Grammatical Annoyances

Eric Hehner

There's a lot wrong with English, and I suppose an equal amount wrong with any other natural language. Natural language is invented bit by bit by people who cannot or will not follow the rules of the language they were taught. Some innovations serve a good purpose: to make something expressible that was not previously expressible. Many innovations serve no purpose: someone made a mistake, or perhaps tried to be “cool”, and it caught on. Some innovations reduce expressiveness, and increase ambiguity; those innovations annoy me.

Punctuated Quotations

Sometimes a sentence occurs within a quotation, as in
   “I think, therefore I am.”
In that case, the period ending the sentence occurs before the closing quotation mark because the sentence is within the quotation. Sometimes a quotation occurs within a sentence, as in
   He shouted “hello” loudly.
Even if the quoted word is last, as in
   He loudly shouted “hello”.
the quoted word is still within the sentence, so the closing quotation mark should precede the period.

A long time ago, a dim-witted grammarian made an idiotic rule: that when a punctuation mark and a closing quotation mark occur together, the punctuation mark must come first. The rule makes no more sense than a rule saying that whenever the letters s and t occur together, the letter s must come first. Today, we still find people who thoughtlessly follow the dim-witted grammarian's rule. But there is a growing number of people, myself included, who don't. I invite you to join us in this minor correction to our language.

How would you punctuate
   Did he emphatically state “I am!”?
   Yes, dammit, and then asked “Who cares?”!

Only

Here are four different sentences, with four different meanings.
   Only I wanted to see it. (Nobody else wanted to see it.)
   I only wanted to see it. (I didn't need to see it.)
   I wanted only to see it. (I didn't want to touch it.)
   I wanted to see only it. (I didn't want to see anything else.)
Grammarians would have us say the second sentence for any of the last three meanings. That makes the sentence “I only wanted to see it.” doubly ambiguous. I invite you to join me in putting the word “only” where it makes sense.
Alarms and Bombs

I'm sure you can see the problem from this little story.

At 6pm the fire alarm went off, and we had to leave the building. It rang continuously for half an hour, and then it went off, so we went back inside.

At 6pm the fire alarm went off, then at 6:30 it went off. It suddenly went off, and then just as suddenly, it went off. What genius decided to use the same words for the start and finish of the alarm? It would make sense to say “the alarm went on” for the start, and “the alarm went off” for the finish. But the words are now ruined, so I have stopped saying “went off”. I say “the alarm rang”, or “the alarm sounded”, for the start, and “the alarm stopped” for the finish.

Bombs don't have quite the same problem; “the bomb went off” isn't ambiguous. But to me it seems wrong to use the word “off” for something that clearly isn't off in the ordinary sense of that word. So I say “the bomb exploded”.

Sooner than Later

If you say that something will happen sooner, you are now obliged to say sooner than what. Some people started saying “sooner rather than later”, hoping that would discharge the obligation. Then that was shortened to “sooner than later”, which seems to say sooner than what, but doesn't really, because sooner is always sooner than later. In every case where this phrase is used, the speaker meant “soon”. Say “Something will happen soon.”. Resist the temptation to add the comparative “er” if you don't have anything to compare with. (Somewhere there is someone who thinks that I should have said “with which to compare”).

Pronouns

It hurts me every time I hear someone say something like “Me and my friend went to a movie.”. Or “Her and her husband bought a condo.”. It is as ignorant as saying “Me went to a movie.” and “Her bought a condo.”. Adding another person into the subject does not make it right. You can say either “I and my friend went to a movie.”, or “My friend and I went to a movie.”, but somehow the first order is rarely used. You can say either “She and her husband bought a condo.”, or “Her husband and she bought a condo.”, but somehow the second order is rarely used. Isn't that strange?

A subjective pronoun is often used where an objective one is wanted, as in “Mary got it from John and I.”. My guess is that someone once said something like “John and me did it.”, and was corrected to “John and I did it.”, from which they concluded that you should never say “John and me”, you should always say “John and I”. I guess context is too complicated for some people. You can say either “Mary got it from John and me.”, or “Mary got it from me and John.”.

Singular and Plural, Male and Female

In English, no-one quite knows whether to treat zero as singular or plural, does he? The previous sentence is grammatically correct, according to grammarians, even though the word “he” has no referent. What male person does “he” refer to? It wouldn't help to change “does he” to “do they”, because “they” would have no referent.

Some genius divided verbs into singular (one) and plural (more than one), totally forgetting the possibility of less than one. Here are four sentences.
Many people go to the theatre.
Only one person goes to the theatre.
Nobody goes to the theatre.
No people go to the theatre.

With a plural subject ("Many people"), the verb is plural ("go"). With a singular subject ("Only one person"), the verb is singular ("goes"). The last two have subjects that are neither singular (one) nor plural (more than one); they both mean zero; one uses a singular verb, and the other a plural verb. In a better language, there wouldn't be singular and plural verb forms; there isn't any need because the subject says how many.

In English long ago, the second person singular pronoun was “thou” (subjective), “thee” (objective), “thy” (possessive adjective), and “thine” (possessive noun, and possessive adjective when followed by a vowel). The words “you”, “your”, and “yours” were plural. Then an idiotic protocol began: a person of importance must be referred to using plural pronouns. Thus the queen says “We are not amused.”. Someone speaking to an important person must treat the important person as being plural, and say “you” to be polite; saying “thou” as though the important person were singular would be impolite. Soon everyone was being polite to everyone else, always saying “you”, and the words “thou”, “thee”, “thy”, and “thine” disappeared. But it was ok to refer to an absent important person in the singular as “he” or “she”, because he or she wouldn't know. So those words stayed with us. But they have a problem: they have a gender attached, and sometimes, as we just saw two sentences ago, we want to refer to a person of unknown gender. The grammarian says to use masculine for unknown gender, but the grammarian is sexist. People have tried inventing gender-neutral third person pronouns, like “himer”, and “s/he”, but they haven't caught on. What has caught on is to use the plural “they” and “them” as neutral singular, as in “First the merchant wrapped it, and then they put a ribbon around it.”. I go so far as to say “The author wrote it all by themself.”. If that sounds wrong, remember that “yourself” sounded just as wrong a few hundred years ago. By the way, we say “myself” not “meself”, “yourself” not “youself”, and “ourselves” not “usselves”; so why is it “himself” not “hisself”, and “themselves” not “theirselves”?

In 1971 Ms. Magazine appeared, introducing the title “Ms.” for women. Before that, a woman had to use either “Miss” or “Mrs.” depending on whether she was single or married. Males have the title “Mr.” which does not say their marital status, so women wanted a title that doesn't give away their marital status. There were howls of outrage from all quarters. Some objected to the period at the end of “Ms.” because it isn't an abbreviation of anything. Some objected to it because it sounds ugly. Some just don't like change. I objected to it for quite a different reason. We use the titles “Mr.” and “Ms.” on official forms, and in speaking to or about someone we do not know intimately. The only information those titles convey is gender, but in such situations, gender should be irrelevant. For almost all jobs, gender should be irrelevant. For reserving an airplane ticket, gender should be irrelevant. For paying taxes, gender should be irrelevant. But the forms ask you to choose a title, and it's a required field. You must tell them your gender before they will sell you an airplane ticket. I think you could make a successful court challenge to that requirement. Gender becomes relevant when people become intimate, and then they use first names and not titles. The right change would have been to get rid of titles, not to introduce another one.

Summary

Finding faults in English is way too easy. Most we just live with. But some cause real problems, and can be easily fixed, so why not fix them? And let's not add any new faults and inconsistencies.