Click Here

Moderator note: Threads merged How would you abbreviate "par exemple" like in english "e.g."? Thanks, Tim Ianna Last edited by a moderator: Nov 1, 2011 As far as I know, we don't abbreviate it. Sorry ! I'm sorry but I don't really agree. "ex." is short for "exemple", not for "par exemple". e.g. (hey!) in a grammar textbook: "Plural nouns often end in 's'. ex. : un chat, des chats" But it's never used in a sentence, _and_ does not stand for "par exemple". Of course you could use it for personal notes, when you're wrinting down something a teacher's saying. But it's not an "official" abbreviation. Anyone else has an opinion? So am I understanding that you never abbreviate "for example" "par exemple"? you just abbreviate "exemple"? Est-ce qu'il y a une abréviation en français pour 'par exemple' en anglais, 'for example' devient 'e.g.' en français, 'par exemple' devient quoi? On utilise assez souvent "par ex." My understanding is that, while in all cases the term is expressed in full when spoken aloud, "ex. : " is commonly used as an abbreviation of par exemple, but the official abbreviation would/should be "p. ex. : ". That said, I have also seen "e.g. :" used in French (since this is an abbreviation of a Latin term, it technically works, although e.g. is seen as an English abbreviation so many people balk at seeing it in French...) Dans un texte français, il n'y a aucune raison de ne pas utiliser les expressions « c'est-à-dire » et « par exemple » ou leur abréviation respective : - l'abréviation « c.-à-d. », qui se prononce « c'est-à-dire » - l'abréviation « p. ex. », qui se prononce « par exemple » L'Office québécois de la langue française recommande d'utiliser ces abréviations françaises au lieu des anglo-latinismes i.e. et e.g. Last edited: Oct 17, 2008 Je sais pas pourquoi personne n'a répondu. Oui, cela peut se lire, pas de problèmes. "par ex." est sûrement plus courant. Bonjour, e.g. se dit également en français, ou plutôt s'écrit. […] Last edited by a moderator: Aug 5, 2012 That's interesting -- I've never seen e.g. written in French, but as I said above, that's been my experience; I'm not an expert. On rencontre de plus en plus souvent dans des textes français abréviations i.e. au sens de « c'est-à-dire » et e.g. pour « par exemple ». Cette pratique, récente en français, trahit l'influence de l'anglais, langue qui emploie couramment et depuis longtemps ces latinismes. En effet, ce sont deux locutions latines qui se cachent derrière ces lettres : i.e. est l'abréviation de id est (« c'est-à-dire »), tandis que e.g. abrège exempli gratia (« par exemple »). Deux latino-anglicismes: i.e. et e.g. | Druide In US English I usually see them with the periods included, i.e. and e.g. (And I see ex.:, p. ex. and c.a.d. in French quite often in the informal texts I read, with and without proper punctuation.) Last edited: Oct 25, 2017 Hello Kelly, In French we write c-à-d and not c.à.d. You should, but not all of you do, in my experience. There are lazy writers even among the French. edit: still, it's best to note the proper versions here. For a translator it is very very important to meet all writing's standard. This what we call in French ``la typographie`` In English we often say 'e.g.' or 'i.e.' as well as writing them In French we write c-à-d and not c.à.d. Actually it is c.-à-d. The "point abbréviatif" is required after the abbreviation of "c'est" and "dire", no need for it after "à" which is not abbreviated. Oui vous avez raison, c'est c.-à-d. Je ne l'ai jamais écrit ainsi In British, we write e.g. and i.e. BUT we say e g and i e - because punctuation is not (normally) spoken. In French, I would say "par exemple" but write "e.g." - the Latin is perfectly acceptable in MOST international languages. I don't think many English speakers would accept "C a D" as international - especially with the accent. In french, there are possible variations depending on what rules you're following which explains why you might have seen some various example and why there are contradictions even in official French rules. In terms of abbreviations, the French actual have an official set of rules that is quite simple to follow: If a word starts with a consonant, it has to be cut after said consonant. If a word starts with a vowel, it has to be cut prior to its first consonant. In both cases, each abbreviated word requires a dot after its abbreviation. If the abbreviation is followed by a punctuation, said punctuation must be stitched to the abbreviation. As such, Par example : can be abbreviated as P.E.: and can also be P.e.: The capital is actually optional because of the conflicting rules regarding dots and capitals when it comes to abbreviations. (In the French language, when there's a conflict between rules, the writer has the right to decide which one to follow. With that said, he or she has to keep following the same rule in followed cases of the document.) E.g. or e.g. can also be used in French, though is rarer to see because people usually think it's "Example given" in English. It's actually stand for exempli gratia in Latin, hence why it can be used as-is in French. (If it's in Latin, French allows its use.) i.e. or I.e. doesn't stand for "In Example" in English either (another common mistake), but stands for id est meaning "That is" in Latin which means it can also be used in French. It's supposed to be used as a sub-conditional example. For example: In English: The park allows people of all age to enter its ground and make uses of its facilities and installations. E.g. There are benches for elderly and adults who wish to relax while keeping an eye on their infants. I.e. Certain installations might have height and/or weight limitations to avoid involving health hazard with the visitors. In French : Le parc offre l'accès à ses lieux, installations et bâtiments à des personnes de tous âges. E.g. Des bancs ont été installés pour permettre aux adultes et aux personnes âgées de relaxer et garder un œil sur leurs enfants. I.e. Certaines installations peuvent comporter des restrictions de grandeurs et/ou de poids afin d'éviter des accidents avec les visiteurs. E.g. is being used to extend a point with an example. I.e. is being used to extend a point that contradict its previous point with an example. If you see the term p.ê.:, it actually means peut être : as may be:. It's not the same thing as it's used as an enumeration and not an example. The term c'est-à-dire or its abbreviation c-à-d. is not the equivalent to E.g. or I.e. It's another common mistake. It's used to follow the previous sentence with more details to enhance a statement. For examples: In French: Avec un permit de Class 3, vous pouvez conduire le véhicule de votre choix sur n'importe quelle route. E.g. Un camion à 18 roues, un mini-vanne, une voiture ou même un camping-car. I.e. Vous ne pouvez pas conduire une grue ou tous autres véhicules qui nécessitent un permis spécial ou qui ont des restrictions quand à la circulation routière. In English: With a Class 3 license, you can drive the vehicle of your choice on any road. E.g. A 18-wheels truck, a minivan, a car or even a motorhome. I.e. You can't drive a crane or any other vehicle that requires a special license or who are restricted on roads. In French: Avec un permit de Class 3, vous pouvez conduire le véhicule de votre choix sur n'importe quelle route. C-à-d. Vous avez le choix de conduire un véhicule de 3 roues ou plus en autant qu'il reste au sol et qu'il n'y a pas de restriction routière quand à son usage. In English: With a Class 3 license, you can drive the vehicle of your choice on any road. n.b. You have the choice to drive any vehicle with 3 or more wheels as long as they remains on the ground and are not restricted from roaming on the roads. Yes, I didn't use i.e., but n.b. as while i.e. might mean that is or that is said which is translated really close to c'est-à-dire in a word-by-word translation, their meaning is different in usage. The closest expression to c'est-à-dire in English would be something like to give more details while that is said in English would be translated as the expression par contre which can also be translated into but. n.b. which means "nota bene" in latin (so can be used in French) means "Take notice" or "Note well" or similar attention-seeking expressions. Well for my part, I have never seen e.g. or i.e. written in French, most people won't understand it. Nor did I see P.E., P.e. or p.e., only par ex. or sometimes p. ex. Hi! I've com across to the words "top man". A crane driver is talking about a book he read about sailing and he says he feels the last of the top men. What does it mean? thanks in advance! Top man usually means a leading figure, the boss, or the best. However, it could be a reference to this film, or perhaps even to the retail chain (I doubt it). Saludos. lovely thought, the height of human achievement; Top Man "Top Man" could also be an exclamation. "Wow! Top Man." Usually used informally. For example, you've been carrying bags of concrete all day and a (male) friend of yours arrives with the beers. You say, "Top Man!" meaning " ¡ Que bien, tio ! " One might not want to (or one might want to) use the phrase in certain contexts. In gay slang, a "top" or "top man" is the guy, well, the guy on top, instead of the guy underneath, if you understand.... So, this crane driver who's reading a book on sailors says that "...he feels the last of the top men". Well, after your post jimreilly my imagination is doing overtime... Where's zaja when we need a bit of context??? thanks for the answers. But I'm still not exactly sure what means in this case. It's an interview with a crane driver. I transcript this bit here: "My daydreams since I don't work as a salesman have changed a lot. I'm less materialistic (...) I also can spend more time reading. I was reading a book about sailing and it had a big description of "the top man" (he stresses the word a lot). And whether crane driving is the last similar profession to it... the guys going through storms, risks, etc I can empathize with them. We are in a certain extend the last top men" Any other idea? thanks! Sorry to preoccupy the imagination--but better now than after one has used the phrase in a context or milieu where one perhaps would rather not! I don't know zaja's original context either..... Edit: I see that while I was writing the above, zaja has answered....maybe it's some kind of a saiing term? the man on the top mast, or the man who takes care of a top sail or something? I know absolutely nothing about sailing..... I reckon it's Top Man as in the last profession of 'real men'. The kind of man that fights off sharks with his bare hands, survives hurricanes on sinking ships, saves women in night-dresses and is the hero of romantic novels all over the world. What this has to do with crane driving I have no idea. He's evidently completely crazy. Yes, I suppose he means it like "real men"... Don't think he is so crazy, elchoco. I'm listening to interviews with quite a few of them and they are all quite romantic about their cranes! Well, hello sailors! Top men and bottom men indeed. Well done, Soy yo. My favourite phrase from your link is: "Rotate bottom man and top man". The mind boggles. I think there may have been a pun, here, in the original quote: 'top man' as in 'top dog' (= the boss) Vs 'topman' relating to certain activities such as sailing. And this would make sense since the crane driver works at a great height, feeling he is 'top man' (above all others), but also feeling he is a bit like a sailor up at the top of the mast. See Wiktionary for 'topman' in one word:- topman (plural topmen) I don't think 'alpha male' is used in the same way that 'top man' is (when 'top man', in 2 words, is used figuratively). 'Top man' can be an innocent compliment, because you feel the person did really well, has been helpful, etc. I feel that 'alpha male' carries more meaning/ connotations, such as the idea that he may be a domineering/ aggressive person. But I suppose it depends on the context, in terms of when you use 'top man'. In the case of the crane driver, 'alpha male' would not make sense. 'Top man' could; and 'topman' in one word would, if there is an implied reference to the world of sail. I don't think 'alpha male' is used in the same way that 'top man' is (when 'top man', in 2 words, is used figuratively). 'Top man' can be an innocent compliment, because you feel the person did really well, has been helpful, etc. I feel that 'alpha male' carries more meaning/ connotations, such as the idea that he may be a domineering/ aggressive person. But I suppose it depends on the context, in terms of when you use 'top man'. In the case of the crane driver, 'alpha male' would not make sense. 'Top man' could; and 'topman' in one word would, if there is an implied reference to the world of sail. Oh well. Anyway, it turns out "top man" in this case is specific to cranes and the like. At first I thought it meant "top banana/ diamond geezer"... What I meant was that 'top man' (in 2 words) is indeed 'top banana' or 'diamond geezer', etc., but it's not exactly the same as 'alpha male', I don't think (but that would depend on the context). Other contributors may want to comment and may disagree. Also, I meant that 'topman' in one word has a completely different meaning. With the crane driver, in the original text, I suspect there was an implicit pun (top man and topman, as it were). I hope this makes sense. To quote the text in your link, I don't think it would apply to the average crane driver. On the other hand, at the top of your crane, you don't really care what anyone else thinks, I suppose. (I haven't tried!) An alpha male is a man who takes charge, one who imposes his will on others, not the other way round. Other men want to be him, women want to be with him. An alpha male intimidates, he's unquestionably in charge, no matter what the situation. An alpha male is loud, brash, doesn't care what anybody else thinks. Hi, I hear a lot 'Bah Qui' or 'Bah Non'. I dont know if the word 'bah' is right or did I hear it wrong? what is its meaning? and why not say 'oui' or 'non' directly? This may be a trivial question but, Im curious to know Merci Moderator note: multiple threads merged to create this one Last edited by a moderator: Jan 19, 2013 Bah is a term/sound for hesitation. In English you'd say "Err, Yeah" "err, Nope...." Actually, I would say that you most probably heard ben oui rather than bah oui. Ben is a transformation of eh bien, meaning well... As babyburns stated, you can easily use ben oui when you don't really know the reply or the reason/grounds of a question. I think "bah" is coming from "eh bien". i think the meaning depends on the intonation you put in "bah". "bah oui..." or "bah non..." will show your hesitation "bah oui !" or "bah non !" will indicate the answer is quite obvious to you. just my own interpretation of it. "bah" is in fact written "ben". it can express hesitation, but also that something is really obvious. - Tu aimes les vacances ? - ben oui! not quite a hesitation. when the answer is obvious, "ben oui" is used in place of "oui" > not quite a hesitation. when the answer is obvious, "ben oui" is used in place of "oui" So in the above example... - Tu aimes les vacances ? - ben oui! ...is the person saying 'Er, yes' (i.e. not really) or 'Of course' (i.e. isn't it obvious? Doesn't everybody like holidays?) Kevin - tu aimes les vacances? - ben...oui (almost an interrogation ; we would even say "ben...ouais...")... (=hesitation) -ben oui!! (=obvious answer) donc : tout dépend de la façon dont on le dit! Actually, bah is not only pronounced that way but also written that way sometimes. By youngsters on chatboards mainly. Before becoming an alteration of ben, the word bah had a life of its own with a different meaning. It usually expressed indifference. I'm not sure it's completely disappeared in that sense. Quick question: is there a difference in pronoucation of 'ben' and 'bah'? 'ben ouais' - well yeah.... et 'bah, y'a pas d'mal !' - so what? there's nothing wrong with it! Thanks. Quick question: is there a difference in pronouncation of 'ben' and 'bah'? Bah oui ! Personally I think I tend to say "bah" rather than "ben". Anyway, there are not supposed to be pronounced the same way: "Bah" rhyming with "le chat verra un rat" "Ben" with "pain", "calin",... (but with an expression like "ben, chais pas" (I dunno), I'm not quite sure what's the first word I use Certainly "ben" because it's easier to pronounce when you are lazy. I guess you have to open your mouth more when you say "bah") Yes I think ben is used when you are lazy : We usualy say "bah oui" or "ben ouais" Je dirais : ah, yes (I think so) / er, yeah (I think so) In colloquial English, if the answer is an obvious yes, you can say: Duh! For example: Were you happy when your school day was cancelled because of snow? Duh! In colloquial English, if the answer is an obvious yes, you can say: Duh! For example: Were you happy when your school day was cancelled because of snow? Duh! I agree, though "Duh!"can sort of imply the other person is a bit daft even to ask... I feel it's something kids say more than adults. And your example is good Gerard because most adults I know are not happy when school is canceled due to snow. They have to shovel, do something with the kids while having to work... Dear all, it seems that on Internet many people write something like "I will be working there for a couple of months". Now, I always thought that continuous tenses are not meant to express duration, but rather being "in the process" at a particular point in time. That is one may not say "I will be working tomorrow for 2 hours", but one may say "I will be working tomorrow at 2PM". Is this correct or am I mistaking? Thanks, Igor. Hi, according to your example you can say instead, in my opinion : I will have been working tomorrow for 2 hours at (a specific time) Hi, according to your example you can say instead, in my opinion : I will have been working tomorrow for 2 hours at (a specific time) I think you are complicating the matter by phrasing it thus. You are saying something completely different. I will work tomorrow at 2pm or I will be working tomorrow at 2pm are both ok. So are I will work tomorrow for 2 hours or will be working for 2 hours. I will be working there for a couple months = I am going to be working there for a couple months. I can see how English must seem complicated to non-speakers, as putting the same words in different combinations can mean very different things. Last edited: May 19, 2010 I think you are complicating the matter by phrasing it thus. You are saying something completely different. I will work tomorrow at 2pm or I will be working tomorrow at 2pm are both ok. So are I will work tomorrow for 2 hours or will be working for 2 hours. I hope this helps. But my example is also correct , isn´t it ? Maybe this (the fact of working tomorrow at a specific time) has several interpretations depending on the speaker . Last edited: May 19, 2010 I edited my post a few minutes later. English is tricky when using the same words in different combinations. I think both are ok, 'I will be working' can be used to emphasize the specific time. The following example may be easier: When you visit the cafe, I will be working there (for couple of months). At a specific time i.e when you visit the cafe. Last edited: May 19, 2010 I will be working there for a couple months = I am going to be working there for a couple months. OK, now the things are getting clearer. I did not know that Future Continuous has the "I am going to" meaning. I think both are ok, 'I will be working' can be used to emphasize the specific time. The following example may be easier: When you visit the cafe, I will be working there (for couple of months). At a specific time i.e when you visit the cafe. Yes, this is a textbook example and I am perfectly fine with it. A specific time is clearly meant in this case. However, sometimes it seems that people say "I will be working" without actually meaning a specific time. hi, bolzano217 my guess : I think 'will be doing' is used to announce one's future plan, making the plan sounds more established than 'be going to do', which makes the plan sound less committed to. An established plan/decision doesn't necessarily mean a fixed time schedule(a specific time) for everyone. When would you use one or the other? The future continuous is a verb tense that indicates that something will occur in the future and continue for an expected length of time. Another way to think of it is that the continuous tense is the situation, whereas the regular future tense is what will happen. Stative verbs are almost always regular future tense, while action verbs can be either regular future tense or future continuous, depending on if you are emphasizing the action for a period of time, or the state of working. Without context, there really isn't much difference between "I will work" and "I' will be working", but for example: "What are you doing tomorrow?" "I think I'll go into work for a couple hours." - it's a decision your making now about what you've decided to do tomorrow. "Mike's party starts at 5 o'clock tomorrow. Do you want to come?" "I'll be working a couple hours, but I'll come afterwards." - emphasizing that you'll be doing this activity for this period of time, maybe in relation to the party. When you visit the cafe, I will be working there (for couple of months). If you say "for a couple of months", this sounds funny to me. It would have to be "When you visit the cafe, I will have been working there for a couple of months". Hello! I'd like to know which of the options above is the correct one. I think that 'My favorite animal are dogs.' sounds natural, but I also know that subject-verb agreement is only seen when we say 'My favourite animal is dogs.' Thanks in advance! My favourite animal is the dog There was a thread about this same question some time back, and there was a lack of consensus among native English speakers as to which form is acceptable. But I would say that the following are correct, or at least commonly used. My favorite animal is the dog. My favorite animal is dogs. Dogs are my favorite animal. Some will say that the second one is incorrect because it lacks agreement in number between verb and noun, but my view is that in such a case, "dogs" is treated as the name of a group, and therefore can be used as a singular noun. Consider this: My favorite food is noodles. We would never say "My favorite food is the noodle." There was a thread about this same question some time back, and there was a lack of consensus among native English speakers as to which form is acceptable. But I would say that the following are correct, or at least commonly used. My favorite animal is the dog. My favorite animal is dogs. Dogs are my favorite animal. Some will say that the second one is incorrect because it lacks agreement in number between verb and noun, but my view is that in such a case, "dogs" is treated as the name of a group, and therefore can be used as a singular noun. Consider this: My favorite food is noodles. We would never say "My favorite food is the noodle." I respectfully disagree and have some support: my favorite animal is dogs My favorite animal are dogs However, there are dissenting opinions. This is just one—there are others. my favorite animal is dogs It irritates my old fashioned ear to hear "Dogs are my favorite animal." or "My favorite animal is dogs." It irritates my old fashioned ear to hear "Dogs are my favorite animal." or "My favorite animal is dogs." Well, if we're going to pick nits, I'll point out that "old fashioned" should be hyphenated. We aren't going to come to an agreement on this issue; as I said above, it has already been discussed a number of times here, and there is no consensus. However, what I think we can agree on is that the verb should agree in number with the subject. Here, the subject is singular (my favorite animal), so the verb is as well. The number of the object of the verb isn't important. Consider these: The most important thing in life is your friends. What he really needs is more opportunities to date. The thing you should focus on is my words, not my actions. You (and others) may counter these arguments, but I stand by my above statement that the three versions I gave are in common use. Last edited: Jul 20, 2019 Well, if we're going to pick nits, I'll point out that "old fashioned" should be hyphenated. We aren't going to come to an agreement on this issue; as I said above, it has already been discussed a number of times here, and there is no consensus. However, what I think we can agree on is that the verb should agree in number with the subject. Here, the subject is singular (my favorite animal), so the verb is as well. The number of the object of the verb isn't important. Consider these: The most important thing in life is your friends. What he really needs is more opportunities to date. The thing you should focus on is my words, not my actions. You'll (and others) may counter these arguments, but I stand by my above statement that the three versions I gave are in common use. "Well, if we're going to pick nits, I'll point out that "old fashioned" should be hyphenated." Ouch! While you were posting this eloquent message, I too was thinking up similar sentences: Dancers are my favorite woman. Poets are my favorite writer. My favorite European is Spaniards. My favorite painter is impressionists. You're right, there will be no agreement on this between us or among us. But, as always, when you're involved, the discussion is thought provoking. (Is that hyphenated too?) Just for anyone who may care, here is what one grammar website says about this (my underlining). Although this problem [of a verb sandwiched between singular and plural nouns] may seem complicated, it's really not. It's as simple as this: the verb agrees with the subject, not the predicate noun. Therefore, "were" is correct in the following sentence because the subject is "the star attractions," a plural noun: The star attractions in the museum were the art. Don't be distracted by the predicate noun. One grammar source calls this problem "false attraction to a predicate noun." Let's try out one more example. What's the right verb here: The real draw of this restaurant is the desserts. or The real draw of this restaurant are the desserts. Well, you know not to be falsely attracted by "the desserts," which is the predicate noun. Instead, let's identify the subject; it's "the real draw," which is singular. Therefore, the verb must be "is": The real draw of this restaurant is the desserts. What comes after the "is" doesn't matter. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, Svartvik 10.46 "Between subject and subject complement and between direct object and object complement, there is usually concord of number (but not of person): My child is an angel. My children are angels. This type of concord arises naturally from the semantic role of the two complements. There are, however, exceptions: My only hope for the future is my children. [also are] More nurses is the next item on the agenda. [also are] Their principal crop is potatoes. That man is nuts. Good manners is a rarity these days. The younger children are a problem. The next few bars are pure Tchaikovsky. Dogs are good company. ... Sentences [4—8] contain a subject complement which, although nominal in form, has a characterizing function closer to that of an adjective. There is no singular / plural contrast; ... Game, set, match to Gengo. Last edited: Jul 20, 2019 I have to agree with Gengo on this matter. The subject controls the verb. I have never known it to be otherwise. Here is my take on the following: My only hope for the future is my children. [also are] My children are my only hope for the future. More nurses is the next item on the agenda. [also are] The next item on the agenda is more nurses. Their principal crop is potatoes. That man is nuts. Good manners is a rarity these days. Good manners are a rarity these days. The younger children are a problem. The next few bars are pure Tchaikovsky. Dogs are good company. There was an ad for the movie by Hitchcock, The Birds, which took advantage of the discordant sound when the subject and verb do not agree -- The Birds is Coming. The ad was, in fact, grammatically correct because The Birds was the title of the movie. You could argue that the ad was not properly formatted, but the point of the ad was to get people talking about it. My guess is that "My favorite animal is dogs" would be crossed out by most editors even though the subject/verb agreement is grammatical. It just sounds unnatural. I would never expect anyone to say that. Sentences IDENTICAL in form, however, like "Your problem is drugs!" sound much more natural. I'm not sure why. Perhaps it's because "the dog" is a species and you have that to use to match the singular. There was an ad for the movie by Hitchcock, The Birds, which took advantage of the discordant sound when the subject and verb do not agree -- The Birds is Coming. The ad was, in fact, grammatically correct because The Birds was the title of the movie. You could argue that the ad was not properly formatted, but the point of the ad was to get people talking about it. I think you're right that they were trying to get attention by writing a seemingly grammatically incorrect sentence that was actually all right. The Birds was a single movie and so with the capital letter it can't be plural and with the a lower case B it has to be plural. My guess is that "My favorite animal is dogs" would be crossed out by most editors even though the subject/verb agreement is grammatical. It just sounds unnatural. I would never expect anyone to say that. I remember that after a similar discussion here some years ago, I did a little experiment with my friends. I said, "Repeat this sentence, and finish it: My favorite animal is..." As I recall, nearly everyone replied with an animal name in plural form. I think that form is far more common than "the dog," etc. Try this experiment yourself! I remember that after a similar discussion here some years ago, I did a little experiment with my friends. I said, "Repeat this sentence, and finish it: My favorite animal is..." As I recall, nearly everyone replied with an animal name in plural form. I think that form is far more common than "the dog," etc. Try this experiment yourself! Yes, "the dog" is kind of scientific as it refers to the species. The Whooping Crane/Whooping Cranes Yes, "the dog" is kind of scientific as it refers to the species. Exactly. I can't imagine myself saying "My favorite animal is the dog." That's just one step short of saying "My favorite animal is Canis familiaris." Exactly. I can't imagine myself saying "My favorite animal is the dog." That's just one step short of saying "My favorite animal is Canis familiaris." In a history book, however, it works fine: For thousands upon thousands of years the closest and most beloved companion of Homo sapiens has been the dog. Exactly. I can't imagine myself saying "My favorite animal is the dog." That's just one step short of saying "My favorite animal is Canis familiaris." My dad WOULD HAVE said My favorite animal is Canis familiarus. He was a biologist and liked to say that kind of thing for fun. Hola a todos, Estoy traduciendo un texto de cine y utilizan la palabra planos constantemente y no estoy segura cuál es la mejor opción: Se busca trabajar mucho con planos abiertos.. Los primeros planos, con fondos desenfocados, nos introducirán... .La muerte, presente constantemente, se verá expresada tanto en los planos abiertos como en los planos cerrados. planos conjunto Muchas gracias Caliban Un primer plano es un "close up". El resto aún no lo sé. Seguramente cada uno de los tipos de plano que describes tenga un nombre. Tengo algo, a ver si te sirve: English ---------- Español cameo (usually uncredited) ------ cameo, aparición en un plano aerial shot ---------- toma aérea, plano aéreo closeup, close up, close shot --- acercamiento, [primer plano] crane shot ---------- plano de grúa cut out ---------- corte (entre planos) extreme close up ---------- acercamento extremo (PPP), primerísimo primer plano extreme long shot ---------- gran plano general focus plane ---------- plano focal full shot ---------- plano general long shot ---------- plano entero medium long shot ---------- plano medio largo medium shot ---------- plano medio, [plano americano] mirror shot ---------- plano especular parallel tracking shot ---------- plano de travelling en paralelo point of view shot ---------- plano desde el punto de vista (subjetiva) reverse angle ---------- ángulo inverso, contraplano sequence shot ---------- plano secuencia, plano de secuencia shot reverse shot cutting -------- plano contra-plano shot, shots ---------- plano single tracking shot ---------- plano secuencia tracking shot ---------- plano de seguimiento, travelling Credit to Muchas gracias Kraken Plano sería definitivamente "shot" en inglés. "FRAME" = encuadre "TAKE" = toma. La palabra "encuadre" es problemática en el lenguaje especializado, algunos la usan para referirse al "frame" y otros como sinónimo del "plano". Hi, I have always had problems with deciding whether I should use past simple or present perfect with "before", so I would like to ask you about it. For example, I am in a gallery looking at paintings and suddenly I see one which I had never seen before I went to the gallery. And the problem I have is what I am about to say in this situation: "I have never seen this picture before." or "I never saw this picture before." ? I'm not sure which one I should use because I would use present perfect because I think it is some kind of experience (like "I've already read the book." or "I've been to England"). But I would also use past simple because I think that the period of time during which the picture is unknown to me is over in the moment I see it. Which one is correct? Thank you very much in advance. Nerevanin I have never seen this picture before - this fits your context very well. I never saw this picture before - the picture was always there hanging on the wall and you probably went past it many times without noticing it, but now at last it caught your attention. I see. Thank you very much. Can I say that "I have never seen the picture before." means the very first time ever I see the picture and it doesn't matter if it is the real painting or if it is only a photo of it or if I see it in a movie etc, while "I never saw the picture before." means that I have already seen it (for example in a photo) but not in this situation (for example the real painting hanging on a wall in the gallery)? I do not quite understand that second distinction that you are trying to make but my instinct tells me that 'I never saw that picture before' cannot mean 'I have already seen it' I'm afraid that in that sentence, the simple past "I never saw this picture before" doesn't work at all for me in the context you've given for it. It may be one of the differences beteween AE and BE, but only the perfect tense "I have never seen this picture before" sounds idiomatic and natural to me. I agree, Donny. If my comment suggested something else, I actually meant what you're saying while on a side note I explained in what context the simple-past version would work for me. OK. So it is better to use present perfect because past simple sounds wierd and unnatural, right? It is not that past simple sounds weird and unnatural. 'I never saw this picture before' is a perfectly valid sentence. It is just not appropriate to the situation you describe (assuming it is your first visit to the gallery). As boozer indicated, if you have walked past the picture many times without being aware of it, and then you notice it for the first time, in that case it is appropriate to say in surprise 'Well, well, I never saw this picture before'. ('Saw' here merely means 'noticed'.) The reason you gave in your first post for preferring the present perfect is correct (if it is the first time you have been there): I would use present perfect because I think it is some kind of experience Last edited: Feb 11, 2014 OK. So it is better to use present perfect because past simple sounds wierd and unnatural, right? Yes, I'd say so. The interesting question is why we don't say I never saw that before but we do say I never noticed that before. I suspect that the reason is that noticing is inadvertent, whereas seeing involves an element of volition. In the same way we wouldn't say I never read that before. I expect the AE members will say that things are different in their language; they use past tenses in ways which surprise a BE ear. The interesting question is why we don't say I never saw that before but we do say I never noticed that before. Changing 'this picture' to 'that' significantly alters the meaning in relation to the difference between past tense and present perfect, because it creates a distancing effect. Nevertheless, two points are worth mentioning: (a) we do in fact say 'I never saw that before'; for example (here again, in the context, 'saw' means 'noticed'): The Proclaimer Well, I never saw that before; another example: Well I Never Saw That Before! | My Isle of Wight (b) The Oxford Dictionaries website gives the following as its first group of synonyms for 'see': discern, perceive, glimpse, catch/get a glimpse of, spot, notice, catch sight of, sight; make out, pick out, spy, distinguish, identify, recognize, detect, note, mark Last edited: Feb 11, 2014 So, "I never saw this picture before" refers to a situation when I notice the picture for the first time although the picture had been there before I noticed it. If I change "picture" to "song", it might be for example that in a film there is some music playing and I hadn't noticed it before someone pointed it out. Or if "picture" changes into "tree" it means for example that in an alley there's a tree which I never noticed til now and so on. So it's like something has been there for some time and I didn't notice it. Can it be said like that? Sometimes the choice between PS and PP is unnecessary complicated, after all we get the same result in physical world either we say I have never seen or I never saw... Sometimes the choice between PS and PP is unnecessary complicated, after all we get the same result in physical world either we say I have never seen or I never saw... Yes, but the grammar might be wrong! I have been trying to see the difference between "I never saw/I have never seen" and to be honest I failed to see a clear and understandable explanation in the thread. I have been trying to see the difference between "I never saw/I have never seen" and to be honest I failed to see a clear and understandable explanation in the thread. Try the suitcase-of-experiences approach. That works well with to see. Try the suitcase-of-experiences approach. That works well with to see. I'm not familiar with this expression. By "suitcase of experiences approach" do you mean that seeing involves a collection experiences and understandings? I have been trying to see the difference between "I never saw/I have never seen" and to be honest I failed to see a clear and understandable explanation in the thread. In post 2 and post 8, me and Wandle explained the difference in this particular context. When you are talking about something specific, as in post 1 I never saw --> the past simple tense indicates one or more past occasions, on which the picture could have been seen, but was not I have never seen --> indicates lack of experience in the present time If you have another set of examples you can give it here and we can discuss the differences, if any. I'm not familiar with this expression. By "suitcase of experiences approach" do you mean that seeing involves a collection experiences and understandings? We are often asked here to explain the difference between the present perfect and the simple past. We have tried to explain the use of the present perfect by saying that it can help to think of someone carrying with him a 'suitcase of experiences', a container in which all his experiences are stored. Using the present perfect is saying that a particular experience is in his suitcase. Thus in BE I have seen X means that seeing X is in my experience. I have seen the Niagara Falls means that seeing the Niagara Falls is in my suitcase of experiences. The simple past, I saw, refers to a particular act of seeing in the past. Of course, if you saw it, you can now say you have seen it, and if you have seen it, you can also say that, at a particular moment in the past, you saw it. The different tenses are appropriate to different uses. I had never heard of the "suitcase of experiences approach", but it is a very nice, imaginative way of explaining the present perfect, TT. I would add to it that we do have the suitcase now, at the moment of speaking and this is what really matters and this is what makes the tense present, even though it refers to past events. Yes, indeed. We carry the suitcase with us at all times and are constantly adding items to it as we have experiences. Hi, I have always had problems with deciding whether I should use past simple or present perfect with "before", so I would like to ask you about it. For example, I am in a gallery looking at paintings and suddenly I see one which I had never seen before I went to the gallery. And the problem I have is what I am about to say in this situation: "I have never seen this picture before." or "I never saw this picture before." ? I'm not sure which one I should use because I would use present perfect because I think it is some kind of experience (like "I've already read the book." or "I've been to England"). But I would also use past simple because I think that the period of time during which the picture is unknown to me is over in the moment I see it. Which one is correct? Thank you very much in advance. Nerevanin If you mean to be talking about the period of time during which the picture was unknown to you, which ended the moment you saw it, use past tense since "never before" in this case means something like "not before I saw it". But if you mean to be referring to the whole period of time before now, and you see the picture only now, not before, use present perfect since "never before" in that case means "never before now". And if you are thinking of missed opportunities to see the picture, and the last such opportunity has ended, use past tense since in this context "never before" means "when I could have". The difference between past simple and present perfect always* reflects whatever period of time you are talking about. If that period of time ended before the present (in other words if time has passed since the period of time you have in mind), use past tense. If not, use present perfect. * I can think of only two exceptions: (1) "have got" and "has got" are present perfect in form, but they are usually not about having gotten but about having. (2) I have heard that news media in some places have a habit of saying, for example, "Two people have died when a crane collapsed", when they actually mean "Two people died when a crane collapsed" This not only has an extra unimportant word at the beginning of what is meant to be a report about fresh news, but it sounds to me like a bad translation from French, not like native edited English. If you mean to be talking about the period of time during which the picture was unknown to you, which ended the moment you saw it, use past tense since "never before" in this case means something like "not before I saw it". But if you mean to be referring to the whole period of time before now, and you see the picture only now, not before, use present perfect since "never before" in that case means "never before now". And if you are thinking of missed opportunities to see the picture, and the last such opportunity has ended, use past tense since in this context "never before" means "when I could have". The difference between past simple and present perfect always* reflects whatever period of time you are talking about. If that period of time ended before the present (in other words if time has passed since the period of time you have in mind), use past tense. If not, use present perfect. * I can think of only two exceptions: (1) "have got" and "has got" are present perfect in form, but they are usually not about having gotten but about having. (2) I have heard that news media in some places have a habit of saying, for example, "Two people have died when a crane collapsed", when they actually mean "Two people died when a crane collapsed" This not only has an extra unimportant word at the beginning of what is meant to be a report about fresh news, but it sounds to me like a bad translation from French, not like native edited English. May I ask you this: 1)Have you used the internet before you started school? OR 2)Did you use the internet before you started school? So, if it relates to time before now, then 2 is correct? We are often asked here to explain the difference between the present perfect and the simple past. We have tried to explain the use of the present perfect by saying that it can help to think of someone carrying with him a 'suitcase of experiences', a container in which all his experiences are stored. Using the present perfect is saying that a particular experience is in his suitcase. Thus in BE I have seen X means that seeing X is in my experience. I have seen the Niagara Falls means that seeing the Niagara Falls is in my suitcase of experiences. The simple past, I saw, refers to a particular act of seeing in the past. Of course, if you saw it, you can now say you have seen it, and if you have seen it, you can also say that, at a particular moment in the past, you saw it. The different tenses are appropriate to different uses. I liked the suitcase of experiences approach! It works perfectly with NO time mentioning. But how do you explain situations when we have to use PP with recently, already, this month....etc? Does it also fall into this approach explanation? I liked the suitcase of experiences approach! It works perfectly with NO time mentioning. But how do you explain situations when we have to use PP with recently, already, this month....etc? Does it also fall into this approach explanation? I'm not personally a great fan of this "suitcase of experiences" approach, but to answer your underlying question, yes - you can use the perfect tense to say things like: - I haven't seen him recently. - I've already done it. - I've paid it twice in error this month. I'm not personally a great fan of this "suitcase of experiences" approach, but to answer your underlying question, yes - you can use the perfect tense to say things like: - I haven't seen him recently. - I've already done it. - I've paid it twice in error this month. Thank you for your prompt answer!) but my question was not in "can or can`t you use PP with already etc" ) but in WHETHER you explain it also in terms of "suitcase of experiences" approach? ) I guess not...then HOW? ) Thank you for your prompt answer! ) but my question was not in "can or can`t you use PP with already etc") but in WHETHER you explain it also in terms of "suitcase of experiences" approach?) I guess not...then HOW?) I think I would attempt to explain it as describing things which have happened (or not happened) in a period of time up to and including now. May I ask you this: 1)Have you used the internet before you started school? OR 2)Did you use the internet before you started school? So, if it relates to time before now, then 2 is correct? Yes. And if we assume that "you started school" could only happen once, 1 is impossible, just as "I have used the internet yesterday" is impossible. But, for example, "Have you ever started your car before you put on your seatbelt?" is possible because "you put on your seatbelt" and "you started your car" are repeatable events. The question asks whether "you started your car before you put on your seatbelt" has ever happened (at least once before now). Yes. And if we assume that "you started school" could only happen once, 1 is impossible, just as "I have used the internet yesterday" is impossible. But, for example, "Have you ever started your car before you put on your seatbelt?" is possible because "you put on your seatbelt" and "you started your car" are repeatable events. The question asks whether "you started your car before you put on your seatbelt" has ever happened (at least once before now). Thank you so much for this clarification! It was very important to know as I could not find the answer elsewhere.... But how do you explain situations when we have to use PP with recently, already, this month....etc? Does it also fall into this approach explanation? The suitcase of experiences approach helps learners see that the present perfect is a present tense and that it is usually stative rather than eventive. Very often the present perfect (I have