starting point of this genitive category, as can be seen in 'the blessing of a good education,' where the genitive can be construed either as a possessive or as an appositive genitive.

Alongside of this appositive construction is another. The appositive is placed after the governing noun, agreeing with it in case: the ànimal mān; the bird hēron; the māmmal whāle; the preposition with; the dēmon rūm; King Hēnry; Cǎrdinal Mǎnníng; Lāke Mīchigan, etc. In oldest English, the stressed appositive, of course, preceded the governing noun: ‘Témesē strēame'
(Bede), now often 'the river Thámes,' since the stressed word in a normal descriptive group stands last. Compare III 1 B, p. 91. The old word-order, however, is still often used here, but the stress is the new descriptive: the Thámes River. Many groups still have thus the old English word-order with the new stress, as Húsdon River; Bèring Séa; St. Gòthard Túnnel; Pánama Canál, etc. The old word-order has been preserved through a change of conception and a consequent change of stress. The proper name is now felt as a descriptive adjective and has accordingly lost its strong stress, so that it must stand before the more strongly stressed governing noun as other descriptive adjectives. But Státe Strée, Wábash Ávenúe, Dráke Hótel, etc., with distinguishing stress.

Chaucer sometimes has alongside of the appositive genitive form the older appositional construction of two nouns agreeing in case: the citee of Rome (The Nonne Preestes Tale, 549); Thebes the citee (The Knightes Tale, 76). We now say the river Jordan or the Jordan River, but in older English, we find also the river of Jordan (Mark, I, 5). We now say Lake Érie, etc., but the appositive genitive form occurs in a few names: the Lake of Tiberias, the Sea of Galilee, etc.

The appositive genitive may be also a genitive clause, as illustrated in 23 I.

a. The appositive genitive is often added to a noun, not to define its meaning more accurately, but to indicate a class to which a thing or person belongs that has just been characterized as an individual by the governing noun: the rásclal of a lándlord; a jéwel of a cup; a béast of a night; a fráil slíp of a wòman; a brúte of a húsdand; his térmagant of a wíse; a lóve of a child; a dèvil of a húrry, etc. This construction is not known in Old English. It has come into the language from the French. Originally, it came from the Latin appositive genitive, which is an outgrowth of the possessive genitive, as in 'scelus viri' rascal of a man, i.e., a rascal who belongs to the class represented by man; 'monstrum mulieris' monstèr of a woman, i.e., monster who belongs to womankind. All feeling for this origin has been lost, for the common class noun after of can now be replaced by a proper name: 'Where is that béast of a Fingal?' = 'Where is that bán Fingal?'

H. Partitive Genitive, denoting the whole of which only a part is taken: a piecé of bréad; the hálft of my próperty; a gláss of wíder; óne of my фrends; twó of the bóys. ‘Háve you a cópy of this bóók?’ In these descriptive groups the idea of quantity or part often becomes logically so important that we must stress the first member: ‘Edward the Confessor was móre of a mónk than a king,’ but ‘He is now móre of a hýpocríte than ever before.’ ‘He
isn't much of a linguist.'  'He is something of an adventurer.'  'She is a bit of a coquette.'  'He is the head (or the very life, or the soul) of the enterprise.'

In rather poetic language, it has long been common to employ a stressed noun here to denote the part and the unstressed genitive of a personal pronoun to denote the whole, where the whole is a person or thing and the part the material body or some part of it, or, on the other hand, an immaterial part or some characteristic feature: *be sāule of him* (Old English Homilies, I, 163, latter half of twelfth century).  'Fetch thou the cōrpse of hēr and bury her by her husband the noble King Arthur' (Malory, *Le Morte d'Arthur*, XXI, 2).  'He is tender to impression at the surface, but there is too much māss of hīm to be moved' (Ruskin, *Modern Painters*).  'They were his environment, these men, and they were moulding the clāy of hīm into a more ferocious thing than had been intended by nature' (Jack London, *White Fang*).  'She was the daughter of a lumberjack and woodcraft was bred into the very fīber of hēr' (Saturday Evening Post, July 29, 1916).  'The chief quality of Burns is the sincērity of hīm' (Carlyle).  'The pity of it āll (= the pitiable feature of his life) is that he had to die without seeing the fruits of his work.'  'I do not remember that I then had any pity for him (the chipmunk).  I think I rather enjoyed the sport of hunting him.  That is the bōy of īt' (John Burroughs, *Field and Study*, Ch. IX).

In a number of expressions the partitive genitive of personal pronouns is also common in plain prose, usually, however, without the poetic meaning of the preceding examples, merely stressing the idea of an integral part:  'That will be the ēnd of īt, the lāst of īt.'  In a vague way we feel life and death as parts of us, vital parts of our human experience:  'I couldn't do it for the life of mé.'  'That will be the dēáth of yōu.'  In all the above examples, where we think of a whole and some part of it, the partitive genitive is closely related to the possessive genitive.  Compare B, p. 79.

The partitive genitive may be also a clause, as illustrated in 23 I.

a. Nature of the Attributive Partitive Genitive.  The Old English attributive partitive genitive was closely related to the adverbial genitive of specification (13 3):  'Heora heriges þær wæs mycel of slægen' = *With regard to their army there was a large part slain.*  This old genitive was early construed also as an attributive genitive, and this conception still survives:  'Of their army a large part was slain,' or 'A large part of their army was slain.'  In older English, however, the old genitive of specification was here often also construed as a partitive genitive subject or object, and later was replaced by a nominative for the subject relation.
and by an accusative for the object relation: 'There is gold and siluer (subject) gret plente' (pred. appos.) (Mandeville). 'Sound (subject) there was none (pred. appos.) only that faint stir that never quite dies of a country evening' (Galsworthy, *The Country House*, p. 26). 'Silver and gold (object) have I none' (pred. appos.) (Acts, III. 6). 'Affection (object) she had none' (pred. appos.) (James Payne, *Not Wookd but Won*, I, 68). 'Paternal relatives (object) Goodwin has as good as none' (pred. appos.) (Gissing, *Born in Exile*, 41).

On the other hand, with certain verbs the old use of the genitive as partitive object or predicate tarried a long while and in poetic and solemn style still lingers on: 'When the woman saw that the tree was good for food . . . she took of the fruit thereof' (Genesis, III, 6). 'Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep' (John, X, 26).

b. Partitive Genitive Replaced by the Appositional Construction. Instead of the genitive we often find apposition after certain words: a little bread; twó dozen eeggs, dozens of eeggs; a great many children; a few bōys; twó thousand dòllars, thóusands of dòllars; four million péople, millions of péople; three score yéars and ten, scéores of tìmes. In older English, the appositional construction here was more widely used than now: 'no morsel bré’d' (Chaucer); 'a bárel ale' (id.), etc. This construction arose in the period of the decay of older inflection. A simple genitive often did not have a distinctive form, so that it appeared to stand in apposition with the governing noun. Later, the true genitive was restored by replacing the appositive by the clear modern prepositional genitive. The old construction, in general, has been retained only where the governing noun has been construed as an adjective.

Another, quite different, appositional construction, the predicate appositional construction described in 6 C, has, in a number of cases, been replaced for the most part by the partitive genitive: 'your broder, the worthyest knighte of the world one' (Malory, *Le Morte d'Arthur*, Book XVI, Ch. XV, fifteenth century), now 'one of the worthiest knights of the world'; 'the receipt of Two your letters' (Thomas Cromwell, Letter to Sir Thomas Wyatt, Feb. 13, 1539), now 'the receipt of two of your letters.' 'He offered unto him the choise in marriage of eyther the sisters' (Sir Philip Sidney, *Arcadia*, Book IV, p. 133, A.D. 1593), now either of the sisters. 'His stature did exceed the height of three the tallest of mortal seed' (Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, I, vii, viii), now 'three of the tallest.' 'My father, king of Spain, was reckon'd one The wisest prince (now 'one of the wisest princes') that there had reign'd by many A year before' (Shakespeare, *Henry the Eighth*, II, iv, 48). 'The letters . . . Of many our contriving friends' (id., Antony and Cleopatra, I, ii, 188), now 'the letters of many of our contriving friends'; 'the fate of some your servants' (Ben Jonson, *Sejanus*, V, i, 59, A.D. 1616), now 'the fate of some of your servants.' 'He does not believe any the most Comick Genius (now 'any of the most comic geniuses') can censure him for talking on such a Subject at such a Time' (Addison, *Spectator*, No. 23, p. 2, A.D. 1711). 'To me and many more my countrymen' (William Dunlap, *André*, Act III, A.D. 1798), now 'many more of my countrymen.' Where the noun after the appositive is in the
plural, this appositional construction survives in colloquial speech: ‘Aunt Fannie saw a newspaper from one the places where Aunt Julia’s visiting her school room-mate’ (Tarkington, Gentle Julia, Ch. XVI). ‘None the girls are going.’ In the case of each we may say: ‘She kissed them each’ (or each of them).

In a few cases this old appositive has become an attributive adjective: ‘to other my poore kynnesfolkes’ (Thomas Cromwell, Testament, A.D. 1529), now ‘to my other poor kinsfolk’; ‘with other the great men of Scotland’ (Burton, Scot. Abr., I, I, 18, A.D. 1864), now ‘with the other great men of Scotland.’ With the original word-order: ‘strict adherence to every the minutest part of their customs and religion’ (Mrs. A. M. Bennett, Juvenile Indiscretions, V, 117, A.D. 1785), now ‘strict adherence to every minutest part,’ etc.; ‘any plainest (from older any the plainest) man who reads this’ (Trollope, Framley Parsonage, Ch. XIV). After possessive adjectives every has become a real attributive adjective: ‘He watched her every movement.’

c. Blending. In the partitive category there is a tendency, once much more common than now, to blend the genitive with some other construction, resulting in illogical expression: ‘His versification is by far the most perfect of any English poet’ (Saintsbury, Nineteenth Century Literature, 268), a blending of ‘His versification is the most perfect of all English poets’ and ‘His versification is more perfect than that of any English poet.’ The omission of the word other after any in the last example is a form of blending still common. In comparisons where there is present the idea of a group or class, the superlative represents the group as complete, while the comparative represents the separation of one or more from all the others in the group. Hence we should say ‘is the most perfect of all English poets,’ or ‘is more perfect than that of any other English poet.’

d. Genitive of Gradation. This is now felt as a variety of the partitive genitive: ‘the King of kings and Lord of lords’ (I Timothy, VI, 15), ‘the book of books.’ ‘But it was not enough for Frances, who found her mind looking for the word of words that would express her own meaning to her own satisfaction’ (May Sinclair, The Tree of Heaven, Ch. XVIII). This genitive has come from the Hebrew through the medieval Latin of the church.

III. APPPOSITION

1. Apposition Proper. A noun which explains or characterizes another noun is placed alongside of it, and from its position is accordingly called an appositive (i.e., placed alongside of): ‘Smith, the banker.’

The idea of apposition is expressed also by the appositive genitive, so that here apposition and the appositive genitive compete with each other, as illustrated in II 2 G. Another common appositional category is that of a sentence or clause explaining a
preceding word, now divided into two distinct groups, called attributive substantive clause and attributive adjective clause. The former is still felt as an appositive. Its use is described at length in 23 I. The latter, though now felt as an adjective relative clause, was once an appositive, and traces of its older function are still to be seen in both literary and popular speech, as described in 23 II. There is still another common appositional category, the prepositional infinitive, which competes with the appositional genitive and the appositional clause: ‘your plan to go yourself (or of going yourself, or that you should go yourself) doesn’t please me.’

Attributive appositives were originally only loosely connected with the headword; words added by way of explanation or in oldest English often preceding the headword on account of their importance. In course of time a close relation has in many cases developed between headword and appositive, so that they now form a close group with the accent upon the second member. Hence there are now two groups of appositives, namely, those loosely connected and those closely attached.

A. LOOSE APPOSITION. Where the appositive noun follows the headword in a rather loose connection with the force of a descriptive (23 II 6) relative clause, it agrees, if possible, with the headword in number and gender, but not always in case: ‘Mary, the belle of the village’; ‘the Smiths, the friends of my youth.’ The appositives belle and friends may here be regarded as agreeing with their headword in number, gender, and case.

Often, however, the appositive does not agree with its headword in case since it is felt as a nominative, the predicate of an abridged relative clause: ‘There was only one close carriage in the place, and that was old Mr. Landor’s, [who was] the banker’ (George Eliot). ‘And these footsteps dying on the stairs were Charley’s — [who was] his old friend of so many years!’ (De Morgan, The Old Madhouse, Ch. XXIV). In Old English, the appositive was usually in the genitive when the headword was in the genitive: ‘on Isais bec þes witegan’ (Luke, III, 4) = ‘in the book of the words of Isaye the prophete’ (Purvey’s ed., A.D. 1388) = ‘in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet’ (Revised Version, A.D. 1881). As can be seen in these translations, the genitive form of the appositive has for the most part been replaced by the nominative, always so after an of-genitive, as in these examples. The of-genitive is never used as an appositive. The simple genitive is sometimes impossible, in which case the nominative must be used: ‘These words were Cicero’s, the most eloquent of men.’ The appositive in all these examples indicates the identity of a person, but where it indicates the identity of a place, a shop, or a residence expressed
by a genitive, it too is in the genitive to make clear that the refer-
ence is to a place, not to a person: 'I bought the book at Smith's, the bookseller's' (= at Smith's store, the bookseller's store). But if we feel the reference is to a person, we may use the nominative, though it is not so common as in older English: 'I bought the book at Smith's the bookseller.' The nominative, however, is the usual form here where the appositive consists of parts connected by a conjunction, or is a noun modified by a prepositional phrase: 'at Smith's, the bookseller and stationer'; 'at Smith's, the bookseller on Main Street.' On the other hand, the headword and the appositive sometimes form a compound noun, as described below, and as a compound take the genitive sign at the end: 'I bought the book at Smith the bookseller's.'

The appositive sometimes stands in rather close relations to the headword, especially when the latter is a pronoun, but the headword and the appositive do not entirely fuse, as in B, p. 91, so that a slight pause separates them: 'we poor fellows.' 'He died in 1859, leaving his property to one Ann Duncan.' The relation between one and the following name, however, is sometimes so close that the two words form a compound, the second component, the name, assuming the genitive ending: 'We breakfasted at one Goldens' (George Washington, Diary, Oct. 14, 1794).

The appositive is often introduced by as: 'I have thought of you as your sister might think and spoken to you as my brother' (Hall Caine). The headword is here often a possessive adjective, which was originally the genitive of a personal pronoun and still implies a personal pronoun in the genitive case: 'Guildford now found himself restricted to his business as a judge in equity' (Macaulay). The appositive is here regularly in the nominative as in the first two examples given in the second paragraph of A, p. 89, where the headword is a noun in the genitive.

The appositional idea often disappears entirely, headword and appositive merging into a compound, as in B, p. 91, so that the new unit, like a simple noun, takes inflection at the end, usually so when the governing noun follows it: Nixon the hatter (Thomas Hughes, Tom Brown's School-Days). 'We stopped at Mr. Barton the clergymans house for a drink of water.' The name and the following appositive often become so closely associated that both together blend into one name: Tom the Pêper, Pêter the Gréat, Pêter the Hérmit, etc. The stress in all these cases is descriptive, i.e., rests upon the last member. If we desire to classify here, we must stress the second member a little more than usual to distinguish it from the usual descriptive stress: 'I have spoken of Tènnyson the pòet, I now desire to speak of Tènnyson the män.'
Similarly, if we desire to distinguish: ‘Nixon the hatter, not Nixon the druggist.’

a. Pronouns as Appositives. An appositive pronoun usually agrees with its headword, noun or pronoun, in case: ‘Mother, who should go, John or I?’ ‘Mother, whom do you want, John or me?’ There is a tendency here in colloquial language to employ the accusative, especially strong in personal pronouns of the first person: ‘Which would you rather took you over the crossing? Me (instead of I) or Papa?’ (May Sinclair, Mary Olivier, p. 88). ‘We’re not like ordinary people, us (instead of we) Cardinals’ (name) (Hugh Walpole, The Captives, p. 15). ‘Will we — us (instead of we) two — go to lunch on Sunday to meet Mr. Snaithe?’ (De Morgan, The Old Madhouse, Ch. VII). Compare 7 C a.

b. Appositive to a Sentence. An appositive in the form of an explanatory remark often belongs to the whole sentence: ‘I, like many another, am apt to judge my fellow men in comparison with myself, a wrong and a foolish thing to do.’ The appositive may be in the plural if it is felt as referring to two or more ideas in the preceding sentence: ‘You are humane and considerate, things few people can be charged with’ (Pope, Letter).

The appositive sometimes precedes the sentence: ‘He (the Indian Chief Logan) had changed, and not for the better, as he grew older, becoming a sombre, moody man; worse than all, he had succumbed to the fire-water, the curse of his race’ (Theodore Roosevelt, The Winning of the West, Vol. I, Ch. VIII). Often introduced by as: ‘As a first step, I secured my vast property, so that the income would be certain’ (Wallace, Ben Hur, I, Ch. V).

On the other hand, a substantive clause may serve as an appositive to a single substantive: ‘Here and there a cleft in the level land occurs, what they call a “chine” in the Isle of Wight’ (Mrs. Gaskell, Sylvia’s Lovers, Ch. IV).

B. Close Apposition. The appositive may be a proper name and enter into such close relations with the preceding headword that it forms with it a group with the stress upon the last member, i.e., the appositive: King Edward, John Smith, my friend Jónes, Uncle Tóm, Profèssor Brówn, the apòstle Pául, the Virgin Márý, the stèamer Ocean Bride, Mòunt Étna, Lâke Mîchigan, the river Thástes, Càpe Hâtteras, Fòrt Wáyne, Fòrt Árthur, etc.

The appositive here assumes the inflection if it precedes a governing noun: at my friend Smith’s house; at Uncle Tom’s house; at Banker Smith’s house.

The stress here is usually descriptive, i.e., rests upon the second member. Of course, we must stress the first member if we desire to classify: ‘I desire here to speak, not of the ëòët Tènnison, but of the mân.’

In many cases the appositive is not a proper name, but a noun
with a similar force, namely, a word or expression representing a thing as an individual, not as a member of a class: the letter α; the figure 6; the verb go; the preposition in; demon Rūm; the old saying 'First come, first served.' 'On her tombstone stood the words "Thy will be done."' The close relation here between the appositive and the headword cannot always be indicated by the stress, since the appositive is often, as in the last two examples, not a single word but a thought as a whole, which may expand into an entire clause or sentence.

In oldest English, the appositive here stood before the headword: 'Ælfred cyning' = 'King Alfred.' Traces of this older usage are still to be found. See II 2 G.

2. Improper Apposition. The appositional construction was often in older English improperly used instead of the partitive genitive. This older usage with the traces it has left behind is described in 10 II 2 H b.

IV. A Prepositional Phrase as Modifier of a Noun

A noun or pronoun may be modified by a prepositional phrase, which usually follows it: (with the force of a descriptive adjective) 'a girl with black hair' (= a black-haired girl); (with the force of a limiting adjective) 'the book on the table.' After verbal nouns the attributive phrase is in a formal sense an adjective element, but logically it is an object, or an adverb: 'a mother's love for her children' (with the force of an object); 'a walk in the evening' (with the force of an adverb of time).

In the early stage of language development there were no prepositions. The modifier was simply placed before the governing noun, the word-order alone indicating that the one noun was dependent upon the other. This primitive type of expression is still found in group-words (63) and on account of its convenient form is still widely used: a ráträp = a trap for rats; hórsewhip = whip for the hórse; tóothbrúsh = brúsh for the téeth. As this construction originated in the period before the introduction of inflection, the plural idea is usually not formally expressed. In clótheshórse, clóthesbrúsh, however, the plural idea has found a formal expression.

a. Attributive Prepositional Clause. In attributive elements the preposition may stand not only before a noun, but also before a clause. There are many prepositions that can stand before a clause introduced by an indefinite relative pronoun, adjective, or adverb: 'He always has a clear insight into what is needed.' 'I haven't the slightest information
as to what plans he has made, as to where he is going.' Compare 23 I (4th par.).

After, before, and since often seem to stand as prepositions before a clause not introduced by a pronoun of any kind. Originally the determinative (56 A) pronoun that stood after the preposition, pointing as with an index finger to the following explanatory clause: 'The day after or before [that:] he came was very beautiful.' 'The long lonesome period since (a contraction of sith than + s; see 27 3, 6th par.) we last met has depressed me very much' (literally, since that: we last met). Gradually after that, before that, since came to be felt as conjunctions introducing an attributive clause. Later, that disappeared after after and before, leaving to after and before the function of conjunction. Compare 27 3 (7th par.).

V. AN INFINITIVE AS MODIFIER OF A NOUN

A noun may be modified by a prepositional infinitive. There are different categories:

1. The infinitive has its original force, i.e., is still a prepositional phrase with the literal meaning of the preposition to: 'Power to forgive sin' (literally, power in the direction of forgiving sin); 'a strong impulse to do it' (literally, toward doing it). See also 50 4 d.

2. The attributive infinitive has often developed the force of a relative clause: 'He was the first man to come' (= who came). 'The King has no children to succeed him on the throne' (= who can succeed him). 'That's the way to do it' (= in which you should do it). 'This is the fourth case of lockjaw to occur (= which has occurred) within a week.' 'This road car is the latest to be offered to the public.' 'They had no windows to speak of' (George Eliot). As the relative force here is quite strong the relative pronoun is often inserted: 'It is the glory of Trinity that she has an abundance of famous men from whom to select' (or in older simpler form to select from). See also 23 II 11.

3. The attributive infinitive often has the force of an appositive. With loose connection: 'I am conscious that a duty devolves upon me, to omit no detail.' With close connection: 'He didn't even do me the honor to come in' (or of coming in, the infinitive competing here with the appositive genitive).

It often takes the place of an appositive clause: 'Your plan that I should go (or for me to go) doesn't please me.' See also 23 I a.

VI. AN ADVERB AS MODIFIER OF A NOUN

An adverb may modify a noun: (1) as an appositive (10 I 1) adjective: 'the room above,' 'the tree yonder,' etc.; (2) as an adherent (10 I 1) adjective: 'the down stroke.' Compare 10 I 2.
VII. A Clause as Modifier of a Noun

A clause may modify a noun: 'The thought that we shall help him gives him courage.' 'The boy who is standing by the door is my son.' For much fuller description of usage here see 23 I and II.

a. Logical Relation of Attributive Clause to Governing Noun. An attributive clause, though formally connected only with its governing noun, often has logical relations to the principal verb: 'A boy who would do a thing like that (with the force of an adverbial conditional clause) would be laughed at.' 'We took the dear little fellow, who was daily getting worse (with the force of an adverbial clause of cause), to the hospital.' Compare I 5, p. 70.
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ACCUSATIVE OBJECT

11 1. Form, Position, and Stress. As explained in 3, page 3, the old distinctive accusative forms of nouns have disappeared. The personal pronouns have fuller inflection than nouns, but they, in part, too, have lost their old accusative and dative forms, as described in detail in Accidence, 35 b. The word-order now in part indicates the accusative and dative functions, as is illustrated in detail below, but the function itself, i.e., the peculiar rôle that the word plays in the sentence, is always important. Sometimes the function alone distinguishes accusative and dative: 'They chose him (ace.) king,' but 'They chose him (dat.) a wife.' English is here at its simplest. Form disappears entirely. The position of the noun or pronoun does not reveal its function. Here function alone distinguishes accusative and dative. The position, however, of noun or pronoun in connection with function often helps to distinguish case.

If there is only one object, it is in most cases an accusative and stands in the position after the verb: 'He broke a glass.' If it becomes necessary to employ a dative object after the verb, we must usually employ the distinctive dative form with to, for otherwise it would be construed as an accusative: 'Robin Hood robbed the rich to give to the poor.' Where the function is clear, however, the older simple dative is sometimes still heard in England and is even common in America, which is here, as so often elsewhere, tenacious of older forms of expression: 'The reason we wired you yesterday' (Pinero, The Thunderbolt, Act I). 'Wire, write me at once.' 'He has already told me.' 'Ten minutes suffice me (or to me) to dress.' The unaccented simple dative still often survives in the passive: 'No consideration was shown me' (or to me), but 'No consideration was shown to me.'

If there are two objects, the dative, or indirect object, stands immediately after the verb, then comes the accusative, or direct object: 'He loves her' (ace.), 'He loves his mother' (ace.), but 'He gave her (dat.) a book' (acc.), 'He gave the house (dat.) a new coat (acc.) of paint.' If the dative ever for any reason follows the accusative, as for instance when it is to be emphasized, when it is to be modified by a clause, or when it serves as a sentence modifier (12 1 B a b), it now usually, as illustrated more fully in 12 1 A B a b, takes the prepositions to, for, on, or from before it to indicate the dative relation: 'I will lend it to you, but not to him.' 'He gave his friend (dat.) a book' (acc.), but 'He gave a book (acc.) to his friend (dat.) who is visiting him.' 'He held my horse (acc.) for me' (sentence dat.). 'He shut the door
on me' (sentence dat.; in older English also to me or the simple dative). 'He stole a watch (acc.) from me' (sentence dat.). The old simple sentence dative sometimes still follows the verb: 'Kindly cash me this check,' or 'Kindly cash this check for me.' Compare 15 I 2 (3rd par.). The old simple dative also not infrequently follows the verb when the accusative precedes the verb: 'What would you recommend me?' 'Everyone is a moon, and has a dark side which he never shows anybody' (or to anybody). Compare 15 I 2 (last par.).

The dative form with to must in general be used to mark the dative relation clearly in cases where doubt might arise: 'I told him (dat.) that I should come' (a that-clause in the acc. relation), but 'I indicated to him that I should come,' because to indicate usually takes an accusative object, and hence a dative that follows it must be clearly marked as such. The dative form with to, however, is sometimes used even where it is not necessary to make the thought clear, especially in a choice literary style: 'He (Columbus) gave to the world (or simply the world) the knowledge of a new land' (Elbridge S. Brooks, A Trip to Washington). Compare 15 I 2 (next to last par.).

Dative before accusative has always been the common word-order in English in normal expression, and, as can be seen from the preceding examples, this order is still well established. But this order has never been common if there are two personal pronouns as objects, or if there are an accusative of the pronoun and a dative of the noun. As the ideas of reference and personal interest which lie in the dative here are prominent and the stress is usually a little stronger and hence also a factor, the dative still as in oldest English stands in the more important final position in the group: 'He gave it to me.' 'She asked him for it and he gave it to her.' 'I gave it to his mother.' In such examples as the last, where the accusative is a weakly stressed pronoun and the dative a noun, the dative by reason of its heavier weight invariably follows the lighter accusative. The placing of the accusative pronoun in the final place in the group in harmony with the normal word-order dative before the accusative is still, as in oldest English, rather uncommon: 'Officers and men Levied a kindly tax upon themselves. Pitying the lonely man, and gave him it' (Tennyson, Enoch Arden). Sometimes even in colloquial speech: 'If you really have it, show me it' or more commonly 'Show it to me,' since the word-order, dative of a personal pronoun after the accusative of a personal pronoun, has become fixed here, now usually with the modern dative form, but in England very often still as in older English with the simple dative: 'Show it me'
(Pinero, *Sweet Lavender*, Act II). Sometimes also in American English: ‘I give it you beforehand’ (Oemler, *Slippy McGee*, Ch. V). On the other hand, if the accusative is a stressed demonstrative it stands in the important final position in the group: ‘I told him that.’ ‘He gave me this.’

2. Meaning and Use of the Accusative with Verbs. In an early stage of our language the accusative could be used with adverbial force after intransitive verbs of motion to indicate a concrete goal. This old usage survives only in the case of home: ‘He went home.’ This old accusative after intransitive verbs of motion is somewhat better preserved where the idea of goal appears in an abstract figurative sense, namely, in the case of the simple infinitive, an old verbal noun here in the accusative of goal, employed in Old English, and even still in the colloquial speech of our time after the imperative and the infinitive of go and come to indicate the goal, i.e., end, purpose, of the verb of motion: ‘Go get it!’ (Dr. Bert Emsley in a communication to the author, July 5, 1930). ‘You’d better go lie down’ (Tarkington, *The Magnificent Ambersons*, Ch. IV). ‘I’ll make May and Lola and their partners come sit in this little circle of chairs’ (id., *Seventeen*, Ch. XXVII). ‘Women could go hang (see 46, 7th par.), because she did not want them’ (W. J. Locke, *The Glory of Clementina*, Ch. II). Elsewhere we now usually employ here the prepositional infinitive: ‘She went upstairs to lie down.’

Although the accusative of goal is no longer common after intransitives of motion, it has from the earliest times been common after transitives to indicate the goal, the object actually hit or affected by the activity, or the thing representing the goal, the real object of the activity, i.e., the result, effect: ‘to hit, reach, or toe a mark;’ ‘to paint a house,’ ‘to burn a house,’ ‘to build a house’ (the goal, the result of the activity), ‘to sketch a house’ (the goal, result of the activity). After the analogy of such transitives that take an accusative of result, the accusative is used after many verbs usually intransitive to indicate a result of the activity or something exhibited by it: ‘to weep tears,’ ‘to look compassion, daggers, death,’ ‘to breathe simplicity.’

Out of the idea of the accusative as an object in these more or less concrete relations has come the more abstract conception that the accusative is the proper case form of a noun or pronoun employed to complete the meaning of the verb, i.e., to make its meaning special: ‘I see a bird.’ ‘I hear the voices of children.’ ‘I felt the truth of the remark.’ ‘I guessed the riddle.’ A common complement of verbs is the cognate accusative, i.e., an accusative of a meaning cognate or similar to that of the verb, repeating
and also explaining more fully the idea expressed by the verb: ‘to sleep the sleep of the righteous,’ ‘to fight a good fight,’ ‘to live a sad and lonely life,’ ‘to sing a song.’ Similarly, verbs are much used with an object that denotes a thing which is closely associated with the activity expressed by the verb: ‘to play cards,’ ‘to talk shop, politics, dogs,’ etc., ‘to jump a fence,’ ‘to skip the country, two pages,’ ‘to ride a horse,’ ‘to flee the country,’ ‘to depart this life.’ ‘Edgar sits a horse as well as any young man in England’ (Mrs. Sherwood, H. Milner, III, V). ‘She did not take any instruction herself or go through the evolutions or maneuvers, but merely sat her horse like a martial little statue and looked on’ (Mark Twain, Joan of Arc, II, Ch. IV). ‘The hen will sit seventeen of her own eggs’ (Journal R. Agric. Soc., III, II, 525).

In modern times the list of transitive verbs has been greatly increased by the addition of a large number of verbs originally intransitive which took a prepositional object, as ‘to depend upon a man,’ ‘to laugh at a person,’ ‘to talk over a matter.’ In course of time the preposition here has become attached to the verb as an integral part of it, so that the object is no longer a prepositional object but a direct object of the compound verb. This becomes apparent in the passive, where the object becomes subject and the preposition remains with the verb: ‘They were laughed at by everybody.’

A transitive verb, its object, and the preposition attached to the object are often felt as a unit forming a compound transitive: ‘We lost sight of the boat in the fog,’ or in passive form, ‘The boat was lost sight of in the fog.’

a. Metonymic Object. The object is often metonymic, i.e., indicates not the real object but something which stands in close relation to it: ‘He wiped off the dust’ (real object) and ‘He wiped off the table’ (metonymic object).

b. ‘It’ and ‘So’ as Object. In a large number of expressions the accusative object is it, which originally was in many instances a concrete reference to a definite thing or a definite situation, but is now also often a convenient complement of transitive and intransitive verbs without definite reference, leaving it to the situation to make the thought clear: ‘You will catch it’ (i.e., reproach, punishment). ‘We footed (in slang hoofed) it.’ ‘I am going to rough it.’ ‘That’s going it rather strong.’ ‘I will have it out with him.’ ‘He tries to lord it over us.’

Where the construction is more or less complicated, it is often used as an anticipatory object, pointing forward to a following full object clause or an abridged, infinitival or gerundial, object clause: ‘I soon brought it about that he thought better of it.’ ‘I found it difficult to
refuse him his request.' 'Rumor has it he is going to leave town.' 'I suppose you think it odd my having gone to church.'

On the other hand, *it* often points backward to a preceding dependent clause or an independent proposition: 'If I get home by eight o'clock, I call *it* good luck.' 'He spoke very sharply to me. I shall not forget *it* soon.' Frequently, however, the adverb *so* is used instead of *it*, pointing backward, referring to the contents of the preceding proposition, especially after verbs of saying, thinking, hearing, fearing, hoping, doing, etc.: 'Did your brother receive the letter?' — 'I think *so*.' 'Will he keep his promise?' — 'I hope *so*.' 'I'll send it tomorrow if I can arrange to do *so*.'

c. Reflexive Object. A reflexive pronoun is often added to transitive verbs to indicate that the subject acts upon himself: 'He dressed *himself* quickly,' 'We all love *ourselves* more and hate *ourselves* less than we ought.' In older English, the personal pronouns were used as reflexive pronouns. This older usage lingers on in Shakespeare, although the new forms are more common: 'A (= he) bears *him* like a portly gentleman' (Romeo and Juliet, I, v, 68). Even in plain prose, however, the older simple accusative is still the rule after prepositions which express local relations in a literal sense: 'I have no money with *me*.' 'The two brothers had only a dollar between *them*.' 'We see the stars above *us*.' 'He shut the door behind *him*.' 'The horse sprang over the precipice bearing its rider with *it*.' 'Look about *you*!' but in a figurative sense 'Look into *yourself*!' and 'He asked me about *myself*.' Usage sometimes fluctuates here according as we feel the force of the preposition as literal or figurative: 'The teacher took it upon *him* or *himself* to punish the lad.' Compare 56 D (next to last par.).

The reflexive form can refer only to the subject of the proposition or clause in which it stands. Hence, if the pronoun in a subordinate clause refers to the subject of the principal proposition, a personal pronoun is used: 'I believed him to be deceiving *me* but 'I believed him to be deceiving *himself*.'

After the plural of majesty *we* and editorial *we*, it is now customary to employ *ourself* as the usual reflexive with reference to a single person in contradistinction to *ourselves* with reference to more than one: 'We feel that in this place we lay *ourself* open to the inquiry whether Mr. Winkle was whispering, during this brief conversation, to Arabella Allen' (Dickens, Pickwick, Ch. XXX).

In the headings of newspapers simple *self* is much used for *himself* or *herself*: 'G. W. Howard, Author, Kills *Self* (Chicago Tribune, Nov. 21, 1922).

One of the marked characteristics of English is the tendency to drop the reflexive pronoun: 'He dressed quickly.' 'Oil will not unite with water.' For fuller discussion see 46.

d. Reciprocal Object. The pronouns *each other* and *one another* are placed after the verb to indicate that the relations between or among the persons designated by the subject are mutual. Although good writers often use these two forms promiscuously, there is a tendency
to use the former for reference to two persons and the latter for reference to two or more: 'These two doctors hate each other.' 'We all at last understood one another.' In older English, the components of each of these compound forms were felt as distinct words and hence were often separated. This older usage persists: 'Each looked at the other' instead of 'They looked at each other.' 'The roosters of the neighborhood are calling one to the other' (or to one another). This older usage is most common, as in these examples, when the pronoun is the object of a preposition. For fuller treatment see Accidence, 37 a, b, c.

In older English, the long reflexive pronouns were sometimes used for reciprocal pronouns: 'Get thee gone; tomorrow We'll hear ourselves (instead of each other) again' (Shakespeare, Macbeth, III, iv, 31). Although this old usage has in general passed away, it is still often found after the prepositions among and between, perhaps prevails here: 'They quarreled among themselves' (but with one another). 'We are still quarreling among ourselves.' 'They resolved between themselves to start immediately.'

As in c the pronominal object here is often omitted: 'Our elbows touched' (or touched each other). 'We met (or, sometimes, met each other) at the post office.' 'We soon came to a place where two roads crossed' (or crossed each other). See 46.

e. INTERROGATIVE AND RELATIVE 'WHOM' AS OBJECT. The interrogative objective whom is used in careful language: 'For what or whom was she waiting?' (Galsworthy, The Man of Property, p. 302). 'Whom did you meet?' 'I asked him whom he met' (an indirect question). 'Whom do you mean?' 'I asked him whom he meant.'

In current colloquial speech, as in older literary English, it is still quite common to use who as an invariable form for both the subject and the object relation: 'Who (subject) was there?' 'Who (object) did you meet?' Likewise in early modern literary English: 'HOR. My lord, I think I saw him yesternight. — HAML. Saw? Who?' (Shakespeare, Hamlet, I, ii, 190). 'To who, my lord?' (id., King Lear, V, iii, 248).

This usage is explained in part by a natural tendency to avoid inflection here, as the other interrogative words, where, when, whence, etc., which stand in the same position as who, are all invariable. The use of the nominative who here as the invariable form for subject and object in contrast to the employment of the accusative me, him, her, us, them, etc., elsewhere as the invariable form, as described in 7 C a, has probably come from the fact that the accusative whom here in the subjective relation standing immediately before the verb, as in 'Whom came?' would be unnatural and contrary to all precedent, while the nominative who before the verb in the object relation, as in 'Who did they meet?' is not unnatural, since the nominative usually stands before the verb. Moreover, the use of the nominative who as object is never ambiguous, since the inverted word-order, as in 'Who did they meet?' indicates clearly that who, like when, where, etc., as in 'Where did they meet?' modifies the verb and hence cannot be the subject. The common use of who as object in direct questions made it natural to use the same
form in indirect questions: ‘Do you know who the property belongs to?’ (Gissing, *The House of Cobwebs*).

We sometimes find *who* for *whom* in substantive clauses, where indefinite relative *who*, which introduces the substantive clause exactly like interrogative *who* in indirect questions, has come under the influence of interrogative *who*: ‘I don’t know who you mean’ (A. Trollope, *Harry Heathcote*, p. 15). In ‘It feels like a fight, but I don’t know who’s fighting who’ (Hugh Walpole, *The Captives*, p. 455), the second *who* is used after the analogy of the second *who* in ‘I couldn’t see who was who.’

Earlier in the period *who* for *whom* is found also when used as a relative pronoun with an antecedent: ‘in company with General Lee, who I requested to attend me’ (George Washington, *Diary*, Oct. 19, 1794). This older usage still occurs in careless language, as in ‘The burthen of her talk is “my Collin,” who she makes out to be the most angelic babe’ (Mrs. Craik).

In general, however, the use of *who* for *whom* is receding in all functions in the literary language.

f. PASSIVE FORM OF STATEMENT. In changing a sentence from the active to the passive the accusative becomes nominative and the nominative is put into the accusative after *by*, in older English of: ‘The boy is beating the dog’ (active), but in the passive ‘The dog is being beaten by the boy.’ ‘Ye shall be hated of all men’ (Matthew, X, 22). ‘He was devoured of a long dragon’ (Bacon, *Essays*).

In normal narrative, the modifier of the verb is usually important and stressed, so that in sentences with an important modifier of the verb the active is the natural form of statement, since the modifier of the verb can often be put in the form of an object and placed in the important end position: ‘Last night the frost took all my pretty flowers.’ On the other hand, the passive is often more appropriate when the verbal activity is prominent, since in this form the verb stands last or near the end: ‘Last night my pretty flowers were all destroyed.’ The idea of active agent or cause is best stressed by employing passive form and putting the word denoting the agent or the cause at the end: ‘The dog was killed by his own master.’ ‘I was hurt by his abrupt manner.’ When we desire to give especial emphasis to the thing effected, we employ passive form and put the subject representing the thing effected at or near the end: ‘From the instant that the lips of the little old lady touched Jill’s there was sealed a bond’ (Temple Thurston, *The City of Beautiful Nonsense*, III, Ch. VIII). But not only the end position is important, the first place is also used for emphasis, especially in excited language, where the thing that is on our mind springs forth first. In the case of persons or things affected the passive form is here appropriate since we can put them into the first place: ‘My pretty flowers were all destroyed last night.’ We can use also active form here by putting the person or thing affected into the first place in the form of an exclamation and referring to them later by a pronoun with the grammatical form required by the construction: ‘My pretty flowers! the frost destroyed them all last night.’ Compare 3 a.
The speaker or writer often employs the passive expressly to avoid mention of the participants: 'Some things have been said here tonight that ought not to have been spoken.'

Passive form is often chosen merely to avoid a change of subject: 'The young couple returned and were pardoned by the baron on the spot.'

g. OBJECT OF AN ADJECTIVE OR ADVERB. The object treated above is in all instances the object of a verb. *Worth* is the only adjective that governs the accusative: 'This book is worth reading.'

In 'He sat opposite [to] me,' *me* is a dative after the adjective *opposite*, as indicated by the suppressed *to*. Similarly, in 'He is like (adjective) his father,' the object is a dative, as can be seen in poetry and in older English, where the dative form occurs: 'Sweet sleep, were death like to thee' (Shelley). 'For ye are like unto whitened sepulchres' (Matthew, XXIII, 27). Likewise, the seeming accusative after the adverb *near*, as in *near me*, is in fact a dative, for we say *nearer to me* and *next to me*. These adjectival and adverbial forms that govern the dative are now, however, often felt as prepositions. Compare 50 4 c bb.

The genitive is the usual construction after *worthy*, but the accusative occasionally occurs: 'The Englishman into whose soul these tales have not sunk is not worthy the name' (Hughes, *Tom Brown*, II, Ch. II, 226), usually *worthy of the name*. In older English, the accusative was more common: 'It was a thought happy and worthy Cæsar' (Ben Jonson, *Sejanus*, V, viii, 59 A.D. 1603). Adjectives now usually take a dative, genitive, or prepositional object. See 12 1 A, 13 3, 14.

h. ACCUSATIVE OBJECT A FULL OR ABRIDGED CLAUSE. The accusative object often has the form of a clause with a finite verb: 'I demand that he go at once.' For the different forms that an accusative clause with a finite verb may have see 24 III. The accusative clause may also have the form of an infinitival or a gerundial clause, as described in 24 III d.

### DATIVE OBJECT

12 1. Form and Use.

A. AFTER VERBS, ADJECTIVES, AND NOUNS. The old dative which is used after transitive verbs as an indirect object in connection with a direct object in the accusative is well preserved. Its present form and position in the sentence are treated in 11 1.

Old English had alongside of the simple accusative also a simple dative object, employed not only as an indirect object in connection with a direct accusative object, as at present, but also much used after many verbs as the only object. As a single object it competed with the accusative, but, as described below, it had a little different meaning, which naturally associated it with certain verbs where the peculiar dative force came into play. This old dative used as a single object has been largely displaced
by the accusative. In Old English, the accusative represents the object—a person or a thing—as affected by an activity, especially in a literal, material sense. The single dative in Old English represents a person as involved or concerned in an activity directed toward him and intended to affect him either in a mere material way or more commonly in an inner sense. If the dative object was a thing, it was felt as having interests like a person. The difference of meaning between dative and accusative was often not great, since both objects completed the meaning of the verb. Later, the difference in form between the two cases entirely disappeared, so that it became difficult to distinguish a dative object from an accusative. Where an object after verbs governing the dative, such as thank, help, injure, please, displease, believe, threaten, oppose, serve, advise, etc., was felt as completing the meaning of the verb, the old dative has been displaced by the accusative. Thus we say today 'He thanks his friend,' not 'He thanks to his friend.' 'The teacher helps the beginners,' not 'The teacher helps to the beginners.' 'The frost injures the plants,' not 'The frost injures to the plants.' The old dative began to be treated as an accusative about 1200. But the feeling for the old dative lingered for a long while after the old native English verbs and the new foreign verbs with the same meaning, as is shown by the employment of the new clear dative form with to, which was in use elsewhere: 'Yf Y do not the workis of my fadir, nyle 3e bileue to me; but if Y do, thou3 3e wolen not bileue to me, bileue 3e to the workis' (John, X 37, John Purvey's ed., A.D. 1388) = 'If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works' (King James Version). 'Thou schalt worschipe thi Lord God, and to hym (now simple him) aloone thou schalt serue' (Luke, IV, 8, Purvey's ed.). The dative disappeared here later because its function was not at this point as clearly differentiated from the accusative as it was elsewhere.

In spite, however, of the decided victory of the accusative in this category of single object the dative maintained itself in a very large number of words where the idea of a person involved or concerned in an activity was strongly pronounced: 'A new thought came to me.' 'Recently much has happened to us.' 'He has yielded to me in this matter.' 'He apologized to me, cringed to me, deferred to me, bowed to me, submitted to me, surrendered to me.' 'He got down on his knees to me.' 'Religion itself is forced to truckle to worldly policy.' 'He read to me, sang to me, wrote to me, complained to me.' 'He proposed to her.' 'It never occurred to me before.' 'Much genuine pleasure
accrued to them from their kindness.' 'It belonged to me.' 'This is all that remains to me of my inheritance.' 'The property has fallen to his son.' The dative has been preserved here because it is felt not as completing the meaning of the verb but rather as modifying the statement as a whole. The dative as a sentence modifier, or sentence object, does not of course compete with the accusative and has not been influenced by it. This common dative is treated in detail in B, p. 106.

To express the dative idea here it became necessary to give it a new form, for dative and accusative had become identical in form, and a single object after a verb would be construed as an accusative. Hence, as in these examples, the preposition to was placed before the noun to indicate the dATIVE relation. Even in oldest English, to was thus often placed before a noun denoting a person, but at this early period it has a more concrete meaning than the old simple dative, indicating that the person was involved or concerned in the activity in an outward, literal sense, as in 'I spoke to him,' 'I called to him,' while the simple dative suggested an inner relation, as in 'I preached to them' (in Old English, a simple dative). As in the first two of these three examples, to in older English often combined the idea of outward and inner relations, so that later when the dative and accusative had become identical in form and it became necessary to create a new, clear dative, it was easy and natural to employ to also like the old simple dative to indicate inner relations, as in the many examples given above.

The dative is well preserved also in other categories where there is no competition between accusative and dative, as after nouns and adjectives. After nouns made from verbs which in oldest English governed the dative or which by virtue of their meaning would have governed the dative if they had been in use, the dative construction is well preserved, and indeed has experienced an extensive development beyond its original boundaries: 'The teacher helps (in Old English, with dative, now with accusative) the beginners,' but 'a help to beginners.' 'The frost injures the plants,' but 'injury to plants.' The dative is also well preserved after adjectives: 'He was helpful to me.' 'The frost is injurious to plants.' 'It lyketh to your fader and to me that I yow wedde' (Chaucer, The Clerkes Tale, 289), now 'It pleases your father (ace) and me (ace) that I marry you,' but after the participial adjective the old dative is still in full use: 'It is pleasing to your father and to me,' etc. 'Never wolde he do nothynge that scholde to hym displesse' (Merlin, 123, about A.D. 1440), now 'that should displease him' (ace.), but after the participial adjec-
tive the dative is the common construction: 'It is displeasing to him.' In a few cases we find the simple dative after adjectives, as illustrated in 11.2.g.

B. Sentence Dative. As explained in A (3rd par.), the dative is well preserved where it modifies not the verb alone but the sentence as a whole. This dative, sometimes still with its old simple form but usually in prepositional form with to, unto, for, from, or on, falls into three groups:

a. Dative of Reference. This dative denotes the person to whom the statement seems true, or with reference to whom it holds good: 'To me the old house doesn't seem like home any more.' 'That doesn't seem true to me now as it once did.' 'To me she is pretty.' 'What is that to me?' 'He never made me such excuses.' 'Am I not any more the same man to whom once all doors stood open?' 'The dress is too long for her.' 'I bet you five dollars (adv. acc.) that you can't do it' (acc. clause).

b. Dative of Interest. This dative denotes the person to whose advantage or disadvantage the action results: 'The umbrella stood me in good stead.' 'It will last the owner a lifetime.' 'He made me a whistle.' 'She made her boy a new coat.' 'She looked him tenderly in the eyes.' 'Ruin seemed to be staring him in the face.' 'You must not look a gift horse in the mouth.' 'He has already done me a good deal of harm.' 'He has done a good deal of harm not only to me but to many others,' where, as often elsewhere, the idea of interest mingles with that of reference. 'Please hand me that book.' 'He lent me his book.' 'He lent a book to me and also one to John.' 'Inasmuch as you have done it unto (in plain prose usually to or for) one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me' (Matthew, XXV, 40). 'I shall do all I can for you.' 'I want you to run an errand for me.' 'His heart beat for all humanity.' The use of for here instead of the simple dative or the dative with to indicates the desire for a clearer expression of the idea of advantage, for to is used also to denote disadvantage. Often, however, for itself denotes disadvantage: 'I'll break his head for him.' 'She'll turn your head for you.' 'He's setting a trap for you.' 'Who digs a pit for others may fall into it himself.' To express more clearly the idea of disadvantage, we sometimes use from instead of the simple dative or the dative with to: 'He stole a watch from me,' i.e., from me to my loss, the concrete idea of from mingling with the abstract idea of loss. 'The horse ran away from me,' i.e., ran away to my loss, discomfiture. In colloquial speech we often find such expressions as 'The fire has gone out on me.' 'He has gone back on me.' 'I found out some-
thing about him and I wrote and told him so, and he got my letter and just called me up and tried to make up with me again, and I hung up on him' (J. P. McEvoy, The Potters). ‘Every three years he’s raised the rent on us’ (Basil King, The Side of the Angels, Ch. I). ‘He shut the door on me’ (in older English, also to me or the simple dative). The development here from the dative to the preposition on (= against) indicates the desire for a clearer expression of the idea of disadvantage, injury. On account of its distinctive form the on-dative is spreading in this meaning in colloquial speech. It is especially common in popular Irish English, which at this point is doubtless influencing American colloquial usage.

The old simple dative is most common in connection with a direct object: ‘She made her boy a new coat.’ In the case of reflexive datives here, the old short form (see 11.2 c), i.e., the personal pronoun instead of the reflexive, is still, especially in colloquial speech, often used in the first and second persons instead of the long literary form: ‘I bought me (or myself) a new hat.’ ‘Did you buy you (or yourself) a new hat?’ Formerly the short form was much used also in the third person: ‘Let every soldier hew him down a bough’ (Macbeth, V, iv, 4). Today we usually employ here the long form on account of the ambiguity of the short form: ‘He bought himself a new hat.’ But in popular speech the old short form is still common: ‘Rutheney here, she never even stops to ax Link may she ride in to town — she jest ketches her a nag and lights out’ (Lucy Furman, The Quare Women, Ch. II). In all these cases the reflexive dative is more common in popular speech than in the literary language, so that in the former it is still often employed where in the latter it has disappeared: ‘I want me a woman [who] can milk’ (ib., Ch. V).

Earlier in the period, a weak, almost pleonastic, dative of interest was often used after sit, lie, and verbs of motion and fearing: ‘I sit me down a pensive hour to spend’ (Goldsmith, Traveller, 32). ‘He walked him forth along the sand’ (Byron, Siege of Corinth, XIII, 17). ‘I dread me, if I draw it (i.e., the lance-head), you will die’ (Tennyson, Lancelot and Elaine, 511). ‘I fear me, tis about faire Abigail’ (Marlowe, The Jew of Malta, I, 904, a.d. 1633). ‘Faith, for the worst is filthy; and would not hold taking, I doubt (= fear) me’ (Shakespeare, Timon of Athens, I, II, 159). After these verbs, especially after to lie down and sit down, this old dative still lingers: ‘He had lost his way and lain him down to die’ (Jerome, Three Men in a Boat, Ch. X, 127). ‘Nor did his eye lighten with any pleasurable excitement as he
sat himself (sometimes, as here, the new long dative instead of the old short form) down in a shadowy corner' (Tarkington, *Penrod and Sam*, Ch. IV).

Earlier in the period, and sometimes still, there is an old redundant accusative, distinguishable from this old dative by neither form nor significance, for both dative and accusative have scarcely an appreciable meaning: 'I remember me of (now simple remember) that day.' 'I repent me of (now simple repent) my suspicions.' The accusative is here sometimes construed as a dative of interest, so that the of drops out: 'I do not repent me those dallyings in enchanted fields' (J. M. Barrie, *The Little White Bird*, Ch. IX).

c. Ethical Dative. In older English, and sometimes still, a simple dative is employed to denote the person who has or is expected to have an emotional or sympathetic interest in the statement: 'Whip me such honest knaves' (*Othello*, I, i, 49). 'Why, he would slip you out of this chocolate-house, just when you had been talking to him — as soon as your back was turned — whip he was gone!' (Congreve, *The Way of the World*, I, I, 241, A.D. 1700).

'The main things are to be able to stand well, walk well, and look with an eye at home in its socket: — I put you my hand on any man or woman born of high blood' (Meredith). 'Has anything happened to you?' — 'No, Ralph, but something may happen to you if you don't heed me what I say' (Hall Caine). Today there is little feeling for this once common construction. Instead of saying 'That was you a joy!' we now usually say 'That was a joy, I tell you!' and instead of 'Now heed me that' we say 'Now I want you to heed that!' We can sometimes, however, employ the prepositional dative with for: 'There's a fine fellow for you!'

2. Original Meaning of the Dative. The dative seems originally to have denoted in a literal sense direction toward, which can often still be felt after transitive verbs and adjectives: 'He sent me a book,' or 'He sent the book to me.' 'He was kind to me,' i.e., manifestations of kindness were directed toward me. Thus originally both accusative and dative indicated a goal or an object toward which an activity was directed. Even in oldest English, however, we find the two forms in general differentiated in meaning as we know them today, so that the accusative often indicates that a person or thing is affected in a literal, exterior sense, while the dative indicates that a person or thing is affected in an inner sense, or that a person is involved in an act or statement as his material or higher interests are connected with the act or statement: 'That caused me (dat. indicating that the person is affected inwardly) pain' (acc. of result). 'That gave the cause (dat. in-
dicating vital inner interests) a mortal blow' (acc.). 'He was unfriendly to me' (indicating direction of feeling toward inner things, i.e., a personality). 'He sent help to me (dat. indicating direction toward in a literal, but also an inner, sense) in my distress.' In all these cases the present prepositional dative corresponds to the simple dative in Old English. Wherever the noun after to is now an object in a literal exterior sense we find also in Old English to followed by a dative: 'He went to town.' 'He sent a messenger to town.' In Old English, to with the dative was employed to express the old original concrete idea of direction toward; the simple dative was used to denote the newer derived idea of direction toward in an inner sense. Later, as the simple dative lost its distinctive form, the prepositional dative took its place wherever ambiguity might arise. The older distinction in meaning had to be sacrificed to the obvious necessity of indicating the dative relation clearly. Compare 1 A (4th par., p.105) and 14 (3rd par.).

GENITIVE OBJECT

13 1. Functions of the Genitive. Today we usually think of the genitive as an attributive adjective element modifying nouns or pronouns, but in Old English it was widely employed also to modify verbs and adjectives. As seen in 3, p. 110, the genitive is still used after verbs and adjectives; but it survives here only in the form of the of-genitive, which we here no longer feel as a genitive but now construe as a prepositional object, so that the old, once common, conception of the genitive as a modifier of verbs and adjectives has been lost. The fact that the genitive after verbs and adjectives now never takes the simple s-form has dulled our feeling for it as a genitive and also for its original close relation to the attributive genitive. The older conception of the genitive as a modifier of nouns, pronouns, verbs, and adjectives indicates that the genitive in all these different functions had the same general meaning — some shade of the general idea of sphere, as described in 3, p. 110, and in 10 II 2. The fact that we no longer have a live feeling for this old meaning has helped to blunt our feeling for the original close relation between the attributive genitive and the genitive after verbs and adjectives.

2. Form of the Genitive. In Old English, the simple genitive was used as the object of a large number of verbs and a smaller number of adjectives. Today, the simple genitive used as object has been entirely replaced by the prepositional genitive with of: 'When I felt of his heart, there was no beat.' 'He is worthy of respect.' 'The glass is full of water.'
3. Meaning of the Genitive. The original meaning of the genitive is unknown, but a study of the older periods where the genitive was much more used than now seems to indicate that the central idea of this case is in a sphere: 'I am thinking of my father, of my duty,' i.e., my thoughts are in the sphere of my father, my duty. 'They robbed him of his money,' in the sphere of his money, with respect to his money, or now more commonly felt as containing the idea of separation. 'They complained of their hard lot,' in the sphere, matter of, with respect to their hard lot. This shade of the genitive, the genitive of specification, is still very common: 'I reminded him of untruths.' 'The glass is full of water,' in the sphere of water, with respect to water.

In older English, to hope, yearn, thirst, wait took the genitive of goal, which represents some object or thing as the goal of the activity, the sphere in which it acts, now replaced by a prepositional object after for: 'Death waites of (now for) no man's will' (George Whetstone, Life of Gascoigne, I, IV, A.D. 1719). The new accusative is used alongside of the old genitive of goal after admit, allow, approve, conceive, and sometimes accept, and a little earlier in the period also remember and recollect: 'The scope of this book does not admit of the discussion of details' (or with the accusative the discussion of details). 'I remember of (now omitted) detesting the name of Cumberland' (Sir Walter Scott).

The partitive genitive object, now replaced by the accusative, was not uncommon earlier in the period: 'She went to it, smelled of it (now usually simple it or at it), and ate it' (Defoe, Crusoe, I, IV). In American colloquial speech, however, the old partitive genitive object is well preserved with a few verbs: 'She tasted of it, felt of it, smelled of it.' Also in the literary language the old genitive is sometimes used when it is desired to raise the tone a little above that of every day: 'Since people give of their time, will they not give also of their money?'

The prepositional genitives in all these cases correspond to the Old English simple genitive, but they are not felt today vividly as genitives. They are mere fragments of a shattered construction which gives no clear outline of older usage. Many older genitives which represented the activity as missing of, desiring of, coveting of, forgetting of an object are now replaced by accusatives, which represent the activity as missing, desiring, coveting, forgetting an object, since we today put the single object that completes the meaning of a verb in the accusative. Just as in 12 1 A, a single dative object was not able to compete successfully with a single accusative object, so here a single genitive object is not able to
compete with a single accusative object, since the old habit of distinguishing between the meaning of the two cases did not prove as strong as the simpler principle of placing, without regard to meaning, a single object uniformly in the accusative, the case most commonly used as object when there is only one. Elsewhere, where the accusative did not compete with the genitive as object, namely, after adjectives and participles, the genitive object is better preserved. Thus, though we no longer miss of, desire of, forget of, etc., we still are desirous of, forgetful of, etc.

Some of the old simple genitives after verbs have been replaced by prepositional objects. Thus we today say 'we yearn for (or after) sympathy,' 'we long for rest,' 'we laugh at a person' instead of employing a genitive or an accusative object, since the idea of an outward direction of an activity toward a person or thing is strong in our feeling and demands a formal expression by some preposition with a concrete force. Compare 14. The use of different prepositions in the last three examples indicates a desire to interpret the genitive object, both the old simple genitive and the newer form with of. The genitive in course of time had taken on so many shades of meaning that the thought was not always clear.

Where the genitive has been retained, namely, the genitive of specification, in all periods of the language the most common category and still deeply rooted in English feeling, as in to complain of, to accuse of, to remind of, etc., also after adjectives, mindful of, thoughtful of, sure of, guilty of, etc., the of is now felt by most people as a preposition, not as a sign of the genitive, although the absolute rigidity of the construction, the impossibility of replacing of by another preposition with the same meaning, such as about, with reference to, with regard to, clearly indicates that the prepositional genitive is in fact intact. The construction with of has been retained here because of has the same meaning as of used elsewhere as a preposition, thus making the thought clear and preserving the old construction at least in external form.

Not a single instance of the old simple genitive object has been preserved. Thus the genitive as object in both its older and its newer form has passed out of the vivid consciousness of English-speaking people. The genitive object has become an accusative object or a prepositional object, the latter at least to the feeling of most people. The dative has been better preserved, in part because its meaning is simpler, in part because the simple dative rests upon a simple, clear principle of word-order, deeply rooted in English feeling, namely, the dative precedes the accusative, as in 'He gave the house a new coat of paint.'
PREPOSITIONAL OBJECT

14. Growth, Development, and Present Use of the Prepositional Object. Preposition and noun together form a prepositional object that serves as the object of a verb or an adjective, i.e., serves to complete the meaning of a verb or an adjective. For many centuries there has been a steady trend toward the prepositional object. Verbs and adjectives which once required a simple genitive or dative object now take a prepositional object. This is a trend toward more concrete expression. The Old English words for thirsty, eager, greedy took a simple genitive, which, as described in 13 3, often meant in the sphere of, with regard to, often also designated a goal and had still other meanings, so that the thought was not always clear. But in the three words under consideration there is always the clear idea of the outward direction of an activity of the mind toward something. This idea has found a concrete expression in the language, for we now say thirsty, eager, greedy for or after. After the decay of the inflections, the old genitive was in part preserved for a while in the form of the prepositional genitive with of, so that forms like eager of, etc., tarried for a time, only, however, to be entirely replaced later by the more concrete forms eager for, eager after, etc. Similarly, the Old English words for to yearn, hope, long, strive, thirst, ask, beg, etc., required a simple genitive, but in modern English these verbs take a preposition which gives a more concrete expression to the idea of an outward direction of an activity toward an object: to yearn for; to hope for; to long for; to strive for, etc. The first evidences of this new trend appear in Old English.

The dative as object after adjectives and as indirect object after transitive verbs is much better preserved than the genitive object, but the prepositional object has made some inroads also upon it, since an appropriate preposition sometimes expresses more concretely the idea of direction toward than to, which not only denotes direction toward but also indicates inner relations, as described in 12 2: 'He is cold, hostile, unfriendly, friendly to me' (or also toward me). Some adjectives do not take to at all but the more concrete at: 'He is mad, angry at me.' Likewise, after verbs at has a more concrete force than the dative with to or the simple dative: 'He threw the matter up to me' (in an inner sense), but 'He threw a stone at me' (in a literal exterior sense). 'He threw (or tossed) me a dollar,' but 'He threw a stone at me.' These last sentences show clearly that our ancestors, while they have destroyed a good deal of the older frame of their language and rebuilt it, working constructively along new lines, have often
wisely retained features of the old framework, fitting them into the new structure.

In our English of today, we make a liberal use of prepositions, but ours is not by any means entirely a prepositional language, as has been claimed. The seemingly prepositional element of, so often used in the attributive genitive categories, is in fact at present not a preposition, but a case sign, and this new genitive with of is just as much a case form as the older simple case forms. Likewise, the to of the modern dative form is not a preposition but the dative case sign. Just as modern English has used concrete prepositional elements to reconstruct its new case forms, so did prehistoric Indo-European, from which English has sprung, once use concrete elements to construct its cases. The stages of the English development all lie open to view. On account of the loss of its inflections English was forced to employ the concrete prepositions of and to as the best available forms to make a clear genitive and a clear dative. This employment to indicate abstract relations has gradually robbed both of and to of a good deal of their original concrete force and they are becoming mere case signs. We are right in the midst of the development, however, not at the end of it, for both of and to are still often used as concrete prepositions. Similarly, for, on, upon, from, all still felt as prepositions with concrete force, are not infrequently used to form the dative case, as illustrated in 12 1 A, B a, b; 15 I 2. Prepositions that have lost their original concrete force and are now used to indicate case relations are called inflectional prepositions.

a. Prepositional Phrase as Object, or as Adverbial Element. It is difficult to distinguish the prepositional phrase in the object relation from the prepositional phrase in the adverbial relation, since there is never a difference in form and no fundamental difference in function. In general, we call the phrase an object when its relation to the verb, adjective, or participle is very close, so close that it is necessary to complete its meaning. The relation of the adverbial phrase to the verb, adjective, or participle is less close. For illustrative examples see 24 IV, 24 IV a, 25 1.

b. Object of the Preposition a Gerund. The object of the preposition may be not only a noun or a pronoun but also a gerundial clause, one of the tersest and most convenient constructions in the language: 'I am counting on his finishing the work tomorrow.' This is a short cut to avoid a clumsy that-clause: 'I am counting on it that he finish the work tomorrow.' But the gerundial clause is often replaced by an infinitive or that-clause if the idea of a wish is present: 'I am longing for a good cheerful letter from him,' or 'I am longing for him to write me a good cheerful letter,' or 'I am longing, hoping that he may write me a good cheerful letter.' Compare 50 4 d.
c. **Object of the Preposition a Clause.** In modern English the object of the preposition may be also a full clause introduced by an indefinite relative pronoun or adverb: 'He thanked me for what I had done for him.' ‘She is sorry for what she said.’ Compare 24 IV. Sometimes the full clause has no formal introduction: ‘My head has been people-tired, I think, but my heart is just satisfied with being full of ‘I’m so glad you’re better!’’ (Clyde Fitch, *Letter*, 1904). Compare 24 IV (7th par.).

d. **Passive Form.** The verb before a prepositional object was originally intransitive, but in modern English the preposition has in many cases become so closely attached to the verb that we feel it as a part of the verb and thus transfer to the new compound verb its function of governing the object and so convert the old intransitive into a transitive. Hence such verbs with closely attached prepositions can assume passive form: *The steamer ran into a sailboat;* in passive form *A sailboat was run into by a steamer.*

## DOUBLE OBJECT

15. An accusative, dative, genitive, or prepositional object may not only each be used singly after a verb, but two objects may be employed, one an accusative, to denote the direct object of the verb, and one a dative, genitive, accusative, or a prepositional object, which stands in various relations to the verb, or some other word, or the sentence as a whole, as described below. Sometimes one object is a dative, the other a prepositional object.

### I. DATIVE AND ACCUSATIVE

1. **Description of the Construction.** This construction is found after a great many verbs, especially those with the general meaning of giving, buying, guaranteeing, devoting, dedicating, consecrating, adapting, pardoning, forgiving, bringing, sending, handing, throwing, telling, teaching, saying, answering, revealing, mentioning, remembering, writing, telephoning, telegraphing, owing, selling, paying, remitting, refunding, refusing, denying, promising, allying, betrothing, introducing, doing, making or causing, explaining, wishing, showing, singing, playing (to play one a trick), saving (to save one a good deal of trouble), yielding, etc. The accusative denotes the direct object, the person or thing affected or produced, and the dative the indirect object, the person or thing to whose advantage or disadvantage the action accrues, or the person to whom the statement seems true or with reference to whom it holds good, or the person who has or is expected to have an emotional or sympathetic interest in the statement, where, however, often in the case of an indirect object, beneath
these, the predominant meanings of the dative, somewhat of the old original concrete idea of direction toward (12 2), is still felt.

a. In older English, the verb learn belonged to this list, as it was often used with the force of teach: ‘Bob this morning begg’d me to learn him lattin’ (Philip Vickers Fithian, Journal, March 14, 1774). This usage survives in popular speech.

2. Form, Position, and Stress. The principal rules for the form and position of the dative in this construction are given in 11 1, but there are still other points that need attention. We can say ‘He threw mé not Jóhn the ball,’ or ‘He threw mé the ball, not Jóhn’ (dat.). The latter form is here made clear only by the parallelism of the accent, for if we say ‘Hé threw me the ball not Jóhn’ (nom.) the meaning is quite different. We can either say: ‘He threw mé and Jóhn down some apples,’ or we may prefer ‘He threw down some apples to mé and Jóhn,’ for by withholding the dative until the end of the sentence we create the feeling of suspense and thus make it more prominent. Of course, for the same reason the accusative often stands in the last place: ‘He threw me and John down some fine apples.’ The other important position is the first place: ‘To a wóman the consciousness of being well dressed gives a sense of tranquillity which religion fails to bestow’ (Helen Choate). ‘To mé he didn’t say a single word.’

We can say ‘He threw the ball up to me,’ or ‘He threw me up the ball,’ but we can only say ‘He threw the matter up to mé,’ for we do not feel to me as an indirect object. The expression to throw up a matter is felt as a unit, a set verbal phrase, which as a whole takes a single dative object. Many such set verbal phrases take a single dative object, usually a prepositional dative, since a simple dative according to 12 1 A has prepositional form.

The dative of reference (12 1 B a) usually has the prepositional form, but sometimes the old simple dative occurs: ‘He never made such excuses to mé,’ or ‘To mé he never made such excuses,’ but we say also ‘He never made mé such excuses.’ Many of the set verbal phrases referred to above might be classed here: ‘They showed their heels to the enemy.’ ‘They declared war upon them.’ Verbs of disguising, hiding, withholding take a prepositional dative of reference with from: ‘He hid the matter from mé.’ ‘He withheld from mé the truth.’ The dative of interest (12 1 B b) usually has the modern prepositional form, but we sometimes find the old simple dative: ‘He cut off a piece of bread for mé,’ or ‘He cut me off a piece of bread.’ Many of the datives found in the set verbal phrases mentioned above might be classed as da-
tives of interest: ‘When I was down, he turned his back upon me.’ ‘He played a mean trick on me,’ or ‘He played me a mean trick.’ Examples of the ethical dative are given in 12 1 B c. The datives of reference and interest and the ethical dative do not differ in inner meaning from the dative of the indirect object. They all contain the idea of personal interest or reference and all contain traces of the original meaning of direction toward. They all may be used in connection with an accusative object as in these examples, but the dative of indirect object stands in closer relation to the verb than the other datives, which modify the verbal phrase, i.e., the verb with all its other modifiers, rather than the verb alone, or are often felt as sentence modifiers: ‘He sent me (indirect object) a book.’ ‘She made me (dative of interest) a cake.’ ‘He never made me (dative of reference) such excuses.’ Often, however, the line of demarcation is not clear: ‘He sent me (dative of reference or indirect object) notice, too.’ The ethical dative is often an out-and-out sentence modifier, but like an indirect object it is often associated with a direct object, as in the examples in 12 1 B c.

English feeling demands a clear dative form: ‘Give back to Ireland her nationality, her individual existence, and soothe thereby the wounded pride,’ etc. (Asquith). Here the prepositional dative to Ireland is required because to give back usually takes as object a single accusative. We could easily say here: ‘Give Ireland (simple dat.) back her nationality,’ etc., because to give is usually found with a dative object followed by an accusative. This sensitiveness of English feeling for a clear dative is a marked feature of the language, which has often been overlooked by foreign and native English grammarians. In such expressions as ‘Mr. Wells, whom competent critics have given a niche among future classics,’ the simple dative is common as the proximity of have given makes it clear that the form is a dative, while in ‘Tiberius, to whom Christ commanded that tribute should be given,’ the prepositional form is necessary to give clear expression to the dative idea. Even in the former example a clear expression of the dative relation by the clear dative form to whom does not sound unnatural. In choice language, of course, more care is taken to give the dative a distinctive form than in loose colloquial speech. With nouns and also pronouns, aside from the relative pronoun, an initial dative regularly takes the prepositional form in order that at the very outset the grammatical relations may become clear: ‘To me he owes nothing.’ ‘To whom did you give the apple?’ In older English, the simple dative could stand in the first place and this older usage lingers on,
especially in poetry: ‘And me that morning Walter show’d the house’ (Tennyson, *Princess*, Prologue).

If a stressed accusative is put into the first place for emphasis, or if a relative or interrogative pronoun, which must always introduce the clause or sentence, is in the accusative, the indirect object is left at or near the end of the sentence or clause separated from the accusative, which under other circumstances would follow it. The simple dative is still often used here, since the word-order is quite fixed and shows plainly that the form is a dative: ‘This much I must tell you,’ ‘He never got back the money which he had lent them’ (or to them). ‘I thanked him for the position which he had procured me’ (or for me). ‘What would it be right to pay the waiter?’ (or to the waiter). The simple dative is often used at the end of a relative clause even though the preceding relative pronoun in the accusative has been suppressed: ‘a little jacket [which] she was knitting me’ (Anne Douglas Sedgwick, *The Little French Girl*, Ch. V) (or for me).

a. Passive Forms of Statement. There are here two forms, the first a favorite in the literary language, the second, in colloquial speech, but often also preferred in choice expression. The accusative becomes nominative and the dative is retained, either in its old simple or its new prepositional form; the latter regularly when the dative is stressed: ‘Ample warning was given them,’ but ‘Ample warning was given to them, but not to me.’ Or the dative becomes nominative and the accusative is retained: ‘They were given ample warning.’ Only the simple dative can become nominative, so that we do not say: ‘I was suggested this,’ for in the active we say ‘He suggested this to me,’ with the prepositional form.

The use of a nominative in the passive corresponding to a dative in the active began in early Middle English. In the thirteenth century we find not only the nominative in the passive corresponding to the simple dative in the active, but we find also the accusative of the active retained in the passive: *He was ileten blood* (*The Ancren Riwle*, 112), literally, *He was let blood, i.e., was bled*, corresponding to the active *The phisicien let him* (dat.) *blood, i.e., The physician bled him*. There was at this time alongside of this construction an older construction out of which it had developed: ‘Him was ileten blood.’ Here *him* is dative and *blood* is nominative, the subject of the sentence. The new construction arose out of the older one in such sentences as ‘*The Duke was ileten blood,*’ where, as the form was not distinctive, *Duke*, a dative, was construed as a nominative, the subject of the verb. This construction began in such set expressions, where the accusative of the active had entered into such close relations with the verb that it had formed a compound with it and hence was retained in the passive form of statement. From such set expressions with a retained accusative object in the passive it gradually became common in colloquial speech to retain in the passive
the accusative of the active. This old construction is more widely used in American and Irish English than in English proper, although it is also there quite common. Similar to the retained object in this construction is the retained object found elsewhere in passive constructions: ‘He took no notice of me,’ in passive form ‘I was taken no notice of,’ where take no notice of is felt as a compound, so that the accusative object no notice of the active is retained in the passive.

In colloquial speech there is another passive form. The subject is always a person, the verb is an active form of have or get, which has as object a thing and as objective predicate a perfect participle, which contains the passive force: ‘I have (or get) something given me (or to me) every birthday.’ ‘I have just had given me (or to me) a fine new knife.’

b. Accusative Object a Full or Abridged Clause. The accusative object is often a full clause with a finite verb: ‘I wrote him that he should come.’ For the different forms that an accusative clause with a finite verb may have see 24 III. The accusative object may have also the form of an infinitival or a gerundial clause, as described in 24 III d.

II. ACCUSATIVE OF THE PERSON AND GENITIVE OF THE THING

In this construction the accusative denotes the person or thing directly affected, and the genitive expresses the idea of specification, which is now often felt as denoting separation, deprivation: ‘to accuse someone of a crime,’ i.e., with respect to a crime; ‘to acquit someone of a charge’; ‘to persuade someone of the wisdom of a course of action’; ‘to suspect someone of treason’; ‘to possess one’s self of a thing’; ‘to assure someone of one’s sincerity’; ‘to remind someone of something’; ‘to strip a bush of leaves,’ literally, with respect to leaves, but now felt as indicating deprivation; ‘to free someone of a burden’; ‘to ease someone of a care’; ‘to purge or cleanse one’s self of sin’; ‘to divest someone of his honor’; ‘to deprive someone of his liberty.’

In Old English, the simple genitive was used here in exactly the same way as the prepositional form of today, but the list of verbs was larger. The old genitive of specification had so many meanings that the thought was often unclear, and this uncleanness finally led to clearer expression. Thus older ask with the simple genitive of specification has disappeared and is now represented by ask someone for something, or for somebody, ask someone about something or somebody, or after somebody. The of in the modern genitive of specification as found in the above examples is now probably felt as a preposition by most people, so that the construction now passes for a prepositional object. The construction, however, corresponds so closely to the Old English accusative and
simple genitive and is even today so set and rigid, not admitting readily of the substitution of another preposition with the same meaning, as about, with respect to, in the place of of, that it seems in fact a fragment of the old accusative and genitive category in modern form.

a. The genitive object may have the form of a clause with a finite verb: 'This convinced me of his innocence' (or that he is innocent). For the different forms that the genitive clause with a finite verb may have see 24 I. The genitive object may have also the form of an infinitival or a gerundial clause, as described in 24 I a.

b. Passive Form. In the passive form of statement the accusative becomes nominative, and the genitive object is retained: 'He was robbed of his money.'

III. DOUBLE ACCUSATIVE

1. Accusative of the Person and Accusative of the Thing.
This construction is now in common usage reduced to the verbs ask, lead, take, envy: 'I asked him his name' (or the price, or the reason, or the way). 'Ask the cabman the fare.' 'He led them a lively dance' (or chase). 'She leads him a dog's life.' 'I took her a drive.' 'I envy him his luck.'

Sometimes banish, debar, dismiss, excuse, expel take a double accusative object, one of the person, one of the thing, which has arisen through the dropping of the preposition from (or, in older English, of) which usually stands before the object of the thing: 'We banish you our territories' (Shakespeare, Richard the Second, I, III, 139), now usually from our territories. 'He debarred himself every kind of amusement' (W. Godwin, The Adventures of Caleb Williams, II, Ch. VII, A.D. 1794). 'They dismissed them the society' (Defoe, Crusoe, II, IV, 72, A.D. 1719), now usually from the society. 'He expelled him the house' (Lytton, The Caxtons, III, Ch. VII), now usually from the house. This type arose under the temporary influence of the two objects with forbid, the first of which was originally a dative, but was sometimes felt as an accusative: 'I forbade him the house.' 'His mother forbade him wine.' This construction has disappeared for the most part with all these verbs except forbid, which still has the original dative and accusative after it, as can be seen in the passive form of statement: 'To all the children wine has been absolutely forbidden.' 'Wine is forbidden him.' 'He is forbidden wine.'

After hear, kiss, and strike (or hit) there are two objects, probably a double accusative, but the first object may be construed as a dative of interest (12 I B b): 'I heard the boys their lessons'
(common in England, but little used in America). ‘I kissed her good night.’ ‘I struck (or hit) him a hard blow.’

a. Passive Form. In the passive, the accusative of the person becomes nominative and the accusative of the thing is retained: ‘He was asked his opinion.’ ‘He is led a dog’s life.’ ‘She was taken a drive.’ ‘He was envied his luck.’ ‘Who, had they dared to imitate him, would have been banished society’ (Disraeli, Vivian Grey, VII, IX, A.D. 1826), now usually from society. ‘You are debarred correspondence for the present’ (Scott, Waverley, Ch. LXII). ‘She saw her husband, who was afterwards dismissed the service (now usually from the service), a strong and powerful man, pine and waste,’ etc. (Lytton, Eugene Aram, Ch. VII). ‘He was excused the entrance-fee’ (Oxford Dictionary under Excuse, 7). ‘The boys were heard their lessons.’ ‘He was struck a hard blow.’

2. Accusative of the Direct Object and an Objective Predicate. This construction differs from the double object in 1, p. 119, in that the two accusatives together form logically a clause in which the first accusative performs the office of subject and the second accusative the office of predicate: ‘The President made him the head of the navy’ (= that he became the head of the navy). ‘The people made him president.’ ‘They called him a traitor.’ ‘The parents have named the baby Thomas, but they of course call him Tommy.’ ‘The pastor baptized him Thomas.’ ‘I have always found him a true friend.’ ‘I saw him come.’ The simple infinitive here, as in the last example, is the accusative of an old type of verbal noun which still is, as in the prehistoric period, without an article before it.

The two accusatives in all these and similar examples were originally the direct objects of the verb. As the construction is very old there has gradually come about a close association between the two accusatives, so that the second one is now felt as a predicate to the first one, its subject. The predicate is here joined to its subject without the aid of a copula, since the statement is now felt to be of the old appositional type of sentence described in 6 B a, where the predicate is placed alongside of the subject like an appositive without the use of a finite verb.

We sometimes insert the copula here between subject and predicate, as in other sentences where a noun, pronoun, or adjective is predicated of the subject: ‘I deem him an honest man’ (or to be an honest man). ‘But what a parcel of fools he would think us for getting in such a stew about him!’ (De Morgan, The Old Madhouse, Ch. X), but with to be when the objective predicate is a pronoun: ‘He thought Richard to be me,’ or in the form of a full clause with finite verb: ‘He thought Richard was I,’ or in
loose colloquial speech usually *me*, as explained in 7 C a. The insertion of *to be* before the accusative predicate was facilitated by the close relation of the objective predicate construction in force and meaning to that of the accusative with the infinitive, described in 24 III d, when the infinitive is the verb *be*. On the other hand, the construction of the infinitive with the accusative is often influenced by the objective predicate construction in that it is often without *to be*: ‘I ordered my bill [to be] made out.’

The objective predicate is not only a noun in the accusative, but it is often also a noun in the genitive of characteristic, an adjective, participle, adverb, or prepositional phrase. For convenience the objective predicate is here treated in two groups.

A. THE OBJECTIVE PREDICATE A NOUN OR PRONOUN IN THE ACCUSATIVE, A NOUN IN THE GENITIVE OF CHARACTERISTIC, AN ADJECTIVE, PARTICIPLE, ADVERB, OR PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE.

The king dubbed *his son a knight.* ‘Willersley and I professed ourselves Socialists’ (H. G. Wells, The New Machiavelli, p. 134). ‘Mr. Crabfield did his duty by Lucius Mason, and sent him home at seventeen a handsome, well-mannered lad’ (Trollope, Orley Farm, I, Ch. II). ‘I thought it a fraud, just, possible.’ ‘I consider what he did a gratuitous interference.’ ‘He showed himself of noble spirit.’ ‘She boiled the eggs hard.’ ‘He wore his coat threadbare.’ ‘He laughed himself sick.’ ‘I consider what he said irrelevant.’ ‘I found him sleeping.’ ‘I kept him waiting.’ ‘I’ll stop him circulating (or from circulating) these reports.’ ‘I pictured myself careering into fame.’ ‘I started the clock going.’ ‘His (Garfield’s) journal shows him constantly going there (i.e., the library) for information’ (Theodore Clarke Smith, James A. Garfield, II, p. 752). ‘I have some money coming to me yet.’ ‘I consider the matter settled.’ ‘I got my work done before six o’clock.’ ‘I at last got the machine running’ (or to running, or to run). ‘I shall have the machine running by the time you get back.’ ‘I found him there.’ ‘Have the children in by nine o’clock.’ ‘I found everything in good condition.’ The copula is now often expressed here: ‘I have always found him to be a true friend’ (or to be of a friendly disposition). ‘I have always found him to be reliable.’ We employ the same forms after verbal nouns except that we use as direct object an objective genitive (10 II 2 D) instead of an accusative: ‘They were men who consecrated their lives to the preservation intact of what had been wrought out in blood and sweat by the countless generations of sturdy freemen who had gone before them’ (Woodrow Wilson, Dec., 1902). For the use of the predicative present participle here see 50 3 (3rd par. from end).

In oldest English, the predicate noun was not so often a plain
accusative as today. It was usually introduced by to or for. The *to* represents the new state as the result of a development or as the purpose of the action, while *for* represents the new state as entirely or seemingly identical with the conception of it held by the person in question. These older conceptions are often found later and in part still survive: in Old English 'to crown him to king' (transformation into a new state), now 'to crown him king.' 'The seven had her to wife' (Mark, XII, 23), indicating purpose, now 'The seven had her as wife.' *For* is still used in a large number of expressions: 'They took him *for* his brother.' 'Though Helen laughs at me now *for* a coward, before I've been in a fight, she won't laugh at me afterwards' (J. T. Trowbridge, *The Drummer Boy*, Ch. I). 'The Reverend Hussell Barter was arrested by the sight of a couple half-hidden by a bushy plant; he knew them *for* Mrs. Bellew and George Pendyce' (Galsworthy, *The Country House*, p. 46). 'Yet he knew himself *for* a greater idiot because he had not been able to tell Walter the truth' (Tarkington, *Alice Adams*, Ch. XVI). 'He gave me this book *for* a Christmas present.' 'You will have Miss Sharp one day *for* your relation' (Thackeray, *Vanity Fair*, I, Ch. XIV). 'All the rest hooted and jeered at her *for* a witch' (A. R. Hope, *Stories of English Schoolboy Life*, p. 8).

The modern favorite here, *as*, first appeared in Old English, but did not become common until much later. In Old English, the single determinative *swa*, i.e., *so*, later *as*, or the double determinative *swa swa* (27 2), i.e., *so so*, is sometimes used here. The single or double *so* points as with a single or double index finger to the following explanatory noun, thus indicating that this noun expresses the idea in mind. In Chaucer we find the single *so*-form combined with the old *for*, i.e., *as for*: 'Thy doghter wol (will) I take . . . as for my wyf' (*The Clerkes Tale*, 251). In the corresponding nominative relation, described in 7 A b (3), Chaucer uses simple *as*, but long before Chaucer's time we find an occasional use of simple *as* also in the accusative relation. Now for centuries in both the nominative and the accusative relation *as* has been gradually replacing older *to* and *for*, while on the other hand the simple accusative is still quite common, especially with certain verbs. Present usage is fluctuating and uneven. We say 'They selected him *president*' (or more commonly *for president, or to be president*), 'I believe the man *insane*' (or *to be insane*), while we prefer 'He turned water into wine' to 'He made the water wine' (John, IV, 46), and yet inconsistently in the case of an adjective say 'It turned his hair *gray*' rather than 'It turned his hair to gray.'
As can be seen by the last example, in the case of nouns we still often have a lively feeling for the old idea of transformation. We now use to or into: ‘His presence will soon melt her resolution into thin air again.’ ‘They never put their aims into practice.’ Also at and on may be used: ‘We set him at liberty.’ ‘He’ll never set the Hudson on fire.’ ‘It was what put Cit’s back up so two years ago that set me on thinking (in popular speech a-thinking) it’ (De Morgan, The Old Madhouse, Ch. XXV), or often to thinking it, or often simply thinking (present participle used as objective predicate) it. However, we now often express the idea of change and transformation also by a simple accusative: ‘They made, proclaimed, elected, him king.’ This is not natural Germanic expression, but represents Latin and Old French influence, which in a number of words has become natural modern English, but in many other cases Germanic usage has prevailed.

Where the idea of transformation is not involved, the latest form, the one with as, is spreading at the expense of the simple accusative as well as the form with for: ‘It’s no sinne to deceiue a Christian; For they themselues hold it a principle, Faith is not to be held with Heretickes’ (Marlowe, The Jew of Malta, II, 1074–1075, about A.D. 1590, ed. 1633); but ‘It would be almost impossible to exaggerate the effect which these schools have had in the gradual process of realizing that ideal of a national speech which the country holds as its standard’ (Krapp, The English Language in America, I, 29, A.D. 1925). As is most widely used where the objective predicate is a noun: ‘I acknowledge myself defeated’ (or as defeated), but usually ‘I acknowledge myself as an offender.’ As has already become established in a large number of expressions, and is often used in others: ‘We all regard him as very skilful’ (as a very skilful man). ‘I regard this as of great importance.’ ‘They represent him as a reliable man’ (as reliable). ‘I consider him still a child’ (or less commonly as a child). ‘I think her the most confounded flirt in London’ or ‘I regard her as the most confounded flirt in London.’ Verbs having a preposition closely attached to them uniformly take as: ‘I always think of him as the most potent force in my entire life.’ ‘I look upon him as my best friend.’ It is used also after verbal nouns: ‘The selection of Smith (objective genitive) as chairman pleases everybody.’

Notice the difference of meaning between as, denoting complete identity, oneness with, and the preposition like, denoting mere similarity: ‘Large minds treat little things as little things and big things as big things,’ but ‘He treats his wife like a child.’
a. Passive Form. In the passive, the first accusative becomes nominative, and the predicate word or phrase is retained as in the active, with the exception that the predicate accusative becomes nominative: 'He was elected president.' ‘He is reputed the best physician in town' (or to be the best physician in town). ‘He was called hard names.’ ‘It is thought to be a fraud.’ ‘It was at first thought to be he’ (or in loose colloquial speech him, as explained in 7 C a). ‘He was found guilty’ (or to be guilty). ‘The egg was boiled hard.’ ‘We were all set laughing’ (or to laughing). ‘He is looked upon as a reliable man.’ ‘Everything was found in good condition.’ ‘I have often been taken for my brother.’

b. Instead of the first accusative we often employ a full clause or an abridged, infinitival or gerundial, clause, which, however, is usually preceded by a formal anticipatory accusative, namely, it: ‘You think it odd that I went to church’ (or for me to have gone to church, or my having gone to church).

B. AN INFINITIVE AS OBJECTIVE PREDICATE. After the verbs let, leave (in popular speech = let), bid, make, have, see, behold, notice, look at, observe, perceive, watch, find, feel, hear, overhear, listen to, the objective predicate is usually a simple infinitive, but after bid, make, have, feel, see, observe, find, we sometimes employ also the infinitive with to, indeed regularly — except after bid, make, have — if the infinitive is the copula be, and after help and know we employ either the simple infinitive or the prepositional form, the latter especially in careful language: ‘I let him go.’ ‘He let (or in popular speech left) go [his hold] of it.’ ‘Let (in popular speech leave; see 43 I A) him come in.’ ‘Bid him come in.’ ‘He bade her to take (usually simple take) courage’ (A. Trollope, Dr. Wortle's School, p. 88). ‘Thou hast made the earth to (common in early Modern English) tremble’ (Psalms, LX, 2). ‘After an exciting subject which has made the general tongue to (now little used) wag ... then start your story’ (Meredith, Harrington, Ch. XXXI). ‘I made him do it.’ ‘I made him be quiet.’ ‘I love your sister as you'd have one love’ (Robert Browning). ‘It really grieves me to have you be so naughty’ (Mrs. H. B. Stowe, Uncle Tom's Cabin, Ch. XXV). ‘An idiot is a human being, sir, and has an immortal soul, I'd have you to (perhaps more commonly omitted) know’ (Marion Crawford, Katherine Lauderdale, I, Ch. VI). ‘I shall have (i.e., cause) him do (sometimes to do) it,’ differing in thought from the two following sentences, which have the same construction but another meaning, expressing not a causing but a suffering or experiencing: ‘I had the gypsies steal my hens’ and ‘I have had many scholars visit me from time to time.’ ‘I saw him come.’ ‘He saw three figures advancing arm in arm. He waited till they came within the radius of a lamp; then, seeing
them to be those of Miltoun (name) and a footman, he at once hastened forward' (Galsworthy, The Patrician, p. 43). 'Look at Glorvina enter a room, and compare her with that poor Mrs. Osborne' (Thackeray, Vanity Fair, Ch. XLIII). 'Oh, look at him run!' (Frank Norris, The Octopus.) 'I observed, watched, him work.' 'He had perceived one human being after another reveal quite nakedly their tumultuous feelings' (Hugh Walpole, The Duchess of Wrexe, Ch. IX). 'I have always found him to be reliable.' 'You'll never find him neglect (or to neglect) his work,' but always with to in the following entirely different constructions 'I couldn't find it (anticipatory object) in my heart to refuse' (accusative object) and 'I find plenty to do' (see 7 D 2). 'Did you ever feel anything sting like that?' 'I heard him come.' 'I overheard him tell his mother about it.' 'It was my privilege a few years ago to listen to Sir Ernest Shackleton speak of his expedition across the Antarctic continent' (Irving Babbitt, Rousseau and Romanticism, p. 277). 'I never knew him to be careless with his work.' 'I never knew anyone do (usually to do) so much in so short a time' (Mrs. H. Ward, Miss Bretherton, Ch. VII). 'I helped him do (or especially in careful language to do) it.'

The present participle is often used here instead of the infinitive, usually, however, with a little different meaning. The infinitive states a fact, while the participle has descriptive force: 'I saw him do it' (a fact), but 'I saw him working in the field' (descriptive). The participle is regularly used after to catch, as the force here is always descriptive: 'I caught him doing it.' Compare 48 2 (4th par.).

The subject of infinitive or participle usually precedes, but if important or long, it often follows: 'I heard come booming up the river what I suppose was the sound of cannon fired in Lowell to celebrate the Whig victory' (Thoreau, Journal, V, p. 507).

Passive force is now often imparted to the objective predicate here, although originally this was impossible, since the infinitive was a noun. The verbal force of the infinitive is now so strong that we give it passive form after let and bid when we feel it as having passive force: 'He wouldn't let her wound be dressed.' 'In his busiest days Alfred found time to learn the old songs of his race by heart, and bade them be taught in the palace school' (Green, Short History, p. 51). After the other verbs we often employ a perfect passive participle to state a fact and a present passive participle to impart descriptive force: 'I have never known it done (or to be done) right.' 'I had (in colloquial speech often got) a new coat made.' 'I saw, watched, the net hauled in' (fact), or 'being hauled in' (descriptive). In fact the perfect passive
participle in this construction is an elliptical present passive infinitive with the infinitive be suppressed. The be, however, is actually expressed only after let, bid, and often after know. It is sometimes found in older English after other verbs in this group: ‘Whuch of 3ou seih me be moad?’ (Lyff of Adam and Eve, p. 2, fourteenth century) = ‘Who of you saw me made?’ ‘Mercy, humanity call loudly that we make our now despised power to be felt’ (William Dunlap, André, Act III, A.D. 1798). We usually suppress be here because the copula has not as yet become established before an objective predicate.

The construction with have or get and the perfect passive participle which represents the subject as planning the action, as in ‘I had (or got) a new suit made,’ is quite different from the construction with have and get and the perfect passive participle which represents the subject as suffering from the action of another or of fate: ‘I had (or got) my right leg hurt in the accident.’ Notice that had or got are stressed in the first example, while they are only lightly stressed in the second. There is a clear difference of meaning between stressed and unstressed had and got. Similarly, there is a difference of meaning between ‘They have (or get) their work done’ (‘They employ others to do their work’) with stressed have or get and ‘They have their work done’ (‘Their work is done’) and ‘They get things done’ (‘They accomplish a good deal’) with unstressed have and get.

In older English, and sometimes still, we find here instead of the new passive form the old active, a present active infinitive or participle with passive force: ‘I heard say (now it said) your lordship was sick’ (Shakespeare, II Henry IV, I, ii, 108). ‘I never heard tell (now usually it said) that we were put here to get pleasure out of life’ (Conan Doyle, Refugees, 231). ‘Annie seem’d to hear her own death-scaffold raising’ (Tennyson, Enoch Arden, 175). ‘I caught him (i.e., the lawyer Barclay) palavering with a juror the other day while we had a case trying’ (William Allen White, A Certain Rich Man, Ch. VI). Compare 46 (close of next to last paragraph).

The use of to before the active and passive forms of the infinitive here with certain verbs indicates that the accusative and the infinitive are felt as abridged infinitive clauses, as in 24 III d, but in the case of the other verbs of this group the development in this direction is not yet so complete. The abridged clauses in 24 III d have the full force of a clause with a nominative subject and a finite verb, but these infinitive clauses without to before the infinitive sometimes have a somewhat different force, so that ‘I heard the bells ring’ is different in meaning from ‘I heard
that the bells rang.' The infinitive ring here is still, as originally, 
the object of the verb heard. In most cases, however, the dif­
ference between these clauses is not so great, often indeed is very 
slight, as in 'I've never known him to neglect (or neglect) his work' 
and 'I've never known that he has neglected his work.' This 
accounts for the tendency to place to before the infinitive here. 
Earlier in the period and in Middle English, we often find here 
for to instead of to: 'It maketh al my drede (dread) for to dyen' 
(die) (Chaucer, The Nonne Preestes Tale, 342).

a. Passive Form. In the passive statement, the direct object becomes 
nominative and the infinitive or the present participle is retained, the in­
finite usually with its prepositional form, sometimes, however, with its 
simple form, especially in set expressions where the simple infinitive, so 
closely associated with the active form, is also employed after the passive: 
(active) 'I saw him do it,' but in the passive: 'He was seen to do it.' 
But sometimes with simple infinitive after a passive: 'The younger 
children were let sleep on' (Hardy, Tess of the D'Urbervilles, Ch. LII). 
'I know it could be made do' (De Morgan, The Old Madhouse, Ch. II). 
Compare 7 D 1 b. Of course, to impart descriptive force here we employ 
a present participle: 'A funeral procession was seen approaching.'

b. Instead of employing have with a dependent infinitive to indicate 
that a person or thing suffers from an act, we simply use in the case of 
spring the intransitive transitively: 'The boat sprang a leak,' i.e., had a 
leak start.

IV. ACCUSATIVE OF THE PERSON OR THING AND A 
PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE

This is a very common type: 'He laid the book upon the table.' 
'He wrote a book about his experiences in the war.'

a. Passive Form. In the passive, the accusative becomes nominative, 
and the prepositional phrase is retained: 'A long book was written by 
him about his experiences in the war.'

V. DATIVE OF THE PERSON AND A PREPOSITIONAL 
PHRASE

This is not so common a type as the preceding one: 'He wrote 
me about his experiences in the war.' 'He wrote, telegraphed 
me (or to me) for help.' 'He told me about his visit to you.'

a. Passive Form. In the passive the dative becomes nominative 
and the prepositional phrase is retained: 'I was told about his visit to 
you.' Such verbs as write, telegraph, etc., require a to in the passive to 
indicate clearly the idea of direction toward: 'I was written to, telegraphed 
to for help.' The to in such expressions is now felt as a part of the verb, 
forming with it a compound.
16 1. Form and Function of Adverbial Modifiers. An adverbial modifier may assume the form of an adverb, a prepositional phrase or clause, or a conjunctural clause: 'He entered quietly.' 'Polish it well.' 'He entered in haste' (prepositional phrase). 'I could see the bird's loaded beak from where I stood' (prepositional clause). In the last example a preposition and its dependent clause together form an adverbial element. It is very much more common for a clause to form an adverbial element with the help of a subordinating conjunction: 'He entered as soon as he had taken off his overcoat.' The adverbial conjunctural clause is treated in 25-34.

An adverb, as indicated by its literal meaning, *joined to a verb*, is an appositive to a verb, i.e., is placed before or after a verb to explain its meaning in the case at hand more clearly, much as an adjective as an appositive is placed before or after a noun to explain it: 'The girl is improving remarkably.' The same form is used as an appositive to an adjective or another adverb and here is
also called an adverb, although of course it is here not true to its name: ‘The girl is remarkably beautiful.’ ‘The girl is improving remarkably fast.’ An adverb, however, modifies not only thus a single word, but often also a prepositional phrase, a subordinate clause, or an independent statement as a whole: ‘He has traveled entirely around the world.’ ‘He is almost across the river.’ ‘He lives a mile (adverbial accusative) beyond our house.’ ‘I arrived soon after it happened.’ ‘I did it only because I felt it to be my duty.’ For sentence adverb see 2 a, p. 130.

Adverbs often occur as the first component of compounds: uproot, overturn, underdone, outlying, tight-fitting, misjudge, return, coöperate, etc. The adverb not is usually replaced here by un-: unable, etc. In many foreign words the negative here is in- (or im-) or dis-: inconvenient, impossible, disobey. Some of these adverbs, mis-, un-, re-, co-, etc., which are not now used outside of compounds, are called prefixes.

An adverbial element modifies a verb, adjective, or other adverb by adding to it some circumstance of place, time, manner, degree, condition, concession, purpose, or means. Though usually different in meaning from a genitive, dative, accusative, or prepositional object, it always performs the same function, i.e., modifies a verb, adjective, or adverb. The adverbial modifier differs from an object in that its relation to the modified word is less close. For illustrative examples see 24 IV, 24 IV a, 25 1. There is a close relation between adverbs and prepositions. For explanation see 62.

Adverbs are often used as nouns: ‘The ups and downs of life.’ ‘The ins (the party in power), the outs’ (the party out of power). ‘He knows the ins and outs (details) of every political move.’ Nouns made from adverbs are very common in prepositional phrases: until tomorrow, after tomorrow, since yesterday, etc. Compare 62 (3rd par.).

Adverbs are often used as pronouns: ‘I saw him a year ago, but since then (used as demonstrative pronoun) we haven’t met.’ ‘I saw him a year ago, since when (used as relative pronoun) I haven’t seen anything of him.’ Compare 23 II 6 (next to last par.), 62 (3rd par.). In older English, adverbs were often used as pronouns in prepositional phrases in which the preposition followed the adverb, adverb and preposition usually being written together as parts of a compound: therein, now in it; therewith, now with it; wherein, now in what (interrogative) or in which (relative); wherewith, now with what (interrogative) or with which (relative); etc. A few of the old adverbial compounds, however, have survived in common use where they have acquired a special mean-
ing, such as therefore (19 1 e), whereupon (23 II 6, next to last par.). In poetical and legal language the old adverbial compounds are still widely used in their original meaning and function. Compare Parts of Speech, 7 1 b and 7 4 a.

Adverbs are often used as adjectives. See 7 F and 10 I 2.

2. Position and Stress of Adverbs. An adverb can freely stand in almost any position except between a verb and its direct object, where it is much less common than elsewhere: ‘Yesterday I met your father,’ ‘I yesterday met your father,’ ‘I met your father yesterday,’ but not ‘I met yesterday your father.’ This usage rests upon the principle that an adverbial element is usually more important than a direct object and, like important elements in general, gravitates toward the end. Sometimes, however, where the direct object by reason of its bulk or its logical force is heavier or more important than the adverbial element, it, of course, follows: ‘I read the letter again,’ but ‘After an absence of fifty years I have just seen again the dear old home of my childhood.’

a. SENTENCE ADVERBS. An adverbial element is often more heavily stressed than a verb and then usually follows it: ‘He acted promptly.’ ‘All that I have learnt farther is, that the populace were going to burn the house’ (Horace Walpole, Letter to Miss Mary Berry, July 10, 1789). In many cases, however, the adverbial element does not modify the verb directly but the sentence as a whole. In this case the adverbial element usually precedes the verb, verbal phrase, or predicate noun or adjective and has a weaker stress, for in English, when we call attention in any way to the thought as a whole, the verb, verbal phrase, or predicate noun or adjective is strongly stressed, since it is felt as the basic element of the statement: ‘He evidently thought so.’ ‘He at last thinks so.’ ‘He not only believes in such books, but he even reads them to his children.’ ‘He absolutely lives from hand to mouth.’ ‘She always lets him have his way.’ ‘The blossoms quite (= entirely) cover the tree.’ ‘A man should be quite (= entirely) certain what he knows and what he doesn’t know.’ ‘It was quite (= truly) a disappointment to me.’ ‘I quite (= positively) like him’ (Concise Oxford Dictionary). ‘I rather (= somewhat) fear that he won’t come.’ ‘The performance was rather good, rather a failure.’

In certain dialects the adverb pure (= absolutely; compare 54 2 a, last par.) is common here: ‘Gal, you pure outdanced youself’ (Julia Peterkin, Scarlet Sister Mary). ‘What you done pure cuts my heartstrings’ (ib.).

Under the influence of strong emotion, the sentence adverb is often strongly stressed; but this stress, resting on an adverb standing before a strongly stressed verb, indicates that it is a
sentence stress, not a stress upon an adverb belonging to the verb alone and thus emphasizing some detail of the predicate: 'I utterly scorn your proposition.'

The position of the lightly stressed sentence adverb before a heavily stressed verb, or, under the influence of strong emotion, a heavily stressed sentence adverb before a heavily stressed verb, are marked characteristics of current English, and the distinct feeling for the meaning of the adverb in this position has helped bring about the split infinitive (49 2 c): 'I hope to even defeat him,' after the analogy of 'He even defeated him.' 'She wishes to utterly forget her past,' after the analogy of 'She would utterly forget her past.'

In a compound form made up of an infinitive or participle and an auxiliary, the sentence adverb stands either after or before the auxiliary, but usually in accordance with the fixed principle that it stands before the accented form of the compound verb: 'I have always trusted your judgment' (George Bernard Shaw, You Never Can Tell, Act III). 'We shall soon know,' 'We may soon know.' The stress upon the part having the verbal meaning, as in these examples, is the normal stress; but if we desire to emphasize, not the verbal meaning, but the idea of actuality, as described in 6 A d (1), we accent strongly the auxiliary: ‘I always have trusted your judgment.’ ‘Refined policy ever has been the parent of confusion and ever will be so, as long as the world endures’ (Burke). ‘I really must go and stop this’ (George Bernard Shaw, You Never Can Tell, Act III). Similarly, we usually place the sentence adverb after or before the copula according to the stress: ‘I am always careful,’ or ‘I always am careful.’

This principle, however, has not become thoroughly established yet, for after the analogy of usage with the simple tenses we sometimes without reference to the stress of the compound verbal forms place the sentence adverb between the subject and the verbal form having the personal ending: ‘He ordered breakfast as calmly as if he never had (instead of he had never) left his home.’ 'He undoubtedly has (instead of he has undoubtedly) worked hard.' In the passive, however, two participles, the one indicating the passive idea, the other the verbal meaning, usually form a unit, so that the sentence adverb cannot stand between them before the stressed participle, but for the most part stands before the participial unit: ‘I have undoubtedly been deceived,’ or, of course, ‘I undoubtedly have been deceived,’ for we can always put the sentence adverb between subject and verb. But even in the case of these participial units we must put the adverb between the participles before the accented verbal form wherever the ad-
verb indicates the manner or degree of the verbal activity: 'I have undoubtedly been grossly deceived.' 'She has always been greatly admired.' As in these examples, there are often two adverbs, one standing in the usual position before the passive auxiliary, the other, an adverb of manner or degree, standing between the two participles before the accented verbal form.

Although these positions of the sentence adverb are very common, they are in principal propositions not the only ones. We sometimes find the sentence adverb at the very beginning of the sentence, or after the verb at or near the end of the sentence; in the former case followed by a slight pause and in the latter case preceded by a pause, which in both cases marks the adverb or adverbialement as a sentence modifier: 'Unfortunately (pause), the message never arrived,' 'The message, unfortunately, never arrived,' or 'The message never arrived (pause), unfortunately.' 'At least (pause) he thinks so,' 'He at least thinks so,' or 'He thinks so (pause) at least.' 'In my opinion (pause) they are wise.' 'It is therefore wholly undesirable that the children of the poor should be laboriously schooled to imitate all its peculiarities — its vices as well as its virtues (i.e., the vices and virtues of the literary language); rather (19 1 c) they should be encouraged to honor their local dialect' (George Willis, The Philosophy of Speech, p. 191). 'Please (pause) go and order a cab!' or 'Go and order a cab (pause), please!' Here please is a subjunctive (may it please you) used as a sentence adverb. Instead of please we may use if you please. Thus also in other cases we may use a short sentence or clause as a sentence adverb: 'He is quite trustworthy, I think,' or 'I think he is quite trustworthy.' 'I dare say things will, somehow or other, turn out for the best.' 'Maybe (for it may be) he will come tomorrow.' In popular and colloquial speech we often find like with the force of the choicer as it were: '[They (i.e., the rich men's sons) don't know how to spend it (i.e., money) properly. They're like chaps who can't carry their drink because they aren't used to it.] The brass gets into their heads, like' (Stanley Houghton, Hindle Wakes, Act III). The use of an if-clause as sentence adverb is especially frequent: 'Their (i.e., loose colloquialisms) employment, if high example counts for anything, is a standard habit of the language' (H. L. Mencken, The American Language, VI). The subordinate clause has its sentence adverb like a principal proposition: 'I do not approve of what I assume will be the trend of your education.'

The English negative is a sentence adverb and, like other sentence adverbs, is normally weakly stressed and stands between subject and predicate: 'I never do such things.' In case there is
an auxiliary of any kind in the sentence the negative not or n’t, like other sentence adverbs, stands before the stressed verbal form: ‘He hasn’t come yet.’ ‘He doesn’t do such things.’ ‘He can’t do such things.’ The perfect infinitive without to is usually considered as a unit, so that the negative stands before the unaccented tense auxiliary of the infinitive: ‘He can scarcely have arrived by this time.’ ‘He can scarcely have been there.’ ‘He had spoken late, but he need not have spoken at all.’ ‘You need not have told me that.’ Other sentence adverbs than negatives may stand before the unaccented tense auxiliary, or, as so often elsewhere, before the unaccented verbal form, or, as in a simple tense, between subject and verb: ‘He must surely have seen him,’ or ‘He must have surely seen him,’ or ‘He surely must have seen him.’ In the passive, however, two participles, the one indicating the passive idea, the other the verbal meaning, usually form a unit, so that the sentence adverb cannot stand between them before the accented verbal form, but for the most part stands before the participial unit: ‘He must surely have been seen,’ or ‘He surely must have been seen.’ But even in the case of these participial units we must put the adverb between the participles before the stressed verbal form wherever the adverb indicates the manner or degree of the verbal activity: ‘He must undoubtedly have been grossly deceived.’ ‘She must undoubtedly have been severely tried.’ As in these examples, there are often two adverbs, one standing before the passive auxiliary, the other, an adverb of manner or degree, standing before the stressed verbal form.

In abridged infinitival or participial clauses the subject is usually understood, so that the negative stands before the verbal form: ‘He promises not to do it again,’ or now sometimes with split infinitive (49 2), since there is a tendency here to place the sentence adverb immediately before the stressed verb, as in the full clause: ‘There can be nothing to — not talk about between you and me, dear mother’ (De Morgan, Alice-for-Short, Ch. XXXV), as in ‘There can be nothing between you and me, dear mother, that we can not talk about.’ ‘[I] Always figured somebody’d come along with the brains to not leave education to a lot of bookworms’ (Sinclair Lewis, Babbitt, Ch. II), as in ‘I always figured that somebody would come along with enough brains that he would not leave education to a lot of bookworms.’ The drift of present usage is evidently in this new direction, though it is not yet so strong as in the case of other sentence adverbs, where it has become very strong. Compare 49 2. In the compound form of the infinitive the negative usually stands before to, or now sometimes in accordance with the new drift,
after the auxiliary, as in the full clause: 'He claims not (or never) to have seen her before,' or sometimes to have not (or never) seen her before, as in ‘He claims that he has not (or never) seen her before.’

Other sentence adverbs than negatives stand either before to or more commonly after the auxiliary before the accented verbal form, as so often elsewhere. For examples see 49 2 c.

In abridged participial clauses, not stands before the present participle: ‘Not knowing the road, I lost my way.’ When the participle is in a compound form, the not regularly stands before the compound as it does before the simple form, but other sentence adverbs stand either after or before the auxiliary, as in the full clause: ‘Not having seen him for a long time, I didn’t recognize him,’ but either ‘Having never seen him before, or less commonly Never having seen him before, I, of course, didn’t recognize him,’ just as we can say either ‘As I had never seen him before, or less commonly As I never had seen him before, I, of course, didn’t recognize him.’

Of course, the negative, like other sentence adverbs, is strongly stressed when the statement as a whole is stressed: ‘I never did it.’ ‘I have not done it.’ The auxiliary takes the stress where not has merged into it: ‘I didn’t do it.’ ‘I can’t do it.’

The adverb enough was originally the adverbial accusative (16 4 a) of the indefinite pronoun enough and stood, as a sentence adverb, at the end of the sentence, the most common position of the sentence adverb in oldest English. Although in Old English it sometimes preceded an adjective or adverb, like an ordinary adverb, it now, as originally, follows it: ‘It is hot enough.’

In questions introduced by a strongly stressed interrogative word, the interrogative is often followed by a sentence adverb, an expression denoting surprise, impatience, or displeasure, usually in the world, on earth, and in British colloquial speech often also ever, which is often improperly written as a part of the preceding interrogative: ‘What in the world did he want?’ or in British English also ‘Whatever (or better What ever) did he want?’ ‘Where in the world did he go?’ or in British English also ‘Wherever (or better Where ever) did he go?’ ‘Why on earth didn’t you say so?’ or in British English also ‘Whyever (or better Why ever) didn’t you say so?’ Ever is sometimes used in American English: ‘Whatever has got into you?’ (Hal G. Evarts, Saturday Evening Post, May 28, 1927, p. 9). ‘Why, there’s Ab Knuckles! What next? However did anybody get him to a party?’ (C. B. Kelland, Saturday Evening Post, Feb. 26, 1927, p. 72), or more commonly ‘How did anybody ever get him to a party?’ ‘Surely you’ll admit
that you like having your own bath.’ — ’WhoeversaidI didn’t?’ (Willa Cather, The Professor’s House, p. 34).

b. Distinguishing Adverbs. Although the negative is a sentence adverb and as such normally stands before the verbal form, it is sometimes felt as a distinguishing adverb, i.e., as belonging to some particular word, phrase, or clause which is prominent in the situation as a whole, and is then placed immediately before this word, phrase, or clause: ‘He did it, not I.’ ‘He hit me, not him.’ ‘He did it for the love of the cause, not for personal gain.’ ‘I did it because I felt it to be my duty, not because I was compelled to do it.’

A number of sentence adverbs and conjunctive (19 1) adverbs, namely, only, solely, simply, merely, just, particularly, especially, even, also, at least, exactly (or precisely), etc., are often, like not, used as distinguishing adverbs, and are then placed immediately before the word, phrase, or clause which they distinguish; sometimes, however, differing from not, are placed after a single word which they distinguish: ‘All were there, only Jóhn (or Jóhn only) was missing.’ ‘If you want it, you have only to say so.’ ‘I have been influenced solely by this consideration.’ ‘I came just to see you.’ ‘I did it simply (or merely) because I felt it to be my duty.’ ‘Almost all of them arrived on time, even Jóhn’ (or Jóhn even). ‘William thinks so, also Jóhn’ (or Jóhn also). ‘None of them will go; at least Jóhn (or Jóhn at least) will not.’ ‘What exactly (or Exactly what) paganism was we shall never know.’ ‘We never knew precisely why he left.’

Two distinguishing adverbs, alone (= only) and too (= also), regularly follow the emphatic word: ‘Jóhn alone knows about it.’ ‘I, too, have troubles.’

The sentence adverb quite (= truly), like a distinguishing adverb, is often used before another word than a predicate. Here it indicates that the circumstances are such as to justify the use of the word before which it stands: ‘It took place at quite an early hour.’ ‘A ship sailing northwards passes quite suddenly from cold into hot water’ (Herschel, Essays, 342). ‘Quite a crowd had already gathered about him.’ ‘There were quite a few there’ (ironic popular American = ‘There were quite a large number there’). ‘He knows quite a little about it’ (ironic popular American = ‘He knows quite a good deal about it’).

c. Use of ‘ONLY.’ Of the adverbs discussed here only has the greatest freedom of position, since as a distinguishing adverb it may stand before or after any word that is to be distinguished, and as a sentence adverb it may stand in the usual position of the sentence adverb, i.e., before a stressed verb or a stressed predicate.
noun, adjective, participle, or infinitive: 'Only John passed in Latin.' 'John passed only in Latin.' 'He only (sentence adverb = barely) passed in Latin.' 'He stayed only a week' (or a week only), but to emphasize the predicate, 'He only (sentence adverb) stayed a week.' 'He is only wounded, not killed.' 'We only believe as deep as we live' (Emerson, Art). 'The mind that lies fallow but a single day sprouts up in follies that are only to be killed by constant and assiduous culture' (Addison). As in the last four examples only regularly stands before a stressed verb or a stressed predicate participle or infinitive. The stressing of the verb or the predicate participle or infinitive indicates that the attention is called to the basic element in the sentence, not to some detail, and suggests the placing of only as a sentence modifier before the basic element of the statement, the verb, or the predicate participle or infinitive. Where the predicate is a stressed adjective, we may put only too or all too before it when we desire to express our regret at having to acknowledge the truth of the statement: 'The report proved only too (or all too) true.' But if we stress the predicate very heavily, much more heavily than only too, the form only too is not a sentence adverb but an intensifying adverb with the force of exceedingly: 'I shall be only too thankful if you accept my invitation.'

d. Historical Explanation of the Position of 'Not.' In oldest English, the negative was ne, which was often strengthened by not (originally the same as nought, from Old English nowiht, i.e., not a whit). As ne was weakly stressed, it later, in the fifteenth century, dropped out of common everyday speech, leaving to not the office of negative. In poetry ne lingered on in occasional use into the nineteenth century: 'Whilome in Albion's isle there dwelt a youth, Who ne in Virtue's ways did take delight' (Byron, Childe Harold, I, II, A.D. 1812). Originally, ne stood before, and not after, the verb, which explains the occasional position of not in poetry and choice prose after the verb, as in older English: 'pomp that fades not' (Wordsworth). In older English, of course, ne stood before the verb: 'pomp that ne fadeth not.' After ne had dropped out and not had thus become a sentence adverb, there naturally arose a tendency to place not before the verb, the usual place for sentence adverbs: 'They sweat, they blunder, they bounce and plunge in the Pulpit, but all is voice and no substance: they deaf men's ears, but not edifie' (Thomas Nashe, Christ's Teares over Jerusalem, Works, II, p. 123, A.D. 1593). 'It not appears to me that,' etc. (Shakespeare, II Henry IV, IV, 1, 107). 'I not doubt t'effect All that you wish' (Ben Jonson, Catiline, I, I, 418, A.D. 1611). This form of negative statement
did not spread, since there was something unnatural about it. As *not* usually had followed the finite form of the verb, and in the case of auxiliaries still maintained this position, as in ‘He cannot come,’ ‘He has not come,’ it gradually became usual to employ instead of a simple verb the periphrastic form with the auxiliary *do*, placing *not* after the auxiliary as in the case of other auxiliaries: ‘He doesn’t work.’ Thus in all these examples *not*, as in older English, still in a formal sense stands *after* the finite verb; but as such auxiliaries are today not felt as true verbs, *not* in reality stands *before* the real verbal element, the part containing the verbal meaning, i.e., infinitive or participle, just as other sentence adverbs stand before infinitive or participle and just as older *ne* as a sentence adverb stood before the real verb. As explained in 6 A d, our ancestors had a free choice between ‘He works’ and ‘He does work.’ In negative statements, they finally chose for normal expression the auxiliary form, in order that *not*, like other sentence adverbs, might stand before the verb.

*CONTRACTIONS OF ‘NOT.’* Since *not* is usually lightly stressed, like older *ne* and sentence adverbs in general, it naturally loses something of its form and often, thus reduced, becomes attached to the preceding auxiliary or copula as an enclitic: ‘He doesn’t like it,’ ‘they, I, you don’t like it’; in popular and loose colloquial speech ‘he don’t like it.’ ‘He isn’t rich,’ ‘we, you, they aren’t rich.’ As can be seen by the examples, there is in the literary language no contraction with *n’t* after *am.* In the declarative form, however, we can contract *am* to ‘*m:* ‘I’m not rich.’ In interrogative form contraction does not take place here in the literary language at all. In colloquial speech *am I not?* or *am not I?* often becomes *ain’t I*? or *aren’t I*? — the latter regarded as choicer by many in England and by some in America: ‘I’m such a catch, *ain’t I*?’ (A. Marshall, *Exton Manor*, Ch. V). ‘Well, man alive, I’m bound to know, *aren’t I*?’ (Hutchinson, *If Winter Comes*, p. 101). ‘*Aren’t I* silly to weep?’ (Francis R. Bellamy, *The Balance*, Ch. XX). The first person singular form *aren’t* is a leveled form, after the analogy of *we aren’t, you aren’t, they aren’t.* Similarly, the first person singular *ain’t* is after the analogy of *we ain’t, you ain’t, they ain’t,* where *ain’t* is corrupted from *aren’t.* As the *r* in *aren’t* is not pronounced in England before a consonant, we often find this form written *an’t,* especially a little earlier in the period, as in Smollett and Dickens. Of course, the *r* is still silent in England, but it is now usually written. In Ireland the contraction *amn’t* is sometimes used instead of *ain’t* in the first person singular: ‘*Amn’t I* after telling you she’s a great help to her mother?’ (Lennox Robinson, *The Whiteheaded Boy*, Act I,
The tendency to level, as seen in the case of *ain't* in colloquial speech in the first person singular, is still stronger in popular speech where the general drift, as described in 8 I 1 h, is to disregard the grammatical relations and use one form for all persons and numbers: ‘I don’t, you don’t, he don’t, we don’t,’ etc.; ‘I ain’t (or an’t), you ain’t (or an’t), he ain’t (or an’t), we ain’t (or an’t),’ etc. In popular speech *ain’t* is employed also for contractions of *not* with forms of *have*, but it is here a variant of *hain’t* with the *h* dropped: ‘I ain’t (or hain’t) got it, he ain’t (or hain’t) got it, we ain’t (or hain’t) got it’ = ‘I haven’t got it,’ etc. In Negro dialect *ain’t* is often used instead of *don’t*: ‘Mus’ be dey ain’t know dis is pay-day’ (Du Bose Heyward, *Porgy*, p. 184). Also used instead of *won’t*: ‘Stick tuh dem, an’ you ain’t git into no trouble’ (ib., p. 57). Sometimes *ain’t* is used as a pure negative adverb = *not*: ‘I might be ain’ changed on de outside, but I sho is changed on de inside’ (Julia Peterkin, *Scarlet Sister Mary*, Ch. XXVI).

As contractions are, in general, so common in colloquial speech, there is a tendency in a choice style to write the full form *not* instead of the common contractions. This is appropriate where the tone is dignified and stately. As *not* is a sentence adverb and is naturally weakly stressed, it ought not in ordinary prose to be inappropriate to write the form as we speak it, provided we employ the correct contractions, but convention often controls us more than our natural feeling, so that we often write out *not* in full where we contract it in the spoken language. Of course, we also in colloquial speech stress *not* strongly in emphatic statements, for we always have a keen sense for its meaning: ‘I did nöt do it.’ The contracted forms first began to appear about 1660 and soon came into wide use.

3. **Negatives.** The usual negative now is *not*. ‘He is *not* working.’ ‘He is *not* strong.’ In Scotch and North English this negative has the form of *no* or *nae* (*ne*), both forms weakened to *na* when used enclitically after auxiliaries: ‘There’s *no* (= *not*) a window in it’ (J. M. Barrie, *Tommy and Grizel*, Ch. V). ‘But I’m *nae* (= *not*) sure that ee (he) didna (did *not*) for a’ that’ (G. Macdonald, *Alec Forbes*, Ch. LXVIII).

Notice the use of *not* in elliptical expressions: ‘I hope [that it is] not [so].’

There is an older negative, *no* (Old English *nā*, from the older negative *ne* ‘*not*’ and *ā* ‘ever’), originally an emphatic form (= *not* at all, *by no means*), which we still use; now, however, not as an adverb as originally, but as the equivalent of a sentence: ‘Are you going tomorrow?’ — ‘*No.*’ It sometimes still
has its original emphasis, but is normally without stress, as we
now have no feeling for its original meaning.

This old emphatic form, now much reduced in force, is used
also as a common adverb with the meaning of not in one common
category, namely, as a modifier of a comparative: ‘Mr. Buck, the
tutor, was no better a scholar than many a fifth form boy.’ ‘He
is no more to be trusted than you are.’ ‘He is no more an officer
than I am.’ ‘I have no more to say.’ ‘The transaction is no less
than a swindle.’ ‘There were no (or not) less than five hundred
people present.’

The negative adverb no also occurs occasionally elsewhere in
a few set expressions, where, however, not is now more common:
‘Have I done it or no?’ (Hardy, *Life’s Little Ironies*, p. 139).
‘It was a question of whether or no she were worth it’ (Haggard,
*She*, p. 159). ‘She would go to London whether he liked it or no’
(Mrs. H. Ward, *Fenwick’s Career*, p. 172). In older English, also
the form non(e) occurs here, so that it seems probable that no and
none in such set expressions were originally the adjective no used
substantively (57 1): ‘“Wherer ar bei Cristen,” he seide, “or
non?”’ (R. Brunne, *Chron. Wace*, 14909, A.D. 1330). ‘“I will,” she
sayde, “do as ye councell me: Comforth or no”’ (Generydes,
2588, A.D. 1440).

In poetry and elevated language instead of no we sometimes use
nay, of Danish (i.e., old Norse) origin. It is here employed to
introduce a contradiction to a preceding statement: ‘You do not
care for me.’ — ‘Nay, I do care for you.’ In this use it often
assumes positive force, since in taking back a preceding word or
statement we often substitute in its stead a stronger expression:
‘Hundreds, nay thousands, perished.’

The adverb no should be distinguished from the limiting adjecte
no, which is of somewhat different origin, as described in
57 5 b: ‘no money, no patience.’ No is used also as a noun, and
as such has a plural: ‘The noes have it.’

Also the accusative singular of the neuter pronoun none is used
as an emphatic negative adverb before a comparative: ‘He was
none the worse for his fall.’ See also 4 a, p. 144, and 57 5 b (last
par.).

a. **DOUBLE NEGATION AND PLEONASTIC EXPRESSION WITH NEG-
ATIVES.** In older literary English, as in current popular speech,
two or three negatives were felt as stronger than a single negative,
on the same principle that we drive in two or three nails instead
of one, feeling that they hold better than one: ‘I can’t see no wit
in her’ (Lamb in a letter to Coleridge in 1797). ‘I don’t know
nothing about it’ (current popular speech). Under Latin influence,
we have come to feel that two negatives make an affirmative statement, although we still in an answer say no, no, to strengthen our negative reply. Even in the literary language, however, there is a survival of older usage after verbs like doubt, wonder, which are affirmative in form but negative in meaning. We sometimes still use the negative but after these words when preceded by a negative, not feeling that the two negatives make the statement affirmative without the help of but, so that but is really pleonastic: ‘I do not doubt but that (now usually simple that) you are surprised.’ ‘I wouldn’t wonder but (now usually suppressed) Hannah’s up-stairs all the while, splitting her sides’ (St. John Ervine, John Ferguson, Act II). A little earlier in the period the list of these verbs was larger. See 24 III for examples. Not feeling that but (= only) is a negative, we sometimes put not before it, so that here not is pleonastic: ‘It will not take but a few moments to dispose of it’ (Mr. Blanton, of Texas, in the House, Aug. 12, 1919). On the other hand, not feeling that help is negative with the force of avoid, we often say, ‘I won’t do any more than I can (instead of the correct can’t) help,’ after the analogy of than I have to or than I must.

b. Rhetorical Question Instead of a Negative Statement. A rhetorical question often replaces a negative statement: ‘Would you do better if you were in my place?’ = ‘You would not do better, if you were in my place.’ Compare 23 II 1 (last par.).

4. Form of Simple Adverbs. Adverbs have in part no distinctive form, as in the case of here, there, then, when, where, why, late, straight, far, near, close, quick, slow, fast, high, low, much, little, very, right, wrong, cheap, just, well, etc.; in part they have the distinctive suffix -ly, as in rapidly, diligently, hurriedly, powerfully, etc.; also often in the case of some of the words in the first group, which have a form in -ly alongside of their simple form, as in slowly, quickly, highly, rightly, cheaply, etc. Sometimes the two forms are differentiated in meaning: ‘I’ll go as high as a hundred dollars,’ but ‘The wood is highly polished.’ ‘He aimed higher,’ but ‘We ought to value our privileges more highly.’ ‘He sat up late,’ but ‘He died lately.’ ‘He works hard,’ but ‘I could hardly hear him.’ ‘He lives near us, nearer to us,’ but ‘It is nearly done.’ ‘He is real (colloquial for very) good,’ but ‘He is really (sentence adverb) good.’ ‘The bird is now flying quite low,’ but ‘He boasted lowly of his power.’ With certain adverbs we use the simple form after the modified word and the form with -ly before it: ‘He guessed right,’ but
He rightly guessed that it was safe. 'He spelled the words wrong,' but 'the wrongly spelled words.' Earlier in the period the old simple form was often used where we now employ the form in -ly: 'to haue him stand in the raine till he was through (or thorough) wet' (Thomas Nashe, *The Vnfortunate Traveller*, Works, II, p. 246, A.D. 1594), now 'thoroughly wet'; but the old simple form is preserved in thoroughbred, thoroughgoing, etc. 'She is not near (now nearly) so small as I had expected' (Horace Walpole, *Letter to Miss Mary Berry*, Sept. 25, 1793). Scarcely was widely used in early Modern English, but is now employed only in rather choice language, yielding to scarcely in normal speech.

In older English, many adverbs had the suffix -e, which distinguished them from the corresponding adjectives. In the fifteenth century, after this ending had disappeared, many adjectives and adverbs had the same form. For a long while there has been a tendency to distinguish the adverb from the adjective by giving it the suffix -ly, as indicated above. The old simple form, though often replaced by the new form in -ly, often remains firm before an adjective or participle: light yellow, dark blue, dead drunk, precious little, mighty delightful, burning hot, red hot, stark naked, pretty bright; new laid eggs, modern built house, foreign born citizens, etc. These are in large measure modern formations, but they belong to the old group-word (63) type of expression, for which we still have a lively feeling. In the old group-word, the modifying word always precedes the governing word, so that the word-order of itself makes the grammatical relations clear and hence the lack of a distinctive adverbial ending is not keenly felt. But here, as also elsewhere, as described in 63, distinctive grammatical forms are sometimes introduced: an uncommon or uncommonly fine fellow; terrible or terribly strong; an exceeding or exceedingly great joy; a newly married pair; the newly appointed chaplain, etc. We should distinguish between 'a goed-natured boy,' where the group-word goed nature has been converted into a derivative adjective by means of the suffix -ed, and 'a well behaved boy,' where behaved is an adjective participle and well the modifying adverb. Similarly, we say 'a high-tempered man,' but 'highly seasoned food.' In many cases we can construe a group of words according to either of these two types, hence we often find a difference of usage: ill-mannered, 'the most sweetly mannered gentleman alive' (Disraeli, *Endymion*, III, III, 25), but also gentle-mannered, simple-mannered. In both constructions the stress shifts to the second component in the predicate: 'He is goed-natured.' 'He is well behaved.'

On the other hand, after verbs, where the word-order is always
different from that required in group-words, the tendency is to give the adverb its distinctive suffix: 'wide-open,' but 'He advertises widely'; 'tight-fitting,' but 'He clasped his hands tightly together.'

While in literary and good colloquial language the form with -ly is becoming ever more firmly fixed, loose colloquial and popular speech still clings tenaciously to the older type of expression without -ly, especially in American and Irish English: 'I wanted to do it bad (instead of the usual good colloquial form badly) enough, and if it was to do over again I w6uld' (Mark Twain, Joan of Arc, Book I, Ch. IV). 'He (a certain dog) isn't anyway near (instead of literary nearly) as full-blooded as Duke' (Tarkington, Penrod Jashber, Ch. I). 'I beat them easy' (instead of the literary form easily), but also in good English with the short form in 'to take it easy' and 'to let one off easy.' This conservative tendency in colloquial and popular speech to employ the old type is especially noticeable in the case of sentence adverbs (see 2 a, p. 130), where in the literary language the form with -ly is most firmly established: 'It sure (in the literary language surely) will help.'

In older English, -ly was often added to adverbs formed from adjectives in -ly, and this older usage survives in a few adverbs: holily, jollily (see 4, p. 140), sillily, wilily. In general, -ly is now avoided here as awkward, although elsewhere there is a strong tendency toward it on account of its distinctiveness. The present tendency in this particular group is to employ the adjective also as an adverb, as in early, daily, hourly, friendly, kindly, only, etc. In many other words, however, we avoid such adverbs, as we feel their lack of distinctive form.

It is common to form an adverb out of a compound adjective provided the final element in the compound is an adjective form: world-wide, adv. world-widely; high-minded, adv. high-mindedly. If the final element is a noun we must employ the compound adjective also as an adverb: 'a first-rate (adj.) machine.' 'I am getting along first-rate' (adv.).

a. GENITIVE, DATIVE, AND ACCUSATIVE USED ADVERTIBIALLY. In oldest English, nouns in the genitive, dative, and accusative were often used adverbiaUy. The old adverbiaul genitive survives in a few nouns and adverbs in the literary language and in a much larger number in popular speech: must needs, nowadays, once (i.e., ones, from one), twice (formerly twyes), thrice, unawares, afterward (especially in America) or afterwards, backward or backwards, forward or forwards, onward or less commonly onwards, seaward or seawards, sideways, always, etc.; in popular speech anywheres, somewheres, nowheres, etc., instead of the literary forms
anywhere, somewhere, nowhere, etc. In colloquial speech it is still common in a few nouns to indicate repeated occurrence, but it is now felt as an accusative plural: ‘returning nights to his home’ (F. J. Mather, Chaucer’s Prologue, p. vii). ‘Farmer Spurrier could see the plow at work before he got out of bed mornings’ (H. C. O’Neill, Told in the Dimpes, p. 28). After the analogy of such common expressions we now often use this plural accusative: ‘The museum is open Sundays’ (or on Sundays). The modern prepositional genitive is used in ‘of a morning,’ ‘of an evening,’ ‘of a Sunday afternoon,’ ‘of late years,’ ‘of rainy afternoons,’ etc. In popular speech an excrescent t is often added to the genitive form once: wunst. While the literary language rejects the genitive form with excrescent t here, it has adopted it in the case of amongst and whilst, adverbial genitive forms now used alongside of among and while as preposition and subordinate conjunction.

The old dative plural survives in whilom (= formerly), now only used in poetry or archaic language. It is the old dative plural form of the noun while, used adverbially: ‘Whilom she was a daughter of Locrine’ (Milton, Comus, 827). It is sometimes, like certain other adverbs, used also as an adjective: ‘his whilom associates.’

The old adverbial accusative of extent is well preserved in the case of nouns: ‘They remained a long while, three years.’ ‘It is a long way off.’ ‘He went the full length.’ ‘That went a long way toward remedying the evil.’ ‘He walked two miles.’ ‘He will not swerve a hair’s breadth from the truth.’ ‘The lake is three miles wide.’ ‘He is fourteen years old.’ ‘The garden is one hundred and seventy feet long.’ ‘He towers head and shoulders above his contemporaries.’ ‘The sober sense of the community are heart and soul with the Chief of Police in his crusade.’ ‘Vivisection must be abolished root and branch.’ In early Modern English, the genitive was not infrequently used here instead of the accusative, and this older usage still lingers in popular speech, which here, as in the first paragraph, is quite fond of the genitive as a more distinctive form: ‘He’d given up sea-faring And moved quite a way’s inland’ (Amy Lowell, East Wind, p. 188, A.D. 1926). ‘It seems a long ways off.’

The adverbial accusative of extent is common also in the case of indefinite pronouns, especially a bit, every bit, a lot, lots, a sight (colloquial and popular), and whatever in the meaning at all, also with other indefinites when used in connection with too or a comparative: ‘Wait a bit.’ ‘I am every bit as good as you.’ ‘I am not a bit tired.’ ‘I have a lot (or lots) more to tell you.’ ‘I have
lots more things to show her' (Clyde Fitch, Letter, Feb. 10, 1903). 'It is a long sight better' (Concise Oxford Dictionary), or more commonly 'a darn sight better.' 'There is no doubt whatever.' 'Is there any chance whatever?' 'I cannot see anyone whatever.' 'No one whatever would have anything to do with him.' 'What (= to what extent or in what way) is he the better for it?' 'The help came none too soon.' 'It is much too large.' 'The triumphant people haven't any too much food' (Westminster Gazette, No. 7069, 6a). 'He is none the worse for his fall.' 'The baby is dying slowly but none the less surely.' 'He is resting all the better for it.' 'Is he resting any the better for it?' 'Is he resting any better today?' 'I began to think that it was of no use crying any more.' 'She is not any less beautiful today than she has ever been.' 'Isn't it any later than that?' or in American colloquial speech also: 'Is that all the later it is?' 'Nothing daunted, he began again.' 'He is a little better.' 'He is much better, much taller.' Much and little are often used outside of the comparative: 'I don't care much about it.' 'I care little about it.' Much is often used sarcastically: 'Much (= not at all) you care about my feelings!'

In general, any, some, none, except with too and the comparative, are now not so common in England as earlier in the period, but in American colloquial speech there is still a great fondness for these forms: 'I slept none that night,' or 'I didn't sleep any that night.' 'If our readers are any like ourselves, we think they cannot help laughing' (Analectic Magazine [Phila.], IX, 437, A.D. 1817). 'A tall fellow . . . stammers some in his speech' (runaway advertisement in Mass. Spy, April 28, 1785). 'I walk some every day.' This usage survives also in Scotland: 'You will quarrel none with Captain Cleveland' (Scott, Pirate, Ch. XVIII). 'Having slept scarcely any all the night' (Hugh Miller, Scenes and Legends, XXX, 450). Scotch influence has strengthened the conservative American tendency here. It occasionally occurs in English writers after verbs: 'He may walk some, perhaps — not much' (Dickens in Forster's Life, III, IV). In American slang some often assumes strong intensive force: 'The papers will make it some hot for you' (Robert Herrick, Memoirs of an American Citizen, p. 310).

Similarly, the accusative of the comparatives more, less, and the superlatives most, the most, least, the least are much used adverbially: 'If indiscretion be a sign of love, you are the most a lover of anybody that I know' (Congreve, Love for Love, I, ii, 354, A.D. 1695); now more commonly 'the most a lover of all that I know,' or 'more a lover than any other person that I know.'
The old adverbial accusative of goal (11 2) after verbs of motion is preserved in home: ‘He went home.’ ‘They brought the charge home to him.’ ‘I was home by six.’ In the last example the verb of motion is not expressed, but the idea of motion is implied. In popular speech home is improperly used where there is no idea of motion implied: ‘Jane was home (for literary at home) all last week.’ In compounds, however, home is used also in the literary language where there is no idea of motion implied: home-made, home-grown, home-brewed, etc. Home is here an old uninflected locative (62, next to last par.) meaning at home. This type of expression has come down to us from the prehistoric period.

The accusative of definite and indefinite time is common: ‘I go to Europe every two years.’ ‘The money was paid the following day.’ ‘First thing in the morning he smokes a cigarette’ (Krapp, A Comprehensive Guide to Good English). ‘He often goes round the last thing to make sure that all is right’ (Rutherford’s Every Boy’s Annual). ‘I met him one day on the street.’ Also the accusative of way: ‘Step this way, please!’ ‘I will take you another way.’ Also the accusative of price: ‘This hat cost five dollars.’

The adverbial accusative construction has replaced others less common and even some once common, since we now feel that the accusative is the natural case form of a noun that completes the meaning of the verb. It is now much used to denote manner: ‘He came full speed.’ ‘The blindfolded man ran full tilt into the fence.’ ‘Have it your own way.’ ‘The windows of the tower face both ways.’ ‘Having sampled America [in] that way, Europe believes and trusts America’ (Woodrow Wilson, July 4, 1919). ‘She ran her fingers comb fashion through her hair.’ ‘Let us go shares, halves!’ ‘I came in and went to bed the same as usual.’ ‘Then why do you come your frowning high and mighty airs with me?’ (William Heyliger, American Boy, Sept., 1927, p. 34). ‘You can’t come it with me.’ In colloquial speech sure thing is often used as an intensive form of colloquial sure (= literary surely): ‘Now that you boys know what the expedition is going to face are you still anxious to go along?’—‘Sure thing’ (Victor Appleton, Don Sturdy in Lion Land, Ch. IV). Also to indicate time, where in more careful language we find a preposition: ‘What (or at what) time do you go?’ Also to indicate place in certain set expressions, but rarely with a single unmodified noun: ‘He struck me on the head,’ but ‘He smote them hip and thigh.’ ‘Bind them hand and foot!’ In the concrete language of popular speech the adverbial accusative of a modified noun is often used instead of an adverb: ‘I looked
every place (instead of literary everywhere) for it.’ ‘What place (instead of literary where) would we run?’ (Synge, The Well of the Saints, Act III).

In many distributive expressions, the noun following a is now construed as an adverbial accusative of extent, but the a, though now felt as an indefinite article, is in fact the reduced form of the preposition on: ‘I visit him twice a year.’ ‘A robin frequently raises two broods a season.’ This construction was originally confined to expressions of time, as in these examples, but it now has much wider boundaries: ‘His terms are a penny a line.’ ‘She asks five dollars a lesson.’ ‘I paid six dollars a pair for my shoes.’

The definite article is sometimes used here instead of the indefinite: ‘She sold her corn at ten shillings the bushel’ (Winthrop, Journal, April 27, 1631). ‘Wheat was at twenty shillings the quarter’ (Macaulay, History, I, Ch. III). ‘Five cents the copy’ (The Saturday Evening Post, Aug. 8, 1925). ‘How much is salmon the can now?’ (Zona Gale, Miss Lulu Bett, Ch. I). We now feel can in the last example as an accusative of extent; but, perhaps originally, it was a nominative, an appositive to salmon. Most of these expressions, except those indicating time, may have originated in this way.

b. ‘THIS’ AND ‘THAT’ USED ADVERBALLY. In the fifteenth century the principle of employing the accusative of indefinite pronouns adverbially to indicate extent or degree was extended to the definite pronouns this and that: ‘This (or that or thus or so) much I hold to be true.’ This usage is best established in the case of ‘this much’ and ‘that much,’ but in colloquial language it has spread much farther: ‘I’ve never been this sick before.’ ‘He didn’t get home until after one o’clock, and his mother told him if he ever came home that late again she would punish him severely.’ On account of the accuracy of expression here adverbial this and that are sometimes employed in the literary language, in spite of the protests of grammarians: ‘Oh, Mimo! how could you let him sit on the grass! Zara exclaimed reproachfully, when he got this far’ (Elinor Glyn, The Reason Why, Ch. XV). ‘I didn’t think he was that young’ (Jack London, Martin Eden, I, Ch. II). Also used like so, pointing to a following clause of result: ‘I’m that hungry, I could eat a dog’ (Hall Caine, The Woman Thou Gavest Me, Ch. IV). Quite commonly in popular speech: ‘I was just that pleased I set down an’ bust out cryin’’ (Alice Hegan Rice, Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch, Ch. VII).

The demonstrative that is thus often used adverbially, but the demonstrative such, which has a somewhat similar meaning, always remains an adjective, although often classed as an adverb.
That it is an attributive adjective when it stands before a descriptive adjective is shown by the fact that it can never be used when there is no noun after the descriptive adjective, i.e., when the descriptive adjective is used predicatively: 'such severe weather,' but not 'The weather is such severe.'

c. Adverbial Use of 'The.' The old neuter instrumental case of the determinative and demonstrative that still survives in the form of the in two common constructions: (1) In clauses of degree expressing proportionate agreement: 'This stone gets the harder the longer it is exposed to the weather.' See 29 1 A b for a more detailed description of this construction. (2) As a determinative adverb of cause standing before a comparative, indicating cause, however, in only a formal way, pointing forward to a following clause or phrase of cause which contains the real cause: 'His unkindness hurt me all the more because I had been previously so kind to him' (or because of my previous kindness to him). 'The indications of inward disturbance moved Archer the more that he too felt that the Mingotts (name) had gone a little too far' (Edith Wharton, The Age of Innocence, Ch. V). 'I think a little the worse of him on this account.' 'She clung the more fiercely to her father for having lost her lover.' The cause is often not thus formally expressed in a clause or phrase of cause but implied in something that has preceded: 'Sir Arthur looked sternly at her. Her head only dropped the lower.' 'If she were silent there was one listener the more.' Compare 30 a.

5. Comparison of Adverbs:

a. Relative Comparison. Adverbs are compared much as adjectives, as described in 54-55. A few monosyllabic adverbs add -er in the comparative and -est in the superlative: fast, faster, fastest. 'He climbed higher.' 'He lives nearer us.' 'Come up closer to the fire.' 'John worked hardest.' 'He couldn't speak finer if he wanted to borrow' (George Eliot). 'I can't stay longer.' 'I would sooner die than do it.' Also the dissyllables, often, easy, early, are compared by means of endings: 'He is absent oftener than is necessary.' 'Easier said than done.' 'You ought to have told me earlier.'

Earlier in the period, terminational comparison was often used where we now employ more and most: 'There is almost no man but he sees clearlier and sharper (now more clearly and sharply) the vices in a speaker then (now than) the vertues' (Ben Jonson, Discoveries, p. 19, A.D. 1641).

Most adverbs are now compared by means of more, most and less, least: rapidly, móre rapidly, móst rapidly; rapidly, lésst rapidly, lést rapidly.
aa. Irregularities. A few irregularities in the form occur, corresponding closely to those found in adjectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Best</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ill, illy (obs.), badly</td>
<td>worse</td>
<td>worst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near, nigh (54 a aa)</td>
<td>nearer, nigher</td>
<td>nearest, nighest, next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far</td>
<td>farther, further</td>
<td>farthest, furthest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>later</td>
<td>last</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rather (comparative of obs. rathe, 'soon')

One of the outstanding features of popular speech is the use of good for well: 'I don’t hear good' (instead of well).

bb. Newer Forms of Expression. Besides the normal usage described on page 147 there is another which is quite common in colloquial speech and occurs sometimes in the literary language. The superlative is formed by employing the adverbial neuter accusative of the noun made from the adjective superlative preceded by the definite article: 'All good and wise Men certainly take care To help themselves and families the first' (Robert Rogers, Ponteach, I, iv, A.D. 1776). 'I am going . . . to Havre, whence I shall get the quickest to Southampton' (Charlotte Smith, Emmeline, IV, 55, A.D. 1788). 'Of all my books I like this the best' (Dickens, David Copperfield, Preface). 'He was the greatest patriot in their eyes who brawled the loudest and who cared the least for decency' (id., Martin Chuzzlewit, Ch. XVI). 'It is impossible to say whose eyes would be the widest opened' (Henry Arthur Jones, The Divine Gift, Dedication, p. 49). 'My father liked this the best' (Alfred, Lord Tennyson, A Memoir by His Son, 3, 245). 'We are sure that those who have known Sommerset the longest will thoroughly enjoy Mr. Hutton's pages' (Athenæum, Dec. 28, 1912). 'Great souls are they who love the most, who breathe the deepest of heaven's air, and give of themselves most freely' (William Allen White, A Certain Rich Man, Ch. XXII). 'Of all the orders of men they fascinate me the most' (H. L. Mencken, Prejudices, Series III, p. 217).

This form is now spreading also to the comparative: 'He runs the faster (instead of the simple faster). 'This led him to consider which of them could be the better spared' (Dickens, Martin Chuzzlewit, Ch. XXXIII). 'I hardly know who was the more to blame for it' (L. M. Montgomery, Anne of Avonlea, Ch. XXIII). 'Ruth could not tell which she liked the better' (Lucy Fitch Perkins, The Children's Yearbook, p. 17).
In the case of the analytic form with *most*, *least*, *more*, *less*,
this adverbial neuter accusative cannot be used at all. We often,
however, add the adverbial ending *-ly* to the analytic adjective,
superlative or comparative, preceded by the definite article, thus
marking the form clearly as an adverb: ‘If it be true that such
meat as is *the most dangerously* earned is the sweetest’ (Goldsmith,
*Natural History*, VI, 82, A.D. 1774). ‘It was difficult to say which
of the young men seemed to regard her *the most tenderly*’ (Thack­
eray, *Pendennis*, II, Ch. XX). ‘Standing here between you the
Englishman, so clever in your foolishness, and this Irishman, so
foolish in his cleverness, I cannot in my ignorance be sure which
of you is *the more deeply damned*’ (George Bernard Shaw, *John
Bull’s Other Island*, Act IV).

In the relation of sentence adverbs the adverbial neuter ac­
cusative form of the superlative is replaced by an adverbial phrase,
consisting of the preposition *at* and the noun made from the ad­
jective superlative preceded by the definite article: ‘I cannot
hear from Dick *at the earliest* before Tuesday’ (Mrs. Alexander,
*A Life Interest*, II, Ch. XVIII), or ‘*At the earliest* I can’t hear
from Dick before Tuesday.’

When it is not the actions of different persons that are com­
pared but the actions of one and the same person at different
times and under different circumstances, we employ the adver­
bial neuter accusative of the noun made from the adjective superla­
tive preceded by a possessive adjective: ‘Two women shrieked
*their loudest*’ (Thackeray, *Pendennis*, II, Ch. XXXVIII).
‘Carver smiled *his pleasantest*’ (R. D. Blackmore, *Lorna Doone*,
Ch. XXVIII). An adverbial phrase with the preposition *at* is
sometimes used instead of the adverbial accusative: ‘He led me
in a courtly manner, stepping *at his tallest*, to an open place beside
the water’ (*ib.*, Ch. XXI). In the relation of sentence adverb
this prepositional phrase form is quite common and freely used
both with the simple and the analytic superlative, especially the
latter: ‘Even *at his ungainliest and his most wilful*, Mr. Thompson
sins still in the grand manner’ (Academy, April 14, 1894, 303).
‘Nature *at her most unadorned* never takes that air of nakedness
which a great open unabashed window throws upon the land­
scape’ (*Atlantic Monthly*, March, 1887, 324).

\[b. \text{ABSOLUTE SUPERLATIVE.} \] This superlative of the adverb is
formed from the absolute superlative of the adjective (54 2 a):
‘Mary’s mother is *a most b é a u t i f u l w o m a n*’ and ‘Mary’s mother
sings *most b é a u t i f u l y*.’

The absolute superlative is sometimes formed by employing
the adverbial neuter accusative of the noun made from the adjec-
tive superlative preceded by the definite article: 'I do not the least mind it' (Alfred, Lord Tennyson, A Memoir by His Son, 4, 72). 'It does not matter the least' (Florence Montgomery, Misunderstood, Ch. IV).

Instead of this form we often use a prepositional phrase containing a simple superlative of an adjective in attributive use, standing before a noun or the simple superlative used as a noun and preceded by the definite article: 'The letter was written in the kindest spirit.' 'That does not concern me in the least.' Compare 54 2 a (3rd par.).

Instead of a superlative here we more commonly use a positive modified by very, exceedingly, absolutely, etc.: 'She sings very beautifully.' In colloquial and popular language, the intensive adverbs, awfully, dreadfully, terribly, etc., are common, sometimes without the suffix -ly before an adverb: 'The work is moving awfully slow.' 'I lived mighty comfortably.'

To express an absolutely high degree of activity in connection with a verb, we place very before an adverb of degree, such as much, greatly, etc.: 'He is suffering very much.' To express an absolutely high degree of a quality, we place very before the positive of the adjective: 'very sick, very pleasing, a very distressed look.' But instead of saying 'I was very much pleased, very greatly distressed,' many incorrectly say 'I was very pleased, very distressed,' feeling pleased and distressed as adjective rather than as verbal forms, which they are. Similarly, we should use too much, too greatly before verbal forms, not simple too: 'I was too much (or too greatly) discouraged by this failure to try again.'
17. Independent elements are words, phrases, or clauses which are not related grammatically to other parts of the sentence, or which stand all alone without sustaining any grammatical relation to some word understood. A historical study of these words shows that some of them were originally dependent. See 3 A, p. 152.

1. Interjections. The simplest interjections, such as oh! (usually O when not followed by a punctuation mark), ouch! belong to the oldest forms of spoken language and represent the most primitive type of sentence. Compare 2 a, p. 1. The large number of interjections now in use shows that they are as useful in modern life as in primitive times; indeed more useful, more needed, for the range of feeling is wider and the desire for varied expression greater: ah! (surprise or satisfaction), bah! or pooh! (disdain), botheration! (vexation), bravo! (approving, encouraging), goody! (joy), alas! (literary form expressing disappointment, grief) or dear me! or oh, dear me! (colloquial), gee whillikers! (surprise), jumping geraniums! (vexation, surprise), why! (expressing discovery, objection, hesitancy, protest at the simplicity of a question), well! (expressing astonishment, relief, concession, resumption of talk), etc.

They are often embodied in modern sentences, without any grammatical relations to the other words, but imparting a distinct
shade of meaning to the sentence as a whole: ‘Oh, when will he come?’

The accusative is found in a few exclamations: ‘Dear me!’ ‘Unhappy me!’ Compare f, p. 6.

2. Direct Address. The name of a person who is called is often spoken alone without other words. Like interjections, such names are independent sentences of a primitive type, which, though a single word, can in connection with the situation and an appropriate accent convey a thought, as in John! spoken in loud tone and prolonged vowel to call him into the house, or John! spoken quickly with a short vowel and angry tone when we scold him. They are also often inserted in a modern sentence, without grammatical relation to the other words, but serving the useful purpose of arousing the attention of someone: ‘John, I’ve brought something home for you.’ Originally and still in the classical languages of antiquity, nouns thus used in direct address stood in a special case called the vocative. Later, the nominative was used for this purpose; always so in English.

3. Absolute Nominative. An absolute nominative, i.e., a nominative without grammatical relations to the principal proposition, is often used in English. There are four groups:

A. In Adverbial Clauses: ‘My task completed (= after my task was completed), I went to bed.’ ‘Off we started, he remaining behind’ (= while he remained behind). The nominative here forms with the words with which it is connected a clause in which it is the subject, and a following participle, adjective, or noun is the predicate. The predicate here now usually follows the subject, but in older English and in poetry it often precedes: ‘All loose her negligent attire, all loose her golden hair, Hung Margaret o’er her slaughtered sire’ (Scott, Last Minstrel, I, 10). This order is occasionally found in prose. See examples in a, c, and d, pp. 154, 155, 156. In one category, f, it is still employed regularly.

In Old English, the words in the adverbial clause stood in the dative, employed here in imitation of the Latin ablative. The Old English dative and the Latin ablative were in fact not used here absolutely since they stood in an adverbial relation to the principal verb, in that the words in the dative and ablative formed an adverbial clause in which the noun was subject, the accompanying participle, adjective, or noun was predicate, and the dative or ablative was the sign of subordination to the principal verb. This is the old appositional type of clause described in 6 B a, where the predicate is placed as an appositive alongside of the subject without the use of a copula. Later, when the inflections lost their distinctive case forms, the dative, no longer distinguish-
able as such, was construed as a nominative, an absolute nominative, since its form does not indicate any relation to the principal proposition. In the literary language, irregularly here and there under foreign influence, the objective case of the personal pronouns continued for a long while to be used here as a nearer approach to the original constructions than the nominative, lingering on into the seventeenth century: ‘Him destroyed for whom all this was made, all this will soon follow’ (Milton, *Paradise Lost*, IX, l. 130). On the other hand, the nominative of pronouns was used here in Middle English by Chaucer, and later this case gradually became established.

Originally, the adverbial clause was always without a copula, as was the rule for the old appositional type, but it is now often conformed to the modern type by the insertion of the copula between subject and predicate: ‘He *being* absent, nothing could be done.’ ‘My task *being* completed, I shall go to bed.’ ‘Mr. Smith *being* the toastmaster, I think we may expect an enjoyable time.’ The copula is now the rule where the predicate of the clause is an adjective, noun, adverb, or prepositional clause, but in older English the copula was lacking here: ‘Thou away, the very birds are mute’ (Shakespeare).

The scope of the nominative absolute construction has been greatly enlarged by the development of strong verbal force in the participle. Originally, the perfect participle could be used here only when it denoted a state, i.e., when it had adjective force, as in the first example in A, p. 152. The perfect participle in this example has passive force, but with intransitives it had active force if it denoted a finished state resulting from the action: ‘These obstacles removed and the right time come for action, we proceeded with energy.’ Here we still have the original condition of things. The two participles, *removed*, now felt as a passive, and *come*, felt as an active, are without any formal signs of tense and voice. They still have their old adjective form. But the verbal force is now so strongly felt in participles that we often give them forms for tense and voice, and hence we may also say here: ‘These obstacles *having been removed* and the right time for action *having come*, we proceeded with energy.’ Although the old adjective form without a sign for tense or voice is still common when the participle has passive force, we now usually give it a tense sign when its force is active: ‘Our luggage *arrived* (or now more commonly *having arrived*), I was dressed in a few minutes.’ ‘The clock *having struck*, we had to go.’ We might construe *arrived* as an adjective, since it denotes a state, but *struck* has only verbal force. Thus we can clearly see that the participle has often developed into a
verb with full verbal meaning, but as yet it has no forms for person, number, or mood, and though it can indicate tense and voice it hasn’t as many tense forms as the finite verb. On the other hand, it is a terse and convenient construction for all practical purposes. For the most part, however, it has become established in the literary language better than in colloquial and popular speech.

Originally, the predicate here was a noun or an adjective, or a participle with adjective force. As we have just seen, the participle has often developed into a verb. The predicate may now be also an adverb or a prepositional phrase: ‘The meal over, prayers were read by Miss Miller’ (Charlotte Brontë, Jane Eyre, Ch. V). ‘John being away, Henry had to do his work.’ ‘He went off, gun in hand.’ In older English, and sometimes still, we find the prepositional infinitive used here as predicate: ‘I send you today three fourths of the sum agreed upon between us, the rest to follow within a month.’ In popular Irish, the infinitive has come into wide use here, so that it can be employed in every kind of subordinate clause, in conditional clauses, temporal clauses, etc.: (conditional clause) ‘It would not be for honor she to go without that much’ (Lady Gregory, McDonough’s Wife). As explained in 19 3, such clauses are often introduced by and: ‘Little it will signify, and we to be making clay (temporal clause = when we shall be moldering in the grave), who was it dug a hole through the nettles or lifted down the sods over our heads’ (ib.).

Instead of the nominative of a personal pronoun we often find here in popular and colloquial speech the accusative, as so often elsewhere in constructions where there is no finite verb, as described in 7 C a: ‘It will be a very good match for me, m’m, me being an orphan girl’ (H. G. Wells, The Country of the Blind, p. 16). ‘You wouldn’t expect anything else, would you, me (instead of the choicer I) being here like this, so suddenly, and talking face to face with you’ (Arnold Bennett, Sacred and Profane Love, Act I, p. 25). ‘It is strange he hasn’t married with all his money, and him (instead of the choicer he) so fond of children’ (Kate Douglas Wiggin, Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm). The accusative subject here is, of course, of entirely different origin from the accusative subject in A (2nd par., p. 153).

The following relations are expressed by this absolute construction:

a. Time: ‘My task having been finished, I went to bed.’ ‘Tea over and the tray removed, she again summoned us to the fire.’

In older English, a preposition was often placed before this construction to make the time relations clearer: ‘I . . . commyttted them vnto ward (prison) where they now do remayne till your gracious pleasure knowen’ (Thomas Cromwell, Letter to Henry VIII, July 23, 1533). ‘After my
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instructions dispatched, I came away in haste' (Sir William Temple, Letter, Sept. 6, 1665). ‘Upon the peace concluded between the Dutch and the same Indians, she was restored to the Dutch governor’ (Winthrop, Journal, July 5, 1646). Compare 20 3 (next to last par.).

Sometimes, as often in older English, the predicate precedes the subject: ‘She’s to be married, turned Michaelmas’ (George Eliot, Silas Marner, II, Ch. XVII). Compare c.

b. Cause: ‘The rain having ruined my hat, I had to get a new one.’ Compare 30 b (4th par.).

The nominative absolute construction is often replaced here by a prepositional phrase: ‘She is lonesome with her husband so much away.’ Compare a (2nd par., p. 154) and 20 3 (next to last par.).

c. Condition and Exception: ‘And in a little while you will come back to me, will you not?’ — ‘Yes, dear, God willing.’ ‘Family for family, a group of small-holders will absorb a much greater amount of industrial produce than the same number of persons, farmer and laborer, in normal proportions, in the large-farm system’ (Noel Skelton, The Quarterly Review, July, 1925, p. 198). ‘As yet few have done their full duty, present company excepted.’

There were formerly two word-orders in the absolute construction, not only here in the clause of condition and exception, but also in clauses of cause, time, concession, etc. The predicate could not only, as in the preceding examples, follow the subject (either a noun or a clause), but could also precede it. Clause of cause: ‘Therefore seen (now seeing; see 4, p. 158) you thinke it not gude to invade, my councell is that we campe still on the bordures’ (Holinshed, History of Scotland, 309, A.D. 1577-1586). Clause of condition: ‘It is enough, considered how easy it is to copy out words from other Dictionaries’ (Gentl. Mag., LVIII, 1153, A.D. 1778). It is still preserved in conditional clauses after a few participles, except (contracted from excepted; see also 31 1 d aa), granted, given, settled, etc.: ‘The whole kingdom, except a small corner (or a small corner excepted), was subjected to the Turkish yoke.’ ‘Granted then these correspondences between Spenser on the one hand and Aristotle and his immediate successors on the other, we may pass to an inquiry into our poet’s indebtedness to the tradition of Christian ethics that derives from the Greek philosopher’ (H. S. V. Jones, The Journal of English and Germanic Philology, p. 288, July, 1926). ‘Given the choice of a fine home without a car and a modest one with a car, the latter will win’ (William Ashdown in Atlantic Monthly, June, 1925). ‘Given such a principle and such a method, it follows that the function of any textbook is to remain in the background until needed’ (D. D. Farrington, The Essay. Introduction). The subject may be a clause: ‘Once settled that teachers must hold the views on all controversial matters that suit the particular community, what persons of independent thought and action will become and remain teachers?’ (American Federation of Teachers, July 11, 1925). This old word-order occurs occasionally also in a, p. 154, and d, p.156, and is even employed regularly in f, p. 157.

This old word-order survives also with the participles during, pending,
notwithstanding and the adjective save (originally with the meaning 'safe,' 'intact,' 'excepted'), but the feeling for the original construction has disappeared, since the old word-order, no longer understood, has obscured the original grammatical relations. Since these words now stand before a noun or a pronoun, except sometimes notwithstanding, as in this notwithstanding, they are now often construed as prepositions; during, pending, notwithstanding regularly so, save, felt by some as a preposition, by others as a conjunction introducing an elliptical clause of exception, as described in 31. Similarly, since the original construction is no longer understood, except is construed by some as a preposition, by others as a conjunction of exception; by still others as the imperative of the transitive verb except. See 31.

When the subject is a clause, this old word-order is still employed also with the past participles provided, given, granted as predicate: 'I will come provided that I have time.' 'Given that he and they have a common object, the one test that he must apply to them is as to their ability to help in achieving that object' (Theodore Roosevelt, The Strenuous Life, p. 74). 'Granted (or granting) that he had the best intentions, his conduct was productive of great mischief.' As past participles do not now usually stand before a clause and hence are not recognized here as predicate in an absolute nominative construction, provided that, given that, granted that are for the most part felt as conjunctions introducing a subordinate clause, provided that and given that introducing a clause of condition, granted that introducing a clause of concession, as in the last example, or a clause of condition. Compare 31 and 32.

The nominative absolute construction is often replaced in the clause of condition by a prepositional phrase: 'With conditions in every way favorable, he might succeed.' Compare 20 3 (next to last par.).

d. Attendant Circumstance: 'He entered upon the new enterprise cautiously, his eyes wide-open,' or here more commonly with a prepositional phrase with wide-open eyes, or with eyes wide-open.

Instead of an adjective element in the predicate relation we often find an adverb or a prepositional phrase or both, for adverbs and prepositional phrases are now quite commonly used as predicates: 'He sat at the table, collar off, head down, and pen in position, ready to begin the long letter' (or with collar off, head down, etc.). The absolute nominative here before a prepositional phrase is more common and natural than anywhere else: 'He lay on his back, his knees in the air, his hands crossed behind his head' (or with his knees in the air, etc.). The form with with was common in Old English and the older stages of all the Germanic languages and is still everywhere in common use. It is native English. Compare 20 3 (next to last par.).

Especial attention is here called to the frequent use of the prepositional infinitive as predicate, which is only a particular application of the common employment of a prepositional phrase as predicate: 'He made a will bequeathing all he possessed to his niece, Mrs. Joyce, the interest for her sole use, the principal to revert to her eldest son after her death.' Sometimes the absolute nominative follows the prepositional phrase,
i.e., contrary to ordinary usage the predicate of the clause precedes the subject of the clause: ‘She stands before him with the dressing gown on her arm, in her eyes an odd look’ (Francis R. Bellamy, The Balance, Ch. IX). This word-order emphasizes the subject of the clause.

e. Manner Proper: ‘He put on his socks wrong side out.’ The absolute construction is often replaced here by a prepositional phrase: ‘He put on his socks with the wrong side out.’ Compare 20 3 (next to last par.).

f. Concession, usually with the predicate of the clause before the subject: ‘Granted the very best intentions, his conduct was productive of great mischief.’ ‘Whatever the immediate outcome of the political and financial crisis in France, it is certain that sooner or later the French people must deal with the results of their government’s post-war policies in some drastic way’ (Chicago Tribune, April 8, 1925). Compare 32 2 (7th par., last example).

The absolute construction is often not possible in this category. It is then usually replaced by a prepositional phrase: ‘Even with conditions quite unfavorable, he would succeed.’ The prepositional construction is often used even where the absolute construction is possible: ‘Art is always art, poetry is always poetry, in whatever form’ (Harold Williams, Modern English Writers, p. 296), or whatever the form.

B. NOMINATIVE ABSOLUTE IN SUBJECT CLAUSES. We often find, especially in colloquial speech, an absolute nominative in subject clauses, where the absolute nominative serves as the logical subject of the clause, and a participle, adjective, or prepositional phrase as the logical predicate: ‘I pray you let me have the dayt of the marriage of my cosyn Hair and your daughter . . . and ye thus doing bynds me to doe you as great a pleasure’ (Plumpton Correspondence, p. 215, A.D. 1515). ‘I avoided him . . . my reasons are that people seeing me speak to him causes a great deal of teasing’ (Swift, J., 493, quoted from Jespersen’s On Some Disputed Points, S. P. E., Tract No. XXV). ‘My two big sisters having now charge of things in the house makes it much easier for Mother.’ ‘Three such rascals hanged in one day is good work for society.’ ‘These difficulties overcome makes the rest easy.’ ‘But things being as they are makes other things, which would have been different otherwise, different from what they would have been’ (Sir Walter Raleigh, Letter to John Sampson, May 4, 1905). ‘She and her sister both being sick makes hard work for the rest of the family.’ ‘Women having the vote reduces men’s political power.’ ‘He saying (present participle) he is sorry alters the case,’ or more commonly ‘His saying he is sorry alters the case.’ ‘It is vilely unjust, men closing two-thirds of the respectable careers to women!’ (Sir Harry Johnston, Mrs. Warren’s Daughter, Ch. III). ‘John and Henry rough-housing every night is enough to destroy the strongest nerves.’ ‘Her hand in his gave him strength
to speak' (De Morgan, *Somehow Good*, Ch. XLVI). The principal verb here is, of course, always in the singular, since its subject is a clause. Other examples in 21 e (last 4 parr.). Compare 50 3 (next to last par.).

In older English, the prepositional infinitive often serves here as predicate: ‘If itt happen the rent to be behynde’ (*Lincoln Diocese Documents*, p. 172, May 19, 1534). ‘It happened immediately Ferardo to retourne home’ (John Lyly, *Euphues*, Works, I, 242, A.D. 1578). ‘I to bear this is some burden’ (*Shakespeare, Timon*, IV, iii, 266). In popular Irish English the to-infinitive has come into wide use here as predicate: (speaking to his wife who lies dead before him) ‘It is a bad case you to have gone and to have left me’ (*Lady Gregory, McDonough’s Wife*). ‘A great wonder he not to have come, and this the fair day of Galway’ (ib.). Compare 21 e (7th par.).

The subject clause in all these cases is of the old appositional type found in A and described in 6 B a. The predicate participle, prepositional phrase, or infinitive lies alongside of the subject, predicating without the aid of a copula.


D. Absolute Nominative in Appositive Clauses: ‘Well, that is just our way, exactly — one half of the administration always busy getting the family into trouble, the other half busy getting it out again’ (Mark Twain, *Letter to Mrs. Grover Cleveland*, Nov. 6, 1887).

4. Absolute Participles. In English, the predicate appositive construction with a present participle is a very common type of abridged adverbial clause: ‘Taking all things into consideration, I must regard my life as a happy one’ = ‘If I take all things into consideration, I must regard my life as a happy one.’ The abridged participial clause usually has a subject which is identical with that of the principal proposition and as a predicate appositive expresses the adverbial relations of condition, cause, etc. A number of these clauses have in course of time become set adverbial elements of condition, cause, concession, etc., and are no longer thought of in connection with a definite subject any more than is any other adverb: ‘Taking all things into consideration (no longer an appositive to the subject but an adverbial element of condition), his life is a happy one.’ If we try to analyze such a clause we can, of course, find no definite subject since it no longer has relations to the subject of the principal proposition. As it has no definite subject, we feel that it has an indefinite or general
subject = if one takes all things into consideration. ‘There are certain proposals for future educational policy, which, omitting details (= if one omits details), may be summarized as follows’ (Manchester Guardian, VII, 8, 150). ‘Generally speaking (= if one may speak in a general sense), boys are a nuisance.’ ‘They suffered little, considering the exposure’ (or that they were badly exposed). ‘Judging from the lengthy notes used by them, the occasion was deemed of great importance.’ The absolute present participle in such clauses of condition has become quite common where the subject is indefinite, as in these examples. Where the reference is indefinite, infinitive, gerund, and participle are often without an expressed subject. Compare 31 2.

Because the subject is indefinite, the absolute participle is common in two other categories—in clauses of concession and in clauses of cause: ‘Even granting the best intentions on his part (or that he had the best intentions; concession), his conduct was productive of mischief.’ ‘The roads in Guernsey are good, which is not to be wondered at, seeing the abundance of granite’ (or that there is an abundance of granite; cause). Compare 32 2 and 30 b (3rd par.).

Like the present and the past participle in 3 A c, p. 155, the present participle here stands before a noun or a clause, but it has not, as in the case of these participles, developed into a preposition or a conjunction. There has been no change here in the word-order. It stands before its object like other present participles, and we still feel it as a present participle, only it is used absolutely without a subject expressed or understood. We feel that there is no need of a subject, as the reference is indefinite. Compare 32 2 and 30 b (3rd par.).

In a number of cases an adjective present participle with its accusative or prepositional object often becomes detached from nouns and for convenience of expression is attached to a verb, thus becoming a preposition: ‘He made me a communication concerning (adjective participle) my friend,’ but ‘He communicated with me concerning (preposition) my friend.’ ‘A peculiar effect owing (adjective participle) to the presence of light,’ but ‘Owing to (preposition) unfavorable weather I was unable to proceed.’ Thus have arisen also the prepositions regarding, touching, including, etc. Compare 62 (5th par.).

Thus the detached, ‘dangling’ or ‘hanging,’ participle has become established here and there in certain categories. It is found also in a few set expressions: ‘The vote of condolence was passed standing.’ ‘Beginning with the July number, it is intended materially to widen the scope of this Quarterly’ (Oxford and
Cambridge Review). ‘Talking of subscriptions, here is one to which your lordship may affix your name.’ In general, however, although occasionally found in good authors, it is felt as slovenly English in spite of its frequency in colloquial speech: ‘Being not yet fully grown, his trousers were too long.’ In older English, the dangling participle was more widely used than today. It was employed even by careful writers where it cannot now be used: ‘In their meals there is great silence and gravitie, using wine rather to ease the stomacke then (now than) to load it’ (John Lyly, Euphues and His England, Works, II, p. 194, A.D. 1580).