

Auhlnet 00

366 667

#834

Leidtorf, Therese

#831f

1. deto. 1932 Jan-  
mustatud teise aulomus  
uadroliseds

Pisnet.  
7. nov. 1932.a  
#309.

Autor: Therese Leidorf

Adults  
white seeds.



366 667

Et fugiant freno,  
non remorato dies.

321973

5/11/32

Bibliography:

Accidence and Syntax of  
the Adjective in Present Day  
English based on Original Collections.

- Lawrence, J. H. English in England.  
Twilight in Italy  
The man who rode away  
An advanced English Syntax  
A New English Grammar  
Essential Lessons in  
English Grammar



D 321973

- Contents
- I. Introduction
- II. Bibliography:
- Deutschbein-Mutschmann: Handbuch der Englischen Grammatik.
- Jespersen, O. A. Modern English Grammar. P. II
- Lawrence, D. H.: England, My England.
- III. The use of the English language
1. Inflection
2. Syntax
3. The use of the English language
4. The use of the English language
5. The use of the English language
- Onions, C. T. An Advanced English Syntax.
- Sweet, H. A New English Grammar
- Hylld Elementary Lessons in English Grammar.
- IV. Conclusion

## Contents :

### I . Introduction

### II . Accidence

1. Inflection.
2. Pronominal adjectives.
3. Adjectives of quantity and number.
4. The use of nouns as adjectives.
5. Adverbs used as adjectives.
6. Substantivized adjectives.
7. Comparison.

### III Syntax .

1. Attributive and predicative use of adjectives.
2. Order of adjective and noun.
3. Comparison.

### IV Conclusion .

### Abbreviations:

- E = Lawrence, D.H. England, My England.  
T = Lawrence, D.H. Twilight in Italy.  
H = Lawrence, D.H. The Roman Who Rode  
Away.

In the above sentences small, high, childish, girlish, hard, purple, white, ancient, uncomfortable are adjectives. We may say that adjectives describe the nature and character of persons and things more particularly than the mere mention

The adjective is a word which qualifies or defines a person or thing. For example: The small brook; high, childish, girlish voices; his heart was hard (E. p. 9); purple and white columbines; the house was ancient and very uncomfortable (E. p. 10).

In the above sentences small, high, childish, girlish, hard, purple, white, ancient, uncomfortable are adjectives. We may say that adjectives describe the nature and character of persons and things more particularly than the mere mention

of their names would do.

In English the adjectives are generally placed before the nouns, which they qualify, as in good food; soft bed; rounded vanity; little figure; sunny hours; poor thing (H. p. 14), etc. On the other hand adjectives often stand in the predicate without any a noun, as in she was small and neat, she was relentless about enjoyment (H. p. 15); the sky being lost and warm (H. p. 14).

The distinction between adjective and noun is often only a relative one: the same word may be a noun in one sentence and an adjective in another. Examples: That perfectly

devoted, marvellous secretarial family (H. p. 16). She invariably restores the family fortune (H. p. 219).

It is sometimes doubtful what part of speech a word belongs to. The less marked the formal characteristics of a word are, the more difficult it is to decide what part of speech it belongs to. Hence particles offer more difficulty than declinable words, as we see in the difficulty of distinguishing between adverbs and conjunctions. Hence also the more inflectional a language is, the easier the distinction of the parts of speech is. Thus in English, where the adjective is nearly indeclinable,

it is more difficult to distinguish it from other parts of speech than in Latin or German.

Let us, however, look a little more closely into the nature and functions of this part of speech than we have hitherto done.

and Early Middle English. The loss of the inflections made the adjectives indeclinable as far as number, case, and gender are concerned: a gallant affair, her gallant affairs (H. p. 2), the gallant lady's eye (H. p. 10).

So in Modern English there is no longer any formal agreement

Old English adjectives were declined according to the strong or weak declension, and had different endings to express the various numbers, genders, and cases. These endings had been wear and tear down in late Old English and Early Middle English. The loss of the inflection made the adjectives indeclinable as far as number, case, and gender are concerned: a gallant affair, her gallant affairs (N. p. 7), to her gallant affairs, the gallant lady's eye (N. p. 10).

So in Modern English there is no longer any formal agreement

of the adjectives with their nouns in case, number, and gender, except with the adjective-pronouns this and that, which have plurals these, those, as in this winter, that case (H. p. 10), compared with these partings (H. p. 27), those words (H. p. 14).

The entire loss of inflexional endings in adjectives is one of the most marked characteristics of the English language as compared with any other of the Germanic language. The English adjectives <sup>lost</sup> <sup>became</sup> formally indistinguishable from the adverbs except by their syntactical relations, the only change

lost -e

of form that was left to them — namely comparison — being shared by the adverbs.

Such numeral adjectives <sup>such</sup> as two, five, fifty, etc. are of course always plural — two blue birds (N. p. 7), five miles (N. p. 57), fifty yards (E. p. 11), etc. Several generally is used to qualify a plural word, e. g. several men (N. p. 3) several villages (T. p. 192), though sometimes it may be found with a singular, the meaning of the word then being separate, distinct, individual. Both of course is plural (dual). But all and whole may be used with singular and plural substantives: all his

servants (H. p. 8), all those words (H. p. 15),  
all the sounds (H. p. 20), all her anger  
(H. p. 29), all long experience (H. p. 34),  
all the time (H. p. 231), all the world  
(H. p. 85); the whole populace of  
the village (H. p. 97), the whole  
thing (H. p. 20), the whole body (T. p. 219).

The freedom with which adjectives  
are joined to substantives in English  
is evidently due to the want of  
inflection in the adjectives. One  
advantage of non-flexional agreement  
is that the same adjective may  
be made to qualify a singular and  
a plural noun at the same time,  
e. g. his gritty, thick, sand-paper  
khari and puttees (E. p. 46). Whereas

in some languages the adjective would have to be put with each noun in a different form.

The absence of adjective-inflection is thus seen to be a real advantage in the structure of the English language.

Not only do such words as small, high, childish, girlish, hard, white, and so on, about which there can be no doubt, come under the heading of adjectives, but further certain forms of pronouns when used before nouns — a woman, the husband, his wife (N. p. 9), each year (N. p. 8), your work (N. p. 10).

Every pronoun is either a noun

or an adjective. Many pronouns are used both as nouns and as adjectives, in which case the adjective use is generally the primary and the more important. Thus that and this are nouns in that's my advice (N. p. 9), this is the sea (N. p. 27) and adjectives in that case (N. p. 10), she meant this dictating business (N. p. 11).

The definite pronouns the, this, that are primarily adjectives. The definite pronoun the is used only as an adjective - the edge, the garden, the shadow (E. p. 9). And although this and that are used as nouns as well as adjectives, yet

we generally think of them as qualifying some noun.

The indefinite pronouns a, an are used only as adjectives: an apple, a bull-dog (E. p. 271), a mystery (E. p. 271), a devil (E. p. 270).

Possessive pronouns are used as possessive adjectives: you've got your secretary and your work (H. p. 10), they knew his affairs by heart (H. p. 11), their lives (H. p. 15)

Also <sup>the</sup> interrogative pronouns which and what are used as adjectives.

It is clear that we have here words which, although they have something in common which justifies us in calling both classes adjectives,

are yet very different in the kind of way in which they qualify the nouns which follow them - her handsome husband (N. p. 7), the husband (N. p. 7). The adjective handsome and the adjective-pronoun the both qualify or define the noun husband, but they do so in different ways. This merely indicates a particular husband from among two or more, but tells us nothing further about (it). Hand-<sup>him</sup>some describes the husband's bodily quality which can be seen by the eye.

Again, a noun can be qualified by an adjective relating to its quantity, amount, mass, number,

thus: - much gold, few wild phrases  
(T. p. 131), any grass, <sup>a</sup>dozen years,  
<sup>one</sup> thousand pounds etc. All the  
numerals - one, two, three up to  
a hundred <sup>(999999)</sup> are adjectives when  
used before nouns - two hours  
(H. p. 27), nine years (H. p. 57),  
four priests (H. p. 34). On the other  
hand, we say a hundred, a thousand,  
a million. There is no doubt that  
used without any noun following,  
these words are nouns. It might be  
argued, however, that in a dozen  
years, a hundred years, two hundred  
years, etc. dozen and hundred are  
adjectives. It is nevertheless doubt-  
ful whether this is always the case.

It appears that in such expressions dozen and hundred may quite well be felt as a noun. It is impossible to lay down hard and fast rules on such points.

Nouns are very often placed immediately before other nouns, and qualify them in precisely the same way as original adjectives do, for instance: snowball bushes, chorusgirl flowers, a magazine article (H. p. 17), a queer, a mere-wolf expression (H. p. 20), the deep iron rhythm (H. p. 28), their winter stars (H. p. 33), graveyard worms (H. p. 33), the dry stone wall (H. p. 39), a resonant Oxford voice (H. p. 155), the

London air (N. p. 175), the family.  
fortune (N. p. 213); every mountain  
peasant (T. p. 22), like violin music  
(T. 89), the village women (T. p. 103),  
her heavy animal blood (T. p. 115),  
so we became bosom friends (T. p. 194),  
the third-class restaurant (T. p. 216),  
that railway restaurant (T. p. 217), the  
old Hampshire cottage (E. p. 9), an  
old country family (E. p. 11), a marriage  
portion (E. p. 12), her family tree (E. p. 24),  
the canal bridges (E. p. 56), the girl  
conductor (E. p. 56), the tramway  
service (E. p. 64), etc., etc. Here I have  
written out only a small part of the  
nouns used as adjectives in Lawrence's  
works. The frequency of this usage is

evidently due to the non-flectional character of the English language.

Grammarians disagree <sup>on</sup> the question whether a noun placed immediately before another noun is an adjective or the first element of a compound substantive. Sweet, H (A New English Grammar § 174) holds that the division into parts of speech is based on formal differences, and says, "But as the most marked formal characteristic of adjectives is comparison, and as comparison of stone in stone wall is impossible, even if the meaning of the combination allowed it, while there would be no grammatical objection to making stony

road, golden hair into stonier road,  
the most golden hair, we must refuse  
to admit that assumptive nouns  
have any of the really distinctive  
features of adjectives."

Sweet here goes too far, for he  
would not refuse the name of adjective  
to such words as that, a, my, other, few,  
monthly, which do not admit of  
comparison.

On the contrary others say that  
stone in 'stone wall' and magazine  
in 'magazine article' are as much  
adjectives as high in 'high house'  
and good in 'good article'.

0. Zespersen used for the noun  
~~which is~~ placed immediately before

another noun the term first-word, and thinks that there is no reason why we should not call the first-word an adjective.

Let us now consider some more positive indications that prove that first-words may be regarded as parallel to real adjectives. The proper way to deal with the problem is to collect as many different examples as possible, and to test them not by one characteristic of adjectives, but by everything that is typical of English adjectives in our present period.

I. The words we are concerned with may be coordinated with adjectives,

connected by and or nor - lilac and snowball bushes (H. p. 7), the imperious clangour of midday and evening bells (T. p. 25), life and death authority (E. p. 26).

II. Equally significant with the conjunction is the comma in the following instances: those curious, shapely, she-wolf legs of hers (H. p. 19), a queer, were-wolf expression (H. p. 20), that low animal cry (H. p. 94), the wild, neighing, animal laughter (H. p. 169), in his gritty, thick, sand-paper khaki and puttees (E. p. 46).

III. The case is quite clear when a noun is placed before the adjective with which it is co-ordinated: a quitesilver little thing (E. p. 28.).

IV In the following example the first-word is used in the same purely predicative manner as an ordinary adjective: the other people were stone (N. p. 222).

The combination of two substantives is often preceded by an adverb which shows that the first element is felt to be an adjective, for if the combination is felt to be a compound substantive, it can only be preceded by an adjective like any other substantive. Rarely a first-word is used alone with the definite article as a plural, in order to designate a whole class. Here the absence of the ending -s shows that the words are no longer substantives.

Some of these adjectival characteristics

*the family name*

are as yet found only occasionally with first-word, especially the preceding adverb and the power to stand alone as predicatives. § 82

The use of proper names as adjectives was formerly more extensive than now, but is still very common, e.g. the old Hampshire cottage (E. p. 9), The London world (E. p. 14), in a resonant Oxford voice (H. p. 155), the London air (H. p. 175), an old Derbyshire stone house (H. p. 216), the New York flat (H. p. 45). The unexpected London accent (T. p. 136).

Some words have retained the old suffix -en, which was used to form adjectives from <sup>adjectives</sup> nouns, as the earthen <sup>names of materials</sup>

roof (H. p. 73), his wooden steed (E. p. 61), wooden chairs (E. p. 64), wooden doors (H. p. 71), a few wooden houses (T. p. 206), etc., etc. — the adjective wooden is used very commonly. In some cases there is a difference as to the meaning between the adjective having the ending -es and the same adjective without this suffix. The adjective golden in 'sunny golden grass' (T. p. 37) is understood to refer to the colour as also in 'a little golden crown of thorns' (T. p. 14), whereas when we say gold crown, we mean one made of gold. When we say silver dress (H. p. 22), silver gown (H. p. 218), we mean the material,

while silken in the expression 'silken hair' is used figuratively.

Sometimes it makes a difference whether the substantive or the derived adjective is used as an adjective: a China tea refers to the kind, while a Chinese tea would mean any tea found in China.

trade name  
India rubber

The non-flexional character of English adjectives makes it easy to use nouns as adjectives. The development and free use of such substantival adjuncts forms one of the most characteristic traits of present-day English.

There are in English some adverbs which can be used as adjuncts before

substantives. This is especially the case with short and everyday adverbs which have no corresponding adjective. This accounts for the frequency of then in this employment as compared with the rarity of now, which has the adjective present - my present wife (N. p. 230), the present Mrs Hale (N. p. 230) - to express the same notion.

There are adjective forms in -ward corresponding to the adverbs which generally end in -wards in colloquial speech, though very often in -ward in <sup>the</sup> written language: we were on the downward slope (T. p. 214), a quick, downward rub (T. p. 30), forward

hussy (T. p. 81).

Far is now hardly anything but an adverb, apart from a comparatively few fixed combinations, the Far West (South etc), a far horizon, the far end.

Now the compounds far-off and far-away are preferred as adjectives: a far-away emotionless intonation (N. p. 76.), a far-off intentness (N. p. 74), the far-off thud (E. p. 48).

In the same degree as the want of inflexions of the English substantives is favourable to their being used as adjectives, the want of inflexions of the English adjectives hinders

their being used as substantives.

In languages which inflect their adjectives the accompanying noun is often dropped when it can be easily supplied from the preceding adjective, the adjective inflections being enough to show the gender, number, and grammatical relations of the resulting free adjective. But in English such free adjectives could not be used without ambiguity because of the want of adjective inflections, hence in English an ordinary adjective cannot be used as a noun without being converted - either wholly or partially - into a noun, and even then its use is often much restricted.

The chief living use of the adjectives as a noun is with the definite article to denote a whole class, either in the singular, in which case it is neuter, and is specially found with abstract notions, as the good, the deep (N. p. 53) meaning what is deep, etc. or in the plural in which case it denotes living beings: the rich, meaning all rich people. Here the conversion is only partial, for although 'the rich' has exactly the same grammatical function as any noun in the plural, it does not take the plural inflection which it would require if it were a real noun. Also the form-word the has a different functions from what it

would have with a noun; for we could not say the boys in the sense of 'boys in general'.

Sometimes adjectives are wholly converted into nouns as my dears (E. 180, 182), I don't care for sweets (N. p. 12). Substantivization in general is the sign of a more specific classification. There is also a greater tendency to use the s-plural of learned words, and the unchanged plural of familiar words.

Adjectives cannot now as in former periods of the language be used freely in the singular without a substantive. But there are some cases left in which it is still possible to use a singular

adjective alone in speaking of a person. One of the adjectives found most frequently substantivized in the singular is the dead, as in the sentence 'to be the living dead, that's awful' (H. p. 215), though colloquially the dead man is preferred.

Adjectives like Spanish in the sentence: "Where are you going?" came the quiet question in Spanish, and English in "Don't you speak English, then?" (H. p. 79), are used to denote languages either without or with the definite article according to the ordinary rules for substantives. That these words, though, of course, not occurring in the plural, have become substantives in this sense,

appears from the fact that they can have possessives and adjectives before them: her hand, Saxon Spanish (H. p. 61).

Another way of using an adjective without its noun, that is to substantivise <sup>an</sup> an adjective in English, is to substitute the non-pronoun one for the noun, the inflection of the noun being transferred to this prop-word, as we may call it.

In this way we can distinguish between the singular 'the young one' and the plural 'the old ones', as in 'Annie-the young one' (E. p. 267), and 'at the back was a small stream with two willows, old ones.' 'Between the olive roots the violets are out, large, white, grave violets, and less serious blue ones.'

(T. p. 112). In such cases a concord-language would, of course, employ the inflected adjective without any noun or prep-word.

Yet one may <sup>generally</sup> only be used in order to substantivize an adjective when referring to a preceding substantive:

"Ah, the black snakes, no! But the yellow ones, yes!" (H. p. 39).

The Pink 'un  
he's a bad 'un  
one

As already mentioned, substantives indicate more special notions than adjectives. In consequence of this specialization the combination 'my dear one' is more expressive of feeling than 'my dear' (H. p. 26), which is now often used very loosely.

The construction with one is somewhat familiar and colloquial, as ~~the~~

sleep my little one, sleep my pretty one, sleep

the young one, the little one (H. p. 126),  
this is probably the reason why the  
old construction the dead has been  
preserved as being more solemn than  
the dead one would be.

The prop-word one is not used  
after (a comparative) and especially  
after a superlative, including such  
words as first and next.

The first expresses a quality or  
attribute of the child, without, however,  
comparing it with other children.  
Strictly speaking, this is not a  
degree of comparison, since no com-  
parison is involved. The second degree  
expresses a greater degree of happiness,  
and the third the most intense form.

As already mentioned the only inflexions of adjectives which exist in English are those of comparison. There are three degrees of comparison: (1) the positive - happy child, beautiful child, (2) the comparative - happier child, more beautiful child and the superlative - the happiest child, the most beautiful child.

The first expresses a quality or attribute of the child, without, however, comparing it with other children. Strictly speaking, this is not a degree of comparison, since no comparison is involved. The second degree expresses a greater degree of happiness, and the third the most intense form.

of all the things considered.

The comparative and superlative are formed in <sup>one of</sup> two ways:

1) By the addition of the suffixes -er, and -est, as in a greater stin (N. p. 11), the greatest admiration (N. p. 24); the higher beauty (N. p. 86), her highest attainment (N. p. 120); the lower half (T. p. 29), the lowest step (T. p. 28), etc.

2) By placing the adverbs more, most before the adjectives, as in more extraordinary (N. p. 238), the most extraordinary (N. p. 169); more playful (N. p. 275), the most playful (N. p. 275).

At first in Early Middle English, the two methods of comparison, the inflexional and periphrastic, were used

indiscriminately. In Modern English the inflectional comparison has come to be used more and more with shorter adjectives, and the periphrastic comparison chiefly with longer and more unfamiliar adjectives.

The inflectional comparison is restricted: (1) to monosyllabic adjectives, such as: deeper (E. p. 13), sterner (E. p. 19), greater, finer (E. p. 26), denser (E. p. 27), the youngest (E. p. 11), the strongest (E. p. 14), the deepest (E. p. 43), etc. Lawrence uses all the monosyllabic adjectives according to this rule, except more shy (T. p. 112); more free (E. p. 21 and 2. p. 208), the most real (T. p. 102) more false (T. p. 122) — here

the periphrastic comparison is used in order to avoid the repetition of the hiss - consonant in the superlative.

With subtle Lawrence uses the inflectional as well as the periphrastic comparison: subtler (N. p. 33, T. p. 121, E. p. 20) and more subtle (T. 133).

The use of more gentle (N. p. 16), <sup>M</sup> is also against the rule.

(2) to dissyllabic adjectives with the stress on the last syllable such as severe, minute. But Lawrence uses here also sometimes the periphrastic comparison: the most sincere regard (N. p. 7), the most polite conventions (T. p. 18). The periphrastic comparison is the more usual of the two when

the adjective ends in a heavy consonant-group, as in more distraught (H. p. 285),<sup>? group?</sup>  
more distinct (T. p. 126).

(3) To many dissyllabic adjectives with the stress on the first syllable, such as: commoner (H. p. 16), angier<sup>er</sup> (H. p. 90), cleverer (H. p. 114), easier (H. p. 126), yellower (H. p. 128), the loveliest (H. p. 26) and others in -ly, but Lawrence writes in H. p. 217 more<sup>er</sup> ghastly, instead of ghastlier.

In the following examples D. H. Lawrence uses instead of the inflectional comparison the periphrastic one: more weary (H. p. 118), more dusky (H. p. 120), more ready (H. p. 158), more cruel (H. p. 275).

The periphrastic comparison is also

used in more dismal (N. p. 135), vulgar (T. p. 116), more human (T. p. 116). With 'yellow' Lawrence uses the inflectional as well as the periphrastic comparison: yellower (N. p. 128), more yellow (N. p. 263), of which the first is compared according to the rule.

The adjectives in -ish, -s, and -st have the periphrastic comparison, so as to avoid the repetition of the hiss-consonants in the superlative. Examples: more smileless (N. p. 106), most breathless (N. p. 200), more monstrous (N. p. 246), more reckless (T. p. 77), more aimless (T. p. 117), more intense (E. p. 68, T. p. 133), more robust (E. p. 13).

So also those in -ive - more sensitive

(X. p. 118), more expensive (T. p. 106), more introspective (T. p. 15), more effective (E. p. 108), apparently because most of them are long words.

The periphrastic comparison is followed: (1) by all adjectives of more than two syllables, such as more impossible (X. p. 12), the most extraordinary (X. p. 169), more comfortable (E. p. 111), more obvious (X. p. 129), more important (T. p. 138), more innocent (X. p. 273) — most of them have besides heavy endings.

(2) by those in -ful, such as the most beautiful (E. p. 20), the most playful (X. p. 275), more grateful (X. p. 243).

(3) by those in -ed and -ing: more

delighted (E. p. 12), more inflamed (E. p. 34),  
more naked (H. p. 16), more amazed (H. p. 203),  
more animated (T. p. 31), more tired  
(T. p. 215), a most disconcerting bore  
(H. p. 227), the most imposing (H. p. 255),  
more moving (T. p. 83), more desolating  
(T. p. 218), most terrifying (T. p. 219).

These adjectives are not inflected,  
because they have the form of verbals,  
so also more known (H. p. 7), more  
interwoven (T. p. 133).

In Early Middle English such  
comparisons as more free, most free,  
beautifuller, beautifullest were frequent;  
and they are still used in poetry and  
the higher prose.

also more and most were sometimes

added to the comparative and superlative, as more greater, most unkindest. Such forms are used to express special emphasis, and are still very common in the dialects.

The adjectives are compared either in one or the other of the ways just mentioned — that is, by adding the suffixes -er, -est to the simple form of the word, or by prefixing more, most. There are a few, however, which form their comparatives and superlatives from a different word than the positive.

They are called irregular adjectives:

good — better — best

bad — worse — worst

In Early Modern English a new

double comparative worse was formed.  
Both worse and the <sup>exceptional</sup> double superlative  
worst occur in Vulgar Modern  
English.

much — more — most

little — less, lesser — least

The new formation lesser is, of  
course, a double comparative like worse.

late } latter — last  
later — latest

last is a shortening of Middle English  
latest, not by phonetic change, but  
apparently by the analogy of best,  
least, etc. When latter and last  
developed special meanings, the new  
comparisons later, latest were formed  
directly from late.

out } utter - utmost, uttermost  
      } outer - outmost, outermost

The Modern English utter, etc., outer, etc., are new formations from out

nigh } near - next  
      } nearer - nearest

The Modern English positive adjective and adverb near is the old comparative adverb, made into a positive on the analogy of here, there, as far. It is compared regularly nearer, nearest, the old superlative next <sup>being</sup> ~~being~~ isolated from it. The old positive is represented by the adjective and adverb nigh, which is obsolete in spoken language.

To these <sup>we</sup> must be added:

far } farther - farthest  
      } further - furthest

which indeed does not form its  
comparison from a different word,  
but is irregular in introducing  
-th- between the <sup>root</sup> word and the suffix.

old } elder - eldest  
      } older - oldest

The word old is peculiar in having  
two forms of <sup>the</sup> comparative and  
superlative - older, oldest, and elder,  
eldest. As <sup>is</sup> now used, elder, eldest, are  
hardly used as the superior degrees of  
old, although probably most people  
do feel vaguely that these words are  
all connected in some way. Elder  
and eldest are practically used to  
enumerate persons of the same family.

We distinguish adjectives as attributives

(assumptive) and predicative, according as they imply or state an attribute or qualification of the nounword.

If we say the old mother was a splendid plain cook (N. p. 11), old is assumed, or taken for granted as a quality of mother. The intention of this sentence is to state that mother was a splendid plain cook. This usage of an adjective is called by most grammarians attributive, Dr. Sweet calls it assumptive.

If on the other hand, we say she was very competent (N. p. 8), we express a deliberate opinion or give a piece of information. It is predicated of she that she was very

competent, and the intention of the sentence is to make this statement. Competent here is said to be used predicatively.

Thus attribution may be regarded as implicit or latent predication, and predication itself may be regarded as strengthened attribution.

As a rule words that can be used as pre-adjuncts, that is, attributively, can also be used in the same form as predicatives: they were both handsome (25. p. 7), her handsome young husband (25. p. 7). But in some cases there is some slight difference in form between the two employments.

(1) Participles with -en as preadjuncts—

a drunken man's murder (E. p. 271),  
and without -en in other positions:  
The distinction is in no case carried  
through with absolute consistency.

(2) In the pronouns we have more  
consistency in the (inverse) employment  
of the forms with and without -s:  
it's no more mine than it is some other  
chap's (E. p. 267), it's yours as much  
as anybody else's (E. p. 268).

(3) A somewhat similar distinction  
is found in other cases, where the  
form with s is used by itself as  
an adverb. Examples: 'Thence, from  
their white, radiant nucleus of death  
in life, flows the great flux down=  
wards, towards life and warmth', while

the form without s is adjectival, thus in 'we were on the downward slope' (T. p. 214), 'a quick, downward rub' (T. p. 30).

Apart from these formal differentiations there are some adjectives that are hardly ever used predicatively, and on the other hand some that are hardly ever used as pre-adjuncts. The former class comprises some ex-comparatives (formal comparatives that cannot now be used as real comparatives, followed by than): the outer world (T. p. 45), the upper terrace (H. p. 93), the outer edges (H. p. 30), its deep inner verandah (H. p. 51), the grave elder men (H. p. 67).

He can say 'the whole thing' (H. p. 8), but if we were to use whole as a predicate, it would convey quite a different meaning.

The second class comprises adjectives that cannot be freely used as pre-adjuncts: able, ashamed, content, exempt, glad, mindful, unable, well. 'The Colonel is very well' (H. p. 258) is a natural and correct expression, but not 'the well Colonel'. In the first case well means 'healthy', and there is obviously no reason from the nature of things why the second sentence should be impossible. The explanation undoubtedly is that well is not really an adjective. at

all, but an adverb, although in the first sentence it appears to be used as an adjective.

Ill, on the other hand, is a genuine adjective, and can be used assumptively as well as predicatively. The fact that we cannot say 'an ill man' can only be explained in that, that ill, the pure adjective, has come to be considered as identical in function with well, the adverb.

With regard to adjectives used predicatively, their normal place is after the linking word is or are — he was not idle (E. p. 15), that was the human trinity for her (E. p. 19), etc.

Here again the language of poetry

and rhetoric often places the predicative adjective at the beginning of the sentence, before the linking word, and the subject qualified at the end. One object which is achieved by placing the predicate in front of the sentence in this way is that it acquires greater importance and emphasis than it would receive in its normal place.

As already stated most words that can be used predicatively can also be used as pre-adjectives. Therefore we find in some cases longish groups transferred from the predicative position into pre-adjective position in spite of the general aversion felt in English to those long group-

adjuncts found so abundantly in German. Examples of participial groups: his black-clad wife (H. p. 49), the old and well-preserved woman (H. p. 218), the well-worn path (H. p. 71), the dead, thrice-dead little Spanish town (H. p. 52), under the pink-flowering horse-chestnut tree (H. p. 18), this being-in-love business (H. p. 181), the all-conquering belly (H. p. 253).

Frequently a group pre-adjunct consists of a participle and subjunct that makes up a necessary part of the verbal idea: the walled-in, one-storey adobe house (H. p. 51), this shut-in flowered potato (H. p. 51), she saw the weird humped-up creature (H. p. 123), the grown-up children (H. p. 109),

Sometimes we have the order subjunct + adjective before the substantive: in a hurried, yet stony voice (H. p. 212), only that intense, yet remote, inhuman glitter (H. p. 69).

A preposition with its object may be used as a pre-adjective: his off-hand way (H. p. 56) weird post-war Germany (H. p. 123), he's on the afternoon shift (H. p. 141).

In some cases the preposition in such combinations is preceded by an adverb; thus especially out of and up to: she's tremendously up-to-date in art and and literature (H. p. 216).

Next we have regular sentences with subject and verb, etc, used as quotation adjuncts, as in 'the people treated him

in a 'heave-half-a-brick-at-him' fashion.

As regards the relative order of two words, we distinguish between pre-position and post-position. Thus pre-adjective position means that the adjective precedes its noun — the small brook (E. p. 9), and the post-adjective position — they had the house spotless and running like a dream (H. p. 12) — that it follows the noun.

In most languages there is a distinction between normal and exceptional order. The normal place of attributive adjectives in English is in front of the noun which they qualify. Thus we generally say — the rough turf, the grey dryish soil (E. p. 9), purple and white columbines (E. p. 10), etc.

From a practical point of view the main distinction between the pre-adjective order — 'his keen blue eyes' (E. p. 9), and the post-adjective order — "the powerful dark legs naked and squatting like an animal's" (H. p. 66), is that the former is suspensive — it makes us expect something to complete the sentence — and hence is more connective than the post-adjective order, and binds adjective and noun more closely together.

The post-adjective order is, however, often reserved <sup>to</sup> in the language of rhetoric and poetry. In Modern English post-position is regular in the case of cardinal numerals used as ordinals: chapter ten (but the tenth chapter),

page twenty, in the year 1928. This usage seems to be due to French influence.

The + adjective follows proper names in such groups as Charles the First (T. p. 53).

Post-position is frequent in the case of participles used as adjectives: the corridor, dark panelled and with blue carpet on the floor (X. p. 217), he looked at us with eyes half glazed, obsessed (X. p. 247). This order is of course, the result of these words being still felt to be half verbs.

Post-position is often necessary in the case of attributive groups:

resting my heart in a balance now at  
last physical as well as spiritual  
(H. p. 236).

One and the same noun may  
have two or more adjectives. When  
for instance two attributive adjectives  
are joined to one noun, the three generally  
follow in immediate succession, as  
in the old smoky torch (E. p. 26), But  
the first may be detached from the  
others, after by a conjunction: a very  
warm and cuddly manner (E. p. 60),  
our famous but uninspired school of  
art (H. p. 206), green or pinky-brown  
hills (H. p. 53), sometimes by a longer  
break: big pink daisy-like flowers,  
and white ones (H. p. 68).

Modern English is very tolerant of suspensiveness and the logical spirit of the language makes it averse to broken order. The Old English order adjective + noun + adjective is now used rarely: a small, glittering white house, windowless, and with closed door (X. p. 71), the noiseless smile immovable (H. p. 103), his rather hooked nose self-derisive (H. p. 166).

The order of the several adjectives is naturally regulated by the order in which the ideas present themselves to the mind of the speaker, and no general rule can therefore be established in those cases in which the adjectives are strictly coordinated. The general principle is that the one most closely

connected with the noun in meaning comes next to it: his powerful, muscular legs (E. p. 86), her gloomy black eyes (E. p. 128), that odd, immediate intimacy (E. p. 128).

When the adjectives are about equally balanced, the order may vary, as in the pale young man (H. p. 102); the young, pale sister (H. p. 103).

In many cases the two adjectives are not really coordinate, as one, which is then placed last, belongs closely to the substantive and forms one composite idea with it: the old Germanic race (H. p. 123), the old barbaric undertone (H. p. 124), etc. This explains why such adjectives as old, young, little are so often

placed after other adjectives, as they form one idea with the following substantive: the thin old church (T. p. 26), a curious old girl (E. p. 57), a steep little gorge (T. p. 36), a grey, shaggy, highly-bred little gentleman (T. p. 57). When little and old come together, little is generally placed before old: the little old ladies (T. p. 194), a third little old lady (T. p. 194).

Adjectives indicating quantity and number precede other adjectives: all long experience (E. p. 34), the few dark hairs (W. p. 251), two young people (E. p. 16), two old ladies (T. p. 193).

When the articles are associated with another adjective they normally

precede the latter: but in some constructions they come immediately before the noun. The definite article does so when associated with certain general adjectives of ~~quality~~: both the ladies; all the sounds and the scents (H. p. 15).

The indefinite article has the same position in combination with half - half a motor car (H. p. 10) - and in other combinations: many a man, such a man.

The construction with possessive pronouns is analogous.

Adjectives modifying indefinite noun-pronouns follow them, as in nothing sensual (H. p. 70), something

wild (N. p. 124), etc

Sometimes the first of two coordinate adjectives tends to be subordinate to the second, as in his dark grey suit (N. p. 42), the heavy dark face (N. p. 3).

It is easily seen how in such combinations the first adjective tends to become a subjunct to the second, as if it were a mere adverb of degree. At first it can only be used as such before an adjective of related signification; but if it is used extensively in such combinations, it is by and by felt as signifying nothing else but intensification, independently of the meaning of the following adjective, and may then be used before all kinds of adjectives.

The development has been carried furthest in the case of the two words very and pretty, which have become frankly adverbs: she was very competent (H. p. 7), etc. Very, meaning 'true', and pretty are used also as adjectives: the very act (H. p. 131), the very soul of the place (T. p. 14), the pretty but rather common little feet (H. p. 13).

Sweet looks upon dark in dark red and greenish in greenish yellow as adverbs, while Jespersen calls the whole combination a compound adjective.

In Modern English there is a tendency to use the superlative instead of the comparative. In colloquial English we say, for example, the highest of

the two hills, the greatest of the two men, etc although it is commonly stated to be incorrect, when only comparing two things or persons, to use the superlative. In careful speech and in writing we should use the comparative, when one thing is contrasted with only one other thing, for in writing we are more exact and accurate than in careless unstudied speech.

It is probable that the superlative was at first used for the comparative to strengthen the force of the comparative, implying 'very much more'.

As already before mentioned

old has two forms of comparison, of which the irregular (original) forms elder, eldest have the more limited range — being used chiefly to distinguish persons of the same family — and the more abstract meaning: the elder brother (T. p. 138), the eldest child (T. p. 116). The new — formations older, oldest, on the other hand, which keep the vowel of their positive unchanged, directly call forth the ideas of age or long duration: the older priest (H. p. 92), that oldest man (H. p. 98).

We say the elder brother, but we do not say the older brother, and if we do we would mean something

rather different from merely eldest brother. The fact is, that when we say the elder brother, we are not thinking primarily of his age, although, of course, this is also implied, but of his place in the order of the family. We can express the difference in other words by saying that elder is practically not the comparative of old, but the opposite of younger.

We do not say my brother is elder than I am, but my brother is older than I am. Here elder does not state differences of age with reference to a fixed <sup>order</sup> member <sup>in</sup> of the family, but picks out two persons, and compares them as if they were strangers.

hence the practical rule that the regular comparison is defined by a sentence introduced by than.

The irregular forms are used only attributively - our elder brother (H. p. 197), the eldest child (T. p. 116) - not predicatively, except with the definite article in such constructions as 'he is the elder of the two brothers,' where the logical predicate is not elder, eldest, but an understood noun of relationship.

If no the precedes, the regular forms alone can be used as predicates: she was older than I was (H. p. 231). But with the definite article we can say she is about four years the

elder instead of the more usual 'she is about four years older'.

The use of elder, eldest is not restricted to family relations, but may be sometimes extended to other personal relations, especially those which imply gradations of rank or authority. Thus in 'The grave elder men were glancing at her' (N. p. 63), 'The elder men looked up at her' (N. p. 63), 'the elder men were all dark' (N. p. 75) Lawrence speaks of a group of men, which consists of one young man and two old ones. 'The elder woman' (N. p. 101) — here the mother Superior is compared to a young sister. In these

cases elder replaces the more usual older, and has exactly the same meaning. The superlative eldest is rare in this use. In the latter examples given the regular comparison might also have been employed.

The irregular comparisons may be applied to other than personal nouns, if the noun suggests personal relations: the elder generation, the elder branches of the tribe. Here, again, the regular comparison may be substituted with hardly any change of meaning.

The irregular comparisons elder, eldest were originally the only ones,

and as the regular ones came into use only slowly, the irregular comparisons were in the earlier stages of English used in many of the constructions where we now use only the regular ones.

Thus we see that the use of the adjective in English differs greatly from that in the concord-languages; especially great differences are to be found in the accidents. The entire loss of inflexional endings is one of the most marked characteristics of the English adjective.

My treatment of the adjective is based on D. H. Lawrence's usage of adjectives in the works mentioned in the bibliography of this essay

366 667  
Auhinnatoo

Leidtorf, Therese.  
Accidence and Syn-  
dax of the... 1932