English Syntax

ENGLISH SYNTAX

Sanjay Kumar Singh

ANMOL PUBLICATIONS PVT. LTD.
NEW DELHI-110 002 (INDIA)

ANMOL PUBLICATIONS PVT. LTD.
Regd. Office: 4360/4, Ansari Road, Daryaganj,
New Delhi-110002 (India)
Tel.: 23278000, 23261597, 23286875, 23255577
Fax: 91-11-23280289
Email: anmolpub@gmail.com
Visit us at: www.anmolpublications.com

Branch Office: No. 1015, Ist Main Road, BSK IIIrd Stage
IIIrd Phase, IIIrd Block, Bengaluru-560 085 (India)
Tel.: 080-41723429 • Fax: 080-26723604
Email: anmolpublicationsbangalore@gmail.com

English Syntax

First Edition, 2013

ISBN 978-81-261-4963-6

PRINTED IN INDIA

Printed at Balaji Offset, Delhi.

Contents

Preface

Within traditional grammar, the syntax of a language is described in terms of taxonomy (i.e. the classificatory list) of the range of different types of syntactic structures found in the language. The central assumption underpinning syntactic analysis in traditional grammar is that phrases and sentences are built up of a series of constituents (i.e. syntactic units), each of which belongs to a specific grammatical category and serves a specific grammatical function. Given this assumption, the task of the linguist analyzing the syntactic structure of any given type of sentence is to identify each of the constituents in the sentence, and (for each constituent) to say what category it belongs to and what function it serves. In contrast to the taxonomic approach adopted in traditional grammar, Noam Chomsky takes a cognitive approach to the study of grammar. For Chomsky, the goal of the linguist is to determine what it is that native speakers *know* about their native language which enables them to speak and understand the language fluently: hence, the study of language is part of the wider study of cognition (i.e. what human beings know). In a fairly obvious sense, any native speaker of a language can be said to *know* the grammar of his or her native language. Syntax is the study of the principles and processes by which sentences are constructed in particular languages. Syntactic investigation of a given language has as its goal the construction of a grammar that can be viewed as a device of some sort for producing the sentences of the language under analysis. Modern

research in syntax attempts to describe languages in terms of such rules. Many professionals in this discipline attempt to find general rules that apply to all natural languages. The term syntax is also used to refer to the rules governing the behavior of mathematical systems, such as formal languages used in logic and computer programming languages. Although there has been interplay in the development of the modern theoretical frameworks for the syntax of formal and natural languages, this article surveys only the latter. There are a number of theoretical approaches to the discipline of syntax. One school of thought, founded in the works of Derek Bickerton, sees syntax as a branch of biology, since it conceives of syntax as the study of linguistic knowledge as embodied in the human mind. Other linguists (e.g. Gerald Gazdar) take a more Platonistic view, since they regard syntax to be the study of an abstract formal system. Yet others (e.g. Joseph Greenberg) consider grammar a taxonomical device to reach broad generalizations across languages. Andrey Korsakov's school of thought suggests philosophic understanding of morphological and syntactic phenomena.

This publication titled, "English Syntax" provides readers with an introductory overview of *English syntax. Attempts are made* towards understanding English grammar in its totality. Focus lies on noun, pronoun, adjective, verb and adverb. Proper reflections are made on tense, preposition and conjugation. Special focus lies on phrase types, article and clause. Special reflections are made on adjunct, conjunct, disjunct and apposition. Additional focus lies on c-command, declension, word, gerund and grammatical aspects of syntax. This publication titled, "English Syntax" is completely user-friendly as it also gives readers a glossary, bibliography and index.

—Editor

1

Introduction to English Syntax

SYNTAX

In linguistics, syntax is the study of the principles and rules for constructing sentences in natural languages. In addition to referring to the discipline, the term *syntax* is also used to refer directly to the rules and principles that govern the sentence structure of any individual language, as in "the syntax of Modern Irish." Modern research in syntax attempts to describe languages in terms of such rules. Many professionals in this discipline attempt to find general rules that apply to all natural languages. The term *syntax* is also used to refer to the rules governing the behavior of mathematical systems, such as formal languages used in logic—see syntax (logic)—and computer programming languages—see syntax (programming languages). Although there has been an interplay in the development of the modern theoretical frameworks for the syntax of formal and natural languages, this article surveys only the latter.

Early History

Works on grammar were written long before modern syntax came about; the *Acmadhyayî* of Pagini is often cited as an example of a premodern work that approaches the sophistication of a modern syntactic theory. In the West, the school of thought that came to be known as "traditional grammar" began with the work of Dionysius

Thrax. For centuries, work in syntax was dominated by a framework known as *grammaire générale*, first expounded in 1660 by Antoine Arnauld in a book of the same title. This system took as its basic premise the assumption that language is a direct reflection of thought processes and therefore there is a single, most natural way to express a thought. That way, coincidentally, was exactly the way it was expressed in French. However, in the 19th century, with the development of historical-comparative linguistics, linguists began to realize the sheer diversity of human language, and to question fundamental assumptions about the relationship between language and logic. It became apparent that there was no such thing as the most natural way to express a thought, and therefore logic could no longer be relied upon as a basis for studying the structure of language. The Port-Royal grammar modeled the study of syntax upon that of logic (indeed, large parts of the Port-Royal Logic were copied or adapted from the *Grammaire générale*). Syntactic categories were identified with logical ones, and all sentences were analyzed in terms of "Subject – Copula – Predicate". Initially, this view was adopted even by the early comparative linguists such as Franz Bopp.

The central role of syntax within theoretical linguistics became clear only in the 20th century, which could reasonably be called the "century of syntactic theory" as far as linguistics is concerned. For a detailed and critical survey of the history of syntax in the last two centuries, see the monumental work by Graffi (2001).

Modern Theories

There are a number of theoretical approaches to the discipline of syntax. One school of thought, founded in the works of Derek Bickerton, sees syntax as a branch of biology, since it conceives of syntax as the study of linguistic knowledge as embodied in the human mind. Other linguists (e.g. Gerald Gazdar) take a more Platonistic view, since they regard syntax to be the study of an abstract formal

system. Yet others (e.g. Joseph Greenberg) consider grammar a taxonomical device to reach broad generalizations across languages. Andrey Korsakov's school of thought suggests philosophic understanding of morphological and syntactic phenomena. At foundations of their linguistic ideas, lies classical philosophy which treats reality as consisting of things, their qualities and relationships. From here the followers of Korsakov's school assert the subdivision of words by the parts of speech. Syntactic problems also get their enlightenment in the terms of philosophic processes. Some more approaches to the discipline are listed below.

Regarding the proliferation of theoretical linguistics frameworks, van Benthem and ter Meulen wrote in their 1997 (1st edition) of *Handbook of Logic and Language*:

> "In the 80's, 'frameworks' started appearing, trying to change and monopolize part of the research agenda, and authors felt the need to present their ideas more forcefully as 'theories' with appealing names, forming schools and proselytizing. Part of this may be symptomatic for a young emerging area trying to establish itself, a phenomenon well documented in fields like linguistics and computer science. This trend toward separatism and rivaling research agendas, though it may have had positive effects in stimulating foundational discussions, has hampered communication, and generated much fortuitous competition."

Generative Grammar

The hypothesis of generative grammar is that language is a structure of the human mind. The goal of generative grammar is to make a complete model of this inner language (known as *i-language*). This model could be used to describe all human language and to predict the grammaticality of any given utterance (that is, to predict whether the utterance would sound correct to native speakers of the language). This approach to language was pioneered by Noam Chomsky. Most generative theories (although not all of them) assume that syntax is based upon the constituent structure of sentences. Generative grammars are among the theories

that focus primarily on the form of a sentence, rather than its communicative function.

Among the many generative theories of linguistics, the Chomskyan theories are:

- Transformational Grammar (TG) (Original theory of generative syntax laid out by Chomsky in *Syntactic Structures* in 1957)
- Government and binding theory (GB) (revised theory in the tradition of TG developed mainly by Chomsky in the 1970s and 1980s).
- Minimalist program (MP) (a reworking of the theory out of the GB framework published by Chomsky in 1995)

Other theories that find their origin in the generative paradigm are:

- Generative semantics (now largely out of date)
- Relational grammar (RG) (now largely out of date)
- Arc Pair grammar
- Generalized phrase structure grammar (GPSG; now largely out of date)
- Head-driven phrase structure grammar (HPSG)
- Lexical-functional grammar (LFG)
- Nanosyntax

Categorial Grammar

Categorial grammar is an approach that attributes the syntactic structure not to rules of grammar, but to the properties of the syntactic categories themselves. For example, rather than asserting that sentences are constructed by a rule that combines a noun phrase (NP) and a verb phrase (VP) (e.g. the phrase structure rule S '! NP VP), in categorial grammar, such principles are embedded in the category of the head word itself. So the syntactic category for an intransitive verb is a complex formula representing the fact that the verb acts as a functor

which requires an NP as an input and produces a sentence level structure as an output. This complex category is notated as (NP\S) instead of V. NP\S is read as " a category that searches to the left (indicated by \) for a NP (the element on the left) and outputs a sentence (the element on the right)". The category of transitive verb is defined as an element that requires two NPs (its subject and its direct object) to form a sentence. This is notated as (NP/(NP\S)) which means "a category that searches to the right (indicated by /) for an NP (the object), and generates a function (equivalent to the VP) which is (NP\S), which in turn represents a function that searches to the left for an NP and produces a sentence).

Tree-adjoining grammar is a categorial grammar that adds in partial tree structures to the categories.

Dependency Grammar

Dependency grammar is a different type of approach in which structure is determined by the relations (such as grammatical relations) between a word (a *head*) and its dependents, rather than being based in constituent structure. For example, syntactic structure is described in terms of whether a particular noun is the subject or agent of the verb, rather than describing the relations in terms of phrases.

Some dependency-based theories of syntax:

- Algebraic syntax
- Word grammar
- Operator Grammar
- Meaning-Text Theory

Stochastic/Probabilistic Grammars/network Theories

Theoretical approaches to syntax that are based upon probability theory are known as stochastic grammars. One common implementation of such an approach makes use of a neural network or connectionism. Some theories based within this approach are:

- Optimality theory
- Stochastic context-free grammar

Functionalist Grammars

Functionalist theories, although focused upon form, are driven by explanation based upon the function of a sentence (i.e. its communicative function). Some typical functionalist theories include:

- Functional grammar (Dik)
- Prague Linguistic Circle
- Systemic functional grammar
- Cognitive grammar
- Construction grammar (CxG)
- Role and reference grammar (RRG)
- Emergent grammar

ENGLISH SYNTAX

In linguistics, syntax is the study of the rules that govern the structure of sentences.

The term *syntax* can also be used to refer to these rules themselves, as in "the syntax of a language". Modern research in syntax attempts to describe languages in terms of such rules, and, for many practitioners, to find general rules that apply to all languages.

Other Pages

- Phrase
- Grammar

Syntactic Terms

- Adjective
- Adverb
- Article
- Clause
- Comparative

- Infinitive
- Noun
- Phrase
- Phrasal verb
- Plural
- Preposition
- Pronoun
- Superlative
- Verb
- Tense
- Word order

NANO-SYNTAX

Nanosyntax is an approach to syntax in which syntactic parse trees are built up out of a large number of syntactic constituents. Each morpheme may correspond to several such elements, which do not have to form a "subtree".

Some recent work in theoretical linguistics suggests that the "atoms" of syntax are much smaller than words or morphemes. From that it immediately follows that the responsibility of syntax is not limited to ordering "preconstructed" words. Instead, within the framework of nanosyntax, the words are derived entities built in syntax, rather than primitive elements supplied by a lexicon.

The beginnings of nanosyntax can be traced to a 1993 article by Kenneth Hale and S. Jay Keyser titled 'On Argument Structure and the Lexical Representation of Syntactic Relations', which first introduced the concept of l-syntax.

RECURSIVE CATEGORICAL SYNTAX

Recursive categorical syntax, also sometimes called algebraic syntax, is an algebraic theory of syntax developed by Michael Brame as an alternative to transformational-

generative grammar. It is a type of dependency grammar, and is related to link grammars.

Definition

Brame formulated an algebra, (technically a non-associative groupoid with inverses) of lexical items (words and phrases), or lexes for short. A lex is a string representation of a word or phrase together with a string of directed types. A directed type is a symbol representing a syntactic type together with a direction (up, down, left, right) usually given by an arrow beside or above the symbol. In this article left and down arrows will be placed to the left and right and up arrows to the right of symbols.

Lexical composition of two lexes is performed by concatenating the phonetic or orthographic representations and composing the directed type strings.

REFERENCES

Brame, Michael. "Recursive Categorical Syntax I: Semigroups, Monoids, Lattices, and Categories" in *Linguistic Analysis*, Vol. 14, No. 1.

Brame, Michael. "Universal Word Induction vs Move á" in *Linguistic Analysis*, Vol. 14, No. 4, 1984.

Brian Roark; Richard William Sproat (2007). *Computational approaches to morphology and syntax*. Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780199274772. part II: Computational approaches to syntax.

Brown, Keith; Jim Miller (eds.) (1996). *Concise Encyclopedia of Syntactic Theories*. New York: Elsevier Science. ISBN 0-08-042711-1.

Brown, Keith; Jim Miller (eds.) (1996). *Concise Encyclopedia of Syntactic Theories*. New York: Elsevier Science.

Carnie, Andrew (2006). *Syntax: A Generative Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. ISBN 1405133848.

Freidin, Robert; Howard Lasnik (eds.) (2006). *Syntax*. Critical Concepts in Linguistics. New York: Routledge. ISBN 0-415-24672-5.

Graffi, Giorgio (2001). *200 Years of Syntax. A Critical Survey*. Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 98. Amsterdam: Benjamins. ISBN 90-272-4587-8.

Hale, Kenneth and S. Jay Keyser. 1993. On Argument Structure and the Lexical Representation of Syntactic Relations. In *The View from Building 20*, edited by Kenneth Hale and S. Jay Keyser, pp. 53-109. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. ISBN 978-0262581240.

Martin Everaert, Henk Van Riemsdijk, Rob Goedemans and Bart Hollebrandse, ed (2006). *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. Blackwell. ISBN 9781405114851. 5 Volumes; 77 case studies of syntactic phenomena.

Mieszko Talasiewicz (2009). *Philosophy of Syntax - Foundational Topics*. Springer. ISBN 9789048132874. An interdisciplinary essay on the interplay between logic and linguistics on syntactic theories.

Starke, Michal. 2011. Towards an elegant solution to language variation: Variation reduces to the size of lexically stored trees. MS. Barcelona, Spain.

2

Towards Understanding English Grammar in Its Totality

GRAMMAR

Grammar means the rules about how to speak and write in a language. The Ancient Greeks used to call it *grammatikç tékhnç*, the craft of letters. It can have any of these meanings:

1. The study of a language: how it works, and everything about it. This is *background research on language*.
2. The study of sentence structure. A set of rules and examples to illustrate how the language should be used. This is a *correct usage grammar*, as in a textbook or manual.
3. The system which people learn as they grow up. This is the *native-speaker's grammar*.

When we speak, we use the native-person's grammar, or as near as we can. When we write, we try to write with correct usage grammar. So, speaking and writing a language each have their own style.

Different Languages

All languages have their own grammar. Most European languages are rather similar whereas, for example, Chinese and Japanese are very different from all European

languages. Nevertheless, English has its own quite special characteristics.

English makes few changes to its word endings ('suffixes'). In the Italic or 'Romance' languages (such as French, Italian, Spanish), word endings carry a lot of meaning. In English we have just a few: plurals and posessives (*John's*) are the most common. In our verbs we have dropped most endings except one: I love, you love, but *she loves*. That final 's' is a remnant of Anglo-Saxon, which had more suffixes. Verbs do have endings which show changes in tense: walked, walking.

Word order is the other big difference. All Romance languages normally put their adjectives in front of the nouns. For example, in English, a person may say *I like fast cars*, but in Spanish, it is *Me gustan los coches rápidos*. The order of the words has changed: if just the words, without the grammar, are translated into English, it would mean 'to me they please the cars fast'. This is because Spanish and English have different rules about word order. In German, main verbs often come near the end of sentences, whereas in English we usually put them between subject and object, as: *the cat sat on the mat*.

Changing Language

Written grammar changes slowly but spoken grammar is more fluid. Sentences English speakers find normal today might have seemed strange to people 100 years ago. And they might not, because many of our favourite sayings come from the Authorized King James Version of the Bible, and from Shakespeare.

Some people use grammar that is different from other people when speaking. For example, people who use what is called General American English or BBC English might say, *I didn't do anything*, while someone who speaks what is called African American Vernacular English or AAVE might say, *I didn't do nothing*. London working class version: *I ain't done nuffink!* These are called *double negatives*, and

are found almost entirely in spoken language, not written language.

These differences are called dialects. The dialect a person uses is usually decided by where they live. Even though the dialects of English use different words or word order, they still have grammar rules. However, when writing in American English, grammar uses the rules of General American English. When people talk about using 'proper English', they usually mean using the grammar of general British English, as described in standard reference works. The models for *spoken* English in Britain are often called Received Pronunciation or BBC English.

Parts of Speech

Grammar studies nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, sentences, phrases, clauses, syntax.

IN LINGUISTICS - GRAMMAR

In linguistics, grammar is the set of structural rules that govern the composition of clauses, phrases, and words in any given natural language. The term refers also to the study of such rules, and this field includes morphology, syntax, and phonology, often complemented by phonetics, semantics, and pragmatics. Linguists do not normally use the term to refer to orthographical rules, although usage books and style guides that call themselves grammars may also refer to spelling and punctuation.

Use of the Term

The term "grammar" is often used by non-linguists with a very broad meaning indeed; as Jeremy Butterfield puts it: "grammar is often a generic way of referring to any aspect of English that people object to". However, linguists use it in a much more specific sense. Every speaker of a language has, in his or her head, a set of rules for using that language. This is a grammar, and—at least in the

case of one's native language—the vast majority of the information in it is acquired not by conscious study or instruction, but by observing other speakers; much of this work is done during infancy. Language learning later in life, of course, may involve a greater degree of explicit instruction.

The term "grammar" can also be used to describe the rules that govern the linguistic behaviour of a group of speakers. The term "English grammar," therefore, may have several meanings. It may refer to the whole of English grammar—that is, to the grammars of all the speakers of the language—in which case, the term encompasses a great deal of variation. Alternatively, it may refer only to what is common to the grammars of all, or of the vast majority of, English speakers (such as subject-verb-object word order in simple declarative sentences). Or it may refer to the rules of a particular, relatively well-defined variety of English (such as Standard English).

"*An* English grammar" is a specific description, study or analysis of such rules. A reference book describing the grammar of a language is called a "reference grammar" or simply "a grammar". A fully explicit grammar that exhaustively describes the grammatical constructions of a language is called a descriptive grammar. Linguistic description contrasts with linguistic prescription, which tries to enforce rules of how a language is to be used.

Grammatical frameworks are approaches to constructing grammars. The most known among the approaches is the traditional grammar which is traditionally taught in schools.

The standard framework of generative grammar is the transformational grammar model developed in various ways by Noam Chomsky and his associates from the 1950s onwards.

Etymology

The word *grammar* derives from *grammatikç techn*ç,

which means “art of letters”, from *gramma*, “letter”, itself from *graphein*, “to draw, to write”.

History

The first systematic grammars originated in Iron Age India, with Yaska (6th c. BC), Pânini (4th c. BC) and his commentators Pingala (ca. 200 BC), Katyayana, and Patanjali (2nd c. BC). In the West, grammar emerged as a discipline in Hellenism from the 3rd c. BC forward with authors like Rhyanus and Aristarchus of Samothrace, the oldest extant work being the *Art of Grammar*, attributed to Dionysius Thrax (ca. 100 BC). Latin grammar developed by following Greek models from the 1st century BC, due to the work of authors such as Orbilius Pupillus, Remmius Palaemon, Marcus Valerius Probus, Verrius Flaccus, and Aemilius Asper.

Tamil grammatical tradition also began around the 1st century BC with the Tolkâppiyam.

A grammar of Irish originated in the 7th century with the Auraicept na n-Éces.

Arabic grammar emerged from the 8th century with the work of Ibn Abi Ishaq and his students.

The first treatises on Hebrew grammar appeared in the High Middle Ages, in the context of Mishnah (exegesis of the Hebrew Bible). The Karaite tradition originated in Abbasid Baghdad. The *Diqduq* (10th century) is one of the earliest grammatical commentaries on the Hebrew Bible. Ibn Barun in the 12th century compares the Hebrew language with Arabic in the Islamic grammatical tradition.

Belonging to the *trivium* of the seven liberal arts, grammar was taught as a core discipline throughout the Middle Ages, following the influence of authors from Late Antiquity, such as Priscian. Treatment of vernaculars began gradually during the High Middle Ages, with isolated works such as the First Grammatical Treatise, but became influential only in the Renaissance and Baroque periods.

In 1486, Antonio de Nebrija published *Las introduciones Latinas contrapuesto el romance al Latin*, and the first Spanish grammar, *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, in 1492. During the 16th century Italian Renaissance, the *Questione della lingua* was the discussion on the status and ideal form of the Italian language, initiated by Dante's *de vulgari eloquentia* (Pietro Bembo, *Prose della volgar lingua* Venice 1525). The first grammar of Slovene language was written in 1584 by Adam Bohoriè.

Grammars of non-European languages began to be compiled for the purposes of evangelization and Bible translation from the 16th century onward, such as *Grammatica o Arte de la Lengua General de los Indios de los Reynos del Perú* (1560), and a Quechua grammar by Fray Domingo de Santo Tomás.

In 1643 there appeared Ivan Uzhevych's *Grammatica sclavonica* and, in 1762, the *Short Introduction to English Grammar* of Robert Lowth was also published. The *Grammatisch-Kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart*, a High German grammar in five volumes by Johann Christoph Adelung, appeared as early as 1774.

From the latter part of the 18th century, grammar came to be understood as a subfield of the emerging discipline of modern linguistics. The Serbian grammar by Vuk Stefanoviæ Karad•iæ arrived in 1814, while the *Deutsche Grammatik* of the Brothers Grimm was first published in 1818. The *Comparative Grammar* of Franz Bopp, the starting point of modern comparative linguistics, came out in 1833.

Development of Grammars

Grammars evolve through usage and also due to separations of the human population. With the advent of written representations, formal rules about language usage tend to appear also. Formal grammars are codifications of usage that are developed by repeated documentation over time, and by observation as well. As the rules become established and developed, the prescriptive concept of

grammatical correctness can arise. This often creates a discrepancy between contemporary usage and that which has been accepted, over time, as being correct. Linguists tend to view prescriptive grammars as having little justification beyond their authors' aesthetic tastes, although style guides may give useful advice about Standard English based on descriptions of usage in contemporary writing. Linguistic prescriptions also form part of the explanation for variation in speech, particularly variation in the speech of an individual speaker (an explanation, for example, for why some people say, "I didn't do nothing"; some say, "I didn't do anything"; and some say one or the other depending on social context).

The formal study of grammar is an important part of education for children from a young age through advanced learning, though the rules taught in schools are not a "grammar" in the sense most linguists use the term, particularly as they are often prescriptive rather than descriptive.

Constructed languages (also called planned languages or conlangs) are more common in the modern day. Many have been designed to aid human communication (for example, naturalistic Interlingua, schematic Esperanto, and the highly logic-compatible artificial language Lojban). Each of these languages has its own grammar.

Syntax refers to linguistic structure above the word level (e.g. how sentences are formed)—though without taking into account intonation, which is the domain of phonology. Morphology, by contrast, refers to structure at and below the word level (e.g. how compound words are formed), but above the level of individual sounds, which, like intonation, are in the domain of phonology. No clear line can be drawn, however, between syntax and morphology. Analytic languages use syntax to convey information that is encoded via inflection in synthetic languages. In other words, word order is not significant and morphology is highly significant

in a purely synthetic language, whereas morphology is not significant and syntax is highly significant in an analytic language. Chinese and Afrikaans, for example, are highly analytic, and meaning is therefore very context-dependent. (Both do have some inflections, and have had more in the past; thus, they are becoming even less synthetic and more "purely" analytic over time.) Latin, which is highly synthetic, uses affixes and inflections to convey the same information that Chinese does with syntax. Because Latin words are quite (though not completely) self-contained, an intelligible Latin sentence can be made from elements that are placed in a largely arbitrary order. Latin has a complex affixation and simple syntax, while Chinese has the opposite.

Grammar Frameworks

Various "grammar frameworks" have been developed in theoretical linguistics since the mid 20th century, in particular under the influence of the idea of a "universal grammar" in the United States. Of these, the main divisions are:

- Transformational grammar (TG)
- Systemic functional grammar (SFG)
- Principles and Parameters Theory (P&P)
- Lexical-functional Grammar (LFG)
- Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar (GPSG)
- Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG)
- Dependency grammars (DG)
- Role and reference grammar (RRG)

Education

Prescriptive grammar is taught in primary school (elementary school). The term "grammar school" historically refers to a school teaching Latin grammar to future Roman citizens, orators, and, later, Catholic priests. In its earliest form, "grammar school" referred to a school that taught students to read, scan, interpret, and declaim Greek and

Latin poets (including Homer, Virgil, Euripides, Ennius, and others). These should not be confused with the related, albeit distinct, modern British grammar schools.

A standard language is a particular dialect of a language that is promoted above other dialects in writing, education, and broadly speaking in the public sphere; it contrasts with vernacular dialects, which may be the objects of study in descriptive grammar but which are rarely taught prescriptively. The standardized "first language" taught in primary education may be subject to political controversy, since it establishes a standard defining nationality or ethnicity.

Recently, efforts have begun to update grammar instruction in primary and secondary education. The primary focus has been to prevent the use outdated prescriptive rules in favor of more accurate descriptive ones and to change perceptions about relative "correctness" of standard forms in comparison to non standard dialects.

The pre-eminence of Parisian French has reigned largely unchallenged throughout the history of modern French literature. Standard Italian is not based on the speech of the capital, Rome, but on the speech of Florence because of the influence Florentines had on early Italian literature. Similarly, standard Spanish is not based on the speech of Madrid, but on the one of educated speakers from more northerly areas like Castile and León. In Argentina and Uruguay the Spanish standard is based on the local dialects of Buenos Aires and Montevideo (Rioplatense Spanish). Portuguese has for now two official written standards, respectively Brazilian Portuguese and European Portuguese, but in a short term it will have a unified orthography

Norwegian has two standards, *Bokmål* and *Nynorsk*, the choice between which is subject to controversy: Each Norwegian municipality can declare one of the two its official language, or it can remain "language neutral". Nynorsk is endorsed by a minority of 27 percent of the

municipalities. The main language used in primary schools normally follows the official language of its municipality, and is decided by referendum within the local school district. Standard German emerged out of the standardized chancellery use of High German in the 16th and 17th centuries. Until about 1800, it was almost entirely a written language, but now it is so widely spoken that most of the former German dialects are nearly extinct.

Standard Chinese has official status as the standard spoken form of the Chinese language in the People's Republic of China (PRC), the Republic of China (ROC) and the Republic of Singapore. Pronunciation of Standard Chinese is based on the Beijing dialect of Mandarin Chinese, while grammar and syntax are based on modern vernacular written Chinese. Modern Standard Arabic is directly based on Classical Arabic, the language of the Qur'an. The Hindustani language has two standards, Hindi and Urdu.

In the United States, the Society for the Promotion of Good Grammar designated March 4 as National Grammar Day in 2008.

WORD GRAMMAR

Word grammar has been developed by Richard Hudson since the 1980s. It started as a model of syntax, whose most distinctive characteristic is its use of dependency grammar, an approach to syntax in which the sentence's structure is almost entirely contained in the information about individual words, and syntax is seen as consisting primarily of principles for combining words. The central syntactic relation is that of dependency between words; constituent structure is not recognized except in the special case of coordinate structures.

However an even more important claim of Word Grammar is that statements about words and their properties form a complex network of propositions. More recent work on Word Grammar cites neurocognitive

linguistics as a source of inspiration for the idea that language is nothing but a network. One of the attractions of the network view is the possibility of analysing language in the same way as other kinds of knowledge, given that knowledge, or long-term memory, is widely considered to be a network.

Word grammar is an example of cognitive linguistics, which models language as part of general knowledge and not as a specialised mental faculty. This is in contrast to the nativism of Noam Chomsky and his students.

OPERATOR GRAMMAR

Operator Grammar is a mathematical theory of human language that explains how language carries information. This theory is the culmination of the life work of Zellig Harris, with major publications toward the end of the last century. Operator Grammar proposes that each human language is a self-organizing system in which both the syntactic and semantic properties of a word are established purely in relation to other words. Thus, no external system (metalanguage) is required to define the rules of a language. Instead, these rules are learned through exposure to usage and through participation, as is the case with most social behavior. The theory is consistent with the idea that language evolved gradually, with each successive generation introducing new complexity and variation.

Operator Grammar posits three universal constraints: Dependency (certain words depend on the presence of other words to form an utterance), Likelihood (some combinations of words and their dependents are more likely than others) and Reduction (words in high likelihood combinations can be reduced to shorter forms, and sometimes omitted completely). Together these provide a theory of language information: dependency builds a predicate-argument structure; likelihood creates distinct meanings; reduction allows compact forms for communication.

Dependency

The fundamental mechanism of Operator Grammar is the dependency constraint: certain words (operators) require that one or more words (arguments) be present in an utterance. In the sentence *John wears boots*, the operator *wears* requires the presence of two arguments, such as *John* and *boots*. (This definition of dependency differs from other dependency grammars in which the arguments are said to depend on the operators.)

In each language the dependency relation among words gives rise to syntactic categories in which the allowable arguments of an operator are defined in terms of their dependency requirements. Class N contains words (e.g. *John*, *boots*) that do not require the presence of other words. Class O_N contains the words (e.g. *sleeps*) that require exactly one word of type N. Class O_{NN} contains the words (e.g. *wears*) that require two words of type N. Class O_{OO} contains the words (e.g. *because*) that require two words of type O, as in *John stumbles because John wears boots*. Other classes include O_O (*is possible*), O_{NNN} (*put*), O_{ON} (*with*, *surprise*), O_{NO} (*know*), O_{NNO} (*ask*) and O_{NOO} (*attribute*).

The categories in Operator Grammar are universal and are defined purely in terms of how words relate to other words, and do not rely on an external set of categories such as noun, verb, adjective, adverb, preposition, conjunction, etc. The dependency properties of each word are observable through usage and therefore learnable.

Likelihood

The dependency constraint creates a structure (syntax) in which any word of the appropriate class can be an argument for a given operator. The likelihood constraint places additional restrictions on this structure by making some operator/argument combinations more likely than others. Thus, *John wears hats* is more likely than *John wears snow* which in turn is more likely than *John wears vacation*. The likelihood constraint creates meaning

(semantics) by defining each word in terms of the words it can take as arguments, or of which it can be an argument.

Each word has a unique set of words with which it has been observed to occur called its selection. The coherent selection of a word is the set of words for which the dependency relation has above average likelihood. Words that are similar in meaning have similar coherent selection. This approach to meaning is self-organizing in that no external system is necessary to define what words mean. Instead, the meaning of the word is determined by its usage within a population of speakers. Patterns of frequent use are observable and therefore learnable. New words can be introduced at any time and defined through usage.

Reduction

The reduction constraint acts on high likelihood combinations of operators and arguments and makes more compact forms. Certain reductions allow words to be omitted completely from an utterance. For example, *I expect John to come* is reducible to *I expect John*, because *to come* is highly likely under *expect*. The sentence *John wears boots and John wears hats* can be reduced to *John wears boots and hats* because repetition of the first argument *John* under the operator *and* is highly likely. *John reads things* can be reduced to *John reads*, because the argument *things* has high likelihood of occurring under any operator.

Certain reductions reduce words to shorter forms, creating pronouns, suffixes and prefixes (morphology). *John wears boots and John wears hats* can be reduced to *John wears boots and he wears hats*, where the pronoun *he* is a reduced form of *John*. Suffixes and prefixes can be obtained by appending other freely occurring words, or variants of these. *John is able to be liked* can be reduced to *John is likeable*. *John is thoughtful* is reduced from *John is full of thought*, and *John is anti-war* from *John is against war*.

Modifiers are the result of several of these kinds of

reductions, which give rise to adjectives, adverbs, prepositional phrases, subordinate clauses, etc.

1. *John wears boots; the boots are of leather* (two sentences joined by semicolon operator) '!
2. *John wears boots which are of leather* (reduction of repeated noun to relative pronoun) '!
3. *John wears boots of leather* (omission of high likelihood phrase *which are*) '!
4. *John wears leather boots* (omission of high likelihood operator *of*, transposition of short modifier to left of noun)

Each language has a unique set of reductions. For example, some languages have morphology and some don't; some transpose short modifiers and some do not. Each word in a language participates only in certain kinds of reductions. However, in each case, the reduced material can be reconstructed from knowledge of what is likely in the given operator/argument combination. The reductions in which each word participates are observable and therefore learnable, just as one learns a word's dependency and likelihood properties.

Information

The importance of reductions in Operator Grammar is that they separate sentences that contain reduced forms from those that don't (base sentences). All reductions are paraphrases, since they do not remove any information, just make sentences more compact. Thus, the base sentences contain all the information of the language and the reduced sentences are variants of these. Base sentences are made up of simple words without modifiers and largely without affixes, e.g. *Snow falls*, *Sheep eat grass*, *John knows sheep eat grass*, *That sheep eat snow surprises John*.

Each operator in a sentence makes a contribution in information according to its likelihood of occurrence with its arguments. Highly expected combinations have low

information; rare combinations have high information. The precise contribution of an operator is determined by its selection, the set of words with which it occurs with high frequency. The arguments *boots*, *hats*, *sheep*, *grass* and *snow* differ in meaning according to the operators for which they can appear with high likelihood in first or second argument position. For example, *snow* is expected as first argument of *fall* but not of *eat*, while the reverse is true of *sheep*. Similarly, the operators *eat*, *devour*, *chew* and *swallow* differ in meaning to the extent that the arguments they select and the operators that select them differ.

Operator Grammar predicts that the information carried by a sentence is the accumulation of contributions of each argument and operator. The increment of information that a given word adds to a new sentences is determined by how it was used before. In turn, new usages stretch or even alter the information content associated with a word. Because this process is based on high frequency usage, the meanings of words are relatively stable over time, but can change in accordance with the needs of a linguistic community.

STOCHASTIC GRAMMAR

A stochastic grammar (statistical grammar) is a grammar framework with a probabilistic notion of grammaticality:

- Stochastic context-free grammar
- Statistical parsing
- Data-oriented parsing
- Hidden Markov model
- Estimation theory

Statistical natural language processing uses stochastic, probabilistic and statistical methods, especially to resolve difficulties that arise because longer sentences are highly ambiguous when processed with realistic grammars, yielding thousands or millions of possible analyses. Methods for

disambiguation often involve the use of corpora and Markov models. "A probabilistic model consists of a non-probabilistic model plus some numerical quantities; it is not true that probabilistic models are inherently simpler or less structural than non-probabilistic models."

The technology for statistical NLP comes mainly from machine learning and data mining, both of which are fields of artificial intelligence that involve learning from data.

GENERATIVE GRAMMAR

In theoretical linguistics, generative grammar refers to a particular approach to the study of syntax. A generative grammar of a language attempts to give a set of rules that will correctly predict which combinations of words will form grammatical sentences. In most approaches to generative grammar, the rules will also predict the morphology of a sentence.

Generative grammar originates in the work of Noam Chomsky, beginning in the late 1950s. Early versions of Chomsky's theory were called transformational grammar, and this term is still used as a collective term that includes his subsequent theories. There are a number of competing versions of generative grammar currently practiced within linguistics. Chomsky's current theory is known as the Minimalist program. Other prominent theories include or have included head-driven phrase structure grammar, lexical functional grammar, categorial grammar, relational grammar, link grammar and tree-adjoining grammar.

Chomsky has argued that many of the properties of a generative grammar arise from an "innate" universal grammar. Proponents of generative grammar have argued that most grammar is not the result of communicative function and is not simply learned from the environment. In this respect, generative grammar takes a point of view different from cognitive grammar, functional and behaviorist theories.

Most versions of generative grammar characterize sentences as either grammatically correct (also known as *well formed*) or not. The rules of a generative grammar typically function as an algorithm to predict grammaticality as a discrete (yes-or-no) result. In this respect, it differs from stochastic grammar, which considers grammaticality as a probabilistic variable. However, some work in generative grammar (e.g. recent work by Joan Bresnan) uses stochastic versions of optimality theory.

Frameworks

There are a number of different approaches to generative grammar. Common to all is the effort to come up with a set of rules or principles that will account for the well-formed expressions of a natural language. The term *generative grammar* has been associated with at least the following schools of linguistics:

- Transformational grammar (TG)
  - o Standard Theory (ST)
  - o Extended Standard Theory (EST)
  - o Revised Extended Standard Theory (REST)
  - o Principles and Parameters Theory (P&P)
    - – Government and Binding Theory (GB)
    - – Minimalist Program (MP)
- Monostratal (or non-transformational) grammars
  - o Relational Grammar (RG)
  - o Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG)
  - o Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar (GPSG)
  - o Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG)
  - o Categorial Grammar
  - o Tree-Adjoining Grammar

Historical Development of Models of Transformational Grammar

The oldest known generative grammar that is still

extant and in common use is the Sanskrit grammar of PâGini, called the Ashtadhyayi, composed by the middle of the 1st millennium BCE.

Generative grammar has been under development since the late 1950s, and has undergone many changes in the types of rules and representations that are used to predict grammaticality. In tracing the historical development of ideas within generative grammar, it is useful to refer to various stages in the development of the theory.

Standard Theory (1957–1965)

The so-called Standard Theory corresponds to the original model of generative grammar laid out in Chomsky (1965).

A core aspect of Standard Theory is a distinction between two different representations of a sentence, called Deep structure and Surface structure. The two representations are linked to each other by transformational grammar.

Extended Standard Theory (1965–1973)

The so-called Extended Standard Theory was formulated in the late 1960s to early 1970s. Features are:

- syntactic constraints
- generalized phrase structures (X-bar theory)

Revised Extended Standard Theory (1973–1976)

The so-called Revised Extended Standard Theory was formulated between 1973 and 1976. It contains

- restrictions upon X-bar theory (Jackendoff (1977)).
- assumption of the COMP position.
- Move á

Relational Grammar (ca. 1975–1990)

An alternative model of syntax based on the idea that notions like Subject, Direct Object, and Indirect Object play a primary role in grammar.

Government and Binding / Principles and Parameters Theory (1981–1990)

Chomsky's *Lectures on Government and Binding* (1981) and *Barriers* (1986).

Context-Free Grammars

Generative grammars can be described and compared with the aid of the Chomsky hierarchy proposed by Noam Chomsky in the 1950s. This sets out a series of types of formal grammars with increasing expressive power. Among the simplest types are the regular grammars (type 3); Chomsky claims that regular grammars are not adequate as models for human language, because all human languages allow the center-embedding of strings within strings.

At a higher level of complexity are the context-free grammars (type 2). The derivation of a sentence by a grammar can be depicted as a derivation tree. Linguists working in generative grammar often view such derivation trees as a primary object of study. According to this view, a sentence is not merely a string of words, but rather a tree with subordinate and superordinate branches connected at nodes.

Grammaticality Judgements

When generative grammar was first proposed, it was widely hailed as a way of formalizing the implicit set of rules a person "knows" when they know their native language and produce grammatical utterances in it (grammaticality intuitions). However Chomsky has repeatedly rejected that interpretation; according to him, the grammar of a language is a statement of what it is that a person has to know in order to recognize an utterance as grammatical, but not a hypothesis about the processes involved in either understanding or producing language.

Music

Generative grammar has been used to a limited extent

in music theory and analysis since the 1980s. The most well-known approaches were developed by Mark Steedman as well as Fred Lerdahl and Ray Jackendoff, who formalised and extended ideas from Schenkerian analysis. More recently, such early generative approaches to music were further developed and extended by several scholars.

TRANSFORMATIONAL GRAMMAR

In linguistics, a transformational grammar or transformational-generative grammar (TGG) is a generative grammar, especially of a natural language, that has been developed in a Chomskyan tradition. Additionally, transformational grammar is the Chomskyan tradition that gives rise to specific transformational grammars. Much current research in transformational grammar is inspired by Chomsky's Minimalist Program.

Deep Structure and Surface Structure

In 1957, Noam Chomsky published *Syntactic Structures*, in which he developed the idea that each sentence in a language has two levels of representation — a deep structure and a *surface structure*. The deep structure represented the core semantic relations of a sentence, and was mapped on to the surface structure (which followed the phonological form of the sentence very closely) via *transformations*. Chomsky believed there are considerable similarities between languages' deep structures, and that these structures reveal properties, common to all languages that surface structures conceal. However, this may not have been the central motivation for introducing deep structure. Transformations had been proposed prior to the development of deep structure as a means of increasing the mathematical and descriptive power of context-free grammars. Similarly, deep structure was devised largely for technical reasons relating to early semantic theory. Chomsky emphasizes the importance of modern formal mathematical devices in the development of grammatical theory:

> But the fundamental reason for [the] inadequacy of traditional grammars is a more technical one. Although it was well understood that linguistic processes are in some sense "creative," the technical devices for expressing a system of recursive processes were simply not available until much more recently. In fact, a real understanding of how a language can (in Humboldt's words) "make infinite use of finite means" has developed only within the last thirty years, in the course of studies in the foundations of mathematics.
>
> —*Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*

Development of Basic Concepts

Though transformations continue to be important in Chomsky's current theories, he has now abandoned the original notion of Deep Structure and Surface Structure. Initially, two additional levels of representation were introduced (LF — Logical Form, and PF — Phonetic Form), and then in the 1990s Chomsky sketched out a new program of research known as *Minimalism*, in which Deep Structure and Surface Structure no longer featured and PF and LF remained as the only levels of representation.

To complicate the understanding of the development of Noam Chomsky's theories, the precise meanings of Deep Structure and Surface Structure have changed over time — by the 1970s, the two were normally referred to simply as D-Structure and S-Structure by Chomskyan linguists. In particular, the idea that the meaning of a sentence was determined by its Deep Structure (taken to its logical conclusions by the generative semanticists during the same period) was dropped for good by Chomskyan linguists when LF took over this role (previously, Chomsky and Ray Jackendoff had begun to argue that meaning was determined by both Deep and Surface Structure).

Innate Linguistic Knowledge

Terms such as "transformation" can give the impression that theories of transformational generative grammar are intended as a model for the processes through which the

human mind constructs and understands sentences. Chomsky is clear that this is not in fact the case: a generative grammar models only the knowledge that underlies the human ability to speak and understand. One of the most important of Chomsky's ideas is that most of this knowledge is innate, with the result that a baby can have a large body of prior knowledge about the structure of language in general, and need only actually *learn* the idiosyncratic features of the language(s) it is exposed to. Chomsky was not the first person to suggest that all languages had certain fundamental things in common (he quotes philosophers writing several centuries ago who had the same basic idea), but he helped to make the innateness theory respectable after a period dominated by more behaviorist attitudes towards language. Perhaps more significantly, he made concrete and technically sophisticated proposals about the structure of language, and made important proposals regarding how the success of grammatical theories should be evaluated.

Grammatical Theories

In the 1960s, Chomsky introduced two central ideas relevant to the construction and evaluation of grammatical theories. The first was the distinction between *competence* and *performance*. Chomsky noted the obvious fact that people, when speaking in the real world, often make linguistic errors (e.g., starting a sentence and then abandoning it midway through). He argued that these errors in linguistic performance were irrelevant to the study of linguistic competence (the knowledge that allows people to construct and understand grammatical sentences). Consequently, the linguist can study an idealised version of language, greatly simplifying linguistic analysis. The second idea related directly to the evaluation of theories of grammar. Chomsky distinguished between grammars that achieve *descriptive adequacy* and those that go further and achieved *explanatory adequacy*. A descriptively adequate grammar for a particular language defines the (infinite) set of

grammatical sentences in that language; that is, it describes the language in its entirety. A grammar that achieves explanatory adequacy has the additional property that it gives an insight into the underlying linguistic structures in the human mind; that is, it does not merely describe the grammar of a language, but makes predictions about how linguistic knowledge is mentally represented. For Chomsky, the nature of such mental representations is largely innate, so if a grammatical theory has explanatory adequacy it must be able to explain the various grammatical nuances of the languages of the world as relatively minor variations in the universal pattern of human language. Chomsky argued that, even though linguists were still a long way from constructing descriptively adequate grammars, progress in terms of descriptive adequacy will only come if linguists hold explanatory adequacy as their goal. In other words, real insight into the structure of individual languages can only be gained through comparative study of a wide range of languages, on the assumption that they are all cut from the same cloth.

"I-Language" and "E-Language"

In 1986, Chomsky proposed a distinction between *I-Language* and *E-Language*, similar but not identical to the competence/performance distinction. (I-language) refers to Internal language and is contrasted with External Language (or E-language). I-Language is taken to be the object of study in linguistic theory; it is the mentally represented linguistic knowledge that a native speaker of a language has, and is therefore a mental object — from this perspective, most of theoretical linguistics is a branch of psychology. E-Language encompasses all other notions of what a language is, for example that it is a body of knowledge or behavioural habits shared by a community. Thus, E-Language is not itself a coherent concept, and Chomsky argues that such notions of language are not useful in the study of innate linguistic knowledge, i.e., competence, even though they may seem sensible and intuitive, and useful in other areas

of study. Competence, he argues, can only be studied if languages are treated as mental objects.

Grammaticality

Chomsky argued that the notions "grammatical" and "ungrammatical" could be defined in a meaningful and useful way. In contrast, an extreme behaviorist linguist would argue that language can only be studied through recordings or transcriptions of actual speech, the role of the linguist being to look for patterns in such observed speech, but not to hypothesize about why such patterns might occur, nor to label particular utterances as either "grammatical" or "ungrammatical." Although few linguists in the 1950s actually took such an extreme position, Chomsky was at an opposite extreme, defining grammaticality in an unusually mentalistic way (for the time). He argued that the intuition of a native speaker is enough to define the grammaticalness of a sentence; that is, if a particular string of English words elicits a double take, or feeling of wrongness in a native English speaker, and when various extraneous factors affecting intuitions are controlled for, it can be said that the string of words is ungrammatical. This, according to Chomsky, is entirely distinct from the question of whether a sentence is meaningful, or can be understood. It is possible for a sentence to be both grammatical and meaningless, as in Chomsky's famous example "colorless green ideas sleep furiously." But such sentences manifest a linguistic problem distinct from that posed by meaningful but ungrammatical (non)-sentences such as "man the bit sandwich the," the meaning of which is fairly clear, but no native speaker would accept as well formed.

The use of such intuitive judgments permitted generative syntacticians to base their research on a methodology in which studying language through a corpus of observed speech became downplayed, since the grammatical properties of constructed sentences were considered to be appropriate data to build a grammatical model on.

Minimalism

In the mid-1990s to mid-2000s, much research in transformational grammar was inspired by Chomsky's *Minimalist Program*. The "Minimalist Program" aims at the further development of ideas involving *economy of derivation* and *economy of representation*, which had started to become significant in the early 1990s, but were still rather peripheral aspects of Transformational-generative grammar theory.

- Economy of derivation is a principle stating that movements (i.e., transformations) only occur in order to match *interpretable features* with *uninterpretable features*. An example of an interpretable feature is the plural inflection on regular English nouns, e.g., *dogs*. The word *dogs* can only be used to refer to several dogs, not a single dog, and so this inflection contributes to meaning, making it *interpretable*. English verbs are inflected according to the number of their subject (e.g., "Dogs bite" vs "A dog bites"), but in most sentences this inflection just duplicates the information about number that the subject noun already has, and it is therefore *uninterpretable*.
- Economy of representation is the principle that grammatical structures must exist for a purpose, i.e., the structure of a sentence should be no larger or more complex than required to satisfy constraints on grammaticality.

Both notions, as described here, are somewhat vague, and indeed the precise formulation of these principles is controversial. An additional aspect of minimalist thought is the idea that the derivation of syntactic structures should be *uniform*; that is, rules should not be stipulated as applying at arbitrary points in a derivation, but instead apply throughout derivations. Minimalist approaches to phrase structure have resulted in "Bare Phrase Structure," an attempt to eliminate X-bar theory. In 1998, Chomsky suggested that derivations proceed in phases. The distinction

of Deep Structure vs. Surface Structure is not present in Minimalist theories of syntax, and the most recent phase-based theories also eliminate LF and PF as unitary levels of representation.

Mathematical Representation

Returning to the more general mathematical notion of a grammar, an important feature of all transformational grammars is that they are more powerful than context-free grammars. This idea was formalized by Chomsky in the Chomsky hierarchy. Chomsky argued that it is impossible to describe the structure of natural languages using context-free grammars. His general position regarding the non-context-freeness of natural language has held up since then, although his specific examples regarding the inadequacy of CFGs in terms of their weak generative capacity were later disproven.

Transformations

The usual usage of the term 'transformation' in linguistics refers to a rule that takes an input typically called the Deep Structure (in the Standard Theory) or D-structure (in the extended standard theory or government and binding theory) and changes it in some restricted way to result in a Surface Structure (or S-structure). In TGG, Deep structures were generated by a set of phrase structure rules.

For example a typical transformation in TG is the operation of subject-auxiliary inversion (SAI). This rule takes as its input a declarative sentence with an auxiliary: "John has eaten all the heirloom tomatoes." and transforms it into "Has John eaten all the heirloom tomatoes?" In their original formulation (Chomsky 1957), these rules were stated as rules that held over strings of either terminals or constituent symbols or both.

X NP AUX Y X AUX NP Y
(where NP = Noun Phrase and AUX = Auxiliary)

In the 1970s, by the time of the Extended Standard Theory, following the work of Joseph Emonds on structure preservation, transformations came to be viewed as holding over trees. By the end of government and binding theory in the late 1980s, transformations are no longer structure changing operations at all, instead they add information to already existing trees by copying constituents.

The earliest conceptions of transformations were that they were construction-specific devices. For example, there was a transformation that turned active sentences into passive ones. A different transformation raised embedded subjects into main clause subject position in sentences such as "John seems to have gone"; and yet a third reordered arguments in the dative alternation. With the shift from rules to principles and constraints that was found in the 1970s, these construction specific transformations morphed into general rules (all the examples just mentioned being instances of NP movement), which eventually changed into the single general rule of move alpha or Move.

Transformations actually come of two types: (i) the post-Deep structure kind mentioned above, which are string or structure changing, and (ii) Generalized Transformations (GTs). Generalized transformations were originally proposed in the earliest forms of generative grammar (e.g., Chomsky 1957). They take small structures, either atomic or generated by other rules, and combine them. For example, the generalized transformation of embedding would take the kernel "Dave said X" and the kernel "Dan likes smoking" and combine them into "Dave said Dan likes smoking." GTs are thus structure building rather than structure changing. In the Extended Standard Theory and government and binding theory, GTs were abandoned in favor of recursive phrase structure rules. However, they are still present in tree-adjoining grammar as the Substitution and Adjunction operations and they have recently re-emerged in mainstream generative grammar in Minimalism as the operations Merge and Move.

In generative phonology, another form of transformation is the phonological rule, which describes a mapping between an underlying representation (the phoneme) and the surface form that is articulated during natural speech.

RELATIONAL GRAMMAR

In linguistics, Relational Grammar (RG) is a syntactic theory which argues that primitive grammatical relations provide the ideal means to state syntactic rules in universal terms. Relational grammar began as an alternative to transformational grammar.

Term Relations

In Relational Grammar, constituents that serve as the arguments to predicates are numbered. This numbering system corresponds loosely to the notions of subject, direct object and indirect object. The numbering scheme is subject '! (1), direct object '! (2) and indirect object '! (3). A schematic representation of a clause in this formalism might look like:

1	P	3	2
John	gave	Mary	a kiss

Other Features

- Strata
- Chomage
- Predicate valence

Universals

One of the components of RG theory is a set of linguistic universals stated in terms of the numbered roles presented above. Such a universal is the Stratal Uniqueness Law which states that there can be "at most *one* 1, 2, and 3 per stratum.

GENERALIZED PHRASE STRUCTURE GRAMMAR

Generalised phrase structure grammar (GPSG) is a

framework for describing the syntax and semantics of natural languages. GPSG was initially developed in the late 1970s by Gerald Gazdar. Other contributors include Ewan Klein, Ivan Sag, and Geoffrey Pullum. Their book *Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar*, published in 1985, is the main monograph on GPSG, especially as it applies to English syntax.

One of the chief goals of GPSG is to show that the syntax of natural languages can be described by context-free grammars (written as ID/LP grammars), with some suitable conventions intended to make writing such grammars easier for syntacticians. Among these conventions are a sophisticated feature structure system and so-called "meta-rules", which are rules generating the productions of a context-free grammar. GPSG further augments syntactic descriptions with semantic annotations that can be used to compute the compositional meaning of a sentence from its syntactic derivation tree. However, it has been argued (for example by Robert Berwick) that these extensions require parsing algorithms of a higher order of computational complexity than those used for basic CFGs.

Gerald Gazdar, and many other syntacticians, have since argued that natural languages cannot in fact be adequately described by CFGs.

GPSG is in part a reaction against transformational theories of syntax. In fact, the notational extensions to context-free grammars developed in GPSG are claimed to make transformations redundant. Most of the syntactic innovations of GPSG were subsequently incorporated into head-driven phrase structure grammar.

LEXICAL FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR

Lexical functional grammar (LFG) is a grammar framework in theoretical linguistics, a variety of generative grammar. The development of the theory was initiated by Joan Bresnan and Ronald Kaplan in the 1970s, in reaction

to the direction research in the area of transformational grammar had begun to take. It mainly focuses on syntax, including its relation with morphology and semantics. There has been little LFG work on phonology (although ideas from optimality theory have recently been popular in LFG research).

LFG views language as being made up of multiple dimensions of structure. Each of these dimensions is represented as a distinct structure with its own rules, concepts, and form. The primary structures that have figured in LFG research are:

- the representation of grammatical functions (f-structure). See feature structure.
- the structure of syntactic constituents (c-structure). See phrase structure rules, ID/LP grammar.

For example, in the sentence *The old woman eats the falafel*, the c-structure analysis is that this is a sentence which is made up of two pieces, a noun phrase (NP) and a verb phrase (VP). The VP is itself made up of two pieces, a verb (V) and another NP. The NPs are also analyzed into their parts. Finally, the bottom of the structure is composed of the words out of which the sentence is constructed. The f-structure analysis, on the other hand, treats the sentence as being composed of attributes, which include features such as number and tense or functional units such as subject, predicate, or object.

There are other structures which are hypothesized in LFG work:

- argument structure (a-structure), a level which represents the number of arguments for a predicate and some aspects of the lexical semantics of these arguments. See theta-role.
- semantic structure (s-structure), a level which represents the meaning of phrases and sentences. See Glue Semantics.

- information structure (i-structure)
- morphological structure (m-structure)
- phonological structure (p-structure)

The various structures can be said to be mutually constraining.

The LFG conception of language differs from Chomskian theories, which have always involved separate levels of constituent structure representation being mapped onto each other sequentially, via transformations. The LFG approach has had particular success with nonconfigurational languages, languages in which the relation between structure and function is less direct than it is in languages like English; for this reason LFG's adherents consider it a more plausible universal model of language.

Another feature of LFG is that grammatical-function changing operations like passivization are said to be lexical. This means that the active-passive relation, for example, is a relation between two types of verb rather than two trees. Active and passive verbs are both listed in the lexicon, and involve alternative mapping of the participants to grammatical functions.

Through the positing of productive processes in the lexicon and the separation of structure and function, LFG is able to account for syntactic patterns without the use of transformations defined over syntactic structure. For example, in a sentence like *What did you see?*, where *what* is understood as the object of *see*, transformational grammar puts *what* after *see* (the usual position for objects) in "deep structure", and then moves it. LFG analyzes *what* as having two functions: question-focus and object. It occupies the position associated in English with the question-focus function, and the constraints of the language allow it to take on the object function as well.

A central goal in LFG research is to create a model of grammar with a depth which appeals to linguists while at

the same time being efficiently parseable and having the rigidity of formalism which computational linguists require. Because of this, LFG has been used as the theoretical basis of various machine translation tools, such as AppTek's TranSphere, and the Julietta Research Group's Lekta.

DEPENDENCY GRAMMAR

Dependency grammar (DG) is a class of syntactic theories developed by Lucien Tesnière. It is distinct from phrase structure grammars, as it lacks phrasal nodes. Structure is determined by the relation between a word (a head) and its dependents. Dependency grammars are not defined by a specific word order, and are thus well suited to languages with free word order, such as Czech and Turkish.

Algebraic syntax, Extensible Dependency Grammar, Tree-adjoining Grammar and Word grammar are types of dependency grammar. Link grammar is similar to dependency grammar, but link grammar does not include directionality in the relations between words, and thus does not describe head-dependent relationships.

Hybrid dependency/constituency grammar uses dependencies between words, but also includes dependencies between phrasal nodes. See for example, the Quranic Arabic Dependency Treebank

Operator Grammar differs from other dependency grammars in that it is also a theory of semantics (information). This theory posits a large collection of reductions (small transformations) that map dependency structures into compact, variant forms. It also reverses the direction of dependency, by having operators (e.g. verbs) depend on their arguments.

Implementations

- Stanford parser A statistical parser.
- DeSR A statistical dependency shift/reduce dependency parser.

- RelEx generates a dependency parse for the English language, by applying graph rewriting to the output of the link grammar parser. Open source license.
- XDG Development Kit An Integrated Development Environment for Extensible Dependency Grammar (XDG).

REFERENCES

Baroni, M. and Callegari, L. (1982) Eds., Musical grammars and computer analysis. Leo S. Olschki Editore: Firenze, 201–218.

Baroni, M., Maguire, S., and Drabkin, W. (1983). The Concept of Musical Grammar. Music Analysis, 2:175–208.

Blake, Barry J. (1990). *Relational grammar*. London: Routledge.

Bresnan, Joan (2001). *Lexical Functional Syntax*. Blackwell. ISBN 0-631-20973-5.

Chomsky, Noam (1956). "Three models for the description of language". *IRE Transactions on Information Theory* 2 (3): 113–124. doi:10.1109/TIT.1956.1056813. http://www.chomsky.info/articles/195609—.pdf.

Chomsky, Noam (1956). "Three models for the description of language". *IRE Transactions on Information Theory* 2 (3): 113–124. doi:10.1109/TIT.1956.1056813. http://www.chomsky.info/articles/195609—.pdf.

Chomsky, Noam (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press. ISBN 0262530074.

Chomsky, Noam (1986). *Knowledge of Language*. New York:Praeger. ISBN 0275900258.

Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. MIT Press. ISBN 0262531283.

Chomsky, Noam (2001). "Derivation by Phase." In other words, in algebraic terms, *the I-Language is the actual function, whereas the E-Language is the extension of this function*. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. MIT Press. Pages 1-52.

Crystal, David 1995. *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge University Press.

Dalrymple, Mary (2001). *Lexical Functional Grammar*. No. 42 in Syntax and Semantics Series. New York: Academic Press. ISBN 0126135347.

Falk, Yehuda N. (2001). *Lexical-Functional Grammar: An Introduction to Parallel Constraint-Based Syntax*. CSLI. ISBN 1-57586-341-3.

G. Khan, J. B. Noah, *The Early Karaite Tradition of Hebrew Grammatical Thought* (2000)

Gazdar, Gerald; Ewan H. Klein, Geoffrey K. Pullum, Ivan A. Sag (1985). *Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell, and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. ISBN 0-674-34455-3.

Giblin, Iain (2008). Music and the generative enterprise. Doctoral dissertation. University of New South Wales.

Goldsmith, John A (1995). "Phonological Theory". In John A. Goldsmith. *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics. Blackwell Publishers. p. 2.

Harper, Douglas, "Grammar", *Online Etymological Dictionary*, http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=grammar, retrieved 8 April 2010

Harris, Zellig (1982), *A Grammar of English on Mathematical Principles*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, ISBN 0471029580.

Harris, Zellig (1988), *Language and Information*, New York: Columbia University Press, ISBN 0-231-06662-7.

Harris, Zellig (1989), *The Form of Information in Science: Analysis of an immunology sublanguage*, Springer, ISBN 90-277-2516-0.

Harris, Zellig (1991), *A Theory of Language and Information: A Mathematical Approach*, Oxford University Press, USA, ISBN 0-19-824224-7.

Heinrich Schenker, Free Composition. (Der Freie Satz) translated and edited by Ernst Ostler. New York: Longman, 1979.

Jackendoff, Ray (1974). *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. MIT Press. ISBN 0262100134.

Jeremy Butterfield, (2008) *Damp Squid: The English Language Laid Bare*, Oxford University Press, Oxford. 978-0-19-923906. p. 142.

Johnson, David E. (1974/1979). *Toward a Theory of Relationally-based Grammar.* Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics Series, ed. Jorge Hankamer. NY: Garland Publishing.

Johnson, David E. and Paul M. Postal (1980). *Arc Pair Grammar.* Princeton: PUP.

Katz, Jonah; David Pesetsky (2009) "The Identity Thesis for Language and Music". http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000959

Lappin, Shalom; Robert Levine and David Johnson (2000). "Topic ... Comment". *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 18 (3): 665–671. doi:10.1023/A:1006474128258.

Lappin, Shalom; Robert Levine and David Johnson (2001). "The Revolution Maximally Confused". *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 19 (4): 901–919. doi:10.1023/A:1013397516214.

Lerdahl, Fred; Ray Jackendoff (1996). *A Generative Theory of Tonal Music*. Cambridge: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262621076.

May, Robert C. (1977). *The Grammar of Quantification*. MIT Phd Dissertation. ISBN 0824013921. (Supervised by Noam Chomsky, this dissertation introduced the idea of "logical form.")

McArthur, Tom (ed) 1992. *The Oxford companion to the English language. Oxford University Press*.

Nash, Walter 1986. *English usage: a guide to first principles*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London. Contains a list of sources.

Newmeyer, Frederick J. (1986). *Linguistic Theory in America (Second Edition)*. Academic Press.

Perlmutter, David M. (1980). Relational grammar. In E. A. Moravcsik & J. R. Wirth (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Current approaches to syntax* (Vol. 13, pp. 195-229). New York: Academic Press.

Perlmutter, David M. (Ed.). (1983). *Studies in relational grammar 1*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Perlmutter, David M.; & Rosen, Carol G. (Eds.). (1984). *Studies in relational grammar 2*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Peters, Stanley; R. Ritchie (1973). "On the generative power of transformational grammars". *Information Sciences* 6: 49–83. doi:10.1016/0020-0255(73)90027-3.

Pinchas Wechter, Ibn Barûn's Arabic Works on Hebrew Grammar and Lexicography (1964)

Postal, Paul M. (1974). *On Raising - An Inquiry into One Rule of English Grammar and Its Theoretical Implications*. Mass.: MIT Press.

Postal, Paul M.; & Joseph, Brian D. (Eds.). (1990). *Studies in relational grammar 3*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Pullum, Geoffrey K.; Gerald Gazdar (1982). "Natural languages and context-free languages". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4 (4): 471–504. doi:10.1007/BF00360802.

Shieber, Stuart (1985). "Evidence against the context-freeness of natural language". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 8 (3): 333–343. doi:10.1007/BF00630917. http://www.eecs.harvard.edu/~shieber/Biblio/Papers/shieber85.pdf.

Steedman, M.J. (1989). "A Generative Grammar for Jazz Chord Sequences". *Music Perception* 2 (1): 52–77. JSTOR 40285282.

Tojo, O. Y. & Nishida, M. (2006). Analysis of chord progression by HPSG. In Proceedings of the 24th IASTED international conference on Artificial intelligence and applications, 305–310.

3

Focus on Noun, Pronoun, Adjective, Verb and Adverb

NOUN

A noun is a kind of word that is usually the name of a person, place, thing, quality, or idea. In English, nouns can be singular or plural.

Nouns often need a word called an article or determiner (like *the* or *that*). These words usually do not go with other kinds of words like verbs or adverbs. (For example, people do not say "I will the go to school" because *go* is a verb.) Adjectives can also describe nouns. In English, there are more nouns than any other kind of word.

Every language in the world has nouns, but they are not always used in the same ways. They also can have different properties in different languages. For example, in some other languages, nouns do not change for singular and plural, and sometimes there is no word for *the*.

Some examples of nouns in English are: *time, people, way, year, government, day, world, life, work, part, number, house, system, company, end, party, information*.

The History of the Word *Noun*

The word 'noun' comes from the Latin *nomen* meaning "name." Words like nouns were described in early days by

the Sanskrit grammarian PâGini and ancient Greeks like Dionysios Thrax.

Uses of Nouns

In English sentences, nouns can be used as a subject, object, or complement. They often come after prepositions, as the 'object of preposition'.

Nouns can sometimes describe other nouns (such as a soccer ball). When they do this, they are called modifiers.

There are also verb forms that can be used in the same way as nouns (such as 'I like *running*.) These are called *verbals* or *verbal nouns*, and include *participles* (which can also be adjectives) and *infinitives*.

Kinds of Nouns

Nouns are grouped into common nouns, and proper nouns. There are also pronouns. These have commonly been considered a different part of speech from nouns, but in the past some grammars have included them as nouns as do many modern linguists.

Proper Nouns

A proper noun (also called proper name) is a name given to individual people, places, companies, or brands. Some examples of proper nouns are: *London, John, God, October, Mozart, Saturday, Coke, Mr. Brown, Atlantic Ocean*

Proper nouns begin with an upper case (capital) letter in English and many other languages that use the Roman alphabet. (However, in German, all nouns begin with an upper case letter.) The word "I" is really a pronoun, although it is capitalized in English, like a proper noun.

Some common nouns can also be used as proper nouns. For example, someone might be named 'Tiger Smith' — even though he is not a tiger or a smith.

Common Nouns

Common nouns are all other nouns that are not proper

nouns. Sometimes the same word can be either a common noun or a proper noun, depending on how it is used; for example:

- there can be many *gods*, but there is only one *God*.
- there can be many *internets* (two or more networks connected together), but the largest internet in the world is the *Internet*.

Number and Countability

In English and many other languages, nouns have 'number'. But some nouns are only singular (such as *furniture, physics*) and others are only plural (such as *clothes, police*). Also, some nouns are 'countable' (they can be counted, for example, *one piece, two pieces*) but others are not (for example, we do not say *one furniture, two furnitures*).

Possessives

Nouns are words for things, and since things can be possessed, nouns can also change to show possession in grammar. In English, we usually add an apostrophe and an *s* to nouns to make them *possessive*, or sometimes just an apostrophe when there is already an *s* at the end, like this:

- This is Sam. This is Sam's cat.
- The woman's hair is long.
- There are three cats. The cats' mother is sleeping.

How Adjectives Become Nouns

Most adjectives become nouns by adding the suffix ness. Example: Take the adjective 'natural', add 'ness' to get 'naturalness', a noun. To see a list of 100 adjectives used in Basic English, click here

PLURAL

Plural is a form of the noun that shows that there are

more than one. The opposite of the plural is the singular, which means there is only one.

In some languages a suffix (word ending) is added to a word to show that the word means many. For example, English usually uses *-s* to mark the plural. For example, *cat* is singular, but *cats* is plural.

All European languages have plurals. Some languages also have duals (2), like Arabic, ancient Hebrew and Inuktitut. Other languages even have:

- nullar (no objects)
- trial (three objects)
- paucal (a few objects)

These different numbers will have different suffixes from the plural suffix.

Some languages do not have plural endings at all. Some of these are the East Asian languages of Chinese, Korean, and Japanese. So native speakers of these languages can easily forget to use plurals.

PRONOUN

A pronoun is traditionally called a part of speech in grammar (but many modern linguists, experts in linguistics, call it a special type of noun) In English, pronouns are words such as *me, she, his, them, herself, each other, it, what*.

Pronouns are often used to take the place of a noun, when that noun is understood (has already been named), to avoid repeating it. For example, instead of saying

- Tom has a new dog. Tom has named the dog Max and Tom lets the dog sleep by Tom's bed.

it is easier to say

- Tom has a new dog. He has named it Max and he lets it sleep by his bed.

When a pronoun replaces a noun, the noun is called the antecedent. But, there are times when the pronoun has no antecedent. This is because generally, the antecedent (what comes before) refers grammatically to the use of the relative pronoun in particular. For example, in the sentence: *The dog that was walking down the street*, the relative pronoun is the word that referring back to the antecedent, the word 'dog'. In the sentence *The spy who loved me*, the relative pronoun is the word 'who' and its antecedent is the word 'spy'.

Differences and Similarities to Nouns

Pronouns are different from common nouns because they normally can not come after *article*s or other *determiner*s. (For example, people do not say "the it".) Pronouns also rarely come after adjectives. They are also different because many of them change depending on how they are used. For example, "we" is a 'subject' in grammar, but the word changes to *us* when used as an object.

Pronouns are the same as nouns because they both change for number (singular & plural), case (subject, object, possessive, etc.), and gender (male, female, animate, inanimate, etc.) Nouns and pronouns can be used in almost all the same places in sentences, and they name the same kinds of things: people, objects, etc. Even though they can not normally come after determiners, or adjectives, neither can proper nouns.

Kinds of Pronouns

There are four kinds of pronouns: personal, reciprocal, interrogative, and relative.

Kinds of English Pronouns

i	personal	you love them	Your sister loves herself
ii	reciprocal	we like each other	we are looking at one another
iii	interrogative	who is there?	what happened?
iv	relative	the person who saw it	the time which you told me

Personal Pronouns in English

This table shows all the personal pronouns in English that are commonly used today.

Personal Pronouns in English

		Singular			*Plural*		
		Subject	*Object*	*Possessive*	*Subject*	*Object*	*Possessive*
First		I	me	mine	we	us	Ours
Second		you	you	yours	you	you	Yours
	Feminine	she	her	hers	they	them	Theirs
Third	Masculine	he	him	his			
	Neuter	it	it	its			

A Subject Pronoun can replace a noun that is the subject of a sentence. Refer to the table above; the subject pronouns are: I, You, He, She, It, We, They.

Another type of personal pronoun is called the 'reflexive pronoun'. Reflexive pronouns are the words ending in '-self' or '-selves', such as: *myself, itself, themselves*.

ADJECTIVE

An adjective is a name for a word that modifies (describes) a noun. Nouns are words that name a place, a person, a thing, or an idea. An adjective is a word that gives more information about the noun that goes with it (accompanies).

Word Order

As a rule, in English, the adjective comes before the noun it describes.

Some examples, with the adjective in bold:

- I like blue skies and fluffy clouds.
- He is a nice man.
- It was a cold day.
- They are good people.

Exception

Sometimes an adjective is not followed by a noun:

- The sky is blue.
- The joke she told was so funny, I could not stop laughing all day.
- He went crazy

It's still an adjective, because we could have "the blue sky", "the funny joke", and "the crazy man". The adjective is still describing the noun though they are not side by side.

An adjective is a name for a word that modifies (describes) a noun. Nouns are words that name a place, a person, or a thing. An adjective is a word that gives instant status about the noun to enable to make a clear picture of the noun in the mind of the reader and create a feeling of the writer.

Comparative and Superlative

Sometimes we have different forms of the same adjective. If one joke makes us laugh more than another joke, then that joke is funnier. This is called the comparative form of the adjective. The day that is colder than any other is the coldest day. This is the superlative form of "cold". Some adjectives need additional words when we want to compare them. For instance, one car may be cheaper than another, but the second car may be more reliable. (We use "more reliable", instead of "reliabler".) Reliable is being trustworthy or worthy of trust, deserving confidence.

The rule is:

For short adjectives ending in a consonant like cold, black, fast, one adds the suffix er to make a comparison of greater magnitude. Example: The North Pole is colder than Florida. The greatest possible comparison is made by adding the suffix est. Example: The North Pole is the coldest place on the Earth. For long adjectives like intelligent, conscientious, comprehensive, one uses the word more to make a comparison

of greater magnitude. Example: Children are more intelligent than adults. To make the greatest possible comparison one uses the word most. Example: She is the most conscientious objector I have ever known.

Nouns as Noun Modifiers

In the English language, it is possible for a noun to modify (describe) another noun. Example: take the noun 'angel' and the noun 'face'. Put them together and the result is 'angel face'. Make one up with 'country' and 'house'. Now, think of two nouns and put them together.

Adjectives and Adverbs

One can make adverbs from some adjectives by adding the suffix ly. Example: take the adjective 'beautiful', the adverb is beautifully. One can do it the other way around: take an adverb like 'presumably', the adjective is 'presumable' (assumable). 'Presumable innocence' means the accused is assumed to be innocent until proven guilty (which is not always practiced everywhere, however).

The adjective 'guilty' becomes the adverb 'guiltily' and viceversa (the other way round)(the opposite), the adverb 'guiltily' becomes the adjective 'guilty'. As a rule, 'dogs chase cats' but not viceversa. Cats seldom chase dogs.

ADJECTIVE

In grammar, an adjective is a word whose main syntactic role is to qualify a noun or noun phrase, giving more information about the object signified.

Adjectives are one of the traditional eight English parts of speech, though linguists today distinguish adjectives from words such as determiners that were formerly considered to be adjectives. In this paragraph, "traditional" is an adjective, and in the preceding paragraph, "main" and "more" are.

Examples

- That's an interesting idea. (attributive)

- That idea is interesting. (predicative)
- Tell me something interesting. (post-positive)
- The good, the bad, and the ugly. (substantive)

Most but not all languages have adjectives. Those that do not typically use words of another part of speech, often verbs, to serve the same semantic function; for example, such a language might have a verb that means "to be big", and would use a construction analogous to "big-being house" to express what English expresses as "big house". Even in languages that do have adjectives, one language's adjective might not be another's; for example, while English uses "to be hungry" (*hungry* being an adjective), Dutch and French use "*honger hebben*" and "*avoir faim*" respectively (literally "to have hunger", *hunger* being a noun), and where Hebrew uses the adjective *zaqûq*, roughly "in need of", English uses the verb "to need".

Adjectives form an open class of words in most languages that have them; that is, it is relatively common for new adjectives to be formed via such processes as derivation. However, Bantu languages are well known for having only a small closed class of adjectives, and new adjectives are not easily derived.

In English, the word "adjective" is frequently used loosely for any part of speech, including nouns and prepositions, when it is used attributively. See adjectival phrase.

Adjectives and Adverbs

Many languages, including English, distinguish between adjectives, which qualify nouns and pronouns, and adverbs, which modify verbs, adjectives, and other adverbs. Not all languages have exactly this distinction, however, and many languages, including English, have words that can function as both. For example, in English *fast* is an adjective in "a fast car" (where it qualifies the noun *car*), but an adverb in "he drove fast" (where it modifies the verb *drove*).

Determiners

Linguists today distinguish determiners from adjectives, considering them to be two separate parts of speech (or *lexical categories*), but formerly determiners were considered to be adjectives in some of their uses. In English dictionaries, which typically still do not treat determiners as their own part of speech, determiners are often recognizable by being listed both as adjectives and as pronouns. Determiners are words that are neither nouns nor pronouns, yet reference a thing already in context. Determiners generally do this by indicating definiteness (as in *a* vs. *the*), quantity (as in *one* vs. *some* vs. *many*), or another such property.

Form

A given occurrence of an adjective can generally be classified into one of four kinds of uses:

1. *Attributive* adjectives are part of the noun phrase headed by the noun they modify; for example, *happy* is an attributive adjective in "happy people". In some languages, attributive adjectives precede their nouns; in others, they follow their nouns; and in yet others, it depends on the adjective, or on the exact relationship of the adjective to the noun. In English, attributive adjectives usually precede their nouns in simple phrases, but often follow their nouns when the adjective is modified or qualified by a phrase acting as an adverb. For example: "I saw three happy kids", and "I saw three kids happy enough to jump up and down with glee." See also Post-positive adjective.
2. *Predicative* adjectives are linked via a copula or other linking mechanism to the noun or pronoun they modify; for example, *happy* is a predicate adjective in "they are happy" and in "that made me happy."
3. *Absolute* adjectives do not belong to a larger construction (aside from a larger adjective phrase),

and typically modify either the subject of a sentence or whatever noun or pronoun they are closest to; for example, *happy* is an absolute adjective in "The boy, happy with his lollipop, did not look where he was going."

4. *Nominal* adjectives act almost as nouns. One way this can happen is if a noun is elided and an attributive adjective is left behind. In the sentence, "I read two books to them; he preferred the sad book, but she preferred the happy", *happy* is a nominal adjective, short for "happy one" or "happy book". Another way this can happen is in phrases like "out with the old, in with the new", where "the old" means, "that which is old" or "all that is old", and similarly with "the new". In such cases, the adjective functions either as a mass noun (as in the preceding example) or as a plural count noun, as in "The meek shall inherit the Earth", where "the meek" means "those who are meek" or "all who are meek".

Adjectival Phrases

An adjective acts as the head of an *adjectival phrase*. In the simplest case, an adjectival phrase consists solely of the adjective; more complex adjectival phrases may contain one or more adverbs modifying the adjective ("*very* strong"), or one or more complements (such as "worth *several dollars*", "full *of toys*", or "eager *to please*"). In English, attributive adjectival phrases that include complements typically follow their subject ("an evildoer *devoid of redeeming qualities*").

Other Noun Modifiers

In many languages, including English, it is possible for nouns to modify other nouns. Unlike adjectives, nouns acting as modifiers (called *attributive nouns* or *noun adjuncts*) are not predicative; a beautiful park is beautiful, but a car park is not "car". In plain English, the modifier often indicates origin ("*Virginia* reel"), purpose ("*work* clothes"),

or semantic patient ("*man* eater"). However, it can generally indicate almost any semantic relationship. It is also common for adjectives to be derived from nouns, as in English *boyish*, *birdlike*, *behavioral*, *famous*, *manly*, *angelic*, and so on.

Many languages have special verbal forms called *participles* can act as noun modifiers. In some languages, including English, there is a strong tendency for participles to evolve into adjectives. English examples of this include *relieved* (the past participle of the verb *relieve*, used as an adjective in sentences (such as "I am so relieved to see you"), *spoken* (as in "the spoken word"), and *going* (the present participle of the verb *go*, used as an adjective in sentences such as "Ten dollars per hour is the going rate").

Other constructs that often modify nouns include prepositional phrases (as in English "a rebel *without a cause*"), relative clauses (as in English "the man *who wasn't there*"), other adjective clauses (as in English "the bookstore *where he worked*"), and infinitive phrases (as in English "cake *to die for*").

In relation, many nouns take complements such as content clauses (as in English "the idea *that I would do that*"); these are not commonly considered modifiers, however.

Adjective Order

In many languages, attributive adjectives usually occur in a specific order. Generally, the adjective order in English is:

1. quantity or number
2. quality or opinion
3. size
4. age
5. shape

6. color
7. proper adjective (often nationality, other place of origin, or material)
8. purpose or qualifier

So, in English, adjectives pertaining to size precede adjectives pertaining to age ("little old", not "old little"), which in turn generally precede adjectives pertaining to color ("old white", not "white old"). So, we would say "A nice (opinion) little (size) old (age) white (color) brick (material) house".

This order may be more rigid in some languages than others; in some, like Spanish, it may only be a default (*unmarked*) word order, with other orders being permissible.

Due partially to borrowings from French, English has some adjectives which follow the noun as postmodifiers, called post-positive adjectives, such as *time immemorial*. Adjectives may even change meaning depending on whether they precede or follow, as in *proper*: *They live in a proper town* (a real town, not a village) vs. *They live in the town proper* (in the town itself, not in the suburbs). All adjectives can follow nouns in certain constructions, such as *tell me something new*.

Comparison of Adjectives

In many languages, adjectives can be *compared*. In English, for example, we can say that a car is *big*, that it is *bigger* than another is, or that it is the *biggest* car of all. Not all adjectives lend themselves to comparison, however; for example, the English adjective *extinct* is not considered comparable, in that it does not make sense to describe one species as "more extinct" than another. However, even most non-comparable English adjectives are still *sometimes* compared; for example, one might say that a language about which nothing is known is "more extinct" than a well-documented language with surviving literature but no speakers. This is not a comparison of the degree of

intensity of the adjective, but rather the degree to which the object fits the adjective's definition.

Comparable adjectives are also known as "gradable" adjectives, because they tend to allow grading adverbs such as *very*, *rather*, and so on.

Among languages that allow adjectives to be compared in this way, different approaches are used. Indeed, even within English, two different approaches are used: the suffixes *-er* and *-est*, and the words *more* and *most*. (In English, the general tendency is for shorter adjectives and adjectives from Anglo-Saxon to use *-er* and *-est*, and for longer adjectives and adjectives from French, Latin, Greek, and other languages to use *more* and *most*.) By either approach, English adjectives therefore have *positive* forms (*big*), *comparative* forms (*bigger*), and *superlative* forms (*biggest*). However, many other languages do not distinguish comparative from superlative forms.

Restrictiveness

Attributive adjectives, and other noun modifiers, may be used either *restrictively* (helping to identify the noun's referent, hence "restricting" its reference), or *non-restrictively* (helping to describe an already-identified noun). In some languages, such as Spanish, restrictiveness is consistently marked; for example, in Spanish *la tarea difícil* means "the difficult task" in the sense of "the task that is difficult" (restrictive), while *la difícil tarea* means "the difficult task" in the sense of "the task, which is difficult" (non-restrictive). In English, restrictiveness is not marked on adjectives, but is marked on relative clauses (the difference between "the man *who recognized me* was there" and "the man, *who recognized me*, was there" being one of restrictiveness).

Agreement

In some languages adjectives alter their form to reflect the gender, case and number of the noun which they describe. This is called agreement or concord. Usually it takes the form of inflections at the end of the word, as in Latin:

puella bona	(good girl, feminine)
puellam bonam	(good girl, feminine accusative object case)
puer bonus	(good boy, masculine)
pueri boni	(good boys, masculine plural)

In the Celtic languages, however, initial consonant lenition marks the adjective with a feminine noun, as in Scottish Gaelic:

balach math	(good boy, masculine)
nighean mhath	(good girl, feminine)

Often a distinction is made here between attributive and predicative usage. Where English is an example of a language where adjectives never agree and French of a language where they always agree, in German they agree only when used attributively, and in Hungarian only when used predicatively.

The good (Ø) *boys.*	*The boys are good* (Ø).
Les bons garçons.	*Les garçons sont bons.*
Die braven Jungen.	*Die Jungen sind brav* (Ø).
A jó (Ø) *fiúk.*	*A fiúk jók.*

ADVERB

An adverb is a word used to tell more about a verb, and it almost always answers the questions *how?*, *when?*, *where?*, *how often?*, and *in what way?*. Words like *slowly*, *loudly*, *carefully*, *quickly*, or *sadly* are all adverbs. Adverbs usually, but not always, end in *-ly*.

Examples of adverbs in a sentence (with the adverb in *italics*):

- How did the man walk? The man walked *slowly*.
- How did the dogs bark? The dogs barked *loudly*.

An adverb can also modify (describe) an adjective or another adverb.

Examples:

Adverb modifying a verb: He writes well
Adverb modifying another adverb: He writes very well
Adverb modifying an adjective: He is very well

In the first two examples the word 'well' is an adverb. In the last example, it is an adjective. This is one example in which the same word can be both an adjective and an adverb but not in the same sentence.

As a rule, the same word can play different roles but not in the same sentence. It all depends on what the word is doing in the sentence. It could be a noun, an adjective, an adverb, a verb, etc. Example: take the word 'cool'. In the sentence, "he walks cool", the word 'cool' is an adverb. In the sentence, "cool the hot dish", the word 'cool' is a verb. In the sentence, "it is a cool evening", the word 'cool' is an adjective. In the first example, "he walks cool", the word 'cool' really means 'coolly' as in "play it cool" (do not get excited; be calm).

Adverb Form

Most adverbs are formed by adding ly to the end of an adjective. To see 100 adjectives used in Basic English, click here —> : adjective

An adverb is a part of speech. It is any word that modifies any part of speech or other verbs other than a noun (modifiers of nouns are primarily adjectives and determiners).

Adverbs can modify verbs, adjectives (including numbers), clauses, sentences and other adverbs.

Adverbs typically answer questions such as *how?*, *in what way?*, *when?*, *where?*, and *to what extent?*. This function is called the adverbial function, and is realized not just by single words (i.e., adverbs) but by adverbial phrases and adverbial clauses.

Adverbs in English

In English, adverbs of manner (answering the question *how?*) are often formed by adding *-ly* to adjectives. For example, *great* yields *greatly*, and *beautiful* yields *beautifully*. (Note that some words that end in *-ly*, such as *friendly* and *lovely*, are not adverbs, but adjectives, in which case the root word is usually a noun. There are also underived adjectives that end in *-ly*, such as *holy* and *silly*.)

The suffix *-ly* is related to the Germanic word *"lich"*. (There is also an obsolete English word *lych* or *lich* with the same meaning.) Both words are also related to the word *like*. The connection between *-ly* and *like* is easy to understand. The connection to *lich* is probably that both are descended from an earlier word that meant something like "shape" or "form".

In this way, -ly in English is cognate with the common German adjective ending *-lich*, the Dutch ending *-lijk*, the Dano-Norwegian *-lig* and Norwegian *-leg*. This same process is followed in Romance languages with the ending -mente, -ment, or -mense meaning "of/like the mind".

In some cases, the suffix *-wise* may be used to derive adverbs from nouns. Historically, *-wise* competed with a related form *-ways* and won out against it. In a few words, like *sideways*, *-ways* survives; words like *clockwise* show the transition. Again, it is not a foolproof indicator of a word being an adverb. Some adverbs are formed from nouns or adjectives by prepending the prefix *a-* (such as *abreast*, *astray*). There are a number of other suffixes in English that derive adverbs from other word classes, and there are also many adverbs that are not morphologically indicated at all.

Comparative adverbs include *more*, *most*, *least*, and *less* (in phrases such as *more beautiful*, *most easily* etc.).

The usual form pertaining to adjectives or adverbs is called the positive. Formally, adverbs in English are inflected

in terms of comparison, just like adjectives. The comparative and superlative forms of some (especially single-syllable) adverbs that do not end in *-ly* are generated by adding *-er* and *-est* (*She ran faster*; *He jumps highest*). Others, especially those ending *-ly*, are periphrastically compared by the use of *more* or *most* (*She ran more quickly*) — while some accept both forms, e.g. *oftener* and *more often* are both correct. Adverbs also take comparisons with *as ... as*, *less*, and *least*. Not all adverbs are comparable; for example in the sentence *He wore red yesterday* it does not make sense to speak of "more yesterday" or "most yesterday".

Adverbs as a "Catch-All" Category

Adverbs are considered a part of speech in traditional English grammar and are still included as a part of speech in grammar taught in schools and used in dictionaries. However, modern grammarians recognize that words traditionally grouped together as adverbs serve a number of different functions. Some would go so far as to call adverbs a "catch-all" category that includes all words that do not belong to one of the other parts of speech.

A more logical approach to dividing words into classes relies on recognizing which words can be used in a certain context. For example, a noun is a word that can be inserted in the following template to form a grammatical sentence:

The _____ is red. (For example, "The hat is red".)

When this approach is taken, it is seen that adverbs fall into a number of different categories. For example, some adverbs can be used to modify an entire sentence, whereas others cannot. Even when a sentential adverb has other functions, the meaning is often not the same. For example, in the sentences *She gave birth naturally* and *Naturally, she gave birth*, the word *naturally* has different meanings. *Naturally* as a sentential adverb means something like "of course" and as a verb-modifying adverb means "in a natural manner". This "naturally" distinction

demonstrates that the class of sentential adverbs is a closed class (there is resistance to adding new words to the class), whereas the class of adverbs that modify verbs isn't.

Words like *very* and *particularly* afford another useful example. We can say *Perry is very fast*, but not *Perry very won the race*. These words can modify adjectives but not verbs. On the other hand, there are words like *here* and *there* that cannot modify adjectives. We can say *The sock looks good there* but not *It is a there beautiful sock*. The fact that many adverbs can be used in more than one of these functions can confuse this issue, and it may seem like splitting hairs to say that a single adverb is really two or more words that serve different functions. However, this distinction can be useful, especially considering adverbs like *naturally* that have different meanings in their different functions. Huddleston distinguishes between a *word* and a *lexicogrammatical-word*.

The category of adverbs into which a particular adverb falls is to some extent a matter of convention; and such conventions are open to challenge as English evolves. A particular category-breaking use may spread after its appearance in a book, song, or television show and become so widespread that it is eventually acknowledged as acceptable English. For example, "well" traditionally falls in a category of adverb that excludes its use as a modifier of an adjective, except where the adjective is a past-participle adjective like "baked". However, imitating characters in television shows, a growing number of English speakers (playfully or even without reflection) use "well" to modify non-past-participle adjectives, as in "That is well bad!" It is possible that this usage will one day become generally accepted. Similarly, other category-breaking uses of adverbs may, over time, move some English adverbs from a restricted adverbial class to a less-restricted one.

Not is an interesting case. Grammarians have a difficult

time categorizing it, and it probably belongs in its own class

PREPOSITIONAL ADVERB

A prepositional adverb is a word - mainly a particle - which is very similar in its form to a preposition but functions as an adverb. Prepositional adverbs occur mainly in English, German and Dutch. Unlike real prepositions, they occur mainly at the end of a phrase and not before nouns. They also modify the verb, which a preposition does not.

An example of a prepositional adverb in English is *inside* in *He came inside*.

Phrasal Verb

A verb combined with a prepositional adverb is called a phrasal verb only if the verb's meaning is changed by the prepositional adverb. In English, there are lots of examples of this. For example, *let* can have many possible meanings depending on which prepositional adverb it is combined with (*let down*, *let in*, *let off*, *let to* etc.)

Prepositional Adverbs in Other Languages

Although prepositional adverbs are largely associated with Germanic languages, those of other classes occasionally have corresponding features. For instance, Slavic languages such as Czech may prefix prepositions to verbs of motion (*jít* to go '! *dojít* to come towards, *odejít* to go away from). In Hungarian, the suffixes added to nouns to perform the same functions as prepositions in Indo-European languages may also be prefixed to verbs, much as in German (*városba* to the city, *bemenni* to go towards).

SUPERLATIVE

A superlative, in grammar, is an adjective describing a noun that is the best example of a given quality. In other

words, a superlative describes a noun that has more of some quality than any other.

Some examples:

- the *coldest* day (i.e. the best example of a cold day, or the day that is colder than all the others)
- the *craziest* man
- the *fluffiest* cloud

In English, most superlatives can be formed by adding -EST to an existing adjective, like the examples above. (For adjectives that end in "-y", like "crazy", you often change the "y" to an "i" before you add the -EST on the end.)

Some adjectives have irregular superlative forms, which do not follow the rules, such as far ("farthest").

Other adjectives have no superlative form at all, and the superlative is made simply by adding the adverb "most" before the adjective. For instance, you do not say "funnest," or "interestingest". Instead, you say "most fun," and "most interesting." This way of making the superlative is used for almost all adjectives ending in "ing" (like "interesting", "fascinating", "disgusting" or "appealing".)

VERB

A verb is a kind of word that usually tells about an action or a state and is the main part of a sentence. Every sentence has a verb. In English, verbs are the only kind of word that changes to show past or present tense.

Every language in the world has verbs, but they are not always used in the same ways. They also can have different properties in different languages. For example, in some other languages (e.g., Chinese & Indonesian) verbs do not change for past and present tense. This means the definition above only works well for English verbs.

There are sixteen verbs used in Basic English. They

are: *be, do, have, come, go, see, seem, give, take, keep, make, put, send, say, let, get.*

The Word 'Verb'

The word *verb* originally comes from **were-*, a Proto-Indo-European word meaning "a word". It comes to English through the Latin *verbum* and the Old French *verbe*.

Verbal Phrase

In simple sentences, the verb may be one word: *The cat* sat *on the mat*. However, the verb may be a whole phrase: *The cat* will sit *on the mat*.

Verbal phrases can be extremely difficult to analyse: *I'm afraid I will need to be going soon*. There seem to be three verbal phrases here, which add to something like *Sorry, I must go soon*.

Verb Forms

In English and many other languages, verbs change their form. This is called inflection. Most English verbs have six inflected forms, but *be* has eight different forms.

Forms of English Verbs

Primary forms	past: walked	She walked home
	3rd singular present: walks	She walks home
	plain present: walk	They walk home
Secondary forms	plain form: walk	She should walk home
	gerund: walking	She is walking home
	past participle: walked	She has walked home

You should notice that some of the verb forms look the same. You can say they have the same shape. For example, the plain present and the plain form of *walk* have the same shape. The same is true for the past and the past participle. But these different forms can have different shapes in other verbs. For example, the plain present of *be* is usually *are* but the plain form is *be*. Also, the past of *eat*

is *ate*, but the past participle is *eaten*. When you look for a verb in the dictionary, it is usually the plain form that you look for.

An English sentence must have at least one primary-form verb. Each main clause can only have one primary-form verb.

Kinds of Verbs

English has two main kinds of verbs: normal verbs (called lexical verbs) and auxiliary verbs. The difference between them is mainly in where they can go in a sentence. Some verbs are in both groups, but there are very few auxiliary verbs in English. There are also two kinds of auxiliary verbs: modal verbs and non-modal verbs. The table below shows most of the English auxiliaries and a small number of other verbs.

Kinds of English Verbs

	auxiliary verbs	*lexical verbs*
modal verbs	Can you play the piano?	I fell
	I will not be there	I didn't fall
	Shall we go	I had breakfast.
	Yes, you may	I'm playing soccer.
	You must be joking	Must you make that noise?
non-modal verbs	Have you seen him?	Have you seen him?
	I did see it	I did see it
	He is sleeping	He is sleeping

There are several auxiliary verbs:

- To *do* (do, does, did)
- To *be* (am, is, are, was, were): Creates a progressive tense
- To have (have, has, had): Creates a perfect tense

The follow verbs are *modal auxiliaries*

- Can

- Could
- May
- Might
- Must
- Shall
- Should

Auxiliary verbs also inflect for negation. Usually this is done by adding *not* or *n't*.

- You shouldn't be here.
- He isn't at home.
- We haven't started yet.

***Use of the Auxilary* Do**

Sometimes the verb *do*. It does not really change the meaning.

- I *do* talk (Present)
- I *did* go (Past)

It is also used in the negative when no other auxiliary verbs are used.

- I *don't* talk (Present)
- I *didn't* go (Past)

Many other languages do not use the verb *do* as an auxiliary verb. They use the simple present for *do*, and the simple past or perfect for '*did*

Tense, Aspect, and Mood

Many people think that all different ways of using verbs are all different tenses. This is not true. There are three main systems related to the verb: tense, aspect, and mood.

Tense

Tense is mainly used to say when the verb happens: in the past, present, or future. Some languages have all three

tenses, some have only two, and some have no tenses at all. English and Japanese for example have only two tenses: past and present. Chinese and Indonesian verbs do not show tense. Instead they use other words in the sentence to show when the verb happens.

English Tenses

Present tense	*Past tense*
She walks home	She walked home
He runs quickly	He ran quickly
I can swim well	I could swim well
Do you live here?	Did you live here?

Aspect

Aspect usually shows us things like whether the action is finished or not, or if something happens regularly. English has two aspects: progressive and perfect. In English, aspect is usually shown by using participle verb forms. Aspect can combine with present or past tense.

Progressive Aspect

English uses the gerund-participle, usually together with the auxiliary *be* (and its forms am, is, are, was, and were) to show the progressive aspect.

- I'm sleeping. (present progressive)
- He was studying English last night. (past progressive)
- He will be going to the store tomorrow (future progressive)

Many other languages, such as French, do not use progressive tenses. They use the simple present instead of the present progressive; and the imperfect instead of the past progressive.

Perfect Aspect

English uses the past participle, usually together with the auxiliary *have* to show the perfect aspect.

- I've seen him twice. (present perfect)
- I had lived there for three years. (past perfect)

The past perfect can be used to express an unrealized hope, wish, etc.

- He had intended to bake a cake but ran out of flour.
- She had wanted to buy him a gift but he refused.

After If, wish and would rather, the past perfect can be used to talk about past events that never happened.

- If only I had been born standing up!
- I wish you had told me that before.
- I would rather you had gone somewhere else.

Mood

Finally, English mood is now usually shown by using modal verbs. In the past, English had a full mood system but that has almost completely disappeared. The subjunctive mood now uses the plain form. There is also a form of *be* that is used in conditionals to show that something is not true (e.g., If I were a bird, I would fly to California.)

Sentence Parts that Go with Verbs

Certain parts of a sentence naturally come before verbs or after them, but these are not always the same for all verbs. The main sentence parts are: subject, object, complement, and modifier.

Subjects

Almost all English sentences have subjects, but sentences that are orders (called imperatives) usually do not have any subjects. A subject usually comes before a verb, but it can also come after auxiliary verbs. In the following examples, the subject is underlined and the primary verb is in bold.

- We need you.

- The food was good.
- The small boy with red hair is sleeping.
- Can you see the car?
- Come here. (no subject)

Objects

Many verbs can be followed by an object. These verbs are called transitive verbs. In fact, some verbs must have an object (e.g., *take*), but some verbs never take an object (e.g., *sleep*). Verbs that do not take an object are called intransitive verbs. Some verbs can even have two objects. They are called ditransitive verbs. In the following examples, the object is underlined and the primary verb is in bold.

- I'm sleeping. (no object)
- I took the book from him.
- I gave him the book. (2 objects)
- I am happy. (no object)
- I became a teacher. (complement, no object)
- I slept in my bed (1 object)

Complements

Some verbs can or must be followed by a complement. These verbs are called linking verbs or copula. In the following examples, the complement is underlined and the verb is in bold.

- He is good.
- He is a boy.
- She became sick.
- She became a manager.
- It looks nice.

Modifiers

Verbs can be modified by various modifiers, mainly adverbs. Note that verbs generally do not need modifiers; it's usually a choice. In the following examples, the adverb is underlined and the verb is in bold.

- The boy ran quickly.
- The freely swinging rope hit him.

Verbs also commonly take a variety of other modifiers including prepositions.

Differences Between Verbs and Other Kinds of Words

Sometimes a verb and another word can have the same shape. In these cases you can usually see the difference by looking at various properties of the words.

Verbs vs. Adjectives

Sometimes a verb and an adjective can have the same shape. Usually this happens with participles. For example, the present participle *interesting* and the adjective *interesting* look the same. Verbs are different from adjectives, though, because they cannot be modified by *very*, *more*, or *most*. For example, you can say "That is very interesting," so you know interesting is an adjective here. But you cannot say "My teacher is very interesting me in math" because in this sentence *interesting* is a verb. On the other hand, if you cannot change the 'be' verb to 'seem' or 'become', it is probably a verb.

- He was isolated / He became isolated (*isolated* is an adjective)
- The door was opening / *The door became opening (*opening* is a verb)

Verbs vs. Nouns

The gerund-particle sometimes looks like a noun. This is especially true when it is used as a subject, as in the following example:

- Running is good for you.

The main differences between these verbs and nouns are: modifiers, number, and object/complement

Modifiers

Verbs cannot generally be modified by adjectives and nouns cannot generally be modified by adverbs. So, in "Running regularly is good for you", *running* is a verb because it is modified by *regularly*, an adverb.

Number

Verbs cannot change for number, so if you can make the word plural, it is a noun, not a verb. For example, "this drawing is nice" can change to "these drawings are nice", so *drawing* is a noun. But "drawing trees is fun" cannot change to "drawings trees is fun", so it is a verb here.

Object / Complement

Many verbs can take objects or complements, but nouns cannot. So, in "parking the car is hard", *parking* is a verb because it takes the object *the car*. But, if you say, "there's no parking", parking may be a noun because it does not have an object.

Verbs vs. Prepositions

Some verbs have become prepositions. Again, usually these share a shape with participles. Here are some examples:

- Given the problems, I do not think we should go.
- We have many helpers, including John.
- According to the map, we are here.
- He went to hospital following the fight.

The main difference between verbs and prepositions is that verbs have a subject. Even if the subject is not written, you can understand what it is. Prepositions do not have a subject.

PHRASAL VERB

Phrasal verb is the name given to an English verb which is composed of two or three words. One verb is

combined with a preposition (like *on, in, under)* or an adverb (like *up, down, away*). Sometimes a phrasal verb can have a meaning that is very different to the meaning of at least one of those two or three words separately. Some text books call these verbs multi-word verbs. Phrasal verbs are used more frequently in everyday speech than in formal, official writing or speaking.

Here are some examples:

Maria didn't know the word, so she looked it up *in the dictionary.*
Oh no, we've run out of *milk! I'll have to buy some more.*
Farmers have to get up *early in the morning.*
The rocket took off *with a loud roar.*

Often these phrasal verbs have a one-word equivalent in other languages. In Spanish, to get up can be translated as *levantarse*, in French as *se lever* etc.

Many students of English as a foreign language panic when they hear the term "phrasal verbs", but in fact phrasal verbs are just vocabulary to memorize, and not some strange, secret grammatical formula. In fact many native speakers of English do not know the term "phrasal verb" at all, even though they probably use them very often!

Types of Phrasal Verbs

There are four different types of phrasal verbs. These are:

- Phrasal verbs which take objects and are separable
- Phrasal verbs which take objects and are inseparable
- Phrasal verbs which do not take objects (these are always inseparable)
- Three-word phrasal verbs

Instead of "separate" or "separable", some text books use the word "split" or "splittable".

A useful piece of advice to confused students of English is this:

> If you do not know if a phrasal verb is separable or inseparable ALWAYS use a noun or noun phrase and do not try to separate the verb.

PHRASAL VERB

A phrasal verb is a combination of a verb and a preposition, a verb and an adverb, or a verb with both an adverb and a preposition, any of which are part of the syntax of the sentence, and so are a complete semantic unit. Sentences may contain direct and indirect objects in addition to the phrasal verb. Phrasal verbs are particularly frequent in the English language. A phrasal verb often has a meaning which is different from the original verb.

According to Tom McArthur:

> ...the term 'phrasal verb' was first used by Logan Pearsall Smith, in "Words and Idioms" (1925), in which he states that the OED Editor Henry Bradley suggested the term to him.

Alternative terms for phrasal verb are 'compound verb', 'verb-adverb combination', 'verb-particle construction (VPC)', AmE 'two-part word/verb' and 'three-part word/verb' (depending on the number of particles), and multi-word verb (MWV).

Prepositions and adverbs used in a phrasal verb are also called particles in that they do not alter their form through inflections (are therefore uninflected: they do not accept affixes, etc.). Because of the idiomatic nature of phrasal verbs, they are often subject to preposition stranding.

Phrasal Verbs in Informal Speech

Phrasal verbs are usually used informally in everyday speech as opposed to the more formal Latinate verbs, such as "to get together" rather than "to congregate", "to put off" rather than "to postpone", or "to get out" rather than "to exit".

Literal Usage

Many verbs in English can be combined with an adverb or a preposition, and readers or listeners will easily understand a phrasal verb used in a literal sense with a preposition:

- "He *walked across* the square."

Verb and adverb constructions can also easily be understood when used literally:

- "She opened the shutters and *looked outside*."
- "When he heard the crash, he *looked up*."

An adverb in a literal phrasal verb modifies the verb it is attached to, and a preposition links the verb to the object.

Idiomatic Usage

It is, however, the figurative or idiomatic application in everyday speech which makes phrasal verbs so important:

- "I hope you will *get over* your operation quickly."
- "Work hard, and *get* your examination *over with*."

The literal meaning of "to get over", in the sense of "to climb over something to get to the other side", no longer applies to explain the subject's enduring an operation or the stress of an examination which they have to overcome. It is when the combined meaning of verb plus adverb, or verb plus preposition is totally different from each of its component parts, that the semantic content of the phrasal verb cannot be predicted by its constituent parts and so becomes much more difficult for a student learning English to recognise.

Other idiomatic usages of phrasal verbs show a verb + direct object + preposition adverb + indirect object construction:

> In her introduction to "Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs, What this dictionary contains", Rosemary Courtney includes as a third category
>
> 3. Idioms which are formed from phrasal verbs, such as *let the cat out of the bag*. These idioms are printed in heavy type. Idioms have a meaning which is different from the meaning of the single words, and usually have a fixed word order.

Courtney then cites among many other examples in the dictionary such phrases as "to add insult to injury", "to add fuel to the flames", "to leave someone in the lurch", "to scare someone out of their wits", etc.

Phrasal Verb Patterns

A phrasal verb contains either a preposition or an adverb (or both), and may also combine with one or more nouns or pronouns.

Particle Verbs

Phrasal verbs that contain adverbs are sometimes called "particle verbs", and are related to separable verbs in other Germanic languages. There are two main patterns: intransitive and transitive. An intransitive particle verb does not have an object:

- "When I entered the room he *looked up*."

A transitive particle verb has a nominal object in addition to the adverb. If the object is an ordinary noun, it can usually appear on either side of the adverb, although very long noun phrases tend to come after the adverb:

- *Switch off* the light.
- *Switch* the light *off*.
- *Switch off* the lights in the hallway next to the bedroom in which the president is sleeping.

With some transitive particle verbs, however, the noun object must come after the adverb. Such examples are said to involve "inseparable" phrasal verbs:

- The gas *gave off* fumes. (not *The gas *gave* fumes *off*.)

According to, still other transitive particle verbs require the object to precede the adverb, even when the object is a long noun phrase:

- I cannot *tell* the dogs *apart*. (not *I cannot *tell apart* the dogs.)
- I cannot *tell* the bulldogs and the pugs who look like them *apart*.

However, some authors say that the particle must be adjacent to the verb *whenever* the noun phrase is lengthy and complicated.

With all transitive particle verbs, if the object is a pronoun, it must, with just one type of exception, precede the adverb:

- *Switch* it *off*. (not *Switch off* it.)
- The smell *put* them *off*. (not **put off* them)
- They *let* him *through*. (not *they *let through* him)

The exception occurs if the direct object is contrastively stressed, as in

- *Figure out* THESE, not THOSE.

Gorlach asserts that the position of the nominal object before or after the adverb has a subtle effect on the degree to which the phrase has resultative implication, as seen in this example involving the simple verb *eat* and the phrasal verb *eat up*:

- *to eat* the apple (neutral for result)
- *to eat up* the apple (greater possibility for result)
- *to eat* the apple *up* (compulsory claim for result)

Prepositional Verbs

Prepositional verbs are phrasal verbs that contain a preposition, which is always followed by its nominal object.

They are different from inseparable transitive particle verbs, because the object still follows the preposition if it is a pronoun:

- On Fridays, we *look after* our grandchildren.
- We *look after* them. (not **look* them *after*)

The verb can have its own object, which usually precedes the preposition:

- She *helped* the boy *to* an extra portion of potatoes.
- with pronouns: She *helped* him *to* some.

Prepositional verbs with two prepositions are possible:

- We *talked to* the minister *about* the crisis.

Phrasal-Prepositional Verbs

A phrasal verb can contain an adverb and a preposition at the same time. Again, the verb itself can have a direct object:

- no direct object: The driver *got off to* a flying start.
- direct object: Onlookers *put* the accident *down to* the driver's loss of concentration.

Phrasal Verbs and Modifying Adverbs

When modifying adverbs are used alongside particle adverbs intransitively (as particle adverbs usually are), the adverbs can appear in any verb/particle/adverb positions:

- "He *unhappily looked round*."
- "He *looked unhappily round*."
- "He *looked round unhappily*."

The particle adverb here is "round" and the modifying adverb is "unhappily". ("Round" is a particle because it is not inflected — does not take affixes and alter its form. "Unhappily" is a modifying adverb because it modifies the verb "look").

With a transitive particle verb, the adverb goes either

before the verb or after the object or particle, whichever is last:

- "He *cheerfully picked* the book *up*."
- "He *picked up* the book *cheerfully*." (not **picked cheerfully up* the book)
- "He *picked* the book *up cheerfully*."

Prepositional verbs are different from transitive particle verbs, because they allow adverbs to appear between the verb and the preposition:

- "He *cheerfully looked after* the children.
- "He *looked after* the children *cheerfully*.
- "He *looked cheerfully after* the children.

Phrasal Verbs Combined with Special Verb Forms and Clauses

Courtney also includes special verb forms and clauses in phrasal verb constructions.

Phrasal verbs combined with wh-clauses and that-clauses

Sentences which include verb + particle + object(s) + wh-clauses

- "The teacher tries to *dictate to* his class *what the right thing to do is*"
  = transitive verb + preposition (dictate to) + indirect object (his class) + wh-clause (what the right thing to do is).
- "My friends *called for* me *when the time came*"
  = transitive verb + preposition (called for) + pronoun (me) + wh-clause (when the time came).
- "*Watch out that you don't hit your head on the low beam*"
  = intransitive verb + adverb (watch out) + that-clause (that you don't hit your head on the low beam).

Phrasal verbs combined with verb-ing forms

- "You can't *prevent* me *from seeing her*"
  = transitive verb + pronoun (prevent me) + preposition (from) + verb-ing form (seeing) + pronoun (her).

ATTRIBUTIVE VERB

In grammar, an attributive verb is a verb which modifies (gives the attributes of) a noun as an attributive, rather than expressing an independent idea as a predicate.

In English, verbs may be attributive as participles or as infinitives: *a barking dog; a hand-fed turkey; uneaten food*; *a place to eat.* It is uncommon for verbs to be used in their root form, and then only in the negative: *a no-go area, no-fly zone* or *list, non-stick pan, no-lose situation, no-rinse shampoo, no-bake cookies.*

However, many other languages allow regular verbs to be attributive. For example, in Japanese, predicative verbs come at the end of the clause, after the nouns, while attributive verbs come before the noun. These are equivalent to relative clauses in English; Japanese does not have relative pronouns like "who", "which", or "when":

Kino	ano	hito	aruita.
yesterday	that	person	walked

"That person walked yesterday."

Ano	kinô	aruita	hito.
that	yesterday	walked	person

"That person who walked yesterday."

In prescriptive speech the particle *ga* would appear after the subject: *Kinô ano hito ga aruita.* However, this it is often omitted as here in conversation.

Japanese attributive verbs inflect for grammatical aspect, as here, and grammatical polarity, but not commonly

for politeness. For example, the polite form of *hito ga aruita* is *hito ga arukimashita,* but the form *arukimashita hito* is not common (felt to be too polite and paraphrastic), though it is grammatically correct. Except for this, modern Japanese verbs have the same form whether predicative or attributive. (The only exception is the copula, which is *da* or *desu* when used predicatively and *na* when used attributively.) Historically, however, these had been separate forms. This is still the case in languages such as Korean and Turkish. The following examples illustrate the difference:

Classical Japanese:

- *hito arukiki* - a person walked
- *arukishi hito* - the person who walked

Turkish:

- *Adam °iir okur* "The man reads poetry."
- *ªiir okuyan adam* "The man who reads poetry."

Notice that all of these languages have a verb-final word order, and that none of them have relative pronouns. They also do not have a clear distinction between verbs and adjectives, as can be seen in Japanese:

- *Sora (ga) aoi.* "The sky is blue."
- *Aoi sora* "A blue sky."

In Japanese, *aoi* "blue" is effectively a descriptive verb rather than an adjective.

All of these characteristics are common among verb-final languages.

AUXILIARY VERB

In linguistics, an auxiliary (also called helping verb, helper verb, auxiliary verb, or verbal auxiliary, abbreviated AUX) is a verb functioning to give further semantic or syntactic information about the main or full verb following it. In English, the extra meaning provided by an auxiliary verb alters the basic meaning of the main verb to make it have

one or more of the following functions: voice, aspect, perfection, or modality.

In English, every clause has a finite verb which consists of a main verb (a non-auxiliary verb) and optionally one or more auxiliary verbs, each of which is a separate word. Examples of finite verbs include *write* (no auxiliary verb), *have written* (one auxiliary verb), and *have been written* (two auxiliary verbs). Many languages, including English, feature some verbs that can act either as auxiliary or as main verbs, such as *be* ("I am writing a letter" vs "I am a postman") and *have* ("I have written a letter" vs "I have a letter"). In the case of *be*, it is sometimes ambiguous whether it is auxiliary or not; for example, "the ice cream was melted" could mean either "something melted the ice cream" (in which case *melt* would be the main verb) or "the ice cream was mostly liquid" (in which case *be* would be the main verb).

The primary auxiliary verbs in English are *to be* and *to have*; other major ones include *shall*, *will*, *may* and *can*.

Functions of the English Auxiliary Verb

Passive Voice

The auxiliary verb *be* is used with a past participle to form the passive voice; for example, the clause "the door was opened" implies that someone (or something) opened it, without stating who (or what) it was. Because many past participles are also stative adjectives, the passive voice can sometimes be ambiguous; for example, "at 8:25, the window was closed" can be a passive-voice sentence meaning, "at 8:25, someone closed the window", or a non-passive-voice sentence meaning "at 8:25, the window was not open". Perhaps because of this ambiguity, the verb *get* is sometimes used colloquially instead of *be* in forming the passive voice, "at 8:25, the window got closed."

Progressive Aspect

The auxiliary verb *be* is used with a present participle

to form the progressive aspect; for example, "I am riding my bicycle" describes what the subject is doing at the given (in this case present) time without indicating completion, whereas "I ride my bicycle" is a temporally broader statement referring to something that occurs habitually in the past, present, and future. Similarly, "I was riding my bicycle" refers to the ongoing nature of what I was doing in the past, without viewing it in its entirety through completion, whereas "I rode my bicycle" refers either to a single past act viewed in its entirety through completion or to a past act that occurred habitually.

Perfect Aspect

The auxiliary verb *have* is used with a past participle to indicate perfect aspect: a current state experienced by the subject as a result of a past action or state. For example, in "I have visited Paris" the current state is one of having a Paris visit in one's past, while the past action is visiting Paris. The past action may be ongoing, as in "I have been studying all night". An example involving the result of a past state rather than a past action is "I have known that for a long time", in which the past state still exists (I still know it) along with the resultant state (I am someone who knew that at some past time). An example involving the result of a past state that no longer exists is "I have felt bad in the past, but not recently". The alternative use of *had* instead of *have* places the perspective from which the resultant state is viewed in the past: "By 1985 I had visited Paris" describes the 1985 state of having a prior Paris visit.

Modality

Modality means the attitude of the speaker to the action or state being expressed, in terms of either degree of probability ("The sun must be down already", "The sun should be down already", "The sun may be down already", "The sun might be down already"), ability ("I can speak French"), or permission or obligation ("You must go now",

"You should go now", "You may go now"). See modal verb and English modal verb.

Properties of the English Auxiliary Verb

Negation

Auxiliaries take *not* (or n't) to form the negative, e.g. cannot (can't), will not (won't), should not (shouldn't), etc. In certain tenses, in questions, when a contracted auxiliary verb can be used, the position of the negative particle *n't* moves from the main verb to the auxiliary: cf. *Does it not work?* and *Doesn't it work?*.

Inversion

Auxiliaries invert to form questions:

- "You will come."
- "Will you come?"

Ellipsis

Auxiliaries can appear alone where a main verb has been omitted, but is understood:

- "I will go, but she will not."

The verb *do* can act as a pro-VP (or occasionally a pro-verb) to avoid repetition:

- "John never sings in the kitchen, but Mary does."
- "John never sings in the kitchen, but Mary does in the shower."

Tag Questions

Auxiliaries can be repeated at the end of a sentence, with negation added or removed, to form a tag question. In the event that the sentence did not use an auxiliary verb, a dummy auxiliary (a form of *do*) is used instead:

- "You *will* come, *won't* you?"
- "You ate, *didn't* you?"
- "You *won't* (will not) come, *will* you?"

- "You *didn't* (did not) eat, *did* you?"
- "You (*do*) know how to dance, *don't* you?"

Similar negative auxiliary verbs are found in Nivkh and the Salish and Chimakuan languages formerly spoken in northwestern North America. Salish and Chimakuan languages also have *interrogative auxiliary verbs* that form questions in the same manner as negative verbs do negated statements.

In many non-Indo-European languages, the functions of auxiliary verbs are largely or entirely replaced by suffixes on the main verb. This is especially true of epistemic possibility and necessity verbs, but extends to situational possibility and necessity verbs in many indigenous languages of North America, indigenous Australian languages and Papuan languages of New Guinea.

In Hawaiian Creole English, a creole language based on a vocabulary drawn largely from English, auxiliaries are used for any of tense, aspect, and modality expression. The preverbal auxiliary *wen* indicates past tense (*Ai wen see om* "I saw him"). The future marker is the preverbal auxiliary *gon* or *goin* "am/is/are going to": *gon bai* "is going to buy". These tense markers indicate relative tense: that is, past or future time relative to some benchmark that may or may not be the speaker's present (e.g., *Da gai sed hi gon fiks mi ap* "the guy said he [was] gonna fix me up". There are various preverbal modal auxiliaries: *kaen* "can", *laik* "want to", *gata* "have got to", *haeftu* "have to", *baeta* "had better", *sapostu* "am/is/are supposed to". *Waz* "was" can indicate past tense before the future marker *gon* and the modal *sapostu*: *Ai waz gon lift weits* "I was gonna lift weights"; *Ai waz sapostu go* "I was supposed to go". There is a preverbal auxiliary *yustu* for past tense habitual aspect : *yustu tink so* "used to think so". The progressive aspect can be marked with the auxiliary *ste* in place of or in addition to the verbal suffix *-in*: *Wat yu ste it*? = *Wat yu itin?* "What are you eating?" *Ste* can alternatively indicate

perfective aspect: *Ai ste kuk da stu awredi* "I cooked the stew already". *Stat* is an auxiliary for inchoative aspect when combined with the verbal suffix *-in*: *gon stat plein* "gonna start playing". The auxiliary *pau* without the verbal suffix indicates completion: *pau tich* "finish(ed) teaching". Aspect auxiliaries can co-occur with tense-marking auxiliaries: *gon ste plei* "gonna be playing"; *wen ste it* "was eating".

Hawaiian is an isolating language, so its verbal grammar exclusively relies on unconjugated auxiliary verbs. It has indicative and imperative moods, the imperative indicated by *e* + verb (or in the negative by *mai* + verb). In the indicative its verbs can optionally be marked by *ua* + verb (perfective aspect, but frequently replaced by the unmarked form); *ke* + verb + *nei* (present tense progressive aspect; very frequently used); and *e* + verb + *ana* (imperfective aspect, especially for non-present time).

In Mandarin Chinese, another isolating language, auxiliary verbs are distinguished from adverbs in that (1) yes-no questions can be answered with subject + auxiliary (e.g., *Ni néng lái ma? WÒ néng* "Can you come? I can" is correct) but not with subject + adverb (e.g., *Ni yídìng lái ma? WÒ yídìng* "Will you definitely come? I definitely" is incorrect), and (2) an auxiliary but not an adverb can be used in the yes-or-no construction verb + "not" + verb (as in *Ni néng bu néng lái?* "you can not can come?"). The auxiliary verbs in Mandarin include three meaning "should", four meaning "be able to", two meaning "have permission to", one meaning "dare", one meaning "be willing to", four meaning "have to", and one meaning either "will" or "know how".

REFERENCES

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads—a cross linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University press.

Courtney, Rosemary: "Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs",

Longman Group Uk Limited, 1989 ISBN 0-582-55530-2 CSD, ISBN 0-582-05864-3 PPR

Dixon, R. M. W. (1977). "Where have all the adjectives gone?". *Studies in Language* 1: 19–80.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1999). Adjectives. In K. Brown & T. Miller (Eds.), *Concise encyclopedia of grammatical categories* (pp. 1–8). Amsterdam: Elsevier. ISBN 0-08-043164-X.

Dixon, R. M. W.; R. E. Asher (Editor) (1993). *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (1st ed.). Pergamon Press Inc. pp. 29–35. ISBN 0080359434.

Ernst, Thomas. 2002. *The syntax of adjuncts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fraser, Bruce, *The Verb-Particle Combination in English*, Academic Press, 1976.

Gorlach, Marina, *Phrasal Constructions and Resultatives in English*, John Benjamins Publ. Co., 2004.

Huddleston R. & Pullum G.K 2005. *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Huddleston, Rodney (1988). *English grammar: an outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 7.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. MIT Press,

James R. Hurford (1994). *Grammar: a student's guide*. Cambridge University Press. p. 20. ISBN 0521456274.

Li, Charles N., and Sandra A. Thompson, *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*, Univ. of California Press, 1989.

Long, Thomas Hill (Editorial Director), Summers, Della (Managing Editor): "Longman Dictionary of English Idioms", Longman Group Limited, 1979 ISBN 0-582-55524-8

McArthur, Tom: "The Oxford Companion to the English Language", pp. 72-76, Oxford University Press, 1992 ISBN 0-19-2114183-X.

Nancy Harrison (1985). *Writing English: a user's manual*. Taylor & Francis. p. 104. ISBN 0709937083.

Pukui, Mary Kawena, and Samuel H. Elbert, *New Pocket Hawaiian Dictionary*, U. of Hawaii Press, 1992: grammar section, pp. 225-243.

Pullum, Geoffrey K. (21 June 2008). "Twenty selected Coalface errors". *Language Log*.

Sakoda, Kent, and Jeff Siegel, *Pidgin Grammar*, Bess Press, 2003.

Warren, Beatrice. (1984). *Classifying adjectives*. Gothenburg studies in English (No. 56). Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. ISBN 91-7346-133-4.

Wierzbicka, Anna (1986). "What's in a noun? (or: How do nouns differ in meaning from adjectives?)". *Studies in Language* 10: 353–389.

4

Reflections on Tense, Preposition and Conjugation

TENSE

Tense is a system of verb forms. Its main job is to show when the verb happens. There are three main tenses:

1. Past tense (things that were true before the words are spoken or written)
2. Present tense (things that are true at the time the words are spoken or written, are generally true, or for some languages will be true in the future)
3. Future tense (things that will or might be true after the words are spoken or written)

Some languages have all three tenses, some have only two, and some have no tenses at all. English and Japanese for example have only two common tenses: past and present. Obviously, English verbal phrases do indicate future time, but not in the form of the verb itself. We only have present (take, takes) and past (took). The rest, including the future, is done by adding auxiliaries such as *be*, *have*, *is*, *shall*, *will*, and so on. So we get the continuous present with *is taking*, the future with *will take*, and so on. These 'tenses' (as they used to be called) are now called 'aspects'. Chinese and Indonesian verbs do not show tense. Instead they use other words in the sentence to show when the verb happens.

Popular Ideas of Tense

Many people think that 'tense' means any verb form or even certain combinations of auxiliary verbs and other verbs. For example, many people say that *will go* is future tense or that *He is loved by many* is passive tense. This is not technically correct.

PREPOSITION

Prepositions are words or word groups which begin a noun phrase with more than one word. Most prepositions tell where or when, or show possession.

Prepositions like *in*, *beside*, *above*, and *out of* all tell *where*, and are usually used with nouns or pronouns. Some examples with the phrases underlined: "The man sat *close to* his wife. He put his arm *around* her shoulder. Then he kissed her *on* the cheek."

Prepositions like *right after*, *until*, *during*, and *before* all tell *when*. "Mr. Prasad had an important meeting *until* ten o'clock. *During* the meeting, his cell phone rang. It was his wife. She asked him to come straight home *right after* work."

The prepositions *of* and *to* are used to show possession, or *belonging-to*: "This book belongs *to Vlad*. The cover *of the book* is torn."

Here is a list of Prepositions:

- about
- Above
- About
- Across
- After
- Along
- Amid
- Among
- Around

- As
- At
- Before
- Behind
- Below
- Beneath
- Between
- Because of
- Down
- During
- Except
- For
- From
- In
- Into
- Inside
- Instead of
- Near
- Next to
- Of
- Off
- On
- Outside
- Past
- Out of
- Round
- Since
- Than
- Through
- Till
- To
- Under
- Underneath
- Until

- Unto
- Upon
- Without
- With
- Within

PREPOSITION AND POSTPOSITION

In grammar, a preposition is a part of speech that introduces a prepositional phrase. For example, in the sentence "The cat sleeps on the sofa", the word "on" is a preposition, introducing the prepositional phrase "on the sofa". In English, the most used prepositions are "of", "to", "in", "for", "with" and "on". Simply put, a preposition indicates a relation between things mentioned in a sentence. Many style guides instruct that prepositions should not be placed at the end of a sentence unless it is necessary to maintain sentence structure or avoid awkward phrasing. However, Winston Churchill said, "This is a rule up with which we should not put."

Another simpler term, a preposition is a prior explanation, typically found before a noun, pronoun, or substantives, that explains the noun, pronoun, or substantive. Examples would be beneath, between, under, above, below, upon, atop, into, onto, within, without, or across. (The princess found the pea 'underneath' her mattress.)

A postposition would be for the same use but used after the noun, pronoun, or substantive. (He drew a line on the map from one state and 'across'.)

In many languages (e.g. Urdu, Turkish, Hindi and Japanese), the words that serve the role of prepositions come after, not before, the dependent noun phrase. Such words are commonly called postpositions; similarly, circumpositions consist of two parts that appear on both sides of the dependent noun phrase. The technical term used to refer collectively to prepositions, postpositions,

and circumpositions is adposition. In more technical language, an adposition is an element that, prototypically, combines syntactically with a phrase and indicates how that phrase should be interpreted in the surrounding context. Some linguists use the word "preposition" instead of "adposition" for all three cases.

In linguistics, adpositions are considered members of the syntactic category "P". "PPs", consisting of an adpositional head and its complement phrase, are used for a wide range of syntactic and semantic functions, most commonly modification and complementation. The following examples illustrate some uses of English prepositional phrases:

- as a modifier to a verb
  - sleep throughout the winter
  - danced atop the tables for hours
- as a modifier to a noun
  - the weather in May
  - cheese from France with live bacteria
- as the complement of a verb
  - insist on staying home
  - dispose of unwanted items
- as the complement of a noun
  - a thirst for revenge
  - an amendment to the constitution
- as the complement of an adjective or adverb
  - attentive to their needs
  - separately from its neighbors
- as the complement of another preposition
  - until after supper
  - from beneath the bed

Adpositions perform many of the same functions as case markings, but adpositions are syntactic elements, while case markings are morphological elements.

Definition

Adpositions form a heterogeneous class, with boundaries that tend to overlap with other categories (like verbs, nouns, and adjectives). It is thus impossible to provide an absolute definition that picks out all and only the adpositions in every language. The following features, however, are often required of adpositions.

- An adposition combines syntactically with exactly one complement phrase, most often a noun phrase (or, in a different analysis, a determiner phrase). (In some analyses, an adposition need have no complement. See below.) In English, this is generally a noun (or something functioning as a noun, e.g., a gerund), called the *object of the preposition*, together with its attendant modifiers.
- An adposition establishes the grammatical relationship that links its complement phrase to another word or phrase in the context. In English, it also establishes a semantic relationship, which may be spatial (*in*, *on*, *under*, ...), temporal (*after*, *during*, ...), or logical (*via*, ...) in nature.
- An adposition determines certain grammatical properties of its complement (e.g. its case). In English, the objects of prepositions are always in the objective case. In Koine Greek, certain prepositions always take their objects in a certain case (e.g., í always takes its object in the dative), and other prepositions may take their object in one of several cases, depending on the meaning of the preposition (e.g., äéÜ takes its object in the genitive or in the accusative, depending on the meaning).
- Adpositions are non-inflecting (or "invariant"); i.e., they do not have paradigms of forms (for different tenses, cases, genders, etc.) in the same way as verbs, adjectives, and nouns in the same language. There are exceptions, though, for example in Celtic languages.

Properties

The following properties are characteristic of most adpositional systems.

- Adpositions are among the most frequently occurring words in languages that have them. For example, one frequency ranking for English word forms begins as follows (adpositions in bold):

  the, of, and, to, a, in, that, it, is, was, I, for, on, you, …

- The most common adpositions are single, monomorphemic words. According to the ranking cited above, for example, the most common English prepositions are the following:

  on, in, to, by, for, with, at, of, from, as, …

- Adpositions form a closed class of lexical items and cannot be productively derived from words of other categories.

Stranding

Preposition stranding is a syntactic construct in which a preposition with an object occurs somewhere other than immediately next to its object. For example: *Who did you give it to?* where *to* refers to *who*, which is placed at the beginning of the sentence because it is an interrogative word. The above sentence is much more common and natural than the equivalent sentence without stranding: *To who(m) did you give it?* Preposition stranding is most commonly found in English, as well as North Germanic languages such as Swedish. The existence of preposition stranding in German and Dutch is debated. Preposition stranding is also found in languages outside the Germanic family, such as Vata and Gbadi (languages of the Niger-Congo) and the dialects of some North American French speakers.

Classification

Adpositions can be organized into subclasses according

to various criteria. These can be based on directly observable properties (such as the adposition's form or its position in the sentence) or on less visible properties (such as the adposition's meaning or function in the context at hand).

Simple vs Complex

Simple adpositions consist of a single word, while complex adpositions consist of a group of words that act as one unit. Some examples of complex prepositions in English are:

- in spite of, with respect to, except for, by dint of, next to

The boundary between simple and complex adpositions is not clear-cut and for the most part arbitrary. Many simple adpositions are derived from complex forms (e.g. *with* + *in* —> *within*, *by* + *side* —> *beside*) through grammaticalization. This change takes time, and during the transitional stages the adposition acts in some ways like a single word, and in other ways like a multi-word unit. For example, current German orthographic conventions recognize the indeterminate status of the following adpositions, allowing two spellings:

- anstelle / an Stelle ("instead of"), aufgrund / auf Grund ("because of"), mithilfe / mit Hilfe ("thanks to"), zugunsten / zu Gunsten ("in favor of"), zuungunsten / zu Ungunsten ("to the disadvantage of"), zulasten / zu Lasten ("at the expense of")

The boundary between complex adpositions and free combinations of words is also a fuzzy one. For English, this involves structures of the form "preposition + (article) + noun + preposition". Many sequences in English, such as *in front of,* that are traditionally regarded as prepositional phrases are not so regarded by linguists. The following characteristics are good indications that a given combination is "frozen" enough to be considered a complex preposition in English:

- It contains a word that cannot be used in any other context: *by dint of*, *in lieu of*.
- The first preposition cannot be replaced: *with a view to* but not *for*/*without a view to*
- It is impossible to insert an article, or to use a different article: *on an*/*the account of*, *for the*/*a sake of*
- The range of possible adjectives is very limited: *in great favor of*, but not *in helpful favor of*
- The number of the noun cannot be changed: *by virtue*/**virtues of*
- It is impossible to use a possessive determiner: *in spite of him*, not **in his spite*

Complex prepositions develop through the grammaticalization of commonly used free combinations. This is an ongoing process that introduces new prepositions into English.

Classification by Position

The position of an adposition with respect to its complement allows the following subclasses to be defined:

- A preposition precedes its complement to form a prepositional phrase.
  German: auf dem Tisch, French: sur la table, Polish: na stole ("on the table")
- A postposition follows its complement to form a postpositional phrase.
  Chinese: zhuô zi shàng (lit. "table on"), Finnish: (minun) kanssani (lit. "my with"), Turkish: benimle (or "benim ile"), Latin: mecum (both lit. "me with"), English: three days ago

The two terms are more commonly used than the general *adposition*. Whether a language has primarily prepositions or postpositions is seen as an important aspect of its typological classification, correlated with many other properties of the language.

It is usually straightforward to establish whether an adposition precedes or follows its complement. In some cases, the complement may not appear in a typical position. For example, in preposition stranding constructions, the complement appears before the preposition:

- {How much money} did you say the guy wanted to sell us the car for?
- She's going to the Bahamas? {Who} with?

In other cases, the complement of the adposition is absent:

- I'm going to the park. Do you want to come with?
- French: Il fait trop froid, je ne suis pas habillée pour. ("It's too cold, I'm not dressed for [the situation]."")

The adpositions in the examples are generally still considered prepositions because when they form a phrase with the complement (in more ordinary constructions), they must appear first.

Some adpositions can appear on either side of their complement; these can be called ambipositions (Reindl 2001, Libert 2006):

- He slept {through the whole night}/{the whole night through}.
- German: {meiner Meinung nach}/{nach meiner Meinung} ("in my opinion")

An ambiposition entlang (along). It can be put before or after the noun related to it (but with different noun cases attached to it).

die Straße entlang
entlang der Straße
along the road

Another adposition surrounds its complement, called a circumposition:

- A circumposition has two parts, which surround the complement to form a circumpositional phrase.
  - English: from now on
  - Dutch: naar het einde toe ("towards the end", lit. "to the end to")
  - Mandarin: áˆ cóng bîngxîang li ("from the inside of the refrigerator", lit. "from refrigerator inside")
  - French: à un détail près ("except for one detail", lit. "at one detail near")

"Circumposition" can be a useful descriptive term, though most circumpositional phrases can be broken down into a more hierarchical structure, or given a different analysis altogether. For example, the Mandarin example above could be analyzed as a prepositional phrase headed by *cóng* ("from"), taking the postpositional phrase *bîngxîang lÐ* ("refrigerator inside") as its complement. Alternatively, the *cóng* may be analyzed as not a preposition at all.

- An inposition is an adposition between constituents of a complex complement.
- Ambiposition is sometimes used for an adposition that can function as either a preposition or a postposition.

Melis (2003) proposes the descriptive term interposition for adpositions in the structures such as the following:

- mot à mot ("word for word"), coup sur coup ("one after another, repeatedly"), page après page ("page upon page")

An interposition is not an adposition which appears inside its complement as the two nouns do not form a single phrase (there is no **mot mot* or **page page*). Examples of actually interposed adpositions can be found in Latin (e.g. *summa cum laude*, lit. "highest with praise"). But

they are always related to a more basic prepositional structure.

Classification by Complement

Although noun phrases are the most typical complements, adpositions can in fact combine with a variety of syntactic categories, much like verbs.

- noun phrases: *It was on {the table}.*
- adpositional phrases: *Come out from {under the bed}.*
- adjectives and adjective phrases: *The scene went from {blindingly bright} to {pitch black}.*
- adverbs or adverb phrases: *I worked there until {recently}*
- infinitival or participial verb phrases: *Let's think about {solving this problem}.*
- interrogative clauses: *We can't agree on {whether to have children or not}*
- full sentences

Also like verbs, adpositions can appear without a complement; see Adverbs below.

Some adpositions could be described as combining with two complements:

- {With Sammy president}, we can all come out of hiding again.
- {For Sammy to become president}, they'd have to seriously modify the Constitution.

It is more commonly assumed, however, that *Sammy* and the following predicate first forms a [small clause], which then becomes the single complement of the preposition. (In the first example above, a word (such as *as*) may be considered to be ellided, which, if present, would clarify the grammatical relationship.)

Semantic Classification

Adpositions can be used to express a wide range of semantic relations between their complement and the rest of the context. The following list is not an exhaustive classification:

- spatial relations: location (inclusion, exclusion, proximity), direction (origin, path, endpoint)
- temporal relations
- comparison: equality, opposition, price, rate
- content: source, material, subject matter
- agent
- instrument, means, manner
- cause, purpose
- Reference

Most common adpositions are highly polysemous, and much research is devoted to the description and explanation of the various interconnected meanings of particular adpositions. In many cases a primary, spatial meaning can be identified, which is then extended to non-spatial uses by metaphorical or other processes.

In some contexts, adpositions appear in contexts where their semantic contribution is minimal, perhaps altogether absent. Such adpositions are sometimes referred to as functional or case-marking adpositions, and they are lexically selected by another element in the construction, or fixed by the construction as a whole.

- English: dispense with formalities, listen to my advice, good at mathematics
- Russian: otvechat' na vopros (*lit.* "answer on the question"), obvinenie v obmane ("accusation in [i.e. of] fraud")
- Spanish: soñar con ganar el título ("dream with [i.e. about] winning the title"), consistir en dos grupos ("consist in [i.e. of] two groups")

It is usually possible to find some semantic motivation for the choice of a given adposition, but it is generally impossible to explain why other semantically motivated adpositions are excluded in the same context. The selection of the correct adposition in these cases is a matter of syntactic well-formedness.

Subclasses of Spatial Adpositions

Spatial adpositions can be divided into two main classes, namely directional and static ones. A *directional* adposition usually involves motion along a *path* over time, but can also denote a non-temporal path. Examples of directional adpositions include *to, from, towards, into, along* and *through*.

- Bob went to the store. (movement over time)
- A path into the woods. (non-temporal path)
- The fog extended from London to Paris. (non-temporal path)

A *static* adposition normally does not involve movement. Examples of these include *at, in, on, beside, behind, under* and *above*.

- Bob is at the store.

Directional adpositions differ from static ones in that they normally can't combine with a copula to yield a predicate, though there are some exceptions to this, as in *Bob is from Australia*, which may perhaps be thought of as special uses.

- Fine: Bob is in his bedroom. (*in* is static)
- Bad: *Bob is to his bedroom. (*to* is directional)

Directional spatial adpositions can only combine with verbs that involve motion; static prepositions can combine with other verbs as well.

- Fine: Bob is lying down in his bedroom.
- Bad: *Bob is lying down into/from his bedroom.

When a static adposition combines with a motion verb, it sometimes takes on a directional meaning. The following sentence can either mean that Bob jumped *around* in the water, or else that he jumped so that he *ended up* in the water.

- Bob jumped in the water.

In some languages, directional adpositions govern a different case on their complement than static ones. These are known as casally modulated prepositions. For example, in German, directional adpositions govern accusative while static ones govern dative. Adpositions that are ambiguous between directional and static interpretations govern accusative when they are interpreted as directional, and dative when they are interpreted as static.

- in seinem Zimmer (in his-DATIVE room) "in his room" (static)
- in sein Zimmer (in his-ACCUSATIVE room) "into his room" (directional)

Directional adpositions can be further divided into telic ones and atelic ones. *To, into* and *across* are telic: they involve movement all the way to the endpoint denoted by their complement. Atelic ones include *towards* and *along*. When telic adpositions combine with a motion verb, the result is a telic verb phrase. Atelic adpositions give rise to atelic verb phrases when so combined.

Static adpositions can be further subdivided into projective and non-projective ones. A non-projective static adposition is one whose meaning can be determined by inspecting the meaning of its complement and the meaning of the preposition itself. A *projective* static adposition requires, in addition, a *perspective* or *point of view*. If I say that *Bob is behind the rock*, you need to know where I am to know on which side of the rock Bob is supposed to be. If I say that *your pen is to the* left *of my book*, you also need to know what my point of view is. No such point of view is

required in the interpretation of sentences like *your pen is on the desk*. Projective static prepositions can sometimes take the complement itself as "point of view," if this provides us with certain information. For example, a *house* normally has a *front* and a *back*, so a sentence like the following is actually ambiguous between two readings: one has it that Bob is at the back of the house; the other has it that Bob is on the *other side* of the house, with respect to the speaker's point of view.

- Bob is behind the house.

A similar effect can be observed with *left of*, given that objects that have fronts and backs can also be ascribed *lefts* and *rights*. The sentence, *My keys are to the left of the phone,* can either mean that they are on the *speaker's* left of the phone, or on the *phone's* left of the phone.

Classification by Grammatical Function

Particular uses of adpositions can be classified according to the function of the adpositional phrase in the sentence.

- Modification
  - o adverb-like

The athlete ran {across the goal line}.

  - o adjective-like
    - – attributively

A road trip {with children} is not the most relaxing vacation.

  - o in the predicate position

The key is {under the plastic rock}.

- Syntactic functions
  - o complement

Let's dispense with the formalities.

Here the words *dispense* and *with* complement one another, functioning as a unit to mean *forego*, and they share the direct object (*the formalities*). The verb *dispense* would not have this meaning without the word *with* to complement it.

{In the cellar} was chosen as the best place to hide the bodies.

Adpositional languages typically single out a particular adposition for the following special functions:

- marking possession
- marking the agent in the passive construction
- marking the beneficiary role in transfer relations

Overlaps with Other Categories

Adverbs

There are many similarities in form between adpositions and adverbs. Some adverbs are clearly derived from the fusion of a preposition and its complement, and some prepositions have adverb-like uses with no complement:

- {down the stairs}/downstairs, {under the ground}/ underground.
- {inside (the house)}, {aboard (the plane)}, {underneath (the surface)}

It is possible to treat all of these adverbs as intransitive prepositions, as opposed to transitive prepositions, which select a complement (just like transitive vs intransitive verbs). This analysis could also be extended to other adverbs, even those that cannot be used as "ordinary" prepositions with a nominal complement:

- here, there, abroad, downtown, afterwards, …

A more conservative approach is to say simply that adverbs and adpositional phrases share many common functions.

Particles

Phrasal verbs in English are composed of a verb and a "particle" that also looks like an intransitive preposition. The same can be said for the separable verb prefixes found in Dutch and German.

- give up, look out, sleep in, carry on, come to
- Dutch: opbellen ("to call (by phone)"), aanbieden ("to offer"), voorstellen ("to propose")
- German: einkaufen ("to purchase"), aussehen ("to resemble"), anbieten ("to offer")

Although these elements have the same lexical form as prepositions, in many cases they do not have relational semantics, and there is no "missing" complement whose identity can be recovered from the context.

Conjunctions

The set of adpositions overlaps with the set of subordinating conjunctions (or complementizers):

- (preposition) before/after/since the end of the summer
- (conjunction) before/after/since the summer ended
- (preposition) It looks like another rainy day
- (conjunction) It looks like it's going to rain again today

All of these words can be treated as prepositions if we extend the definition to allow clausal complements. This treatment could be extended further to conjunctions that are never used as ordinary prepositions:

- unless they surrender, although time is almost up, while you were on the phone

Coverbs

In some languages, the role of adpositions is served by coverbs, words that are lexically verbs, but are generally used to convey the meaning of adpositions.

For instance, whether prepositions exist in Chinese is sometimes considered an open question. Coverbs are often referred to as prepositions because they appear before the noun phrase they modify. However, unlike prepositions, coverbs can sometimes stand alone as main verbs. For instance, in Standard Chinese, *dào* can be used in a prepositional or a verb sense:

- *qù* ("to go") is the main verb:
  "I go to Beijing."
- *dào* ("to arrive") is the main verb:
  "I have arrived."

Case Affixes

From a functional point of view, adpositions and morphological case markings are similar. Adpositions in one language can correspond precisely to case markings in another language. For example, the agentive noun phrase in the passive construction in English is introduced by the preposition *by*. While in Russian it is marked by the instrumental case: "oy", "om", or "ami", depending on the noun's gender and number. Sometimes both prepositions and cases can be observed within a single language. For example, the genitive case in German is in many instances interchangeable with a phrase using the preposition *von*.

Despite this functional similarity, adpositions and case markings are distinct grammatical categories:

- Adpositions combine syntactically with their complement phrase. Case markings combine with a noun morphologically.
- Two adpositions can usually be joined with a conjunction and share a single complement, but this is normally not possible with case markings:

{of and for the people} vs. Latin populi et populo, not *populi et -o ("people-*genitive* and -*dative*")

- One adposition can usually combine with two

coordinated complements, but this is normally not possible with case markings:

> of {the city and the world} vs. Latin urbis et orbis, not *urb- et orbis ("city and world-*genitive*")

- Case markings combine primarily with nouns, whereas adpositions can combine with phrases of many different categories.
- A case marking usually appears directly on the noun, but an adposition can be separated from the noun by other words.
- Within the noun phrase, determiners and adjectives may agree with the noun in case (case spreading), but an adposition only appears once.
- A language can have hundreds of adpositions (including complex adpositions), but no language has this many distinct morphological cases.

It can be difficult to clearly distinguish case markings from adpositions. For example, the post-nominal elements in Japanese and Korean are sometimes called case particles and sometimes postpositions. Sometimes they are analysed as two different groups because they have different characteristics (e.g. ability to combine with focus particles), but in such analysis, it is unclear which words should fall into which group.

- Japanese: *densha de*, "by train"
- Korean: *Hangug-e, "to Korea"*

Turkish and Finnish have both extensive case-marking and postpositions, and here there is evidence to help distinguish the two:

- Turkish: (case) sinemaya (cinema-*dative*, "to the cinema") vs (postposition) sinema için ("for the cinema")
- Finnish: (case) talossa (house-*inessive*, "in the house")

vs (postposition) "talon edessä (house-*gen* in-front, "in front of the house")

In these examples, the case markings form a word with their hosts (as shown by vowel harmony, other word-internal effects and agreement of adjectives in Finnish), while the postpositions are independent words.

Some languages, like Sanskrit, use postpositions to emphasize the meaning of the grammatical cases, and eliminate possible ambiguities in the meaning of the phrase. For example: (Râmena saha, "in company of Râma"). In this example, "RâmeGa" is in the instrumental case, but, as its meaning can be ambiguous,the postposition *saha* is being used to emphasize the meaning of company.

In Indo-European languages, each case often contains several different endings, some of which may be derived from different roots. An ending is chosen depending on gender, number, whether the word is a noun or a modifier, and other factors.

Word Choice

The choice of preposition (or postposition) in a sentence is often idiomatic, and may depend either on the verb preceding it or on the noun which it governs: it is often not clear from the sense which preposition is appropriate. Different languages and regional dialects often have different conventions. Learning the conventionally preferred word is a matter of exposure to examples. For example, most dialects of American English have "to wait *in* line", but some have "to wait *on* line". Because of this, prepositions are often cited as one of the most difficult aspects of a language to learn, for both non-native speakers and native speakers. Where an adposition is required in one language, it may not be in another. In translations, adpositions must be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, and one may be either supplied or omitted. For instance:

- Those learning English may find it hard to choose

between *on*, *in*, and *at*, as other languages may use only one or two prepositions as the equivalents of these three in English.

- Speakers of English learning Spanish or Portuguese have difficulty distinguishing between the prepositions *por* and *para*, as both frequently mean *for* in English.
- The German preposition *von* might be translated as *by*, *of*, or *from* in English depending on the sense.

GRAMMATICAL CONJUGATION

In linguistics, conjugation is the creation of derived forms of a verb from its principal parts by inflection (regular alteration according to rules of grammar). Conjugation may be affected by person, number, gender, tense, aspect, mood, voice, or other grammatical categories. All the different forms of the same verb constitute a lexeme and the form of the verb that is conventionally used to represent the canonical form of the verb (one as seen in dictionary entries) is a lemma. Inflection of nouns and adjectives is known as declension.

Conjugated forms of a verb are called finite forms. In many languages there are also one or more forms that remain unchanged with all or most of grammatical categories: the non-finite forms, such as the infinitive or the gerund. A table giving all the conjugated variants of a verb in a given language is called a conjugation table or a verb paradigm.

A regular verb has a set of conventions for conjugation (paradigm) that derives all forms from a few specific forms or *principal parts* (maybe only one, such as the infinitive in English), in spelling or pronunciation. A verb that has conjugations deviating from this convention is said to be an irregular verb. Typically the principal parts are the root and/or several modifications of it (stems).

Conjugation is also the traditional name of a group of verbs that share a similar conjugation pattern in a particular language (a *verb class*). This is the sense in which teachers say that Latin has four conjugations of verbs. This means that any regular Latin verb can be conjugated in any person, number, tense, mood, and voice by knowing which of the four conjugation groups it belongs to, and its principal parts.

Examples

In Latin the present conjugation is o, s, t, mus, tis, nt. Which means I__, You__, He/she/it____, we___, you(pl.)___, they___(respectiviely) Indo-European languages usually inflect verbs for several grammatical categories in complex paradigms, although some, like English, have simplified verb conjugation to a large extent. Afrikaans and Swedish have gone even further and virtually abandoned verb conjugation altogether. Below is the conjugation of the verb *to be* in the present tense, indicative mood, active voice, in English, German, Dutch, Afrikaans, Icelandic, Swedish, Latvian, Bulgarian, Bosnian, Serbian, Croatian, Polish, Slovenian, Hindi, Persian, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Albanian, Armenian, Ancient Attic Greek and Modern Greek. This is usually the most irregular verb. You may notice the similarities in corresponding verb forms. Some of the conjugations may be disused, like the English *thou*-form, or have additional meanings, like the English *you*-form, which can also stand for 2nd. person singular, or be impersonal.

Verbal Agreement

Verbal agreement or concord is a morpho-syntactic construct in which properties of the subject and/or objects of a verb are indicated by the verb form. Verbs are then said to agree with their subjects (resp. objects).

Many English verbs exhibit subject agreement of the following sort: whereas *I go*, *you go*, *we go*, *they go* are all grammatical in standard English, *she go* is not. Instead, a

special form of the verb *to go* has to be used to produce *she goes*. On the other hand *I goes*, *you goes* etc. are not grammatical in standard English. (Things are different in some English dialects that lack agreement.) A few English verbs have no special forms that indicate subject agreement (*I may*, *you may*, *she may*), and the verb *to be* has an additional form *am* that can only be used with the pronoun *I* as the subject.

Verbs in written French exhibit more intensive agreement morphology than English verbs: *je suis* (I am), *tu es* ("you are", singular informal), *elle est* (she is), *nous sommes* (we are), *vous êtes* ("you are", plural), *ils sont* (they are). Historically, English used to have a similar verbal paradigm. Some historic verb forms are used by Shakespeare as slightly archaic or more formal variants (*I do*, *thou dost*, *she doth*, typically used by nobility) of the modern forms.

Some languages with verbal agreement can leave certain subjects implicit when the subject is fully determined by the verb form. In Spanish, for instance, subject pronouns do not need to be explicitly present, even though in French, its close relative, they are obligatory. The Spanish equivalent to the French *je suis* (I am) can be simply *soy* (lit. "am"). The pronoun *yo* (I) in the explicit form *yo soy* is only required for emphasis or to clear ambiguity in complex texts.

Some languages have a richer agreement system in which verbs also agree with some or all of their objects. Ubykh exhibits verbal agreement for the subject, direct object, indirect object, benefaction and ablative objects (*a.w3.s.xe.n.t'u.n*, *you gave it to him for me*).

Basque can show agreement not only for subject, direct object and indirect object, but it also on occasion exhibits agreement for the listener as the implicit benefactor: *autoa ekarri digute* means "they brought us the car" (neuter agreement for listener), but *autoa ekarri ziguten* means

"they brought us the car" (agreement for feminine singular listener).

Languages with a rich agreement morphology facilitate relatively free word order without leading to increased ambiguity. The canonical word order in Basque is Subject-Object-Verb. However, all permutations of subject, verb and object are permitted as well.

Nonverbal Person Agreement

In some languages, predicative adjectives and copular complements receive a form of person agreement that is distinct from that used on ordinary predicative verbs. Although this is a form of conjugation in that it refers back to the person of the subject, it is not "verbal" because it always derives from pronouns that have become cliticised to the nouns to which they refer. An example of nonverbal person agreement, along with contrasting verbal conjugation, can be found from Beja (person agreement morphemes in bold):

- *wun.tu.wi*, "you (fem.) are big"
- *hadá.b.wa*, "you (masc.) are a sheik"
- *e.n.fór*, "he flees"

Another example can be found from Ket:

- *fèmba.di*, "I am a Tungus"
- *dh.fen*, "I am standing"

In Turkic, and a few Uralic and Australian Aboriginal languages, predicative adjectives and copular complements take affixes that are identical to those used on predicative verbs, but their negation is different. For example, in Turkish:

- *ko°.uyor.sun* "you are running"
- *çavuš.sun* "you are a sergeant"

but under negation this becomes (negative morphemes boldface):

- *koš.m.uyor.sun* "you are not running"
- *çavu° deðil.sin* "you are not a sergeant"

For this reason, the person agreement morphemes used with predicative adjectives and nominals in Turkic languages are considered to be nonverbal in character. In some analyses, they are viewed as a form of verbal takeover by a copular strategy.

Factors that Affect Conjugation

Common grammatical categories according to which verbs can be conjugated are the following:

- Finite verb forms:
  - o Grammatical person
  - o Grammatical number
  - o Grammatical gender
  - o Grammatical tense
  - o Grammatical aspect
  - o Grammatical mood
  - o Grammatical voice
- Non-finite verb forms.

Other factors which may affect conjugation are:

- Degree of formality
- Inclusiveness and exclusiveness in the 1st. person plural
- Transitivity
- Valency

CONJUNCTION

In grammar, a conjunction (abbreviated CONJ or CNJ) is a part of speech that connects two words, sentences, phrases or clauses together. A discourse connective is a conjunction joining sentences. This definition may overlap with that of other parts of speech, so what constitutes a "conjunction"

should be defined for each language. In general, a conjunction is an invariable grammatical particle, and it may or may not stand between the items it conjoins.

The definition can also be extended to idiomatic phrases that behave as a unit with the same function as a single-word conjunction (*as well as*, *provided that*, etc.).

Coordinating Conjunctions

Coordinating conjunctions, also called coordinators, are conjunctions that join two or more items of equal syntactic importance, such as words, main clauses, or sentences.

In English the mnemonic acronym *FANBOYS* can be used to remember the coordinators *for*, *and*, *nor*, *but*, *or*, *yet*, and *so*.

These are not the only coordinating conjunctions; various others are used, including "and nor" (British), "but nor" (British), "or nor"(British), "neither" ("They don't gamble; neither do they smoke"), "no more" ("They don't gamble; no more do they smoke"), and "only" ("Can we perform? Only if we practise").

Here are the meanings and some examples of coordinating conjunctions in English:

- for: presents a reason ("He is gambling with his health, for he has been smoking far too long.") (though "for" is more commonly used as a preposition)
- and: presents non-contrasting item(s) or idea(s) ("They gamble, and they smoke.")
- nor: presents a non-contrasting negative idea ("They don't gamble, nor do they smoke.")
- but: presents a contrast or exception ("They gamble, but they don't smoke.")
- or: presents an alternative item or idea ("Every day they gamble, or they smoke.")

- yet: presents a contrast or exception ("They gamble, yet they don't smoke.")
- so: presents a consequence ("He gambled well last night, so he smoked a cigar to celebrate.")

Correlative Conjunctions

Correlative conjunctions are pairs of conjunctions that work together to coordinate two items. English examples include *both…and*, *[n]either…[n]or*, and *not [only]…but [also]*, *whether... or*.

Examples:

- Either do your work or prepare for a trip to the office.
- Not only is he handsome but he is also brilliant.
- Neither the basketball team nor the football team is doing well.
- Both the cross country team and the swimming team are doing well.
- Whether you stay or go is your decision.

Subordinating Conjunctions

Subordinating conjunctions, also called subordinators, are conjunctions that introduce a dependent clause. The most common subordinating conjunctions in the English language include the following: *after*, *although*, *as if*, *as much as*, *as long as*, *as soon as*, *as though*, *because*, *before*, *but*, *even if*, *even though*, *if*, *in that*, *in order that*, *lest*, *since*, *so that*, *than*, *that*, *though*, *unless*, *until*, *when*, *whenever*, *where*, *wherever*, *whether*, and *while*. Complementizers can be considered to be special subordinating conjunctions that introduce complement clauses (*e.g.*, "I wonder *whether* he'll be late. I hope *that* he'll be on time"). Some subordinating conjunctions (*until*, *while*), when used to introduce a phrase instead of a full clause, become prepositions with identical meanings.

In many verb-final languages, subordinate clauses *must precede* the main clause on which they depend. The equivalents to the subordinating conjunctions of non-verb-final languages such as English are either

- *clause-final conjunctions* (e.g. in Japanese), or
- *suffixes* attached to the verb and *not* separate words

Such languages in fact often lack conjunctions as a part of speech because:

1. the form of the verb used is formally nominalised and cannot occur in an independent clause
2. the clause-final conjunction or suffix attached to the verb is actually formally a marker of case and is also used on nouns to indicate certain functions. In this sense, the subordinate clauses of these languages have much in common with postpositional phrases.

In other West-Germanic languages like German or Dutch, the word order after a subordinating conjunction is different from the one in an independent clause, e.g. in Dutch *want* (for) is coordinating, but *omdat* (because) is subordinating. Compare:

Hij gaat naar huis, *want* hij is ziek. – He goes home, for he is ill.

Hij gaat naar huis, *omdat* hij ziek is. – He goes home because he is ill.

Similarly, in German, "denn" (for) is coordinating, but "weil" (because) is subordating:

Er geht nach Hause, denn er ist krank. – He goes home, for he is ill.

Er geht nach Hause, weil er krank ist. – He goes home because he is ill.

REFERENCES

Algeo, John. *British or American English? A Handbook of Word and Grammar Patterns*, 2006, Cambridge Univ. Press.

Bennett, David C. (1975) *Spatial and Temporal Uses of English Prepositions: An Essay in Stratificational Semantics*. London: Longman.

Burchfield, R. W., editor, *Fowler's Modern English Usage*, third edition, 1996.

Curzan, Anne; Adams, Michael (2009), *How English Works: A Linguistic Introduction* (2nd ed.), New York: Pearson Longman, p. 152, ISBN 9780205605507

Dryer, Matthew S. 2005. "Order of adverbial subordinator and clause". In The World Atlas of Language Structures, edited by Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil, and Bernard Comrie. Oxford University Press.

Emonds, Joseph E. (1985) *A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Haspelmath, Martin. (2003) "Adpositions". *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics.* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN 0-19-513977-1.

Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-43146-8.

Jackendoff, Ray S. (1973) "Base Rules for PPs". In S. R. Anderson and P. Kiparsky (eds), *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, pp. 345–356. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Koopman, Hilda. (2000) "Prepositions, postpositions, circumpositions, and particles". In *The Syntax of Specifiers and Heads*, pp. 204–260. London: Routledge.

Libert, Alan R. (2006) *Ambipositions*. LINCOM studies in language typology (No. 13). LINCOM. ISBN 3-89586-747-0.

Maling, Joan. (1983) "Transitive adjectives: A case of categorial reanalysis". In F. Heny and B. Richards (eds), *Linguistic Categories: Auxiliaries and Related Puzzles,* Vol. 1, pp. 253–289. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Mark, L Hernandez *The power of the letter* (2001). ISBN 9780534420666.

McArthur, Tom (ed) 1992. *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford University Press.

Melis, Ludo. (2003) *La préposition en français*. Gap: Ophrys.

Pullum, Geoffrey K. (2005) "Phrasal Prepositions in a Civil Tone." *Language Log*. Accessed 9 September 2007.

Rauh, Gisa. (1991) *Approaches to Prepositions*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Reindl, Donald F. (2001) "Areal Effects on the Preservation and Genesis of Slavic Postpositions". In Lj. Šariæ and D. F. Reindl *On Prepositions* (= Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 8), pp. 85–100. Oldenburg: Carl-von-Ossietzky-Universitat Oldenburg.

Stassen, Leon; Intransitive Predication (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory); published 1997 by Oxford University Press; p. 39. ISBN 0199258932

5

Focus on Phrase Types, Article and Clause

PHRASE

A phrase is a small group of words that adds meaning to a word. A phrase is not a sentence because it is not a complete idea with a subject and a predicate.

In English there are five different kinds of phrases, one for each of the main parts of speech. In a phrase, the main word, or the word that is what the phrase is about, is called the *head.* In these examples, it is printed in bold. The other words in the phrase do the work of changing or *modifying* the head.

In a noun phrase, one or more words work together to give more information about a noun.

- all my dear children
- the information age
- seventeen hungry lions in the rocks

In an adjective phrase, one or more words work together to give more information about an adjective.

- so very sweet
- earnest in her desire
- very happy with his work

In a verb phrase, one or more words work together to give more meaning to a verb. In English, the verb phrase is very complex, but a good description of its many forms can be found here.

In an adverb phrase, one or more words work together to give more information about an adverb.

- especially softly
- formerly of the city of Perth
- much too quickly to see clearly

In a prepositional phrase, one or more words work together to give information about time, location, or possession, or condition. The preposition always appears at the front of the phrase.

- after a very long walk
- behind the old building
- for all the hungry children
- in case it should happen again

Here, we start the construction of your writing with the phrase, one of the key building blocks of the sentence. There are several different kinds of phrases, including prepositional phrases (with the subcategories adjectival phrases and adverbial phrases), appositives, and verbals. In this section, you learn them all. First, I teach you the individual parts of each different phrase and then ease you into the phrases themselves.

Phrases of the Moon

A *phrase* is a group of words that functions in a sentence as a single part of speech. A phrase does not have a subject or a verb. As you write, you use phrases to …

- Add detail by describing.
- Make your meaning more precise.
- Fold in additional information.

The following table shows the different types of phrases.

Different Types of Phrases

Type of Phrase	*Definition*	*Example*
Prepositional	Begins with a preposition and ends with a noun or a pronoun	… *by* the *lake*
Adjectival	Prepositional phrase that funtions as an adjective	She has a fish *with red gills*.
Adverbial	Prepositional phrase that functions as an adverb.	We cheered *with loud voices*.
Appositive	Noun or pronoun that renames another noun or pronoun.	Lou, *a Viking*, enjoys plunder.
Verbal	A verb form used as another part of speech.	(See the following three entries.)
Participle	Verbal phrase that functions an adjective.	*Eating slowly*, as the child was finally quiet.
Gerund	Verbal phrase that functions as a noun	*Partying hearty* requires great endurance.
Infinitive	*Verbal phrase that functions as a noun, adjective, or adverb.*	To sleep late on Sunday *is a real treat.*

DETERMINER

A determiner is a noun-modifier that expresses the reference of a noun or noun-phrase in the context, rather than attributes expressed by adjectives.

This function is usually performed by articles, demonstratives, possessive determiners, or quantifiers.

Function

In most Indo-European languages, determiners are either independent words or clitics that precede the rest of the noun-phrase.

In other languages, determiners are prefixed or suffixed to the noun, or even change the noun's form. For example,

in Swedish *bok* "book", when definite, becomes *boken* "the book" (suffixed definite articles are common in Scandinavian languages), while in Romanian *caiet* "notebook" becomes *caietul* "the notebook".

Some constructions, such as those that use names of school subjects ("Physics uses mathematics"), don't use a determiner.

This condition is called the "zero determiner" instance. X-bar theory contends that every noun has a corresponding determiner.

In a case where a noun does not have a pronounced determiner, X-bar theory hypothesizes the presence of a zero article.

English Determiners

The determiner function is usually performed by the determiner class of words, but can also be filled by words from other entities:

1. Basic determiners are words from the determiner class (e.g. *the* girl, *those* pencils) or determiner phrases (e.g. *almost all* people, *more than two* problems).
2. Subject determiners are possessive noun phrases (e.g. *his* daughter, *the boy's* friend).
3. Minor determiners are plain NPs (e.g. *what colour* carpet, *this size* shoes) and prepositional phrases (*under twenty* meters, *up to twelve* people).

Determiner Class

A determiner establishes the *reference* of a noun or noun-phrase, including quantity, rather than its *attributes* as expressed by adjectives. Despite this tendency, determiners have a variety of functions including, in English, modifiers in adjective phrases and determiner phrases, and even markers of coordination.

This word class, or part of speech, exists in many

languages, including English, though most English dictionaries still classify determiners under other parts of speech. Determiners usually include articles, and may include items like demonstratives, possessive determiners, quantifiers, and cardinal numbers, depending on the language.

English Determiners

Determiners, in English, form a closed class of words that number about 50 (not counting the cardinal numerals) and include:

- Alternative determiners: *another*, *other*, somebody *else*, *different*
- Articles: *a, an*, *the*
- Cardinal numbers: *zero*, *one*, *two*, *fifty*, *infinite*, etc.
- Degree determiners/Partitive determiners: *many*, *much*, *few*, *little*, *several*, *most*
- Demonstratives: *this*, *that*, *these*, *those*, *which*
- Disjunctive determiners: *either*, *neither*
- Distributive determiners: *each*, *every*
- Elective determiners: *any*, *either*, *whichever*
- Equative determiners: the *same*
- Evaluative determiners: *such*, *that*, *so*
- Exclamative determiners: *what* eyes!
- Existential determiners: *some*, *any*
- Interrogative and relative determiners: *which*, *what*, *whichever*, *whatever*
- Multal determiners: *a lot of*, *many*, *several*, *much*
- Negative determiners: *no*, *neither*
- Paucal determiners: *a few*, *a little*, *some*
- Personal determiners: *we* teachers, *you* guys
- Possessive determiners: *my*, *your*, *our*, his, her, etc.
- Quantifiers: *all*, *few*, *many*, *several*, *some*, *every*, *each*, *any*, *no*, etc.

- Sufficiency determiners: *enough*, *sufficient*, *plenty*
- Uniquitive determiners: the *only*
- Universal determiners: *all*, *both*

Each of these determiners can be classified as:

- Definite determiners, which limit their reference back to a specific already-established entity. *(cardinals, demonstratives, equatives, evaluatives, exclamatives, relatives, personals, possessives, uniquitives)*
- Indefinite determiners, which broaden their referent to one not previously specified, otherwise newly introduced into discourse. *(disjunctives, electives, existentials, interrogatives, negatives, universals)*

Many of these can also be either or, thus allowing such pairs as *(1)the (2)other one*, or *(1)an(2)other one*. *(alternatives, articles, partitives, distributives, quantifiers)*

While many words belong to this lexical category exclusively, others belong to a number of categories, for example, the pronoun *what* in *What is good* as opposed to the determiner *what* in *what one is good*. While numerals exist as nouns, it is debated whether numerals are determiners or not. For instance, the English numerals for 100 or larger need a determiner, such as "a hundred men." Similarly, while pronouns like my, your, etc. function as determiners in a noun phrase, many grammars do not make the distinction between class and function and so lump these in with determiners.

For a mostly complete list, see Wiktionary.

Differences from Adjectives

Traditional English grammar does not include determiners and calls most determiners adjectives. There are, however, a number of key differences between determiners and adjectives. (The [*] indicates intentionally incorrect grammar.)

1. In English, articles, demonstratives, and possessive determiners cannot co-occur in the same phrase, while any number of adjectives are typically allowed.
    1. A big green English book
    2. * The his book (note however that Italian allows exactly this construction - *il suo libro*)
2. Most determiners cannot occur alone in predicative complement position; most adjectives can.
    1. He is happy.
    2. He is the.
3. Most determiners are not gradable, while adjectives typically are.
    1. happy, happier, happiest
    2. (However in colloquial usage an English speaker might say [eg] "This is very much my house" for emphasis)
4. Some determiners have corresponding pronouns, while adjectives don't.
    1. Each likes something different.
    2. Big likes something different.
5. Adjectives can modify singular or plural nouns, while some determiners can only modify one or the other.
    1. a big person / big people
    2. many people / * many person
6. Adjectives are never obligatory, while determiners often are.

Differences from Pronouns

Determiners such as *this*, *all*, and *some* can often occur without a noun. In traditional grammar, these are called pronouns. There are, however, a number of key differences between such determiners and pronouns.

1. Pronouns may occur in tag questions. Determiners cannot.
   1. This is delicious, isn't it?
   2. This is delicious, isn't this?
2. In phrasal verbs, pronouns must appear between the verb and particle. Determiners may occur after the particle.
   1. pick it up
   2. pick up it
   3. pick this up
   4. pick up this
3. Pronouns all have distinct genitive forms. Determiners do not.
   1. This is mine/yours/theirs.
   2. This is all's.

Other Realisations

In English, and in many other Indo-European languages, determiners are either independent words or clitics that precede the rest of the noun phrase. Not all languages, however, have a lexically distinct class of determiners. Determiner functions are sometimes realized morphologically as affixes on the noun, or by changing the noun's form. For example, Swedish *bok* ("book"), when definite, becomes *boken* ("the book"). Definite-article suffixes are also found in the other North Germanic languages, in Romanian, Macedonian and in Bulgarian.

DETERMINER PHRASE

In linguistics, a determiner phrase (DP) is a syntactic category, a phrase headed by a determiner. On the DP-hypothesis, the noun phrase is strictly speaking a determiner phrase, and NP designates a constituent of the noun phrase, taken to be the complement of the determiner. This is opposed to the traditional view that determiners are

specifiers of the noun phrase. The overwhelming majority of generative grammarians today adopt the DP hypothesis in some form or other. However, some traditional and formal grammarians continue to consider nouns, not determiners, to be the heads of noun phrases.

Determiners govern the referential or quantificational properties of the noun phrases they embed. The idea that noun phrases preceded by determiners are determiner phrases is known as the *DP hypothesis*. The DP hypothesis goes very well with the theory of generalized quantifiers, which is the prevailing theory of the semantics of determiners.

In some versions of the Minimalist Program the DP is itself the complement of a phase head, *n*, from which it inherits the ability to agree with its complement and assign case.

ADJECTIVAL PHRASE

The term adjectival phrase, adjective phrase, or sometimes phrasal adjective may refer to any one of three types of grammatical phrase.

In syntax, the term *adjectival phrase* or *adjective phrase* refers to a phrase built upon an adjective, which functions as the head of that phrase. For example, the phrase *much quicker than I* is based on the adjective 'quick', and the phrase *fond of animals* is based on the adjective 'fond'. Such phrases may be used predicatively, as in *They are much quicker than I* (H" they are quick) or *they are fond of animals* (H" they are fond). When used attributively within a noun phrase, complex adjectival phrases tend to occur after the noun: *I found a typist much quicker than I* (compare *I found a quick typist*, where a simple adjective occurs before the noun). The words modifying the head adjective may be adverbs (*much* quicker, *very* pretty), prepositional phrases (fond *of animals*, happy *about the news*), or subordinate clauses (happy *that you came*).

A different use of the term is for a phrase that modifies a noun as an adjective would, even if it does not contain or is not based on an adjective. These may be more precisely distinguished as *phrasal noun modifiers*. For example, in *Mr Clinton is a man of wealth*, the prepositional phrase *of wealth* modifies *a man* the way an adjective would, and it could be reworded with an adjective as *Mr Clinton is a wealthy man*. Similarly, *that boy is friendless* (an adjective *friendless* modifies the noun *boy*) and *that boy is without a friend* (a prepositional phrase *without a friend* modifies *boy*).

Under some definitions the term is only used for phrases in attributive position, within the noun phrase they modify. These may be more precisely distinguished as *phrasal attributives* or *attributive phrases*. This definition is commonly used in English style guides for writing, because attributive phrases are typically hyphenated, whereas predicative phrases generally are not, despite both modifying a noun. Compare *a light-blue purse* and *a purse which is light blue*; without the hyphen, *a light blue purse* would be read as *a light purse which is blue* – that is, without 'light blue' being understood as a unit. Only *a light-blue purse* would be considered to contain an adjectival phrase under this definition, although under the syntactic definition *a purse which is light blue* contains an adjectival phrase as well.

Although the purse example is based on an actual adjective, this is not generally the case: *an on-again-off-again relationship* contains no adjectives, for example, and so is not an adjectival phrase under the syntactic definition. The hyphenation conventions apply regardless: in *a curious out-of-the-way place* the prepositional phrase *out of the way* is hyphenated, as it's attributive (it modifies the noun and is part of the noun phrase), but in *the place lies rather out of the way* it is not hyphenated, as it is no longer part of the noun phrase.

COMPARISON (GRAMMAR)

Comparison, in grammar, is a property of adjectives and adverbs in most languages; it describes systems that distinguish the degree to which the modifier modifies its complement.

English, due to the complex etymology of its lexicon, has two parallel systems of comparison. One involves the suffixes *-er* (the "comparative") and *-est* (the "superlative"). These inflections are of Germanic origin, and are cognate with the Latin suffixes *-ior* and *-issimus*. They are typically added to shorter words, words of Anglo-Saxon origin, and borrowed words that have been fully assimilated into the English vocabulary. Usually the words that take these inflections have fewer than three syllables. This system contains a number of irregular forms, some of which, like *good*, *better*, *best*, contain suppletive forms. These irregular forms include:

Positive	*Comparative*	*Superlative*
good	better	best
well	better	best
bad	worse	worst
far	farther	farthest
far	further	furthest
little	smaller, less(er)	smallest, least
many, much	more	most

More and Most

The second system of comparison in English appends the grammatical particles *more* and *most*, themselves the irregular comparatives of *many*, to the adjective or adverb being modified. This series can be compared to a system containing the diminutives *less* and *least*.

This system is most commonly used with words of French or Latin derivation; adjectives and adverbs formed with suffixes other than *-ly* (e.g. *beautiful*); and with longer,

technical, or infrequently used words. Knowing which words fall into which system is a highly idiomatic issue in English syntax. Some words require the suffixing system: e.g. *taller* is required; **more tall* is not idiomatic English.

Some words (e.g. *difficult*) require *more* and *most*. Some words (e.g. *polite*) can be used with either system; curiously, while *polite* can go either way, the derived word *impolite* requires *more* and *most*.

The general rule is that words with one syllable require the suffix, words with three or more syllables require *more* or *most* and words with two syllables can go either way.

Absolute Adjectives

A perennial issue in English usage involves the comparison of so-called "absolute" adjectives, adjectives that logically do not seem to admit of comparison. There are many such adjectives — generally adjectives that name qualities that are either *present* or *absent*: nothing is *"more Cretaceous" or *"more igneous" than anything else.

Other examples include *perfect*, *unique*, and *parallel*, which name qualities that are inherently superlative: if something is perfect, there can be nothing better, so it does not make sense to describe one thing as *"more perfect" than something else; if something is unique, it is one of a kind, so something cannot be *"very unique", or *"more unique" than something else. See also tautology (rhetoric) and pleonasm.

In general, terms like *perfect* and *parallel* cannot ever apply *exactly* to things in real life, so they are commonly used to mean *nearly perfect*, *nearly parallel*, and so on; and in this (inexact) use, *more perfect* (i.e., more nearly perfect, closer to perfect) and *more parallel* (i.e., more nearly parallel, closer to parallel) do seem to make sense.

RESTRICTIVENESS

In semantics, a modifier is said to be restrictive (or

defining) if it restricts the reference of its head. For example, in "the red car is fancier than the blue one", *red* and *blue* are restrictive, because they restrict which cars *car* and *one* are referring to. ("The car is fancier than the one" would make little sense.) By contrast, in "John's beautiful wife", *beautiful* is non-restrictive; presuming John has only one wife, "John's wife" identifies her sufficiently, while "beautiful" only serves to add more information. (Note that in the unusual case that John has multiple wives, only one of whom is considered "beautiful", the modifier could be used in the restrictive sense.)

Restrictive modifiers are also called *defining*, *identifying*, *essential*, or *necessary*; non-restrictive ones are also called *non-defining*, *non-identifying*, *descriptive*, or *unnecessary* (though this last term can be misleading). In certain cases, generally when restrictiveness is marked syntactically through the lack of commas, restrictive modifiers are called *integrated* and non-restrictive ones are called *non-integrated* or *supplementary*.

Restrictiveness in English

English does not generally mark modifiers for restrictiveness. The only modifiers that are consistently marked for restrictiveness are relative clauses: non-restrictive ones are set off in writing by using commas, and in speech through intonation (with a pause beforehand and an uninterrupted melody), while restrictive ones are not. Further, while restrictive clauses are often headed by the relative pronoun *that* or by a zero relative pronoun, non-restrictive clauses are not. For example:

- Restrictive: *We saw two puppies this morning: one that was born yesterday, and one that was born last week. The one that (*or *which*) was born yesterday is tiny.*
- Non-restrictive: *We saw a puppy and a kitty this morning. The puppy, which was born yesterday, was tiny.*

> (*In formal American English, the use of *which* as a restrictive pronoun is often considered to be incorrect. See That and which.)

While English does not consistently mark ordinary adjectives for restrictiveness, they can be marked by moving them into relative clauses. For example, "the red car is fancier than the blue one" can be rewritten as, "the car that's red is fancier than the one that's blue," and "John's beautiful wife" can be rewritten as "John's wife, who is beautiful." English speakers do not generally find such locutions necessary, however.

Restrictiveness in Other Languages

Spanish is notable for marking all descriptive adjectives for restrictiveness: restrictive adjectives follow their nouns, while non-restrictive ones precede them. Italian employs the same mechanism to an extent.

Many languages, such as German and Japanese, do not mark restrictiveness explicitly. In Dutch, only written language distinguishes restrictive clauses by leaving out the comma that would normally follow the noun.

French tends to mark restrictive clauses in the same way as English, and the Hebrew Academy endorses English-style punctuation (though it is not in universal use among Hebrew-speakers).

Turkish has a tendency to assume restrictiveness in adjectives more so than in English, in some cases requiring that *non-restrictiveness* be specified. For example, if the English sentence "He came with his tall son" were translated mechanically "Uzun boylu oðluyla geldi", it would be understood to mean both that the man in question has more than one son, and that he came with the tallest of them, neither of which is understood from the English sentence. Even the rendering "Uzun boylu *olan* oðluyla geldi", "He came with his son *who is* tall", would be understood similarly. Neither can commas be used to specify

restrictiveness or non-restrictiveness. A translator would have to provide the information that the son is tall separately, eg. “Uzun boylu bir oðlu vardý; onunla birlikte geldi” (“He had a tall son; he came with him”).

Sources

On the intonation question, see Beverly Colins and Inger M. Mees, *Practical Phonetics and Phonology*, Routledge 2003.

ARTICLE

In English there is just one definite article: “the”. There are two indefinite articles: “a” and “an”. The word “an” is used before a word starting with a vowel sound: we say “a horse”, “a child”, “a European” (Euro has a “Y” sound), “a university”, but “an orange”, “an elephant”.

Some languages have more than one word for “the”. This is because each noun is either masculine or feminine or, in some languages it can be masculine, feminine or neuter. For example: in French “le” is used for masculine nouns (“le jardin” - “the garden”) and “la” for feminine nouns (“la table” - “the table”). “The” becomes “les” in front of plural nouns. The indefinite articles in French are “un” (masculine) and “une” (feminine). German and Dutch have masculine, feminine and neuter nouns, but in the case of Dutch the word for “the” is the same for masculine and feminine (“de”) so you do not need to know which it is.

Some languages (for example: Russian and Japanese) do not have articles. When speakers of these languages are learning English, it is often difficult to explain to them what an article is. English speakers use them automatically.

In general: “the” in English is used for something you have already been talking about. The word “a” is used when introducing a new idea:

> “The tired woman was looking for her cat. Suddenly she saw *the* cat up *a* tree”. (We are already talking about the cat. The tree is a new idea).

"The tired woman was walking along when she suddenly saw *a* cat up *a* tree". (She had not been thinking about cats until then).

Sometimes we do not need an article, for example when talking about something in general:

"The dogs do not bite" (meaning: dogs that you are thinking about). "Barking dogs do not bite" (barking dogs in general).

ARTICLE (GRAMMAR)

An article (abbreviated ART) is a word that combines with a noun to indicate the type of reference being made by the noun. Articles specify the grammatical definiteness of the noun, in some languages extending to volume or numerical scope. The articles in the English language are *the* and *a*/*an*. 'An' and 'a' are modern forms of the Old English 'an', which in Anglian dialects was the number 'one' (compare 'on', in Saxon dialects) and survived into Modern Scots as the number 'ane'. Both 'on' (respelled 'one' by the Normans) and 'an' survived into Modern English, with 'one' used as the number and 'an' ('a', before nouns that begin with a consonant sound) as an indefinite article.

The word *some* is thus used as a functional plural of *a*/*an*. "An apple" never means more than one apple. "Give me *some* apples" indicates more than one is desired but without specifying a quantity. This finds comparison in Spanish, where the indefinite article is completely indistinguishable from the single number, except that 'uno/una' ("one") has a plural form ('unos/unas'): *Dame una manzana" ("Give me an apple")* > *"Dame* unas *manzanas" ("Give me some apples").*

Among the classical parts of speech, articles are considered a special category of adjectives. Some modern linguists prefer to classify them within a separate part of speech, determiners.

In languages that employ articles, every common noun, with some exceptions, is expressed with a certain definiteness

(e.g., definite or indefinite), just as many languages express every noun with a certain grammatical number (e.g., singular or plural). Every noun *must* be accompanied by the article, if any, corresponding to its definiteness, and the lack of an article (considered a *zero article*) itself specifies a certain definiteness. This is in contrast to other adjectives and determiners, which are typically optional. This obligatory nature of articles makes them among the most common words in many languages—in English, for example, the most frequent word is *the*.

Types

Articles are usually characterized as either *definite* or *indefinite*. A few languages with well-developed systems of articles may distinguish additional subtypes.

Within each type, languages may have various forms of each article, according to grammatical attributes such as gender, number, or case, or according to adjacent sounds.

Definite Article

A definite article indicates that its noun is a particular one (or ones) identifiable to the listener. It may be the same thing that the speaker has already mentioned, or it may be something uniquely specified. The definite article in English is *the*.

The children know the fastest way home.

The sentence above contrasts with the much more general observation that:

Children know the fastest way home.

Likewise,

Give me the *book*

has a markedly different meaning in most English contexts from

Give me a *book.*

It can also be used to indicate a specific class among other classes:

The cabbage white butterfly lays its eggs on members of the Brassica genus.

But it should not be used to refer to a specimen:

The writing is the human invention.

Indefinite Article

An indefinite article indicates that its noun is not a particular one (or ones) identifiable to the listener. It may be something that the speaker is mentioning for the first time, or its precise identity may be irrelevant or hypothetical, or the speaker may be making a general statement about any such thing. English uses *a*/*an*, from the Old English forms of the number 'one', as its indefinite article. The form *an* is used before words that begin with a vowel sound (even if spelled with an initial consonant, as in *an hour*), and *a* before words that begin with a consonant sound (even if spelled with a vowel, as in *a European*).

She had a house so large that an elephant would get lost without a map.

Before some words beginning with a pronounced (not silent) *h* in an unstressed first syllable, such as *hallucination*, *hilarious*, *historic(al)*, *horrendous*, and *horrific*, some (especially older) British writers prefer to use *an* over *a* (*an historical event*, etc.). *An* is also preferred before *hotel* by some writers of BrE (probably reflecting the relatively recent adoption of the word from French, where the *h* is not pronounced). The use of "an" before words beginning with an unstressed "h" is more common generally in BrE than American. Such usage would now be seen as affected or incorrect in AmE. American writers normally use *a* in all these cases, although there are occasional uses of *an historic(al)* in AmE. According to the New Oxford Dictionary of English, such use is increasingly rare in BrE too. Unlike

BrE, AmE typically uses *an* before *herb*, since the *h* in this word is silent for most Americans.

Partitive Article

A partitive article is a type of indefinite article used with a mass noun such as *water*, to indicate a non-specific quantity of it. Partitive articles are used in French and Italian in addition to definite and indefinite articles. The nearest equivalent in English is *some*, although this is considered a determiner and not an article.

French: *Voulez-vous du café ?*

Do you want (some) coffee? (or, dialectally but more accurately, *Do you want some of this coffee?*)

Negative Article

A negative article specifies *none* of its noun, and can thus be regarded as neither definite nor indefinite. On the other hand, some consider such a word to be a simple determiner rather than an article. In English, this function is fulfilled by *no*.

No man is an island.

Zero Article

The zero article is the absence of an article. In languages having a definite article, the lack of an article specifically indicates that the noun is indefinite. Linguists interested in X-bar theory causally link zero articles to nouns lacking a determiner. In English, the zero article rather than the indefinite is used with plurals and mass nouns, although the word "some" can be used as an indefinite plural article.

Visitors walked in mud.

Variation Among Languages

Among the world's most widely spoken languages, articles are found almost exclusively in Indo-European and Semitic languages. Strictly speaking, Chinese, Japanese,

Hindi, Malay, and Russian have no articles, but certain words can be used like articles, when needed.

Linguists believe the common ancestor of the Indo-European languages, Proto Indo-European, did not have articles. Most of the languages in this family do not have definite or indefinite articles; there is no article in Latin, Sanskrit, Persian, nor in some modern Indo-European languages, such as the Baltic languages and most Slavic languages.

Although Classical Greek has a definite article (which has survived into Modern Greek and which bears strong resemblance to the German definite article), the earlier Homeric Greek did not. Articles developed independently in several language families.

Not all languages have both definite and indefinite articles, and some languages have different types of definite and indefinite articles to distinguish finer shades of meaning; for example, French and Italian have a partitive article used for indefinite mass nouns, while Colognian has two distinct sets of definite articles indicating focus and uniqueness, and Macedonian uses definite articles in a demonstrative sense, distinguishing *this* from *that* (with an intermediate degree). The words *this* and *that* (and their plurals, *these* and *those*) can be understood in English as, ultimately, forms of the definite article *the* (whose declension in Old English included *thaes*, an ancestral form of this/that and these/those).

In many languages, the form of the article may vary according to the gender, number, or case of its noun. In some languages the article may be the only indication of the case, e.g., German *Der Hut des Napoleon*, "Napoleon's hat". Many languages do not use articles at all, and may use other ways of indicating old versus new information, such as topic-comment constructions.

Articles Used in the World's Most Widely Spoken Languages

Language	*definite article*	*indefinite article*	*partitive article*
Arabic	*al-*	None	
English	*The*	*a, an*	
German	*der, die, das*	*ein, eine, einer*	
	des, dem, den	*einem, einen*	
Dutch	*de, hetde*	*een*	
Tamazight	__	*yan, yatittsn, ittsnt*	
Spanish	*el, lalos, las*	*un, unaunos, unas*	
Portuguese	*o, aos, as*	*um, umauns, umas*	
French	*le, la, l'les*	*un, unedes*	*du, de lade l', des*
Italian	*il, lo, la, l'*	*un, uno, una,*	*del, dello, della, dell'*
	i, gli, le	*un'*	*dei, degli, degl', delle*
Hungarian	*a, az*	*egy*	

In the above examples, the article always precedes its noun (with the exception of the Arabic tanween). In some languages, however, the definite article is not always a separate word, but may be postfixed, attached to the end of its noun as a suffix. For example,

- Albanian: *plis*, a white fez; *plisi*, the white fez
- Romanian: *drum*, road; *drumul*, the road
- Icelandic: *hestur*, horse; *hesturinn*, the horse
- Norwegian: *stol*, chair; *stolen*, the chair
- Swedish: *hus* house; *huset*, the house
- Bulgarian: ñòîë *stol*, chair; ñòîëúò *stolÎt*, the chair (subject); ñòîëà *stola*, the chair (object)
- Macedonian: ñòîë *stol*, chair; ñòîëîò *stolot*, the chair; ñòîëîâ *stolov*, this chair; ñòîëîí *stolon*, that chair

Evolution

Articles have developed independently in many different language families across the globe. Generally, articles develop over time usually by specialization of certain adjectives.

Joseph Greenberg describes "the cycle of the definite article": Definite articles (Stage I) evolve from demonstratives, and in turn can become generic articles (Stage II) that may be used in both definite and indefinite contexts, and later merely noun markers (Stage III) that are part of nouns other than proper names and more recent borrowings. Eventually articles may evolve anew from demonstratives.

Definite Articles

Definite articles typically arise from demonstratives meaning *that*. For example, the definite articles in the Romance languages—e.g., *el*, *il*, *le*, *la*—derive from the Latin demonstratives *ille* (masculine) and *illa* (feminine).

The English definite article *the*, written *þe* in Middle English, derives from an Old English demonstrative, which, according to gender, was written *se* (masculine), *seo* (feminine) (*þe* and *þeo* in the Northumbrian dialect), or *þæt* (neuter). The neuter form *þæt* also gave rise to the modern demonstrative *that*. The *ye* occasionally seen in pseudo-archaic usage such as "Ye Olde Englishe Tea Shoppe" is actually a form of *þ*, where the letter thorn (*þ*) came to be written as a *y*.

Multiple demonstratives can give rise to multiple definite articles. Macedonian, for example, in which the articles are suffixed, has *stolot*, the chair; *stolov*, this chair; and *stolon*, that chair. Colognian prepositions articles such as in *dat Auto*, or *et Auto*, the car; the first being specifically selected, focussed, newly introduced, while the latter ist not selected, unfocussed, already known, general, or generic.

Indefinite Articles

Indefinite articles typically arise from adjectives meaning *one*. For example, the indefinite articles in the Romance languages—e.g., *un*, *una*, *une*—derive from the

Latin adjective *unus*. Partitive articles, however, derive from Vulgar Latin *de illo*, meaning *(some) of the*.

The English indefinite article *an* is derived from the same root as *one*. The *-n* came to be dropped before consonants, giving rise to the shortened form *a*. The existence of both forms has led to many cases of juncture loss, e.g. transforming the original *a napron* into the modern *an apron*.

CLAUSE

A clause is a part of a sentence. Each clause has only one main verb. *I love you* is a sentence which has only one clause. *I love you and I will always love you* is a sentence which has two clauses. The two clauses are *I love you* and *I will always love you*. These clauses are joined together by the word *and* (a conjunction).

Two clauses can be joined with a pronoun. For example: *I live in London, which is in England*. Here, *I live in London* is the first clause, and *which is in England* is the second clause. The word *which* is a pronoun which takes the place of *London*. It joins the two clauses.

A sentence can contain many clauses. But sentences with fewer clauses are easier to understand.

A subordinating clause is one which is dependent on the main clause (the primary clause). The main clause makes sense on its own. However, the subordinating clause does not. E.g. *I love you* makes perfect sense left on its own. However, *and always will*, does not.

CLAUSE

In grammar, a clause is the smallest grammatical unit that can express a complete proposition . In some languages it may be a pair or group of words that consists of a subject and a predicate, although in other languages in certain clauses the subject may not appear explicitly as a noun

phrase. It may instead be marked on the verb (this is especially common in null subject languages). The most basic kind of sentence consists of a single clause. More complicated sentences may contain multiple clauses, including clauses contained within clauses. Clauses are divided into two categories: independent clauses and dependent clauses. Independent clauses can be easily differentiated from dependent clauses by their ability to stand by themselves, even when connected with different clauses in the same sentence. A sentence made up of just one clause which can stand by itself is made up of an independent clause. Dependent clauses would be awkward or nonsensical if they were to stand by themselves, and therefore require an independent clause in the same sentence.

Clauses are often contrasted with *phrases*. Traditionally, a *clause* was said to have both a finite verb and its subject, whereas a *phrase* either contained a finite verb but not its subject (in which case it is a *verb phrase*) or did not contain a finite verb. Hence, in the sentence "I didn't know that the dog ran through the yard," "that the dog ran through the yard" is a clause, as is the sentence as a whole, while "the yard," "through the yard," "ran through the yard," and "the dog" are all phrases. However, modern linguists do not draw the same distinction, as they accept the idea of a *non-finite clause*, a clause that is organized around a non-finite verb.

Functions of Dependent Clauses

Under this classification scheme, there are three main types of dependent clauses: *noun clauses*, *adjective clauses*, and *adverb clauses*, so-called for their syntactic and semantic resemblance to nouns, adjectives, and adverbs, respectively. In the following English examples, dependent noun clauses are shown in bold:

- "I imagine that they're having a good time."
- "I keep thinking about what happened yesterday."

(The word *that* is optional in the first sentence, highlighting a complication in the entire dependent/ independent contrast: "They're having a good time" is a complete sentence, and therefore an independent clause, but "that they're having a good time" is a dependent clause.)

An *adjective clause* modifies a noun phrase. In English, adjective clauses typically come at the end of their phrase and usually have a relative pronoun forming a relative clause. The pronoun can sometimes be omitted to produce a reduced relative clause:

- "The woman I saw said otherwise."
- "I found the book that she suggested to me."

An *adverb clause* typically modifies its entire main clause. In English, it usually precedes (in a periodic sentence) or follows (in a loose sentence) its main clause. The following adverb clauses show when (with the subordinating conjunction "when") and why (with the subordinating conjunction "because"):

- "When she gets here, all will be explained."
- "She's worried because they were already an hour late."

The line between categories may be indistinct, and, in some languages, it may be difficult to apply these classifications at all. At times more than one interpretation is possible, as in the English sentence "We saw a movie, after which we went dancing," where "after which we went dancing" can be seen either as an adjective clause ("We saw a movie. After the movie, we went dancing.") or as an adverb clause ("We saw a movie. After we saw the movie, we went dancing."). Sometimes the two interpretations are not synonymous, but are both intended, as in "Let me know when you're ready," where "when you're ready" functions both as a noun clause (the object of *know*, identifying what knowledge is to be conveyed) and as an

adverb clause (specifying when the knowledge is to be conveyed).

Structures of Dependent Clauses

The other major way to classify dependent clauses is by their *structure*, although even this classification scheme does make some reference to the clause's function in a sentence. This scheme is more complex, as there are many different ways that a dependent clause can be structured. In English, common structures include the following:

- Many dependent clauses, such as "before he comes" or "because they agreed," consist of a preposition-like subordinating conjunction, plus what would otherwise be an independent clause. These clauses act much like prepositional phrases, and are either adjective clauses or adverb clauses, with many being able to function in either capacity.
- Relative clauses, such as "which I couldn't see," generally consist of a relative pronoun, plus a clause in which the relative pronoun plays a part. Relative clauses usually function as adjective clauses, but occasionally they function as adverb clauses; in either case, they modify their relative pronoun's antecedent and follow the phrase or clause that they modify.
- Fused relative clauses, such as "what she did" (in the sense of "the thing she did"), are like ordinary relative clauses except that they act as noun clauses; they incorporate their subjects into their relative pronouns.
- Declarative content clauses, such as "that they came," usually consist of the conjunction *that* plus what would otherwise be an independent clause, or of an independent clause alone (with an implicit preceding *that*). For this reason, they are often called *that-clauses*. Declarative content clauses refer to states of affairs; it is often implied that the state

of affairs is the case, as in "It is fortunate that they came," but this implication is easily removed by the context, as in "It is doubtful that they came."

- Interrogative content clauses, such as "whether they came" and "where he went" (as in "I don't know where he went"), are much like declarative ones, except that they are introduced by interrogative words. Rather than referring to a state of affairs, they refer to an unknown element of a state of affairs, such as one of the participants (as in "I wonder who came") or even the truth of the state (as in "I wonder whether he came").
- Small clauses, such as "him leave" (as in "I saw him leave") and "him to leave" (as in "I wanted him to leave"), are minimal predicate structures, consisting only of an object and an additional structure (usually an infinitive), with the latter being predicated to the former by a controlling verb or preposition.

COMPARATIVE

Adjectives and Adverbs can be comparative in English and some other languages. When people are talking about two or more nouns, they can compare them (say the differences between them). The word which explains how they compare is called the comparative. They can also compare actions using adverbs.

Examples: (The comparative is in bold).

- John is tall, but Mark is taller
- An hour is longer than a minute.

Many words can be made into a comparative by adding *er* to the end of the word.

- cool - cooler
- big - bigger

- wet - wetter
- dark - darker

Words that end with the letter 'Y' can still be made into a comparative, but people change the 'Y' to an 'I' and then add 'ER'.

- happy - happier
- fluffy - fluffier
- angry - angrier
- costly - costlier

Some words cannot be made into a comparative by adding 'ER' Instead we use the word more in front. Most of these words have three or more syllables, such as *beautiful*, *reliable*.

If people are not sure about a word, it is always acceptable to say "more" (something), such as "more beautiful", "more expensive".

Warning: The 'ER' ending and the word "more" together cannot be used.

- I am happier than you. - Correct.
- I am more happy than you. - Correct.
- I am more happier - WRONG.

Other Pages

- As
- Like

INFINITIVE

An infinitive is a special type of a verb. It has no person, no number, no mood and no tense.

In English there are two types of infinitives:

- the full infinitive (to-infinitive) - this infinitive has the word *to* at the beginning. For example: *to run*

- the bare infinitive - this infinitive has not the word *to*. For example: *I must go*.

After a modal verb you must use an infinitive. For example: *I must go*, *he must go* (*he must goes* is not correct)

In German, the infinitives end with *-en*, *-eln* or *-ern*. There are 2 exceptions - *sein* (to be) and *tun* (to do).

In Esperanto, the infinitives end with *-i*, for example *dormi* (to sleep)

Advanced version: there are 6 types of infinitives in English:

1. simple infinitive e.g. to write
2. continuous infinitive e.g. to be working
3. perfect infinitive e.g. to have written
4. prefect continuous infinitive e.g. to have been working
5. passive infinitive e.g. to be written
6. passive perfect infinitive e.g. to have been written.

REFERENCES

Abney, S. P. (1987). The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect. Ph. D. thesis, MIT, Cambridge MA.

Barwise, Jon and Robin Cooper (1981). Generalized quantifiers and natural language. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4: 159-219.

Chomsky, Noam. Approaching UG from Below. Interfaces + Syntax = Language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the View from Syntax-Semantics. ed. Uli Sauerland and Hans-Martin Gärtner, 1-29. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kroeger, Paul (2005). *Analysing Grammar: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 32.

Montague, Richard (1974)., 'The proper treatment of quantification in English', in R. Montague, Formal Philosophy, ed. by R. Thomason (New Haven).

ScienceDirect Master, Peter (1997). "The English Article System: acquisition, function, and pedagogy" in: *System*, Volume 25, Issue 2, pp. 215–232.

Szabolcsi, A. (1983). The possessor that ran away from home. The Linguistic Review 3.

World English. "The 500 Most Commonly Used Words in the English Language". http://www.world-english.org/english500.htm. Retrieved 2007-01-14.

Zweig, Eytan (2005). "Nouns and Adjectives in Numeral NPs", *Proceedings of NELS* 33, http://homepages.nyu.edu/~ez255/downloads/NELS35_numeral_phrases_proceedings.pdf

6

Reflections on Adjunct, Conjunct, Disjunct and Apposition

ADJUNCT

In linguistics, an adjunct is an optional, or *structurally dispensable*, part of a sentence that, when removed, will not affect the remainder of the sentence. A more detailed definition of an adjunct is its attribute as a modifying form, word, or phrase which depends on another form, word, or phrase, being an element of clause structure with adverbial function.

A simple example of this is as follows:

Take the sentence *John killed Bill in Central Park on Sunday*. In this sentence:

1. John is the *Subject*
2. killed is the *Predicator*
3. Bill is the *Object*
4. in Central Park is the first *Adjunct*
5. on Sunday is the second *Adjunct*

An *adverbial adjunct* is a sentence element that usually establishes the circumstances in which the action or state expressed by the verb take place.

The following sentence uses adjuncts of time and place:

Yesterday, Lorna saw the dog in the garden.

Notice that this example is ambiguous between whether the adjunct "in the garden" modifies the verb "saw" (in which case it is Lorna who saw the dog while she was in the garden) or the noun "the dog" (in which case it is the dog who is in the garden).

This definition can be extended to include adjuncts that modify nouns or other parts of speech:

The large dog in the garden is very friendly.

Adjuncts are always extranuclear; that is, removing an adjunct leaves a grammatically well-formed sentence. It is for this reason that "is very friendly" in the sentence above is not an adjunct; though it is adjectival, it acts as the predicate and its removal would render the sentence meaningless. However, optional complements are also often removable, so not all removable elements are adjuncts. They are contrasted with complements, which are elements directly selected by another element.

Forms

An adjunct can be a single word, a phrase, or a clause.

Single word

She will leave tomorrow.

Phrase

She will leave in the morning.

Clause

She will leave after she has had breakfast.

Semantic Function of Adverbial Adjuncts

Adverbial adjuncts establish circumstances for the nuclear of a sentence, which can be classified as followings:

Temporal

Temporal adjuncts establish when, for how long or how often a state or action happened or existed.

He arrived yesterday. (time point)
He stayed for two weeks. (duration)
She drinks in that bar every day. (frequency)

Locative

Locative adjuncts establish where, to where or from where a state or action happened or existed.

She sat on the table. (locative)

Modicative

Modicative adjuncts establish how the action happened or the state existed, or modifying its scope.

He ran with difficulty. (manner)
He stood in silence. (state)
He helped me with my homework. (limiting)

Causal

Causal adjuncts establish the reason for, or purpose of, an action or state.

The ladder collapsed because it was old. (reason)
She went out to buy some bread. (purpose)

Instrumental

Instrumental adjuncts establish the instrument of the action.

Mr. Bibby wrote the letter with a pencil.

Conditional

Conditional adjuncts establish the condition in which a sentence becomes true.

I would go to Paris, if I had the money.

Concessive

Concessive adjuncts establish the contrary circumstances.

Lorna went out although it was raining.

Adverbial Adjunct and Adverbial Complement Distinguished

An adjunct must always be a removable, i.e. extranuclear, element in the sentence. In the sentence below *in the park* can be removed and a well-formed sentence remains.

John drank a beer in the park. (locative adjunct)

In the sentence below, however, *in the park* is part of the nucleus of the sentence and cannot be removed. It is thus not an adjunct but an adverbial complement.

John is in the park. (locative complement)

NOUN ADJUNCT

In grammar, a noun adjunct or attributive noun or noun premodifier is a noun that modifies another noun and is optional — meaning that it can be removed without changing the grammar of the sentence. For example, in the phrase "chicken soup" the noun adjunct "chicken" modifies the noun "soup". It is irrelevant whether the resulting compound noun is spelled in one or two parts. "Field" is a noun adjunct in both "field player" and "fieldhouse".

Adjectival noun is a term that was formerly synonymous with noun adjunct but is now usually used to mean *an adjective used as a noun*.

Noun adjuncts were traditionally mostly singular (e.g., "trouser press") except when there were lexical restrictions (e.g., "arms race"), but there is a recent trend towards more use of plural ones, especially in UK English. Many of these can also be and/or were originally interpreted and spelled as plural possessives (e.g., "chemicals' agency", "writers' conference", "Rangers' hockey game"), but they are now often written without the apostrophe although this is criticised by some authorities.

Fowler's Modern English Usage states in the section "POSSESSIVE PUZZLES": "6. Five years' imprisonment, Three weeks' holiday, etc. Years and weeks may be treated as possessives and given an apostrophe or as adjectival nouns without one. The former is perhaps better, as to conform to what is inevitable in the singular — a year's imprisonment, a fortnight's holiday."

CONJUNCT

In linguistics, the term conjunct has three distinct uses:

- A conjunct is an adjunct that adds information to the sentence that is not considered part of the propositional content (or at least not essential) but which connects the sentence with previous parts of the discourse. Rare though this may be, conjuncts may also connect to the following parts of the discourse.
  - *It was raining. Therefore, we didn't go swimming.*
  - *It was sunny. However, we stayed inside.*
  - *You are such a dork. Still, I love you from the bottom of my heart.*
- A coordination structure connects two words, phrases or clauses together, usually with the help of a coordinating conjunction:
  - [Gretchen and her daughter] bought [motor oil, spark plugs, and dynamite].
  - Take two of these and call me in the morning.
- A verb form, for example the conjunct verb endings of Old Irish or the conjunct mood (sometimes called the subjunctive mood) of the Algonquian languages.

This article discusses the first kind of conjunct.

The Semantic Functions of Conjuncts

English conjuncts often have the following functions

- Listing (indicating that what follows is a list of propositions)
  To begin with, I have to tell you that I'm most displeased with your performance in the show. I also think you did a bad job painting the house. You're a lousy cook. You smell. Your hat is ... etc.
- Enumerative (indicating items on a list of propositions)
  First, we have to buy bread. Second, we need to take the car to the garage. Third, we have to call your dentist and make an appointment.
- Additive (indicating that the content of the sentence is in addition to the preceding one)
  He has no money. In addition, he has no means of getting any.
- Summative (summing up, or concluding, on the preceding sentence(s))
  A is B. A is C. To sum up, A is several things.
- Appositive (rephrasing the preceding sentence)
  The French love music. In other words, music is appreciated in France.
- Resultative/inferential (indicating that the content of the sentence is a result of the events expressed in the preceding sentence)
  Miss Gold lost her job. She, therefore, had no money.
- Antithetic (indicating that the content of the sentence is in contrast to the content of the preceding sentence)
  It is said that water flows up hill. On the contrary, it flows downhill
- Concessive (indicating that the content of the sentence "exists" despite the content in the preceding sentence)

It is very cold. I went for my morning walk, however.

- Temporal (indicating temporal relation between the content of the sentence and the preceding sentence)
  I had lunch. Meanwhile, my wife had her hair cut.

DISJUNCT

In linguistics, a disjunct is a type of adverbial adjunct that expresses information that is not considered essential to the sentence it appears in, but which is considered to be the speaker's or writer's attitude towards, or descriptive statement of, the propositional content of the sentence. For instance:

- *Honestly*, I didn't do it. (Meaning "I'm honest when I say I didn't do it" rather than *"I didn't do it in an honest way.")
- *Fortunately for you*, I have it right here.
- *In my opinion*, the green one is better.

Sometimes, the same word or phrase can be interpreted either as a disjunct or as a simple adjunct:

> They *seriously* worked in an underground diamond mine run by Barbara.
>
> Disjunct meaning: *I'm serious when I say that they worked in an underground diamond mine ...*
>
> Adjunct meaning: *They worked with seriousness...*

More generally, the term *disjunct* can be used to refer to any sentence element that is not fully integrated into the clausal structure of the sentence. Such elements usually appear peripherally (at the beginning or end of the sentence) and are set off from the rest of the sentence by a comma (in writing) and a pause (in speech).

A specific type of disjunct is the *sentence adverb* (or sentence adverbial), which modifies a sentence, or a clause within a sentence, to convey the mood, attitude or sentiments

of the speaker, rather than an adverb modifying a verb, an adjective or another adverb within a sentence.

An example of a sentence adverb modifying a sentence is: *Unfortunately, when I got to the supermarket it had run out of the vegetable I like.* An example of a sentence adverb modifying a clause within a sentence is: *I liked the red car in the forecourt, but unfortunately, when I got to the dealer it was already sold.*

"Unfortunately" thus communicates the regret or disappointment the speaker experiences and so manifests as a sentence adverb the sentiments of the speaker.

"Unfortunately," however, is only one of many sentence adverbs that can modify a speaker's attitude. Others include "mercifully," "gratefully," "oddly," "admittedly," etc.

Hopefully

In the last forty years or so, a controversy has arisen over the proper usage of the adverb *hopefully*. Some grammarians began to object when they first encountered constructions like: "Hopefully, the sun will be shining tomorrow." Their complaint stems from the fact that the term "hopefully" dangles, and is intended to describe the speaker's state of mind, rather than the (grammatically more pure) manner in which the sun will shine.

One of the reasons the sentence adverb usage seems more acceptable these days is that its semantics are reminiscent of the German hoffentlich ("it is to be hoped that") which implies (in the context of the first example) that the speaker hopes the sun will shine. Furthermore, it is because of their conciseness, avoiding the need to put into several words what can be said in one, that the use of sentence adverbs is establishing itself more and more in colloquial speech.

Merriam-Webster gives a usage note on its entry for "hopefully" in which the editors point out that the disjunct sense of the word dates to the early 18th century and had

been in fairly widespread use since at least the 1930s. Objection to this sense of the word, they state, only became widespread in the 1960s. The editors maintain that this usage is "entirely standard."

ANTECEDENT-CONTAINED DELETION

Antecedent-contained deletion is a phenomenon found in Verb phrase ellipsis contexts containing a quantifier. To understand the issue involved, it is necessary to understand how VP-elision works. Consider the following examples, where the expected, but missing, VP is represented with the symbol Ä.

(1) John washed the dishes, and Mary did Ä, too.

(2) John washed the dishes on Tuesday, and Mary did Ä, too.

In both of these sentences, the VP has been elided in the second half of the sentence ("and Mary did, too"). In both cases, the elided VP must be identical to the antecedent in the first clause. That is, in (1), the missing predicate can only mean "wash the dishes" and in (2), the missing predicate can only mean "wash the dishes on Tuesday."

Assuming that the missing VP must be identical to an antecedent VP leads to a problem, first noticed by Bouton 1970. Consider the following sentence:

(3) John read every book Mary did Ä.

First, consider the VP that Ä takes as its antecedent. Assuming that the elided VP must be identical to its antecedent, that is, it must be the same exact VP that is predicated of John, we get:

(4) Ä = "read every book that Mary did Ä"

But we see that this VP contains an elided VP itself, so we replace that elided VP with its referent:

(5) Ä = "read every book that Mary did read every book that Mary did Ä"

The reader can easily verify at this point that this sentence leads to infinite regress. To avoid this problem, Sag 1976 proposed that the NP "every book that Mary did" undergoes quantifier raising (QR) to a position above the verb.

(6) [every book that Mary did Ä]$_i$ John read t_i.

Now the reference for the elided VP is simply the following:

(7) read t_i

If we replace the elided VP in (6), A, with (7), we get the following

(8) [every book that Mary did read t_i]$_i$ John read t_i.

The problem of infinite regress is now avoided.

APPOSITION

Apposition is a grammatical construction in which two elements, normally noun phrases, are placed side by side, with one element serving to define or modify the other. When this device is used, the two elements are said to be *in apposition*. For example, in the phrase "my friend Alice", the name "Alice" is in apposition to "my friend".

More traditionally, appositions were called by their Latin name *appositio*, although the English form is now more commonly used. It is derived from Latin: *ad* ("near") and *positio* ("placement").

Apposition is a figure of speech of the scheme type, and often results when the verbs (particularly verbs of being) in supporting clauses are eliminated to produce shorter descriptive phrases. This makes them often function as hyperbatons, or figures of disorder, because they can disrupt the flow of a sentence. For example, in the phrase: "My wife, a nurse by training, ...", it is necessary to pause before the parenthetical modification "a nurse by training".

Restrictive Versus Non-Restrictive

Apposition can either be *restrictive*, or *non-restrictive*

where the second element parenthetically modifies the first.

In a non-restrictive appositive, the second element parenthetically modifies the first without changing its scope. Non-restrictive appositives are not crucial to the meaning of the sentence. In a restrictive appositive, the second element limits or clarifies the foregoing one in some crucial way. For example in the phrase "my friend Alice", "Alice" specifies to which friend the speaker is referring and is therefore restrictive. On the other hand, in the above example: "my wife, a nurse by training, ..." the parenthetical "a nurse by training" does not narrow down the subject, but rather provides additional information about the subject, namely, "my wife". In English, a non-restrictive appositive must be preceded or set off by commas, while a restrictive appositive is not set off by commas.

Not all restrictive clauses are appositives. For example, *Alice* in "Bill's friend Alice ..." is an appositive noun; *Alice* in "Bill's friend, whose name is Alice, ..." is not an appositive but, rather, the predicate of a restrictive clause. The main difference between the two is that the second explicitly states what an apposition would omit: that the friend in question is named Alice. If the meaning is clear "Bill's friend Alice" can be used ("Bill was here with his friend. [other remarks] Bill's friend Alice...").

The same words can change from restrictive to non-restrictive (or vice versa) depending on the speaker and context. Consider the phrase "my brother Nathan". If the speaker has more than one brother, the name Nathan is restrictive as it clarifies which brother. However, if the speaker has only one brother, then the brother's name is parenthetical and the correct way to write it is: "my brother, Nathan, ...". If it is not known which is the case, it is safer to omit the restrictive commas: "John's brother Nathan" is acceptable whether or not John has more brothers, unlike "John's brother, Nathan".

Examples

In the following examples, the appositive phrases are offset in italics:

- Barry Goldwater, *the junior senator from Arizona*, received the Republican nomination in 1964.
- John and Bob, *both friends of mine*, are starting a band.
- Alexander the Great, *the Macedonian conqueror of Persia*, was one of the most successful military commanders of the ancient world.
- Dean Martin, *a very popular singer*, will be performing at the Sands Hotel.

A kind of appositive phrase that has caused controversy is the "false title", as in "United States Deputy Marshal Jim Hall said Tuesday that *fatally wounded Lawrence County Sheriff* Gene Matthews told him that *fugitive tax protester* Gordon W. Kahl was dead before other law enforcement officials started shooting." Such phrases are usually non-restrictive, as in the above example.

Appositive Genitive

In several languages, the same syntax which is used to express such relations as possession can also be used appositively. Examples include:

- In English:
  - "Appositive oblique", a prepositional phrase with *of* as in: *the month of December*, *the sin of pride*, or *the City of New York*. This has also been invoked as an explanation for the double genitive: *a friend of mine*.
  - The ending *-'s* as in "In Dublin's Fair City". This is uncommon.
- In classical Greek:
  - "Genitive of explanation" as in *hyòs méga*

chrêma, "a monster (great affair) of a boar" (Histories (Herodotus) 1.36);

- In Japanese:
  - Postpositive *no* as in: *Fuji no Yama*, "the Mountain of Fuji";
- In Biblical Hebrew:
  - Construct, "genitive of association" as *Gan 'Çden*, "Garden of Eden".

REFERENCES

Baltin, Mark (1987). Do Antecedent-Contained Deletions Exist? Linguistic Inquiry 18 (4):579-595.

Bouton, L. (1970). Antecedent-Contained Pro-forms. In Proceedings of Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, ed. M. Campbell Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Hornstein, Norbert (1994). An Argument for Minimalism: The Case of Antecedent-Contained Deletion. Linguistic Inquiry 25 (3):455-480.

Kahn, John Ellison and Robert Ilson, Eds. (1985). *The Right Word at the Right Time: A Guide to the English Language and How to Use It*, pp. 27–29. London: The Reader's Digest Association Limited.

Kennedy, Christopher (1997). Antecedent-Contained Deletion and the Syntax of Quantification. Linguistic Inquiry 28 (4):662-688.

Lyons, John (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. London: Cambridge U.P., Print.

May, Robert (1985). *Logical Form: Its Structure and Derivation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McArthur, Tom (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*, pp. 16-17. Oxford University Press.

7

Focus on C-command, Declension, Word, Gerund and Grammatical Aspects of Syntax

C-COMMAND

In syntax, c-command is a relationship between nodes in parse trees. Originally defined by Tanya Reinhart (1976, 1983), it corresponds to the idea of "siblings and all their descendants" in family trees.

Definition and Example

The definition of c-command is based partly on the relationship of *dominance*. A node "dominates" another node if it is above it in the tree (it is a parent, grandparent, etc.)

Using this definition of dominance, node *A* c-commands node *B* if and only if:

- A does not dominate B
- B does not dominate A
- The first branching node that dominates A, also dominates B

For example, according to this definition, in the tree at the right,

- *M* does not c-command any node because it dominates all other nodes.

- *A* c-commands *B*, *C*, *D*, *E*, *F*, and *G*.
- *B* c-commands *A*.
- *C* c-commands *D*, *F*, and *G*.
- *D* c-commands *C* and *E*.
- *E* c-commands *D*, *F* and *G*.
- *F* c-commands *G*.
- *G* c-commands *F*.

Origin of Term

The term "c-command" was introduced by Reinhart in her 1976 MIT dissertation (p. 32), and is a shortened form of "constituent command." Reinhart herself thanks Nick Clements for suggesting both the term and its abbreviation. As discussed by Andrew Carnie, the term "c-command" may also have been chosen so as to contrast with the similar notion *kommand* (often read as "k-command"), proposed by Howard Lasnik in 1976.

C-command and the First Branching Node

The above definition specified that the domain of c-command is the first *branching* node that dominates A. This relationship is sometimes known as *strict c-command*. Without this specification, c-command would be limited to cases in which the first node of any sort dominating A also dominates B. The following tree illustrates how these two accounts differ in their result. If all nodes are considered, then *A* does not c-command any other nodes, because *B* dominates it and does not dominate any other nodes; if only branching nodes are considered, then *B* is irrelevant in evaluating the third criterion, and *A* does c-command *D*, *E*, and *F*.

CLOSED CLASS

In linguistics, a closed class (or closed word class) is a word class to which no new items can normally be added, and that usually contains a relatively small number of items. Typical closed classes found in many languages are

adpositions (prepositions and postpositions), determiners, conjunctions, and pronouns.

Contrastingly, an open class offers possibilities for expansion. Typical open classes such as nouns and verbs can and do get new words often, through the usual means such as compounding, derivation, coining, borrowing, etc.

A closed class may get new items through these same processes, but the change takes much more time. The closed class is normally viewed as part of the core language and is not expected to change. Most readers can undoubtedly think of new nouns or verbs entering their lexicon, but it's very unlikely that they can recall any new prepositions or pronouns appearing in the same fashion.

Different languages have different word classes as open class and closed class – for example, in English, pronouns are closed class and verbs are open class, while in Japanese, pronouns are open class, while verbs are closed class – to form a new verb, one suffixes (*-suru,* "to do") to a noun.

COMPARATIVE

In grammar, the comparative is the form of an adjective or adverb which denotes the degree or grade by which a person, thing, or other entity has a property or quality greater or less in extent than that of another, and is used in this context with a subordinating conjunction, such as *than*, *as...as*, etc.

If three or more items are being compared, the corresponding superlative needs to be used instead.

Structure

The structure of a comparative in English consists normally of the positive form of the adjective or adverb, plus the suffix -er, or (in the case of polysyllabic words borrowed from foreign languages) the modifier *more* (or

less/fewer) before the adjective or adverb. The form is usually completed by *than* and the noun which is being compared, e.g. "He is taller *than* his father", or "The village is *less* picturesque than the town nearby". *Than* is used as a subordinating conjunction to introduce the second element of a comparative sentence while the first element expresses the difference, as in "Our new house is larger *than* the old one", "There is *less* water in Saudi Arabia *than* in the United States", "There are *fewer* people in Canada *than* in California."

Two-Clause Sentences

For sentences with the two clauses other two-part comparative subordinating conjunctions may be used:

1. *as...as* "The house was *as* large *as* two put together."
2. *not so / not as ...as* "The coat of paint is *not as* [*not so*] fresh *as* it used to be."
3. *the same ... as* "This car is *the same* size *as* the old one."
4. *less / more ... than* "It cost me *more* to rent *than* I had hoped."

Adverbs

In English, adverbs are usually formed by adding *-ly* to the end of an adjective. In the comparative, *more* (or *less*) is added before the adverb, as in "This sofa seats three people *more* comfortably than the other one."

Some irregular adverbs such as *fast* or *hard* do not use *more*, but add an *-er* suffix, as the adjectives do. Thus: "My new car starts *faster* than the old one" or "She studies *harder* than her sister does."

For some one-syllable adjectives, the comparative of adjectives may be used interchangeably with the comparative of adverbs, with no change in meaning: "My new car starts more *quickly* than the old one" or "My new car starts *quicker* than the old one".

However, if the adjective has an irregular comparative, then the adverb must use it: "She writes *better* than I do" or "He threw the ball farther than his brother did."

Null Comparative

The null comparative is a comparative in which the starting point for comparison is not stated. These comparisons are frequently found in advertising.

For example, in typical assertions such as "our burgers have more flavor", "our picture is sharper" or "50% more", there is no mention of what it is they are comparing to. In some cases it is easy to infer what the missing element in a null comparative is. In other cases the speaker or writer has been deliberately vague in this regard, for example "Glasgow's miles better".

Greater/Lesser

Scientific classification, taxonomy and geographical categorization conventionally include the adjectives *greater* and *lesser*, when a *large* or *small* variety of an item is meant, as in the greater celandine as opposed to the lesser celandine. These adjectives may at first sight appear as a kind of *null comparative*, when as is usual, they are cited without their opposite counterpart. It is clear however, when reference literature is consulted that an entirely different variety of animal, scientific or geographical object is intended. Thus it may be found, for example, that the lesser panda entails a giant panda variety, and a gazetteer would establish that there are the Lesser Antilles as well as the Greater Antilles.

It is in the nature of grammatical conventions evolving over time that it is difficult to establish when they first became widely accepted, but both *greater* and *lesser* in these instances have over time become mere adjectives (or adverbial constructs), so losing their *comparative* connotation.

When referring to metropolitan areas, *Greater* indicates that adjacent areas such as suburbs are being included. Although it implies a comparison with a narrower definition that refers to a central city only, such as Greater London versus the City of London, or Greater New York versus New York City, it is not part of the "comparative" in the grammatical sense this article describes. A comparative always compares something directly with something else.

COMPLEMENT (LINGUISTICS)

In grammar the term complement is used with different meanings. The primary meaning is a word, phrase or clause which is *necessary* in a sentence to complete its meaning. We find complements which function as an argument (i.e. of equal status to subjects and objects) and complements which exist within arguments.

Both complements and modifiers add to the meaning of a sentence. However, a complement is necessary to complete a sentence; a modifier is not. For example, "Put the bread on the table" needs "on the table" to make it complete. In most dialects of English, you cannot merely put something; you need to put it somewhere. In this context, the phrase "on the table" is a complement. By contrast, "The bread on the table is fresh." does not require "on the table" to be complete, so here, the phrase "on the table" is a modifier. A modifier, unlike a complement, is an *optional* element of a sentence.

Predicative Complements

In linguistics, complement refers only to the predicative complement. A predicative complement is the complement that is predicated by a predicate. A predicate is the completer of a sentence; a predicator (verb) + complement. The term predicate complement refers to the fact that the predication depends on the attribution of a subject and its predicator (a verb, verb string, or compound verb). The predicative

complement consists of few contrasting varieties:

- Object complement (common complement)
- Predicative nominal (noun,nominal,pronominal; common in SUB or OBJ complement)
- Predicative adjective (or adjectival, common in subject complement)
- Predicative adverb (or adverbial, common in intransitive predication)
- Predicative adjunct (optional complement)....

Subject Complements

A subject complement tells more about the subject by means of the verb. In the examples below the sentence elements are (SUBJECT + VERB + COMPLEMENT)

Mr. Johnson is a management consultant. (a predicative nominative)

She looks ill. (a predicative adjective)

Objective Predicative Complements

An object complement tells us more about the object by means of the verb. In the examples below the sentence elements are (SUBJECT + VERB + OBJECT + COMPLEMENT). Object complements can often be removed leaving a well-formed sentence, thus the use of the term complement is slightly illogical.

We elected him chairman. (a predicative nominal)

We painted the house red. (a predicative adjective)

An object complement can be a noun, pronoun, or adjective that follows and modifies a direct object. It can describe, clarify, re-name, or show completion of a process. It is most often used with verbs involving judgement, nomination, or creation.

Examples:

My son painted his room blue. (*Blue* modifies the direct object *room*.)

The class elected the smallest boy President. (*President* modifies *boy* and shows the result of the election.)

The clown made the children very excited. (The participle *excited* describes *children*.)

It can be confused with subject complements (predicate nominatives or predicate adjectives).

For example:

The waitress seems grumpy. (*Grumpy* is a subject complement modifying the subject, *waitress*.)

I consider the waitress grumpy. (*Grumpy* modifies the direct object, *waitress*.)

Adverbials as Complements

Adverbials, central to the meaning of a sentence, are usually adjuncts (i.e. they can be removed and a well-formed sentence remains). If, however, an adverbial is a necessary sentence element, then it is an adverbial complement. Adverbial complements often occur with a form of the copula *be* acting as a clause's main verb. The structure of the sentence below is (SUBJECT + VERB + ADVERBIAL COMPLEMENT)

John is in the garden.

Verb Objects

Some grammarians refer to objects as *complements*.

Complement Clauses

Unlike a relative clause, which is only part of an argument, a complement clause is itself an argument, i.e. a subject (S/A) or an object (O/E). There are several criteria to distinguish between relative and complement clauses, for example passivization, topicalization, coordination and interrogation.

An example of a complement clause is "that she is beautiful" in the following sentence, *that* acting as a complementizer:

I know that she is beautiful.

COMPOUND (LINGUISTICS)

In linguistics, a compound is a lexeme (less precisely, a word) that consists of more than one stem. Compounding or composition is the word formation that creates compound lexemes (the other word-formation process being derivation). Compounding or Word-compounding refers to the faculty and device of language to form new words by combining or putting together old words. In other words, compound, compounding or word-compounding occurs when a person attaches two or more words together to make them one word. The meanings of the words interrelate in such a way that a new meaning comes out which is very different from the meanings of the words in isolation.

Formation of Compounds

Compound formation rules vary widely across language types.

In a synthetic language, the relationship between the elements of a compound may be marked with a case or other morpheme. For example, the German compound *Kapitänspatent* consists of the lexemes *Kapitän* (sea captain) and *Patent* (license) joined by an *-s-* (originally a genitive case suffix); and similarly, the Latin lexeme *paterfamilias* contains the (archaic) genitive form *familias* of the lexeme *familia* (family). Conversely, in the Hebrew language compound, the word *bet sefer* (school), it is the head that is modified: the compound literally means "house-of book", with *bayit* (house) having entered the construct state to become *bet* (house-of). This latter pattern is common throughout the Semitic languages, though in some it is combined with an explicit genitive case, so that both parts of the compound are marked.

Agglutinative languages tend to create very long words with derivational morphemes. Compounds may or may not

require the use of derivational morphemes also. The longest compounds in the world may be found in the Finnish and Germanic languages. In German, extremely long compound words can be found in the language of chemical compounds, where in the cases of biochemistry and polymers, they can be practically unlimited in length. German examples include *Farbfernsehgerät* (color television set), *Funkfernbedienung* (radio remote control), and the jocular word *Donaudampfschifffahrtsgesellschaftskapitänsmütze* (Danube steamboat shipping company Captain's hat).

In Finnish there is no theoretical limit to the length of compound words, but in practice words consisting of more than three components are rare. Even those can look mysterious to non-Finnish, take emergency exit as an example. Internet folklore sometimes suggests that Airplane jet turbine engine auxiliary mechanic non-commissioned officer student would be the longest word in Finnish, but evidence of it actually being used is scant and anecdotic at best.

Compounds can be rather long when translating technical documents from English to some other language, for example, Swedish. "Motion estimation search range settings" can be directly translated to *rörelseuppskattningssökintervallsinställningar*; the length of the words are theoretically unlimited, especially in chemical terminology.

Subclasses

Semantic Classification

A common semantic classification of compounds yields four types:

- endocentric
- exocentric (also bahuvrihi)
- copulative (also dvandva)
- appositional

An endocentric compound consists of a *head*, i.e. the categorical part that contains the basic meaning of the whole compound, and modifiers, which restrict this meaning. For example, the English compound *doghouse*, where *house* is the head and *dog* is the modifier, is understood as a house intended for a dog. Endocentric compounds tend to be of the same part of speech (word class) as their head, as in the case of *doghouse*. (Such compounds were called *tatpuruca* in the Sanskrit tradition.) Exocentric compounds (called a *bahuvrihi* compound in the Sanskrit tradition) do not have a head, and their meaning often cannot be transparently guessed from its constituent parts. For example, the English compound *white-collar* is neither a kind of collar nor a white thing. In an exocentric compound, the word class is determined lexically, disregarding the class of the constituents. For example, a *must-have* is not a verb but a noun. The meaning of this type of compound can be glossed as "(one) whose B is A", where B is the second element of the compound and A the first. A bahuvrihi compound is one whose nature is expressed by neither of the words: thus a *white-collar* person is neither white nor a collar (the collar's colour is a metaphor for socioeconomic status). Other English examples include *barefoot* and *Blackbeard*. Copulative compounds are compounds which have two semantic heads.

Appositional compounds refer to lexemes that have two (contrary) attributes which classify the compound.

Type	*Description*	*Examples*
endocentric	A+B denotes a special kind of B	*darkroom*, *smalltalk*
exocentric	A+B denotes a special kind of an unexpressed semantic head	*skinhead*, *paleface* (head: 'person')
copulative	A+B denotes 'the sum' of what A and B denote	*bittersweet*, *sleepwalk*
appositional	A and B provide different descriptions for the same referent	*actor-director*, *maidservant*

Formal Classification

Noun-Noun Compounds

Most natural languages have compound nouns. The positioning of the words (i. e. the most common order of constituents in phrases where nouns are modified by adjectives, by possessors, by other nouns, etc.) varies according to the language. While Germanic languages, for example, are left-branching when it comes to noun phrases (the modifiers come before the head), the Romance languages are usually right-branching.

In French, compound nouns are often formed by left-hand heads with prepositional components inserted before the modifier, as in *chemin-de-fer* 'railway' lit. 'road of iron' and *moulin à vent* 'windmill', lit. 'mill (that works)-by-means-of wind'.

In Turkish, one way of forming compound nouns is as follows: yeldeðirmeni 'windmill' (yel: wind, deðirmen-i:mill-possessive); demiryolu 'railway'(demir: iron, yol-u: road-possessive).

Verb-Noun Compounds

A type of compound that is fairly common in the Indo-European languages is formed of a verb and its object, and in effect transforms a simple verbal clause into a noun.

In Spanish, for example, such compounds consist of a verb conjugated for third person singular, present tense, indicative mood followed by a noun (usually plural): e.g., *rascacielos* (modelled on "skyscraper", lit. 'scratches skies'), *sacacorchos* ('corkscrew', lit. 'removes corks'), *guardarropas* ('wardrobe', lit. 'stores clothing'). These compounds are formally invariable in the plural (but in many cases they have been reanalyzed as plural forms, and a singular form has appeared). French and Italian have these same compounds with the noun in the singular form: Italian *grattacielo*, 'skyscraper'; French *grille-pain*, 'toaster' (lit.

'toasts bread') and *torche-cul* 'ass-wipe' (Rabelais: See his "propos torcheculatifs").

This construction exists in English, generally with the verb and noun both in uninflected form: examples are *spoilsport*, *killjoy*, *breakfast*, *cutthroat*, *pickpocket*, *dreadnought*, and *know-nothing*.

Also common in English is another type of verb-noun (or noun-verb) compound, in which an argument of the verb is incorporated into the verb, which is then usually turned into a gerund, such as *breastfeeding*, *finger-pointing*, etc. The noun is often an instrumental complement. From these gerunds new verbs can be made: *(a mother) breastfeeds (a child)* and from them new compounds *mother-child breastfeeding*, etc.

In the Australian Aboriginal language Jingulu, (a Pama-Nyungan language), it is claimed that all verbs are V+N compounds, such as "do a sleep", or "run a dive", and the language has only three basic verbs: do, make, and run.

A special kind of composition is incorporation, of which noun incorporation into a verbal root (as in English *backstabbing*, *breastfeed*, etc.) is most prevalent.

Verb-Verb Compounds

Verb-verb compounds are sequences of more than one verb acting together to determine clause structure. They have two types:

- In a serial verb, two actions, often sequential, are expressed in a single clause. For example, Ewe *trT dzo*, lit. "turn leave", means "turn and leave", and Hindi " *jâ-kar dekh-o*, lit. "go-CONJUNCTIVE PARTICIPLE see-IMPERATIVE", means "go and see". In each case, the two verbs together determine the semantics and argument structure.

Serial verb expressions in English may include *What did you go and do that for?*, or *He just upped and left*; this

is however not quite a true compound since they are connected by a conjunction and the second missing arguments may be taken as a case of ellipsis.

- In a compound verb (or *complex predicate*), one of the verbs is the primary, and determines the primary semantics and also the argument structure. The secondary verb, often called a vector verb or explicator, provides fine distinctions, usually in temporality or aspect, and also carries the inflection (tense and/or agreement markers). The main verb usually appears in conjunctive participial (sometimes *zero*) form. For examples, Hindi *nikal gayâ*, lit. "exit went", means 'went out', while *nikal paRâ*, lit. "exit fell", means 'departed' or 'was blurted out'. In these examples *nikal* is the primary verb, and *gayâ* and *paRâ* are the vector verbs. Similarly, in both English *start reading* and Japanese *-yomihajimeru* "start-CONJUNCTIVE-read" "start reading," the vector verbs *start* and *hajimeru* "start" change according to tense, negation, and the like, while the main verbs *reading* and -Šn0 *yomi* "reading" usually remain the same. An exception to this is the passive voice, in which both English and Japanese modify the main verb, i.e. *start to be read* and *yomarehajimeru* lit. "read-PASSIVE-(CONJUNCTIVE)-start" *start to be read*. With a few exceptions all compound verbs alternate with their simple counterparts. That is, removing the vector does not affect grammaticality at all nor the meaning very much: *nikalâ* '(He) went out.' In a few languages both components of the compound verb can be finite forms: Kurukh *kecc-ar ker-ar* lit. "died-3pl went-3pl" '(They) died.'
- Compound verbs are very common in some languages, such as the northern Indo-Aryan languages Hindi-Urdu and Panjabi where as many as 20% of verb forms in running text are compound.

They exist but are less common in Dravidian languages and in other Indo-Aryan languages like Marathi and Nepali, in Tibeto-Burman languages like Limbu and Newari, in potentially macro-Altaic languages like Turkish, Korean, Japanese, Kazakh, Uzbek, and Kyrgyz, and in northeast Caucasian languages like Tsez and Avar.

- Under the influence of a Quichua substrate speakers living in the Ecuadorian altiplano have innovated compound verbs in Spanish:
- Compound verb equivalents in English (examples from the internet):

What did you go and do that for?

If you are not giving away free information on your web site then a huge proportion of your business is just upping and leaving.

Big Pig, she took and built herself a house out of brush.

- Caution: In descriptions of Persian and other Iranian languages the term 'compound verb' refers to noun-plus-verb compounds, not to the verb-verb compounds discussed here.

Compound Adpositions

Compound prepositions formed by prepositions and nouns are common in English and the Romance languages (consider English *on top of*, Spanish *encima de*, etc.). Japanese shows the same pattern, except the word order is the opposite (with postpositions): *no naka* (lit. "of inside", i.e. "on the inside of"). Hindi has a small number of simple (i.e., one-word) postpositions and a large number of compound postpositions, mostly consisting of simple postposition *ke* followed by a specific postposition (e.g., *ke pas*, "near"; *ke nîche*, "underneath").

As a member of the Germanic family of languages, English is special in that compound words are usually

written by separating them into their parts. Although English does not form compound nouns to the extent of Dutch or German, such constructions as "Girl Scout troop", "city council member", and "cellar door" are arguably compound nouns and used as such in speech. Writing them as separate words is merely an orthographic convention, possibly a result of influence from French.

Recent Trends

Although there is no universally agreed-upon guideline regarding the use of compound words in the English language, in recent decades written English has displayed a noticeable trend towards increased use of compounds. Recently, many words have been made by taking syllables of words and compounding them, such as pixel (picture element) and bit (binary digit). This is called a syllabic abbreviation. Moreover, the English way of spelling compound words is spreading to other languages:

There is a trend in Scandinavian languages towards splitting compound words, known in Norwegian as "særskrivingsfeil" (separate writing error). Because the Norwegian language relies heavily on the distinction between the compound word and the sequence of the separate words it consists of, this has dangerous implications. For example smokefree, meaning no smoking has been seen confused with "røyk fritt" (smoke freely).

The German spelling reform of 1996 introduced the option of hyphenating compound nouns when it enhances comprehensibility and readability. This is done mostly with very long compound words by separating them into two or more smaller compounds, like *Eisenbahn-Unterführung* (railway underpass) or *Kraftfahrzeugs-Betriebsanleitung* (car manual).

DIFFERENTIAL OBJECT MARKING

Differential object marking (DOM) is a linguistic phenomenon that is present in more than 300 languages;

the term was coined by Georg Bossong. In languages where DOM is active, direct objects are divided in two different classes, depending on different meanings, and, in most DOM languages, only one of the classes receives a marker, the other being unmarked (but there are languages, like Finnish, where both types of objects are marked with different endings).

Spanish

A well-known DOM language is Spanish. In Spanish, direct objects that are both human and specific require a special marker (the preposition *a* "to"):

- *Pedro besó a Lucía.* = Peter kissed Lucy. (Literally, "Peter kissed to Lucy")

Inanimate direct objects do not usually allow this marker, even if they are specific:

- *Pedro besó el retrato.* = Peter kissed the picture.

Yet, some animate objects that are specific can optionally bear the marker:

- *Pedro vio (a) la gata.* = Peter saw (to) the cat-FEM

Other Languages

Other examples of languages with differential object marking are Turkish, Copala Triqui and Amharic. In Turkish, the direct object can either have accusative case or have no (visible) case at all; when it has accusative case, it is interpreted as specific (e.g. one specific person), and otherwise it is interpreted as nonspecific (e.g. some person).

This is different from what happens in non-DOM languages, where all direct objects are uniformly marked in the same way; for instance, a language could mark all direct objects with an accusative ending (as in Latin); other language could leave all direct objects without overt marker (as in English).

Research on DOM

Although the phenomenon has been known for a very long time, it was considered a minor quirk in a few languages until Georg Bossong, during the eighties, presented evidence of DOM in more than 300 languages.. Since then, it has become an important topic of research in grammatical theory. This is a selection of works that deal with the phenomenon:

- Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. Economy. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21:435–448.
- Bittner, Maria. 1994. *Case, scope, and binding*. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory v. 30. Dordrecht ; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bossong, Georg. 1983–1984. Animacy and Markedness in Universal Grammar. *Glossologia* 2–3:7–20.
- Bossong, Georg. 1985. *Empirische Universalienforschung. Differentielle Objektmarkierung in der neuiranischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Bossong, Georg. 1991. Differential object marking in Romance and beyond. In *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics*, Selected Papers from the XVIII Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages 1988, eds. D. Wanner and D. Kibbee, 143–170. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bossong, Georg. 1997. Le Marquage Différentiel de L'Objet dans les Langues d'Europe. In *Actance et Valence dans les Langues d'Europe*, ed. J. Feuillet, 193–258. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyte.
- Brugé, Laura, and Brugger, Gerhard. 1996. On the Accusative a in Spanish. *Probus* 8:1–51.
- De Swart, Peter. 2007. Cross-linguistic Variation

in Object Marking, University of Nijmegen: PhD Dissertation.[5]

- Heusinger, Klaus von, and Kaiser, Georg A. 2003. Animacy, Specificity, and Definiteness in Spanish. In *Proceedings of the Workshop Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Specificity in Romance Languages*. Arbeitspapier 113, eds. Klaus von Heusinger and Georg A. Kaiser, 41–65. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz.
- Heusinger, Klaus von, and Kaiser, Georg A. 2005. The evolution of differential object marking in Spanish. In Proceedings of the Workshop "Specificity And The Evolution / Emergence of Nominal Determination Systems in Romance", eds. Klaus von Heusinger, Georg A. Kaiser and Elisabeth Stark, 33–70. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz.
- Leonetti, Manuel. 2004. Specificity and Differential Object Marking in Spanish. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 3:75–114.
- Öztürk, Balkiz. 2005. *Case, Referentiality and Phrase Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pensado, Carmen ed. 1995. *El complemento directo preposicional*. Madrid: Visor.
- Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, Miguel. 2007. The Syntax of Objects. Agree and Differential Object Marking, University of Connecticut: PhD Dissertation.
- Torrego, Esther. 1998. *The dependencies of objects*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs, 34. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

DANGLING MODIFIER

A dangling modifier, a specific case of which is the dangling participle, is an error in sentence structure whereby a grammatical modifier is associated with a word other than the one intended, or with no particular word at all. For example, a writer may have meant to modify the

subject, but word order makes the modifier seem to modify an object instead. Such ambiguities can lead to unintentional humor or difficulty in understanding a sentence.

A typical example of a dangling modifier is illustrated in the sentence *Turning the corner, a handsome school building appeared.* The modifying clause *Turning the corner* is clearly supposed to describe the behaviour of the narrator (or other observer), but grammatically it appears to apply to nothing in particular, or to the school building. Similarly, in the sentence *At the age of eight, my family finally bought a dog*, the modifier *At the age of eight* "dangles" in mid-air, attaching to no named person or thing.

Dangling Participles and Participial Clauses

Participles or participial clauses may be at the beginning or the end of a sentence, and a participial clause is usually attached to its subject, as in "Walking down the street (clause), the man (subject) saw the beautiful trees (object)." However, when the subject is missing or the participle attaches itself to another object in a sentence, the clause is seemingly "hanging" on nothing or on an entirely inappropriate noun. It thus becomes a dangling participle, as in these sentences:

"Walking down Main Street, the trees were beautiful."

"Reaching the station, the sun came out."

In the first sentence, the "walking down" participle modifies "trees," the subject of the sentence. However, the trees are presumably not themselves walking down Main Street. The participle in fact modifies the unmentioned speaker of the sentence, the one doing the walking (and finding the trees beautiful).

In the second sentence, "reaching" is the dangling participle that nonsensically qualifies "sun," the subject of the sentence; thus, the meaning is as if the sun came out when it, "the sun," reached the station. Presumably, there is another, human subject that did reach the station and

observed the sun coming out, but since this subject is not mentioned in the text, the intended meaning is obscured, and therefore this kind of sentence is considered incorrect in standard English.

Strunk and White's *The Elements of Style* provides another kind of example, a misplaced modifier (another participle):

> "I saw the trailer peeking through the window."
>
> Presumably, this means the speaker was peeking through the window, but the placement of the clause "peeking through the window" makes it sound as though the trailer were peeking through the window. More correctly, it can be written as, "Peeking through the window, I saw the trailer."

Dangling participles should not be confused with clauses in absolute constructions, which are considered grammatical. Because the participial phrase in an absolute construction is not semantically attached to any single element in the sentence, it is easily confused with a dangling participle. The difference is that the participial phrase of a dangling participle is intended to modify a particular noun, but is instead erroneously attached to a different noun, whereas a participial phrase serving as an absolute clause is not intended to modify any noun at all. An example of an absolute construction is:

> "Barring bad weather, we plan to go to the beach tomorrow."

Modifiers Reflecting the Mood or Attitude of the Speaker

Participial modifiers sometimes can be intended to describe the attitude or mood of the speaker, even when the speaker is not part of the sentence. Some such modifiers are standard and are not considered dangling modifiers: "Speaking of [topic]", and "Trusting that this will put things into perspective", for example, are commonly used to transition from one topic to a related one or for adding a conclusion to a speech.

However, attention must be paid to the placement of participial modifiers within a sentence. For example, in the sentence, "Fuming, she left the room", "fuming" can mean only one thing: it must modify (the mood of) "she". Note that "fuming", when it's misplaced, can also become a dangling modifier, as in, "She left the room fuming." In that example, the room could conceivably be "fuming".

Non-Participial Modifiers

Non-participial modifiers' dangling can also be troublesome:

> "After years of being lost under a pile of dust, Walter P. Stanley, III, left, found all the old records of the Bangor Lions Club."

The above sentence, from a newspaper article, humorously suggests that it is the subject of the sentence, Walter Stanley, who was buried under a pile of dust, and not the records. It is the prepositional phrase "after years of being lost under a pile of dust" which dangles. This example has been cited in at least one usage manual as an example of the kind of ambiguity that can result from a dangling modifier.

Another famous example of this humorous effect is by Groucho Marx as Captain Jeffrey T. Spaulding in the 1930 film, *Animal Crackers*:

> "One morning I shot an elephant in my pajamas. How he got into my pajamas I'll never know." –Groucho Marx

Though under the most plausible interpretation of the first sentence, Captain Spaulding would have been wearing the pajamas, the line plays on the grammatical possibility that the elephant was somehow within his pajamas.

Usage of "Hopefully"

In the last forty years or so, controversy has arisen over the proper usage of the adverb *hopefully*. Some grammarians objected when they first encountered

constructions such as "Hopefully, the sun will be shining tomorrow." Their complaint stems from the fact that the term "hopefully" dangles and can be understood to describe either the speaker's state of mind or the manner in which the sun will shine. It was no longer just an adverb modifying a verb, an adjective or another adverb, but conveniently also one that modified the whole sentence to convey the attitude of the speaker.

Grammatically speaking, "hopefully" used in this way is a disjunct (cf. "admittedly", "mercifully", "oddly"), and is reminiscent of the German "hoffentlich", which similarly means "it is to be hoped that...". Disjuncts (also called sentence adverbs) are useful in colloquial speech due to the concision they permit. Per Bernstein's *Miss Thistlebottom's Hobgoblins*:

No other word in English expresses that thought. In a single word we can say it is regrettable that (*regrettably*) or it is fortunate that (*fortunately*) or it is lucky that (*luckily*), and it would be comforting if there were such a word as *hopably* or, as suggested by Follett, *hopingly*, but there isn't. [...] In this instance nothing is to be lost—the word would not be destroyed in its primary meaning—and a useful, nay necessary term is to be gained.

What had been expressed in lengthy adverbial constructions, such as "it is regrettable that …" or "it is fortunate that …", had of course always been shortened to the adverbs "regrettably" or "fortunately". Bill Bryson says, "those writers who scrupulously avoid 'hopefully' in such constructions do not hesitate to use at least a dozen other words—'apparently', 'presumably', 'happily', 'sadly', 'mercifully', 'thankfully', and so on—in precisely the same way". What has changed, however, in the controversy over "hopefully" being used for "he was hoping that ...", or "she was full of hope that ...", is that the original clause was transferred from the speaker, as a kind of shorthand to the subject itself, as though "it" had expressed the hope. ("Hopefully, the sun will be shining"). Although this still

expressed the speaker's hope "that the sun will be shining" it may have caused a certain disorientation as to who was expressing what when it first appeared. As time passes, this controversy may fade as the usage becomes increasingly accepted, especially since such adverbs as "mercifully", "gratefully", and "thankfully" are similarly used.

Merriam-Webster gives a usage note on its entry for "hopefully" in which the editors point out that the disjunct sense of the word dates to the early 18th century and had been in widespread use since at least the 1930s. Objection to this sense of the word, they state, only became widespread in the 1960s. The editors maintain that this usage is "entirely standard".

Yet the choice of "regrettably" above as a counterexample points out an additional problem. At the time that objection to "hopefully" became publicized, grammar books relentlessly pointed out the distinction between "regrettably" and "regretfully". The latter is not to be used as a sentence adverb, they state; it must refer to the subject of the sentence. The misuse of "regretfully" produces worse undesired results than "hopefully", possibly contributing to disdain for the latter. The counterpart *hopably* was never added to the language.

DECLENSION

In linguistics, declension is the inflection of nouns, pronouns, adjectives, and articles to indicate number (at least singular and plural), case (nominative or subjective, genitive or possessive, etc.), and gender. A declension is also a group of nouns that follow a particular pattern of inflection.

Declension occurs in many of the world's languages, and features very prominently in many European languages, including Old English, but is much less prominent in Modern English. In contrast to Old English, at least 80 percent of the vocabulary of Modern English has been borrowed from

foreign, mostly non-Germanic languages (especially Latin), whose systems of declension conflicted with those of Old English. The resulting compromises effectively eliminated most forms of inflection in late Middle and Modern English.

Modern English

Most Modern English nouns are declined for number, to distinguish singular and plural: goose/geese, book/books, ox/oxen, child/children, medium/media, syllabus/syllabi, alumna/alumnae; but some do not change: deer/deer, sheep/sheep; and a few have two kinds of plural: fish/fish/fishes, and in British English penny/pennies/pence. Two 'fishes' indicates two types of fish (e.g., salmon and cod) while two 'fish' is just a raw number (i.e., may be two of the same fish or two different fishes).

Likewise, two 'pennies' indicates two coins, whereas two 'pence' indicates a two-penny value (i.e., one coin valued at two pence, five pence, etc., or two pennies, five pennies, etc.) Ultimately, 'pence' is a phonetic contraction - 'pennies' compressed from two to one syllable (viz., pennies > penns > pence), with "two pence" and "three pence" further compressed to "tuppence" and "thruppence" (or "tuppenny coin" and "thruppenny coin"). Words borrowed from Latin typically form their plurals in English as they do in Latin - thus, datum > data (not 'datums'), syllabus > syllabi, alumna > alumnae. By default, they also display the same gender in English as they do in Latin (datum, syllabus and alumna being neuter, masculine and feminine, respectively).

All Modern English nouns are still inflected for the genitive case, which is usually limited to expressing possession (occasionally, attribution) - Mary/Mary's, lamb/lamb's. Three days of the week still display the genitive case in ancient form without the apostrophe, which indicates omission of the letter 'e' - Tuesday, not Tu's Day; Wednesday, not Weden's Day (the second 'e' having been lost by orthographic contraction); and Thursday, not Thur's Day

(though the 'e' is missing, so it's arguably half-way to the apostrophe).

Many Modern English nouns are inflected for gender, but these are almost invariably words borrowed from other languages, especially Latin words and most personal names: Alumnus (male, singular)/Alumna (female, singular), Alumni (male, plural), Alumnae (female, plural); Marc/Marcia, John/Johanna, Andrew/Andrea, Peter/Petra, Paul/Paula, George/Georgia, Carl/Carole, Gerald/Geraldine, William/Williametta, Anthony/Antonia, etc.

On the whole, however, Modern English continues to use the same system of natural gender that was characteristic of Old English (but with four genders instead of three), so distinctive declension for gender has only really been visible in words borrowed from foreign languages (such as alumnus/alumna). Otherwise, in natural gender, things which have an actual masculine or feminine gender, are classified as masculine or feminine. In Old English, everything that was neither male nor female was neuter, except for things that could be identified abstractly with men or, more frequently, with women (such as ships and countries, which are still regarded as feminine in Modern English, too). In Modern English, things that are neither male nor female are neuter; but they are distinguished from things that can be *either* male or female, which are classified as common gender. Thus, "stallion" is masculine; "mare" is feminine; and "horse", which might indicate either a male or female animal, is common; while the scientific name, "equus ferus caballus", being inherently neither male nor female, is neuter. But none of these words is in any way an inflected form of the other three. That is, they are four completely distinct words, whereas, to use a *faux* example, "horsi", "horsa", "horse", and "horsu" might be masculine, feminine, common, and neuter inflections of a shared basic root word, "hors".

Six pronouns still display a distinct dative-accusative inflection (the dative distinguished from the accusative by

use of an express or implied preposition): I/My-Mine/Me; Thou/Thy-Thine/Thee; He/His/Him, We/Our-Ours/Us, They/Their-Theirs/Them, and Who/Whose/Whom. Otherwise, the declension of pronouns is uneven, with declension for number usual and declension for gender unusual.

Adjectives are rarely declined for any purpose. They can be declined for number when they are used as substitutes for nouns (as in, "I'll take the reds", meaning "I'll take the red ones" or as shorthand for "I'll take the red wines", for example). Some nouns borrowed from other languages are or can be declined for gender, such as 'blond' (male) and 'blonde' (female); or a 'bonie' lad as compared to a 'bonnie' lass. Adjectives are not declined for case in Modern English, though they were in Old English.

The article is never regarded as declined in Modern English, though, technically, the words *this*, *that* and their plural forms, *these* and *those*, are modern forms of *the* as it was declined in Old English. Certain non-standard regional and economic class-associated dialects do decline the article, either in regular speech or in slang - as in such expressions as "How do you like *them* apples?" and "Oh, *them* are nice!" (instead of "those").

English once had a much richer system of declension. For more information, *see* Old English declension and Old English morphology.

Latin

An example of a Latin noun declension is given below, using the singular forms of the word *homo* (*man*), which belongs to Latin's third declension.

- *homo* (nominative) "[the] man" [as a subject] (e.g., *homo ibi stat* the man is standing there)
- *hominis* (genitive) "of [the] man" [as a possessor](e.g., *nomen hominis est Claudius* the man's name is Claudius)
- *hominî* (dative) "to [the] man" [as an indirect object]

(e.g., *homini donum dedi* I gave a present to the man; *homo homini lupus est* Man is a wolf to man.)

- *hominem* (accusative) "[the] man" [as a direct object] (e.g., *ad hominem* toward the man, in the sense of argument directed personally; *hominem vidi* I saw the man)
- *homine* (ablative) "[the] man" [in various uses not covered by the above] (e.g., *sum altior homine* I am taller than the man).

There are two further noun cases in Latin, the vocative and the locative. The vocative case indicates that a person or thing is being addressed (e.g., *O Tite, cur ancillam pugnas?* O Titus, why do you fight the slave girl?). Though widely used, it differs in form from the nominative only in the masculine singular of the second declension (that is, never in the plural, never in the feminine or neuter, and never in any declension other than the second). The locative case is rare in Latin.

Sanskrit

Grammatical case was analyzed extensively in Sanskrit. The grammarian PâGini identified six semantic roles or *karaka*, which are related to the seven Sanskrit cases (nominative, accusative, instrumental, dative, ablative, genitive, and locative), but not in a one-to-one way. The six *karaka* are:

- agent (*kartri*, related to the nominative)
- patient (*karman*, related to the accusative)
- means (*karaGa*, related to the instrumental)
- recipient (*sampradâna*, related to the dative)
- source (*apâdâna*, related to the ablative)
- locus (*adhikaraGa*, related to the locative)

For example, consider the following sentence:

vriksh[at]	parn[am]	bhûm[au]	patati
[from] the tree	a leaf	[to] the ground	falls

"a leaf falls from the tree to the ground"

Here *leaf* is the agent, *tree* is the source, and *ground* is the locus, the corresponding declensions are reflected in the morphemes *-am -at* and *-au* respectively.

DUAL (GRAMMATICAL NUMBER)

Dual (abbreviated DU) is a grammatical number that some languages use in addition to singular and plural. When a noun or pronoun appears in dual form, it is interpreted as referring to precisely two of the entities (objects or persons) identified by the noun or pronoun. Verbs can also have dual agreement forms in these languages.

The dual number existed in Proto-Indo-European, persisted in many of the now extinct ancient Indo-European languages that descended from it—Sanskrit, Ancient Greek and Gothic for example—and can still be found in a few modern Indo-European languages such as Scottish Gaelic, Slovenian, Frisian, Chakavian and Sorbian. Many more modern Indo-European languages show residual traces of the dual, as in the English distinctions *both* vs. *all*, *either* vs. *any*, *twice* vs. <*number*> *times*, and so on.

Many Semitic languages also have dual number. For instance, in Arabic all nouns can have singular, plural, or dual forms. For non-broken plurals, masculine plural nouns end with æä *-kn* and feminine plural nouns end with ÇÊ *-t*, whilst Çä *-n*, is added to the end of a noun to indicate that it is dual (even among nouns that have broken plurals).

Comparative Characteristics

Many languages make a distinction between singular and plural: English, for example, distinguishes between *man* and *men*, or *house* and *houses*. In some languages, in addition to such singular and plural forms, there is also a dual form, which is used when exactly two people or things are meant. In many languages with dual forms, use of the dual is mandatory, and the plural is used only for groups greater than two. However, use of the dual is optional in

some languages such as many modern Arabic dialects including Egyptian Arabic. In other languages such as Hebrew, the dual exists only for words naming time spans (day, week, etc.), a few measure words, and for words that naturally come in pairs and are not used in the plural except in rhetoric: eyes, ears, and so forth. In Slovene use of the dual is mandatory, except for nouns that are natural pairs, such as trousers, eyes, for which the plural form can be used.

Although relatively few languages have the dual number and most have no number or only singular and plural, using different words for groups of two and groups greater than two is not uncommon. English has words distinguishing dual vs. plural number, including: *both* / *all*, *either* / *any*, *neither* / *none*, *between* / *among*, *former* / *first*, and *latter* / *last*. Japanese, which has no grammatical number, also has words *dochira* (which of the two) and *dore* (which of the three or more), etc.

Use in Modern Languages

Among living languages, Modern Standard Arabic has a mandatory dual number, marked on nouns, verbs, adjectives and pronouns. (First-person dual forms, however, do not exist; compare this to the lack of third-person dual forms in the old Germanic languages.) Many of the spoken Arabic dialects have a dual marking for nouns (only), but its use is not mandatory. Likewise, Akkadian had a dual number, though its use was confined to standard phrases like "two hands", "two eyes", and "two arms". The dual in Hebrew has also atrophied, generally being used for only time, number, and natural pairs even in its most ancient form.

Inuktitut and the related Central Alaskan Yup'ik language use dual forms; however, the related Greenlandic language does not (though it used to have them).

Austronesian languages, particularly Polynesian languages such as Hawaiian, Niuean and Tongan, possess

a dual number for pronouns but not for nouns, as nouns are generally marked for plural syntactically and not morphologically. Other Austronesian languages, particularly those spoken in the Philippines, have a dual first-person pronoun; these languages include Ilokano (*data*), Tausug (*kita*), and Kapampangan (*ikata*). These forms mean *we*, but specifically *you and I*. This form once existed in Tagalog (*kata* or sometimes *kita*) but has disappeared from standard usage (save for certain dialects such as in Batangas) since the middle of the 20th century.

The dual was a standard feature of the Proto-Uralic language, and lives on in Sami languages and Samoyedic languages, while other branches like Finnish, Estonian and Hungarian have lost it. Sami also features dual pronouns, expressing the concept of "we two here" as contrasted to "we". Nenets, two closely related Samoyedic languages, features a complete set of dual possessive suffixes for two systems, the number of possessors and the number of possessed objects (for example, "two houses of us two" expressed in one word).

The dual form is also used in several modern Indo-European languages, such as Scottish Gaelic, Slovenian, Frisian and Sorbian. The dual was a common feature of all early Slavic languages at the beginning of the second millennium CE.

Hebrew

Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew

In Biblical, Mishnaic, and Medieval Hebrew, like Arabic and other Semitic languages, all nouns can have singular, plural or dual forms, and there is still a debate whether there are vestiges of dual verbal forms and pronouns. However, in practice, most nouns use only singular and plural forms. Usually éí -îm is added to masculine words to make them plural. Some words occur so often in pairs that the form with the dual suffix -¡yim is used in practice for the general plural, used even in a sentence like, "The

spider has eight eyes." Thus words like »çn¡yim only appear to be dual, but are in fact what is called "pseudo-dual", which is a way of making a plural. Sometimes, words can change meaning depending on whether the dual or plural form is used, for example; 'ayin can mean eye or water spring in the singular, but in the plural eyes will take the dual form of 'enayim whilst springs are 'eynot. Adjectives, verbs, and pronouns have only singular and plural, with the plural forms of these being used with dual nouns.

Modern Hebrew

In Modern Hebrew as used in Israel, there is also a dual number, but its use is very restricted. The dual form is usually used in expressions of time and number. These nouns have plurals as well, which are used for numbers higher than two, for example:

> In this case, even if there are more than two, the dual is still used, for instance lY-kélev yesh arba» ragláyim ("a dog has four legs").

The Dual in Indo-European Languages

The category of dual can doubtless be reconstructed for the Proto-Indo-European, the ancestor of all Indo-European languages, and it has been retained as a fully functioning category in the earliest attested daughter languages. The best evidence for the dual among ancient Indo-European languages can be found in Old Indo-Iranian (Vedic Sanskrit and Avestan), Homeric Greek and Old Church Slavonic, where its use was obligatory for all inflected categories including verbs, nouns, adjectives, pronouns and some numerals. Various traces of dual can also be found in Gothic and Old Irish, and in some fossilized terms in Latin.

Due to the scarcity of evidence, the reconstruction of dual endings for Proto-Indo-European is difficult, but at least formally according the comparative method it can be ascertained that no more than three dual endings are reconstructible for nominal inflection.

Proto-Indo-European category of dual did not only denote two of something: it could also be used as an associative marker, the so-called *elliptical dual*. For example, the Vedic deity Mitrá, when appearing in dual form *Mitrâì* it refers to both Mitra and his companion VaruGa. Homeric dual Á4áíôå refers to Ajax the Greater and his fighting companion Teucer, and Latin plural *Castorçs* is used to denote both the semi-god Castor and his twin brother Pollux.

Beside nominal (nouns, adjectives and pronouns), the dual was also present in verbal inflection where the syncretism was much lower.

Of living Indo-European languages, the dual can be found in Scottish Gaelic dialects, Welsh, Breton, but fully functioning as a paradigmatic category only in Sorbian, Chakavian and Slovene. Remnants of the dual can be found in many of the remaining daughter languages, where certain forms of the noun are used with the number two.

The Dual in Greek

The dual can be found in Ancient Greek Homeric texts such as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey,* although its use is only sporadic, owing as much to artistic prerogatives as dictional and metrical requirements within the hexametric meter. There were only two distinct forms of the dual in Ancient Greek.

In classical Greek, the dual was all but lost, except in the Attic dialect of Athens, where it persisted until the fifth century B.C. Even in this case, its use depended on the author and certain stock expressions.

In Koine Greek and Modern Greek the only remnant of the dual is the numeral for "two", äýï, *dýo*, which has lost its Genitive and Dative cases (both äõïÖí, *dyo)n*) and retains its Nominative/Accusative form. Thus it appears to be undeclined in all cases.

The Dual in Latin

The dual was lost in Latin and its sister Italic languages. However, certain fossilized forms remained, for example, *diviginti* (twenty), but *triginta* (thirty), the words *ambo* (both, compare Slavic *oba*), *duo*/*duae* with a dual declension.

The Dual in the Celtic Languages

Reconstructed Common Celtic nominal and adjectival declensions contain distinct dual forms; pronouns and verbs do not. In Old Irish, nouns and the definite article still have dual forms, but only when accompanied by the numeral *da* "two". Traces of the dual remain in Middle Welsh, in nouns denoting pairs of body parts that incorporate the numeral two: e.g. *deulin* (from *glin* "knee"), *dwyglust* (from *clust* "ear").

In the modern languages, there are still significant remnants of dual number in Scottish Gaelic in nominal phrases containing the numeral *dà* (including the higher numerals 12, 22, etc.) As the following table shows, *dà* combines with a singular noun, which is lenited. Masculine nouns take no special inflection, but feminine nouns have a slenderized dual form, which is in fact identical to the dative singular.

Singular	*Dual*	*Plural*
cù ("a dog", *masculine*)	*dà chù* ("two dogs")	*trì coin* ("three dogs")
clach ("a stone", *feminine*)	*dà chloich* ("two stones")	*trì clachan* ("three stones")

Languages of the Brythonic branch do not have dual number. As mentioned above for Middle Welsh, some nouns can be said to have dual forms, prefixed with a form of the numeral "two" (Breton *daou-*/*div-*, Welsh *dau-*/*deu-*/*dwy-*, Cornish *dew-*/*diw-*). This process is not fully productive, however, and the prefixed forms are semantically restricted. For example, Breton *daouarn* (< *dorn* "hand") can only

refer to one person's pair of hands, not any two hands from two different people. Welsh *deufis* must refer to a period of two consecutive months, whereas *dau fis* can be any two months.

The dDual in the Germanic Languages

The dual was present in all the early Germanic languages, as well as in Proto-Germanic. However, the dual had been entirely lost in nouns by that time, and since verbs agreed with nouns in number, so had the third-person dual form of verbs as a result. The dual therefore remained only in the first and second person pronouns and their accompanying verb forms.

Gothic retained this situation more or less unchanged. It had markings for the first and second person for both the verbs and pronouns, for example *wit* "we two" as compared to *weis* "we, more than two". Old English, Old Norse and the other old Germanic languages had dual marking only in the personal pronouns, but not in the verbs.

The dual has disappeared as a productive form in all the living languages, with loss of the dual occurring in North Frisian dialects only quite recently. The dual survives very marginally in some Limburgish dialects as *weet* (we two) and *jee* (you two), but is archaic and no longer in common use. In Austro-Bavarian, the old dual pronouns have replaced the standard plural pronouns, for example, accusative *enk*, *you plural* (from Proto-Germanic **inkw*, **inkwiz*). A similar development in the pronoun system can be seen in Icelandic and Faroese. Another remnant of the dual can be found in the use of the pronoun *begge* ("both") in the Scandinavian languages of Norwegian and Danish, *bägge* in Swedish and *báðir*/*báðar*/*bæði* in Faroese and Icelandic. In these languages, in order to state "all + number", the constructions are *begge to*/*báðir tveir*/*báðar tvær*/*bæði tvey* ("all two") but *alle tre*/*allir tríggir*/*allar*

tríggjar/øll trý ("all three"), while the form **alle to* is unattested.

Another example of a lost dual exists in the Faroese ordinals 1st and 2nd, which can be translated two ways: First there is *fyrri* and *seinni*, which mean the 1st and 2nd of two respectively, while *fyrsti* and *annar* mean 1st and 2nd of more than two.

The Dual in the Baltic Languages

Among the Baltic languages, the dual form existed but is now nearly obsolete in standard Lithuanian. It can be occasionally found in poetic contexts and some dialects. The dual form *Du litu* was still used on two litas coins issued in 1925, but the plural form (*2 litai*) is used on modern two litas coins.

Singular	*Dual*	*Plural*
vyras ("a man")	*vyru* ("two men")	*vyrai* ("men")
mergina ("a girl")	*mergini* ("two girls")	*merginos* ("girls")
einu ("I go")	*einava* ("We two go")	*einame* ("We (more than two) go")

The Dual in the Slavic Languages

Common Slavic had a complete singular-dual-plural number system, although the nominal dual paradigms showed considerable syncretism, just as they did in Proto-Indo-European. Dual was fully operable at the time of Old Church Slavonic manuscript writings, and it has been subsequently lost in most Slavic dialects in the historical period.

Of the living languages, only Slovene, Chakavian and Sorbian have preserved the dual number as a productive form. In all of the remaining languages, its influence is still found in the declension of nouns of which there are commonly only two: eyes, ears, shoulders, in certain fixed

expressions, and the agreement of nouns when used with numbers.

Languages with Dual Number

- Austronesian languages
  - Tagalog language
  - Cabuano language
  - Ilocano language
  - Mâori (only the personal pronouns)
  - Samoan (only the personal pronouns)
- Indo-European languages
  - Avestan
  - Ancient Greek
  - Germanic languages (only first and second person pronouns and verb forms)
    - Frisian (only pronouns in some North Frisian dialects)
    - Gothic
    - Limburgish (obsolete, only the personal pronouns)
    - Old English (only the personal pronouns)
  - Old Irish
  - Old Church Slavonic
  - Old East Slavic
  - Sanskrit
  - Scottish Gaelic (only nouns, only following the numeral for 'two')
  - Slovene
  - Chakavian
  - Sorbian languages:
    - Lower Sorbian
    - Upper Sorbian

- Uralic languages
  - Khanty
  - Mansi
  - Nenets
  - Sami languages
- Afroasiatic languages
  - Akkadian (Assyrian and Babylonian)
  - Arabic
  - Biblical Hebrew
  - Egyptian (including Coptic)
  - Maltese
- Other languages
  - Hmong
  - Lakota (only the personal pronouns, always means "you and I")
  - Inuktitut
  - American Sign Language
  - Quenya (a fictional language devised by J. R. R. Tolkien)

EXPLETIVE

The word expletive is currently used in three senses: syntactic expletives, expletive attributives, and "bad language".

The word *expletive* comes from the Latin verb *explere*, meaning "to fill", via *expletivus*, "filling out". It was introduced into English in the seventeenth century to refer to various kinds of padding—the padding out of a book with peripheral material, the addition of syllables to a line of poetry for metrical purposes, and so forth. Use of *expletive* for such a meaning is now rare. Rather, *expletive* is a term in linguistics for a meaningless word filling a syntactic vacancy (syntactic expletives). Outside linguistics, the word

is much more commonly used to refer to "bad language". Some linguists use it to refer to meaningless, "filler" use of "bad language" (expletive attributives), distinguishing this from meaningful use.

Syntactic Expletives

Syntactic expletives are words that perform a syntactic role but contribute nothing to meaning. Expletive subjects are part of the grammar of many non-pro-drop languages such as English, whose clauses normally require overt provision of subject even when the subject can be pragmatically inferred (for an alternative theory considering expletives like *there* as a dummy predicate rather than a dummy subject based on the analysis of the copula see Moro 1997 in the list of references cited here). Consider this example:

"*It* is important that you work hard for the exam."

Following the eighteenth-century conception of pronoun, Bishop Robert Lowth objected that since *it* is a pronoun, it should have an antecedent. Since it cannot function like that in Latin, Lowth said that the usage was incorrect in English. By this approach, the correct phrasing (with the omission of the syntactic expletive "it") would be:

"That you work hard for the exam is important."

Contrast *it is necessary that you ...* with its Latin equivalent *oportet tibi*, meaning more or less 'necessitates for you'. Since subject pronouns aren't used in Latin except for emphasis, neither are expletive pronouns and the problem doesn't arise.

Whether or not *it* is a pronoun here (and linguists today would say that it is one), English is not Latin; and the sentence was and is fully acceptable to native speakers of English and thus was and is grammatical. *It* has no meaning here; it merely serves as a dummy subject. (It is sometimes called *preparatory it* or *prep it*, or a *dummy pronoun*.)

Bishop Lowth did not condemn sentences that use *there* as an expletive, even though it is one in many sentences, for example:

"*There* are ten desks here."

The nomenclature used for the constituents of sentences such as this is still a matter of some dispute, but *there* might be called subject, *are* copula, and *ten desks* predicate nominal. Meanwhile *here* is an adverbial phrase that conveniently reveals the semantic vacuity of *there* in this example.

There is some disagreement over whether the *it* in such sentences as

"*It* is raining now."

is an expletive. Whereas it makes no sense to ask what the *it* means in "It is important that you work hard for the exam", some people might say that the dummy *it* in "It is raining now" means the weather (even if the word *weather* has not previously been mentioned). Thus the *it* in such sentences is sometimes called expletive, sometimes a *weather "it"*. Compare with weather verb.

Expletive Attributives

In sentences such as

"You'd better pray for a *bloody* miracle if you want to avoid bankruptcy."

"That was a *bloody* good meal."

"The *bloody* policeman tailed me all the way home."

"I *bloody* hope he *bloody* chokes on his *bloody* pretzels."

"You'd better *bloody* well make it happen!"

bloody contributes nothing to the meaning. Rather, it suggests the strength of feeling (usually anger or irritation, but often admiration, etc.) of the speaker. In having no meaning, it resembles the syntactic expletives discussed

above; in these uses, *bloody* is an expletive. An expletive attributive is a grammatical intensifier.

The expletive "goddamn", a counterpart to *bloody* more commonly used in North America, can be used as a substitute in most (but not all) situations. On the examples above, only "I goddamn hope" would be infelicitous.

Other words that are never thought of as offensive can be used in similar ways. For example:

> "I forgot to pay the phone bill twice running, so the *wretched* line was cut off."

The phone line discussed may (before it was cut off) have been just as good as any other, and therefore would not have been *wretched* in the dictionary senses of "extremely shoddy", "devoid of hope" or similar. Rather, *wretched* serves here as a politer equivalent of expletive *bloody* and the like. However, such meaningless uses of inoffensive words are seldom referred to as "expletive".

"Bad Language"

"Expletive deleted" redirects here. For the expression based on a profanity, see Expletive-deletive.

The term *expletive* is commonly used outside linguistics to refer to any "bad language" (or "profanity") that has been censored by the author or by a subsequent censor, used with or without meaning. A few examples are *shit*, *fuck*, *bugger* or *Jesus H. Christ*.

Expletives in this wide sense may be adjectives, adverbs, nouns or, most commonly, interjections, or (rarely) verbs.

This sense became popular when transcripts of Richard Nixon's internal tapes were made public. The phrase "expletive deleted" was put into the court record when the notoriously profanity-laced discussions with H. R. "Bob" Haldeman and other Watergate insiders went beyond the bounds of common decency. The phrase entered the public consciousness to the point where protestors outside the

White House held up picket signs reading, "IMPEACH THE (EXPLETIVE DELETED)!" As the tapes were declassified over the years, and clips of them were aired on television for documentaries, the word "goddamned" appeared to account for a majority of the references to "Expletive Deleted."

In later years, the phrase *expletive deleted* became commonplace as an ironic expression that indicates that a profanity has been omitted and passed into general usage as a convenient linguistic figleaf. A musical derivative of this term is "radio edit".

FUNCTION WORD

Function words (or grammatical words or synsemantic words or structure-class words) are words that have little lexical meaning or have ambiguous meaning, but instead serve to express grammatical relationships with other words within a sentence, or specify the attitude or mood of the speaker. They signal the structural relationships that words have to one another and are the glue that holds sentences together. Thus, they serve as important elements to the structures of sentences.

Consider the following sentences (1) and (2):

(1) The *winfy prunkilmonger* from the *glidgement mominkled* and *brangified* all his *levensers vederously*.

(2) *Glop* angry investigator *larm blonk* government harassed *gerfritz* infuriated *sutbor pumrog* listeners thoroughly.

In sentence (1) above, the content words have been changed into nonsense syllables but it is not difficult for one to posit that *winfy* is an adjective, *prunkilmonger, glidgement, levensers* as nouns, *mominkled, brangified* as verbs and *vederously* as an adverb based on clues like the derivational and inflectional morphemes. (The clue is in

the suffixes: -y indicates adjectives such as "wintery"; -er, -ment and -ers indicates nouns such as "baker", "battlement" and "messengers"; -led and -fied suggests verbs such as "mingled" and "clarified"; and -ly is that of adverbs such as "vigorously"). Hence, even without lexical meaning, the sentence can be said to be rather "meaningful". However, when the reverse is done and the function words are being changed to nonsense syllables as in sentence (2), the result is a totally incomprehensible sentence as the grammatical meaning which is signaled by the structure words is not present. Hence, function words provide the grammatical relationships between the open class words and helps create meaning in sentences.

Words that are not function words are called content words (or open class words or lexical words or autosemantic words): these include nouns, verbs, adjectives, and most adverbs, although some adverbs are function words (e.g., *then* and *why*). Dictionaries define the specific meanings of content words, but can only describe the general usages of function words. By contrast, grammars describe the use of function words in detail, but treat lexical words in general terms only.

Function words might be prepositions, pronouns, auxiliary verbs, conjunctions, grammatical articles or particles, all of which belong to the group of closed-class words. Interjections are sometimes considered function words but they belong to the group of open-class words. Function words might or might not be inflected or might have affixes.

Function words belong to the closed class of words in grammar in that it is very uncommon to have new function words created in the course of speech, whereas in the open class of words (that is, nouns, verbs, adjectives, or adverbs) new words may be added readily (such as slang words, technical terms, and adoptions and adaptations of foreign words). See neologism.

Each function word either gives some grammatical information on other words in a sentence or clause, and cannot be isolated from other words, or it may indicate the speaker's mental model as to what is being said.

Grammatical words, as a class, can have distinct phonological properties from content words. Grammatical words sometimes do not make full use of all the sounds in a language. For example, in some of the Khoisan languages, most content words begin with clicks, but very few function words do. In English, only function words begin with voiced *th-*.

The following is a list of the kind of words considered to be function words:

- articles — *the* and *a*. In some inflected languages, the articles may take on the case of the declension of the following noun.
- pronouns — inflected in English, as *he* — *him*, *she* — *her*, etc.
- adpositions — uninflected in English
- conjunctions — uninflected in English
- auxiliary verbs — forming part of the conjugation (pattern of the tenses of main verbs), always inflected
- interjections — sometimes called "filled pauses", uninflected
- particles — convey the attitude of the speaker and are uninflected, as *if*, *then*, *well*, *however*, *thus*, etc.
- expletives — take the place of sentences, among other functions.
- pro-sentences — *yes*, *okay*, etc.

WORD ORDER

Word order is a part of grammar. It has to do with the order words are in a sentence. The word order is often different between languages. For example, in English, people say "I only play tennis sometimes." In German, they would

say "Ich spiele nur manchmal Tennis," which if they translate only the words says "I play only sometimes tennis." In Norwegian that same sentence would be "Jeg spiller bare tennis noen ganger", directly translated to "I play only tennis some times" in English. In Portuguese this sentence could be "Eu só jogo tênis algumas vezes"; translating each word to English: "I only play tennis some times". Or even in Portuguese people can change the word order to "Eu jogo tênis só algumas vezes" ("I play tennis only some times"), but they cannot say "Eu jogo só tênis algumas vezes", because this means "I play only tennis sometimes".

Subject, Object and Verb

In English, a simple sentence with a verb (an action), subject (who or what is doing the action), and an object (who or what the action is done to) is written in a Subject-Verb-Object word order. For example, in the sentence "Robert opens the door", Robert is the subject, opens is the verb and door is the object. In other languages, sentences like this can be in different orders. For example, in Latin, that sentence could be written "Robert ianuam aperit", literally "Robert the door opens". It could even be written "aperit ianuam Robert". Languages that let you choose how to order the words often have a grammatical case system. In that sentence, "ianuam" is the accusative case of ianua (door). Accusative case means that the noun is the object of the sentence. "Robert" is in the nominative case, which means that it is the subject of the sentence. In English, changing the word order to "The door opens Robert" will change the meaning of the sentence. In Latin, however, "Robert ianuam aperit" and "ianuam Robert aperit" mean the same thing because ianuam is in the accusative case, so it is the object and Robert is the subject. Changing the cases of the words, however, to "Robertem ianua aperit" will change the meaning of the sentence - ianua is now in the nominative case so it is the subject and Robert is now the object.

GERUND

In linguistics, gerund (abbreviated GER) is a term used to refer to various non-finite verb forms in various languages:

- As applied to English, it refers to the usage of a verb (in its *-ing* form) as a noun (for example, the verb "learning" in the sentence "Learning is an easy process for some").
- As applied to French, it refers either to the adverbial participle—also called the *gerundive*—or to the present adjectival participle.
- As applied to Hebrew, it refers either to the verb's action noun, or to the part of the infinitive following the infinitival prefix (also called the *infinitival construct*).
- As applied to Latin, it is formed similarly to the present active participle as in English. However, the –ns becomes an –ndus, and the preceding â or ç is shortened
- As applied to Japanese, it designates verb and verbals adjective forms in dictionary form paired with the referral particle *no*, which turns the verbal into a concept or property noun.
- As applied to Portuguese, it refers to an adverbial participle (a verbal adverb), called the *gerúndio*.
- As applied to Romanian, it refers to an adverbial participle (a verbal adverb), called the *gerunziu*, formed by appending *-ând* or *-ind*, to the verb stem, like in cânt*ând*/fug*ind*".
- As applied to Spanish, it refers to an adverbial participle (a verbal adverb), called in Spanish the *gerundio*.
- As applied to Turkish, it refers to the Turkish verbal nouns formed by appending *-ma* or *-me*, depending on vowel harmony, to the verb stem, like in "Yapma *deðil, Avrupa malý bu*." ("It is not a fake, but produced in Europe" - not to confuse with

the negational *-ma* postfix.) The Turkish gerund is rather similar in meaning and use to the English gerund.

- As applied to West Frisian, it refers to one of two verb forms frequently referred to as infinitives, this one ending in -n. It shows up in nominalizations and is selected by perception verbs.

In other languages, it may refer to almost any non-finite verb form; however, it most often refers to an action noun, by analogy with its use as applied to English or Latin.

Etymology

The word 'gerund' in English comes from the Latin term *gerundium*, of the same meaning. *Gerundium* itself comes from the gerundive of the Latin verb *gero*, *gerundus*, meaning "to be carried out".

Gerunds in English

In English, the gerund is identical in form to the present participle (ending in *-ing*) and can behave as a verb within a clause (so that it may be modified by an adverb or have an object), but the clause as a whole (sometimes consisting of only one word, the gerund itself) acts as a noun within the larger sentence. For example: *Eating this cake is easy.*

In "Eating this cake is easy," "eating this cake," although traditionally known as a phrase, is referred to as a non-finite clause in modern linguistics. "Eating" is the verb in the clause, while "this cake" is the object of the verb. "Eating this cake" acts as a noun phrase within the sentence as a whole, though; the subject of the sentence is the non-finite clause, specifically *eating*.

Other examples of the gerund:

- *I like swimming.* (direct object)
- *Swimming is fun.* (subject)

Not all nouns that are identical in form to the present participle are gerunds. The formal distinction is that a gerund is a *verbal* noun – a noun derived from a verb that retains verb characteristics, that functions *simultaneously* as a noun and a verb, while other nouns in the form of the present participle (ending in *-ing*) are *de*verbal nouns, which function as common nouns, not as verbs at all. Compare:

- *I like fencing.* (gerund, an activity, could be replaced with "to fence")
- *The white fencing adds to the character of the neighborhood.* (deverbal, could be replaced with an object such as "bench")

Double Nature of the Gerund

As the result of its origin and development the gerund has nominal and verbal properties. The *nominal* characteristics of the gerund are as follows:

1. The gerund can perform the function of subject, object and predicative:
   - *Smoking endangers your health.* (subject)
   - *I like making people happy.* (object)
2. The gerund can be preceded by a preposition:
   - *I'm tired of arguing.*
3. Like a noun the gerund can be modified by a noun in the possessive case, a possessive adjective, or an adjective:
   - *I wonder at John's keeping calm.*
   - *Is there any objection to my seeing her?*
   - *Brisk walking relieves stress.*

The *verbal* characteristics of the gerund include the following:

1. The gerund of transitive verbs can take a direct object:
   - *I've made good progress in speaking Basque.*

2. The gerund can be modified by an adverb:
   - *Breathing deeply helps you to calm down.*
3. The gerund has the distinctions of aspect and voice.
   - *Having read the book once before makes me more prepared.*
   - *Being deceived can make someone feel angry.*

Verb Patterns with the Gerund

Verbs that are often followed by a gerund include *admit, adore, anticipate, appreciate, avoid, carry on, consider, contemplate, delay, deny, describe, detest, dislike, enjoy, escape, fancy, feel, finish, give, hear, imagine, include, justify, listen to, mention, mind, miss, notice, observe, perceive, postpone, practice, quit, recall, report, resent, resume, risk, see, sense, sleep, stop, suggest, tolerate* and *watch*. Additionally, prepositions are often followed by a gerund.

For example:

- *I will never quit smoking.*
- *We postponed making any decision.*
- *After two years of deciding, we finally made a decision.*
- *We heard whispering.*
- *They denied having avoided me.*
- *He talked me into coming to the party.*
- *They frightened her out of voicing her opinion.*

Verbs Followed by a Gerund or a to-Infinitive

With little change in meaning*—advise, recommend* and *forbid*:

These are followed by a *to*-infinitive when there is an object as well, but by a gerund otherwise.

- *The police advised us not to enter the building, for a murder had occurred.* (*Us* is the object of *advised*.)
- *The police advised against our entering the building.* (*Our* is used for the gerund *entering*.)

consider, contemplate and *recommend*:

These verbs are followed by a *to*-infinitive only in the passive or with an object pronoun.

- *People consider her to be the best. – She is considered to be the best.*
- *I am considering sleeping over, if you do not mind.*

begin, continue, start; hate, like, love, prefer

With *would*, the verbs *hate, like, love*, and *prefer* are usually followed by the *to*-infinitive.

- *I would like to work there.* (more usual than *working*)

When talking about sports, there is usually a difference in meaning between the infinitive and gerund.

With a change in meaning

like, love, prefer

In some contexts, following these verbs with a *to*-infinitive when the subject of the first verb is the subject of the second verb provides more clarity than a gerund.

- *I like to box.* (I enjoy doing it myself.)
- *I like boxing.* (Either I enjoy watching it, I enjoy doing it myself, or the idea of boxing is otherwise appealing.)
- *I do not like gambling, but I do like to gamble."*

dread, *hate* and *cannot bear*:

These verbs are followed by a *to*-infinitive when talking subjunctively (often when using *to think*), but by a gerund when talking about general dislikes.

- *I dread / hate to think what she will do.*
- *I dread / hate seeing him.*
- *I cannot bear to see you suffer like this.* (You are suffering now.)

- *I cannot bear being pushed around in crowds.* (I never like that.)

forget and *remember*:

When these have meanings that are used to talk about the future from the given time, the *to*-infinitive is used, but when looking back in time, the gerund.

- *She forgot to tell me her plans.* (She did not tell me, although she should have.)
- *She forgot telling me her plans.* (She told me, but then forgot having done so.)
- *I remembered to go to work.* (I remembered that I needed to go to work.)
- *I remembered going to work.* (I remembered that I went to work.)

go on:

- *After winning the semi-finals, he went on to play in the finals.* (He completed the semi-finals and later played in the finals.)
- *He went on giggling, not having noticed the teacher enter.* (He continued doing so.)

mean:

- *I did not mean to scare you off.* (I did not intend to scare you off.)
- *Taking a new job in the city meant leaving behind her familiar surroundings.* (If she took the job, she would have to leave behind her familiar surroundings.)

regret:

- *We regret to inform you that you have failed your exam.* (polite or formal form of apology)
- *I very much regret saying what I said.* (I wish that I had not said that.)

try:

When a *to*-infinitive is used, the subject is shown to make an effort at something, attempt or endeavor to do something. If a gerund is used, the subject is shown to attempt to do something in testing to see what might happen.

- *Please try to remember to post my letter.*
- *I have tried being stern, but to no avail.*

stop, quit:

When the infinitive is used after 'stop' or 'quit', it means that the subject stops one activity and starts the activity indicated by the infinitive. If the gerund is used, it means that the subject stops the activity indicated by the gerund.

- *She stopped to smell the flowers.*
- *She stopped smelling the flowers.*

Or more concisely:

- *She stopped walking to smell the flowers.*
- *He quit working there to travel abroad.*

Gerunds Preceded by a Genitive

Because of its noun properties, the genitive (possessive case) is preferred for a noun or pronoun preceding a gerund.

- *We enjoyed their* [genitive] *singing.*

This usage is preferred in formal writing or speaking. The objective case is often used in place of the possessive, especially in casual situations:

- *I do not see it making any difference.*

Really, 'I do not see its making any difference' is the correct option.

This may sound awkward in general use, but is still

the correct manner in which to converse or write. And this form of gerund is applicable in all relative cases, for instance:

- *He affected my going there.*
- *He affected your going there.*
- *He affected his / her / its going there.*
- *He affected our going there.*
- *He affected their going there.*

This is because the action, of doing or being, belongs, in effect, to the subject/object (direct or indirect) practising it, thus, the possessive is required to clearly demonstrate that.

In some cases, either the possessive or the objective case may be logical:

- *The teacher's shouting startled the student.* (*Shouting* is a gerund, and *teacher's* is a possessive noun. The shouting is the subject of the sentence.)
- *The teacher shouting startled the student.* (*Shouting* is a participle describing the teacher. This sentence means *The teacher who was shouting startled the student.* In this sentence, the subject is the teacher herself.)

Either of these sentences could mean that the student was startled because the teacher was shouting.

Using the objective case can be awkward, if the gerund is singular but the other noun is plural. It can look like a problem with subject-verb agreement:

- *The politicians' debating was interesting.*

One might decide to make *was* plural so that *debating* can be a participle.

- *The politicians debating were interesting.*

Gerunds and Present Participles

Insofar as there is a distinction between gerunds and

present participles, it is generally fairly clear which is which; a gerund or participle that is the subject or object of a preposition is a gerund, if it refers to the *performance* of an action (but present participles may be used substantively to refer to the *performer* of an action), while one that modifies a noun attributively or absolutely is a participle. The main source of potential ambiguity is when a gerund-participle follows a verb; in this case, it may be seen either as a predicate adjective (in which case it is a participle), or as a direct object or predicate nominative (in either of which cases it is a gerund). In this case, a few transformations can help distinguish them. In the table that follows, ungrammatical sentences are marked with asterisks, per common linguistic practice; it should be noted that the transformations all produce grammatical sentences with similar meanings when applied to sentences with gerunds but either ungrammatical sentences, or sentences with completely different meanings, when applied to sentences with participles.

Transformation	*Gerund use*	*Participle use*
(*none*)	John suggested asking Bill.	John kept asking Bill.
Passivization	Asking Bill was suggested.	* Asking Bill was kept.
Pronominal substitution	John suggested it.	* John kept it.
Use as a noun	John suggested the asking of Bill.	* John kept the asking Bill.
Replacement with a finite clause	John suggested that Bill be asked.	* John kept that Bill be asked.
Use with an objective or possessive subject	John suggested our asking Bill.	* John kept his asking Bill.
Clefting	Asking Bill is what John suggested.	* Asking Bill is what John kept.
Left dislocation	Asking Bill John suggested.	* Asking Bill John kept.

None of these transformations is a perfect test, however.

English Gerund-Like Words in Other Languages

English words ending in *-ing* are often transformed into pseudo-anglicisms in other languages, where their use is somewhat different from in English itself. In many of these cases, the loanword has functionally become a noun rather than a gerund. For instance, *camping* is a campsite in Bulgarian, Dutch, French, Greek, Italian, Romanian, Russian, and Spanish; in Bulgarian, Dutch, French, Polish, and Russian *parking* is a car park; *lifting* is a facelift in Bulgarian, French, German, Italian, Polish, Romanian, Hebrew, and Spanish. The French word for shampoo is *(le) shampooing*.

The Gerund in Popular Culture

In the Molesworth books by Geoffrey Willans and Ronald Searle, Searle included a series of cartoons on the private life of the gerund, intended to parody the linguistic snobbery of Latin teachers' striving after strict grammatical correctness and the difficulty experienced by students in comprehending the construction.

Owen Johnson's "Lawrenceville Stories" feature a Latin teacher who constantly demands that his students determine whether a given word is a gerund or a gerundive.

In the new episode of Dan Vs., "The Ninja", after Dan's milk carton exploded from the ninja's shuriken, a teenager said to Dan "Drinking problem much?" and Dan complained that the sentence had no verb, just a gerund.

INFINITIVE

In grammar, infinitive is the name for certain verb forms that exist in many languages. In the usual (traditional) description of English, the infinitive of a verb is its basic form with or without the particle *to*: therefore, *do* and *to do*, *be* and *to be*, and so on are infinitives. As with many linguistic concepts, there is not a single definition of *infinitive* that applies to all languages. Many Native American languages and some languages in Africa and Aboriginal Australia simply do not have infinitives or verbal nouns.

In their place they use finite verb forms used in ordinary clauses or special constructions.

In languages that have infinitives, they generally have most of the following properties:

- In most uses, infinitives are non-finite verbs.
- They function as other lexical categories — usually nouns — within the clauses that contain them, for example by serving as the subject of another verb.
- They do not represent any of the verb's arguments.
- They are not inflected to agree with any subject.
- They cannot serve as the only verb of a declarative sentence.
- They do not have tense, aspect, moods, and/or voice, or they are limited in the range of tenses, aspects, moods, and/or voices that they can use. (In languages where infinitives do not have moods at all, they are usually treated as being their own non-finite mood.)
- They are used with auxiliary verbs.

However, it bears repeating that none of the above is a defining quality of the infinitive; infinitives do not have all these properties in every language, as it is shown below, and other verb forms may have one or more of them. For example, English gerunds and participles have most of these properties as well.

English

English language has three non-finite verbal forms, but by long-standing convention, the term "infinitive" is applied to only one of these. (The other two are the past- and present-participle forms, where the present-participle form is also the gerund form.) In English, a verb's infinitive is its unmarked form, such as *be*, *do*, *have*, or *sit*, often introduced by the particle *to*. When this particle is absent, the infinitive is said to be a *bare infinitive*; when it is present, it is generally considered to be a part of the

infinitive, then known as the *full infinitive* (or *to-infinitive*), and there is a controversy about whether it should be separated from the main word of the infinitive. Nonetheless, modern theories typically do not consider the to-infinitive to be a distinct constituent, instead taking the particle *to* for operating on an entire verb phrase; so, *to buy a car* is parsed as *to [buy [a car]]*, not as *[to buy] [a car]*.

The bare infinitive and the full infinitive are mostly in complementary distribution. They are not generally interchangeable, but the distinction does not generally affect the meaning of a sentence; rather, certain contexts call almost exclusively for the bare infinitive, and all other contexts call for the full infinitive.

Huddleston and Pullum's recent *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (CGEL) does not use the notion of the *infinitive*, arguing that English uses the same form of the verb, the *plain form*, in infinitival clauses that it uses in imperative and present-subjunctive clauses.

Bare

The bare infinitive is not used in as many contexts as the full infinitive, but some of these are quite common:

- The bare infinitive is used as the main verb after the dummy auxiliary verb *do*, or most modal auxiliary verbs (such as *will*, *can*, or *should*). So, "I will/do/can/etc. see it."
- Several common verbs of perception, including *see*, *watch*, *hear*, *feel*, and *sense* take a direct object and a bare infinitive, where the bare infinitive indicates an action taken by the main verb's direct object. So, "I saw/watched/heard/etc. it happen." (A similar meaning can be effected by using the present participle instead: "I saw/watched/heard/etc. it happening." The difference is that the former implies that the entirety of the event was perceived, while the latter implies that part of the progress of the event was perceived.)

- Similarly with several common verbs of permission or causation, including *make*, *bid*, *let*, and *have*. So, "I made/bade/let/had him do it." (However, *make* takes a to-infinitive in the passive voice: "I was made to do it.")
- After the *had better* expression. So, "You had better leave now."
- With the verb *help*. So, "He helped them find it." (The use of the to-infinitive with the verb *help* is also common.)
- With the word *why*. So, "Why reveal it?" (Use of the to-infinitive following *why* is also common.)
- The bare infinitive is the dictionary form of a verb, and is generally the form of a verb that receives a definition; however, the definition itself generally uses a to-infinitive. So, "The word 'amble' means 'to walk slowly.'"
- The bare infinitive form coincides with the present subjunctive form as well as the imperative form, but most grammarians do not consider uses of the present subjunctive or imperative to be uses of the bare infinitive.

Full

The full infinitive (or to-infinitive) is used in a great many different contexts:

- Outside of dictionary headwords, it is the most commonly used citation form of the English verb: "How do we conjugate the verb *to go*?"
- It can be used like a noun phrase, expressing its action or state in an abstract, general way. So, "To err is human"; "To know me is to love me". (However, a gerund is often preferred for this — "Being is doing" would be more natural than the abstract and philosophical sounding "To be is to do.")
- It can be used like an adjective or adverb, expressing purpose or intent. So, "The letter says I'm to wait

outside", or "He is the man to talk to", or "[In order] to meditate, one must free one's mind."

- In either of the above uses, it can often be given a subject using the preposition *for*: "For him to fail now would be a great disappointment"; "[In order] for you to get there on time, you'll need to leave now." (The former sentence could also be written, "His failing now would be a great disappointment.")
- It can be used after many intransitive verbs; in this case, it generally has the subject of the main verb as its implicit subject. So, "I agreed to leave", or "He failed to make his case." (This may be considered a special case of the noun-like use above.) With some verbs the infinitive may carry a significantly different meaning from a gerund: compare *I stopped to talk to her* with *I stopped talking to her*, or *I forgot to buy the bread* with *I forgot buying the bread*.
- It can be used after the direct objects of many transitive verbs; in this case, it generally has the direct object of the main verb as its implicit subject. So, "I convinced him to leave with me", or "He asked her to make his case on his behalf." However, in some cases, the subject of the main clause is also subject of the infinitival clause, as in "John promises Mary to cook", where the cook is John (the subject of the main sentence), and not Mary (the object).
- As a special case of the above, it can often be used after an intransitive verb, together with a subject using the preposition *for*: "I arranged for him to accompany me", or "I waited for summer to arrive."

When the verb is implied, some dialects will reduce the to-infinitive to simply *to*: "Do I have to?"

Auxiliary Verbs

The auxiliary verb *do* does not have an infinitive —

even though *do* is also a main verb and in that sense is often used in the infinitive. One does not say **I asked to do not have to*, but rather, either *I asked not to have to* or *I asked to not have to* (but *see* split infinitive). Similarly, one cannot emphasize an infinitive using *do*; one cannot say, "I hear him do say it all the time."

Nonetheless, the auxiliary verbs *have* (used to form the perfect) and *be* (used to form the passive voice and continuous aspect) both commonly appear in the infinitive: "It's thought to have been a ceremonial site", or "I want to be doing it already."

Defective Verbs

The modal auxiliary verbs, *can*, *may*, *shall*, *will* and *must* are defective in that they do not have infinitives; so, one cannot say, **I want him to can do it*, but rather must say, *I want him to be able to do it*. The periphrases *to be able to*, *to have to* and *to be going to* are generally used in these cases.

Impersonal Constructions

There is a specific situation in which the infinitive is used like an "impersonal future tense", replacing "will". This is done through the construction:

to be + "*to*" + bare infinitive

Grammatically, this is identical to the instructional "I am to wait outside" construction (above), but *does not* signify somebody having been issued an instruction; rather, it expresses an intended action, in the same way as "will". This "tense" is used extensively in news reports, eg. –

- *The Prime Minister is to visit the West Bank* (active)
- *Aid is to be sent to war-torn Darfur* (passive)

This "future infinitive" construction is interesting in that it only has a future aspect to it in situations where the speaker is significantly distanced from the event. In

cases where the subject of the sentence is not quite as distanced from the speaker, then the same construction takes on a sense of *instruction* or *necessity* (as in "he is to wait outside", or "he is to go to hospital").

The same construction can be used in conditional clauses – *If you are to go on holiday, then you need to work hard* (or, conversely, *if you want to...then you are to...*).

The impersonality aspect comes from the fact that the emotionless verb *to be* is used in the place of the more usual modal verbs which would normally connect the speaker to the statement. In this way, statements are given weight (as if some external force, rather than the speaker, is governing events).

Conversely, however, the construction also provides an uncertainty aspect, since it frees the speaker from responsibility on their statement – in the phrase "John will go", for example, the speaker is almost advocating their certainty that John will, in fact, go; meanwhile, "the Prime Minister is to go" simply states the *knowledge* that the PM's going is in some way foreseen. (If John ends up not going, for example, the "will go" construction is negated, while the PM's "to go" construction would still hold true, since all it expresses is an *expectation*). In both cases, the knowledge is simply being reported (or pretends to be) from an independent source. In this sense, this impersonal *to* + *verb* construction can almost be seen as a fledgeling renarrative mood.

Other Germanic Languages

The original Proto-Germanic ending of the infinitive was *-an*, with verbs derived from other words ending in *-jan* or *-janan*.

In German it is *-en* ("sagen"), with *-eln* or *-ern* endings on a few words based on -l or -r roots ("segeln", "ändern"). The use of *zu* with infinitives is similar to English *to*, but is less frequent than in English. German infinitives can

function as nouns, often expressing abstractions of the action, in which case they are of neuter gender: *das Essen* means *the eating*, but also *the food*.

In Dutch infinitives also end in *-en* (*zeggen — to say*), sometimes used with *te* similar to English *to*, e.g. "Het is niet moeilijk te begrijpen" ! "It is not difficult to understand." The few verbs with stems ending in *-a* have infinitives in -n (*gaan — to go*, *slaan — to hit*). Afrikaans has lost the distinction between the infinitive and present forms of verbs, with the exception of the verbs "wees" (to be), which admits the present form "is", and the verb "hê" (to have), whose present form is "het".

In Scandinavian languages the *n* has dropped out and the infinitive suffix has been reduced to *-e* or *-a*. The infinitives of these languages are inflected for passive voice through the addition of *-s* to the active form.

Latin and Romance Languages

The formation of the infinitive in the Romance languages reflects that in their ancestor, Latin, almost all verbs had an infinitive ending with *-re* (preceded by one of various thematic vowels). For example, in Spanish and Portuguese, infinitives end in *-ar*, *-er*, or *-ir*, while similarly in French they typically end in *-re*, *-er*, *oir*, and *-ir*. In Romanian the so-called "long infinitives" end in *-are, -ere, -ire* and they are converted into verbal nouns by articulation (verbs that cannot be converted into the nominal long infinitive are very rare). The "short infinitives" used in verbal contexts (e.g. after an auxiliary verb) have the endings *-a*,*-ea*, *-e*, and *-i* (basically removing the ending in "-re"). In Romanian, the infinitive is usually replaced by a clause containing the preposition *sÎ* plus the subjunctive mood. The only verb that is modal in common modern Romanian is the verb *a putea*, to be able to. But in popular speech, the infinitive after a putea is also increasingly replaced by the subjunctive.

In all Romance languages, infinitives can also be used as nouns.

Latin infinitives challenged several of the generalizations about infinitives. They did inflect for voice (*amare*, "to love", *amari*, to be loved) and for aspect (*amare*, "to love", *amavisse*, "to have loved"), and allowed for an overt expression of the subject (*video Socratem currere*, "I see Socrates running").

Romance languages inherited from Latin the possibility of an overt expression of the subject. Moreover, the "inflected infinitive" (or "personal infinitive") found in Portuguese, Galician, and (some varieties of) Sardinian inflects for person and number. These are the only Indo-European languages that allow infinitives to take person and number endings. This helps to make infinitive clauses very common in these languages; for example, the English finite clause *in order that you/she/we have...* would be translated to Portuguese as *para teres/ela ter/termos...* (it is a null-subject language). The Portuguese personal infinitive has no proper tenses, only aspects (imperfect and perfect), but tenses can be expressed using periphrastic structures. For instance, *even though you sing/have sung/are going to sing* could be translated to *apesar de cantares/teres cantado/ires cantar*.

Other Romance languages (including Spanish, Romanian, Catalan, and some Italian dialects) allow uninflected infinitives to combine with overt nominative subjects. For example, Spanish *al abrir yo los ojos* ("when I opened my eyes") or *sin yo saberlo* ("without my knowing about it").

To form the first infinitive, the strong form of the root (without consonant gradation or epenthetic 'e') is used, and these changes occur:

1. the root is suffixed with *-ta/-tä* according to vowel harmony

2. consonant elision takes place if applicable, e.g. *juoks+ta —> juosta*
3. assimilation of clusters violating sonority hierarchy if applicable, e.g. *nuol+ta —> nuolla*, *sur+ta '—>surra*
4. 't' weakens to 'd' after diphthongs, e.g. *juo+ta —> juoda*
5. 't' elides if intervocalic, e.g. *kirjoitta+ta —> kirjoittaa*

As such, it is inconvenient for dictionary use, because the imperative would be closer to the root word. Nevertheless, dictionaries use the first infinitive.

There are four other infinitives, which create a noun-, or adverb-like word from the verb. For example, the third infinitive is *-ma / -mä*, which creates an adjective-like word like "written" from "write": *kirjoita-* becomes *kirjoittama*.

Seri

The Seri language of northwestern Mexico has infinitival forms which are used in two constructions (with the verb meaning 'want' and with the verb meaning 'be able'). The infinitive is formed by adding a prefix to the stem: either *iha-* [i"a-] (plus a vowel change of certain vowel-initial stems) if the complement clause is transitive, or *ica-* [ika-] (and no vowel change) if the complement clause is intransitive. The infinitive shows agreement in number with the controlling subject. Examples are: *icatax ihmiimzo* 'I want to go', where *icatax* is the singular infinitive of the verb 'go' (singular root is *-atax*), and *icalx hamiimcajc* 'we want to go', where *icalx* is the plural infinitive. Examples of the transitive infinitive: *ihaho* 'to see it/him/her/them' (root *-aho*), and *ihacta* 'to look at it/him/her/them' (root *-oocta*).

Translation to Languages Without an Infinitive

In languages without an infinitive, the infinitive is translated either as a *that*-clause or as a verbal noun. For example, in Literary Arabic the sentence "I want to write

a book" is translated as either *urîdu an aktuba kitâban* (lit. "I want that I write a book", with a verb in the subjunctive mood) or *urîdu kitâbata kitâbin* (lit. "I want the writing of a book", with the *masdar* or verbal noun), and in Demotic Arabic *biddi aktob kitâb* (subordinate clause with verb in subjunctive).

Even in languages that have infinitives, similar constructions are sometimes necessary where English would allow the infinitive. For example, in French the sentence "I want you to come" translates to *Je veux que vous veniez* (lit. "I want that you come", with *come* being in the subjunctive mood). However, "I want to come" is simply *Je veux venir*, using the infinitive, just as in English. In Russian, sentences such as "I want you to leave" do not use an infinitive. Rather, they use the conjunction ÷òîáû "in order to/so that" with the past tense form (most probably remnant of subjunctive) of the verb: *ß õî÷ó ÷òîáû âû óøëè* (literally, "I want so that you left").

GRAMMATICAL GENDER

Grammatical gender is defined linguistically as classes of nouns which trigger specific types of behavior in associated words, such as adjectives, verbs and others.

Genders are types of noun classes in which the gender is referenced by the structure of the word. Every noun must belong to one of the classes and there should be very few that belong to several classes at once.

If a language distinguishes between genders, each noun in that language will belong to one of those genders: in order to correctly decline any noun and any modifier or other type of word affecting that noun, one must identify the gender of the subject.

While Old English (Anglo-Saxon) had grammatical gender, Modern English is normally described as lacking grammatical gender.

The linguistic notion of grammatical gender is distinguished from the biological and social notion of natural gender, although they interact closely in many languages. Both grammatical and natural gender can have linguistic effects in a given language.

Although some authors use the term "noun class" as a synonym or an extension of "grammatical gender", for others they are separate concepts. One can in fact say that grammatical gender is a type of noun class, as well as a grammatical category.

Overview

Grammatical gender is typical of Afro-Asiatic, Dravidian, Indo-European, Northeast Caucasian, and several Australian aboriginal languages such as Dyirbal. It is usually absent in the Altaic, Austronesian, Sino-Tibetan, Uralic and most Native American language families. The Niger-Congo languages typically have an extensive system of noun classes, which can be grouped into several grammatical genders (Corbett, 1991).

Many languages place each noun into two or three gender classes commonly called masculine, feminine and neuter gender. It is important to note that the terms are used purely for linguistic classification and have no real-world implications. It is possible for words pertaining to the sexes (male and female) to be inconsistent with their respective gender designation in any specific language.

Polish

For example, in their nominative singular forms Polish nouns are typically feminine if they have the ending *-a*, neuter when they end with *-o*, *-e*, or *-ê*, and masculine if they have no gender suffix (null morpheme). Thus, *encyklopedia* "encyclopaedia" is feminine, *krzes³o* "chair" is neuter, and *rêcznik* "towel" is masculine. When the adjective *du¿y* "big" is combined with these nouns in phrases, it changes form according to their grammatical gender:

Gender	*Noun*	*Phrase*	*Meaning*
Masculine	rêcznik	du¿y rêcznik	*big towel*
Feminine	encyklopedia	du¿a encyklopedia	*big encyclopaedia*
Neuter	krzesto	duze krzesto	*big chair*

As can be seen, the neuter gender does not include all nouns that correspond to genderless realities. Some of these may be designated by nouns that are grammatically masculine or feminine. Also, some nouns that refer to males or females may have a different grammatical gender.

In general, the boundaries of noun classes are rather arbitrary, although there are rules of thumb in many languages. In this context, the terms "masculine", "feminine" and "neuter" should be understood merely as convenient labels. They are suggestive class descriptors, but not every member of a class is well described by its label. Note that some words, called epicene, may have identical forms for different genders. For example, in Spanish *testigo* "witness" and *grande* "big" can be masculine or feminine.

Spanish is also an example of a language with only two genders, masculine and feminine; it has no neuter noun class. Nouns that designate entities with no natural gender, such as objects or abstractions, are distributed among the masculine and the feminine. In a few other languages, notably North Germanic languages like Danish, the former masculine and feminine genders have become indistinguishable with time, merging into a new class called the common gender, which however remains distinct from the neuter gender.

Common Gender

Includes most words that refer to males or females, but is distinct from the neuter gender.

A full system of grammatical gender involves two phenomena:

Inflection

Many words have different forms for different genders, and certain morphological markers are characteristic of each gender.

Agreement

Every noun is associated with one gender class. In a phrase or clause, words that refer to a given noun inflect to match the gender of that noun.

English

Other languages still, like English, are rarely regarded as having grammatical gender, since they do not make gender distinctions through inflection, and do not generally require gender agreement between related words. Although gender marking is not significant in modern English, some distinctions in personal pronouns have been inherited from Old English, in which nouns had grammatical gender, giving speakers of Modern English a notion of how grammatical gender works, although these gendered pronouns are now ordinarily selected based on the physical sex (or lack thereof) of the items to which they refer rather than any strictly linguistic classification:

John insisted that he would pay for his own dinner.
Jane insisted that she would pay for her own dinner.

Here, the gender of the subject is marked both on the personal pronouns (*he* / *she*) and on the possessive adjectives (*his* / *her*). Marking of gender on the possessive form can be considered redundant in these examples, since *his own* and *her own* must refer to their respective antecedents, *he* and *she*, which are already unambiguously marked for gender.

Gender Inflection

In many languages, gender is marked quite profusely, surfacing in different ways.

The switch from one gender to the other is typically achieved by inflecting appropriate words, the object suffix of the verb *u'ibbu-ka / ki* in the Arabic example (gender is not marked in the first person, in Arabic), and the suffix in the past participle (or adjective) *obrig-ado / a* in the Portuguese example (literally this means "much obliged," with "I am" understood; thus it agrees with the gender of the speaker).

In Spanish, most masculine nouns and their modifiers end with the suffix *-o* or with a consonant, while the suffix *-a* is characteristic of feminine nouns and their modifiers (though there are many exceptions). Thus, *niño* means "boy," and *niña* means "girl." This paradigm can be exploited for making new words: from the masculine nouns *abogado* "lawyer," *diputado* "member of parliament" and *doctor* "doctor," it was straightforward to make the feminine equivalents *abogada*, *diputada*, and *doctora*.

Sometimes, gender is expressed in more subtle ways. On the whole, gender marking has been lost in Welsh, both on the noun, and often, on the adjective. However, it has the peculiar feature of initial mutation, where the first consonant of a word changes into another in certain syntactical conditions. Gender is one of the factors that can cause mutation, especially the so-called soft mutation. For instance, the word *merch*, which means girl or daughter, changes into *ferch* after the definite article. This only occurs with feminine singular nouns; for example, *mab* "son" remains unchanged after the definite article. Adjectives are affected by gender in a similar way.

Gender	*Default*		*After definite article*		*With adjective*	
Masculine	mab	*son*	y mab	*the son*	y mab mawr	*the big son*
Feminine Singular	merch	*girl*	y ferch	*the girl*	y ferch fawr	*the big girl*
Feminine Plural	merched	*girls*	y merched	*the girls*	y merched mawr	*the big girls*

Personal Names

Personal names are frequently constructed with language-specific affixes that identify the gender of the bearer. Common feminine suffixes used in English names are *-a*, of Latin or Romance origin (cf. *Robert* and *Roberta*) and *-e*, of French origin (cf. *Justin* and *Justine*). Although gender inflection may be used to construct cognate nouns for the people of opposite genders in languages that have grammatical gender, this alone does not constitute grammatical gender. Distinct names for men and women are also common in languages where gender is not grammatical.

Personal Pronouns

Personal pronouns often have different forms based on gender. Even though it has lost gender-related inflections, English still distinguishes between "he" (generally applied to a male person), "she" (female person), and "it" (object, abstraction, or animal). But this also does not guarantee the existence of grammatical gender. There is a spoken form, "they," which although not part of the standard literary language, is cosmopolitan in the English-speaking world and is used when the gender of a person being referred to is not known (e.g. "This person doesn't know where *they* are going").

Gendered pronouns and their corresponding inflections vary considerably across languages. In languages that never had grammatical gender, there is normally just one word for "he" and "she," like *dia* in Indonesian, *hän* in Finnish, *õ* in Hungarian and *o* in Turkish. These languages have different pronouns and inflections in the third person only to differentiate between people and inanimate objects (and even this distinction is commonly waived in spoken Finnish).

Dummy Pronouns

In languages with only a masculine and a feminine gender, the default dummy pronoun is usually the masculine

third person singular. For example, the French sentence for "It's raining" is *Il pleut*, literally "He rains." There are some exceptions: the corresponding sentence in Welsh is *Mae hi'n bwrw glaw*, "She's raining." In languages with a neuter gender, the neuter gender is usually used: German: *Es regnet*, literally "It rains." In fact, the English word 'it' comes from the Old English neuter gender. If it is a pro-drop language, the dummy pronoun can be dropped: *Choveu ontem* is literally "rained yesterday" in Portuguese, meaning "It rained yesterday."

Gender Agreement

In the French sentences *Lui, c'est un grand acteur* "*He* is a great actor" and *Elle, c'est une grande actrice* "*She* is a great actress", almost every word changes to match the gender of the subject. The noun *acteur* inflects by replacing the masculine suffix *-eur* with the feminine suffix *-rice*, the disjunctive personal pronoun *lui* "he" changes to *elle* "she", and the feminine suffix *-e* is added to the article (*un* '! *une*) and to the adjective (*grand* '! *grande*). Only the presentative set phrase *c'est* "he/she/it is" remains unchanged.

The following "highly contrived" Old English sentence serves as an example of gender agreement.

Old English	Seo brade lind wæs tilu and ic hire lufod.
Modern English gloss	That broad shield was good and I her loved.
Modern English translation	That broad shield was good and I loved it.

The word *hire* "her" refers to *lind* "shield". Since this noun was grammatically feminine, the adjectives *brade* "broad" and *tilu* "good", as well as the pronouns *seo* "the/that" and *hire* "her", which referred to *lind*, must also appear in their feminine forms. Old English had three genders, masculine, feminine and neuter, but gender inflections were greatly simplified by sound changes, and then completely lost (as well as number inflections, to a lesser extent).

In modern English, by contrast, the noun "shield" takes

the neuter pronoun "it", since it designates a genderless object. In a sense, the neuter gender has grown to encompass most nouns, including many that were masculine or feminine in Old English. If one were to replace the phrase "broad shield" with "brave man" or "kind woman", the only change to the rest of the sentence would be in the pronoun at the end, which would become "him" or "her", respectively.

Grammatical vs. Natural Gender

The grammatical gender of a word does not always coincide with real gender of its referent. An often cited example is the German word *Mädchen*, which means "girl", but is treated grammatically as neuter. This is because it was constructed as the diminutive of *Magd* (*maidservant*; archaic nowadays), and the diminutive suffix *-chen* conventionally places nouns in the "neuter" noun class. There is a certain tendency to keep the grammatical gender when a close back-reference is made, but to switch to natural gender when the reference is further away.

Therefore, it is possible to say either *Das Mädchen ist aus der Schule gekommen. Es macht jetzt seine Hausaufgaben.* and *Das Mädchen ist aus der Schule gekommen. Sie macht jetzt ihre Hausaufgaben.* (both: *The girl has come home from school. She is now doing her homework*). With one or more intervening sentences, the second way (which may be frowned upon by language purists) becomes more likely: *Das Mädchen ist aus der Schule gekommen. Heute ist es ziemlich spät geworden, da der Schulbus im Stau stecken blieb. Sie macht jetzt ihre Hausaufgaben.* (*... It has gotten pretty late today, as the school bus was caught up in a traffic jam. ...*). However, no number of adjectives put between the article and the noun (like *das schöne, fleißige, langhaarige, blonde, Jeans und T-Shirt tragende [...] Mädchen*) can license a switch from the neutral to the feminine article, so it is always considered wrong to say a sentence like *die schöne [...] Mädchen*.

A few more examples:

- German *die Frau* (feminine) and *das Weib* (neuter) both mean "the woman", though the latter is considered archaic for most purposes (although some people may use *mein Weib* in a jocular fashion in non-formal contexts, and *Weiber* is still used sometimes with a derogatory meaning).
- Irish *cailín* "girl" is masculine, while *stail* "stallion" is feminine.
- Scottish Gaelic *boireannach* "woman" is masculine.
- Slovenian *dekle* "girl" is neuter, while its cognate *dekla* "maidservant" is feminine.
- Swedish *människa* "human" is feminine; in proper Swedish the feminine pronoun is used to refer to *människa* regardless of natural gender, although this usage may sound overly formal today.
- Spanish *la gente* "the people" is feminine, even if the collective term refers to a group of men.

Normally, such exceptions are a small minority. However, in some local dialects of German, nouns and proper names for female persons have shifted to the neuter gender (presumably further influenced by the standard word *Weib*), but the feminine gender remains for words denoting objects, and few words for outstanding women, such as "nun" or "queen" (but not usually "princess"). Some dialects switch the gender of proper names to female, when they refer to one of those outstanding female persons.

Indeterminate Gender

In languages with a masculine and feminine gender (and possibly a neuter), the masculine is usually employed by default to refer to persons of unknown gender. This is still done sometimes in English, although a disputed alternative is to use the singular "they". Another alternative is to use two nouns, as in the phrase "ladies and gentlemen" (hendiadys).

In the plural, the masculine is often used to refer to a

mixed group of people. Thus, in French the feminine pronoun *elles* always designates an all-female group of people, but the masculine pronoun *ils* may refer to a group of males, to a mixed group, or to a group of people of unknown genders. In English, this issue does not arise with pronouns, since there is only one plural third person pronoun, "they". However, a group of actors and actresses would still be described as a group of "actors". However, this is also because the word "actress" is falling out of use in English, while the word "actor," like "doctor," applies to thespians of both sexes.

In all these cases, one says that the feminine gender is semantically marked, while the masculine gender is unmarked.

In Swedish, on the other hand, it is the masculine form of an adjective that is marked (in the weak inflection, with an *-e*,) e.g. *min lille bror* "my little brother". This form is reserved for naturally masculine nouns or male human beings in modern Swedish. Even so, the third person singular masculine pronoun *han* would normally be the default for a person of unknown gender in Swedish, although in practice the indefinite pronoun *man* and the reflexive *sig* and/or its possessive forms *sin/sitt/sina* usually make this unnecessary.

Animals

Often, the masculine/feminine classification is only followed carefully for human beings. For animals, the relation between real and grammatical gender tends to be more arbitrary. In Spanish, for instance, a cheetah is always *un guepardo* (masculine) and a zebra is always *una cebra* (feminine), regardless of their biological sex. If it becomes necessary to specify the sex of the animal, an adjective is added, as in *un guepardo hembra* (a female cheetah), or *una cebra macho* (a male zebra). Different names for the male and the female of a species are more frequent for

common pets or farm animals, e.g. English *cow* and *bull*, Spanish *vaca* "cow" and *toro* "bull".

In English, it is common to refer to animals, especially house pets, for which the natural gender is known as "he" and "she", accordingly, and to animals of unknown gender as "it". Individual speakers may refer to animals of unknown sex by a gender, depending on species — for instance, some speakers may tend to refer to dogs as "he" and to cats as "she".

Objects and Abstractions

Since all nouns must belong to some noun class, many end up with genders which are purely conventional. For instance, the Romance languages inherited *sol* "sun" (which is masculine) and *luna* "moon" (which is feminine) from Latin but in German and other Germanic languages *Sonne* "sun" is feminine and *Mond* "moon" is masculine. Two nouns denoting the same concept can also differ in gender in closely related languages, or within a single language. For instance, there are two different words for "car" in German: "Wagen" is masculine, whereas "Auto" is neuter. Meanwhile the word "auto" is masculine in Spanish, but it is feminine in French. In all cases, the meaning is the same. Similarly, there are two Swedish words for "boat." "En båt" is common gender, while "ett skepp" is neutral.

Several words ending in -aje in Spanish are masculine: viaje (travel), paisaje (landscape), coraje (courage). But their Portuguese equivalent are feminine: viagem, paisagem, coragem. The Latin word via, from which both variants (viaje and viagem) derived was feminine. Conversely, the Spanish word "nariz" (nose) is feminine, whereas the Portuguese word for "nose" is spelled identically, but it is masculine.

Also, in Polish the word ksieyc "moon" is masculine. The Russian word for "sun", while Latin word of the same archaic root *sol* is masculine.

Examples:

Language	*Word*	*Meaning*	*Gender*
Polish	ksieyc	moon	masculine
Portuguese	lua	moon	feminine
Spanish	luna	moon	feminine
Spanish	patata	potato	feminine
Polish	tramwaj	tram	masculine
Czech	tramvaj	tram	feminine
Romanian	tramvai	tram	neuter

There is nothing inherent about the moon which makes it objectively "male" or "female". In these cases, gender is quite independent of meaning, and a property of the nouns themselves, rather than of their referents.

Sometimes the gender switches: Russian *òîïîëü* (*poplar*) is now masculine, but less than 200 years ago (in writings of Lermontov) it was feminine. The modern loanword *âèñêè* (from whisky/whiskey) was originally feminine (in a translation of Jack London stories, 1915), then masculine (in a song of Alexander Vertinsky, 1920s or 1930s), and today it has become neuter (the masculine variant is typically considered archaic, and the feminine one is completely forgotten). In Polish *kometa* (*comet*) is nowadays feminine, but less than 200 years ago (in writing of Mickiewicz) it was masculine.

Gender Assignment

There are three main ways by which natural languages categorize nouns into genders: according to logical or symbolic similarities in their meaning (semantic), by grouping them with other nouns that have similar form (morphological), or through an arbitrary convention (lexical, possibly rooted in the language's history). Usually, a combination of the three types of criteria is used, though one is more prevalent.

Semantics

In Alamblak, a Sepik Hill language spoken in Papua New Guinea, the masculine gender includes males and things which are tall or long and slender, or narrow such as fish, crocodiles, long snakes, arrows, spears and tall, slender trees, while the feminine gender includes females and things which are short, squat or wide, such as turtles, frogs, houses, fighting shields, and trees that are typically more round and squat than others.

Sometimes, semantics prevails over the formal assignment of grammatical gender (agreement *in sensu*). In Polish, the nouns *mezczyzna* "man" and *ksiazê* "prince" are masculine, even though words with the ending *-a* are normally feminine and words that end with *-ê* are usually neuter. Interestingly, in Sicilian dialect the noun indicating the male sexual organ is feminine (*a minchia*), while the female sexual organ is masculine (*u sticchiu*).

Morphology

In Portuguese/Spanish, grammatical gender is most obviously noticeable by noun morphology. Since nouns that refer to male persons usually end in *-o* or a consonant and nouns that refer to female persons usually end in *-a*, most *other* nouns that end in *-o* or a consonant are also treated as masculine, and most nouns that end in *-a* are treated as feminine, whatever their meaning. (Nouns that end in some other vowel are assigned a gender either according to etymology, by analogy, or by some other convention.) Morphology may in fact override meaning, in some cases. The noun *membro/miembro* "member" is always masculine, even when it refers to a woman, but *pessoa/persona* "person" is always feminine, even when it refers to a man. It would however be far more useful to consider that the grammatical gender of almost all nouns in the Romance languages is determined by etymology, that is to say that on the whole, the gender of a word in Portuguese, Spanish, Italian or French is the same as the gender of its cognate word in Latin with very few exceptions.

In German also, diminutives with the endings *-chen* and *-lein* (cognates of English *-kin* and *-ling*, meaning "little, young") are always neuter, which is why *Mädchen* "girl" and *Fräulein* "young woman" are neuter. Another ending, the nominalizing suffix *-ling*, can be used to make countable nouns from uncountable nouns (*Teig* "dough" '! *Teigling* "piece of dough"), or personal nouns from abstract nouns (*Lehre* "teaching", *Strafe* "punishment" '! *Lehrling* "apprentice", *Sträfling* "convict") or adjectives (*feige* "cowardly" '! *Feigling* "coward"), always producing masculine nouns.

In Irish, nouns ending in *-óir* / *-eoir* and *-ín* are always masculine, while those ending *-óg* / *-eog* or *-lann* are always feminine.

On the other hand, the correlation between grammatical gender and morphology is usually not perfect: *problema* "problem" is masculine in Spanish (this is for etymological reasons, as it was derived from a Greek noun of the neuter gender), and *radio* "radio station" is feminine (because it is a shortening of *estación de radio*, a phrase whose head is the feminine noun *estación*).

Lexicon

In some languages, gender markers have been so eroded by time that they are no longer recognizable, even to native speakers (this is generally known as deflexion). Most German nouns give no morphological or semantic clue as to their gender. It must simply be memorized. The conventional aspect of grammatical gender is also clear when one considers that there is nothing objective about a table which makes it feminine, as French *table*, masculine as German *Tisch*, or neuter, as Norwegian *bord*. The learner of such languages should regard gender as an integral part of each noun. A frequent recommendation is to memorize a modifier along with the noun as a unit, usually a definite article, e.g. memorizing *la table* — where *la* is the French feminine singular definite article — *der Tisch* — where *der* is the

German masculine singular nominative definite article — and *bordet* — where the suffix *-et* indicates the definite neuter singular in Norwegian. In French the noun's ending often indicates gender. Certain suffixes are quite reliable indicators, e.g. the suffix *-age* when added to a verb, (e.g. *garer* ("to park") -> *garage*; nettoyer ("to clean") -> *nettoyage* ("cleaning")) indicates a masculine noun, although when -*age* is part of the root of the word, it can be feminine, as in *plage* ("beach") or 'image*). This is the case for noun's ending in "-tion" "-sion" and* -aison *which are all feminine.*

Whether a distant ancestor of French, German, Norwegian, and English had a semantic value for genders is of course a different matter. Some authors have speculated that archaic Proto-Indo-European had two noun classes with the semantic values of animate and inanimate.

Gender in English

While grammatical gender was a fully productive inflectional category in Old English, Modern English has a much less pervasive gender system, primarily based on natural gender.

There are a few traces of gender marking in Modern English:

- Some loanwords inflect according to gender, such as *actor*/*actress*, where the suffix *-or* denotes the masculine, and the suffix *-ress* denotes the feminine.
- The third person singular pronouns (and their possessive forms) are gender specific: "he/his" (masculine gender, overall used for males), "she/her(s)" (feminine gender, for females), "it/its" (neuter gender, mainly for objects and abstractions), "one/one's" (common gender, for anyone or anything).

But these are insignificant features compared to a typical language with grammatical gender:

- English has no live productive gender markers. An example is the suffix *-ette* (of French provenance),

but it is seldom used, and mostly with disparaging or humorous intent.

- The English nouns that inflect for gender are a very small minority, typically loanwords from non-Germanic languages (the suffix *-ress* in the word "actress", for instance, derives from Latin *-rix* via French *-rice*). Feminine forms of Latin-derived words may also use *-rix*, as in *aviatrix*.
- The third-person singular forms of the personal pronouns are the only modifiers that inflect according to gender.

It is also noteworthy that, with few exceptions, the gender of an English pronoun coincides with the real gender of its referent, rather than with the grammatical gender of its antecedent, frequently different from the former in languages with true grammatical gender. The choice between "he", "she" and "it" invariably comes down to whether they designate a male or female human or animal of a known sex, or something else.

Some exceptions:

- Animals are generally referred to as *it* unless the gender is known. Some animals such as cattle and chickens have different words for male and female animals (bull and cow, rooster and hen, for example) and *he* and *she* are therefore used correspondingly; however note that "a chicken" can be used to refer to an individual of either sex, but there is no singular term for *cattle*. The gender of other animals such as rabbits, insects, etc. is not usually obvious and so these animals are usually referred to as *it* except in some veterinarian or literary contexts. Alternatively, the use of "it" referring to an animal may imply the speaker lacks or disdains emotional connection with the animal. Thus, even though physical gender is undetermined, Rabbits for Dummies advises "You can win your bunny over to

the point where he's incredibly comfortable with you."

- The pronoun "she" is sometimes used to refer to things which can contain people such as countries, ships, or vehicles, or when referring to certain other machines. This, however, is considered a stylistically marked, optional figure of speech, and may reflect a tendency of early translators to reflect grammatical gender in the original language: e.g. in many classical and modern languages the word for "ship" (Spanish *la nave,*) or "city".

Gender Across Language Families

Indo-European

Many Indo-European languages, though not English, provide archetypical examples of grammatical gender.

Research indicates that the earliest stages of Proto-Indo-European had two genders, animate and inanimate, as did Hittite, but the animate gender (which, in contrast to the inanimate gender, has an independent accusative form) later split into masculine and feminine, originating the classical three-way classification into masculine, feminine, and neuter which most of its descendants inherited. Many Indo-European languages kept these three genders. Such is the case with most Slavic languages, classical Latin, Sanskrit, Greek, and German, for instance. Other Indo-European languages reduced the number of genders to two, either by losing the neuter (like Urdu/Hindi, most Romance languages and the Celtic languages), or by having the feminine and the masculine merge with one another into a common gender (as has happened, or is in the process of happening, to several Germanic languages). Some, like English and Afrikaans, have nearly completely lost grammatical gender, while Persian has completely lost it. On the other hand, a few Slavic languages have arguably added new genders to the classical three. In those ancient and modern Indo-European languages that preserve a system

of noun declension (including Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, Slavic, and some Germanic languages), there is a high but not absolute correlation between grammatical gender and declensional class. Many linguists also believe this to be true of the middle and late stages of Proto-Indo-European.

Exceptionally for a Romance language, Romanian has preserved the three genders of Latin, although the neuter has been reduced to a combination of the other two, in the sense that neuter nouns have masculine endings in the singular, but feminine endings in the plural. As a consequence, adjectives, pronouns, and pronominal adjectives only have two forms, both in the singular and in the plural. The same happens in Italian, to a lesser extent.

Some nouns have different genders in two different languages; for example, *une équipe* "a team" in French is feminine, while *un equipo* in Spanish is masculine.

Italian third-person singular pronouns have also a "neuter" form to refer to inanimate subjects (*egli* and *ella* vs. *esso* and *essa*). In fact, even in those languages where the original three genders have been mostly lost or reduced, there is sometimes a trace of them in a few words.

English, personal pronouns: *he, she, it*

Spanish, definite articles (words meaning "the"): *el, la, lo*

Spanish, demonstratives (words meaning "this, this one"): *este, esta, esto*

Portuguese, indefinite pronouns (words meaning "all of him/her/it"): *todo, toda, tudo*

The Spanish neuter definite article *lo*, for example, is used with nouns that denote abstractions, e.g. *lo único* "the only thing"; *lo mismo* "the same thing". In Portuguese, a distinction is made between *está todo molhado* "he's all wet", *está toda molhada* "she's all wet", and *está tudo molhado* "it's all wet" (used for unspecified objects). In terms of agreement, however, these "neuter" words count as masculine: both Spanish *lo mismo* and Portuguese *tudo*

take masculine adjectives. English modifiers do not generally inflect with gender.

In Venetian, only the demonstratives have a neuter form referring to abstractions, so a distinction is made between *varda questo* "look at this thing" (neuter), *varda 'sto qua* "look at this one" (masculine e.g. man, book, mobile) and *varda 'sta qua* "look at this one (feminine eg. woman, pen, hand); along the same line a distinction is made between *l'è que³o / que³a* "it's that thing/fact" (neuter), *l'è qûe³o là* "it's that one" (masc.) and *l'è qûe³a là* "it's that one" (fem.) where the *û* sound can be dropped only in the masculine and in the feminine which however take *là*.

See Vulgar Latin: loss of neuter, and Gender in Dutch grammar, for further information.

Other Indo-European languages that lack grammatical gender beside English are Persian, Armenian, Bangla, Assamese, Oriya, Khowar, and Kalasha, among others.

Other Types of Gender Classifications

Some languages have gender-like noun classifications unrelated to gender identity. Particularly common are languages with animate and inanimate categories. The term "grammatical genders" is also used by extension in this case, although many authors prefer "noun classes" when none of the inflections in a language relate to sex. Note however that the word "gender" derives from Latin *genus* (also the root of *genre*) originally meant "kind", so it does not necessarily have a sexual meaning. For further information, see Animacy.

Australian Aboriginal Languages

The Dyirbal language is well known for its system of four noun classes, which tend to be divided along the following semantic lines:

I — animate objects, men

II — women, water, fire, violence

III — edible fruit and vegetables

IV — miscellaneous (includes things not classifiable in the first three)

The class usually labeled "feminine", for instance, includes the word for fire and nouns relating to fire, as well as all dangerous creatures and phenomena. This inspired the title of George Lakoff's book *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things* (ISBN 0-226-46804-6).

Gurr-goni, an Australian Aboriginal language spoken in Arnhem Land, has the word *erriplen* (English *aeroplane*) in its noun class for edible vegetables. This confusion arose through some logical analogies: firstly, the gender of 'edible vegetables' must have been extended to other plants, and hence to all kinds of wooden things. Canoes are made of wood and so, logically, they came to be included in this class as well. The class was then widened to include modes of transport more generally and so, when the borrowed word *erriplen* first entered the language, it was assigned to the 'edible vegetable' gender. Each analogy made perfect sense in its own local domain, but the end result however, seems ever so slightly bizarre.

The Ngangikurrunggurr language has noun classes reserved for canines, and hunting weapons, and the Anindilyakwa language has a separate noun class for things that reflect light. The Diyari language distinguishes only between female and other objects. Perhaps the most noun classes in any Australian language are found in Yanyuwa, which has 16 noun classes.

Caucasian Languages

Some members of the Northwest Caucasian family, and almost all of the Northeast Caucasian languages, manifest noun class. In the Northeast Caucasian family, only Lezgian, Udi, and Aghul do not have noun classes. Some languages have only two classes, while the Bats language has eight. The most widespread system, however, has four classes, for male, female, animate beings and

certain objects, and finally a class for the remaining nouns. The Andi language has a noun class reserved for insects.

Among Northwest Caucasian languages, Abkhaz shows a masculine-feminine-neuter distinction. Ubykh shows some inflections along the same lines, but only in some instances, and in some of these instances inflection for noun class is not even obligatory.

In all Caucasian languages that manifest class, it is not marked on the noun itself but on the dependent verbs, adjectives, pronouns and prepositions.

Niger-Congo Languages

The Zande language distinguishes four noun classes:

Criterion	*Example*	*Gloss*
male human	Kumba	*man*
female human	Dia	*wife*
animate	Nya	*beast*
other	Bamboo	*house*

There are about 80 inanimate nouns which are in the animate class, including nouns denoting heavenly objects (moon, rainbow), metal objects (hammer, ring), edible plants (sweet potato, pea), and non-metallic objects (whistle, ball). Many of the exceptions have a round shape, and some can be explained by the role they play in Zande mythology.

Basque

In Basque there are two classes, animated and inanimated; however, the only difference is in the declension of locative cases (inessive, locative genitive, adlative, terminal adlative, ablative and directional ablative). There are a few words with both masculine and feminine forms, generally words for relatives (cousin: lehengusu (m)/ lehengusina (f)) or words borrowed from Latin ("king": *errege*, from the Latin word *regem*; "queen": *erregina*, from *reginam*). In names for familiar relatives, where both genders

are taken into account, either the words for each gender are put together ("son": *seme*; "daughter": *alaba*; "children"(meaning son(s) and daughter(s)): *seme-alaba(k)*) or there is a noun that includes both: "father": *aita*; "mother": *ama*; "father" (both genders): *guraso*.

Gender Borrowed from One Language by Another

According to linguist Ghil'ad Zuckermann, "morphemic adaptations of English words into American Italian or British Italian often carry the linguistic gender of the semantically-similar word in Italian itself, e.g. British Italian *bagga* 'bag' (feminine), induced by Italian *borsa* 'bag' (feminine)."

Zuckermann argues that "Israeli" (his term for "Modern Hebrew") demonstrates the same phenomenon. One of the examples he provides is the Israeli word for "brush": *mivréshet*. He suggests that the choice of the feminine noun-template *miXXéXet* (each *X* represents a slot where a radical is inserted) was engendered by the (feminine) gender of the following words for "brush": Yiddish *barsht* (feminine), Polish *szczotka* (f), Russian *shchëtka* (f) (also *kist'* (f) "painting brush"), German *Bürste* (f), French *brosse* (f) and Arabic *mábrasha* (f). Although the *miXXéXet* noun-template is used for instruments, there were many other possible suitable noun-templates, cf. **mavrésh* and **mivrásh*, both masculine.

Auxiliary and Constructed Languages

Many constructed languages have natural gender systems similar to that of English. Animate nouns can have distinct forms reflecting natural gender, and personal pronouns are selected according to natural gender. There is no gender agreement on modifiers. The first three languages below fall into this category.

- Esperanto features the female infix *-in-*. While it differentiates a small number of male and female nouns such as *patro* (father) and *patrino* (mother),

most nouns are gender-neutral and the use of it is not necessary. For instance, *hundo* means either a male or female dog, *virhundo* means a male dog, and *hundino* means a female dog. The personal pronouns *li* (he) and *ʃi* (she) and their possessive forms *lia* (his) and *ʃia* (her) are used for male and female antecedents, while *”i* (it) and its possessive form *”ia* (its) are used to refer to a non-personal antecedent, or as an epicene pronoun.

- Ido has the masculine infix *-ul* and the feminine infix *-in* for animate beings. Both are optional and are used only if it is necessary to avoid ambiguity. Thus: *kato* “a cat”, *katulo* “a male cat”, *katino* “a female cat”. There are third person singular and plural pronouns for all three genders: *masculine*, *feminine*, and *neuter*, but also *gender-free* pronouns.
- Interlingua has no grammatical gender. It indicates only natural gender, as in *matre* “mother” and *patre* “father”. Interlingua speakers may use feminine endings. For example, *-a* may be used in place of *-o* in *catto*, producing *catta* “female cat”. *Professora* may be used to denote a professor who is female, and *actrice* may be used to mean “actress”. As in Ido, inflections marking gender are optional, although some gender-specific nouns such as *femina*, “woman”, happen to end in *-a* or *-o*. Interlingua has feminine pronouns, and its general pronoun forms are also used as masculine pronouns.
- The fictional Klingon language has three classes: capable of speaking, body part and other.

List of Languages by Type of Grammatical Genders

Masculine and Feminine

- Albanian The *neuter* has almost disappeared.
- Akkadian
- Asturian
- Ancient Egyptian

- Amharic
- Arabic However, Arabic distinguishes masculine and feminine in the singular and the dual. In the plural it distinguishes between male humans, female humans and non-human plurals (including collectives of humans, such as "nation," "people," etc.); non-human plurals are treated as feminine singular regardless of their gender in the singular.
- Aramaic
- Breton
- Catalan
- Coptic
- Cornish
- Corsican
- French
- Friulan
- Galician
- Hebrew
- Hindi
- Irish
- Italian There is a trace of the *neuter* in some nouns and personal pronouns. E.g.: singular *l'uovo*, *il dito*; plural *le uova*, *le dita* ('the egg(s)', 'the finger(s)').
- Ladin
- Latvian
- Lithuanian There is a *neuter* gender for adjectives with very limited usage and set of forms.
- Maltese
- Manchu Used vowel harmony in gender inflections.
- Occitan
- Portuguese There is a trace of the *neuter* in the demonstratives and some indefinite pronouns.
- Punjabi
- Romani
- Sardinian

- Scottish Gaelic
- Sicilian
- Spanish There is a *neuter* of sorts, though generally expressed only with the definite article *lo*, used with nouns denoting abstract categories: *lo bueno*.
- Tamazight (Berber)
- Urdu
- Venetian
- Welsh

Common and Neuter(Note that the Common/Neuter Distinction is Close to Animate/Inanimate)

- Danish
- Dutch (The *masculine* and the *feminine* have merged into a *common gender* in standard Dutch, but a distinction is still made by many when using pronouns, and in Southern-Dutch varieties. See Gender in Dutch grammar.)
- Faroese
- Low German
- Norwegian (In the dialect of Bergen elsewhere three genders.)
- Swedish The distinction between *masculine* and *feminine* still exists for persons and some animals. Some dialects retain all three genders for all nouns.
- Hittite language

Animate and Inanimate

- Basque (two different paradigms of noun declension are used, although adjectives and demonstratives do not show gender)
- Elamite
- Hittite
- Many Native American languages, including most languages of the Algic, Siouan and Uto-Aztecan language families, as well as isolates such as Mapudungun

- Russian. Note that 3 genders present there as well.
- Sumerian In many such languages, what is commonly termed "animacy" may in fact be more accurately described as a distinction between human and non-human, rational and irrational, "socially active" and "socially passive" etc..

Masculine, Feminine, and Neuter

- Belarusian
- Bulgarian
- Dutch The *masculine* and the *feminine* have merged into a *common gender* in standard Dutch, but a distinction is still made by many when using pronouns. In South-Dutch (Flemish) spoken language all articles, possessives and demonstratives differentiate between masculine and feminine: see gender in Dutch grammar.
- Faroese
- Gaulish
- German
- Greek In Ancient Greek, neuter plurals are treated like singulars in verbal agreement
- Gujarati
- Icelandic
- Kannada
- Latin
- Macedonian
- Marathi
- Norwegian The three-gender system is widely used throughout the country, except in the Bergen dialect (some sociolects in Oslo also lacks it), where the dialect allows feminine nouns to be given the corresponding masculine inflections or do not use the feminine gender at all.
- Old English
- Old Irish

- Old Persian
- Old Prussian
- Romanian The neuter gender (called *neutru* or sometimes *ambigen* in Romanian) has no separate forms of its own; neuter nouns behave like masculine nouns in the singular, and feminine in the plural. This behavior is seen in the form of agreeing adjectives and replacing pronouns. See Romanian nouns.
- Russian
- Sanskrit
- Serbo-Croatian
- Slovene
- Sorbian
- Swedish As in Dutch, the *masculine* and the *feminine* have merged into a *common gender* in standard Swedish. But some dialects, mainly in Dalecarlia, Ostrobothnia (Finland) and northern Sweden, have preserved three genders in spoken language.
- Telugu
- Ukrainian
- Yiddish
- Zazaki

Note. In Slavic languages marked with an asterisk (*), traditionally only *masculine*, *feminine* and *neuter* genders are recognized, with *animacy* as a separate category for the masculine; the actual situation is similar to Czech and other Slavic languages, so they may be analyzed as four-gender languages as well.

More than Three Grammatical Genders

- Czech and Slovak: *Masculine animate*, *Masculine inanimate*, *Feminine*, *Neuter* (traditionally, only masculine, feminine and neuter genders are recognized, with animacy as a separate category for the masculine).

- Polish: *Masculine animate*, *Masculine inanimate*, *Masculine personal*, *Feminine*, *Neuter* (traditionally, only masculine, feminine and neuter genders are recognized, with animacy as a separate category for the masculine).
- Dyirbal: *Masculine*, *feminine*, *vegetal* and *other*. (Some linguists do not regard the noun class system of this language as grammatical gender.)
- Luganda: ten classes called simply *Class I* to *Class X* and containing all sorts of arbitrary groupings but often characterised as *people*, *long objects*, *animals*, *miscellaneous objects*, *large objects and liquids*, *small objects*, *languages*, *pejoratives*, *infinitives*, *mass nouns*
- Swahili: 18 noun classes
- Zande: *Masculine*, *feminine*, *animate*, and *inanimate*.
- Russian: *Masculine*, *Feminine*, *Neuter*, *Common* (dual concord model), *Reciprocal* (one concord model).

Influence on Culture

According to research by Lera Boroditsky, grammatical genders are among the aspects of languages that shape how people think (a hypothesis called "linguistic relativity"). In one study by Boroditsky, in which native speakers of German and Spanish were asked to describe everyday objects in English, she found that they were more likely to use attributes conventionally associated with the genders of the objects in their native languages. For instance, German-speakers more often described a bridge (in German: *die Brücke*, feminine) with words like "beautiful," "elegant," "fragile," "peaceful," "pretty," and "slender," whereas Spanish-speakers (for whom *el puente* is masculine) used terms like "big," "dangerous," "long," "strong," "sturdy," and "towering." Also according to Boroditsky, the gender in which concepts are anthropomorphized in art is dependent, in 85% of all cases, on the grammatical gender of the concept in the artist's language. Therefore, death is generally

portrayed as male in German art (*der Tod*, masculine), but as female in Russian art (*Ñìåðòü*, feminine).

GRAMMATICAL ASPECT

In linguistics, the grammatical aspect of a verb is a grammatical category that defines the temporal flow (or lack thereof) in a given action, event, or state (in a given situation). Commonly the distinction is in how the speaker views the situation, either as unitary and bounded ("I ate") or as ongoing and unbounded ("I was eating"): The distinction here is not in the situation itself, but in the speaker's portrayal of it. Other common aspectual distinctions include whether the situation is repetitive or habitual ("I used to eat"), continues in a particular time frame ("I was eating"), or has continuing relevance in a later time frame ("I have eaten"). Any one language will have at most a subset of the attested aspectual distinctions made in the world's languages.

Basic Concept

Aspect is often confused with the closely-related concept of tense, because they both convey information about time. While tense relates the time of a situation to some other time, commonly the time of speaking, aspect conveys other temporal information, such as duration, completion, or frequency, as it relates to the time of action. Thus tense refers to *temporally when* while aspect refers to *temporally how*. Aspect can be said to describe the texture of the time in which a situation occurs, such as a single point of time, a continuous range of time, a sequence of discrete points in time, etc., whereas tense indicates its location in time.

For example, consider the following sentences: "I eat", "I am eating", "I have eaten", and "I have been eating". All are in the present tense, as they describe the present situation, yet each conveys different information or points of view as to how the action pertains to the present. As such, they differ in aspect.

Grammatical aspect is a *formal* property of a language, distinguished through overt inflection, derivational affixes, or independent words that serve as grammatically required markers of those aspects. For example, the K'iche' language spoken in Guatemala has the inflectional prefixes *k-* and *x-* to mark incompletive and completive aspect; Mandarin Chinese has the aspect markers *-le*, *-zhe*, *zài-*, and *-guo* to mark the perfective, durative stative, durative progressive, and experiential aspects, and also marks aspect with adverbs; and English marks the continuous aspect with the verb *to be* coupled with present participle and the perfect with the verb *to have* coupled with past participle. Even languages that do not mark aspect morphologically or through auxiliary verbs, however, can convey such distinctions by the use of adverbs or other syntactic constructions.

Grammatical aspect is distinguished from lexical aspect or *aktionsart*, which is an inherent feature of verbs or verb phrases and is determined by the nature of the situation that the verb describes.

Grammatical aspect may have been first dealt with in the work of the Indian linguist Yaska (ca. 7th century BCE), who distinguished actions that are processes (*bhâva*), from those where the action is considered as a completed whole (*mûrta*). This is the key distinction between the imperfective and perfective. Yaska also applied this distinction to a verb versus an action nominal.

Common Aspectual Distinctions

The most fundamental aspectual distinction, represented in many languages, is between perfective aspect and imperfective aspect. This is the basic aspectual distinction in the Slavic languages. It semantically corresponds to the distinction between the morphological forms known respectively as the aorist and imperfect in Greek, the preterite and imperfect in Spanish, the simple past (passé simple) and imperfect in French, and the perfect and

imperfect in Latin (from the Latin "perfectus", meaning "completed").

Essentially, the perfective aspect looks at an event as a complete action, while the imperfective aspect views an event as the process of unfolding or a repeated or habitual event (thus corresponding to the progressive/continuous aspect for events of short-term duration and to habitual aspect for longer terms). For events of short durations in the past, the distinction often coincides with the distinction in the English language between the simple past "X-ed," as compared to the progressive "was X-ing" (compare "I wrote the letters this morning" (i.e. finished writing the letters: an action completed) and "I was writing letters this morning"). In describing longer time periods, English needs context to maintain the distinction between the habitual ("I called him often in the past" - a habit that has no point of completion) and perfective ("I called him once" - an action completed), although the construct "used to" marks both habitual aspect and past tense and can be used if the aspectual distinction otherwise is not clear.

Sometimes, English has a lexical distinction where other languages may use the distinction in grammatical aspect. For example, the English verbs "to know" (the state of knowing) and "to find out" (knowing viewed as a "completed action") correspond to the imperfect and perfect of the French verb "savoir".

Aspect vs. Tense

The Germanic languages combine the concept of aspect with the concept of tense. Although English largely separates tense and aspect formally, its aspects (neutral, progressive, perfect, progressive perfect, and (in the past tense) habitual) do not correspond very closely to the distinction of perfective vs. imperfective that is found in most languages with aspect. Furthermore, the separation of tense and aspect in English is not maintained rigidly. One instance of this is the alternation, in some forms of English, between sentences

such as “Have you eaten yet?” and “Did you eat yet?”. Another is in the pluperfect (“I had eaten”), which sometimes represents the combination of past tense and perfect (“I was full because I had already eaten”), but sometimes simply represents a past action that is anterior to another past action (“A little while after I had eaten, my friend arrived”). (The latter situation is often represented in other languages by a simple perfective tense. Formal Spanish and French use a past anterior tense in cases such as this.)

Like tense, aspect is a way that verbs represent time. However, rather than locating an event or state in time, the way tense does, aspect describes “the internal temporal constituency of a situation”, or in other words, aspect is a way “of conceiving the flow of the process itself”. English aspectual distinctions in the past tense include “I went, I used to go, I was going, I had gone”; in the present tense “I lose, I am losing, I have lost, I have been losing, I am going to lose”; and with the future modal “I will see, I will be seeing, I will have seen”. What distinguishes these aspects within each tense is not (necessarily) when the event occurs, but how the time in which it occurs is viewed: as complete, ongoing, consequential, planned, etc.

In most dialects of Ancient Greek, aspect is indicated uniquely by verbal morphology. For example, the very frequently used aorist, though a functional preterite in the indicative mood, conveys historic or ‘immediate’ aspect in the subjunctive and optative. The perfect in all moods is used as an aspectual marker, conveying the sense of a resultant state. E.g. AñÜù - I see (present); å6äïí - I saw (aorist); ï6áá - I am in a state of having seen = I know (perfect).

Many Sino-Tibetan languages, like Mandarin, lack grammatical tense but are rich in aspect.

Lexical vs. Grammatical Aspect

There is a distinction between grammatical aspect, as described here, and lexical aspect. Lexical aspect is an

inherent property of a verb or verb-complement phrase, and is not marked formally. The distinctions made as part of lexical aspect are different from those of grammatical aspect. Typical distinctions are between states ("I owned"), activities ("I shopped"), accomplishments ("I painted a picture"), achievements ("I bought"), and punctual, or semelfactive, events ("I sneezed"). These distinctions are often relevant syntactically. For example, states and activities, but not usually achievements, can be used in English with a prepositional *for*-phrase describing a time duration: "I had a car for five hours", "I shopped for five hours", but not "*I bought a car for five hours". Lexical aspect is sometimes called *Aktionsart*, especially by German and Slavic linguists. Lexical or situation aspect is marked in Athabaskan languages.

One of the factors in situation aspect is telicity. Telicity might be considered a kind of lexical aspect, except that it is typically not a property of a verb in isolation, but rather a property of an entire verb *phrase*. Achievements, accomplishments and semelfactives have telic situation aspect, while states and activities have atelic situation aspect.

The other factor in situation aspect is duration, which is also a property of a verb phrase. Accomplishments, states, and activities have duration, while achievements and semelfactives do not.

Indicating Aspect

In some languages, aspect and time are very clearly separated, making them much more distinct to their speakers. There are a number of languages that mark aspect much more saliently than time. Prominent in this category are Chinese and American Sign Language, which both differentiate many aspects but rely exclusively on optional time-indicating terms to pinpoint an action with respect to time. In other language groups, for example in most modern Indo-European languages (except Slavic

languages), aspect has become almost entirely conflated, in the verbal morphological system, with time.

In Russian, aspect is more salient than tense in narrative. Russian, like other Slavic languages, uses different lexical entries for the different aspects, whereas other languages mark them morphologically, and still others with auxiliaries (e.g., English).

In literary Arabic *al-Fusha* the verb has two aspect-tenses: perfective (past), and imperfective (non-past). There is some disagreement among grammarians whether to view the distinction as a distinction in aspect, or tense, or both. The "Past Verb" fi'l maadiy denotes an event (hadath) completed in the past, but says nothing about the relation of this past event to present status. For example, "æÕá", *wasala*, "he arrived", indicates that arrival occurred in the past without saying anything about the present status of the arriver - maybe he stuck around, maybe he turned around and left, etc. - nor about the aspect of the past event except insofar as completeness can be considered aspectual. This "Past Verb" is clearly similar if not identical to the Greek Aorist, which is considered a tense but is more of an aspect marker. In the Arabic, aorist aspect is the logical consequence of past tense. By contrast, the "Verb of Similarity" fi'l al-mudaara'ah), so called because of its resemblance to the active participial noun, is considered to denote an event in the present or future without committing to a specific aspectual sense beyond the incompleteness implied by the tense: "yadribu", he strikes/ is striking/will strike/etc. Those are the only two "tenses" in Arabic (not counting "amr", command, which the tradition counts as denoting future events.) At least that's the way the tradition sees it. To explicitly mark aspect, Arabic uses a variety of lexical and syntactic devices.

Contemporary Arabic dialects are another matter. One major change from al-Fusha is the use of a prefix particle (È "bi" in most dialects) to explicitly mark progressive,

continuous, or habitual aspect: bi-yiktib, he is now writing, writes all the time, etc.

Aspect can mark the stage of an action. The prospective aspect is a combination of tense and aspect that indicates the action is in preparation to take place. The inceptive aspect identifies the beginning stage of an action (e.g. Esperanto uses *ek-*, e.g. *Mi ekman"as*, "I am beginning to eat.") and inchoative and ingressive aspects identify a change of state (*The flowers started blooming*) or the start of an action (*He started running*). Aspects of stage continue through progressive, pausative, resumptive, cessive, and terminative.

Important qualifications:

- Although the perfective is often thought of as representing a "momentary action", this is not strictly correct. It can equally well be used for an action that took time, as long as it is *conceived of* as a unit, with a clearly defined start and end, such as "Last summer I visited France".
- Grammatical aspect represents a formal distinction encoded in the grammar of a language. Although languages that are described as having imperfective and perfective aspects agree in most cases in their use of these aspects, they may not agree in every situation. For example:
  - Some languages have additional grammatical aspects. Spanish and Ancient Greek, for example, have a perfect (not the same as the perfective), which refers to a state resulting from a previous action (also described as a previous action with relevance to a particular time, or a previous action viewed from the perspective of a later time). This corresponds (roughly) to the "have X-ed" construction in English, as in "I have recently eaten". Languages that lack this aspect (such as Portuguese, which

is closely related to Spanish) often use the past perfective to render the present perfect (compare the roughly synonymous English sentences "Have you eaten yet?" and "Did you eat yet?").

- In some languages, the formal representation of aspect is optional, and can be omitted when the aspect is clear from context or does not need to be emphasized. This is the case, for example, in Mandarin Chinese, with the perfective suffix *le* and (especially) the imperfective *zhe*.
- For some verbs in some languages, the difference between perfective and imperfective conveys an additional meaning difference; in such cases, the two aspects are typically translated using separate verbs in English. In Greek, for example, the imperfective sometimes adds the notion of "try to do something" (the so-called *conative imperfect*); hence the same verb, in the imperfective (present or imperfect) and aorist, respectively, is used to convey *look* and *see*, *search* and *find*, *listen* and *hear*. (For example, çêïõîìåí *çkouomen* "we listened" vs. çêïõóáìåí *çkousamen* "we heard".) Spanish has similar pairs for certain verbs, such as (imperfect and preterite, respectively) *sabía* "I knew" vs. *supe* "I found out", *podía* "I was able to" vs. *pude* "I succeeded (in doing something)", *quería* "I wanted to" vs. *quise* "I tried to", *no quería* "I did not want to" vs. *no quise* "I refused (to do something)". Such differences are often highly language-specific.

Aspect by Language

English

The English tense-aspect system has two

morphologically distinct tenses, present and past. No marker of a future tense exists on the verb in English; the futurity of an event may be expressed through the use of the auxiliary verbs "will" and "shall", by a present form, as in "tomorrow we go to Newark", or by some other means. Past is distinguished from present-future, in contrast, with internal modifications of the verb. These two tenses may be modified further for progressive aspect (also called *continuous* aspect), for the perfect, or for both. These two aspectual forms are also referred to as BE +ING and HAVE +EN, respectively, which avoids what may be unfamiliar terminology.

Aspects of the present tense:

- Present simple (not progressive, not perfect): "I eat"
- Present progressive (progressive, not perfect): "I am eating"
- Present perfect (not progressive, perfect): "I have eaten"
- Present perfect progressive (progressive, perfect): "I have been eating"

Aspects of the past tense:

- Past simple (not progressive, not perfect): "I ate"
- Past progressive (progressive, not perfect): "I was eating"
- Past perfect (not progressive, perfect): "I had eaten"
- Past perfect progressive (progressive, perfect): "I had been eating"

(While many elementary discussions of English grammar classify the present perfect as a past tense, it relates the action to the present time. One cannot say of someone now deceased that he "has eaten" or "has been eating"; the present auxiliary implies that he is in some way *present* (alive), even if the action denoted is completed (perfect) or partially completed (progressive perfect).)

The uses of the progressive and perfect aspects are quite complex. They may refer to the viewpoint of the speaker:

I was walking down the road when I met Michael Jackson's lawyer. (Speaker viewpoint in middle of action)

I have traveled widely, but I have never been to Moscow. (Speaker viewpoint at end of action)

But they can have other illocutionary forces:

You are being stupid now. (You are doing it deliberately)

You are not having chocolate with your sausages! (I forbid it)

I am having lunch with Mike tomorrow. (It is decided)

English expresses some other aspectual distinctions with other constructions. *Used to* + VERB is a past habitual, as in "I used to go to school", and *going to* / *gonna* + VERB is a prospective, a future situation highlighting current intention or expectation, as in "I'm gonna go to school next year".

Note that the aspectual systems of certain dialects of English, such as African-American Vernacular English, and of creoles based on English vocabulary, such as Hawaiian Creole English, are quite different from those of standard English, and often distinguish aspect at the expense of tense.

German Vernacular and Colloquial

Although Standard German does not have aspects, many Upper German languages, all West Central German languages, and some more vernacular German languages do make one aspectual distinction, and so do the colloquial languages of many regions, the so called German regiolects. While officially discouraged in schools and seen as 'bad language', local English teachers like the distinction, because it corresponds well with the English continuous form. It is formed by the conjugated auxiliary verb "sein" (to be) followed by the preposition "am" and the infinitive, or the

nominalized verb. The latter two are phonetically indistinguishable; in writing, capitalization differs: "Ich war am essen" vs. "Ich war am Essen" (I was eating, compared to the Standard German approximation: "Ich war beim Essen"); yet these forms are not standardized and thus are relatively infrequently written down or printed, even in quotations or direct speech. If written, the first form (the infinitive) is preferred.

Slavic Languages

It has been suggested that this section be split into a new article titled *Grammatical aspect in Slavic languages*. (Discuss)

In Slavic languages, only one nearly universal type of aspectual opposition forms two grammatical aspects: perfective and imperfective (in contrast with English, which has several aspectual oppositions: perfect vs. neutral; progressive vs. nonprogressive; and in the past tense, habitual ("used to ...") vs. neutral). The aspectual distinctions exist on the lexical level - speakers have no unique method of forming a perfective verb from a given imperfective one (or conversely). Perfective verbs are most often formed by means of prefixes, changes in the root, or using a completely different root (suppletion). Note, however, that possessing a prefix does not necessarily mean that a verb is perfective. Contrast between a perfective and an imperfective verb may be also indicated by stress, e.g. Russian perfective *îñûïàòü*, imperfective *îñûïàòü* (to strew, shower, heap upon something).

With a few exceptions each Slavic verb is either perfective or imperfective. Most verbs form strict pairs of one perfective and one imperfective verb with generally the same meaning. However, each Slavic language contains a number of bi-aspectual verbs, which may be used as both imperfective and perfective. They are mainly borrowings from non-Slavic languages, but some native verbs also belong to this group. As opposed to them, mono-aspectual

verbs are mainly native. There are mono-aspectual imperfective verbs without perfective equivalents (among others, verbs with the meaning "to be" and "to have") as well as perfective verbs without imperfective equivalents (for instance, verbs with the meaning "become ...", e.g. "to become paralyzed", etc.).

The perfective aspect allows the speaker to describe the action as finished, completed, finished in the natural way. The imperfective aspect does not present the action as finished, but rather as pending or ongoing.

An example is the verb "to eat" in the Serbo-Croatian language. The verb translates either as *jesti* (imperfective) or *pojesti* (perfective). Now, both aspects could be used in the same tense of Serbian. For example (omitting, for simplicity, feminine forms like *jela*):

Serbo-Croatian

Example	*Tense*	*Aspect*
Ja sam pojeo/ Ja cam nojeo	past	imperfective
Ja sam bio jeo/ Ja cam 6no jeo		perfective
Ja sam bio jeo/ Ja cam 6no jeo	pluperfect	imperfective
Ja sam bio pojeo/ Ja cam 6no nojeo		perfective
Ja æu jesti/ Ja hy jectn	future	imperfective
Ja æu pojesti/ Ja hy nojctn		perfective

Ja sam pojeo signals that the action was completed. Its meaning can be given as "I ate (something) and I finished eating (it)"; or "I ate (something) up".

Ja sam jeo signals that the action took place (at a specified moment, or in the course of one's life, or every day, etc.); it may mean "I was eating", "I ate" or "I have been eating".

The following examples are from Polish.

Imperfective verbs mean:

- actions in progress, just ongoing states and activities, with significant course (in opinion of the speaker);
- durative activities, lasting through some time, e.g. *krzycza³* 'he was shouting', *bêdzie drgaæ* 'it will be vibrating';
- motions without a strict aim, ex. *chodzê* 'I am walking here and there';
- multiple (iterative) activities, ex. *dopisywaæ* 'to insert many times to the text', *bêdziemy wychodzi³y* 'we will go out (many times)';
- non-resultative activities, only heading towards some purpose: 'I will be writing the letter';
- continuous states, ex. *bêdê staæ* 'I will be standing'.

Perfective verbs can refer to the past or to the future, but not to present activities – an activity happening now cannot be ended, so it cannot be perfective. Perfective verbs convey:

- states and activities that were ended (even if a second ago) or will be ended, with insignificant course, short or treated as a whole by the speaker, ex. *krzykn¹³* 'he shouted', *drgnie* 'it will stir';
- single-time activities, ex. *dopisaæ* 'to insert to the text', *wyszed³* 'he has gone out';
- actions whose goals have already been achieved, even if with difficulty, ex. *przeczyta³em* 'I have read', *doczyta³a siê* 'she finished reading and found what she had sought';
- reasons for the state, ex. *pokocha³a* 'she came to love', *zrozumiesz* 'you (sg.) will understand', *poznamy* 'we will get to know';
- the beginning of the activity or the state, ex. *wstanê* 'I will stand up' (and I will stand), *zaczerwieni³ siê* 'he reddened';
- the end of the activity or the state, ex. *doœpiewaj* 'sing until the end';

- activities executed in many places, on many objects or by many subjects at the same time, ex. *powynosi³* 'he carried out (many things)', *popêkaj¹* 'They will break out in many places', *poucinaæ* 'To cut off many items';
- actions or states that last some time, ex. *postojê* 'I will stand for a little time', *poby³* 'he was (there) for some time'.

Most simple Polish verbs are imperfective (as in other Slavic languages), ex. *iœæ* 'to walk, to go', *nieœæ* 'to carry', *pisaæ* 'to write'. But there are also few simple perfective verbs, ex. *daæ* 'to give', *si¹œæ* 'to sit down'. There exist many perfective verbs with suffixes and without prefixes, ex. *krzykn¹æ* 'to shout', *kupiæ* 'to buy' (cf. the imperfective *kupowaæ* with a different suffix).

Numerous perfective verbs are formed from simple imperfectives by prefixation. To create the perfective counterpart, verbs use various prefixes without any clear rules. The actual prefix can even depend on a dialect or special meaning. For example: the perfective counterpart to *malowaæ* is *pomalowaæ* when it means 'to paint a wall; to fill with a color', or *namalowaæ* when it means 'to paint a picture; to depict sth/sb'.

Besides the strict perfective equivalent, a number of other prefixed verbs may be formed from a given simple imperfective verb. They all have similar but distinct meaning. And they form, as a rule, their own imperfective equivalents by means of suffixation (attaching suffixes) or stem alternation. Example:

- *praæ* 'to wash / clean clothes with water and soap / washing powder' is a simple imperfective verb;
- *upraæ* is its perfective counterpart while *dopraæ*, *przepraæ*, *opraæ* are other derived perfective verbs with a little different meanings;
- *dopieraæ*, *przepieraæ*, *opieraæ* are secondary imperfective verbs that are counterparts for *dopraæ,*

przepraæ, opraæ respectively; **upieraæ* does not exist because the basic verb *praæ* is the imperfective counterpart of *upraæ*.

A number of verbs form their aspectual counterparts by simultaneous prefixation and suffixation or by suppletion, ex. (the first one is imperfective) *stawiaæ - postawiæ* 'to set up', *braæ - wzi¹æ* 'to take', *widzieæ - zobaczyæ* 'to see'.

Special imperfective verbs express aimless motions. They are mono-aspectual, i.e., they have no perfective equivalents. They are formed from other imperfective verbs by stem alternations or suppletion, ex. *nosiæ* 'to carry around' (from *nieœæ*), *chodziæ* 'to walk around, to go around' (from *iœæ* 'to go, to walk'). However, when such a verb gets an aim anyway, it becomes iterative: *chodziæ do szko³y* 'to go to school'.

Other iteratives build another group of mono-aspectual imperfective verbs. They are formed from other imperfective verbs, including the previous group: *chadzaæ* 'to walk around usually (from *chodziæ*), *jadaæ* 'to eat usually' (from *jeœæ* 'to eat'). Both groups are not too numerous: most Polish verbs cannot form iterative counterparts.

Perfective verbs that express activities executed in many places, on many objects, or by many subjects at the same time, and those that express actions or states that last some time, have no imperfective counterparts. They are formed with the prefix *po-* (which can have other functions as well).

States and activities that last for some time can be expressed by means of both imperfective and perfective verbs: *ca³y dzieñ le¿a³ w ³ó¿ku* 'he was in bed all day long' (literally: 'he lay in bed') means nearly the same as *ca³y dzieñ przele¿a³ w ³ó¿ku*. The difference is mainly stylistic: imperfective is neutral here, while using perfective causes stronger tone of the statement.

Aspect in Slavic is a superior category in relation to

tense or mood. Particularly, some verbal forms (like infinitive) cannot distinguish tense but they still distinguish aspect. Here is the list of Polish verb forms formed by both imperfective and perfective verbs (such a list is similar in other Slavic languages). The example is an imperfective and a perfective Polish verb with the meaning 'to write'. All personal forms are given in third person, masculine singular, with Russian analog:

- Infinitive: *pisaæ - napisaæ*
- Passive participle: *pisany - napisany*
- Gerund: *pisanie - napisanie*
- Past impersonal form: *pisano - napisano*
- Past impersonal form in subjunctive: *pisano by - napisano by* / not exists
- Past tense: *pisat - napisat*
- Future tense: *bêdzie pisaæ* / *bêdzie pisat - napisze*
- Conditional, first form: *pisat by - napisat by*
- Conditional, second form: *bytby pisat - bytby napisat* / not exists
- Imperative: *pisz - napisz*

The following may be formed only if the verb is imperfective:

- Contemporary adverbial participle – *piszac* / not exists, but usually does
- Active participle – *piszacy*
- Present tense – *pisze*

One form may be created only if the verb is perfective, namely:

- Anterior adverbial participle – *napisawszy*

Romance Languages

Modern Romance languages merge the concepts of aspect and tense, but consistently distinguish perfective and imperfective aspects in the past tense. This derives directly

from the way the Latin language used to render both aspects and *consecutio temporum*.

Italian language example (verb *mangiare*, to eat):

Mood: *indicativo* (indicative)

- *Presente* (present): io mangio ("I eat", "I'm eating") - merges habitual and continuous aspects, among others
- *Passato prossimo* (recent past): io ho mangiato ("I ate", "I have eaten") - merges perfective and perfect
- *Imperfetto* (imperfect): io mangiavo ("I was eating", or "I usually ate") - merges habitual and progressive aspects
- *Trapassato prossimo* (recent pluperfect): io avevo mangiato ("I had eaten") - tense, not ordinarily marked for aspect
- *Passato remoto* (far past): io mangiai (I "ate") - perfective aspect
- *Trapassato remoto* (far pluperfect): io ebbi mangiato ("I had eaten") - tense
- *Futuro semplice* (simple future): io mangerò ("I shall eat") - tense
- *Futuro anteriore* (future perfect): io avrò mangiato ("I shall have eaten") - future tense and perfect tense/aspect

The *imperfetto/trapassato prossimo* contrasts with the *passato remoto/trapassato remoto* in that *imperfetto* renders an imperfective (continuous) past while *passato remoto* expresses an aorist (punctual/historical) past.

Other aspects in Italian are rendered with other periphrases, like prospective (*io sto per mangiare* "I'm about to eat", *io starò per mangiare* "I shall be about to eat"), or continuous/progressive (*io sto mangiando* "I'm eating", *io starò mangiando* "I shall be eating").

Finnic Languages

Finnish and Estonian, among others, have a grammatical aspect contrast of telicity between telic and atelic. Telic sentences signal that the intended goal of an action is achieved. Atelic sentences do not signal whether any such goal has been achieved. The aspect is indicated by the case of the object: accusative is telic and partitive is atelic. For example, the (implicit) purpose of shooting is to kill, such that:

- *Ammuin karhun* — "I shot the bear (succeeded it is done)" i.e., "I shot the bear dead".
- *Ammuin karhua* — "I shot at the bear" i.e., "I shot the bear (and I am not telling if it died)".

Sometimes, corresponding telic and atelic forms have as little to do with each other semantically as "take" has with "take off". For example, *naida* means "to marry" when telic, but "to have sex with" when atelic.

Also, derivational suffixes exist for various aspects. Examples:

- *-ahta-* "do suddenly by itself" as in *ammahtaa* "to shoot up" from *ampua* "to shoot"
- *-ele-* "repeatedly" as in *ammuskella* "to go shooting around"

There are derivational suffixes for verbs, which carry frequentative, momentane, causative, and inchoative aspect meanings also, pairs of verbs differing only in transitivity exist.

Philippine Languages

Like many Austronesian languages, the verbs of the Philippine languages follow a complex system of affixes in order to express subtle changes in meaning. However, the verbs in this family of languages are conjugated to express the aspects and not the tenses. Though many of the Philippine languages do not have a fully codified grammar,

most of them follow the verb aspects that are demonstrated by Filipino or Tagalog.

Hawaiian

The Hawaiian language conveys aspect as follows:

- The unmarked verb, frequently used, can indicate habitual aspect or perfective aspect in the past.
- *ke* + verb + *nei* is frequently used and conveys the progressive aspect in the present.
- *e* + verb + *ana* conveys the progressive aspect in any tense.
- *ua* + verb conveys the perfective aspect but is frequently omitted.

Creole Languages

Creole languages, typically use the unmarked verb for timeless habitual aspect, or for stative aspect, or for perfective aspect in the past. Invariant pre-verbal markers are often used. Non-stative verbs typically can optionally be marked for the progressive, habitual, completive, or irrealis aspect. The progressive in English-based Atlantic Creoles often uses *de* (from English "be"). Jamaican Creole uses *pan* (from English "upon") for the present progressive and *wa* (from English "was") for the past progressive. Haitian Creole uses the progressive marker *ap*. Some Atlantic Creoles use one marker for both the habitual and progressive aspects. In Tok Pisin, the optional progressive marker follows the verb. Completive markers tend to come from superstrate words like "done" or "finish", and some creoles model the future/irrealis marker on the superstrate word for "go".

American Sign Languages

American Sign Language (ASL) is similar to many other sign languages in that it has no grammatical tense but many verbal aspects produced by modifying the base verb sign.

An example is illustrated with the verb TELL. The basic form of this sign is produced with the initial posture of the index finger on the chin, followed by a movement of the hand and finger tip toward the indirect object (the recipient of the telling). Inflected into the unrealized inceptive aspect ('to be just about to tell'), the sign begins with the hand moving from in front of the trunk in an arc to the initial posture of the base sign (i.e. index finger touching the chin) while inhaling through the mouth, dropping of the jaw, directing eye gaze toward the verb's object. The posture is then held rather than moved toward the indirect object.

During the hold, the signer also stops the breath by closing the glottis. Other verbs (such as 'look at', 'wash the dishes', 'yell', 'flirt') are inflected into the unrealized inceptive aspect similarly: the hands used in the base sign move in an arc from in front of the trunk to the initial posture of the underlying verb sign while inhaling, dropping the jaw, and directing eye gaze toward the verb's object (if any), but subsequent movements and postures are dropped as the posture and breath are held.

Other aspects in ASL include the following: stative, inchoative ("to begin to..."), predisposional ("to tend to..."), susceptative ("to... easily"), frequentative ("to... often"), protractive ("to... continuously"), incessant ("to... incessantly"), durative ("to... for a long time"), iterative ("to... over and over again"), intensive ("to... very much"), resultative ("to... completely"), approximative ("to... somewhat"), semblitive ("to appear to..."), increasing ("to... more and more"). Some aspects combine with others to create yet finer distinctions.

Aspect is unusual in ASL in that transitive verbs derived for aspect lose their grammatical transitivity. They remain semantically transitive, typically assuming an object made prominent using a topic marker or mentioned in a previous sentence. See Syntax in ASL for details.

Terms for Various Aspects

The following aspectual terms are found in the literature. Approximate English equivalents are given.

- Perfective: 'I struck the bell' (an event viewed in its entirety, without reference to its temporal structure during its occurrence)
- Momentane: 'The mouse squeaked once' (contrasted to 'The mouse squeaked / was squeaking')
- Perfect (a common conflation of aspect and tense): 'I have arrived' (brings attention to the consequences of a situation in the past)
  - Recent perfect, also known as after perfect: 'I just ate' or 'I am after eating' (Hiberno-English)
- Prospective (a conflation of aspect and tense): 'I am about to eat', 'I am going to eat" (brings attention to the anticipation of a future situation)
- Imperfective (an action with ongoing nature: combines the meanings of both the progressive and the habitual aspects): 'I am walking to work' (progressive) or 'I walk to work every day' (habitual).
- Continuous: 'I am eating' or 'I know' (situation is described as ongoing and either evolving or unevolving; a subtype of imperfective)
- Progressive: 'I am eating' (action is described as ongoing and evolving; a subtype of continuous)
- Stative: 'I know French' (situation is described as ongoing but not evolving; a subtype of continuous)
- Habitual: 'I used to walk home from work', 'I would walk home from work every day', 'I walk home from work every day' (a subtype of imperfective)
- Gnomic/generic: 'Fish swim and birds fly' (general truths)
- Episodic: 'The bird flew' (non-gnomic)
- Continuative aspect: 'I am still eating'
- Inceptive ~ inchoative: 'I fell in love'

- Terminative ~ cessative: 'I finished my meal'
- Defective : 'I almost fell'
- Pausative: 'I stopped working for a while'
- Resumptive: 'I resumed sleeping'
- Punctual: 'I slept'
- Durative: 'I slept and slept'
- Delimitative: 'I slept for an hour'
- Protractive: 'The argument went on and on'
- Iterative: 'I read the same books again and again'
- Frequentative: 'It sparkled', contrasted with 'It sparked'. Or, 'I run around', vs. 'I run'
- Experiential: 'I have gone to school many times'
- Intentional: 'I listened carefully'
- Accidental: 'I knocked over the chair'
- Intensive: 'It glared'
- Moderative: 'It shone'
- Attenuative: 'It glimmered'

GRAMMATICAL CASE

In grammar, the case of a noun or pronoun is a change in form that indicates its grammatical function in a phrase, clause, or sentence. For example, a noun may play the role of subject ("*I* kicked the ball"), of direct object ("John kicked *me*"), or of possessor ("*My* ball"). Languages such as ancient Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit had ways of altering or inflecting nouns to mark roles which are not specially marked in English, such as the ablative case ("John kicked the ball *away from the house*") and the instrumental case ("John kicked the ball *with his foot*"). In ancient Greek those last three words would be rendered *tô podi*, with the noun *pous*, foot changing to *podi* to reflect the fact that John is using his foot as an instrument (any adjective modifying "foot" would also change case to match). Usually a language is said to "have cases" only if nouns change their form (decline) to reflect their case in this way. Other languages perform the same function in different ways.

English, for example, uses prepositions like "of" or "with" in front of a noun to indicate functions which in ancient Greek or Latin would be indicated by changing (declining) the ending of the noun itself.

More formally, case has been defined as "a system of marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear to their heads." Cases should be distinguished from thematic roles such as *agent* and *patient*. They are often closely related, and in languages such as Latin several thematic roles have an associated case, but cases are a syntactic notion, while thematic roles are a semantic one. Languages having cases often exhibit free word order, since thematic roles are not dependent on position in a sentence.

Etymology

In many European languages, the word for "case" is cognate to the English word, all stemming from the Latin *casus*, related to the third conjugation verb *cado, cadere*, "to fall", with the sense that all other cases have fallen away from the nominative. Its proto-Indo-European root is **kad-1*.

Similarly, the word for "declension" and its many European cognates, including its Latin source *declinatio* come from the root **klei-*, "to lean".

Indo-European Languages

While not very prominent in modern English, cases featured much more saliently in Old English and other ancient Indo-European languages, such as Latin, Ancient Greek, and Sanskrit. Historically, the Indo-European languages had eight morphological cases, though modern languages typically have fewer, using prepositions and word order to convey information that had previously been conveyed using distinct noun forms. Among modern languages, cases still feature prominently in most of the Balto-Slavic languages, with most having six to eight cases,

as well as German and Modern Greek, which have four. In German, cases are mostly marked on articles and adjectives, and less so on nouns.

The eight historic Indo-European cases are as follows, with examples:

- The nominative case, which corresponds to English's subjective case, indicates the subject of a finite verb:

  We went to the store.
- The accusative case, which together with the dative and ablative cases (below) corresponds to English's objective case, indicates the direct object of a verb:

  The clerk remembered us.
- The dative case indicates the indirect object of a verb:

  The clerk gave a discount to us .
- The ablative case indicates movement *from* something, and/or *cause*:

  The victim went from us to see the doctor.

  He was unhappy because of depression.
- The genitive case, which roughly corresponds to English's possessive case and preposition *of*, indicates the possessor of another noun:

  John's book was on the table.

  The pages of the book turned yellow with time.
- The vocative case indicates an addressee:

  John, are you O.K.? or *Hey John, are you O.K.?*
- The locative case indicates a location:

  We live in China.
- The instrumental case indicates an object used in performing an action:

  We wiped the floor with a mop.

  Written by hand.

All of the above are just rough descriptions; the precise distinctions vary from language to language, and are often quite complex. Case is arguably based fundamentally on changes to the noun to indicate the noun's role in the sentence. This is not how English works, where word order and prepositions are used to achieve this; as such it is debatable whether the above examples of English sentences can be said to be examples of 'case' in English.

Modern English has largely abandoned the inflectional case system of Indo-European in favor of analytic constructions. The personal pronouns of Modern English retain morphological case more strongly than any other word class (a remnant of the more extensive case system of Old English). For other pronouns, and all nouns, adjectives, and articles, grammatical function is indicated only by word order, by prepositions, and by the genitive clitic *-'s*.

Taken as a whole, English personal pronouns are typically said to have three morphological cases: the *nominative case* (such *subjective pronouns* as *I*, *he*, *she*, *we*), used for the subject of a finite verb and sometimes for the complement of a copula; the *accusative/dative case* (such *objective pronouns* as *me*, *him*, *her*, *us*), used for the direct or indirect object of a verb, for the object of a preposition, for an absolute disjunct, and sometimes for the complement of a copula; and the *genitive case* (such *possessive pronouns* as *my/mine*, *his*, *her(s)*, *our(s)*), used for a grammatical possessor. That said, these pronouns often have more than three forms; the possessive typically has both a *determiner* form (such as *my*, *our*) and a distinct *independent* form (such as *mine*, *ours*). Additionally, except for the interrogative personal pronoun *who*, they all have a distinct *reflexive* or *intensive* form (such as *myself*, *ourselves*).

Though English *pronouns* can have subject and object forms (he/him, she/her), *nouns* show only a singular/plural and a possessive/non-possessive distinction (e.g., *chair*,

chairs, *chair's*, *chairs'*). Note that *chair* does not change form between "the chair is here" (subject) and "I saw the chair" (direct object).

Declension Paradigms

Languages with rich nominal inflection typically have a number of identifiable declension classes, or groups of nouns that share a similar pattern of case inflection. While Sanskrit has six classes, Latin is traditionally said to have five declension classes, and ancient Greek three declension classes.

In Indo-European languages, declension patterns may depend on a variety of factors, such as gender, number, phonological environment, and irregular historical factors. Pronouns sometimes have separate paradigms. In some languages particularly Slavic, a case may contain different groups of endings depending on whether the word is a noun or an adjective. A single case may contain many different endings, some of which may even be derived from different roots. For example, in Polish, the genitive case has *-a, -u, -ow, -i* / *-y, -e-* for nouns, and *-ego, -ej, -ich* / *-ych* for adjectives. To a lesser extent, a noun's animacy and/or humanness may add another layer of complication.

Latin

An example of a Latin case inflection is given below, using the singular forms of the Latin term for "sailor," which belongs to Latin's first declension class.

- *nauta* (nominative) "[the] sailor" [as a subject] (e.g. *nauta ibi stat* the sailor is standing there)
- *nautae* (genitive) "the sailor's/of [the] sailor" (e.g. *nomen nautae est Claudius* the sailor's name is Claudius)
- *nautae* (dative) "to/for [the] sailor" [as an indirect object] (e.g. *nautae donum dedi* I gave a present to the sailor)

- *nautam* (accusative) "[the] sailor" [as a direct object] (e.g.*nautam vidi* I saw the sailor)
- *nautâ* (ablative) "from/with/in/by [the] sailor" [in various uses not covered by the above] (e.g. *sum altior nautâ* I am taller than the sailor).'
- *nauta* (vocative) "calling to/ addressing the sailor" (e.g. "gratias tibi ago, nauta" I thank you, sailor).

Sanskrit

Grammatical case was analyzed extensively in Sanskrit. The grammarian Paini identified six semantic roles or *karaka*, which are related to the seven Sanskrit cases (nominative, accusative, instrumental, dative, ablative, genitive, and locative), but not in a one-to-one way. The six *karaka* are:

- agent (*kartri*, related to the nominative)
- patient (*karman*, related to the accusative)
- means (*karaGa*, related to the instrumental)
- recipient (*sampradâna*, related to the dative)
- source (*apadana*, related to the ablative)
- locus (*adhikarana*, related to the locative)

For example, consider the following sentence:

vrikœh-at parn-am bhûm-au patati
from the tree a leaf to the ground falls
"a leaf falls from the tree to the ground"

Here *leaf* is the agent, *tree* is the source, and *ground* is the locus, the corresponding declensions are reflected in the morphemes *-am -at* and *-au* respectively.

Tamil

The Tamil case system is analyzed in native and missionary grammars as consisting of a finite number of cases. The usual treatment of Tamil case (Arden 1942) is one where there are seven cases—the nominative (first case), accusative (second case), instrumental (third), dative

(fourth), ablative (fifth), genitive (sixth), and locative (seventh). In traditional analyses there is always a clear distinction made between postpositional morphemes and case endings. The vocative is sometimes given a place in the case system as an eighth case, although vocative forms do not participate in usual morphophonemic alternations, nor do they govern the use of any postpositions.

Evolution

As languages evolve, case systems change. In Ancient Greek, for example, the genitive and ablative cases became combined, giving five cases, rather than the six retained in Latin. In modern Hindi, the Sanskrit cases have been reduced to two: a direct case (for subjects and direct objects) and an oblique case. In English, apart from the pronouns discussed above, case has vanished altogether.

Linguistic Typology

Languages are categorized into several case systems, based on their *morphosyntactic alignment* — how they group verb agents and patients into cases:

- *Nominative-accusative* (or simply *accusative*): The argument (subject) of an intransitive verb is in the same case as the agent (subject) of a transitive verb; this case is then called the *nominative case*, with the patient (direct object) of a transitive verb being in the *accusative case*.
- *Ergative-absolutive* (or simply *ergative*): The argument (subject) of an intransitive verb is in the same case as the patient (direct object) of a transitive verb; this case is then called the *absolutive case*, with the agent (subject) of a transitive verb being in the *ergative case*.
- *Ergative-accusative* (or *tripartite*): The argument (subject) of an intransitive verb is in its own case (the *intransitive case*), separate from that of the agent (subject) or patient (direct object) of a

transitive verb (which is in the ergative case or accusative case, respectively).

- *Active-stative* (or simply *active*): The argument (subject) of an intransitive verb can be in one of two cases; if the argument is an *agent*, as in "He ate," then it is in the same case as the agent (subject) of a transitive verb (sometimes called the *agentive case*), and if it's a *patient*, as in "He tripped," then it is in the same case as the patient (direct object) of a transitive verb (sometimes called the *patientive case*).
- *Trigger*: One noun in a sentence is the topic or focus. This noun is in the trigger case, and information elsewhere in the sentence (for example a verb affix in Tagalog) specifies the role of the trigger. The trigger may be identified as the agent, patient, etc. Other nouns may be inflected for case, but the inflections are overloaded; for example, in Tagalog, the subject and object of a verb are both expressed in the genitive case when they are not in the trigger case.

The following are systems that some languages use to mark case instead of, or in addition to, declension:

- *Positional*: Nouns are not inflected for case; the position of a noun in the sentence expresses its case.
- Adpositional: Nouns are accompanied by words that mark case.

Some languages have very many cases; for example, a Northeast Caucasian language, Tsez can be analyzed as having 126.

With a few exceptions, most languages in the Finno-Ugric group make extensive use of cases. Finnish has 15 cases according to the traditional understanding (or up to 30 depending on the interpretation). However, only 10 are

commonly used in speech. Estonian has 14 and Hungarian has 18.

John Quijada's constructed language Ithkuil has 81 noun cases, and its descendent Ilaksh has a total of 96 noun cases.

The lemma forms of words, which is the form chosen by convention as the canonical form of a word, is usually the most unmarked or basic case, which is typically the nominative, trigger, or absolutive case, whichever a language may have.

GRAMMATICAL MODIFIER

In grammar, a modifier (or qualifier) is an optional element in phrase structure or clause structure; the removal of the modifier typically doesn't affect the grammaticality of the construction. Modifiers can be a word, a phrase or an entire clause. Semantically, modifiers describe and provide more accurate definitional meaning for another element.

English Modifiers

In English, *adverbs* and *adjectives* prototypically function as modifiers, but they also have other functions. Moreover, other constituents can function as modifiers as the following examples show (the modifiers are in bold):

- [*Put it gently in the drawer*]. (adverb in verb phrase)
- *She set it down* [*very gently*]. (adverb in adverb phrase)
- *He was* [*very gentle*]. (adverb in adjective phrase)
- [*Even more*] *people were there.* (adverb in determiner phrase)
- *It ran* [*right up the tree*]. (adverb in prepositional phrase)
- *It was* [*a nice house*]. (adjective in noun phrase)
- *His desk was in* [*the faculty office*]. (noun in noun phrase)

- [*The swiftly flowing waters*] *carried it away*. (verb phrase in noun phrase)
- *I saw* [*the man whom we met yesterday*]. (clause in noun phrase)
- *She's* [*the woman with the hat*]. (preposition phrase in noun phrase)
- *It's not* [*that important*]. (determiner in adjective phrase)
- [*A few more*] *workers are needed*. (determiner in determiner phrase)
- *We've already* [*gone twelve miles*]. (noun phrase in verb phrase)
- *She's* [*two inches taller than I*]. (noun phrase in verb adjective phrase)

A premodifier is a modifier placed before the head (the modified component). A postmodifier is a modifier placed after the head, for example:

- *land mines* (pre-modifier)
- *mines in wartime* (post-modifier)
- *time immemorial* (post-modifier)

A few adjectives, borrowed from French, may be postmodifiers, generally with a change in meaning from their premodifier use. An example is *proper*:

They live in a proper town (in a real town)

They live in the proper town (in the town that's right for them)

They live in the town proper (in the town itself).

REFERENCES

Arden, A. H. (1942, repr. 1969). A Progressive Grammar of the Tamil Language. Madras: Christian Literature Society.

Bache, C. (1982). Aspect and Aktionsart: Towards a semantic distinction. Journal of Linguistics, 18(01), 57-72.

Berdinetto, P. M., & Delfitto, D. (2000). Aspect vs. Actionality: Some reasons for keeping them apart. In O. Dahl (Ed.), Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe (pp. 189–226). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Binnick, R. I. (1991). Time and the verb: A guide to tense and aspect. New York: Oxford University Press.

Binnick, R. I. (2006). Aspect and Aspectuality. In B. Aarts & A. M. S. McMahon (Eds.), The Handbook of English Linguistics (pp. 244–268). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Browne, Wayles and Theresa Alt (2004) A Handbook of Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian. [1] P.21

Carnie, Andrew (2002). *Syntax: A Generative Introduction* (1st ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. p. 75.

Chertkova, M. Y. (2004). Vid or Aspect? On the Typology of a Slavic and Romance Category [Using Russian and Spanish Material]. Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta, Filologiya, 58(9-1), 97-122.

Clackson, James (2007). *Indo-European Linguistics, An Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, B. (1976). Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dunn, Mark; Sergio Aragones (2005). *ZOUNDS!: A Browser's Dictionary of Interjections*. St. Martin's Griffin. ISBN 0-312-33080-4.

Frawley, W. (1992). Linguistic semantics. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Haegeman, Liliane (1994). *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. p. 137.

Harris, C. L. and Bates, E. A. (2002) 'Clausal backgrounding and pronominal reference: A functionalist approach to c-command'. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 17(3):237-269.

Heinecke, Johannes (2002). "Is there a Category of Dual in Breton or Welsh?". *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 7: 85–101.

Hockett, Charles F. (1958) *A Course in Modern Linguistics*, Macmillan, p. 231.

Kim Schulte (1994), *Pragmatic Causation in the Rise of the Romance Prepositional Infinitive: A statistically-based study with special reference to Spanish, Portuguese and Romanian*. PhD Dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Kortmann, B. (1991). The Triad "Tense-Aspect-Aktionsart". Belgian Journal of Linguistics, 6, 9-30.

MacDonald, J. E. (2008). The syntactic nature of inner aspect: A minimalist perspective. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Maslov, I. S. (1998). Vid glagol'nyj [Aspect of the verb]. In V. N. Yartseva (Ed.), Jazykoznanie: Bol'shoj entsyklopedicheskij slovar' (pp. 83–84).

Mayer, Gerald L. (1973) "Common Tendencies in the Syntactic Development of 'Two', 'Three,' and 'Four' in Slavic." *The Slavic and East European Journal* 17.3:308–314.

Richardson, K. (2007). Case and aspect in Slavic. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Ringe, Donald (2006). *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. New York: Oxford University Press

Sasse, H.J. (2002). Recent activity in the theory of aspect: Accomplishments, achievements, or just non-progressive state? Linguistic Typology, 6(2), 199-271.

Sasse, H.J. (2006). Aspect and Aktionsart. In E. K. Brown (Ed.), Encyclopedia of language and linguistics (Vol. 1, pp. 535–538). Boston: Elsevier.

Smith, C. S. (1991). The parameter of aspect. Dordrecht; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Swan, Oscar E. (2002). *A Grammar of Contemporary Polish*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica. pp. 57, 199, 216.

Tatevosov, S. (2002). The parameter of actionality. Linguistic Typology, 6(3), 317-401.

Tom McArthur (1992) "The Oxford Companion to the English Language", Oxford University Press.

Torrego, Esther (1998). *The dependencies of objects*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 34. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

van Berkum, J.J.A. (1996) *The psycholinguistics of grammatical gender: Studies in language comprehension and production.* Doctoral Dissertation, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics. Nijmegen, Netherlands: Nijmegen University Press.

Verkuyl, H. (2005). How (in-)sensitive is tense to aspectual information? In B. Hollebrandse, A. van Hout & C. Vet (Eds.), Crosslinguistic views on tense, aspect and modality (pp. 145–169). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Zalizniak, A. A., & Shmelev, A. D. (2000). Vvedenie v russkuiu aspektologiiu [Introduction to Russian aspectology]. Moskva: IAzyki russkoi kul'tury.

Zuckermann, Ghil'ad (2006). "Complement Clause Types in Israeli", *Complementation: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, edited by R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 72-92 (Chapter 3).

Glossary

Ablative: One of the six recognized cases in Latin. The ablative case signifies that a noun is either the object of a preposition that takes the ablative case or is being used in one of several adverbial usages, which students of Latin must simply learn: cause, description, degree of difference, manner, means, personal agent, respect, separation, time.

Ablative Absolute: This is a construction that uses a participle. It consists of a noun or pronoun in the ablative case with a participle agreeing with it. That explains why it's called *ablative*. It's called *absolute* because none of the words is tied directly into the grammar of the main clause of the sentence. In English, we have something we call a nominative absolute. Like this: *The door being open, all the flies were coming in.* Here's a simple one in Latin: His verbis ab oratore dictis, omnes se contulerunt, *with these words having been said by the orator, everyone departed.*

Ablative of Cause: An example may be more useful than a definition that merely rephrases the name. In hac urbe, multi cupiditate pecuniae novas res petebant, *in this city, many were seeking revolution because of the desire of money.*

Ablative of Description: We sometimes see the ablative case used to describe something. Like, Hoc erat monstrum magnâ magnitudine, *it was a monster in* (*or of*) *huge size.*

Ablative of Degree of Difference: Here's another instance of a use of the ablative case which is nearly perfectly

explained by its name. There are two ways to show comparison between two things in Latin. One is with the adverb quam, and another is to put the thing something is being compared to in the ablative case. So for the sentence *This city is bigger than that city*, Latin could write either Haec urbs maior est quam illa urbs, or Haec urbs maior est illâ urbe. Latin can also put a word into the ablative case to specify by how much something possess a quality. Like this: paulô post, *after by a little.*

Ablative of Manner: If Latin wants to indicate the way in which an action is performed, it can use either an adverb, or a word in the ablative case with the preposition cum. The preposition is somewhat optional in this construction, however. When the word isn't modified by an adjective, cum is always used. But if it is modified, the cum is optional. Study these examples: Caesar Galliam cum virtute vicit, *Caesar conquered Gaul with courage (or courageously)*; Caesar Galliam magnâ cum virtute vicit or Caesar Galliam magnâ virtute vicit, *Caesar conquered Gaul with great courage.*

Ablative of Means: The means by which an action is accomplished in indicated by the ablative case: Caesar omnem Galliam exercitu vicit, *Caesar conquered all of Gaul with his army.*

Ablative of Personal Agent: The person who performs the action of a passive verb is expressed with ab + ablative: Rex ab amicis necatus est, *the king was killed by his friends.* Please note that this construction is used *only* if the agent is a person. Otherwise, the ablative of means is used: Rex hoc glaudio necatus est, *the king was killed by (or with) this sword.*

Ablative of Respect or Specificiation: Latin can put a noun into the ablative case to indicate in what respect a statement is true, or to specify something

about another noun. Caesar virtute praeerat, *Caesar excelled in virtue*. Rex quidam, Cepheus nomine, hoc regnum illo tempore obtinebat, *a king, Cepheus by name, held the kingdom at that time.*

Ablative of Separation: Usually Latin expresses motion away from something with one of the prepositions ab, ex, de plus the ablative case. But if the idea of separation is strongly implied in the verb itself, then Latin can, and typically does, omit the preposition. This is called the ablative of separation. Caesar nos timore liberavit, *Caesar freed us from fear.*

Ablative of Time: A word denoting a unit of time can be put into the ablative case to indicate the time at which, or within which, a certain act takes place. Like this: Caesar paucis horis ad urbem pervênit, *Caesar arrived at the city within a few hours*; or Caesar diê eâdem ad urbem pervênit, *Caesar arrived at the city on the same day*.

Absolute (in Degrees of Adjectives): The comparative and superlative forms of adjectives and adverbs can be used without direct reference to anything else. We call this the absolute use and find different ways to translate it. For the comparative, we'd say *rather* instead of *more*. For the superlative, we'd say *very*, instead of *most*. For example, if the adjective fortior being used absolutely, you'll translate it as *rather brave*, instead of *braver*. Fortissimus used absolutely would be *very brave*, instead of *most brave*.

Accusative: One of the six cases in Latin. Nouns in the accusative case will be the direct object of a preposition, the direct object of a verb, or the subject of an infinitive in indirect statement. Another specialized use is the Accusative of Duration of Time.

Accusative of Duration of Time: One of the time

expressions in Latin. It indicates the length of time over which a certain action took, is taking, or will take place. Multos annos Caesar in Galliâ erat, *Caesar was in Gaul for many years.*

Adjective: A word that qualifies a noun is an adjective. Its etymology—*thrown* (iacio) and *near* (ad)—isn't a particularly useful guide to its meaning, other than indicating that adjectives are typically near the nouns they qualify. *Blue skies*, *tall building*. Adjectives can be in the positive, comparative, or superlative degrees.

Adverb: A word that qualifies a verb or an adjective is an adverb. A common formation of adverbs in English is an *-ly* suffix added to an adjective. *True* = *truly*; *helpful* = *helpfully*. In Latin, adjectives become adverbs by adding suffixes to the adjective in the positive, comparative, or superlative degrees.

Agreement: This word, and the verb *agree*, refers to grammatical correlation of related words. That is, in many constructions, the properties of one word has to be reflected in another word. Adjectives have to *agree* with the nouns they're modifying by taking on the number, gender, and case of the nouns: Video equum celerem, *I see the swift horse* A verb has to *agree* with its subject in person and number: Haec puellae ad urbem pervenerunt, *these girls arrived at the city.* A pronoun has to agree with its antecedent in number and gender: Haec urbs, quam Caesar cepit, parva erat, *this city, which Caesar captured, was small.* Verbal endings have to agree with the subject of the verb: In hac civitate multi pecuniam cupiebant, *In this city many people used to desire money.*

Allomorph: An alien being from another planet: *allo* from the Greek word *other* and *morph-* from the Greek word meaning *shape* or *form*: *Even the President was unaware of the extent of the conspiracy to conceal*

the allomorphs recovered at the Roswell crash site.

Antecedent: From the Latin words cedo meaning *to come* and ante meaning *before*. An antecedent is a word or idea to which a pronoun is referring. For example: *Betty is a friend of mine. We all like her.* In the second sentence, the word *her* is referring you to *Betty*, which came in the first sentence. Hence we can say that *Betty* is the antecedent of *her*.

Anticipatory Clause: The subjunctive can be used in subordinate clauses that express something that is expected or anticipated: Expectabam dum frater rediret, *I was waiting until my brother should return.*

Apodosis: The result of in a conditional, pronounced "ah PAH doh sis." Think of it as the "then" clause, even if there's no "then": *If you think I'm kidding, [then] you're sadly mistaken.* The "if" clause is called the "protasis" (pronounced "PRAH tah sis").

Apposition: From ad, *near* and positus, *placed*. It describes the construction in which one noun is placed next to another so as to modify it. *George, a friend of mine, is going to meet us at the theater*. *Friend* is in apposition to (or with) *George*. In Latin, the word in apposition will take on the same case as the word it's next to: Videsne Brutum, amicum Caesaris, *do you see Brutus, the friend of Caesar?*

Auxiliary Verb: In English, our verbs get helped along by all kinds of little words that change the verb's tense, mood and voice. These are called *auxiliary* or *helping* verbs. Like this *he will be seen.* Latin doesn't do this. All its helpers are attached to the end of the verb. The English example in Latin is videbitur, *see will he be*, where vide- is the verb, and bi and tur are helpers.

Case: A grammatical role or function a noun, adjective, or pronoun (or any word acting as a noun, adjective or pronoun) can play in a sentence. Latin and Greek indicate such roles principally by adding endings

to the word, called *case endings* (duh!). By contrast, English indicates different cases principally by position, though there still exist some case endings: e.g., *Jerry's friend*. Latin recognizes as many as seven such cases: Nominative, Genitive, Dative, Accusative, Ablative, Vocative, Locative.

Clause: This is basically a subject and a verb and whatever other helpful words that are related to them. You might think of a clause as a thought, like *this tree is tall.* That's a clause. A sentence can be made up of just one clause, like the example I just gave you. Or it can be made of several clauses. See the related topics Simple Sentence, Compound Sentence, Complex Sentence, Independent (or Main) Clause, Subordinate Clause, Coordinating Conjunction, Subordinating Conjunction.

Compound Sentence: This is a sentence composed of more than one clause and whose clauses are given equal importance. *The tree is tall and it's green.* This could also be written in a way that abbreviates the second clause: *The tree is tall and green.* Clauses in compound sentences are linked together by what's called *coordinating conjugations*, such as *and, but, or, nor,* because they *co*ordinate instead of *sub*ordinate clauses. When a sentence has more than one clauses that aren't given equal importance, the sentence is called complex (q.v.).

Cum Clause: A subordinate clause introduced by the conjunction cum can take a verb in the subjunctive mood: Cum haec intellegerent, irâ commoti sunt, *since they understood this, they were enraged.*

Dative: One of the cases in Latin. Words in the dative case can often be translated into English with the prepositions *to* or *for*.

Dative After a Compound Verb: You're going to see the dative case after compound verbs (a verb that's formed from a verbal stem and a prefix attached).

For example, occurro comes from preposition ob plus the verb curro, *to run*. We have curro, which means *to run*, turning into *to run up to* with the addition of the prefix ob. Hence it will be followed by the dative case.

Dative of Possession: The verb *sum* is often coupled with a dative case to show possession. So we have, Filii duo ei erant, *there were to him two sons,* or *he had two sons*; Nomen mihi est Exiliens, *my name is Skippy*.

Dative of Purpose: A common idiomatic use of the dative is to indicate the purpose of something: Hunc librum dono misi, *I sent this book as a gift*; Haec pecunia tibi auxilio erit, *this money will be as a help to you (will be helpful to you)*. This last construction is an example of what's often called the *double dative* because the person who's going to reap the benefit — tibi in this sentence — is also in the dative.

Dative with Special Verbs: This isn't really a grammatical category like the others; it's just a list of verbs in Latin that take the dative case which we English speakers strongly expect an accusative. That is, the Latin verbs are intransitive, whereas the English verbs are transitive. Here are some: placeo, *please*; displiceo, *displease*; servio, *serve*; confido, *trust*; ignosco, *forgive*; credo, *believe*; resisto, *resist*; studeo, *study*; impero, *command*; noceo, *harm*; pareo, *obey*; persuadeo, *persuade;* faveo, *favor*; parco, *spare*.

Declension: A pattern of case endings. There are five declensions in Latin.

Defective Verb: Some Latin verbs don't have all four principal parts. Like our verb *can* in English, which has no future, future perfect, pluperfect, or present perfect. The dictionary will list these verbs as best it can. Have a look at a couple of defective Latin verbs: coepi, coepisse, ceptus. This verb doesn't have a present system, so the dictionary just starts

with the perfect tense (which is really its third principal part if it had the first two), then the perfect infinitive, followed by the perfect passive participle. Another common occurrence is that a verb will lack the perfect passive participle. When this is the case, dictionaries will either put a blank when it would be, or will stick in the future active particple: fugio, -ere, fugi, ——, or fugio, -ere, fugi, fugiturus.

Demonstrative: A word that points to something: *this, that, these, those*, etc. Demonstratives can be used either as adjectives or as pronouns; that's why they're more properly called just *demonstratives,* and not demonstrative *pronouns, or* demonstrative *adjectives*. Adjective: *That car is blue*; Pronoun: *I don't like that*. The main demonstratives in Latin are *ille, hic, iste*.

Finite Verb: I don't know whether anyone else uses this term, but I use it to refer to a verb that has person (of which you can say first, second or third person). It helps distinguish them from forms that don't have person: infinitives, participles, and gerunds. So we say, *In the sentence* Caesar urbem capere non poterat, *the verb* poterat *is the finite verb.*

Future Active Participle: A participle formed from the fourth principal part of the verb + ûr + the first and second declension adjectival endings -us, -a, -um. It's hard to translate into English literally, but the formulas *about to* or *going to* can be used as stand-in's until the construction can be studied and a more felicitous translation found: laudaturus, *about to praise.* A note: the future active participle is one of the rare active forms in deponent verbs.

Future Passive Participle: A participle formed from the first principal part of the verb + nd + the first and second declension adjectival endings -us, -a, -um. It's hard to translate into English literally, but the

formulas *about to be* or *going to be* can be used as stand-in's until the construction can be studied and a more felicitous translation found: laudandus, *about to be praised.* A very common use of the future passive participle is in construction is known as the passive periphrastic.

Genitive: One of the six cases in Latin. In addition to a few specialized uses which have to be studied separately, the genitive case very often shows possession, and therefore can be translated with our preposition *of* or the ending *-'s.*

Genitive of Description: The name practically tells you everything about this construction. The genitive case can be used like an adjective: equus magnae celeritatis, *horse of great speed.*

Gerund: A verbal noun. That is, a verb treated as if it were a noun. In English, there are two forms for gerunds. We can use the infinitive, as in *To know me is to love me*, and the stem + -ing, as in *Seeing is believing*. Latin uses the infinitive for the nominative case, and the first principal part + nd + 2nd declension, neuter endings for the other cases. The gerund is considered to be neuter in gender.

Gerundive: A gerund*ive* is an adject*ive*. That's how you can keep it distinct from a gerund (above) which is a verbal noun. The gerundive is morphologically the future passive participle of the verb: the first principal part + nd + -us, -a, -um. One common use is the future passive periphrastic. Another is with the proposition ad to show purpose. And example of the latter is Ad urbes conservandas omnia paravit, *he did everything to save the cities.*

Historical Present: Very often a story will refer to a past event in the present tense. This is to give the event some vividness that a past tense would lack. We do this in English frequently, when we say *So I sezs to him, I sezs . . .* instead of *So I said to him, I said*

. . . Or, in what what has become common in football commentary during replay, *If he catches it, it's a touchdown.*

Hortatory or Jussive Subjunctive: One use of the subjunctive mood is to give a command, or inducement to do something in the first or third persons. (A command in the second person is usually given in the imperative mood.) Examples, Veniant, *let them come*; fugiamus, *let's beat it.*

Independent (or Main) Clause: This is a clause in the sentence that conveys the principal idea. If you can take a clause as it is out of a sentence and make a whole sentence out of it without changing anything, then you what you have is an Independent (or Main) Clause. For example: *George, who is a friend of mine, is on his way here.* This is a complex sentence because it has a subordinate clause in it. The main clause is *George . . . is on his way here.* This can stand alone as a sentence, but the subordinate clause *who is my friend* can't.

Indirect Command: One of kind of noun clause is the indirect command. It's exactly what it sounds like, an original command that reported as the object of a verb. In English, an indirect command is verb often expressed by nothing more than an infinitive. Direct: *Get lost.* Indirect: *I'm telling you to get lost*. Latin expresses its indirect commands in a subordinate clause introduced by ut, for a positive command, or by ne, for a negative command. The verb is subjunctive. Like so: Caesar eis persuasit ut sibi pecuniam traderent, *Caesar persuaded them to give him the money.*

Indirect Question: A question that is reported as the object of another verb. In English, we have *Where are you?* as a direct question. In this sentence, *I wonder where you are*, the question is dependent on the main verb *wonder*. Hence we call the second

instance of the question *indirect*. In Latin, the main verb of an indirect question is in the subjunctive mood: Direct: Quid mihi placet *what do I like?* Indirect: Scis quid mihi placeat, *you know what I like.*

Indirect Statement: A statement that is reported as the object of another verb. Like this: The direct statement, *Caesar is coming*, becomes indirect as the object of a verb like *I think* or *say* or *hear* or *believe* . . . any kind of a verb that connotes a mental or sensate activity. So in English, we could say *I think that Caesar is coming*, or we could omit the conjunction *that* and just say *I think Caesar is coming.* Very little is changed in the original direct statement when it becomes indirect.

Infinitive: One of the verb forms that doesn't have person. This one is often translated with our English thingie *to* plus the meaning of the verb, but not always: Haec urbs deleri non poterat, *this city was not able to be destroyed* or *could not be destroyed*.

Interrogative: It means *asking a question*. You'll hear this in expressions like *interrogative pronoun* and *interrogative adjective*. The former means a pronoun that asks a question, like quid, *what?* or quis, *who?* The latter means an adjective that asks a question, like qui homines, *which men?* or quae femina, *which woman*.

Intransitive: When the energy depicted in a verb doesn't affect anything but the subject itself—that is, when the verb has no direct object—we say that the verb is *intransitive*. That's because there's no *transition* of energy from a subject to an object. In English, *sneeze* is intransitive, but *push* is not. We say *push*—as in *they're pushing the envelope*—is a transitive verb. Beginning students of Latin experience some difficulty grasping this concept because most verbs in English can be used transitively or intransitively

depending on the context. For example, we can say *The bird is flying,* (intransitive), but we can also say *I'm flying a kite* (transitive). Latin verb typically don't have this kind of dual possibility. They're either transitive or intransitive.

Imperfect Subjunctive: Stem of the first principal part + re + primary personal endings: laudaret.

Labial: Referring to any sound made with the lips: the *p* and the *b*.

Locative Case: One of the six cases in Latin. This case is pretty rare, and it looks like other, more popular cases. It's the case a word is in when it's showing location (hence the name *locative*). You'll see only certain words in the locative case—obviously only words that connote place. Like humi (*from* humus), *on the ground.* Also the names of cities and small islands are used in the locative case to show place where, instead of what we'd expect: the preposition in plus the ablative case. See Place Constructions.

Linking Verb: Also called a copulative verb.(Don't look up c*opulative verb*. You'll be sent right back here.) Verbs that link the subject directly to something in the predicate that modifies it are called linking verbs. When this happens, the thing out in the predicate is in the nominative case and is therefore called a predicate nominative. Caesar videtur esse bonus dux, *Caesar seems to be a good leader.*

Litotes: Pronounced *lie TOE teez*, this construction a way to affirms a positive by denying the negative. In English, we can say *not bad*, when we mean *good*; *not far* when we mean *nearby*. It has nothing to do with elementary Latin grammar, but I like the word, so I included it.

Morphology: This is a bombastic term I use sometimes in weak moments when I get writer's block. It basically means *form*, and I'll use it to refer to the grammar of a word that's contained in its form. So I'll say,

the morphology of this word is passive, but we have to translate it as if it's active. Translation: *if we look at the way the word is spelled, we see that it has a passive form, but we have to translate it as if it's active.*

Nominative: One of the six recognized cases in Latin. A word in the nominative is often the subject of a verb, but not always. A word in the nominative can be found in the predicate of the sentence, if it is referring to the subject. This use of the nominative is called the predicate nominative. It's also the form of the word that's used in referring to the word in a Latin class. For example, if the teacher asks *What's the Latin word for 'tree*,' the student should answer 'arbor,' which is the nominative case of the word.

Noun: A word signifying a thing, place, idea, or an action that is being conceived of as an idea; *tree*, *city, truth*, *running*. See also Noun Clause.

Noun Clause: A clause that functions as a noun in a sentence by being the subject or object of a verb. Sometimes called an object clause. Dixit Caesarem ad urbem venturum esse. You can analyze this sentence as a verb with an object. He said "x." And what is "x?" It's the fact that Caesar was coming to the city. You'll often see noun clauses as the object of verbs of fearing: Vereor ne pecuniam omnem amittam*, I'm afraid that I'll lose my money*. Another common use of a noun clause is as a noun clause of fact: Accidit ut Ceasar in urbe esset, *it happened that Caesar was in the city*.

Optative Subjunctive: This somewhat rare subjunctive is limited to certain stock invocations of something wished for. It's nearly always introduced by an adverb, like this: Utinam veniat! *would that he would come* or *golly, I wish he'd come.*

Participle: An adjective derived from a verb. In the

expression *the singing nun, singing* is derived from the verb *to sing*, and here it's modifying *nun*. Participles preserve tense and voice from their verbal heritage. In the example above, the participle is present and active, since *singing* is something the nun does (active) and this quality is seen as an ongoing, continuous state (present). A verb can have as many as four participles: the future active and passive, the present active, and the perfect passive. Since they are adjectives, it follows that they will have to agree in number, gender, and case with the nouns they're modifying. Accordingly, participles will have to decline according to declensional patterns.

Passive Periphrastic: This is a very common construction using the gerundive of the verb linked to the subject through a conjugated form of the verb sum. It's called *periphrastic* because it contains the additional sense of obligation or necessity that has to be periphrased in the English translation. Like this: Haec urbs conservanda est, *this city is to be (ought to be, should be, must be, has to be) saved.*

Perfect Passive System of Tenses: Verb tenses in Latin divided into three different systems, depending on which principal part of the verb they use in their formation. The perfect passive system of tenses consists of the perfect, future perfect, and pluperfect in the passive voice, and they are all formed using the fourth principal part of the verb linked to the subject with a conjugated form of the verb sum. Like this: Laudatus (4th principal part) sum (conjugated form of sum) = *I was praised.* Adiuti sumus, *we were helped*. Omnis dies consumptus est, *the entire day was spent.*

Perfect Subjunctive: Active: third principal part + eri + active primary personal endings. Passive: fourth principal part and the present subjunctive of sum: laudaverit; laudatus sit.

Person: In the patois of grammar, this means the position a being has relative to the speaker of a sentence. What? Like this: If a reference is being made to the speaker or to a group of people to speaker is identified with, we call that the first person. If a reference is being made to the speaker's direct audience, we call that second person. And if a reference is being made to the thing that the speaker is speaking about (and if it's not his audience), then we call that the third person. And there you have it. *Have I* (first person) *explained it* (third person) *clearly enough to you* (second person)?

Personal Pronoun: These are pronouns which also convey grammatical person: 1st: ego, nos*, etc.;* 2nd, tu, vos*, etc.;* 3rd. is, ea, id*, etc.*

Pluperfect Subjunctive: Active: third principal part + isse + active primary personal endings. Passive: fourth principal part and the imperfect subjunctive of sum: laudavisset; laudatus esset.

Predicate: The part of the sentence left over after you take the subject out. You see, the subject of a sentence is what you're talking about. The predicate is what you're saying about it. For example, in this sentence the subject group is underlined, and the predicate is in green: *The tree is a real monster to climb because it has thorns and no low branches you can reach from the ground without a ladder.*

Predicate Nominative: When you have something in predicate that's directly referring to the subject, it'll be in the nominative case. That's what we mean by a predicate nominative. Here's one: Haec filia Claudia appellabatur, *this girl was named Claudia*. Do you see? Claudia is tied to the subject by the linking verb appellabatur.

Present Active Participle: A participle formed from the first principal part of the verb, with the third declension adjectival ending -ns, -ntis. It shows time contemporaneous with that of the main verb.

Present System of Tenses: Verb tenses in Latin divided into three different systems, depending on which principal part of the verb they use in their formation. The present system of tenses consists of the present, future and imperfect and they are all formed from the first principal part of the verb.

Present Subjunctive: 1st conjugation verbs: replace the thematic vowel â with ê. 2nd, 3rd and 4th conjugation verbs: first principal part + â + primary personal endings: laudet < laudo; moneat < moneo; ducat < duco; capiat < capio; veniat < venio. For a discussion of the subjunctive mood *per se*, *vide* subjunctive.

Primary Personal Endings: This is the set of personal endings used in the present system of tense and the subjunctive mood of the present and perfect active systems: -o, -m, -r; -s, -ris; -t, -tur; -mus, -mur; -tis, -mini; -nt, -ntur.

Primary Sequence: This is one of the categories of the rules of the Sequence of Tenses. If the main verb of a sentence is in a primary tense (present, future, or a perfect that can be translated into English with the auxiliary *have*), then any subordinate subjunctives in the sentence must be in one of these three tenses: present, to show time contemporaneous with or subsequent to that of the main verb, perfect, to show time prior to that of the main verb, or a periphrastic future (the future active participle plus the present subjunctive of the verb sum) to show time subsequent.

Principal Parts: The building blocks of verbs. They are the stems or roots of all the tenses of a verb. Typically a verb will have four principal parts, unless it's a defective or deponent verb. The first principal part is the stem for the present system of tenses active and passive, the second principal is there to give you more information about the first principal part (namely to identify the stem vowel and hence its

conjugation), the third principal part is the stem of the perfect system active, and the fourth principal part is use as the participle in the perfect system passive.

Primary Tenses: These are the tenses that use the stem of the first principal part as the root. To wit, the present, future, and imperfect tenses.

Protasis: The "if" clause of a conditional sentence, where the condition is stated: *If you think I'm kidding, [then] you're sadly mistaken.* Then "then" clause is called the apodosis (ah PAH doh sis). Sometimes we can omit the "if": *Had you done your homework correctly (= if you had done your homework correctly), you would not have made such an idiot out of yourself in class yesterday.*

Pronoun: A word that stands in (pro-) for another noun. *We all like Betty. She is very nice.*

Proper Noun: Like *Bob*. The word *proper* ultimately comes from the Latin proprius, which means *one's own.* Not all boys can be called *Bob.* Only those boys whose *propre* — that is, own — name is *Bob* can be called *Bob*. If this isn't right, please contact me immediately: dagrote@email.uncc.edu.

Proviso Clause: The conjunctions dum, modo, and dummodo, when they mean *provided that* or *if only*, take the subjunctive mood: Urbs salva erit, dum tu exeas, *the city will be safe provided that you leave.*

Purpose Clause: A subordinate clause that indicate the purpose for which the action of the main clause is undertaken is called a purpose, or final, clause: Haec dixit, ut (ne) veritatem sciretis, *he said these things so that you would (not) know the truth*.

Question: Don't be stupid, Larry. You really don't know what a question is? Okay, here goes. It's a sentence that seeks information. In English, we can make questions by using interrogatives or auxiliary verbs or sometimes both: *What is wrong with you?, Are*

you coming? Whom do you see? Since Latin doesn't have auxiliaries like us, it mostly used interrogatives. Quid novi? Venisne? Quem vides?

Quîn Clause : This is always hard for beginning, and even intermediate students, to grasp. The conjunction quîn means *but that*, and since no one goes around saying *but that* anymore, it's not a terribly helpful definition. Quîn is often used to link a negatived main clause, usually expressing a doubt, with a subordinate clause. The verb in the subordinate clause is subjunctive. Like so: Non dubium quin Caesar fortis sit, *there is no doubt that Caesar is brave.*

Relative Clause: A subordinate clause introduced by a relative pronoun. Relative clauses modify something, called the antecedent, in the main clause of the sentence in the way an adjective would. Hence a relative clause is sometimes referred to as an *adjective clause*. Puellam vidi, quae ad urbem nostram pervenerat, *I saw the girl who had arrived at our city*.

Relative Clause of Characteristic: When a relative clause is modifying an antecedent that is indefinite, or when the relative clause is stating something hypothetical or conditional about its antecedent, its verb is in the subjunctive: Nemo est qui haec faciat, *there is no one who would do these things.*

Relative Clause of Purpose: A common use of the relative clause is to show purpose. In this usage, the verb is in the subjunctive mood, and the best way to translate it into English is with an infinitive: Legatos Caesar misit, qui haec nuntiarent, *Caesar sent messengers who would announce these things* or better *to announce these things.*

Result Clause: A subordinate clause that indicates the result of something expressed in the main clause is called a result, or consecutive, clause. See that,

Larry, result . . . clause, result clause: Tantâ cum celeritate cucurrit, ut amicum sequeretur, *he ran with such great speed that he caught up with his friend.* Tantâ cum celeritate cucurrit, ut nemo eum sequeretur, *he ran with such great speed that no one caught up with him.*

Resumptive Relative: The Latin relative pronoun often stands at the beginning of a sentence and refers to something in the preceding sentence, or it may refer to the whole sentence as its antecedent. We call this use of the relative pronoun the *resumptive relative* because it *resumes* the line of thought from the last sentence. Did you get that, Larry? *resumes, resumptive?* You can translate it either as it is, which drives English purists out of their minds, or you can replace the relative with its equivalent of the demonstrative. Example: Quae cum dixisset . . . , *when he had said which things*, or *when he had said these things* (haec).

Secondary Sequence: This is one of the categories of the rules of the Sequence of Tenses. If the main verb of a sentence is in a secondary tense (perfect, future perfect, or a pluperfect), then any subordinate subjunctives in the sentence must be in one of these three tenses: imperfect, to show time contemporaneous with or subsequent to that of the main verb, pluperfect, to show time prior to that of the main verb, or a periphrastic future (the future active participle plus the imperfect subjunctive of the verb sum) to show time subsequent.

Sequence of Tenses: The dirty little secret about the subjunctive mood is that it doesn't allow verbs to show absolute tense. Instead, verbs in the subjunctive mood indicate only aspect of action: whether the action is conceived of as a progressive act, or whether it is conceived as a complete act. That may seem like nothing but cheap metaphysics,

but it has some real consequences in Latin grammar. Verbs in subordinate clauses that require the subjunctive mood show action *relative* to the time of the main verb; they'll show time before it, after it, or contemporaneous with it. In summary the sequence of tense are the rules that state the tenses that are permissible in subordinate subjunctives and what temporal relationship they indicate to the main verb. See Primary and Secondary Sequence.

Simple Sentence: This is a sentence consisting of only one clause. *The river is wide* is a simple sentence. See Clause for more stuff.

Subject: Sentences can be thought of as a subject (what you're talking about) and a predicate (what you're saying about it). Usually the subject will be the thing performing the action of the finite verb, or will be receiving the action of the verb if the verb is passive. In the sentence *George talks too much, George* is the subject of the sentence, and the subject of the finite verb *talks*. In Latin, the subject of a verb will be in the nominative case.

Subjunctive Mood: This is one of the moods (or modes) of a Latin verb. (The others are indicative, infinitive, participial, and imperative.) The word *subjunctive* gives some indication as to the use of the subjunctive mood: sub*, under,* and *junctive* from the Latin verb iungo, which means *join*. The subjunctive mood is called the *under joined* mood, because it's mostly used in subordinate clauses. The hard thing for us to get used to is that the subjunctive mood doesn't really mean anything in itself. The subjunctive mood is simply a feature of Latin syntax for which we have to find English equivalents. This means that to become comfortable with this mood, we have to learn (1) to recognize the subjunctive when we see it, and (2) to study the different constructions in which it appears in Latin.

Subordinating Conjunction: This is a word that joins (*conjunction)* two clauses in a way that attributes a supporting role to the clause it's in. Like this: *After it rained, many mushrooms were found in the forest.* See there? The most important idea is *mushrooms were found in the forest,* the *after* clause tells you a little something more about it. Some other subordinating conjunctions in English are: *although, as if, because, if, when, while.*

Subordinate Clause: This is a clause that's a dependent part of a complex sentence. They are usually introduced by a subordinating conjunction, and can't stand by themselves as a sentence if taken out. For example, *George, who is a friend of mine, is on his way here.* This is a complex sentence because it has a subordinate clause in it. The main clause is *George . . . is on his way here.* This can stand alone as a sentence, but the subordinate clause *who is my friend* can't.

Transitive: If a verb takes a direct object, it's called a *transitive* verb. This means that there's a movement of energy from a subject, through the verb, and onto an object which it directly affects. That's what the word *transitive* means etymologically: *trans* (*across*) and *it* (from the verb eo, *to go*). There's a *transition* of energy. What makes this concept a little difficult to grasp for English speaking students is that English verbs nearly always be used both intransitively and transitively. Consider. You can *run an engine* (transitive) or you can *run* in the park (intransitive). Latin verbs don't usually have this capacity: they're either transitive or intransitive by nature.

Vocative: One of the six cases in Latin. It's the form a word has when it's being directly addressed, as in Ave, Caesar, *hail Caesar.* It had nearly disappeared as an identifiable form of the noun by the classical

period, being almost always the same as the nominative case of the noun. The only place it differs is in nouns of the second declension whose nominative ends in -us: Et tu, Brute, *You too, Brutus*?

Voice: A term used to describe the relationship between a subject of a verb and the action of the verb. In Latin, there are two voices that are recognized by the verb form. Either the subject is performing the action (active voice) or receiving the action (passive voice). Active: Romani Caesarem laudaverunt, *the Romans praised Caesar*. Passive: Caesar ab Romanis laudatus est, *Caesar was praised by the Romans.*

Bibliography

Abney, S. P. (1987). The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect. Ph. D. thesis, MIT, Cambridge MA.

Arden, A. H. (1942, repr. 1969). A Progressive Grammar of the Tamil Language. Madras: Christian Literature Society.

Bache, C. (1982). Aspect and Aktionsart: Towards a semantic distinction. Journal of Linguistics, 18(01), 57-72.

Baltin, Mark (1987). Do Antecedent-Contained Deletions Exist? Linguistic Inquiry 18 (4):579-595.

Barwise, Jon and Robin Cooper (1981). Generalized quantifiers and natural language. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4: 159-219.

Bennett, David C. (1975). *Spatial and Temporal Uses of English Prepositions: An Essay in Stratificational Semantics*. London: Longman.

Berdinetto, P. M., & Delfitto, D. (2000). Aspect vs. Actionality: Some reasons for keeping them apart. In O. Dahl (Ed.), Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe (pp. 189–226). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Binnick, R. I. (1991). Time and the verb: A guide to tense and aspect. New York: Oxford University Press.

Binnick, R. I. (2006). Aspect and Aspectuality. In B. Aarts & A. M. S. McMahon (Eds.), The Handbook of English Linguistics (pp. 244–268). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Bouton, L. (1970). Antecedent-Contained Pro-forms. In Proceedings of Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago

Linguistic Society, ed. M. Campbell Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Brian Roark; Richard William Sproat (2007). *Computational approaches to morphology and syntax*. Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780199274772. part II: Computational approaches to syntax.

Brown, Keith; Jim Miller (eds.) (1996). *Concise Encyclopedia of Syntactic Theories*. New York: Elsevier Science. ISBN 0-08-042711-1.

Brown, Keith; Jim Miller (eds.) (1996). *Concise Encyclopedia of Syntactic Theories*. New York: Elsevier Science.

Browne, Wayles and Theresa Alt (2004) A Handbook of Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian. [1] P.21

Carnie, Andrew (2002). *Syntax: A Generative Introduction* (1st ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. p. 75.

Carnie, Andrew (2006). *Syntax: A Generative Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. ISBN 1405133848.

Chertkova, M. Y. (2004). Vid or Aspect? On the Typology of a Slavic and Romance Category [Using Russian and Spanish Material]. Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta, Filologiya, 58(9-1), 97-122.

Clackson, James (2007). *Indo-European Linguistics, An Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, B. (1976). Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Curzan, Anne; Adams, Michael (2009). *How English Works: A Linguistic Introduction* (2nd ed.), New York: Pearson Longman, p. 152.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1977). "Where have all the adjectives gone?". *Studies in Language* 1: 19–80.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1999). Adjectives. In K. Brown & T. Miller (Eds.), *Concise encyclopedia of grammatical categories* (pp. 1–8). Amsterdam: Elsevier. ISBN 0-08-043164-X.

Dixon, R. M. W.; R. E. Asher (Editor) (1993). *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (1st ed.). Pergamon Press Inc. pp. 29–35. ISBN 0080359434.

Dunn, Mark; Sergio Aragones (2005). *ZOUNDS!: A Browser's Dictionary of Interjections*. St. Martin's Griffin. ISBN 0-312-33080-4.

Emonds, Joseph E. (1985) *A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Frawley, W. (1992). Linguistic semantics. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Freidin, Robert; Howard Lasnik (eds.) (2006). *Syntax*. Critical Concepts in Linguistics. New York: Routledge.

Graffi, Giorgio (2001). *200 Years of Syntax. A Critical Survey*. Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 98. Amsterdam: Benjamins. ISBN 90-272-4587-8.

Haegeman, Liliane (1994). *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. p. 137.

Harris, C. L. and Bates, E.A. (2002). 'Clausal backgrounding and pronominal reference: A functionalist approach to c-command'. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 17(3):237-269.

Haspelmath, Martin. (2003). "Adpositions". *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics.* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN 0-19-513977-1.

Heinecke, Johannes (2002). "Is there a Category of Dual in Breton or Welsh?". *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 7: 85–101.

Hockett, Charles F. (1958) *A Course in Modern Linguistics*, Macmillan, p. 231.

Hornstein, Norbert (1994). An Argument for Minimalism: The Case of Antecedent-Contained Deletion. Linguistic Inquiry 25 (3):455-480.

Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge*

Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Kahn, John Ellison and Robert Ilson, Eds. (1985). *The Right Word at the Right Time: A Guide to the English Language and How to Use It*, pp. 27–29. London: The Reader's Digest Association Limited.

Kennedy, Christopher (1997). Antecedent-Contained Deletion and the Syntax of Quantification. Linguistic Inquiry 28 (4):662-688.

Kroeger, Paul (2005). *Analysing Grammar: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 32.

Libert, Alan R. (2006). *Ambipositions*. LINCOM studies in language typology (No. 13). LINCOM. ISBN 3-89586-747-0.

Lyons, John (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. London: Cambridge U.P., Print.

MacDonald, J. E. (2008). The syntactic nature of inner aspect: A minimalist perspective. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Maslov, I. S. (1998). Vid glagol'nyj [Aspect of the verb]. In V. N. Yartseva (Ed.), Jazykoznanie: Bol'shoj entsyklopedicheskij slovar' (pp. 83–84).

May, Robert (1985). *Logical Form: Its Structure and Derivation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Montague, Richard (1974). 'The proper treatment of quantification in English', in R. Montague, Formal Philosophy, ed. by R. Thomason (New Haven).

Pullum, Geoffrey K. (2005). "Phrasal Prepositions in a Civil Tone." *Language Log*. Accessed 9 September 2007.

Pullum, Geoffrey K. (21 June 2008). "Twenty selected Coalface errors". *Language Log*.

Rauh, Gisa. (1991). *Approaches to Prepositions*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Reindl, Donald F. (2001). "Areal Effects on the Preservation and Genesis of Slavic Postpositions". In Lj. Šariæ and D. F. Reindl *On Prepositions* (= Studia Slavica

Oldenburgensia 8), pp. 85–100. Oldenburg: Carl-von-Ossietzky-Universitat Oldenburg.

Richardson, K. (2007). Case and aspect in Slavic. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Ringe, Donald (2006). *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. New York: Oxford University Press

Sasse, H.J. (2002). Recent activity in the theory of aspect: Accomplishments, achievements, or just non-progressive state? Linguistic Typology, 6(2), 199-271.

Sasse, H.J. (2006). Aspect and Aktionsart. In E. K. Brown (Ed.), Encyclopedia of language and linguistics (Vol. 1, pp. 535–538). Boston: Elsevier.

Smith, C. S. (1991). The parameter of aspect. Dordrecht; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Swan, Oscar E. (2002). *A Grammar of Contemporary Polish*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica. pp. 57, 199, 216.

Zuckermann, Ghil'ad (2006). "Complement Clause Types in Israeli", *Complementation: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, edited by R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 72-92 (Chapter 3).

Zweig, Eytan (2005). "Nouns and Adjectives in Numeral NPs", *Proceedings of NELS* 33, http://homepages.nyu.edu/~ez255/downloads/NELS35_numeral_phrases_proceedings.pdf

Index

■■■

Contents

Preface

Within traditional grammar, the syntax of a language is described in terms of taxonomy (i.e. the classificatory list) of the range of different types of syntactic structures found in the language. The central assumption underpinning syntactic analysis in traditional grammar is that phrases and sentences are built up of a series of constituents (i.e. syntactic units), each of which belongs to a specific grammatical category and serves a specific grammatical function. Given this assumption, the task of the linguist analyzing the syntactic structure of any given type of sentence is to identify each of the constituents in the sentence, and (for each constituent) to say what category it belongs to and what function it serves. In contrast to the taxonomic approach adopted in traditional grammar, Noam Chomsky takes a cognitive approach to the study of grammar. For Chomsky, the goal of the linguist is to determine what it is that native speakers *know* about their native language which enables them to speak and understand the language fluently: hence, the study of language is part of the wider study of cognition (i.e. what human beings know). In a fairly obvious sense, any native speaker of a language can be said to *know* the grammar of his or her native language. Syntax is the study of the principles and processes by which sentences are constructed in particular languages. Syntactic investigation of a given language has as its goal the construction of a grammar that can be viewed as a device of some sort for producing the sentences of the language under analysis. Modern

research in syntax attempts to describe languages in terms of such rules. Many professionals in this discipline attempt to find general rules that apply to all natural languages. The term syntax is also used to refer to the rules governing the behavior of mathematical systems, such as formal languages used in logic and computer programming languages. Although there has been interplay in the development of the modern theoretical frameworks for the syntax of formal and natural languages, this article surveys only the latter. There are a number of theoretical approaches to the discipline of syntax. One school of thought, founded in the works of Derek Bickerton, sees syntax as a branch of biology, since it conceives of syntax as the study of linguistic knowledge as embodied in the human mind. Other linguists (e.g. Gerald Gazdar) take a more Platonistic view, since they regard syntax to be the study of an abstract formal system. Yet others (e.g. Joseph Greenberg) consider grammar a taxonomical device to reach broad generalizations across languages. Andrey Korsakov's school of thought suggests philosophic understanding of morphological and syntactic phenomena.

This publication titled, "English Syntax" provides readers with an introductory overview of *English syntax. Attempts are made* towards understanding English grammar in its totality. Focus lies on noun, pronoun, adjective, verb and adverb. Proper reflections are made on tense, preposition and conjugation. Special focus lies on phrase types, article and clause. Special reflections are made on adjunct, conjunct, disjunct and apposition. Additional focus lies on c-command, declension, word, gerund and grammatical aspects of syntax. This publication titled, "English Syntax" is completely user-friendly as it also gives readers a glossary, bibliography and index.

—Editor

English Syntax

This publication provides readers with an introductory overview of *English syntax. Attempts are made* towards understanding English grammar in its totality. Focus lies on noun, pronoun, adjective, verb and adverb. Proper reflections are made on tense, preposition and conjugation. Special focus lies on phrase types, article and clause. Special reflections are made on adjunct, conjunct, disjunct and apposition. Additional focus lies on c-command, declension, word, gerund and grammatical aspects of syntax.

English Syntax