

The Editor of THE EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY: SIR,—As you have opened a department for Notes and Queries by teachers, will you allow me to ask whether English masters generally are accustomed, when explaining the construction of such sentences as, "He acted like a fool," to supply a verb (acts), and to parse *like* as a conjunctive adverb. My reason for asking, is that I have always regarded such an explanation and parsing as wrong, and have taught my pupils accordingly, but that I observe that Mr. Williams, of Collingwood, the author of one of our text books on English, regards it as correct. In a little book of Notes and Questions on Rhetoric, Grammar and Composition, lately issued by him, he more than once speaks of *like* as a conjunctive adverb, and in dealing with the sentence, "I had acted like a giddy pated boy," he says that *acts* is to be supplied after *boy*.

It seems to me that the correctness or incorrectness of this parsing, turns simply on this. Can Mr. Williams, or any other teacher that upholds this mode of dealing with such sentences, show that it is in accordance with good English usage, to express a verb in this way after *like*. That such expressions as "He acted like a boy does," "If you had done like we did," "I would not have stood up there like he did," are very common in colloquial English, and that even educated persons may sometimes be heard using them, I readily admit, but that they have established themselves as part of our written and literary English, I do not believe, and nothing but the production of half a dozen examples from the carefully written works of as many of our standard British or American authors will convince me that I am wrong. If, then, as I believe, it is not in accordance with good literary usage to express a verb in this way after *like*, it certainly can not be

correct grammatically to explain the noun after *like* as subject to a verb understood, and, if not, then *like* is not a conjunctive adverb. Besides, to conclude, I see no reason why it should not be regarded as a simple adverb of manner in such cases.

Yours,

INQUIRER.

To the Editor of THE EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY:

SIR,—I quite agree with "Master" in his criticism of the majority of the expressions given in his letter of last month.

1. "To catch a train"—or a car—is at least becoming sanctioned by usage, though it is not classic English.

2. "To champion a cause" is simply a metaphor.

3. "To confess, used in the sense of admit" is an Americanism, I think.

4. "This is of no consequence" is sanctioned by several writers. Macbeth, Act I., Sc. 3: "Betray us in deepest consequence."

5. "Constantly"—In Hood's *Bridge of Sighs* we have:

"Whilst the wave constantly
Drips from her clothing."

6. This is perhaps slightly doubtful.

7. I cannot see the objection to this.

8. Prof. Genung is evidently thinking of "He don't."

9. I am inclined to think that one cannot properly speak of a river *emptying* into the sea.

10. This objection is surely ungrounded. Do we blunder also in the words execution, executioner, etc.?

11. Is there any objection to the monthly magazine being supposed to be a record of the *days* of the month?

12. I think this objection is valid. "This is the same picture *that* I saw yesterday" is better.

Yours respectfully,

TEACHER.