<u>Observing Flawed Grammar:</u> <u>Inspired by our</u> <u>Volunteer Correspondent # 12:</u>

I have read this statement on numerous *quasi* legal documents, and it always left me pondering. So I analyzed the grammar. Enjoy:

"Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent and Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal."

Assuming "Joe" is the Principal; and assuming "someone else" is the Agent(s):

Sending Notice to Joe, is [*is* = *actually*] sending that Notice to "someone else", meaning literally, that Joe did not receive what I sent him, and sending Notice to someone else, is [*is* = *actually*] sending that Notice to Joe, meaning literally, that someone else did not receive what I sent him either (*or them*).

So apparently if I send Notice to Joe, he will not get it, because sending it to him is actually sending it to someone else, and even if he admits getting it, it won't help me, because I've already told him that whatever Notice I sent him, it is was actually for someone else, so now everyone's confused, because even if someone else also gets Notice I sent, they are actually receiving it for Joe, so whoever they are, they can honestly say they did not get Notice from me, because the Notice they received was not for them.

Apparently everything was actually sent to someone else, while no one actually received any Notice.

And just because it bugs me wnenever people say, or write words such as forwardS, or towardS, or backwardS, I must point out the obvious error. (Error is not that the S is capitalized.)

In proper English, these words with the emphasized "S" at the end, do not exist. For example, if you are moving left, you cannot be mocing leftS. Or if you are moving in a direction you are facing, you cannot be moving frontwardS.

You can move left (not lefts), or right (not rights), or you can move forward (not forwards) – how many front facing sides do you have?

Just like you can move backward (not backwards), or you can travel toward a destination – but you cannot travel towards one destination, such an oxymoron would necessitate being able to travel in at least two directions, both of those directions being toward at least two destinations at the same time!