



## Usage questions from 2000

### GTN 00:1

1. Which form of the verb - the infinitive, the - *ing* form or the *to* infinitive - should be used after the construction *rather than*?
2. I've heard Shania Twain's hit *That don't impress me much*, but to me this title just sounds wrong. Shouldn't it be *That doesn't impress me much*?
3. Can you say *He behaved himself badly*?
4. Can *friendly* be used as an adverb?
5. Are the names of foreign newspapers used with or without the definite article in English?
6. How frequent is the use of reflexive instead of personal pronouns in sentences such as *She closed the door behind herself*?

### GTN 00:2

1. When visiting the States, I have heard people use the preterite form of irregular verbs as past participles (e.g. *I have came*). How frequent is this usage? Does it only occur in the U.S.?
2. How are the female titles *Mrs*, *Miss* and *Ms* used in present-day English?
3. What is the origin of the noun *woman* and why is the plural form, *women*, pronounced so strangely?
4. How acceptable and how frequent is the use of plural verbal agreement with subjects consisting of *either*, *neither* and *none*?
5. I don't know which preposition to choose! Can your corpora help me?

### GTN 00:3

1. How are uncountable nouns, such as *advice* and *furniture*, treated in authentic usage? I have a feeling that constructions of the type *a piece of furniture* and *a word of advice* actually are very infrequent.
2. I learnt about logical plurals at school: *My children have good appetites* etc. Do native speakers always use this, or would it be possible to say as we do in Swedish: *My children have good appetite*?
3. It seems that with some adverbs both the - *ly* form and the suffix-less form are used together with some verbs. Is this okay?
4. My teacher told me never to use the adjective *handsome* about women and never to use *beautiful* about men. Is English usage really this strict?
5. How should one refer back to an indefinite pronoun or noun phrase denoting a person, as in *You could ask someone/a friend what \_\_\_\_\_ would do*?

6. At school my teacher told me that I should avoid using the word *siblings* to refer to *brothers and sisters*, since it was restricted to scientific (especially medical) usage. Nowadays I often hear and see *siblings* used, both by my students and by native speakers. Has this word become everyone's possession lately?

---

Uppdaterad/kontrollerad 2008-06-24

[Hem](#)

[In English](#) 

-----

[Internt](#)

## Studera vid Linnéuniversitetet



Nu har Högskolan i Kalmar och Växjö universitet blivit Linnéuniversitetet! Besök oss på [Lnu.se](http://Lnu.se).

Växjö universitet, 351 95 Växjö

Telefon: 0470-70 80 00. Fax: 0470-832 17Uppdaterad/kontrollerad 2010-01-01



## @ GramTime News @

\* \* \* \* \*

00:1, February 2000

Welcome to the eighth issue of GramTime News, the electronic newsletter on English usage from Växjö University!

Editor-in-chief: [Hans Lindquist](#), PhD

Managing editor: [Maria Estling](#), MA

Contributing editors: [Jan Svartvik](#), Prof Em and [Magnus Levin](#), MA

---

### **Contents**

[0. Editorial](#)

[1. The GramTime Project: Grammatical Trends in Modern English \(general information\)](#)

[2. Usage questions and answers](#)

[3. Useful websites](#)

[4. Book tip](#)

[5. Christmas competition - the winners](#)

[6. GramTime publications](#)

[7. Practical information](#)

[8. The next issue](#)

---

### ***0. Editorial***

Dear Readers,

The skylark was observed outside Lund today. What else is there to say? Perhaps that our contributing editor Jan Svartvik was awarded the August prize in December for his book *Engelska – öspråk, världsspråk, trendspråk*, but that was probably not missed by anyone. Congrats, Jan!

Meanwhile, Maria and Magnus have been industrious at their computers, finding out about *rather than* + ? and whether it is OK to behave oneself badly and slam the door shut behind oneself, or perhaps better to behave friendly. Magnus has an exciting new piece on article usage, and he also found out that he could avoid work by looking up the answer to one of the questions in a recent corpus-based grammar, which we will return to. We continue to recommend some of our competitors' websites, in the vain hope that they will do the same with ours. This issue's book tip is about a book claiming that gossip is the origin of language. Finally, three cheers for the winners of our Christmas competition, Olle Kjellin and Pia George!

Looking forward to seeing all of you at the LMS conference in Göteborg 1–2 April!

Hans Lindquist

Editor-in-chief

---

## ***1. The GramTime project: Grammatical Trends in Modern English***

### **Basic facts:**

GramTime started on 1 July, 1996. It received funding from The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation (Riksbankens Jubileumsfond) until the end of 1999.

The aim of GramTime is to use existing computer corpora to investigate on-going and recent changes in English, particularly in the area of grammar. Comparisons are made between different varieties (British, American, Australian and New Zealand English); between genres like fiction, non-fiction and journalistic prose; and between spoken and written language.

The project is based at Växjö University and is directed by Hans Lindquist with Jan Svartvik (Lund) as project adviser. Two research assistants have worked half-time in the project: PhD students Maria Estling and Magnus Levin.

### **The following corpora are used:**

- The British National Corpus (BNC): 100 million words, written and spoken British English (1980s and 1990s)
- The Bank of English. We use a subset called the CobuildDirect Corpus: 50 million words, written and spoken British, American and Australian English (1980s and 1990s)
- The London-Lund corpus: 500 000 words, spoken British English (1960s and 1970s)
- The Brown corpus: 1 million words, written American English (1960s)
- The Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen corpus (LOB): 1 million words, written British English (1960s)
- The Freiburg updated version of LOB (FLOB): 1 million words, written British English. (1990s)
- The Freiburg updated version of Brown (Frown): 1 million words, written American English (1990s)
- The Longman Spoken American Corpus (LSAC): 5 million words, spoken American English (1990s)
- The Wellington Corpus of Spoken English (WCSE): 1 million words, spoken New Zealand English (1990s)
- The Wellington Corpus of Written English (WCWE): 1 million words, written New Zealand English (1990s)
- *The Independent* on CD-ROM 1990 & 1995
- *The Times* on CD-ROM 1990 & 1995

- *The New York Times* on CD-ROM 1990 & 1995
- *The Sydney Morning Herald* on CD-ROM 1992–1995

## 2. Usage questions and answers

### 1. Which form of the verb – the infinitive, the *-ing* form or the *to* infinitive – should be used after the construction *rather than*?

There seems to be a great deal of variation in this area. All three alternatives can be found, as can be seen in (1) to (3) below:

- (1) *Rather than face* the shame of interrogation, the Phoenix King took poison. (BrE)
- (2) I just participate 'cause there are some interns who decided that *rather than teaching* they're going to sit out and it's really not, it's not appropriate. (AmE)
- (3) (...) people's aim was to get out *rather than to improve* the conditions or or work on local issues. (BrE)

There are clear distributional differences, however. The bare infinitive in (1) and the *-ing* form in (2) appear to be about equally common, while the *to*-infinitive in (3) is very rare. No noticeable differences between British and American English and written and spoken language were found.

ML

### 2. I've heard Shania Twain's hit *That don't impress me much*, but to me this title just sounds wrong. Shouldn't it be *That doesn't impress me much*?

Non-standard verb agreement causes problems for many people – not least English teachers! The non-standard forms, which we have been taught are 'wrong', are not infrequent in spontaneous conversations. We have all come across instances such as those in (1) to (4):

- (1) I thought *you was* never comin'. (BrE)
- (2) *He don't* even know what it's called. (BrE)
- (3) *They doesn't* want to do them. (BrE)
- (4) Are you in agreement with me, *I says*. (BrE)

Fortunately, this issue is investigated in a recent corpus-based grammar, Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan, *Longman grammar of spoken and written English* (1999). In this grammar they present some statistics of agreement with personal pronouns, as is seen below:

Percentage use of non-standard forms in conversation (BrE + AmE) (Biber et al 1999:191)

Standard form	Non-standard form	% use non-standard
<i>I was</i>	<i>I were</i>	c. 5%
<i>You were</i>	<i>You was</i>	c. 10%
<i>She was</i>	<i>She were</i>	c. 10%
<i>They were</i>	<i>They was</i>	c. 5%
<i>I say</i>	<i>I says</i>	c. 50%
<i>You say</i>	<i>You says</i>	Less than 2%
<i>He doesn't</i>	<i>He don't</i>	c. 40%
<i>They don't</i>	<i>They doesn't</i>	Less than 2%

Disconcerting figures, indeed. It is particularly striking that the reporting clause *I says* (see (4) above) and the sequence *he don't* (2 above) are so very frequent. Apart from these cases, however, non-standard forms appear to be relatively rare. It is noteworthy that some sequences almost never occur; apart from the tag sequence *aren't I*, the sequence *\*I are* almost never occurs.

In written standard English, however, we can of course still stick to traditional agreement patterns.

ML

### 3. Can you say *He behaved himself badly*?

When recently watching an episode of the American TV-series *Ally MacBeal*, I was puzzled by a construction which goes against what grammar books and dictionaries say about how the English verb *behave* should be used. The general rule is that *to behave* is not reflexive unless its meaning is 'to behave well' (especially in exhortations like *Behave yourself!*) and is not followed by an adverbial (or preceded by an adverb such as *how*). The construction I heard was *He behaved himself badly in court*. Since I was curious to know if we are facing a new feature of English usage, I checked with some corpora and indeed found some examples of *behave* + reflexive pronoun + adverbial:

(1) But perhaps one of the reasons that deputies and their aides *behave themselves so wantonly* is that this is how they were taught in Soviet schools to view American democracy. (*The New York Times*)

(2) They come in all shapes and sizes, from all different molds, and a good number of them *behave themselves just like Hill*. (*The New York Times*)

(3) His recent . . . but all shall be well, which had its London premiere on Tuesday, *behaves itself alarmingly well*. (*The Independent*)

(4) ... it seemed unlikely that they were *behaving themselves with appropriate decorum*. (*The Independent*)

(5) Then France recalls its ambassador for consultations on the grounds that Australia has not been *behaving itself diplomatically*. (*The Sydney Morning Herald*)

(6) He probably *behaves himself properly* for MX. (spoken British English)

It seems, however, that native speakers, although sometimes disregarding the general norm for how *behave* is used, more often than not follow the norm. There were several hundred times more instances of the construction without a reflexive pronoun.

ME

### 4. Can *friendly* be used as an adverb?

One of our students recently reacted against our claim that *friendly* is just an adjective, and cannot be used as an adverb on its own. Grammar books tell us that (apart from a few particular adjectives) only temporal words like *daily* and *monthly* can be used both as adjectives and as adverbs. Words like *friendly*, *lively*, *manly* and so forth have to be expanded into prepositional phrases such as *in a friendly manner*, *way* or *fashion* in order to be used in adverbial functions. Now, what do our corpora say on the matter? Are adjectives of this type ever used as adverbs on their own, without an expanded construction?

I looked at the words *disorderly*, *friendly*, *gentlemanly*, *godly*, *heavenly*, *kindly*, *kingly*, *leisurely*, *lively*, *manly*, *masterly*, *orderly*, *seemly*, *slovenly*, *timely*, *unseemly* and *womanly* in texts comprising more than fifty million words. Some of these words were used very rarely or not at all in adverbial contexts and when they were, they generally occurred in prepositional phrases just as the grammar books suggest. There were between 0 (*heavenly*, *kingly* and *womanly*) and 28 (*friendly*) examples per word. I also noticed that in some of the occurrences with *fashion* the indefinite article was missing, as in (1):

(1) At the start of the Congregation, before they were locked up incommunicado, Paul VI addressed them *in friendly fashion* ... (British book)

I did, however, find some examples where the simple word is used as an adverb without a prepositional phrase. There were two examples of adverbial *friendly* and one each of *lively* and *orderly* :

(2) Big Chas's hand fell on my shoulder. "Lovejoy," he *said friendly*, and sang. (British book)

(3) I knew Mr. Pugh wanted to *talk peaceably and friendly* with everybody, but Pritchard Ellis always turned it into a thing like those debating societies they have. (British book)

(4) You tell me how to drive, you tell me how to walk. Step *lively*, Amy. You're a woman, you need some direction. (American conversation)

(5) We want you to remember that, as members of a government-in-waiting, you have a responsibility to behave *orderly* and with dignity. (American radio)

The words *leisurely* and *kindly* deviate from the other words in that they are recognized in some dictionaries as also being used as adverbs in the simple form, the latter sometimes with a slightly different meaning. In the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, *kindly* is defined as (a) 'in a kind way; generously', (b) 'a word meaning 'please', which is often used when you are annoyed: *Will you kindly put that book back?*. It also occurs in some phrases.

There were hundreds of examples of *kindly* and eight examples of *leisurely* used as adverbs, and few examples of these words in the prepositional construction (3 for *in a kindly* X and 5 for *in a leisurely* X), so, at least with *kindly* it seems that the simple form is preferred to the prepositional construction. Here is one example of *leisurely* used as an adverb found in a British magazine:

(6) Then stroll *leisurely* up the hill to Belgin's Kitchen, a supposedly authentic Turkish-style restaurant complete with carpets cushions and low tables.

Since there were so few tokens overall of these *-ly* words in adverbial function, it is difficult to know whether the occurrences of *friendly* and *orderly* as adverbs are noteworthy or not – it would have been easier to draw conclusions if we had had 200 instances of *in a friendly way* and 2 instances of just *friendly*.

Finally, the most likely explanation seems to be that the *-ly* ending misleads people (maybe even natives) to feel that *friendly* is already an adverb form and thus needs no further elaboration, especially since some similar words are used in this way (cf. *daily*, *kindly* and *leisurely*).

ME

## 5. Are the names of foreign newspapers used with or without the definite article in English?

If a foreign article is clearly expressed at the beginning of the name, as in *Le Figaro* or *der Spiegel*, then this article is used also in English, as seen in (1):

(1) *Le Monde*, France's daily newspaper of record, has been redesigned and relaunched with the help of a Fr25m advertising campaign which proclaims: "*Le Monde* is changing." (BrE)

Swedish newspapers, which have the definite article placed at the end of the name, do not appear to be used with a definite article in English. The sample studied here was small – about 20 tokens – but not a single instance of *the Dagens Nyheter* or *the Svenska Dagbladet* was found. This is an interesting finding, since Svartvik & Sager in their university grammar write that the article is included 'sometimes' with these names. A typical example is seen in (2):

(2) Indeed, if the scores are in reality comparable across countries, *The Times* today is about as difficult as *Dagens Nyheter* was in 1900! (BrE)

However, there appears to be some variation with certain German names. These names do not have the definite article included in the official logotype of the paper, which means that there is some confusion for English writers. Two representative instances are seen in (3) and (4):

(3) Whatever was said, Becker clearly seems to have changed his mind about the credibility and validity of the Grand Slam Cup, judging by a recent interview he gave to *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, one of Germany's most influential newspapers. (BrE)

(4) The most plausible explanation comes from *the Stuttgarter Zeitung*, a respected local German newspaper. (BrE)

## 6. How frequent is the use of reflexive instead of personal pronouns in sentences such as *She closed the door behind herself*?

An English sentences such as *She closed the door behind her* would be translated into Swedish with a reflexive pronoun for the English personal pronoun *her*. Svartvik & Sager write that, generally, a personal pronoun is used after prepositions of space in such constructions. They also admit, however, that constructions with reflexive pronouns do occur. I used the example sentences in the book to see how frequent this usage really is. The constructions I studied in a corpus of spoken and written British and American material (c. 30 million words) are:

- *look **about/around*** + PRON
- *have something **ahead of*** + PRON
- *have/place/put something **around*** + PRON
- *close/shut etc. the door **behind*** + PRON
- *have/place/put something **beside*** + PRON
- *have/place/put something **between*** + PRON
- *push something **in front of*** + PRON
- *take something **with*** + PRON

There was great variation in the frequency of tokens (including both reflexive and personal pronouns), from less than five to several hundred, which of course makes it difficult to talk about general frequencies. The corpus material provided a few examples of reflexive pronouns, even though the ordinary construction with a personal pronoun was far more frequent. Note that five out of six of the examples were found in the American material.

(1) `Yeah," she said. `Well, thanks." S'okay," the girl said as she shut the door *behind herself*. (American book)

(2) Lainey and Sarah came in, shutting the front door *behind themselves*. (American book)

(3) There it was--the well-known whereabouts of that stray grandson whom Lulu Lamartine and Marie Kashpaw shared uneasily *between themselves*. (American book)

(4) Er she'll make us a drink and we'll sit there and have a just have a natter *between ourselves* ... (spoken British English)

(5) No, no right now we know who we're gonna play right now we're having our own little tournament *between ourselves*. (spoken American English)

(6) And then one day Lulu's mailed picture of Gerry Nanapush arrived in Fargo, a wanted-poster message regarding his father that evidently made the boy stop and *look around himself*. (American book)

It is possible that some patterns are more likely than others to accept a reflexive pronoun. The two patterns exemplified by Svartvik & Sager were also two of the three constructions that were found in the corpus: *close/shut the door behind* + reflexive pronoun, as in (1) and (2) and *have/place/put something between* + reflexive pronoun, as in (3) – (5). I also found a third pattern, the *look around/about* pattern, as in (6). As for the use of *between ourselves* etc. it could possibly be attributed to the fact that such an expression exists, although carrying another meaning, i.e. 'between you and me'.

## Expand your lexical universe!

Are you curious about the etymologies of the expressions *Come hell or high water* or *knock on wood*? Would you like to know what *hybrid CD:s* and *web rings* are? Answers to these and many other questions can be found at a website called *World Wide Words*. A couple of GTN issues ago we presented *The Majority English Dibal*. The website of this issue is another website devoted to words in English and the producer, Michael Quinion, also provides a newsletter that is sent weekly to subscribers all over the world. You will find the site at the following address:

<http://www.quinion.com/words/>.

The website has a great deal of information to offer about such things as...

- ... new words and phrases that have not yet been described in dictionaries, e.g. *v-mail* = 'a short video message sent by e-mail' and *raw foodism* = 'an extreme form of vegetarianism, in which all cooking is eschewed in favour of raw ingredients as near their natural state as possible' (under the headline *Turn of phrases*)
- ... new meanings of words and phrases, e.g. (under the headline *Topical words*)
- ... origins of words and phrases, e.g. *arms akimbo* and *honeymoon* (under the headline *Questions and answers*)
- ... weird words: "obscure or odd words are dragged out, blinking in the light, from the darker recesses of the Oxford English Dictionary"

Furthermore, the website provides book reviews and discussions of language usage, such as whether verbs should end in *-ize* or *-ise* and whether one should say *data is* or *data are*. You will also find information about how to become a subscriber to the newsletter – which is free!

*World Wide Words* has received a great deal of positive criticism in the press. Here are a few mentions:

"Michael Quinion ... records the latest words and explains some common phrases on this wonderful site, so finding out about new words can be a daily event. A treat for etymologists, wordsmiths and show-offs everywhere." [The Editor supplement in *The Guardian*, 20 February 1999.]

"Michael Quinion's ever-growing site is the place to chew over questions .. and get the low-down on hot new words." [Technofile column in *Independent on Sunday*, 31 January 1999.]

"Anyone who loves words will love World Wide Words." [*USA Today*, 20/27 January 1999.]

ME

---

### 4. Book tip

**Dunbar, Robin. 1996. *Grooming, Gossip and the Evolution of Language*. London: Faber and Faber. 230 pp. GBP 7.99.**

The origin of language has fascinated linguists and laymen for a long time. Historical linguists have traced developments backwards in time into a misty past, postulating ancestor languages like proto-Indo-European (PIE) for the European languages and, more recently, the even more ancient (and dubious) Nostratic for even more languages. Now scholars from Archaeology (e.g. the controversial Colin Renfrew), Neuroscience (Steven Pinker), Genetics and Psychology seem to be moving towards an understanding of the possible origins of language, and linguists like Derek Bickerton and Ray Jackendoff have picked up on their theories. The field is still looked upon with a certain amount of suspicion by many, but in the nineties there have been two international conferences on The Evolution of Language, and a third will be organized in Paris 3-6 April this year with many famous linguists participating.

In 1996 Robin Dunbar, a British professor of psychology who has also been professor of biological anthropology, caused quite a stir with a book where he argues that language must have developed from the need of apes to create social networks to survive in big flocks. Most scholars now believe that language developed in Africa with

early man, and then spread, perhaps in three separate waves, over the globe. Dunbar carried out extensive field studies of monkeys in East and West Africa, and the following is, in short, his argument.

The grooming that goes on among monkeys is basically an act to create social networks. A monkey that is attacked is usually defended by its grooming partners. To keep up a grooming relationship takes a number of hours a day, and with the need for food gathering and other activities there is only time for a limited number of such relationships. But apes that were able to keep up networks using language had an evolutionary edge over those that could not, since with language you can "groom" (gossip with) approximately three people at a time instead of one with physical grooming! And according to Dunbar and many studies he cites, gossiping and the various kinds of group control that is carried out by similar means is a major part of everyday language use among humans. I suppose teachers are a bit different, since we tend to preach a lot, but study all your verbal interaction with friends and colleagues for a day: How much of it is describing, commenting on, discussing, condemning and (less frequently) praising the actions of your fellow humans? I did this and was surprised.

Dunbar's book is not the last word on the origin of language, but possibly it provides one piece of the solution. At any rate, it is full of fascinating information on apes and people and is highly recommended reading.

## References

Bickerton, Derek. 1981. Roots of language. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Karoma

Bickerton, Derek. 1990. Language and species. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Jackendoff, Ray. 1992. Languages of the mind. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press

Pinker, Steven. 1994 (1995). The language instinct. New York: Harper Collins

Renfrew, Colin. (1987) 1989 Archaeology and language. The puzzle of Indo-European Origins. London: Penguin

HL

---

## **5. Christmas competition - the winners**

The Christmas competition that we offered in the last issue of GramTime News was obviously either too difficult or too boring; the avalanche of suggestions for nonce-words (of the type that David Crystal describes in his book *Language Play*) that we had expected never appeared. We did, however, receive one small avalanche, coming from Olle Kjellin and Pia George who came up with no fewer than 25 very creative suggestions. Well done! We will send you Crystal's book and hope you will enjoy reading it. Here are some of their nonce-words:

- *infaumatized* = receiving such amounts of information that your head spins and you end up in a shock-like state due to brain overload (*information* + *traumatized*)
- *moniac* = a person obsessed with money (*money* + *maniac*)
- *pressent* = a Christmas gift you felt forced to give (*pressed* + *present*)
- *buyased* = being partial to the art of shopping (*buy* + *biased*)
- *purchase* = the act of adding a feline member to your family (*purr* + *purchase*)
- *clanliness* = when you avoid genetic contamination by keeping it all in the family (*clan* + *cleanliness*)
- *internotional* = the modern way of uniting in brotherhood between peoples (*Internet* + *international*)
- *predictionary* = word list containing only well-known words (*predict* + *dictionary*)
- *emphatigue* = marked tiredness (*emphasis* + *fatigue*)
- *Lapp top* = summit in northern Scandinavia

## 6. GramTime publications

- Estling, Maria. 1998a. *A preposition thrown out (of) the window? On British and American use of out of versus out*. Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities, No.5 1998.
- ——. 1998b. *Your English is different from/to/than mine! Om rivaliserande prepositioner i brittisk och amerikansk engelska*. LMS Lingua, 5/98.
- ——. 1999a. Going out (of) the window? A corpus-based study of competing prepositional constructions in American and British English. *English Today*, 59, Vol. 15, No. 3: 22–27.
- ——. 1999b. Fönster mot språkvärlden. Om textdatabaser (korpora) i forskning, undervisning och textproduktion. In *Universitet 2000. Föreläsningar hållna under humanistdagarna 15–16 oktober 1999*. Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities, No.3 1999.
- ——. In press. Competition in the wastebasket: A study of constructions with *all*, *both* and *half*. Proceedings from ICAME 99, Freiburg.
- ——. Forthcoming. Korpusar, prepositioner och regional variation i modern engelska. To appear in *Korpusar i forskning och undervisning (KORFU 99)*. Gunilla Byrman, Hans Lindquist, Maria Estling & Magnus Levin (eds). Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities.
- ——. Forthcoming. Prepositional variation in British and American English. To appear in *Studies in Mid-Atlantic English*. Marco Modiano (ed).
- Levin, Magnus. 1998a. Manchester United are my team: Concord with collective nouns. *Moderna Språk*, 1/98.
- ——. 1998b. On concord with collective nouns in English. Antoinette Renouf (ed). *Explorations in Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- ——. 1998c. *On concord with collective nouns in English*. Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities, No.7 1998.
- ——. 1998d. Concord with collective nouns in British and American English. In Lindquist et al (eds) 1998.
- ——. 1999. Concord with collective nouns revisited. *ICAME Journal* 23, 21–33.
- ——. Forthcoming. Mid-Atlantic Agreement. Marco Modiano (ed). *Studies in Mid-Atlantic English*.
- Lindquist, Hans. 1998. The comparison of English disyllabic adjectives in *-y* and *-ly* in present-day British and American English. In Lindquist et al (eds)
- ——. 1999. Electronic corpora as tools for translation. Gunilla Anderman & Margaret Rogers (eds). *Word, text and translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- ——. 2000. *Livelier or more lively?* Syntactical and contextual factors influencing the comparison of disyllabic adjectives. John Kirk (ed) *Corpora galore. Analyses and Techniques in Describing English*. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.
- ——. In press. Apples and oranges: On comparing data from different corpora. Proceedings from ICAME99, Freiburg.

- —, Staffan Klintborg, Magnus Levin & Maria Estling (eds). 1998. *The major varieties of English. Papers from MAVEN 97*. Växjö: Acta Wexionensia.
  - Svartvik, Jan. 1998. Varieties of English: Major and minor. In Lindquist et al (eds).
  - —. 1999a. *Engelska – öspråk, världsspråk, trendspråk*. Stockholm: Norstedts Ordbok.
  - —. 1999b. English corpus studies: past, present, future. *English Corpus Studies*. Japan Association for English Corpus studies.
  - —. In press. *Corpora and Dictionaries. The perfect learner's dictionary*. Proceedings from a symposium at Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik. Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg.
  - —. Forthcoming. *How many Englishes are there – and which is the pick of the bunch?* Association of Teachers of English of the Czech Republic Newsletter.
  - — & Hans Lindquist. 1997. *One and body language*. Viviane Müller & Peter Schneider (eds). *From Ælfric to the New York Times: Studies in English Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- 

## **7. Practical information**

Would you like to get in touch with the editors to get more information, ask usage questions, give comments and tips etc.? Please send an e-mail to [gramtime@hum.vxu.se](mailto:gramtime@hum.vxu.se). We cannot give you personal replies to usage questions, but if we find your question of interest to the public and if we can answer it, it will be discussed in the newsletter.

If you want to read back issues of *GramTime News*, please go to

<http://www.vxu.se/hum/publ/gtn/>

**Please note that we have a new website address!**

---

## **8. The next issue**

We plan to distribute the next newsletter in May 2000.

---

Institutionen för humaniora  
Växjö universitet, 351 95 Växjö.  
Besöksadress: Pelarplatsen 7  
Telefon: 0470-70 80 00. Fax: 0470-75 18 88.  
Senast ändrad/kontrollerad 2005-07-25



## @ GramTime News @

\* \* \* \* \*

00:2, June 2000

Welcome to the ninth issue of GramTime News, the electronic newsletter on English usage from Växjö University!

Editor-in-chief: [Hans Lindquist](#), PhD

Managing editor: [Maria Estling](#), MA

Contributing editors: [Jan Svartvik](#), Prof Em and [Magnus Levin](#), MA

---

### **Contents**

[0. Editorial](#)

[1. The GramTime Project: Grammatical Trends in Modern English \(general information\)](#)

[2. Usage questions and answers](#)

[3. Useful websites](#)

[4. GramTime publications](#)

[5. Practical information](#)

[6. The next issue](#)

---

### ***0. Editorial***

Dear Readers,

At this time of the year time goes real quick (or is it really quickly?). It flies so fast, indeed, that this May issue of GTN will be reaching you in June. And we can't even blame the postal services. But we are busy reading student papers, one of which in fact says (almost) everything about quick/quickly and slow/slowly. We hope to be able to tell you the whole story in our September issue in October.

In the present issue, Maria unveils some quite shocking verbal practices in both America and Great Britain, and continues to enlighten us about prepositional usage, while our staff feminist Magnus solves the female mystique, or at least the women pronunciation riddle, and describes the current state of the art in referring to people of the so-called second sex. He also tells us everything we never wanted to know about agreement with *either*, *neither*

and *none*.

We all wish you a really great summer, with lots of fun books to read! Do drop us a line when you come across some interesting usage or abuse of the English language.

Hans Lindquist

Editor-in-chief

---

## 1. *The GramTime project: Grammatical Trends in Modern English*

### **Basic facts:**

GramTime started on 1 July, 1996. It received funding from The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation (Riksbankens Jubileumsfond) until the end of 1999.

The aim of GramTime is to use existing computer corpora to investigate on-going and recent changes in English, particularly in the area of grammar. Comparisons are made between different varieties (British, American, Australian and New Zealand English); between genres like fiction, non-fiction and journalistic prose; and between spoken and written language.

The project is based at Växjö University and is directed by Hans Lindquist with Jan Svartvik (Lund) as project adviser. Two research assistants have worked half-time in the project: PhD students Maria Estling and Magnus Levin.

### **The following corpora are used:**

- The British National Corpus (BNC): 100 million words, written and spoken British English (1980s and 1990s)
- The Bank of English. We use a subset called the CobuildDirect Corpus: 50 million words, written and spoken British, American and Australian English (1980s and 1990s)
- The London-Lund corpus: 500 000 words, spoken British English (1960s and 1970s)
- The Brown corpus: 1 million words, written American English (1960s)
- The Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen corpus (LOB): 1 million words, written British English (1960s)
- The Freiburg updated version of LOB (FLOB): 1 million words, written British English. (1990s)
- The Freiburg updated version of Brown (Frown): 1 million words, written American English (1990s)
- The Longman Spoken American Corpus (LSAC): 5 million words, spoken American English (1990s)
- The Wellington Corpus of Spoken English (WCSE): 1 million words, spoken New Zealand English (1990s)
- The Wellington Corpus of Written English (WCWE): 1 million words, written New Zealand English (1990s)
- *The Independent* on CD-ROM 1990 & 1995
- *The Times* on CD-ROM 1990 & 1995
- *The New York Times* on CD-ROM 1990 & 1995
- *The Sydney Morning Herald* on CD-ROM 1992–1995

---

## 2. Usage questions and answers

### 1. When visiting the States, I have heard people use the preterite form of irregular verbs as past participles (e.g. *I have came*). How frequent is this usage? Does it only occur in the U.S.?

I looked at preterite forms of some 50 irregular verbs where the preterite and past participle forms are (or can be) different. The material consisted of two corpora of spoken English: one American (c. 5 million words) and one British (c. 10 million words), both of which contain a number of dialogues in various settings. A problem in connection with corpora of spoken text is that they contain a fairly large amount of transcription error, and one can never be quite sure that what is on the screen is the exact representation of the actual spoken interaction. One might also hypothesise that some transcribers would correct obvious "errors", such as a preterite form of a verb in the present perfect, the consequence of which would be that there may have been more instances of the preterite form in the original recordings than the written version actually shows.

In the corpus of British English, I found 65 instances of *have* (in any form) + an irregular verb in preterite form, and the American corpus yielded 93 tokens. These seem to be fairly large figures (even though the number of ordinary past participle forms of course is much higher), especially considering the fact that constructions with an intervening adverbial (such as *not* or *almost*) were not included in the search. The corpus results may also suggest that the construction, although used in both varieties investigated, is more frequent in American English. The American material had almost 19 tokens per million words, whereas the figure in the British material was around 7.

Here are three examples from the corpora:

(1) I *had forgot* we were being taped. (American)

(2) (...) then they should *have came* er on the first of April and they rung me up to say they couldn't (...) (British)

(3) But when I got into his class for history he couldn't *have gave* me the time of day. (British)

The most frequent constructions were *have went*, *have took* and (in the American corpus) *have did*, examples of which are given in (4) – (6):

(4) I would never *have went* up to my mum's (...) (British)

(5) Oh, for Pete's sakes that's why they *had took* all the lamps down, but the cooking was all completed and they were all ready to eat ... (American)

(6) I'll tell you when those people glued that tile down on that floor, they must *have did* a good job. (American)

The reason is probably that these very common verbs are more frequent overall than other words with more semantic content. One could otherwise have expected that less frequent words would be more prone to get preterite forms, owing to uncertainty, also among native speakers, about how more infrequent irregular verbs should be inflected.

One example from the corpus reflects the fact that, even though the use of preterite forms in the present perfect is fairly common, it is not considered to be accepted as standard English:

(7) Somebody *had wrote in* and **written in I should say** and complained that the Microsoft software manual wasn't very easy to understand (...) (British)

It thus seems advisable not to accept these forms in our pupils' and students' writing.

ME

### 2. How are the female titles *Mrs*, *Miss* and *Ms* used in present-day English?

Good question. With the advent of feminism and 'political correctness' one might expect that it is becoming increasingly popular to use *Ms* instead of *Miss* and *Mrs*.

Starting with a little bit of background, all three titles are related to the noun *mistress* and according to the *Longman* dictionary *Ms* is 'a title used before a woman's family name because it is not important to say whether she is married or not, or when you do not know whether she is married or not.' It is not commented on whether it is regarded impolite to point out a woman's marital status. (*Ms* without a full stop is considered by that dictionary to be the BrE variant and *Ms.* the AmE way to write the title.)

The question of which title to use when referring to women is a controversial issue that is hotly discussed in English speaking countries, as can be seen in (1) from *The New York Times* 1990.

(1) Before her arrival in 1981, Justice O'Connor added, case summaries referred to women lawyers appearing before the Supreme Court as 'Miss' or 'Mrs.,' while there was no honorific for men. 'Now the men are listed as 'Mr.' and the women as 'Ms.,' ' she said. 'None of these changes have affected the way in which any lawsuit has proceeded,' she said, 'but I believe they send an important signal.' (NYT 90)

The material that we studied mainly comprises the 1990 and 1995 CD-ROM editions of *The New York Times* and *The Independent*. Just before our deadline we also got hold of the first three months of the year 2000 for *The Independent*. By using different years we may catch a glimpse of linguistic change in progress.

A few points must also be made about the material. All tokens of *Mrs Thatcher* were excluded from the material from the *Ind*. The reason for this is that *Mrs Thatcher* was amazingly frequent in the 1990 edition, representing 47% (!) of all tokens of *Mrs*, while this percentage had dropped to only 5% in 1995. It is also important to bear in mind that the editorial policy of the newspapers influences the results in this area. If the editors decide that the paper should use *Ms* instead of *Miss* and *Mrs* we would see a sharp increase in the use of the former title. However, there was a slow but steady increase in the use of *Ms* for every quarter of 1990 and 1995 in *NYT*, which may indicate that at least journalists are gradually getting more aware of this issue. Furthermore, it should be remembered that some of the instances of *Miss* were found in fixed titles of musicals (*Miss Saigon*), plays (Strindberg's *Miss Julie*) and, ahem, beauty contests (*Miss World*). The overall frequencies of *Miss* are therefore probably even lower than can be seen from Table 1 below. The percentages refer to the proportions of the various titles in a given year.

Table 1. The use of the titles *Ms*, *Miss* and *Mrs* in *The New York Times* and *The Independent* 1990 and 1995 (and January to March 2000, *Ind*).

	<i>Ms</i>		<i>Miss</i>		<i>Mrs</i>			<i>Ms</i>		<i>Miss</i>		<i>Mrs</i>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%
NYT 90	28716	47	8623	14	23427	39	IND 90	3559	26	2790	21	7117	53
NYT 95	43654	68	3493	5	17276	27	IND 95	5082	36	2378	17	6499	47
							IND 00	2236	53	625	15	1350	32

To begin with, titles are much more common in *NYT* than in *Ind*, for some reason. In addition, titles are used more frequently in 1995 than in 1990 in both newspapers, which may be an indication that women are given slightly more space in newspapers (barring the exceptional *Mrs Thatcher*), or simply that writers have become more careful to use titles with women.

The trend seen most clearly in Table 1 is the increase of *Ms* in *NYT*, and for 2000 also in *Ind*. It seems that AmE is leading the way in the trend towards *Ms*. In *Ind* 00 the percentage of *Ms* is higher than that in *NYT* 90, so BrE is moving in the same direction as AmE. Another interesting point to note is how very rare *Miss* is becoming in *NYT*.

It seems that there is very little variation with individual women. Once a woman has been called either *Ms* or *Mrs* the title appears to be firmly established. Famous examples only used with *Mrs* are *Mrs Thatcher* and *Mrs Clinton*.

Looking a little more closely at the tokens of *Miss*, we can notice an interesting trend. It seems that this title is mainly used to refer to older women who must have been called *Miss* before the invention of *Ms*. This phenomenon is exemplified in (2). Alternatively, *Miss* is used to refer to very young women, as seen in (3).

(2) Frances Cole (...) died on Oct. 10 (...) She was 94. *Miss Cole*, who was born in Greenville, Ohio, (...) (NYT 95)

(3) (...) students voiced criticism and support for the 19-year-old *Miss Grant*, whose admission to Harvard University was rescinded after it was learned that she had killed her mother (...) (NYT 95)

A further interesting point to note is that the names of some well-known feminists only appear to be used with *Ms*, as in (4):

(4) Such stereotypes do not work to illustrate the feminism *Ms. Weldon* so ardently professes; (NYT)

Interestingly, some women do not want to be called '*Ms*', as is evident from (5):

(5) (...) PEGGY POST, who makes her debut as the etiquette columnist of Good Housekeeping magazine in the September issue. *Mrs. Post* (don't call her *Ms.*, though she says that's a perfectly fine title) has already started making appearances at bridal shows at department stores. (NYT)

What does the situation look like in spoken language? Well, to begin with it is difficult for people who transcribe the sometimes unclear spoken language to discern between *Miss*, *Ms* and *Mrs*, so it is hard to obtain reliable results here. Anyway, our corpus of spoken AmE indicated that the three titles are used in about equal proportions in spoken language, that is AmE speakers are less 'politically correct' in everyday speech than the writers on NYT are. This shows that the written language, which is more carefully planned, is leading the way in the conscious change from *Miss/Mrs* to *Ms*.

ML

### 3. What is the origin of the noun *woman* and why is the plural form, *women*, pronounced so strangely?

The first part of the question is relatively easy to answer. The Old English masculine noun *mann* referred both to men and women, while *wifmann* only referred to women, although it also was a masculine noun. In contrast, *wif* was neuter in Old English. These three forms developed into the present day nouns *man*, *woman* and *wife*.

The second part of the question, why *women* is pronounced so differently from *woman* is more difficult to answer. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the rounding of *wi-* to *wu-* was established by about 1200, and from 1400 *woman* and *women* became regular spellings for the singular and the plural. OED concludes rather vaguely that "in the standard speech the pronunciation (wu-) was ultimately appropriated to the sing. and (wi-) to the pl., probably through the associative influence of pairs like *foot* and *feet*."

ML

### 4. How acceptable and how frequent is the use of plural verbal agreement with subjects consisting of *either*, *neither* and *none*?

For this question we looked at spoken AmE and BrE (where we found rather few tokens) and written AmE (*New York Times* 1995), written BrE (*Independent* 1995) and written AusE (*Sydney Morning Herald*). It seems that learners' uncertainty about which verb form to use is shared by native speakers. Subject phrases containing *either* or *neither* are quite often followed by modal verbs, which means that number-specific marking on the verb is avoided in many cases (*Neither Bill nor Hillary would comment*). This strategy can of course also be applied by uncertain learners.

Two noun phrases co-ordinated with *either* followed by an inflected verb, as exemplified in (1) and (2), is a highly unusual construction.

(1) There is no suggestion that *either Mr Taylor or Mr Gibson* faces an adverse finding by the Police Royal Commission. (written AusE)

(2) (...) French financial markets have shown signs of nervousness about whether *either Mr. Jospin or Mr. Chirac* share the commitment made by Mr. Balladur (...) (written AmE)

In the present material it occurred less than once every three million words. The singular seems to be the preferred alternative with 34 tokens against only 8 cases of plural agreement.

Plural agreement appears to be more common after singular subject NPs co-ordinated with *neither* than with *either*. Below are two typical examples in (3) and (4). (It should perhaps be pointed out that the grammar checker in my word processor insists that a singular verb should be used in (4).)

(3) *Neither the officer nor the suspect under arrest was injured.* (written AmE)

(4) *Neither Mr Gingrich nor Mr Dole have appeared on TV since Wednesday morning.* (written BrE)

Interestingly, there are clear differences between the newspapers in this study. The plural was most frequent in the BrE paper (42%), least frequent in the AmE one (17%) and intermediate in the AusE one (31%). It is not quite clear how much of this difference depends on regional variation and the individual style guides of the newspapers, however.

Sometimes a singular and a plural NP are co-ordinated with *neither*. According to some grammars the verb tends to agree with the NP closest to it, while others claim that the plural is the rule irrespective of the order of the subject constituents. The present material shows that the plural is indeed almost exclusively used when the plural NP comes closest to the verb, as in (5). Furthermore, the plural is slightly more frequent than the singular when the singular NP is closest to the verb, as in (6) below.

(5) *And neither he nor the film's other speakers are allowed to go on at length, no matter how interesting what they have to say.* (written AmE)

(6) *Neither the memos obtained by The Times nor his testimony describe him as informing compliance officers of the problems.* (written AmE)

With subjects containing *neither of* + plural NP, the singular was used in about three quarters of the tokens in all three newspapers, (7) thus being more common than (8).

(7) *Again, neither of these charges was ever proven.* (written BrE)

(8) *Neither of these estimates include dilution costs, which might total \$100 million.* (written AmE)

With none there seems to be some resistance from purists against the use of plural agreement. For instance, this phenomenon is mentioned by Biber et al in their recent grammar, the *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, as being a construction that some people find worth condemning. The writer in (9) from *NYT* (writing about the obscene and non-obscene usage of the noun *bugger*) apparently considered it amusing to explain the choice of singular agreement in the first sentence by referring to purists' feelings about linguistic obscenity.

(9) *None of these usages is obscene.* ('None are' would be obscene to purists.) (written AmE)

If we turn to the authentic use of agreement with *none* we find that there are clear differences between *NYT* and *Ind*. *None* alone, as used in (10) and (11) below, is used with plural agreement in 22% of the cases in *Ind* while a majority of the instances in *NYT*, 57%, are plural.

(10) *Though there have been four recordings, at least two on CD, none is currently available.* (written AmE)

(11) *Of the 989 rental units in the Gardens, none are currently available.* (written AmE)

Plural agreement is even more frequent with subjects consisting of *none of* and a plural NP. In (12) below is an example of singular agreement and in (13) we have plural agreement. The plural is used in 40% of the tokens in *Ind* and 75% of the tokens in *NYT* and it is even more frequent in speech.

(12) *None of the major mobile phone companies was available for comment yesterday.* (written BrE)

(13) *This time, none of the usual conscience-soothers were available.* (written BrE)

In conclusion, plural agreement seems to be quite frequent with *either*, *neither* and *none*, although some people - and computer programmes - still object to this usage.

One area that causes constant problems for non-native speakers of English is the use of prepositions. Since the last issue of GramTime News we have collected a number of constructions where people seem to be uncertain about which preposition is the only possible or the most frequent form. The results of a corpus-study of spoken and written British and American English can be summarised in the following table:

	<b>Average percentage</b>
<i>at the beginning/end</i>	<b>c.75%</b>
<i>in the beginning/end</i>	c.25%
<i>at the receiving end</i>	c.20%
<i>on the receiving end</i>	<b>c.80%</b>
<i>in contrast to</i>	<b>c.90%</b>
<i>in contrast with</i>	c.10%
<i>comparable to</i>	<b>c.80%</b>
<i>comparable with</i>	c.20%
<i>compare (X) to</i>	c.50%
<i>compare (X) with</i>	c.50%
<i>in comparison to</i>	c.40%
<i>in comparison with</i>	<b>c.60%</b>
<i>in connection to</i>	c.0%
<i>in connection with</i>	<b>c.100%</b>
<i>frown on</i>	<b>c.55%</b>
<i>frown upon</i>	c.45%

These findings call for some comments. With some of the constructions one of the alternatives was clearly predominant. This was the case with *in connection to/with* (where *with* was used in virtually all instances), *in contrast to/with* (where *to* was used in 90% of the cases). Also, *on the receiving end* was four times more frequent than *at the receiving end*, and *comparable to* was four times more frequent than *comparable with*.

*At/in the beginning/end* too was four times more frequent than *in* overall. It should be noted, however, that in a construction with an *of* following the phrase, as shown in (1), *at* was used as often as *in* between 98 and 100% of the cases:

(1) I said she should move out *at the beginning of* August.

In such *of*-constructions *in* was slightly more frequent in speech than in writing, and there was sometimes something in the previous context requiring that *in* should be used, as in (2):

(2) Oh I thought you meant you tore it up into little thin strips and rolled it up and *stuck it in the end of* a rolling cigarette so you didn't get tobacco in your mouth.

With some prepositional constructions, both alternatives were fairly equally common. This was true of *frown on/upon* (where *on* was just slightly more frequent than *upon*) and *in comparison to/with* (where the latter alternative was somewhat more common).

The only case where we can spot a clear dialectal difference was in tokens including the verb *compare* – and only in expressions where a direct object comes between the verb and the preposition, as in (3):

(3) He *compared himself to* a fly which can travel a hundred miles because it has hidden itself in a horse's tail.

Here, *to* was the more frequent alternative in all American corpora and *with* was more frequent in the British material, whereas there were no such clear differences in constructions where no object occurred between the verb and the preposition. In the latter case the average figures in the table (50–50) are somewhat misleading. In fact, there was great variation between the different corpora – from 92% *to* vs. 8% *with* in a corpus of spoken American to 81% *with* vs. 19% *to* in another American, written source, *The New York Times*. We could not find any regional or stylistic tendencies in this case.

It is very possible that a more in-depth study would reveal subtle usage differences between alternatives – differences which pass by unnoticed in a quick, quantitative survey like this one. I hope to find the time to come back to such findings in the future.

ME

---

### 3. Useful websites

#### "To IT or not to IT, that's your question" - a paradise for teachers without "net-fright"!

If you listened to the paper by Mike Hegarty at the LMS conference in Gothenburg in April, you can stop reading here, since what I will tell you about now is a website mentioned in his very interesting talk about how to use computers in foreign language teaching. At

<http://esl.about.com/education/esl/mbody.html>

you will find an overview of a large number of useful links to other websites which provide material for classroom activities and interesting information and discussions about the English language. There is, for instance, one site full of (self-correcting) exercises for practising vocabulary in context on the net:

<http://esl.about.com/homework/esl/blvocab.htm>

Another website offers lesson plans for various levels and within several different areas, such as grammar, vocabulary, reading and speaking. If you prefer not to use entire lesson plans that others have devised, you might at least get some ideas for your own teaching. This website can be found at:

<http://esl.about.com/homework/esl/bllessonplans.htm>

Information and exercises concerning differences between British and American English are to be found at:

<http://esl.about.com/homework/esl/msub21.htm>

If you want your students to practise their English by chatting with other pupils or writing to penpals in other countries, you will find chatting rooms and penpal lists at:

<http://esl.about.com/homework/esl/msub1.htm>

There are also a number of links to sites dealing with computer-assisted language learning (CALL) in general, where you will find (among other things) suggestions about how to use the computer and the Internet in the language classroom, software presentations and reviews. The main site about CALL is at:

And there is a lot more for you to find out for yourself. Happy surfing!

ME

---

#### 4. GramTime publications

- Estling, Maria. 1998a. *A preposition thrown out (of) the window? On British and American use of out of versus out*. Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities, No.5 1998.
- ——. 1998b. *Your English is different from/to/than mine! Om rivaliserande prepositioner i brittisk och amerikansk engelska*. LMS Lingua, 5/98.
- ——. 1999a. Going out (of) the window? A corpus-based study of competing prepositional constructions in American and British English. *English Today*, 59, Vol. 15, No. 3: 22–27.
- ——. 1999b. Fönster mot språkvärlden. Om textdatabaser (korporar) i forskning, undervisning och textproduktion. In *Universitet 2000. Föreläsningar hållna under humanistdagarna 15–16 oktober 1999*. Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities, No.3 1999.
- ——. In press. Competition in the wastebasket: A study of constructions with *all*, *both* and *half*. In *Corpus linguistics and linguistic theory*. Christian Mair & Marianne Hundt (eds.). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- ——. Forthcoming. Korpusar, prepositioner och regional variation i modern engelska. In *Korpusar i forskning och undervisning (KORFU 99)*. Gunilla Byrman, Hans Lindquist & Magnus Levin (eds). Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities.
- ——. Forthcoming. Prepositional variation in British and American English. In *Studies in Mid-Atlantic English*. Marco Modiano (ed.).
- Levin, Magnus. 1998a. Manchester United are my team: Concord with collective nouns. *Moderna Språk*, 1/98.
- ——. 1998b. On concord with collective nouns in English. Antoinette Renouf (ed). *Explorations in Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- ——. 1998c. *On concord with collective nouns in English*. Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities, No.7 1998.
- ——. 1998d. Concord with collective nouns in British and American English. In Lindquist et al (eds) 1998.
- ——. 1999. Concord with collective nouns revisited. *ICAME Journal* 23, 21–33.
- ——. Forthcoming. Mid-Atlantic Agreement. In *Studies in Mid-Atlantic English*. Marco Modiano (ed).
- Lindquist, Hans. 1998. The comparison of English disyllabic adjectives in *-y* and *-ly* in present-day British and American English. In Lindquist et al (eds)
- ——. 1999. Electronic corpora as tools for translation. In *Word, text and translation*. Gunilla Anderman & Margaret Rogers (eds). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- ——. 2000. *Livelier or more lively?* Syntactical and contextual factors influencing the comparison of disyllabic adjectives. In *Corpora galore. Analyses and techniques in describing English*. John Kirk (ed.). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

- ——. In press. Apples and oranges: On comparing data from different corpora. In *Corpus linguistics and linguistic theory*. Christian Mair & Marianne Hundt (eds.). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- ———, Staffan Klintborg, Magnus Levin & Maria Estling (eds). 1998. *The major varieties of English. Papers from MAVEN 97*. Växjö: Acta Wexionensia.
- Svartvik, Jan. 1998. Varieties of English: Major and minor. In Lindquist et al (eds).
- ———. 1999a. *Engelska – öspråk, världsspråk, trendspråk*. Stockholm: Norstedts Ordbok.
- ———. 1999b. English corpus studies: past, present, future. *English Corpus Studies*. Japan Association for English Corpus studies.
- ———. In press. *Corpora and Dictionaries. The perfect learner's dictionary*. Proceedings from a symposium at Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik. Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg.
- ———. Forthcoming. *How many Englishes are there – and which is the pick of the bunch?* Association of Teachers of English of the Czech Republic Newsletter.
- ——— & Hans Lindquist. 1997. *One and body language*. Viviane Müller & Peter Schneider (eds). *From Ælfric to the New York Times: Studies in English Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

## **5. Practical information**

Would you like to get in touch with the editors to get more information, ask usage questions, give comments and tips etc.? Please send an e-mail to [gramtime@hum.vxu.se](mailto:gramtime@hum.vxu.se). We cannot give you personal replies to usage questions, but if we find your question of interest to the public and if we can answer it, it will be discussed in the newsletter.

If you want to read back issues of *GramTime News*, please go to

<http://www.vxu.se/hum/publ/gtn/>

**Please note that we have a new website address!**

## **6. The next issue**

We plan to distribute the next newsletter in September 2000.

Institutionen för humaniora  
 Växjö universitet, 351 95 Växjö.  
 Besöksadress: Pelarplatsen 7  
 Telefon: 0470-70 80 00. Fax: 0470-75 18 88.  
 Senast ändrad/kontrollerad 2005-07-25



## @ GramTime News @

\* \* \* \* \*

**00:3, September 2000**

Welcome to the tenth issue of GramTime News, the electronic newsletter on English usage from Växjö University!

Editor-in-chief: [Hans Lindquist](#), PhD

Managing editor: [Maria Estling Vannestål](#), MA

Contributing editors: Jan Svartvik, Prof Em, [Magnus Levin](#), MA, Roy Liddle

---

### **Contents**

[0. Editorial](#)

[1. The GramTime Project: Grammatical Trends in Modern English \(general information\)](#)

[2. Usage questions and answers](#)

[3. Useful websites](#)

[4. GramTime publications](#)

[5. Practical information](#)

[6. The next issue](#)

---

### ***0. Editorial***

Dear Readers,

I'm writing this with aching muscles - I'm moving house and have spent the last couple of weeks sorting and driving to the recycling centre car load after car load of left-over adverbials, adjectives and modals. At such times it is good to have helpful friends, like Magnus, who generously offers his advice on furniture!

If that article whetted your appetite(s) for more troublesome plurals you can go on to Maria's pieces about logical plurals, the generic pronoun problem and siblings vs. brothers and sisters. Or with Magnus, cavort with handsome women and beautiful men.

In our continuing effort to make other people do our job, we have invited Roy Liddle, who completed his D paper last term, to explain the difference between the adverbs quick and quickly. Read and enjoy!

On the surfing scene, Maria has found that CNN has a useful website; one wonders if MTV shouldn't come next? Finally, we would like to mention that there is now a handy alphabetical index of all usage problems we have dealt with in GTN so far at <http://www.vxu.se/hum/publ/gtn/GTN-index.html>.

Hans Lindquist

Editor-in-chief

---

## ***1. The GramTime project: Grammatical Trends in Modern English***

### **Basic facts:**

GramTime started on 1 July, 1996. It received funding from The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation (Riksbankens Jubileumsfond) until the end of 1999.

The aim of GramTime is to use existing computer corpora to investigate on-going and recent changes in English, particularly in the area of grammar. Comparisons are made between different varieties (British, American, Australian and New Zealand English); between genres like fiction, non-fiction and journalistic prose; and between spoken and written language.

The project is based at Växjö University and is directed by Hans Lindquist with Jan Svartvik (Lund) as project adviser. Two research assistants have worked half-time in the project: PhD students Maria Estling and Magnus Levin.

### **The following corpora are used:**

- The British National Corpus (BNC): 100 million words, written and spoken British English (1980s and 1990s)
- The Bank of English. We use a subset called the CobuildDirect Corpus: 50 million words, written and spoken British, American and Australian English (1980s and 1990s)
- The London-Lund corpus: 500 000 words, spoken British English (1960s and 1970s)
- The Brown corpus: 1 million words, written American English (1960s)
- The Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen corpus (LOB): 1 million words, written British English (1960s)
- The Freiburg updated version of LOB (FLOB): 1 million words, written British English. (1990s)
- The Freiburg updated version of Brown (Frown): 1 million words, written American English (1990s)
- The Longman Spoken American Corpus (LSAC): 5 million words, spoken American English (1990s)
- The Wellington Corpus of Spoken English (WCSE): 1 million words, spoken New Zealand English (1990s)
- The Wellington Corpus of Written English (WCWE): 1 million words, written New Zealand English (1990s)
- *The Independent* on CD-ROM 1990 & 1995
- *The Times* on CD-ROM 1990 & 1995
- *The New York Times* on CD-ROM 1990 & 1995

## 2. Usage questions and answers

**1. How are uncountable nouns, such as *advice* and *furniture*, treated in authentic usage? I have a feeling that constructions of the type *a piece of furniture* and *a word of advice* actually are very infrequent.**

Nouns like *furniture* and *advice* are unproblematic for native speakers of English since these nouns quite simply belong to the group of uncountables. However, foreign learners may have problems with these because the corresponding nouns are countable in their native languages (cf. Swedish *en möbel* vs. *två möbler* and German *ein Möbel* vs. *zwei Möbel*).

This question gives us an excellent opportunity to compare what contrastive English/Swedish grammars have to say on the subject with real usage. Svartvik & Sager write in their university grammar that constructions of the type *a piece of furniture* can be used to denote number, but that it suffices "in general" to use the noun alone. Ljung & Ohlander are more specific in that they argue that these individuating phrases should be used sparingly.

In fact our corpora reveal that these individuating constructions are, in most cases, very rare.

We begin our survey with the noun *furniture*, whose usage is exemplified in (1) to (4).

(1) Bring *a piece of furniture* you wish to restore. (BrE)

(2) Among the most beautifully turned *pieces of furniture* in the house are the wheelbacked Windsor kitchen chairs, made from yew. (BrE)

(3) Televisions, computers, *furniture* and cookers are among the items available. (BrE)

(4) We think that our *furniture* is unique. (BrE)

What learners should be made aware of here is that only 4% of the tokens included *piece(s) of*. Sentences (3) and (4) are therefore far more typical of standard usage than (1) and (2).

This tendency is even more clearly seen with *advice*. The alternative constructions *piece(s) of advice* and *word(s) of advice* each occurred in less than 1% of the tokens. (5) and (6) are therefore exceptional, while (7) is more typical of the usage of native speakers.

(5) *A word of advice*; look at the small print very carefully. (BrE)

(6) Perhaps the most important *piece of advice* of all is to trust your own instincts. (BrE)

(7) *The advice* is search your attic, he says. (BrE)

*Piece of evidence* is also a construction exemplified in Svartvik & Sager's grammar, although this construction is used in less than 1% of the tokens of *evidence*. (8) is thus a far more likely construction than (9).

(8) The only *evidence* for his existence was a phone-call from Nicola and his name scribbled in a book. (BrE)

(9) There are *several pieces of evidence* that suggest that daily rhythms develop spontaneously even in the absence of environmental cues. (BrE)

The two alternative constructions with *information*, *bit(s) of* and *piece(s) of*, are also rare. These occur less than once in every one hundred tokens of *information*. Anyone reading English texts would therefore be much more likely to come across the construction in (10) than those in (11) or (12).

(10) *This information* will enable you to connect lines which flow freely and melodically between all chord changes. (BrE)

(11) Their newspapers provided odd *bits of information*, such as plutonium-poisoning maps that frightened readers rather than reassuring them because they did not know how to interpret them. (BrE)

(12) I offer this merely as *a piece of information*. (BrE)

With the last item in this overview, *news*, Svartvik & Sager provide three alternative constructions to using the noun alone - *a piece of news*, *item of news* and *news item* - which may give the impression that (13) is about as common as (14) - (16).

(13) *The news* reached Napoleon III just before he left the Tuileries (...) (BrE)

(14) I've *a piece of news* that will surprise you both very much. (BrE)

(15) That *item of news* is of great interest to me. (BrE)

(16) The *news item* was on the front page: (BrE)

However, none of the constructions in (14) to (16) are at all frequent. They occur in somewhere between one in every hundred and one in every thousand tokens of *news*. Although the individuating constructions are rare, they are useful when language users want to stress the number of items in question. Examples of this are provided below.

(17) Apart from the bed, the only other piece of furniture in the room was a chaise longue upholstered in red-tinged chintz. (BrE)

(18) Exercise your mind by reading widely and reflecting on life. Cultivate the affairs of the heart and of the soul. Be open to God in all of your existence, as the highest good in all of life. All these pieces of advice contain a certain amount of wisdom. (BrE)

(19) Only the last of these pieces of information is accurate. (BrE)

(20) Before then the office came alive with two pieces of news: Sniffy Wilson had been captured and Marilyn Duxbody had been charged under the Obscene Publications Act. (BrE)

However, even in cases similar to those in (17) - (20) it is often possible to use the noun alone. Compare (21) with (17) above.

(21) The only other furniture was an old chest under the squat window. (BrE)

All four noun types are sometimes used with *some*, as in (17) - (20) below.

(22) I saw crates piled high, and *some furniture* with dust-covers on. (BrE)

(23) Ring round the experts and take *some advice* today. (BrE)

(24) This book would not be complete without providing you with *some information* on the subject. (BrE)

(25) There was *some evidence* for it. (BrE)

These constructions are also rare. The most common type, *some evidence*, occurs twice in every one hundred tokens, while the others are even more uncommon.

In sum, this small study teaches us three things: to be careful not to overuse the individuating constructions with these uncountable nouns, to be wary of the claims made in grammars and, finally, to listen to the *advice* that we can derive from the *information* that corpora give us.

ML

**2. I learnt about logical plurals at school: *My children have good appetites* etc. Do native speakers always use this, or would it be possible to say as we do in Swedish: *My children have good appetite?***

Constructions of this type are sometimes referred to as "logical plurals" (cf. *Gleerups engelska grammatik* by Ohlander/Ljung). Other examples of logical plurals are *They shook their heads*, *We shook hands* and *Will I have to change buses?* Such constructions are problematic for many Swedish learners of English, since the corresponding Swedish constructions often take singular objects: *Mina barn har god aptit*, *De skadade på huvudet*, *Vi skakade hand*, *Måste jag byta buss?* etc. But how consistent are native speakers really? Will we find any instances of singular constructions in our corpora?

I divided the so-called logical plurals into three groups:

(a) Group 1: more or less set phrases: *change buses/hands/jobs/lanes/places/planes/seats/tickets/trains*, *hold/shake hands*

(b) Group 2: constructions including body parts: *backs, bellies, bosoms, chests, faces, heads, jaws, laps, mouths, necks, noses, stomachs, tongues and throats*

(c) Group 3: constructions including abstract phenomena related to the human body and mind: *appetites, breaths, memories, minds and voices*

The corpora consulted suggest that the expressions in the first group indeed are fixed. There were no instances whatsoever of *hold/shake hand*, and very few examples of singular forms with the verb *change*, all of them occurring in spoken material as in (1).

(1) (...) so if you wanted to come from the State of Mexico into Mexico City you had to *change bus* at the boundary. (spoken British English)

It is worth noting that the clearly most frequent noun occurring after *change* was *hands*, as in (2), a collocation that is seldom mentioned in (at least Swedish) grammars:

(2) It is ironic that at a time when the shares of motor traders are dropping like stones, the price at which dealerships *change hands* has remained steady. (written British English)

As for the other two groups, I looked at constructions like *their nose(s)* and *their appetites(s)*. I also tried searching for constructions like (PLURAL NOUN or PRONOUN) + *have X nose(s)* and (PLURAL NOUN or PRONOUN) + *with X nose(s)*, but these searches would take a close study of the surrounding text to identify the relevant examples (which there was not time for). Furthermore, tokens of this type seem to be fairly rare (compared to those with *their*). Cases of body parts where each human being has two items (e.g. *eyes, ears* and *breasts*) were of course not included, since a singular form would be an unlikely alternative. Furthermore, instances referring to the word *memory/memories* as something other than the mental capacity for remembering things were excluded.

In these two groups, we find much more variation between singular and plural forms than with constructions like *change places* and *shake hands*. With body parts (group 2) there were quite a few instances of nouns in the singular in the written material (although plural forms were about 10 times more frequent). In the spoken material, singular forms were just as common as plural forms. No regional variation could be observed.

The following corpus extracts exemplify the use of singular and plural noun forms, (3) and (4) regarding body parts and (5) and (6) regarding abstract phenomena:

(3) If the word you say rhymes with head, they should point to *their head*. (written American)

(4) Coolie women heaved baskets from *their heads* and cast gravel before it. (written British)

(5) It might be possible to persuade them to change *their mind* in favour of another punishment, even if your youngster has broken the rules. (written British)

(6) But I doubt either will change *their minds*. (written American)

It turns out, however, that in a majority of the cases of singular form of the noun (especially in the written material), the singular form is used because the noun it "belongs to" is an indefinite singular noun or pronoun (*a doctor, someone, nobody* etc.), exemplified in (7) and (8):

(7) She could not understand why *a doctor* – with as much money as they made charging five dollars a day to just stick *their head* in the hospital door and look at you – couldn't afford a decent-sized waiting room. (written American)

(8) The post-coital cigarette is not as popular as it once was and the idea of making love to *someone* who has a fag in *their mouth* must be one of life's great turn-offs. (written British material)

See more about how to refer back to such indefinite antecedents in question 5!

Finally, we can conclude that singular forms for our expected "logical plurals" are fairly frequent in speech, but that most of the cases found in writing can be explained by their being used to refer back to singular "owners". It thus seems that we can advise our students to avoid the use of singular forms in other cases in their writing.

ME

### 3. It seems that with some adverbs both the *-ly* form and the suffix-less form are used together with some verbs. Is this okay?

Magnus answered a similar question to this one in issue 98:3, and showed what a complex area dual-form adverbs are. There is, indeed, one hard and fast rule that governs all dual-form adverbs, and that is that the zero (suffix-less) forms must come after the main verb and the object, if there is one. So you cannot *slow walk*, but you can *walk slow*; you cannot *drive quick your car*, but you can *drive your car quick*. I have looked pretty closely at *quick* and *slow* and there do seem to be 'rules' governing their use, such as that they rarely occur before a preposition of direction. They also tend not to be used adjacent to nouns. So in spoken AmE, where the zero forms are most frequent, they are most often used at the end of simple clauses and there is very often a modifier before the adverb, as in (1):

(1) I ran out of there *pretty quick*.

The colloquial language also prefers to use the comparative forms *quicker* and *slower* rather than *more quickly* and *more slowly*.

Now, all this is very confusing, especially since these restrictions do not appear to apply to other adverbs, but it seems there may be an all-encompassing rule that explains why some zero-form adverbs have restrictions. In the case of *quick* and *slow*, they tend to occur in positions where they cannot be mistaken for adjectives (this is probably the reason all zero forms must come after the main verb). For reasons too complex to go into here this rule also seems to be responsible for the other limitations I mentioned above.

For other adverbs too, it may be important that they are not mistaken for adjectives, or that an adverb of manner is not mistaken for one of place. If we look at *deep* and *deeply*, for instance, a general rule would seem to be that if you can measure the depth in feet and inches then you use the adverb of place *deep*; if it relates to emotions and cognition you use *deeply*. So you normally *dig, cut* and *penetrate deep* (usually followed by *into* ...); and you *care, feel, regret* and *think deeply*.

(2) ...the scientists are *drilling deep* into the frozen earth...

(3) ...Marlette still *cared deeply* about her.

Interestingly, although we usually find *bite deep*, the two exceptions I have found refer to the recession *biting deeply*, which would, of course, be immeasurable as in (4).

(4) With the recession *biting deeply*, most of these have reduced...

Where there is significant variation with the same verb, i.e. people tend to use either form, we can see that there is depth that can be neither felt nor measured, and there seems to be no risk of confusion. We find *breathe deep/deeply, look deep/deeply* (into someone's eyes, for example) and *draw deep/deeply* (on a cigarette).

When it comes to *cheap/cheaply* there is a risk of mistaking the zero form for the adjective, but, again, it appears that with those verbs where there is free variation it does not matter. So we can buy and sell things either *cheap* or *cheaply*, and things can come *cheap* and they can come *cheaply*. After all, what does it matter whether we have bought something *cheaply* or whether it was *cheap* when we bought it? It boils down to the same thing. But where the meaning would change depending on which form is used then it is important to get it right.

*More cheaply* in (5) refers to the manufacturing method. Had *cheaper* been used it might have meant that the product was of poor quality.

(5) With this new machinery goods can be made more *cheaply*.

*Direct* and *directly* are another interesting pair. One of the meanings of *directly* given in any dictionary is 'immediately', but this meaning is now old-fashioned and restricted to British English. As a consequence it no longer has that meaning for Americans and most Britons. So we can now fly either *direct* or *directly* to New York. We can also buy things either *direct* or *directly* from the manufacturers.

These observations probably will not make things much easier for students of English, especially since there are numerous exceptions to any "rule" we can try to come up with. But it is worth bearing in mind that where the two forms do not have different meanings it is still considered more correct to use the *-ly* form, and the zero form is usually more common in the spoken language. Dual-form adverbs are, as Magnus said, very complicated, and they do not become any less so when we look closely at them. Getting them right probably requires a good ear for the language and a lot of time spent listening to native speakers.

RL

#### 4. My teacher told me never to use the adjective *handsome* about women and never to use *beautiful* about men. Is English usage really this strict?

The idea that there is no variation in this area is probably wide-spread among English teachers. The variation in usage has been acknowledged by major reference works, however. For instance, *The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* has the following to say about the adjectives *beautiful*, *pretty*, *handsome* and *good-looking*: "*beautiful* and *pretty* can be used of women, children and things, but not usually of men, unless you want to suggest that they have female features (...) *Beautiful* (...) suggests that someone has almost perfect looks. *Pretty* means good-looking in a more ordinary way, but not really beautiful. *Handsome* is not common in spoken English. It is usually used to describe men, especially if they have strong regular features that men in romantic stories [sic!] are supposed to have. A handsome woman is good-looking in a strong, healthy way. *Good-looking* can be used about men and women, but not usually about things."

Now let's have a look at what our corpora have to say on the subject. Both handsome men and handsome women were found in the corpora, although the men were clearly the most common. In 100 million words the following number of tokens were found:

<i>handsome man/men</i>	98	<i>handsome woman/ women</i>	18
-------------------------	----	----------------------------------	----

In (1) and (2) two typical instances can be seen.

(1) Men, especially *handsome men*, were not to be trusted! (BrE)

(2) He saw a tall, *handsome woman* dressed with careful and expensive informality in a black cashmere sweater with a silk scarf at the throat and fawn trousers. (BrE)

Interestingly, many of the tokens of *handsome woman* also include references to the height of these women. They tend to be tall, as exemplified in (2). However, the use of *handsome woman* does not appear to be entirely uncontroversial, if we are to judge from (3).

(3) She was - is - what people call a *handsome woman*, a phrase which has always struck me as a bit patronising. (What does it mean? It means something like: surprisingly fanciable if it was socially OK to fancy women of that age...) (BrE)

In contrast to usage with *handsome*, women very strongly predominate in connection with *beautiful*, as seen below:

<i>beautiful man/men</i>	14	<i>beautiful woman/women</i>	213
--------------------------	----	------------------------------	-----

Here are two examples:

(4) Ludovico was the most *beautiful man* she had ever seen. (BrE)

(5) Some of the world's most *beautiful women* have also cut more birthday cakes than Clinton. (BrE)

Regarding the purported existence of "female features" in beautiful men, see (6):

(6) (...) a Roman epic about the Emperor Hadrian and his love affair with the most *beautiful* man in the world, Antinous. (BrE)

*Pretty* may also be used to refer to men and women, although men are very rarely pretty, as seen below.

*pretty man/men* 2 *pretty woman/women* 34

*Pretty woman* is about six times less frequent than *beautiful woman* in the corpus. References to Julia Roberts were not included in the statistics. (7) is an example of *pretty*.

(7) His head would never again be turned by a *pretty woman*. (BrE)

Girls are prettier than women, who in turn are more beautiful. Some girls are even handsome. Boys are more likely to be pretty than to be beautiful or handsome. Here are the statistics for boys and girls who are pretty, beautiful and handsome:

*pretty boy(s)* 23 *pretty girl(s)* 136

*beautiful boy(s)* 12 *beautiful girl(s)* 97

*handsome boy(s)* 12 *handsome girl(s)* 6

Since this investigation is mainly concerned with men and women, we only give one example of *girl* in (8). This is because *handsome girl* is perhaps the most surprising of the combinations with *boys* and *girls*. Note that this handsome girl is tall, just as handsome women tend to be.

(8) That is perhaps why I didn't hear the name of a tall, dark-haired *handsome girl* whom I hadn't met before. (BrE)

*Good-looking* appears to be the most gender-neutral adjective, as seen from these figures:

*good-looking man/men* 35 *good-looking woman/women* 46

*good-looking boy(s)* 14 *good-looking girl(s)* 10

Here are two examples of this. Note the use of *handsome* in (10).

(9) Laidler was a tall, very *good-looking man*, quiet and observant, who remained cheerful in spite of his illness. (BrE)

(10) She had clearly been a very *good-looking woman* when younger, and even now was *handsome*; (...) (BrE)

*Good-looking* is only used marginally with objects. (11) and (12) are from the handful of examples found in our corpus.

(11) Wednesday approached a difficult job well and scored two *good-looking goals*, but the truth is the tie was really lost in Kaiserslautern, (...) (BrE)

(12) A *good-looking, pre-war pen* cost less than a third of its modern cousin, and wrote just as well. (BrE)

Judging from the frequencies of these adjectives, one may be lead to believe that women in general look better than men. However, it rather seems that the looks of women are judged to be more important than the looks of men in our society, because women also predominate after the adjective *ugly*, but that's another story.

ML

### 5. How should one refer back to an indefinite pronoun or noun phrase denoting a person, as in *You could ask someone/a friend what \_\_\_\_\_ would do?*

This is a tricky issue (sometimes referred to as "the generic pronoun problem") and quite a lot has been said and written about it in the last few years. A common way of referring to someone whose sex is unknown or unimportant has been to use a male pronoun (*he*), and this usage even used to be prescribed as the only correct one in certain formal contexts not that long ago. These days, however, many people consider the use of *he* not to be politically correct, fossilizing old stereotyped roles of men and women. Some people have claimed that, since *he* has been used for such a long time, it should now be replaced by *she*! Furthermore, many more or less serious attempts have been made over the years to create a new, gender-neutral third-person pronoun, such as *nim*, *ips*, *thir*, *po* and *xe*. None of these very creative suggestions have, however, obtained general approval. What then should we use?

In a lecture at our university some months ago, Dr Anne Curzan from the University of Washington, Seattle, who has carried out research on the topic, gave the audience the following possibilities. Sometimes you can use a plural noun instead of an indefinite singular one in the first place, especially to replace noun phrases introduced by *each* (*students* instead of *each student*). In some other cases it is possible to rephrase the sentence, using a relative clause instead (*a student who* or *a student whose...* instead of *a student --- he* or *a student --- his*). It is also possible to say or write *he or she* (*his or her*), *he/she* (*his/her*) or *s/he*, but such constructions often feel clumsy, especially in speech. Dr Curzan suggested another alternative, viz. to use a plural pronoun (*they* or *their*), as in (1), but she also recognized that this usage is not accepted by all grammar books yet. It has, however, been used alongside other alternatives for a very long time, and it is certainly the most frequent construction in speech according to our lecturer.

(1) You could ask *someone/a friend* what *they* would do.

Some people in the audience were somewhat surprised to hear Anne Curzan claim that a plural pronoun is also sometimes used when the antecedent's sex is indeed known to the speaker/writer, but they (!) do not want to reveal it, as in (2), but after being alerted to this fact in the lecture I have heard and seen it used in exactly that way several times.

(2) *The caller* said *they* would ring back. (example taken from Michael Barlow in *A situated theory of agreement*, 1992:297)

At a conference at Gävle university college on *Mid-Atlantic English* a few weeks ago, Magnus, Hans and I heard Dr Angela Karstadt report on an investigation into some students' acceptance of certain linguistic phenomena. Interestingly, her respondents turned out to show greater acceptance for a sentence using *she* as a generic pronoun than a sentence where *they* was used!

Now it is high time we looked for some information in our corpora. First, I tried to get some statistics on the issue, but this proved a very difficult a task, especially with those generic pronouns having noun phrase antecedents. When you create a search string such as "article (*a, an, the*) + singular noun + some intermediate words + personal/possessive pronoun (e.g. *he, her, they*)", you get thousands of tokens, most of which are not relevant at all.

I did, however, carry out a small impressionistic survey on the indefinite pronouns (*someone/somebody, everyone/everybody* etc.) in some newspapers and spoken corpora, and could conclude that plural nouns (*they, them* or *their*), as in (3) – (5) are far more frequent than the "old and sexist" *he, him* or *his*, as in (6). In the spoken corpora, the plural forms were extremely frequent. Also, more clumsy constructions like *he or she*, as in (7) were quite infrequent. When the antecedent is *everyone/everybody*, as in (5), one could argue that a plural pronoun is the most natural choice, since *everyone/everybody* in function (although not in grammatical form) refers to more than one person (cf. Swedish *alla* and the problem Swedish learners of English tend to have with remembering that *everyone* and *everybody* are singular pronouns, taking singular verb forms!).

(3) If you wish to insult *someone*, invade *their* space, lean over *them* and touch *their* possessions in a proprietary way. (written British)

(4) *Nobody* admitted *they'd* seen him. There wasn't any reason for them to admit it. (written American)

(5) Princess Anne soon put *everybody* at *their* ease. (written British)

(6) This would happen if *someone* stopped playing *his* role, stopped denying the underlying painful feelings and problems ... (written American)

(7) Prejudice is not disliking *someone* you meet because you find *his or her* behavior objectionable. It is disliking an entire racial or ethnic group, even if you have had little or no contact. (written American)

The results of my small-scale study (that plural forms are in the majority) seem to be reliable since they correspond both to Dr Curzan's claims and to the results of another corpus-based study made by one of our students (Elisabeth Gustavsson: *Unspecified indefinite pronouns and their referents*, 1999). As Gustavsson concludes: "It seems therefore that feminists have succeeded in their effort to influence people to use *they*-forms instead of 'generic *he*'".

It is interesting to note that, although many people avoid using a male pronoun, those who opt for the combination of a male and a female one (*he or she, his or her*), virtually always put the male pronoun first, whereas constructions such as *she or he* are extremely rare. For instance, when I searched for such combinations in two of my corpora I found almost 1000 *he or she, him or her* and *his or her* compared to 30 *she or he, her or him* and *her or his*. It seems that some stereotypes are still difficult to get rid of!

Gustavsson also investigated whether usage differs between different contexts and found that this seems to be the case. She found, for instance, that *he*-forms were quite frequent in connection with business and politics, and she observes that this might be a case of a cultural bias, since politicians and business people are more often male than female.

As to the generic pronoun problem regarding reference to nouns with the indefinite article (e.g. *a person*), suffice it to say that these constructions certainly exist, even though we cannot say how frequent they are. Here is one examples from the corpora:

(8) That's also helping *a person* understand *their* own needs... (spoken British)

I did not find any clear instances of a noun with the definite article referring to someone whose identity the speaker or writer knows but does not want to reveal. There were, however, quite a few examples such as (9):

(9) The fact that *the driver* has to be phoned in itself ensure (sic) that *they* are the person in question and that *they* can easily be traced. If *the driver* wishes, *they* can ask for the passenger's number so they can call back to check it. (written British English)

This example is interesting in that, although the antecedent (*the driver*) is definite from a formal grammatical point of view, it is indefinite from a functional point of view, resulting in the use of *they* as a generic pronoun. The noun phrase does not refer to a particular driver, but the scenario of car-driving is so familiar to people (they know that a car generally contains a driver!) that it is possible to use a definite article anyway (cf. Brown & Yule: *Discourse Analysis*, 1983).

Finally, plural pronouns frequently refer back to antecedents that are collective nouns (like *team, government* and *family*), as in (10). If you are interested in this area, I suggest you consult one of the articles written by Magnus, our expert on collectives (see the publication list below).

(10) At the ceasefire negotiations, the FMLN had agreed to disband the armed wing of their organization if *the government* agreed to cut *their* own armed forces by half. (written British)

ME

**6. At school my teacher told me that I should avoid using the word *siblings* to refer to *brothers and sisters*, since it was restricted to scientific (especially medical) usage. Nowadays I often hear and see *siblings* used, both by my students and by native speakers. Has this word become everyone's possession lately?**

Some dictionaries I consulted all note that *sibling* belongs to formal language (*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, Cambridge International Dictionary of English, Norstedts stora svensk-engelska ordbok*)

and formal or technical language (*Collins Cobuild Dictionary of the English language*). Sidney Greenbaum writes (in *Good English and the grammarian*, 1988:98) referring to Lyons (1968), that "*brother* and *sister* can be replaced with *male sibling* and *female sibling* only in anthropological or quasi-anthropological context, and that most English speakers probably do not know the word *sibling*".

If we look at our corpora, we can see that the singular form *sibling* is fairly infrequent and mainly occurs in scientific or pseudo-scientific contexts, as in (1) or as a premodifier in certain expressions, particularly in the collocation *sibling rivalry*, as exemplified in (2):

(1) If we transfer our envy from mother to *sibling* before we have worked through to a place where we wish to make amends then, developmentally, we may become stuck. (written British)

(2) Roland suffered from *sibling rivalry* and tended to lash out at his little sister ... (written British)

The singular form is also used in various transferred senses, especially about businesses, as in (3)

(3) Even ventures as stable and successful as *The Miami Herald's Spanish-language sibling, El Nuevo Herald*, have had their staffs trimmed as part of broad campaigns to cut costs. (written American)

The plural form *siblings*, however, was as frequent as (and in some corpora more frequent than) *brothers and sisters* in the written material, but it is true that many of these cases occurred in more or less formal contexts, e. g. in newspaper and scientific articles (not necessarily medical, psychological or technical ones, though). Examples (4) – (6) are representative:

(4) After interviewing the mother, the child and her *siblings*, a caseworker found no credible evidence of abuse or neglect and closed the case. (*The New York Times*, 1995)

(5) Only the alpha female breeds and it seems that the monogamous reproductive male suppresses sexual interactions between *siblings*. (written British)

(6) In postwar Britain, the clothes, accents, and diction of the *siblings* may have changed, but, so far as I can judge, the suffocating insular coziness is just the same. (written British)

It seems that the word *siblings* is more frequent in American English than in British English, at least in writing. In the spoken material *brothers and sisters* was about three times more frequent than *siblings* (in both American and British English), again reflecting the fact that *sibling* is considered a more formal word. On the other hand, even though many of the instances occurred in more or less formal or scientific contexts, there were also some examples from, for instance, natural conversation, as in (7) and (8):

(7) Do you have, how many, do you have *siblings*? (spoken American)

(8) But I don't think it's fair to my other *siblings*. (spoken British)

We could also spot a slight increase in the use of *siblings* in *The Independent* from 1990 (44%, compared to *brothers and sisters*) via 1995 (50%) to 2000 (58%). It seems that we can conclude that, yes, *siblings* is today everyone's possession (and might be gaining ground), even though many people still consider it a bit formal.

ME

---

### 3. Useful websites

#### Learn English and learn about the world – at the same time!

The website on the agenda today is supplied by the American news company CNN. Its Learning Resources site provides news stories on a wide variety of topics, both in a more comprehensive format and in an abridged and simplified one. There is also a brief outline of each story. Besides the "Story of the Week", you will find archives of articles about Adventure, Business & Economy, Crime, Culture & Society, Disasters, Education, Environment, Health, Politics, Religion and Science & Technology – all in both complete and abridged versions. Most of the stories also come with audio and video recordings.

For the "Story of the Week", there are special learner activities, such as vocabulary exercises and questions on

the content. The website also provides questions about the learner's view of the current topic, the answers to which can be submitted to CNN (and are then posted at the website). Such questions can of course also be used for class discussions.

You will find the CNN Learning Resources website at:

<http://literacynet.org/cnnsf/>

Enjoy!

ME

---

#### 4. GramTime publications

- Estling, Maria. 1998a. *A preposition thrown out (of) the window? On British and American use of out of versus out*. Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities, No.5 1998.
- ——. 1998b. Your English is different from/to/than mine! Om rivaliserande prepositioner i brittisk och amerikansk engelska. *LMS Lingua*, 5/98.
- ——. 1999a. Going out (of) the window? A corpus-based study of competing prepositional constructions in American and British English. *English Today*, 59, Vol. 15, No. 3: 22–27.
- ——. 1999b. Fönster mot språkvärlden. Om textdatabaser (korpora) i forskning, undervisning och textproduktion. In *Universitet 2000. Föreläsningar hållna under humanistdagarna 15–16 oktober 1999*. Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities, No.3 1999.
- ——. In press. Competition in the wastebasket: A study of constructions with *all*, *both* and *half*. In *Corpus linguistics and linguistic theory*. Christian Mair & Marianne Hundt (eds.). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Estling Vannestål, Maria. Forthcoming. Korpusar, prepositioner och regional variation i modern engelska. In *Korpusar i forskning och undervisning (KORFU 99)*. Gunilla Byrman, Hans Lindquist & Magnus Levin (eds). Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities.
- ——. Forthcoming. Prepositional variation in British and American English. In *Studies in Mid-Atlantic English*. Marco Modiano (ed.). Gävle: Gävle University Press.
- ——. & Magnus Levin. "Neither the singular nor the plural is/are wrong". Some aspects of number variation in English. *Moderna Språk*.
- Levin, Magnus. 1998a. Manchester United are my team: Concord with collective nouns. *Moderna Språk*, 1/98.
- ——. 1998b. On concord with collective nouns in English. Antoinette Renouf (ed). *Explorations in Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- ——. 1998c. *On concord with collective nouns in English*. Växjö: Reports from Växjö University – Humanities, No.7 1998.
- ——. 1998d. Concord with collective nouns in British and American English. In Lindquist et al (eds) 1998.
- ——. 1999. Concord with collective nouns revisited. *ICAME Journal* 23, 21–33.
- ——. Forthcoming. Mid-Atlantic Agreement. In *Studies in Mid-Atlantic English*. Marco Modiano (ed). Gävle: Gävle University Press.

- Lindquist, Hans. 1998. The comparison of English disyllabic adjectives in -y and -ly in present-day British and American English. In Lindquist et al (eds)
- ——. 1999. Electronic corpora as tools for translation. In *Word, text and translation*. Gunilla Anderman & Margaret Rogers (eds). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- ——. 2000. *Livelier or more lively?* Syntactical and contextual factors influencing the comparison of disyllabic adjectives. In *Corpora galore. Analyses and techniques in describing English*. John Kirk (ed.). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- ——. Mid-Atlantic in the context of language change, language birth and language death. In *Studies in Mid-Atlantic English*. Marco Modiano (ed). Gävle: Gävle University Press.
- — & Magnus Levin. In press. Apples and oranges: On comparing data from different corpora. In *Corpus linguistics and linguistic theory*. Christian Mair & Marianne Hundt (eds.). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- —, Staffan Klintborg, Magnus Levin & Maria Estling (eds). 1998. *The major varieties of English. Papers from MAVEN 97*. Växjö: Acta Wexionensia.
- Svartvik, Jan. 1998. Varieties of English: Major and minor. In Lindquist et al (eds).
- ——. 1999a. *Engelska – öspråk, världsspråk, trendspråk*. Stockholm: Norstedts Ordbok.
- ——. 1999b. English corpus studies: past, present, future. *English Corpus Studies*. Japan Association for English Corpus studies.
- ——. In press. *Corpora and Dictionaries. The perfect learner's dictionary*. Proceedings from a symposium at Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik. Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg.
- ——. Forthcoming. *How many Englishes are there – and which is the pick of the bunch?* Association of Teachers of English of the Czech Republic Newsletter.
- — & Hans Lindquist. 1997. *One and body language*. Viviane Müller & Peter Schneider (eds). *From Ælfric to the New York Times: Studies in English Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

## **5. Practical information**

Would you like to get in touch with the editors to get more information, ask usage questions, give comments and tips etc.? Please send an e-mail to [gramtime@hum.vxu.se](mailto:gramtime@hum.vxu.se). We cannot give you personal replies to usage questions, but if we find your question of interest to the public and if we can answer it, it will be discussed in the newsletter.

If you want to read back issues of *GramTime News*, please go to

<http://www.vxu.se/hum/publ/gtn/>

## **6. The next issue**

We plan to distribute the next newsletter in December 2000.

---

Institutionen för humaniora  
Växjö universitet, 351 95 Växjö.  
Besöksadress: Pelarplatsen 7  
Telefon: 0470-70 80 00. Fax: 0470-75 18 88.  
Senast ändrad/kontrollerad 2005-07-25