Click to prove
you're human

Hi all, For the construction "find something (to be) + adjective", is the "to be" optional? e.g. You have given me the same reply, which I still find (to be) unclear. e.g. I find your behaviour (to be) unacceptable. Many thanks! Yes, it is optional. Using it is a style choice. The to be is not normally required at all. When it is used, it tends to either add emphasis and/or denote a contrast. I find her charming / He found the case delightful I found the book to be even better than he been led to expect They found the story to be true Hi all, For the construction "find something (to be) + adjective", is the "to be" optional? e.g. You have given me the same reply, which I still find (to be) unclear. e.g. I find your behaviour (to be) unacceptable. Many thanks! Yes: In complex-transitives the AdjP or NP can be complement of the verb, thus "unacceptable" and "unclear" are complements of "find". Some modern grammars have an analysis of which (i.e. reply) unclear and behaviour unacceptable are verbless (or small) clauses. Hi. Is the "was" optional in the following sentence? I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. Thanks a lot! Hi. Is the "was" optional in the following sentence? I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. Thanks a lot! My guess here! I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. = I found that taking a warm bath was relaxing. = I discovered that taking a warm bath was relaxing. I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. = In my opinion, taking a warm bath was relaxing. Waiting for a native speaker to confirm the above. EdisonBhola answered that question, Silver. Your sentence with "was" sounds literary and would be less common, I think. Thanks a lot, but my question is: Is the "was" optional in the following sentence? I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [1] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [2] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. Grammatically, I'd say that [1] is correct. Direct objects are virtually always noun phrases, but exceptionally there are grounds for saying that "taking a warm bath" is direct object of "found", and "relaxing" is objective predicative complement. [2] is strictly speaking incorrect because gerund-participial (ing) clauses do not function as complement to the verb "find". Last edited: Jan 21, 2021 Is the "was" optional in the following sentence? I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. It works for me without the "was" but if you put it in I think it sounds better as: I found that taking a warm bath was relaxing. I found that taking a warm bath was relaxing. It certainly sounds OK, but the problem is that the subordinator "that" (leaving aside relative clauses) only introduces declarative content clauses, which are finite, whereas "taking a warm bath" is, of course, non-finite. I found taking a warm bath [to be] relaxing I found [that] taking a warm bath was relaxing I found taking a warm bath [to be] relaxing I found [that] taking a warm bath was relaxing I found taking a warm bath [to be] relaxing I found [that] taking a warm bath was relaxing. Yes, but how do you get round the grammatical problem that declarative content clauses, i.e. that clauses, are always finite whereas "taking a warm bath" is non-finite. "Taking a warm bath was relaxing" is finite. I found [that] taking a warm bath was relaxing. Yes, but how do you get round the grammatical problem that declarative content clauses, i.e. that clauses, are always finite whereas "taking a warm bath" is non-finite. I don't see it as a problem to be got round. It sounds perfectly okay to me (post #10), it evidently does to Lingo (post #12) and I'll hazard a guess that loads of native speakers would happily say it without giving it a second thought. Chalk it up to another instance of people saying things that grammarians hold to be wrong. I don't see it as a problem to be got round. It sounds perfectly okay to me (post #10), it evidently does to Lingo (post #12) and I'll hazard a guess that loads of native speakers would happily say it without giving it a second thought. Chalk it up to another instance of people saying things that grammarians hold to be wrong. I'd go along with you there. Their large ears were pricked, and one of them cocked its head as if it found me to be deeply puzzling, an opinion of me that is not limited to coyotes. I think under this circumstance, "to be" is necessary. Without "to be", "deeply" seems to modify the "found". Hi. I wonder if they both are okay. I find Barack Obama's speeches are powerful and impressive. I find Barack Obama's speeches powerful and impressive. Much appreciated. The one without are is far better. What do you think of his speeches? I think [that] they are impressive. How do you find his speeches? Hello, What is the difference between the two? 1. It is of great danger to go to the area without a bodyguard in the night. 2. It is very dangerous to go to the area without a bodyguard in the night. I reckon No.1 implies a little more formality. 1. It is of great danger to go to that area without a bodyguard at night. Hi, just two corrections, 'the' should be 'that' as you're referring to a specific place (you can't mean everywhere) 'in the night' it sounds better with 'at'... I would always say number 2, 1 is very strange, I can't even tell if it can be considered correct as I only go by what sounds right, but as I've come to discover, there are many things considered 'correct' that nobody on this planet would ever say..I have never in my entire life heard 1), so my recommendation would be to use No 2. Thank you, Alxmrphi. I always welcome corrections. In fact, I'm not confident in using English to communicate with others. It is also very hard for me to understand the differences between 'the' and 'that' and other things. Let me ask one more. 3. All the blocks must be the same color. 4. All the blocks must be of the same color. Are both correct? If so, what difference do you see? Of course it's difficult for you, you're Japanese, and Japanese doesn't have articles, so they must be a very confusing thing!! Your second one... both are fine, that 'of' sounds a lot better than the 'of' in the first post, of course 3. is more common, but 4. is also fine, (a little bit more formal). Thank you, Alxmrphi. 5. All the blocks must be the same colour as that one. 6. All the blocks must be of the same colour as that one. Are these correct? Thanks in advance. Yeah that is the same as #3 ... (essentially, regarding the 'of' question) 5 + 6 are fine, 5 is more common, 6 is a little bit more formal.I think the reason is "of the same colour" is fairly common, they all 'belong' to the same colour so-to-speak, but 'of danger' doesn't really work in the same way (and that's why it didn't sound good in the first post) Thank you, Alxmrphi. How about these? 7. These sewing machines are of great use. 8. These sewing machines are very useful. Are both correct and idiomatic? Many thanks in advance. Thank you, Alxmrphi. 1. It is of great danger to go to that area without a bodyguard at night. 7. These sewing machines are of great use. I couldn't see the difference between the two. Let me assume one thing. To go to a certain area at night is an everyday occurrence. So it needs to use a casual way to express it. But 'of great danger' is not a casual expression. This is the reason native English speakers judge No.1 is not idiomatic. Is this guess right? Thanks in advance. It's more of the fact that it's acceptable to say "of" for certain things, 'use/colour' are fine, but danger is not, I'm not sure how best to explain this but.. I just don't know I'm sorry, I think it's best to understand this 'of' construction, works well in some cases but doesn't work in a lot of others, and try to learn where it sounds normal...You are correct 'of great danger' is not a casual expression. Thank you, Alxmrphi. 9. Those ancient constructions were of splendid height. 10. Those ancient constructions were splendidly high. Are Those idiomatic? Or you don't say 'splendidly high'? Thanks in advance. Hello, What is the difference between the two? 1. It is of great danger to go to the area without a bodyguard in the night. 2. It is very dangerous to go to the area without a bodyguard in the night. I reckon No.1 implies a little more formality. .... Danger is a thing...a noun. Great danger describes what kind of danger is present. Dangerous is an adjective...it describes the area. Very (adverb), further modifies dangerous to indicate how dangerous the situation is. I would use the adjective form. It is very dangerous to go to THAT area without a bodyguard AT night. The thing you need to be asking is does it work with 'height', the adjective is irrelevant. Thank you, Alxmrphi. 9. Those ancient constructions were of splendid height. 10. Those ancient constructions were splendidly high. Are Those idiomatic? Or you don't say 'splendidly high'? Thanks in advance. No, those are not idiomatic. Splendid (which means magnificent, radiant, excellent, acclaimed) does not collocate with height. And even if you did use the phrase, it would be they are of a splendid height. Thank you, JohndoL. Alxmrphi, Desert fox. I guess these two sentences are idiomatic. 1) Those ancient constructions were all of splendour. 12. Those ancient constructions were all splendid. Am I correct? No, taked. We don't say "be of splendor", either. Taked --Of all the sentences you have listed, I would chose the adjectival form as opposed to the "be of" form. While some of the "be of" forms may be grammatically correct, most of them sound incorrect and none of them sound markedly better than the adjectival forms. Some of them sound pretentious rather than just formal. As an added bonus, it will make it easier for you. Taked -- Of all the sentences you have listed, I would chose the adjectival form as opposed to the "be of" form. While some of the "be of" forms may be grammatically correct, most of them sound incorrect and none of them sound markedly better than the adjectival forms. Some of them sound pretentious rather than just formal. As an added bonus, it will make it easier for you. I absolutely agree. To say "These sewing machines are of great use" or "All of these blocks must be of the same colour" is grammatically correct but not idiomatic. This use might be appropriate in certain writings but sound stilted and old-fashioned in speech. Thank you, all. I understand that the word 'idiomatic' means a certain expression is used in a daily conversation and in this sense, "These sewing machines are of great use" or "All of these blocks must be of the same colour" is not the one you use in a daily conversation. Thanks again. be ofpossess intrinsically; give rise to13-A.This work is of great interest and value 13-B.This work is greatly interesting and valuable.14-A.This is a matter of importance. 14-B.This is an important matter.15-A."It is true of every case." 15-B."It is true in every case." (Source:Oxford Dictionary, Doosan English-Korean dictionary) The left sentences are excerpts from the stated source(A), and I wrote sentences having familiar structure to me on the right(B). Does each two-sentence 13 to 15 mean the same thing except for the nuance of formality? And I'm not sure whether the sentence 15-A sounds natural. Sorry to barge in like that, but it seems to me the adjectives and adverbs are mostly irrelevant here. Some nouns are used with 'of' to act as adjectives, some just aren't, however syntactically correct that usage would be. I think this is it in a nutshell. I'd happily accept "of great interest", "of importance" and possibly "of the same colour", but most of the other "of...[noun]" examples in this thread sound a bit bizarre to me, quite honestly. Here are some of the most common phrases, found by searching with "it is of great":Google Ngram Viewer"A situation of great danger", "a monument of great antiquity", "lakes of great depth" are good, but without "great" they don't really work. I just remembered one example of fixed expressions : "a man of might" or "a man of means". Not sure if there are many like that though. These examples with "great" could be rephrased as "whose xxx is great", i.e. qualifying an intrinsic quality (the danger of a situation, the depth of a lake...). Maybe that's one logical way of looking at it: a wall intrinsically has a height, so "a wall of height" does not give any extra information about the wall, while "a high wall" implies the height is above average.On the other hand, "of value" might work with about anything (especially in our materialistic culture where about anything can be sold or deemed useless). Maybe that's one logical way of looking at it: a wall intrinsically has a height, so "a wall of height" does not give any extra information about the wall, while "a high wall" implies the height is above average.On the other hand, "of value" might work with about anything (especially in our materialistic culture where about anything can be sold or deemed useless). I think you are right and very logical. That being said, I wonder which of the two sentences is more idiomatic. 1. She has a golden heart. 2. She has a heart of gold. I guess "of gold" would work as well as "of value".Thanks in advance. That being said, I wonder which of the two sentences is more idiomatic. 1. She has a golden heart. 2. She has a heart of gold.I guess "of gold" would work as well as "of value". Yes, it's (2): To describe someone as having "a heart of gold" is very idiomatic. It's virtually a 'set phrase'. Thank you, DonnyB. You and all the other contributors are great help to me. Thanks again,taked4700 Hi, The context is chess. Never mind the technical vocabulary, it's more of a question on grammar. My sentence goes, Notoriously drawish as the exchange variation is, it's unlikely that they'll play it. meaning: The exchange variation is notoriously drawish. Therefore, it's unlikely that they'll play it.I know that the construction [adjective] + as + to be, seem, sound, etc. usually expresses concession (e.g. 'Silly as it sounds'). In this instance, though, I'm talking about a causal relationship, that's why I wrote 'therefore' in bold. For some reason it sounds right to me but what do you think? It's grammatically correct. Stylistically therefore sounds too formal for speech (at least at the beginning of this sentence). I'd say so. (I wouldn't have the comma.) Hi There, What are the rules of forming negative comparative sentences? With adjective of more than 2 syllables, it seems like substituting more with less works all the time.A is more beautiful than B. vs. A is less beautiful than B.A is more careful than B. vs. A is less careful than B. A is less interesting than B. vs. A is less interesting than B.but with adjectives of 1 or 2 syllables, the rule does not apply.The other solution is to use not as..as, but for the sake of figuring this out, could you help clarifying the rules? Sounds weird:A is happier than B. vs. A is less happy than B.A is cleverer than B. vs. A is less clever than B.A is bolder than B. vs. A is less bold than A.A is taller than B. vs. A is less tall than A.A is younger than B. vs. A is less young than B.A is stronger than B. vs. A is less strong than B.After citing all these examples, maybe it is not conventional to use less + adjective with adjective of 1 or 2 syllables? With adjectives of 1 or 2 syllable, we need to use the as..as structure. Would you agree with this conclusion? Thanks a lot,Chris What do you mean by "as...as"? All your examples use "less [adjective] than", which is correct. You have not used "as...as" anywhere. I suppose A is more beautiful than B means B isn't as beautiful as A. (Careful has only two syllables.) In any case, A is less beautiful than B isn't a negative sentence. A is less bold than B sounds all right, although perhaps you'd be more likely to say B is bolder than A or A isn't as bold as B. A is less young than B sounds odd. This is probably because you could say older. If I'm eighty, I'm older than than someone who's seventeen. If I'm less young, I could still be young. But I wouldn't consider myself young if I were eighty. I don't think it's got anything to do with the number of syllables in young. What do you mean by "as...as"? All your examples use "less [adjective] than", which is correct. You have not used "as...as" anywhere. The as...as structure i was referring to:A is not as happy as B.A is not as clever as B.... I suppose A is more beautiful than B means B isn't as beautiful as A. (Careful has only two syllables.) In any case, A is less beautiful than B isn't a negative sentence.A is less bold than B sounds all right, although perhaps you'd be more likely to say B is bolder than A or A isn't as bold as B.A is less young than B sounds odd. This is probably because you could say older. I agree entirely. Most of the "weird" sounding ones in post #1 (which don't sound particularly weird to me) have a corresponding "opposite comparative" form:less happy - sadderless tall - shorterless young - olderless strong - weakerWhile for each of them the "not as...as" form is fine, having such an obvious alternative to the "less..." form makes it far less likely to be used, although I would not say that any of them are wrong. "Less clever" and "less bold" seem fine to me. Got it! A negative sentence is one where the verb is modified by "not".B isn't as beautiful as A" is a negative sentence".A is more beautiful than B" is not"B is less beautiful than A" isn't a negative sentence eitherIt does not matter that all three sentences mean the same thing. A is less young than B sounds odd. This is probably because you could say older. I agree entirely. Most of the "weird" sounding ones in post #1 (which don't sound particularly weird to me) have a corresponding "opposite comparative" form:less happy - sadderless tall - shorterless young - olderless strong - weakerWhile for each of them the "not as...as" form is fine, having such an obvious alternative to the "less..." form makes it far less likely to be used, although I would not say that any of them are wrong. "Less clever" and "less bold" seem fine to me. Got it! A negative sentence is one where the verb is modified by "not".B isn't as beautiful as A" is a negative sentence".A is more beautiful than B" is not"B is less beautiful than A" isn't a negative sentence eitherIt does not matter that all three sentences mean the same thing. I agree entirely. Most of the "weird" sounding ones in post #1 (which don't sound particularly weird to me)...]It can also be a preparatory subject for an -ing form. This is usually informal.It was nice seeing you. [...] Here is [an] expert's opinion. He states that gerund clauses "generally resist extraposition. (a) "It was easy understanding the lesson." (He does not accept that sentence.)(b) "It came as a complete surprise to his coach Herb's winning the gold medal." (Neither does he accept this sentence.)(c) "It would be no use protesting the new policies." (He DOES accept this sentence.) -- Cowan, THE TEACHER'S GRAMMAR OF ENGLISH (accessed in the "books" section of Google).gerund in extraposition Hello Does anybody know the adjective of the noun genre? I was thinking about generic, but I'm not at all sure. Or does generic refer to gender? I'm currently working on my master thesis in English linguistics and want to write that weblogs have been studied from a _____ point of view. Can anybody help? Thanks. I wouldn't use generic, which comes from genus and means general rather than specific or special.I don't see any obvious adjective related to genre (in the OED).And as I don't know what genre means in reference to weblogs I'm stuck for an alternative suggestion I could help you if I understood exactly what you mean when you say "study weblogs from a genre point of view" -> does that even make sense? Or do you mean that weblogs have been studied in the sense that it is like a genre? If so, I'd say: "weblogs have been studied in the form of genres" or "weblogs are analysed from the viewpoint of a genre" (implying that the weblog has become a genre in itself). As for generic, panjandrum explained it well. I see that you come from the German-part of Switzerland. Is there a particular German word you are thinking of for the adjective to genre? Maybe I could try translating that into English?Hope I helped. Does every noun have to have a derived adj.? "The point of view of their genre" would be better. But I think the whole genre is probably not a good one here. I agree that the sentence should be rephrased. "Generic" is similar to "general". There is the adjective "gendered", but it obviously doesn't work here. I suggest "weblogs have been studied from the point of view of gender." But he's not talking about genders."Weblogs have been studied from with regard to their genre". I'm currently working on my master thesis in English linguistics and want to write that weblogs have been studied from a _____ point of view.Thanks. tigerduck, One adjective that came to mind when I read your question was: Categorical You need to give us a little more context, I think. AngelEyes Genre is a French word which has been borrowed by English, and because of its French spelling is not conducive to being modified into an adjective. Although it is related to words like generic and general (and gender) it has a specific meaning which is different from those, so adjective based on them will not do. I expect you want to use the word genre and not a substitute, so you will have to rephrase in a way similar that suggested by Governor. E.g. "Studied from the standpoint of genre." I don't think substitutes like category or type will do as genre has such a particular meaning it. As several members have mentioned, genre is an existing variant of generic, but seems to be pretty much out of work at the moment) How about Blogs have been studied from the point of view of their classification into genres? how about ? "Weblogs have been studied by means of literary] genre theory." This is the first paragraph of the related Wiki passage."Genre studies are a structuralist approach to literary theory, film theory,and other cultural theories. When studying a genre in this way, oneexamines the structural elements that combine in the telling of a storyand find patterns in collections of stories. When these elements (or codes) begin to carry inherent information, a genre is emerging." The article uses both the terms "genre theory" and "genre studies." Might someone please explain how I could have inserted "weblogs" into the sentence, "Genre is similar to "general". There is the adjective "gendered", but it obviously doesn't work here. I suggest "weblogs have been studied from the point of view of gender." But he's not talking about genders."Weblogs have been studied from with regard to their genre". I'm currently working on my master thesis in English linguistics and want to write that weblogs have been studied from a _____ point of view. If you mean that using weblogs, various genres have been identified, several of the other suggestions will serve. Well, I study literature and of course literary criticism. Academics in this field use the word "generic" as an adjective form of "genre,"although dictionaries don't mention this point. Therefore, I think you should regard generic as an adjective form of the word "genre." Well, I study literature and of course literary criticism. Academics in this field use the word "generic" as an adjective form of "genre,"although dictionaries don't mention this point.Therefore, I think you should regard generic as an adjective form of the word "genre." In fact it's generic not generic. No, I'm familiar with genre studies, and academics say 'generic'. Just do a search for 'generic structure' and you'll see many examples. Yes, 'generic' is used, but it's one of those strange technical uses that are best avoided except in contexts where you're certain your readership will recognise them, because they have a much more common and contradictory meaning. Exactly. Although it might be technically true, the only people who generally know that would be academic people who use that very specialized meaning. Most people I believe are unaware of it. So it depends on your audience and context whether it's appropriate or not.It's unclear in the OP who the intended audience is but to me it sounds like a general audience. I'm stuck in helping to come up with an adjective because I now think the original sentence itself is actually going on in our heads. It's true that using an adjective is probably not going to sit right with a lot of prescriptivists. However, I think pretty much every native English speaker has used, or at the very least hears very often sentences like "He was acting really weird yesterday" or "Stop acting stupid." If native speakers regularly use it, then it shouldn't be considered wrong—nonstandard at the very most. It all depends on what you mean by act. If it describes an action, i.e. what the person does/is doing, then modifying it with an adverb is fine (and even prescriptively preferred as "correct") - though many native speakers will modify it with an adjective, at least colloquially.If, however, it does not describe an action, but rather the person - similar to the verb look or smell - then it cannot be modified by an adverb. Compare:(1) John looks strange today. (2) John looks strangely today. My PC is acting strangely. I agree with what Cagey says about "acting ferocious" vs. "acting ferociously", and I think the same thing applies to "acting crazy" vs. "acting crazily" and to "acting strange" vs. "acting strangely". Both ferocious acting dogs and strange-acting computers are common where I live, and if Randy is acting strange today, he is acting like a strange person, not acting crazily.I was disagreeing with most of PaulQ's comments in this post: "My PC is acting strangely lately." vs is informal but you will hear it said by native speakers. I don't consider PC is acting strangely" is not ungrammatical, but it is not the correct "version". "My PC is acting strangely lately", in fact, makes more sense to me. Speak in a strange manner,(ii) if you write it, it will simply sound wrong. (ii) If you use it in an examination, you will lose marks. or this: (iv) if you write it in a formal letter, you will be thought of as "a little uneducated." I realize PaulQ is intending this as good advice for his environment, but it is bad advice for mine. Last edited: Nov 30, 2014 Would you say: 1) to speak bravelyor 2) to speak brave How about "act entitled"(i) If you use it in an examination, you will lose marks. or this: (iv) if you write it in a formal letter, you will be thought of as "a little uneducated." I realize PaulQ is intending this as good advice for his environment, but it is bad advice for mine. My PC is acting strangely" is not ungrammatical, but it is not the correct "version". "My PC is acting strangely lately", in fact, makes more sense to me. Normally a verb is followed by an adverb in this simple type of sentence - and much depends on what the speaker meant/ was trying to say. I made the assumption that the PC was behaving in an unexpected and strange way, and "strangely" was appropriate. However, if we consider1. She arrived drunk.She arrived drunk and that are the complements of their respective sentences (1. is a descriptive, and 2 is a resultative. 1. = She arrived and she was drunk; 2. = he hammered it and as a result it was flat.) These are not the same as 3. She arrived drunkenly (adv.) -> she arrived in a manner that gave the impression of her being drunk.4. He hammered it flatly (adv.) -> he hammered it without emotion (?) It is important to note that 1. and 3. are not the same: 1. she is drunk; 2. her appearance is that of someone who is drunk but there may be other reasons.5. "My PC is acting strange" - What PC is acting and it is strange6. "My PC is acting strange" - What PC is acting and it is strange" is what is required.6. "My PC is acting strange" - What PC is acting and it is strange. However, the nature of "strange" is not at all clear, whereas in 5. we know the way that it is acting is strange.Subject verb adjective is not wrong, but it can be used wrongly/wrong. Thank you for answering my questions, Forero! When you say "Joan acts strangely", you are emphasizing the manner or way in which Joan behaves. The adverb "strangely" describes how Joan's actions are different, unusual, or not typical. This usage focuses on the specific behaviour itself and how it appears out of the ordinary. You're highlighting the manner in which Joan acts. On the other hand, when you say "John acts strange," you are using "John acts strange" as an adjective to describe John's overall demeanour or appearance. The adjective "strange" directly characterizes John as a person who is different or unusual in some way. This usage focuses on John's general disposition or the impression he gives as a person.some people will get confused for to say that sb acts strange (looks strange) is through their actions and behaviours, more precisely through their odd, weird actions which can mean directly acting strangely The answer is in the forum dictionary. Here prove is an intransitive verb:10.to turn out: The experiment proved to be successful. "To prove" can be used as a linking verb. The answer is in the forum dictionary. Here prove is an intransitive verb:10.to turn out: The experiment proved to be successful. Is there any difference between 'prove successful' and 'prove to be successful' ? I would say not. But I would probably use to be after turn out.You can also use a noun after prove (to be), as in if the experiment proves (to be) a success. Many thanks for the replies

Give me four adjectives. Adjective kelas 4. Adjectives for 4th grade. What is an adjective for class 4. Words for class 4. Adjectives for 4th graders. Adjective words for class 5.

- https://dolaodong.com/userfiles/file/51176184711.pdf
- http://fujieshubao.com/zk/UploadFile/file/2025112119065573499.pdf
- https://dananeye.com/uploads/files/202511220553397812.pdf
- qidaja
- impact of the missouri compromise of 1820
- http://hanarotalk.com/userfiles/file/\gabidisiv.pdf
- tijowalu
- http://techbis.pl/files/file/131a120f-cf4e-4626-9459-97307124c1ec.pdf
- market expansion strategy ppt