Chapter VI.

OF ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS.

THE relation between adjectives and nouns is similar to that between adverbs and verbs; some words serve both as adjectives and as adverbs; many adverbs are formed from adjectives; and it is often a question whether the proper word in a given case is an adjective or an adverb. For these reasons, we may conveniently deal with these two parts of speech together.

Vulgarisms. — Some inaccuracies in the use of adjectives or adverbs are, or should be, confined to the illiterate.

I.	II.
You can go everywhere.	You can go *everywheres*.
A tired look about the eyes showed that she had not slept well during the night.	A tired look about the eyes showed that she had not slept *good* during the night.
I should describe Jessica as having a light complexion.	I should describe Jessica as being *light-complected*.
He will probably be for Harrison.	He will *likely* be for Harrison.
Nobody was likely to stir abroad.	Nobody was *like* to stir abroad.
They gave us not fewer but more trains.	They gave us not *less* but more trains.
Seldom had the little port seen a costlier funeral.	Seldom had the little port seen a *more costlier* funeral.
The only marked change in Elizabeth was that her manner was statelier.	The only marked change in Elizabeth's actions was that her manner was *more statelier*.
His simplicity may be seen in almost everything he has written.	His simplicity may be seen in *most* everything he has written.

I.	II.
That poem I like better than any other single piece.	That poem I like *most* of any other single piece.
The carriage rattled down Prickett's lane, to the great amusement of that place.	The carriage rattled down Prickett's lane to the *much* amusement of that locality.
He was not nearly so prolific a writer as Wordsworth.	He was *nowhere near* so prolific a writer as Wordsworth.
The house was quite large enough.	The house was *plenty* large enough.
There is n't a finer situation in the world for a house.	There ain't a *sightlier* place in the world for a house.
The outside of the earth, after it had cooled somewhat, was hard and solid.	The outside of the earth, after it had cooled *some*, was hard and solid.
I remember when allusions of this sort were pleasant.	I remember when *these* sort of allusions were pleasant.
I never have anything to do with that kind of person.	I never have anything to do with *those* kind of people.
There is, first, the old distinction of the laws of science.	There is, *firstly*, the old distinction of the laws of science.
They treated him ill.	They treated him *illy*.
What he said amused me much.	What he said amused me *muchly*.
We reason from experience thus.	We reason from experience *thusly*.

In each of the last four sentences as originally written, the fault consists in the addition of the adverbial termination "-ly" to a word that is an adverb without it. Of these incorrect forms only one is to be found in serious writings by good authors. That one is *firstly*, the prevalence of which comes, perhaps, from the belief that it belongs with "secondly," "thirdly," etc. This supposed analogy is, however, a false one. "Second," "third," etc., are adjectives only; "first" serves both as adjective and as adverb. *Illy* is current among the uneducated in some parts of America. *Muchly* is popular with American "humorists,"

from Artemas Ward on. *Thusly* figures in the writings of the ignorant as well as in those of "humorists."

I.	II.
He remembered her distinctly, used to think her the most tastefully dressed young lady in the whole place.	He remembered her *famously*, used to think her the *tastiest* young lady in the whole place.
He was a stranger to us.	He was a stranger *unbeknown* to us.
He was unknown to us.	
Pope does not translate accurately.	Pope does not translate *accurate*.

The adverb "accurately," not the adjective *accurate*, is correct; for the word qualifies "translate."

Other vulgarisms of this class are—

I.	II.
The ancients were not so very badly off.	The ancients were not so very *bad* off.
Swift treated Stella as meanly as a man could treat a woman.	Swift treated Stella as *mean* as a man could treat a woman.
Byron could be terribly scathing.	Byron could be *terrible* scathing.
You are so uncommonly tall.	You are so *uncommon* tall.

Avoid VULGARISMS.

Adjective or **Adverb**. — It is sometimes a question whether to use an adjective or an adverb.

I.	II.
When his money was at an end, these unprincipled friends began to look coldly upon him.	When his money was at an end, these unprincipled friends began to look *cold* upon him.

The qualifying word belongs with the verb, not with the subject of the verb. The coldness is in the way in which his friends looked at him, not in his friends. In "You look cold," on the contrary, it is "you" who are "cold."

I.	II.
An old shoe feels easy.	An old shoe feels *easily*.
An old shoe goes on easily.	An old shoe goes on *easy*.

In the first example, "easy" belongs with "shoe;" in the second, "easily" belongs with "goes on."

I.	II.
Miss Amy looked pretty.	Miss Amy looked *prettily*.
Miss Ayr danced gracefully.	Miss Ayr danced *graceful*.

"Looked pretty" means almost the same thing as "was pretty;" "danced gracefully" does not mean the same thing as "was graceful."

As a rule, it is proper to use an adjective whenever some form of "to be" or "to seem" may be substituted for the verb, an adverb when no such substitution can be made.

I.	II.
I came in late, and I felt badly when I wrote this theme.	I came in late and I felt *bad* when I wrote this theme.

In this example, "bad" might, according to the rule just stated, seem to be the proper word. The reason for preferring "badly" is that *bad* is ambiguous, "bad" being in use in two senses.

I.	II.
We learned that really clear days were rare.	We learned that *real* clear days were rare.

The adverb "really," not the adjective *real*, is proper; for the word qualifies "clear."

I.	II.
Relatively to her population, England has nearly four times as many railway passengers as the United States.	England has, *relative* to her population, nearly four times as many railway passengers as the United States.

"Relatively to," not *relative to,* is proper; for the expression belongs with a participle which is understood. The meaning is: "Considered relatively to," etc.

I.	II.
On important occasions the party went solid.	On important occasions the party went *solidly*.

"Solid" is preferable to *solidly,* for the quality spoken of seems to belong to the "party" rather than to its action.

I.	II.
Sydney Carton, not only in the last act of his life but long before, was a hero.	Sydney Carton, not *alone* in the last act of his life but long before, was a hero.

The writer means to say that Sydney Carton, both "in the last act of his life" and "before," was a hero: he does not mean to say that some one was with Sydney Carton "in the last act of his life."

I.	II.
She was not only an object of love to him, but also a bond between him and his pure childhood.	She was not *alone* an object of love to him, but a bond between him and his pure childhood.

As the writer means to say that "she" was both an object of love and a bond, "only" is the proper word.

I.	II.
Only by comparison with similar characters in real life can the choice between the two interpretations be made.	The choice between the two interpretations can be made *alone* by comparison with similar characters in real life.

If we put "only" in the place occupied by *alone* in this sentence as originally written, we leave the reader uncertain whether the word goes with "made" or with "by comparison." To remove the ambiguity, a change of order

is necessary. The practice of using *alone* instead of "only" is common; but it is not sanctioned by good use, and it often obscures the meaning.

The question whether to use an adjective or an adverb is determined by the rules of thought rather than by those of grammar.

Adjectives go with nouns and pronouns; adverbs with verbs, adjectives, and adverbs.

Omitted Adverbs. — In haste of speech or of composition, adverbs that are necessary to the sense are omitted.

I.	II.
That night old Ezra could not sleep, the idea of a pension had excited him so much.	That night old Ezra could not sleep, the idea of a pension had excited him so.
Elizabeth was too much surprised to answer.	Elizabeth was too surprised to answer.
His poems, as a rule, are not particularly melodious, but sometimes they are very much so.	His poems, as a rule, are not particularly melodious, but sometimes they are very so.
As Gulliver behaved himself well, he was given his liberty.	Since Gulliver behaved himself he was given his liberty.

The verb "behave," like the noun "behavior," requires a qualifying word to determine the meaning.

Adverbs necessary to make the meaning clear, or the syntax grammatically correct, should never be omitted.

Redundant Adjectives and **Adverbs.** — Untrained writers stuff their sentences with useless, or worse than useless, adjectives and adverbs.

I.	II.
He was absorbed in thoughts of the boy.	He was absorbed with *exclusive* thoughts of the boy.

I.	II.
The obsequies were very solemn.	The *funeral* obsequies were very solemn.
Dunstan had the habit of spending money.	Dunstan had the *habitual* habit of spending money.
The regulations soon became a lead letter.	The regulations soon became a *mere* dead letter.
From one of his hands hung his opera-hat.	From one of his hands his opera-hat hung *pendent*.
One by one, the dignitaries of the Church, followed by their trains, took their places.	One by one the dignitaries of the Church, followed by their *respective* trains, took their places.
I hope that the collection will be up to the average.	I hope that the collection will be up to the *usual* average.
I had noticed this peculiarity throughout the book.	I had noticed this peculiarity throughout the *whole* book.
We parted disgusted with each other's opinions.	We parted *mutually* disgusted with each other's opinions.[1]
Our friends were so nearly upon a par in intellect that they were happy in each other.	Our friends were so much upon a par in intellect, that they were *reciprocally* happy in each other.
Seeing the harm that was wrought by the publications of the day, Lowell started on a radically different basis.	Seeing the harm that was wrought by the publications of the day, Lowell started *in* upon a radically different basis.
He will find out his mistake later.	He will find out his mistake later *on*.
It has been asserted that a long time ago the Azores were connected with the mainland.	It has been asserted that a long time ago the Azores were *once* connected with the mainland.
The command of the Congo opened a new career to commerce.	The command of the Congo opened *up* a new career to commerce.

"Open *up*" is often seen in print, but it is not in good use.

[1] See page 78.

Other examples of a redundant *up* are —

I.	II.
Matters were finally settled between the King of Naples and Prospero.	Matters were finally settled *up* between the King of Naples and Prospero.
The book ends, however, with the expected marriage.	The book ends *up*, however, with the expected marriage.
All was shrouded in darkness.	All was shrouded *up* in darkness.
After ten years of successful business, the firm failed.	After ten years of successful business the firm failed *up*.
A long journey weakens her.	A long journey weakens her *up*.

In these examples, *up* is redundant, either because its meaning is sufficiently expressed by the verb, as in "opens *up*" and "ends *up*," or because, as in "shrouded *up*," "failed *up*," and "weakens *up*," it is a mere expletive.

"Up" is, of course, useful when it modifies the meaning of the verb: *e. g.*, "bring" and "bring up," "burn" and "burn up," "cast" and "cast up," "cut" and "cut up," "draw" and "draw up," "get" and "get up," "give" and "give up," "hold" and "hold up," "jump" and "jump up," "keep" and "keep up," "take" and "take up."

Beware of REDUNDANT ADJECTIVES *and* ADVERBS.

Misused Adjectives and Adverbs. — Adjectives and adverbs are misused in various ways.

I.	II.
This was a re-assertion by each party of the position taken at the start.	This was a reassertion by *both* parties of the position taken at the start.

In this example, two parties are regarded as opposite each other in separate positions, not as side by side in one position; as antagonists, not as allies. This meaning is expressed by "each," not by *both*.

I.	II.
Every evening, as I sit by my desk, the glow of the sunset falls upon me.	*Each* evening as I sit by my desk, the glow of the sunset falls upon me.

"Every" is preferable to *each* because the writer is speaking of what happens on all evenings without exception; he is not considering one evening by itself, and then another. No one would say "*Each* dog has his day."

I.	II.
The "armies" whose exploits are recorded seldom numbered as many as (or, seldom numbered) a thousand men.	The "armies" whose exploits are recorded seldom numbered as *much* as a thousand men.
We escape many of the baser struggles of the turbulent world.	We escape *much* of the baser struggles of the turbulent world.

"Many" is the proper word when the reference is to number, "much" when the reference is to quantity.

I.	II.
I would myself encounter the resentment of the Regent, of my son Sir William, of all my friends, rather than that you should meet your fate in this castle.	I would myself encounter the resentment of the Regent — of my son, Sir William — of my *whole* friends, rather than you should meet your fate in this castle.
Will all the finance ministers and upholsterers and confectioners of modern Europe undertake, in joint-stock company, to make one shoeblack happy?	Will the *whole* Finance Ministers and Upholsterers and Confectioners of modern Europe undertake, in joint-stock company, to make one Shoeblack HAPPY?

"All" refers to number: *e. g.*, "all the oranges." "Whole" means "containing all the parts:" *e. g.*, "a whole orange."[1]

[1] See page 53.

I.	II.
Of the provinces already mentioned beyond the Tigris, the first four had been dismembered by the Parthians.	Of the provinces already mentioned beyond the Tigris, the *four first* had been dismembered by the Parthians.

In a list of provinces only one can be first, but there may be a "first four."

I.	II.
She chose what she supposed was the most irritating thing to say.	She chose what she supposed the most *aggravating* thing to say.

In the United States often, and in England sometimes, *aggravating* is used for "irritating;" in good use it means making heavier, more grave, worse in some way: *e. g.*, "In consequence of aggravating circumstances, the sentence was severe."

I.	II.
This is an offer of so remarkable a character that it seems hardly credible.	This is an offer of so remarkable a character that it seems hardly *creditable*.

That is "credible" which may be believed; that is "creditable" which is in good repute.

I.	II.
The decision of the finance committee was definitive.	The decision of the finance committee was *definite*.

"Definite" is the opposite of "indefinite," "definitive" of "provisional." An answer may be "definite," without being "definitive," — that is, final.

I.	II.
He confesses his love for her, but confesses also that he is unworthy of her. Here, too, Sydney Carton is an exceptional man.	He confesses his love for her, but confesses also that he is unworthy of her. Here, too, Sydney Carton is an *exceptionable* man.

"Exceptional" means making an exception, not according to rule; "exceptionable," that to which exception may be taken, open to criticism, objectionable.

I.	II.
That statement is not likely to carry conviction.	That statement is not *liable* to carry conviction.

"Likely" implies a probability of whatever character; "liable," an unpleasant probability.

I.	II.
This is a meritorious and trustworthy book.	This is a *meretricious* and trustworthy book.

"A meretricious" book is one that allures by false show; a book that does this is not likely to be trustworthy.

I.	II.
Over this joint pastry (or, Over this pastry) they grew intimate.	Over this *mutual* pastry they grew intimate.

This sentence as originally written refers to two children who were making sand-pies together. The pastry was their joint work. The writer means to say that a mutual feeling sprang up between the children over the pastry which they had in common. To call the pastry "mutual," is to imply that reciprocal relations existed between it and the children.

I.	II.
The disconsolate husband employed a common friend to engage Dryden to compose a beautiful tribute to his wife's memory.	The disconsolate husband employed a *mutual* friend to engage Dryden to compose a beautiful tribute to his wife's memory.

Macaulay stigmatized the use of *a mutual friend* for "a common friend" as "a vulgarism." The phrase had made its appearance in print long before Dickens, by the publication of "Our Mutual Friend," put it into everybody's mouth; but it has never been in good use, and is not likely to be, for the reason that it does not say what the writer means to say. If A is B's friend and B is A's friend, they are mutual friends; for there is reciprocity in the relation. If friendship exists between A and C and between B and C, A and C are mutual friends, and so are B and C; but C is the friend whom A and B have in common. It is nonsense to talk of *a mutual friend;* for there must be two sides to a mutual relation.

"The distinction between the two words ["mutual" and "common"] is strongly marked in a sentence of 'The Saturday Review' (Dec. 16, 1865): '*Common* enmities are said to cement friendship.' Substitute *mutual* here, and the sense is utterly destroyed, 'mutual enmities' meaning, not enmity borne to another by two or more persons, but enmity conceived by one against the other."[1]

I.	II.
His raptures were partly politic.	His raptures were partly *political.*

"Politic" means shrewd; "political," having to do with politics. One may be politic in the management of a political campaign.

I.	II.
He is very sensitive to cold.	He is very *sensible* of cold.

"Sensitive to" means affected by; "sensible of," aware of.

I.	II.
As if wholly unaware of the clouds outside, he remembered that it was a fine day.	He remembered as if wholly *unconscious* of the clouds outside that it was a fine day.

[1] W. B. Hodgson: Errors in the Use of English. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1882. Dr. Hodgson gives many examples of the correct and the incorrect use of "mutual."

"Conscious" and "unconscious" refer to what passes within us, "aware" and "unaware" to what passes outside of us. This distinction is, however, often disregarded even by good writers.

I.	II.
Swift's character has in it little that is worthy of admiration.	Swift's character has in it little *worth* of admiration.
The view from the summit is worth climbing to see.	The view from the summit is *worthy* climbing.

A man may be worth millions without being worthy of them. "Worth" does not take a preposition before the following noun; "worthy" requires "of."

I.	II.
The statement quoted above is incorrect.	The *above* statement is incorrect.
The board mentioned above (or, just spoken of) is to decide the question.	The *above* board is to decide the question.

The use of *above* as an adjective is gaining ground, and may, as matter of convenience, establish itself in the language; but it is not yet approved by good use.

I.	II.
Thus a reconciliation was almost brought about.	Thus an *almost* reconciliation was brought about.

In the sentence as originally written, *almost* is incorrectly used as an adjective qualifying "reconciliation."

I.	II.
The bells of a church near by rang the hour of five.	The bells of a *near-by* church rang the hour of five.
This old man was at one time the (or, was the former) servant of the king.	This old man was the *one-time* servant of the king.

I.	II.
She felt a little as she used to feel when she sat by him who was now her husband.	She felt a little as she had used to feel when she sat by her *now* husband.

Now as an adjective is not in good use; "then" as an adjective — *e. g.*, "The then ministry" — seems to have established itself in the language.

I.	II.
The day of the mediocre man in poetry is almost gone by (or, almost over).	The day of the mediocre man in poetry has *about* gone by.
This was, of course, not known by the faithful party till afterward.	This was, of course, not known till *after* by the faithful party.

About for "almost" and *after* for "afterward" are so common in conversation and in ordinary prose that they cannot be severely condemned; but careful writers avoid them. They are not favored by the best use.

I.	II.
This disgrace seemed to be the starting-point in his subsequently useful life.	This disgrace seemed to be the starting point in his *afterward* useful life.
As soon as she saw his face, she knew that there was but little matter for congratulation.	*Directly* she saw his face, she knew that there was but little matter for congratulation.

Directly in the sense of "as soon as" is frequently used in England, but it is not in good use there. It has come into America with other damaged goods.

Other adverbs misused in a similar way are —

I.	II.
As soon as he had said this, his regret became apparent.	*Immediately* he said this, his regret became apparent.
After this was done, there was no turning back.	*Once* this was done, there was no turning back.

I.	II.
He chose a little white bonnet, and a white dress partly made, which the lady's maid could arrange in an hour.	He chose a little white bonnet, and a white dress, *partially* made, which the lady's maid could arrange in an hour.

Partially is common in the sense of "not wholly;" but good use restricts "partially" to the sense of "with partiality," "partly" to the sense of "not wholly."

I.	II.
No sooner had the smoke of the great fire passed away than the reconstruction of the "Eternal City" began.	*Scarcely* had the smoke of the great conflagration passed away than the reconstruction of the "Eternal City" began.

"Than" implies comparison, and requires an adverb or adjective of comparison before it.

I.	II.
You are not so wise as I.	You are not *as* wise as I.
The town is not so dismal as it is said to be.	The town is not *as* dismal as it is said to be.

In a negative declarative sentence, "so" is preferable to *as*.

I.	II.
He combines the charm of both sexes, and understands one as well as the other (or, both equally well).	He combines the charm of both sexes and understands either *equally* well.
He was rather stout, and had a large face.	He was *quite* stout and had a large face.
As we went along, the garden became like a labyrinth.	As we went along the garden became *quite* a labyrinth.
They had a protracted philological discussion at the last meeting of the aldermen.	They had *quite* a philological discussion at the last meeting of the aldermen.

I.	II.
I stayed long enough to hear several speeches.	I staid long enough to hear *quite* a number of speeches.
They impressed me strongly.	They impressed me *quite* a great deal.
This article disgusts Thackeray to such an extent that he dwells on it for some time.	This article disgusts Thackeray to such an extent that he dwells on it for *quite* a time.

"Quite" is properly used in the sense of "entirely" or "altogether," but not in the sense of "rather" or "very," or as a means of vaguely indicating quantity or size. A recent English writer says that the misuse of no other single word is "more injurious to the effect of literary composition." In the United States, *quite* is so often employed in the sense of "not quite" that an insurance company which advertised itself as "quite safe" found difficulty, it is said, in inducing property-holders to take its policies.

I.	II.
He wore a much (or, deeply) dyed mustache.	He wore a *very* dyed mustache.

Few intelligent persons would deliberately say that a mustache was *very dyed;* but it is difficult to distinguish this expression from others that are less obviously incorrect.

I.	II.
They were much respected.	They were *very* respected.
Her daughters were much pleased to have her with them.	Her daughters were *very* pleased to have her with them.

We may properly say "very glad," but not *very pleased*, though the two expressions have nearly the same meaning. *Very pleased* is more common in Great Britain than in the United States.

I.	II.
He was too much[1] fatigued (or, too tired) to eat.	He was *too* fatigued to eat.

Grammarians who insist that "very" and "too" should be "avoided with all past participles except such as have been turned fully into adjectives," go too far. Under this rule, it would be difficult to account for the difference in usage between "very (or, too) tired" and *very* (or, *too*) *fatigued.* Neither "tired" nor "fatigued" has ceased to be a participle, — if that is what is meant by being "fully turned into an adjective," — and both "tired" and "fatigued" sometimes serve as adjectives; but good use favors "very (or, too) tired," and does not favor *very* (or, *too*) *fatigued.* The distinction between participles that do, and those that do not, go with "very" and "too" is made by good use; but it cannot be stated in the form of a hard and fast rule.

Other adjectives or adverbs that may be confounded with one another or that are otherwise misused are —

abstractly and abstractedly.
accessary and accessory.
akin to and kindred to.
barbaric[2] and barbarous.
ceremonious and ceremonial.
consequent and consequential.
contemptible and contemptuous.
continual and continuous.
deadly and deathly.
decisive and decided.
designed and destined.
distinctly and distinctively.
equable and equitable.
evidently and manifestly.
extant and existing.
external and exterior.
farther and further.
haply and happily.
healthy and wholesome.
lachrymal and lachrymose.
latest and last.
luxuriant and luxurious.
new and novel.
oral and verbal.
pitiable and pitiful.
practicable and practical.
professional and professorial.
speckled and specked.
subtile and subtle.
unusual and uncommon.
unreverential and irreverent.
visible and palpable.

Beware of misusing adjectives and adverbs.

[1] See page 123.

[2] See page 57.

Adjectives and **Adverbs incapable of Comparison.** — Some adjectives and adverbs are incapable of comparison.

I.	II.
The sky gradually became cloudless.	The sky became *more and more cloudless.*
His shouts gradually became inaudible.	His shouts grew *more and more inaudible.*
In this characteristic, Coleridge is unique.	In this characteristic Coleridge is *most unique.*
The vote was so nearly unanimous that I threw up my hat.	The vote was *so unanimous* that I threw up my hat.
We go about, professing openly total isolation.	We go about, professing openly *the totalest* isolation.

The sky may be "cloudless," — that is, have no clouds in it; but it cannot be *more cloudless,* — that is, have fewer clouds than none. Shouts may be "inaudible," — that is, out of hearing; but they cannot be *more inaudible,* — that is, more out of hearing. A poet cannot be more than "unique," (the only one of his kind), a meeting more than "unanimous" (of one mind), or isolation more than "total."

Among the adjectives or adverbs which are absolute in meaning, and with which, therefore, *more, most, so, too,* and *very* cannot properly be coupled, are the following: —

absolutely
axiomatic
conclusively
continually
entirely
essential
exclusively
extreme
faultless
fundamental
impregnable
incessant
incredible
indispensable
insatiate
inseparable
intangible
intolerable
invariable
masterly
sufficient
unbearable
unbounded
unerring
universally
unparalleled
unprecedented

In poetry or in impassioned prose, adverbs of comparison are coupled with some words that are absolute in meaning,

and are therefore, as matter of principle, not susceptible of comparison: *e. g.*, "graceless," "hopeless," "merciless," "priceless." In simple prose, some others take inflections or adverbs of comparison: *e. g.*, "safe," "satisfactory," "sound," "true," "truly," and perhaps "certain," "certainly," "complete" and "perfect." This liberty should not, however, be abused.

Beware of using the comparative or the superlative of ADJECTIVES *and* ADVERBS INCAPABLE OF COMPARISON.

Misplaced Adverbs. — Adverbs are often put where they do not belong.

I.	II.
He early began to write poems and essays which were envied by even the Professors.	He early began to write poems and essays which were *even* envied by the Professors.
I have rewritten themes in the class-room only.	I have re-written themes *only* in the class-room.
When he took command in India, he had only three hundred Englishmen and two hundred Sepoys.	When he took command in India, he *only* had three hundred Englishmen and two hundred Sepoys.

So far as the rules of grammar permit, an adverb should be so placed as to indicate its exact relation to the other words in the sentence. Usually it should come next to the word, or words, which it modifies.

Adverbs between **To** and **The Infinitive.** — Adverbs and adverbial phrases are often placed between "to" and the infinitive.

I.	II.
I would have told him not to shoot.	I would have told him *to not shoot.*

This example shows a common fault, one into which even good writers occasionally fall, — that of putting an

adverb or an adverbial phrase between "to" and the infinitive, — words so closely connected that they should not be separated. Often, as in the example given above, the adverb thus misplaced gives a harsh sound to the sentence.

Other examples are —

I.	II.
The soldiers of the guard refused to fight longer.	The soldiers of the guard refused *to longer fight.*
You've no idea what a bother it is to be always neat and in order.	You've no idea what a bother it is *to always be* neat and in order.
Various means were sought by his Majesty to kill Gulliver secretly.	Various means were sought by his majesty *to secretly kill* Gulliver.
If the criticism of a tutor helps me to accomplish my purpose better, I see no harm in it.	If the criticism of a tutor helps me *to better accomplish* my purpose, I see no harm in it.
His father telegraphed to him to return instantly.	His father telegraphed him *to instantly return.*
He moved to postpone the subject indefinitely.	He moved *to indefinitely postpone* the subject.
He moved that the subject be indefinitely postponed.	
So to do (or, To do so) would be to sacrifice truth to convenience.	*To so do* would be to sacrifice truth to convenience.
The American knows how to use to the best advantage the mechanism of life.	The American knows how *to fullest use* the mechanism of life.
We hope to do without advertisements even.	We hope *to even do* without advertisements.
The question is, whether he will pledge himself to support loyally and faithfully the candidate of the party.	The question is, whether he will pledge himself *to loyally and faithfully support* the candidate of the party.
Properly and promptly to handle the mass of matter that goes through his hands is a vast undertaking.	*To properly and promptly handle* the mass of matter that goes through his hands is a vast undertaking.

I.	II.
It is well for me, first of all, to tell you why I visited Netherfield.	It is well for me *to first of all tell* you why I visited Netherfield.
As the fog cleared, the life-boat was seen still to struggle gallantly to reach "The Eider" (or, still gallantly struggling to reach "The Eider").	As the fog cleared, the life-boat was seen *to still gallantly struggle* to reach "The Eider."

These examples, which are drawn from various sources, should suffice to show both the prevalence of the fault indicated by the italicized words, and the ease with which it may be remedied. Its prevalence has led some students of language to insist that good use sanctions, or at least condones, the practice of putting adverbial expressions between "to" and the infinitive; and one well-known scholar has adduced what at first sight seems to be a formidable array of citations, ranging from the time of Wickliffe to the present day. On examination, however, it turns out that the names of some of the highest authorities on a question of good use — Addison, Goldsmith, and Cardinal Newman, for instance — are conspicuous by their absence; and that each of several other authors of highest repute is represented by only one example. "How it has come to pass," naïvely remarks the indefatigable author to whose industry we are indebted for the list in question, — "how it has come to pass that professional authors so voluminous as Dr. Johnson, Lord Macaulay, and Mr. De Quincey are seen to furnish, so far as appears, only one example, each, of the phraseology under discussion, it would be fruitless to inquire. It is, however, somewhat remarkable, that the consideration which prompted those scanty examples, whether it was that which has been suggested above, or whether it was a desire of terseness, or of euphony, did not operate to multiply them in the pages of the vigilant stylists who have thus just countenanced their type." [1]

[1] Fitzedward Hall. The American Journal of Philology, vol. iii. (1882).

For the practice in question no stronger case has been made than could be made for several practices which are admitted on all hands to be sins against good use, — such, for example, as that of making a plural pronoun represent a singular noun, a fault of which Miss Austen is frequently guilty.

On the other hand, unpractised writers are precisely those who are most ready to misplace their adverbs. "Many reports of 'Bureaus of Statistics of Labor,' of 'Committees on Internal Improvements,' and of 'Commissioners of Canals' have lately come under my eye," writes a student of political economy, "and I have watched the English a little, wishing to see what the ordinary legislator or state official knows about composition. The first things to force themselves upon my notice were two glaring defects. Committees would advise a legislature 'to gradually construct' and 'to properly reform.' Officials would fall into a perfect slough of pronouns; 'they' would refer back to 'each,' and 'it' again to 'they.'"

The one thing to be said in favor of caging an adverb between "to" and the infinitive is that a writer can thus, with least trouble to himself, show that the adverb and the verb belong together. This consideration, which does not affect writers who know their business, would, even if good use were divided, be more than counterbalanced by the harshness of the construction, and by the danger that soon we may have expressions like Herrick's "to incense burn;" or like these from Bishop Pecock's "Repressor" (1456). "Whanne ever he takith upon him *for to in neighbourli or brotherli maner correpte* his cristen neighbour or brother;" "The more able, as bi that, he schal be *forto perfitli, sureli, and sufficientli undirstonde* Holi Scripture;" "Oon maner is bi tiranrie, which is *forto, in alle deedis of overte, awaite* and performe her owne profit oonli." [1]

[1] Quoted by Fitzedward Hall: The American Journal of Philology, vol. iii. (1882).

I.	II.
Even such a prospect as this failed to bring peace wholly back to my mind.	Even such a prospect as this failed *to wholly restore* peace to my mind.
Even such a prospect as this did not wholly restore peace to my mind.	

Occasionally, as in the last example, it is impossible to amend the sentence without recasting it. "Wholly failed" is not the meaning; "failed wholly to restore" and "to restore peace wholly to my mind" are ambiguous; "failed to restore wholly peace" is both ambiguous and uneuphonious; "wholly" at the end of the sentence is unbearable.

Beware of putting an ADVERB *between* TO *and* THE INFINITIVE.[1]

[1] Since the last edition of this book was published, Dr. Fitzedward Hall has contributed to *The Nation* (New York) of April 13, 1893, a paper on what he calls "the cleft infinitive." The citations in this paper, which come from various sources, confirm Dr. Hall's assertion that the practice of putting the adverb between *to* and the infinitive has existed from an early date, and is supported by a body of writers respectable both in numbers and in position. It is clear that usage is, to a certain extent, divided; but it is also clear that the writers who are of the highest authority, and who decide what is the best use, either do not employ this locution at all, or employ it very sparingly. It may, moreover, be noted that Dr. Hall is careful to say that he himself habitually avoids the "cleft infinitive." On the whole, the safest conclusion still seems to be that arrived at in the text, namely, that a careful writer will do well to avoid the construction which places the adverb between *to* and the infinitive. It is true that the construction in question is a common one; but it is also true that those who are most addicted to the practice are not those who count most as authorities on questions of good usage.

Chapter VII.

OF PREPOSITIONS

Vulgarisms. — Some blunders in the use of prepositions are, or should be, confined to the illiterate.

I.	II.
You should see them come to get their wages.	You should see them come *for to* get their wages.

For to, which is now distinctly vulgar, was formerly in good use.[1]

I.	II.
Of course, she will always love it for his sake.	*In* course she will always love it for his sake.
There will be no war within six months.	There will be no war *inside of* six months.
Consider what is proposed to you.	Consider *of* what is proposed to you.
I did not recollect saying that he had a cane.	I did not recollect *of* saying that he had a cane.
She replied, "Not that I remember."	She replied, "Not that I remember *of*."

"Consider *of*," "recollect *of*," and "remember *of*" are gross instances of the common fault of adding an unnecessary preposition to the verb.

I.	II.
It belonged to him of whom I have made mention (or, him whom I have mentioned).	It belonged to him as I have made mention *on*.
He asked whether John was at home.	He asked whether John was *to* home.

Avoid VULGARISMS.

[1] See page 139.