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) 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 task difficult / We 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 and "unclear" are complements of "find". Some modern grammars have an analysis of which (i.e. reply) unclear and behaviour unacceptable as verbless (or small) clauses. Hi. Is the "was" optional in the following sentence? I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. = I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. = I discovered that taking a warm bath was relaxing. = I discovered that taking a warm bath was relaxing. = I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. = I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. = I discovered that taking a warm bath was relaxing. = I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. = I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. relaxing. I found taking a warm bath relaxing. = In my opinion, taking a warm bath was relaxing. Waiting for a native speaker to confirm the above. EdisonBhola answered that 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 relaxing. [2] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [1] 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. [3] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [4] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [5] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [6] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [7] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [8] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [8] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. [9] I found taking a warm bath was relaxing. predicative complement.[2] is strictly speaking incorrect because gerund-participial (ing) clauses do not function as complement to the "was" but if you put it in I think it sounds better as: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 taking a warm bath was relaxing. that 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. If ound that taking a warm bath was relaxing as if ound that 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. clauses, which are finite, whereas "taking a warm bath" is, of course, non-finite. I found taking a warm bath was relaxing I found [that] taking a warm bath was relaxing I found [that] taking a warm bath was relaxing I found taking a warm bath was relaxing I found [that] taking a warm bath was relaxing I f grammatical problem that declarative content clauses, i.e. that clauses, are always 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, 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 #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 foundthat (conjunction/complementiser) taking a warm bath (noun/gerund phrase as subject) was (finite verb) relaxing (adjective) 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. 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. I reckon No.1 implies a little more formality. 1. It is of great danger to go to that area without a bodyguard in the night. 2. It is very dangerous 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 of the same color. 4. All the blocks 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 of the same color as that one. Are those 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 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 of great use. 1 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, Alxmirphi. 9. Those ancient constructions were of 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 .. Danger is a thing...a noun. Great danger describes what kind of danger is present. Dangerous is an adejective...it describes the area. Very (adverb), further modifys dangerous to indicate how dangerous the situation is. I would use the without a bodyguard in the night. I reckon No.1 implies a little more formality. . adjective form. It is very dangerous to go to THAT area without a boduguard 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 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. Thank you, Johndot, Alxmrphi, Desert fox. I guess these two sentences are idiomatic. 11. Those ancient constructions were all of splendor. 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 convesation. Thanks again. be of great interest and value 13-A. This work is a matter of importance. 14-B. This is an important matter. 15-A. "It is true of every case." (Source: Oxford Dictionary, Doosan English-Korean dictionary) The left sentences are excerpts from the stated source(A), and I wrote 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. "of use", "of height" are not. Adding more words to the mix does not make much difference, except maybe in some fixed expressions (none of which I could think of, but I'm no native). 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 antiquity", "walls 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 guality (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 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 (as pecially 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". 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 of great help to me. Thanks again, taked 4700 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 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. 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 less bold than A.A is less tall than A.A is less strong than B. vs. A is less tall than A.A is younger than B. vs. A is less strong than B. vs. A is less tall than A.A is younger than B. vs. A is less strong than B. vs. A is less tall than A.A is younger than B. vs. A is less strong than B. vs. A is less tall than A.A is younger than B. vs. A is les all these examples, maybe it is not conventional to use less + adjective of 1 or 2 syllables? With adjective 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 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 clever as B.... I suppose A is less beautiful than B means B isn't a negative sentence. A is less bold than B sounds all right, although the number of syllables in young. A is less beautiful than B isn't a negative sentence? A negative sentence? Why isn't it a negative sentence? A negative sentence? Why isn't it a negative sentence? Why isn't it a negative sentence? Why isn't it a negative sentence? A negative sentence is one where the verb is modified by "not". "B isn't as beautiful as A" is a negative sentence? A negative sentence? Why isn't it a negative sentence? Why isn't i one where the verb is modified by "not". "B isn't as beautiful as A" is a negative sentence either 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 bold" seem fine to me. Thanks a lot. I see the pattern that you pointed out. It seems like all these short words have a corresponding opposite comparative form. Hello, everyone. There's a question in a textbook, which is to change the following sentence into It... The question: Travelling around the world is wonderful. And the answer provided is It is wonderful travelling around the world. I wonder if "It is wonderful to travel around the world" is more correct. Or are both of them the same? Thank you. Both are correct; people might prefer "to travel around the world is wonderful.02 To travel around the world is the world is wonderful.02 To travel around the world is wonderful. Sentence01 says the speaker (for example) is enjoying his/her trip.sentence02 says the speaker (for example) imagines if s/he has a chance to make a trip around the world, then the trip will be wonderful. Would there be such a difference? Thank you. I remembered my teacher talked about this distinction before (long ago when I was a senior high school student). The Ving version is a suggestion/recommendation. I wonder what the native speakers would think about this. [From Practical English Usage 4th ed.] 268.1When the subject of a clause is an infinitive expression, this does not + infinitive.It will suit me best for you to arrive at about ten o'clock.It's essential for the papers to be ready before Thursday.268.3It can 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.)(c) "It came as a complete surprise to his coach Herb's winning the gold medal." (Neither does he accept this sentence.) -- Cowan, THE TEACHER'S GRAMMAR OF ENGLISH (accessed in the "books" section of 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 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 of genre? Maybe I could try translating that into English? Hope I helped. Does evey noun have to have a derived adj.? "The point of view of their genere" would be better. But I think the work genere 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 with regard to their 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 to 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 in, for example, film and literature, which I expect the author wishes to retain. (If I was to invent and adjective for genre it would be generical, which is an existing variant of generic, but seems to be pretty much out of work at the moment.) How about Plogs have been studied from the point of view of their classification into genres? how about Plogs have been studied from the point of view of their classification into genres? how about Plogs have been studied from the point of view of their classification into genres? how about Plogs have been studied by means of [literary] genre theory." This is the first paragraph of the related Wiki passage. "Genre studies are a structuralist paragraph of the related Wiki passage." approach to literary theory, film theory, and other cultural theories. When studying a genre in this way, oneexamines the structural 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 a link to the above passage? "by genre" from the viewpoint/perspective of genre-wise." It is not clear to me what you intend to say. Do you mean that Academics in this field use the word "generic" as an adjective form of "genre," although dictonaries don't mention this point. Therefore, I think you should regard generic as an adjective form of the word "genre," as an adjective form of th "genre, "although dictonaries don't mention this point. Therefore, I think you should regard generic as an adjective form of the word "generic." In fact it's 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 it self is flawed. I have experience in the genre of romance novels, so that's my focus. We start with romance sub-genres of the Romance genre are stylistic tropes are story arcs - or themes - like childhood sweethearts, May-December from many points of view: lexical, grammatical, philological, linguistic, etymological, and language-centric to name a few. I asked Meta to give me adjectives and that's what she did. How to present them in a pertinent way here would require more details, though. However, he asked this question 17+ years ago! I think we're too late. But leave it to WR nerds to still want to solve it. Hi everyone, I recently came accross this strange yet intriguing form to connect two adjectives: adjective + if + adjective Two examples:- he quickly came up with a well-designed if conventional service- he listened politely if impassivelyHow should I interpred the connector "if"? Should it be interpreted as "not to say"? came up with a well-designed if conventional service- he listened politely if impassivelyHow should I interpret as "not to say"?Or how should I interpret it?Any other example? Many thanks to those of you who will help me! Alberto I interpret it as concession:He quickly came up with a well-designed, yet conventional, service. i.e. a well-designed service may implicate it is not conventional, but in this case it was conventional. This may express some surpirse on the part of the speaker. This if may be interpreted differently depending on context: although, even though, yet, etc. I interpret it as concession: He quickly came up with a well-designed, yet conventional, service. i.e. a well-designed service may implicate it is not conventional. This may express some surpirse on the part of the speaker. This if may be interpreted differently depending on context: although, even though, yet, etc. Yes, I would interpret it like this too. The fact that it is well-designed implies that the speaker is impressed by it, but the fact that he was listening politely (which may imply that he is a good listener) is slightly negated by the fact that he was listening politely (which may imply that he is a good listener) is slightly negated by the fact that he was impassive (perhaps if he had more input into the conversation he would have been a better listener). The words "yet" or "but" would be a good substitute for "if" in this context. Hello everyone, Can I use "very" before "fun"? Thanks in advance. Very fun is one of those banes that haunt teachers. Children use it all the time and eventually I'm sure it will creep into general acceptance. It should be very much fun, or a lot of fun, but never very fun. Very fun is incorrect in my view. I think I would probably say great fun. Thank you so very much. If your child says "very fun", do you tell him or her to say "great fun"? Well, if you want a natural manner of saying this,try "I had a great time" or idiomatically speaking"I had a whale of a time" Akasaka, remember that "fun" is a noun. This is why you can say "good fun" or "a lot of fun" but not "very fun". Loob Thanks Loob. Yes, you are right But doesn't this word look like an adjective, does it? Thanks Loob. Yes, you are right. But doesn't this word look like an adjective, does it? Yes Akasaka, in some contexts it does look as though it's an adjective. In "the party was fun", for example, you could replace "fun" with a whole series of adjectives - "great" "boring" "excellent" and so on. But "fun" is still a noun... It's just one of those oddities of English, I'm afraid. Loob And do please try to remember, dear Akasaka, thatIt was great funandIt was very funnydo not mean the same thing, necessarily. I think this accepted adjectivisation of fun will, eventually, happen. One (very speculative) reason for that is that other adjectives of a similar meaning got hijacked by specifics (gay means homosexual, merry has green-men-of-the-forest associations or means slightly drunk) etc. Thanks Loob. Yes, you are right. But doesn't this word look like an adjective, does it? Hi Akasaka, "Fun" can also be used as a noun. Blues Please see other threads for critical comment on the use of fun as an adjective. That was very fun can be heard regularly from kids around here. They grow out of it Hi Akasaka, "Fun" can also be used as a noun. Blues Hi Blues I know the WRF dictionary allows "fun" as an adjective in the sort of phrases you mention. But personally, I still prefer to see it as a noun. Nouns often modify other nouns - as in, say, "party animal" or "ghost writer". But what's conclusive, for me, is the fact that you can't say: "That was a very fun party.""We had a very fun because fun's a noun"/"fun must be a noun because you can't say very fun"). I'll go away now and look up some of those other threads, panj... Loob Hi Blues I know the WRF dictionary allows "fun" as an adjective in the sort of phrases you mention. But personally, I still prefer to see it as a noun. Nouns often modify other nouns - as in, say, "party animal" or "ghost writer". But what's conclusive, for me, is the fact that you can't say very fun party.""We had a very fun time last night." I recognise there's a degree of circularity in my argument ("you can't say very fun because fun's a noun"/"fun must be a noun because you can't say very fun"). I'll go away now and look up some of those other threads panj... Loob Hmmm...Circular. Okay, Loob -- I can work with that. We're having a really fun time, discussing this issue. Can't say "real fun time" is not a noun and "fun" must be an adjective. And if "fun" is an adverb can't modify a noun, either "fun" or "fun time" is not a noun and "fun" must be an adjective. And if "fun" is an adverb can't modify a noun, either "fun" or "fun time." and "fun" is an adverb. So, therefore, Q.E.D., since an adverb can't modify a noun, either "fun" or "fun time." and "fun" is an adverb. So, therefore, Q.E.D., since an adverb can't modify a noun, either "fun" or "fun time." and "fun" is an adverb. So, therefore, Q.E.D., since an adverb can't modify a noun, either "fun" or "fun time." and "fun" is an adverb. So, therefore, Q.E.D., since an adverb can't modify a noun, either "fun" or "fun time." and "fun" is an adverb. So, therefore, Q.E.D., since an adverb. So, therefore, Q.E.D., sin well, an adjective-turned adverb). However at this point in time, the word 'fun' used in this fashion is still only considered informal. If fun is used as an adjective it would be regarded as informal English speech. In formal writing you would want to employ formal language; eg. enjoyable or pleasurable. Now, you could use very enjoyable or very pleasurable. "Very fun" sounds natural to me too. I have no qualms about "a (very) fun party", "a (truly) fun night". Does formal writing have to be serious, with no mention of fun things? If fun is used as an adjective it would be regarded as informal English speech. In formal writing you would want to employ formal language; eg. enjoyable or pleasurable. Now, you could use very enjoyable or very pleasurable. Hi Harry, I don't have a strong opinion on this, but here is what Merriam Webster has to say: adjective circa 1846 1:providing entertainment, amusement, or enjoyment 2:full of fun:pleasant For myself, I think I would be comfortable using fun as an adjective in just about any written work. Other words could certainly be substituted, such as amusing, enjoyable, entertaining, and others, but I don't think any of them mean exactly the same thing. Just my two cents worth, Blues Some adjectives are rather fickle. The adjectives alike, alive, and alone work as predicate adjectives, but for some reason they have to lose the a- when placed before a noun. Fun appears to be most workable before a noun and "wants" to become a noncount noun when used in a predicate. Those a- adjectives belong in their own thread, but is it common for an adjective to work only before a noun? Please see other threads for critical comment on the use of fun as an adjective. That was very fun can be heard regularly from kids around here. They grow out of it Yes, I agree with Panjandrum, very fun sounds like a childish mistake on this side of the pond, one that is soon grown out of, like "thinked". I can't imagine our Antipodean cousins saying very fun, either. However, it does somehow sound more natural in a North American accent. In fact, if used intentionally by a European English speaker it would sound like an affectation, trying to sound American formulation. Blues' post 19, jamesjiao's 21, and Forero's 25 have made me do some reflecting (and sent me off to consult some of my reference books). Here's a quote from an Open University publication (Describing language, by Graddol, Cheshire and Swan, p78): We set up word classes to help in our analysis of syntactic structure, but word classes are more marginal is one way in which we can take account of the indeterminacy which exists in syntax. I was wrong to argue in my previous post that "fun" in "a fun party" could not be an adjective because you couldn't say 'very fun': not all adjective because you couldn't say 'very fun': not all adjective because you couldn't say 'very fun' in "a fun party" with the adverb "really", it was acting as an adjective. Forero (post 25) highlighted the fact that some adjectives can only be used before nouns and some after copular verbs like BE ("utter" as in "utter nonsense" being an example of the latter). And jamesjiao (post 21) pointed out, equally wisely, that things change over time. I'm now persuaded that: "fun" can be an adjective before a nounas yet, though, it's still a 'marginal' example of the classover time, it may move towards becoming a 'prototypical' adjective, able to be used after copular verbs and to be graded &/or given a comparative cross: funner) and superlative cross: funner) and supe speakers who accept "a very fun party" (more numerous on the other side of the pond??) are perhaps in the vanguard of the drive towards making "fun" a 'prototypical' adjective. For the moment, though, I would still recommend speakers of English as a second language to use "fun" only as a noun. You can't go wrong that way... Loob PS: panj, I couldn't find those previous threads either Thank you Loob. That's a very comprehensive and thoughtful analysis. Here's one of the threads, found at last.make something more fun? Many of the fun (adjective) uses seem quite natural to me, but so far that does not include very fun. Is it wrong to say "very fun"? Dictionary say "fun" can be an adjective so it should be ok to say very fun. But a native speaker say it should be "lots of fun". What do you think? Last edited by a moderator: Jan 16, 2011 Both sound good to me. I think I would be more inclined to use an adjective. I disagree with askalon. Adverbs modify the verb, adjectives modify the noun. Their roles cannot be switched. He is acting strangely, he acts strangely, he acts strangely, he acts strangely. Having said that, it is a rule in grammar broken by most people all the time. pops: The grammar rules scholars have come up with often only approximate what's actially 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 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. (3) John is acting ferocious vs. "acting ferocious", and I think the same thing applies to "acting crazy" vs. "acting crazily" and to "acting strange" vs. "acting strange" vs. "acting strange today, he is acting strange today. PC is acting strangely" is not ungrammatical, but it is not the correct "version". "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange machine." "M it "very informal". It is suitable for any register. (I would consider "talking crazy" to be informal language, but "acting crazy/ferocious/strange" is different.) I agree with this: (iii) If you write it in, for example, a computer forum, probably nobody will notice it. but not with this: As you are a non-native speaker, (i) if you say 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 PaulO is intending this as good advice for mine. Last edited: Nov 30, 2014 Would you say: 1) to speak bravelyor 2) to speak bravelyor 4. entitled" (as in "Don't act entitled.")? That makes sense, formally or informally. (A person saying it is probably prejudiced.) There is no adverb form of "entitled." If so, is this omission applicable to other examples in this thread as well? Yes, and yes. - act crazy -> act (like you are) crazy- talk crazy -> talk (like you are) crazy- act strange -> act (like you are) strange I am not sure what works for act is the same for talk. For me, "talk crazy" is not a way to say "talk as if you are crazy" but a very informal, probably nonstandard, way to say "talk nonsense", i.e. speak in a way that makes no logical sense. "My PC is acting strangely lately." is the correct version. "My PC is acting strange lately." is very informal but you will hear it said by native speakers. I was disagreeing with most of PaulQ's comments in this post: "My PC is acting strange", 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 consider 1. She arrived drunk (adj.) 2. He hammered it flat (adj.) In which drunk and tlat are the complements of their respective sentences (1. is a descriptive, and 2 is 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 flat. (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 causes. 5. "My PC is acting strange" - "My 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 nature of the actions Joan is performing. On the other hand, when you say "John acts strange," you are using 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. 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

- https://dolaodong.com/userfiles/file/51176184711.pdf
 http://fujieshubao.com/zk/UploadFile/file/2025112119065573499.pdf
 https://dananeye.com/uploads/files/202511220553397812.pdf
 gidaja
 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