Click to prove you're human

The answer is in the forum dictionary. Here prove is an intransitive verb: 10.to turn out: The experiment proved to be successful. "To prove" can be used as a linking verb. The answer is in the forum dictionary. Here prove is an intransitive verb: 10.to turn out: The experiment proved to be successful. Is there any difference between 'prove successful' and 'prove to be successful' ? I would say not. But I would probably use to be after turn out. You can also use a noun after prove (to be), as in if the experiment proves (to be) a success. Many thanks for the replies Hello, everyone. There's a question in a textbook, which is to change the following sentence into It... The question: Travelling around the world is wonderful. And the answer provided is It is wonderful travelling around the world. I wonder if "It is wonderful to travel around the world" is more correct. Or are both of them the same? Thank you. Both are correct; people might prefer "to travel" but the evidence is slim. It is also a question I want to be confirmed. 01 Travelling around the world is wonderful. 02 To travel around the world is wonderful. sentence01 says the speaker (for example) is enjoying his/her trip. sentence02 says the speaker (for example) imagines if s/he has a chance to make a trip around the world, then the trip will be wonderful. Would there be such a difference? Thank you. Last edited: Jan 11, 2022 It is also a question I want to be confirmed. 01 Travelling around the world is wonderful. 02 To travel around the world is wonderful. sentence01 says the speaker (for example) is enjoying his/her trip. sentence02 says the speaker (for example) imagines if s/he has a chance to make a trip around the world, then the trip will be wonderful. Would there be such a difference? Thank you. I remembered my teacher talked about this distinction before (long ago when I was a senior high school student). The Ving version is one's own experience while the to V version is a suggestion/recommendation. I wonder what the native speakers would think about this. [From Practical English Usage 4th ed.] 268.1 When the subject of a clause is an infinitive expression, this does not normally come at the beginning. We usually prefer to start with the 'preparatory subject' it, and to put the infinitive expression later (long or complicated items are often put towards the end of a sentence). It's nice to talk to you. (More natural than To talk to you is nice.) It was good of you to phone. [...] It can also be a preparatory subject for for + object + infinitive. It will suit me best for you to arrive at about ten o'clock. It's essential for the papers to be ready before Thursday. 268.3 It can be a preparatory subject for an -ing form. This is usually informal. It was nice seeing you. [...] Here is [an] expert's opinion. He states that gerund clauses "generally resist extraposition. (a) "It was easy understanding the lesson." (He does not accept that sentence.) (b) "It came as a complete surprise to his coach Herb's winning the gold medal." (Neither does he accept this sentence.) (c) "It would be no use protesting the new policies." (He DOES accept this sentence.) -- Cowan, THE TEACHER'S GRAMMAR OF ENGLISH (accessed in the "books" section of Google). gerund in extraposition Randy is acting crazy today. I donot know why he is being so strange. Hi. all. The "crazy" above is a adjective, how can it modify the verb "act"? If not,then modify what? Thank you for your clearness for me. This is an example of a commonly used substitution of a two-syllable adjective for a three-syllable adverb. It's not grammatically correct, but nevertheless often used in colloquial speech. The adjective here is functioning as an adverb. Using an adjective with a verb such as "act" is more acceptable than with some other verbs because "act" is behaving more like a copular verb, more like "to be". "She is acting crazy today" is similar to "she is crazy today". It seems to depend on how you choose to understand "act". If it means "behave" then you need an adverb ... act crazily. If it means "pretend to be, portray as an actor", then you need an adjective ... act crazy. In the topic example, I suspect that Randy is behaving in a crazy manner, crazily. Having said that, I am sure you will hear acting crazy a great deal more often than acting crazily, even when it means behave crazily. If it means "behave" then you need an adverb ... act crazily. If it means "pretend to be, portray as an actor", then you need an adjective ... act crazy. That's interesting... But I don't think it can be used as a rule of thumb, especially in reference to animals (they can't possibly pretend to be "crazy"): These dogs are acting crazy. Well, I'm just thinking out loud. That's interesting... But I don't think it can be used as a rule of thumb, especially in reference to animals (they can't possibly pretend to be "crazy"): These dogs are acting crazy. Well, I'm just thinking out loud. That's why dogs act crazily in English exams, but they act crazy in the street It seems to depend on how you choose to understand "act". If it means "behave" then you need an adverb ... act crazily. I don't think it necessarily needs an adverb - as long as it is basically the person we are describing rather than the way of behaving. I think this is even clearer with a verb like "talk". If I say "you're talking crazy" then I mean that "you are crazy and the words you are using are proving this". If I say "you're talking crazily" then perhaps you're talking very very fast, making some very strange noise in between the words and snorting, for example. I think you can use adjectives with a verb that allows for the fact that in some way the person speaking themselves is being described. Thank you all. English culture is immense and need me to chew over and over,only in the specific environment. I don't think it necessarily needs an adverb - as long as it is basically the person we are describing rather than the way of behaving. [....] I am inclined to agree. Our own dictionary has as the first definition for act as a verb: "do, behave" and the example:The dog acts ferocious, but he is really afraid of people. Substituting the adverb "ferociously" doesn't work. To me, it seems to shift the meaning of act to "play a part". In any case, the sentence becomes odd and difficult to make sense of:The dog acts ferociously, but he is really afraid of people. I fairly confident that "The dog acts ferocious" is acceptable in most registers of spoken AE. Possibly the sentence would have to be reworded for a formal or academic paper, if such a paper included a reference to a pet. This is my way of saying that the construction may not be regarded as fully standard. (Probably here I am repeating what Panjandrum said.) Do you use adjective or adverb after the verb "act"? For example: "He acts strange" VS. "He acts strangely." My PC is acting strangely. I don't understand why you disagree here then because your words seem to suggest that you agree (as I read it anyway). My PC is exhibiting strange behaviour > My PC is acting strangely. I agree with what Cagey says about "acting ferocious" vs. "acting ferociously", and I think the same thing applies to "acting crazy" vs. "acting crazily" and to "acting strange" vs. "acting strangely". Both ferocious-acting dogs and strange-acting computers are common where I live, and if Randy is acting strange today, he is acting like a strange person, not acting crazily. I was disagreeing with most of PaulQ's comments in this post: "My PC is acting strangely lately." is the correct version. "My PC is acting strangely" is not ungrammatical, but it is not the correct "version". "My PC is acting strange", in fact, makes more sense to me. Why would it be better to say a PC exhibits strange behavior than to say it acts like a strange machine? "My PC is acting strange lately." is very informal but you will hear it said by native speakers. I don't consider it "very informal". It is suitable for any register. (I would consider "talking crazy" to be informal language, but "acting crazy/ferocious/strange" is different.) I agree with this: (iii) If you write it in, for example, a computer forum, probably nobody will notice it. but not with this: As you are a non-native speaker, (i) if you say it, it will simply sound wrong. (ii) If you use it in an examination, you will lose marks. or this: (iv) if you write it in a formal letter, you will be thought of as "a little uneducated." I realize PaulQ is intending this as good advice for his environment, but it is bad advice for mine. Last edited: Nov 30, 2014 Would you say: 1) to speak bravely or 2) to speak brave How about "act entitled" (as in "Don't act entitled.")? There is no adverb form of "entitled," is there? Is "Don't act entitled" short for "Don't act (like you are) entitled"? If so, is this omission applicable to other examples in this thread as well? - act crazy -> act (like you are) crazy - talk crazy -> talk (like you are) crazy - act strange -> act (like you are) strange How about "act entitled" (as in "Don't act entitled.")? That makes sense, formally or informally. (A person saying it is probably prejudiced.) There is no adverb form of "entitled," is there? No, there isn't. Is "Don't act entitled" short for "Don't act (like you are) entitled"? If so, is this omission applicable to other examples in this thread as well? Yes, and yes. - act crazy -> act (like you are) crazy - talk crazy -> talk (like you are) crazy - act strange -> act (like you are) strange I am not sure what works for act is the same for talk. For me, "talk crazy" is not a way to say "talk as if you are crazy" but a very informal, probably nonstandard, way to say "talk nonsense", i.e. speak in a way that makes no logical sense. "My PC is acting strangely lately." is the correct version. "My PC is acting strange lately." is very informal but you will hear it said by native speakers. I was disagreeing with most of PaulQ's comments in this post: "My PC is acting strangely" is not ungrammatical, but it is not the correct "version". "My PC is acting strange", in fact, makes more sense to me. Normally a verb is followed by an adverb in this simple type of sentence - and much depends on what the speaker meant/ was trying to say. I made the assumption that the PC was behaving in an unexpected and strange way: and "strangely" was appropriate. However, if we consider 1. She arrived drunk (adj.) 2. He hammered it flat (adj.) In which drunk and flat are the complements of their respective sentences (1. is a descriptive, and 2 is a resultative. 1. = She arrived and she was drunk; 2. = he hammered it and as a result it was flat.) These are not the same as 3. She arrived drunkenly (adv.) -> she arrived in a manner that gave the impression of her being drunk. 4. He hammered it flatly (adv.) -> he hammered it without emotion (?) It is important to note that 1. and 3. are not the same: 1. she is drunk; 2. her appearance is that of someone who is drunk but there may be other causes. 5. "My PC is acting strangely." is what is required. 6. "My PC is acting strange" - "My PC is acting and it is strange." However, the nature of "strange" is not at all clear, whereas in 5. we know the way that it is acting is strange. Subject verb adjective is not wrong, but it can be used wrongly/wrong. Thank you for answering my questions, Forero! When you say "Joan acts strangely," you are emphasizing the manner or way in which Joan behaves. The adverb "strangely" describes how Joan's actions are different, unusual, or not typical. This usage focuses on the specific behaviour itself and how it appears out of the ordinary. You're highlighting the nature of the actions Joan is performing. On the other hand, when you say "John acts strange," you are using an adjective to describe John's overall demeanour or appearance. The adjective "strange" directly characterizes John as a person who is different or unusual in some way. This usage focuses on John's general disposition or the impression he gives as a person. some people will get confused for to say that sb acts strange (looks strange) is through their actions and behaviours, more precisely through their odd, weird actions which can mean directly acting strangely I have a doubt. I was wondering if the comparative of "fun" (as an adjective) is "funner" or "more fun". funny is funnier, but "fun"? thanks Hi, As far as I know 'funner' doesn't exist in English, only 'more fun'. but let natives say a word Saludos The truth is, "fun" is not an adjective but a noun: "we had a lot of fun" - "we had more fun today than yesterday" However, it's informally used -but not exactly correct- and pretty much accepted as an adjective. Therefore, since it's not a real adjective "funner" and "funnest" are not said. On the page indicated by m_lara_r, they mention "funny", which is an adjective and the comparatives are "funnier" and "funniest" Last edited: Apr 14, 2013 Correct: "funner" and "funnest" are used in English by children. They are not considered correct in standard English. Informally, it is quite common to hear "We had a fun time" or some variation. Dictionary.com lists its use as informal. (I checked to make sure.) The truth is, "fun" is not an adjective but a noun: "we had a lot of fun" - "we had more fun today than yesterday" However, it's informally used -but not exactly correct- and pretty much accepted as an adjective. Therefore, since it's not a real adjective "funner" and "funnest" are not said. [...] Even my Concise OED, which I've had for more than forty year, recognizes "fun" as an adjective ("amusing, entertaining, enjoyable") without feeling any need to gloss it as informal. "Funner" and "funnest" are not said (except by children) because the accepted comparatives are "more / most fun." Even my Concise OED, which I've had for more than forty year, recognizes "fun" as an adjective ("amusing, entertaining, enjoyable") without feeling any need to gloss it as informal. "Funner" and "funnest" are not said (except by children) because the accepted comparatives are "more / most fun." fun (fŭn) adj. Informal Enjoyable; amusing: "You're a real fun guy" The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language fun adjective Informal: intended for, or giving, pleasure or amusement: a fun gift Webster's New World College Dictionary fun Pronunciation: /fʌn/ adjective informal amusing, entertaining, or enjoyable: it was a fun evening Oxford dictionaries These are just a few dictionaries that consider informal the use of "fun" as an adjective. By the way I changed the color of "informal" to red to make it stand out. Some dictionaries I found don't even mention the fact that "fun" can be an adjective, informal or not. Hullo. I think a rule of thumb for labelling "fun" as a noun or an adjective is that it is an adjective only when it is followed by a noun. Thus, "He's a fun guy" (adj.), but "She's great fun" (noun). That said, I feel rather insecure about "He's fun to work with". GS I can´t see anything wrong with fun as an adjective as in "he's fun to work with." The usual comparative/superlative would be, "He´s more fun to work with than my previous boss." "He´s the most fun of all the bosses I have ever had." In time it is logical that "funner" and "funnest" will be accepted though they are not yet standard English. For example I saw an advert where Apple described the iPod Touch as the “funnest iPod ever." I can´t see anything wrong with fun as an adjective as in "he's fun to work with." [...] Or with "we'll see if we can find some fun things to do for the weekend." I think the dictionaries have some catching up to do with this usage. Or with "we'll see if we can find some fun things to do for the weekend." I think the dictionaries have some catching up to do with this usage. Yes, that's true. Language evolves because common usage changes and grammarians and dictionaries ought to accept that. A. This is going to be a fun year. B. It could be a funner year if... Eso es algo que he escuchado en una serie. Por tanto, ya, 9 años después de este post, parece que empieza a normalizarse su uso. No sé si ya es más frecuente en la calle que antes. @ splurge Eso no se oye en mi calle, ni lo empleo yo. A. This is going to be a fun year. B. It could be a funner year if... Eso es algo que he escuchado en una serie. Por tanto, ya, 9 años después de este post, parece que empieza a normalizarse su uso. No sé si ya es más frecuente en la calle que antes. No, the incidence of this use is not increasing. There have always been native speakers with a limited grasp of English grammar knowledge who say "funner" and "funnest," but those are not accepted as correct by the majority of speakers. In the context you heard, it is also possible that the speaker intentionally made this mistake for affectation (to make it humorous). Correct: The year could be even more fun if... I know that it is commonly rejected, but I do say "funner" sometimes in very informal conversations (mostly as a joke, though I don't personally know why people are so against its use). Both an adjective and a noun; this very word reference dictionary explains it ok. As an adjective, we can say eg "We had a fun day." Comparative would be "We had a more fun day on Sat than on the Friday." Or, "The most fun day on the trip was the Wednesday when we visited ...." As a noun, eg "It was a lot of fun" , "We had so much fun". Comparative and superlative: "We had more fun than they did." Or "That was the most fun I've had for ages". These sound a little "off" to me, as if fun is not quite a fully versatile adjective (yet): You're a more fun guy than George. You got a more fun gift than I did. Saturday was a more fun day than Friday. The most fun day on the trip was the Wednesday we visited …. It could be a more fun year if …. Hello, What is the difference between the two? 1. It is of great danger to go to the area without a bodyguard in the night. 2. It is very dangerous to go to the area without a bodyguard in the night. I reckon No.1 implies a little more formality. 1. It is of great danger to go to that area without a bodyguard at night. 2. It is very dangerous to go to that area without a bodyguard at night. Hi, just two corrections, 'the' should be 'that' as you're referring to a specific place (you can't mean everywhere) 'in the night' it sounds better with 'at'... I would always say number 2, 1 is very strange, I can't even tell if it can be considered correct as I only go by what sounds right, but as I've come to discover, there are many things considered 'correct' that nobody on this planet would ever say.. I have never in my entire life heard 1), so my recommendation would be to use No 2. Thank you, Alxmrphi. I always welcome corrections. In fact, I'm not confident in using English to communicate with others. It is also very hard for me to understand the differences between 'the' and 'that' and other things. Let me ask one more. 3. All the blocks must be the same color. 4. All the blocks must be of the same color. Are both correct? If so, what difference do you see? Of course it's difficult for you, you're Japaneese, and Japanese doesn't have articles, so they must be a very confusing thing!! Your second one... both are fine, that 'of' sounds a lot better than the 'of' in the first post, of course 3. is more common, but 4. is also fine, (a little bit more formal). Thank you, Alxmrphi. 5. All the blocks must be the same color as that one. 6. All the blocks must be of the same color as that one. Are those correct? Thanks in advance. Yeah that is the same as #3 .. (essentially, regarding the 'of' question) 5 + 6 are fine, 5 is more common, 6 is a little bit more formal. I think the reason is "of the same colour" is fairly common, they all 'belong' to the same colour so-to-speak, but 'of danger' doesn't really work in the same way (and that's why it didn't sound good in the first post) Thank you, Alxmrphi. How about these? 7. These sewing machines are of great use. 8. These sewing machines are very useful. Are both correct and idiomatic? Many thanks in advance. Thank you, Alxmrphi. 1. It is of great danger to go to that area without a bodyguard at night. 7. These sewing machines are of great use. I couldn't see the difference between the two. Let me assume one thing. To go to a certain area at night is an everyday occurrence. So it needs to use a casual way to express it. But 'of great danger' is not a casual expression. This is the reason native English speakers judge No.1 is not idiomatic. Is this guess right? Thanks in advance. It's more of the fact that it's acceptable to say "of " for certain things, 'use/colour' are fine, but danger is not, I'm not sure how best to explain this but.. I just don't know I'm sorry, I think it's best to understand this 'of' construction, works well in some cases but doesn't work in a lot of others, and try to learn where it sounds normal... You are correct 'of great danger' is not a casual expression. Thank you, Alxmrphi. 9. Those ancient constructions were of splendid height. 10. Those ancient constructions were splendidly high. Are Those idiomatic? Or you don't say 'splendidly high'? Thanks in advance. Hello, What is the difference between the two? 1. It is of great danger to go to the area without a bodyguard in the night. 2. It is very dangerous to go to the area without a bodyguard in the night. I reckon No.1 implies a little more formality. ..... Danger is a thing...a noun. Great danger describes what kind of danger is present. Dangerous is an adejective...it describes the area. Very (adverb), further modifys dangerous to indicate how dangerous the situation is. I would use the adjective form. It is very dangerous to go to THAT area without a boduguard AT night. The thing you need to be asking is does it work with 'height', the adjective is irrelevant. Thank you, Alxmrphi. 9. Those ancient constructions were of splendid height. 10. Those ancient constructions were splendidly high. Are Those idiomatic? Or you don't say 'splendidly high'? Thanks in advance. No, those are not idiomatic. Splendid (which means magnificent, radiant, excellent, acclaimed) does not collocate with height. And even if you did use the phrase, it would be ‘they are of a splendid height’. Thank you, Johndot, Alxmrphi, Desert_fox. I guess these two sentences are idiomatic. 11.Those ancient constructions were all of splendor. 12. Those ancient constructions were all splendid. Am I correct? No, taked. We don't say "be of splendor", either. Taked -- Of all the sentences you have listed, I would chose the adjectival form as opposed to the "be of" form. While some of the "be of" forms may be grammatically correct, most of them sound incorrect and none of them sound markedly better than the adjectival forms. Some of them sound pretentious rather than just formal. As an added bonus, it will make it easier for you. Taked -- Of all the sentences you have listed, I would chose the adjectival form as opposed to the "be of" form. While some of the "be of" forms may be grammatically correct, most of them sound incorrect and none of them sound markedly better than the adjectival forms. Some of them sound pretentious rather than just formal. As an added bonus, it will make it easier for you. I absolutely agree. To say "These sewing machines are of great use" or "All of these blocks must be of the same colour" is grammatically correct but not idiomatic. This use might be appropriate in certain writings but sound stilted and old-fashioned in speech. Thank you, all. I understand that the word 'idiomatic' means a certain expression is used in a daily conversation and in this sense, "These sewing machines are of great use" or "All of these blocks must be of the same colour" is not the one you use in a daily convesation. Thanks again. be of possess intrinsically; give rise to 13-A.This work is of great interest and value 13-B.This work is greatly interesting and valuable. 14-A.This is a matter of importance. 14-B.This is an important matter. 15-A."It is true of every case." 15-B."It is true in every case." (Source:Oxford Dictionary, Doosan English-Korean dictionary) The left sentences are excerpts from the stated source(A), and I wrote sentences having familiar structure to me on the right(B). Does each two-sentence 13 to 15 mean the same thing except for the nuance of formality? And I'm not sure whether the sentence 15-A sounds natural. Sorry to barge in like that, but it seems to me the adjectives and adverbs are mostly irrelevant here. Some nouns are used with 'of' to act as adjectives, some just aren't, however syntactically correct that usage would be. "of use", "of value" are OK, "of danger", "of height" are not. Adding more words to the mix does not make much difference, except maybe in some fixed expressions (none of which I could think of, but I'm no native). Some nouns are used with 'of' to act as adjectives, some just aren't, however syntactically correct that usage would be. I think this is it in a nutshell. I'd happily accept "of great interest", "of importance" and possibly "of the same colour", but most of the other "of...[noun]" examples in this thread sound a bit bizarre to me, quite honestly. Here are some of the most common phrases, found by searching with "it is of great": Google Ngram Viewer "A situation of great danger", "a monument of great antiquity", "walls of great height", "lakes of great depth" are good, but without "great" they don't really work. I just remembered one example of fixed expressions : "a man of might" or "a man of means". Not sure if there are many like that though. These examples with "great" could be rephrased as "whose xxx is great", i.e. qualifying an intrinsic quality (the danger of a situation, the depth of a lake...). Maybe that's one logical way of looking at it: a wall intrinsically has a height, so "a wall of height" does not give any extra information about the wall, while "a high wall" implies the height is above average. On the other hand, "of value" might work with about anything (especially in our materialistic culture where about anything can be sold or deemed useless). Maybe that's one logical way of looking at it: a wall intrinsically has a height, so "a wall of height" does not give any extra information about the wall, while "a high wall" implies the height is above average. On the other hand, "of value" might work with about anything (especially in our materialistic culture where about anything can be sold or deemed useless). I think you are right and very logical. That being said, I wonder which of the two sentences is more idiomatic. 1. She has a golden heart. 2. She has a heart of gold. I guess "of gold" would work as well as "of value". Thanks in advance. That being said, I wonder which of the two sentences is more idiomatic. 1. She has a golden heart. 2. She has a heart of gold. I guess "of gold" would work as well as "of value". Yes, it's (2): To describe someone as having "a heart of gold" is very idiomatic. It's virtually a 'set phrase'. Thank you, DonnyB. You and all the other contributors are of great help to me. Thanks again, taked4700 Hi, The context is chess. Never mind the technical vocabulary, it's more of a question on grammar. My sentence goes, Notoriously drawish as the exchange variation is, it's unlikely that they'll play it. meaning: The exchange variation is notoriously drawish. Therefore, it's unlikely that they'll play it. I know that the construction [adjective] + as + to be, seem, sound, etc. usually expresses concession (e.g. 'Silly as it sounds'). In this instance, though, I'm talking about a causal relationship, that's why I wrote 'therefore' in bold. For some reason it sounds right to me but what do you think? It's grammatically correct. Stylistically therefore sounds too formal for speech (at least at the beginning of this sentence). I'd say so. (I wouldn't have the comma.) Hello Does anybody know the adjective of the noun genre? I was thinking about generic, but I'm not at all sure. Or does generic refer to gender? I'm currently working on my master thesis in English linguistics and want to write that weblogs have been studied from a _____ point of view. Can anybody help? Thanks. I wouldn't use generic, which comes from genus and means general rather than specific or special. I don't see any obvious adjective related to genre (in the OED). And as I don't know what genre means in reference to weblogs I'm stuck for an alternative suggestion I could help you if I understood exactly what you mean when you say "study weblogs from a genre point of view" --> does that even make sense? Or do you mean that weblogs have been studied in the sense that it is like a genre? If so, I'd say: "weblogs have been studied in the form of genres" or "weblogs are analysed from the viewpoint of a genre" (implying that the weblog has become a genre in itself). As for generic, panjandrum explained it well. I see that you come from the German-part of Switzerland. Is there a particular German word you are thinking of for the adjective of genre? Maybe I could try translating that into English? Hope I helped. Does evey noun have to have a derived adj.? "The point of view of their genere" would be better. But I think the work genere is probably not a good one here. I agree that the sentence should be rephrased. "Generic" is similar to "general". There is the adjective "gendered", but it obviously doesn't work here. I suggest "weblogs have been studied from the point of view of gender." But he's not talking about genders. "Weblogs have been studied from with regard to their genre". I'm currently working on my master thesis in English linguistics and want to write that weblogs have been studied from a _____ point of view. Thanks. tigerduck, One adjective that came to mind when I read your question was: Categorical You need to give us a little more context, I think. AngelEyes Genre is a French word which has been borrowed by English, and because of its French spelling is not conducive to being modified into an adjective. Although it is related to words like generic and general (and gender) it has a specific meaning which is different from those, so adjective based on them will not do. I expect you want to use the word genre and not a substitute, so you will have to rephrase in a way similar to that suggested by Governor. E.g. "Studied from the standpoint of genre." I don't think substitutes like category or type will do as genre has such a particular meaning in, for example, film and literature, which I expect the author wishes to retain. (If I was to invent and adjective for genre it would be generical, which is an existing variant of generic, but seems to be pretty much out of work at the moment) How about Blogs have been studied from the point of view of their classification into genres? how about ? "Weblogs have been studied by means of [literary] genre theory." This is the first paragraph of the related Wiki passage. "Genre studies are a structuralist approach to literary theory, film theory, and other cultural theories. When studying a genre in this way, one examines the structural elements that combine in the telling of a story and find patterns in collections of stories. When these elements (or codes) begin to carry inherent information, a genre is emerging." The article uses both the terms "genre theory" and "genre studies." Might someone please explain how I could have inserted a link to the above passage ? "by genre" "from the viewpoint/perspective of genre" "as classified by genre" "grouped by genre" I can't think of a one-word alternative except for, god help me, "genre-wise." It is not clear to me what you intend to say. Do you mean that weblogs taken together constitute a genre? Then you might say "weblogs have been studied as a genre". Or, Matching Mole and Governor have made suggestions that would work. If you mean that among weblogs, various genres have been identified, several of the other suggestions will serve. Well, I study literature and of course literary criticism. Academics in this field use the word "generic" as an adjective form of "genre," although dictonaries don't mention this point. Therefore, I think you should regard generic as an adjective form of the word "genre." Well, I study literature and of course literary criticism. Academics in this field use the word "generic" as an adjective form of "genre," although dictonaries don't mention this point. Therefore, I think you should regard generic as an adjective form of the word "genre." In fact it's genric not generic. No, I'm familiar with genre studies, and academics say 'generic'. Just do a search for 'generic structure' and you'll see many examples. Yes, 'generic' is used, but it's one of those strange technical uses that are best avoided except in contexts where you're certain your readership will recognise them, because they have a much more common and contradictory meaning. Exactly. Although it might be technically true, the only people who generally know that would be academic people who use that very specialized meaning. Most people I believe are unaware of it. So it depends on your audience and context whether it's appropriate or not. It's unclear in the OP who the intended audience is but to me it sounds like a general audience. I'm stuck in helping to come up with an adjective because I now think the original sentence itself is flawed. I have experience in the genre of romance novels, so that's my focus. We start with romance sub-genres. (The very first breaking down of specific categories in romance writing.) For instance, historical, erotica, rom-com, LGBTBQ, etc. Within those sub-genres of the Romance genre are stylistic tropes. Tropes are story arcs - or themes - like childhood sweethearts, May-December lovers, soulmates. The overall arc, though, is the happy ending. Always. A specific trope in a specific genre stays within the confines of this formula to produce a romance novel. For this specific question, I think it needs more than one adjective because there are so many sub-genres in linguistics. Perhaps you can start with: Weblogs have been studied from many points of view: lexical, grammatical, philological, linguistic, etymological, and language-centric to name a few. I asked Meta to give me adjectives and that's what she did. How to present them in a pertinent way here would require more details, though. However, he asked this question 17+ years ago! I think we're too late. But leave it to WR nerds to still want to solve it.