

Continue

























weblogs have been studied from the standpoint of genre, or perhaps from their classification into genres, would be more accurate expressions here. ===== It's essential to consider the context and audience when choosing an adjective, especially in cases where the term "generic" is used. In linguistics, there's a distinction between technical and common usage of "generic." The latter is more widely recognized and understood by the general public, whereas the former is typically reserved for academic circles. The Romance genre, with which I'm familiar, has sub-genres like historical, erotica, and rom-com. These sub-genres are characterized by specific tropes or story arcs that contribute to the overall happy ending formula. In linguistics, terms like weblogs have been studied from various angles, including lexical, grammatical, philological, and linguistic perspectives. The OP's question touches on the difference between "generic" and "of great danger." While both phrases convey a sense of risk, the former implies a more formal tone, whereas the latter is more concise. A correction suggests that in the second phrase, "that area" should be replaced with "that place," as the term refers to a specific location rather than generalizing it. In some cases, using "of" instead of "in" or "on" can improve sentence clarity and sound. For instance, saying "at night" sounds better than "in the night." However, there may be instances where both versions are acceptable, such as in idiomatic expressions or when referring to specific places. The question also explores the difference between "same color" and "of the same color." While both constructions are grammatically correct, they convey slightly different meanings. The former implies a physical similarity, whereas the latter suggests a shared characteristic or quality. Lastly, there's a comparison between "of great use" and "very useful." Both phrases convey the idea that something is helpful, but the idiomatic expression "of great use" is more commonly used in informal contexts. Difference between the two. Let me assume one thing. To go to a certain area at night is an everyday thing. 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, Akmrphi. 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 more formal way. Is this right? Thanks again. 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 of possess intrinsically; give rise to 13-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. 'of use', 'of value' are OK, 'of danger', 'of height' areNot adding more words to the mix does not make much difference, except perhaps in certain fixed expressions. Some nouns are used with 'of' as adjectives, while others aren't, although syntactically correct usage would be acceptable. I think this is my main point. I'd happily accept "of great interest", "of importance" and possibly "of the same colour", but most of the other "of...[noun]" examples sound a bit strange to me. Here are some common phrases found by searching with "it is of great!"; Google Ngram Viewer shows "A situation of great danger", "a monument of great antiquity", "walls of great height", and "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 anything (especially in our materialistic culture where many things 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 common. It's virtually a 'set phrase'. Thank you, DonnyB. You and all the other contributors are of great help to me. Thanks again, taked4700 Hello everyone, Can I use "very" before "fun"? The party was very fun. Which is better, "much fun" or "very fun"? Thanks in advance. Very fun is one of those phrases that bother teachers. Children use it all the time and eventually I'm sure it will become common. 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"? 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 way 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 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 fun does it? Yes Akasaka, in some contexts it does look like an adjective. In "the party was great" example, you could replace "great" with a whole series of adjectives - "excellent" "amazing" "superb" 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, that It was great fun and It was very funny do 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 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 an adjective. For example: "That was a fun party." "We had a fun time last night." In all the posts so far, though, it is 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 an adjective. For example: "That was a fun party." "We had a fun time last night." In all the posts so far, though, it is 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 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 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 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 great time discussing this issue. Can't say "real fun time." And "really" is an adverb. So, therefore, Q.E.D., since 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 adjective, we have to say "really fun time." Are we having real fun now or what? Blues Being from Ohio, "Very fun" sounds very natural to me... you learn something new every day Remember languages do change over time. The use of the word 'fun' as an adjective has become increasingly accepted. You have expressions like "He's a real fun person to be with" (note the use of 'real' as 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. "Very fun" sounds natural to me too. I have no qualms about "a (very) fun party", "a (really) fun person to be with", "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. 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. The adjectival fickleness of some words is an intriguing topic. Certain adjectives like alive and alone function well as predicate adjectives but lose their 'a'-prefix when placed before nouns. The adjective fun seems to work best in this position, while its use as a non-count noun in predicate contexts is common. Those with the 'a'-prefix belong to their own category. However, it's less common for an adjective to solely function before a noun. Many have discussed the use of fun as an adjective, but opinions remain divided. Those on the other side of the pond tend to agree that it should be used only as a noun. The author of this thread agrees with Panjandrum and concedes that "very fun" sounds like a childish error that people grow out of. However, the American formulation makes it sound more natural in certain accents. The post also touches upon how using 'fun' intentionally might evoke an affection in European English speakers. The author conducted research after reading the responses, consulting reference books and analyzing word classes from Graddol's publication. This research led to a better understanding of the indeterminacy in syntax and highlighted that not all adjectives are gradable. Some key points emerged during this analysis: "fun" can be an adjective before a noun but remains a 'marginal' example. It may move towards becoming a more 'prototypical' adjective, accepting comparative and superlative forms. However, for now, the author still recommends that non-native English speakers use "fun" only as a noun. The discussion also revealed interesting points about regional preferences and linguistic evolution. The author shares their findings on word usage, including ngrams, to shed more light on this topic.I was unclear when I said "great fun" is more formal than "lots of fun". To me, the most obvious way to express that idea is with "great fun". One can say "very great fun", where the very modifies the great, rather than the fun. If you're happy to use "fun" as an adjective, I don't see what's wrong with it. "Fun" is already quite informal, and "lots of fun" sounds strange - like something from fifty years ago. The more frequent formal expression is "great fun". I think I might be alone on this one, but we'll see. ===== Note: I've maintained the original tone and language of the text while applying a subtle transformation to make it sound slightly less formal and conversational.If you use it as an adjective-which IS possible-then "real" would be incorrect. It's just a different (and not wrong) interpretation; no need to make such a big deal. I can't imagine our Antipodean cousins sayin very fun, either. (bolding added) I'd like you to know that's very perceptive. Twoflower, and entirely correct, but unfortunately you haven't been seen here for several years, and thus may never see this post. I can happily put a lot of words together with fun, e.g. that was fun, great fun, lots of fun, a fun time, a fun night out, and so on... but very fun really grates. It's a fun game. I agree with Andycg #55. "Fun" is a noun here used attributively. It doesn't qualify as an adjective by virtue of the grading and adverbial dependents criteria, which explains why it doesn't take "very" or "too". However, for speakers who accept "It's a very fun thing to do", "fun" is an adjective. Last edited: Apr 29, 2024 I suspect that using "fun" as an adjective came from "fun person" - he/she is a fun person. From there it's an easy step to "very fun." But the real test is to ask whether "fun" has a comparative and superlative degree. If it did, it would be "funner" and "funnest." So if you say "funner" and "funnest," then you may say "very fun." I'm locking this thread to prevent further circular discussion which is of little help to learners. The fact is that some people use the term adjective to mean any word or phrase which modifies a noun or noun phrase. Other people consider this too broad and prefer a more restricted definition. There is no "right" answer. Debating what name should be applied to fun when it is used to modify a noun is of some academic interest but it does not help learners understand how to use the word. In a few days this thread will be pruned to retain the information useful to dictionary users about how fun can be used. Hi Is using the two structures below a matter of personal preference? to be of + noun VS to be + adjective It's a book that will be of no interest to a wide range of readers. It's a book that won't be interesting to a wide range of readers. It's an odd sentence (as to when it would appropriately be used),It's a matter of personal preference when choosing between "to be of interest to" and "to be interesting to". Both structures convey similar meanings, but they put emphasis on different aspects. The negative form of the verb can make a difference in tone and implication. ===== He had no interest in the matter, which is equivalent to saying he didn't find it at all captivating. This usage is common in casual conversations. Using "to be of + noun" or "to be + adjective" structures allows for varying levels of emphasis and connotation. It's a book that will be of no interest to many readers, whereas the alternative phrasing might imply that it's not worth reading at all. Similarly, it's a book that won't be interesting to anyone suggests that it's boring. Aloyalfrind explained that the two structures differ in emphasis and implications. The first sentence provides an example where the focus is on the speaker enjoying their trip (sentence01), whereas the second sentence implies the speaker imagines traveling around the world would be wonderful if given the chance (sentence02). However, this distinction might not be significant. The grammar expert mentioned in Practical English Usage 4th ed. noted that when the subject of a clause is an infinitive expression, it usually comes after the preparatory subject "it" and the infinitive expression later in the sentence. This rule helps create more natural-sounding sentences. It's nice to talk to you puts emphasis on the speaker's enjoyment, whereas To talk to you is nice shifts the focus to the recipient's appreciation. The expert also discussed gerund clauses and extraposition, stating that some constructions "generally resist" this process. ===== Hermione is right that "my English" shouldn't be an adjective, but rather a noun when referring to one's native language or dialect. However, she's correct that using it as an adjective can be confusing, especially in contexts where the focus is on speaking or writing in English. The French do capitalize the initial letter of nouns and adjectives derived from their country name, such as "French" or "french." This distinction is essential to understand when discussing languages like English, which has a different approach. Interestingly, there are exceptions to this rule, especially in idiomatic expressions or slang terms. For example, "Englishing" the crap out of something might be used to describe applying knowledge or skill in a particular area. The term "snowclone" refers to a phrase or sentence that can be adapted and used in various contexts. It's often created using common templates and clichés, making it easily recognizable and adaptable. While the concept of snowclones may seem oxymoronic, as no two snowflakes are alike, the term itself has become an integral part of internet culture and language. In programming, finding exceptions to a rule is crucial, which led one user to ponder the meaning of "Englishing" something. The result was a fascinating discussion that highlighted the complexities of language and its many nuances. =====Rewritten text here ===== I am going to apply the IB rewriting method to this article's text, which means varying sentence lengths and structures to create a more dynamic, engaging text. Looking forward to seeing everyone at the meeting tomorrow and discussing our strategies sounds like a normal statement. A is more beautiful than B but with adjectives of 1 or 2 syllables, the rule does not apply as easily. Instead of using more with less, we use not as...as for comparisons involving short words. For instance, we can say A is happier than B vs A is less happy than B. We also have to consider a different structure when dealing with adjectives that have more than two syllables. In such cases, it seems like substituting more with less works all the time. However, when it comes to short words, the as...as form becomes our default option. For example, A is not as happy as B sounds more natural than A is happier than B. Similarly, A is cleverer than B vs A is less clever than B sound better with the as...as structure because the word "clever" has only two syllables. As for your comment, I agree that using as...as seems unusual but it's a common way to make comparisons when we're working with short words. Although all three sentences mean the same thing, having an alternative form like "less [adjective] than" makes the original structure sound less natural and more forced. This is true for words like "young", "bold", or "strong". Using these alternatives would result in a sentence that sounds awkward, as you mentioned earlier. A is less young than B vs older sounds odd because we have another way to express this idea, which is "A is younger than B". In conclusion, when it comes to making comparisons, we often rely on the as...as form for short words and use "less [adjective] than" with longer words. While it might sound unusual at first, this approach helps create more varied sentence structures that keep our language interesting and engaging.