I'm not a robot

Sabemos que la versión anglo del nombre Christian se acentúa en la primer sílaba, siendo la pronunciación CHRIStian. Ahora, tengo una duda con mi propio nombre, Cristian. Mucha gente, casi todos los que conozco, lo pronuncian como en la versión anglo, en la primer sílaba. Sin embrago, me han dicho que no teniendo la H, se debe acentuar en la segunda sílaba, crisTIAN. Sólo quisiera saber qué regla sigue y a qué se debe. Soy profesor de inglés pero de español no sé mucho, sólo hablar y escibir. ;) Gracias!! Cristian no es muy común por acá, pero naturalmente lo pronunciaría igual que con h. Crístian. Yo conozco el nombre Cristian (grave) y Cristián (aguda) en lo que respecta a la pronunciación. No sé si el que se escribe con "h" se pronuncia como el segundo que puse, habría que ver. Si tu nombre se escribe Cristian (sin tilde), es una palabra grave/llana y debes pronunciarlo marcando el acento en la primera sílaba. Para pronunciarlo acentuando la última sílaba (como palabra aguda), debería llevar tilde sobre la a. Si tu nombre se escribe Cristian (sin tilde), es una palabra grave/llana y debes pronunciarlo marcando el acento en la primera sílaba. Para pronunciarlo acentuando la última sílaba (como palabra aguda), debería llevar tilde sobre la a. Y ambos nombres (con y sin tilde) existen. _ Y ambos nombres (con y sin tilde) existen. _ ¿Existe también el Christian pero con tilde? ¿Christián? Tengo un primo que se llama Cristian y se pronuncia como se lee, claro. También un profesor se llamaba Cristián; pero la versión con H no la vi en conocidos ni familiares. En español se puede escribir con o sin acento y pronunciar en consecuencia así que elige el que más te guste. Viene del griego y signifina cristiano o seguidor de Cristo. El femenino es Cristina, que es mi nombre. Un saludo, tocayo. Yo la única pronunciación que he oído , tanto si lleva hache (que os recuerdo que aquí sigue siendo muda, si no, sería difícil de pronunciar una che seguida de una erre), como si no lleva la hache, dando el "golpe de voz" sobre la primera sílaba. No lo he oído nunca pronunciarla con el acento tónico sobre la última sílaba. Si lo intento me sale cristiano. El masculino de Cristina es Cristino. Aún usado por España, antes lo fue mucho. Pues yo he conocido españoles que se llamaban Cristián o Cristian y un belga Christian pero eso es un nombre extranjero. Se me olvidaba Cristino pero era el nombre que se daba a los partidarios de doña MariaCristina de Borbon Dos Sicilias, l esposa del rey Fernando vii. Gracias a todos! Muy bueno el debate que se armó, aunque se desvió un poco de mi pregunta original. Saludos! Gracias a todos! Muy bueno el debate que se armó, aunque se desvió un poco de mi pregunta original. Saludos! El comentario #4, de Pinairun, fue muy claro. Con o sin hache, Christian tiene el acento en la primera i. Para que lo tenga en la a habría que escribir Cristián. Y en eso de los nombres propios de la gente es mejor no adentrarse mucho. En Colombia y otros países de este lado es costumbre bien arraigada inventar, literalmente inventar los nombres de los críos y aparecen unas cosas asombrosas: Leididí, con variadísimas ortografías; Usnavy, en memoria de unos buques de guerra gringos que nunca, según la versión oficial, estuvieron frente a las costas del Chocó, en el Pacífico colombiano. Como que mientras más raro el nombre, más propio. La lista puede dar para una emocionante antología. Pero yo no sé si Pinairum es profesor de Lengua Española o por qué debería ser claro justo su comentario si hay como 20 personas diciendo algo diferente? Pero yo no sé si Pinairum es profesor de Lengua Española o por qué debería ser claro justo su comentario si hay como 20 personas diciendo algo diferente? Choa, no veo tal divergencia de opiniones. Tanto Christian como Cristian se pronuncian /K/ristian, con acento en la primera sílaba. Para acentuar la segunda sílaba habría que escribir Christián o Cristián y se pronunciaría /K/ristián. Aparecieron, además, pero no son tan divergentes, Cristina y Cristino, como podrían aparecer algunos Cristiano o Cristiana Pulgarín, que no Ronaldo, o Cristóforo o cualquier cosa que surja de la imaginación y la creatividad de quienes buscan un nombre para sus hijos. Entonces la conclusión es que los nombres no siguen las reglas básicas de acentuación. Da lo mismo una cosa u otra. No? ¿Por qué dices que no siguen las normas de acentuación? Entonces la conclusión es que los nombres no siguen las reglas básicas de acentuación. Da lo mismo una cosa u otra. No? Este hilo ya parece el cuento de la buena pipa. ¿De dónde sacas tú, despues de todo lo dicho, esa conclusión? De nuevo: Cristian Christian Cristián. _ Porque mi nombre no lleva tilde (Cristian) y hay gente que me llama CrisTIAN, acentuando la segunda sílaba. Estarían equivocados entonces... En español, ¿Qué usa para B.C. (Before Christ), B.C.E (Before Common Era), A.D (anno domini), and C.E (common era) cuando se referiendo a un siglo? e.j. 16th century B.C. = el siglo dieciseis _____ Gracias, Kim AC --> Antes de Cristo DC --> Después de Cristo El siglo XIV AC / El año 324 DC Saludos Como dice ILT, sólo usamos AC (antes de Cristo) y DC (después de Cristo). Normalmente casi nunca se usa DC, porque consideramos que una fecha sin ninguna indicación (AC, DC) quiere decir siempre DC. Sólo si en un mismo texto o párrafo hay referencias a fechas antes de Cristo, y a fechas después de Cristo, usamos DC para que quede claro. Si no hay posibilidad de confusión, no utilizamos DC. Para escribir los siglos: en español usamos números romanos para referirnos a los siglos. No escribimos el siglo 16, sino el siglo XVI. ¿No se usa ? A.D. es latín para (Anno Domini). No es inglés. Yo pensaría que podría ser lo mismo. Pero, Soy muy mal en el español. Por favor, me correcta si soy confuso. Muchas gracias por su ayuda, -Rebekah Creo que es "anno domini" (con dos "n") [la ñ en español se deriva de la "doble n" en latín. Es con doble ene, como puso Kimberly1603 al principio. Creo que es "anno domini" (con dos "n") [la ñ en español se deriva de la "doble n" en latín. You're right. It's with 2 'n's. But why does "in the year of our Lord" become "After Christ"? It's obviously not de-Christianizing at all. Too many interesting cultural differences! Gracias, -Rebekah You're right. It's with 2 'n's. But why does "in the year of our Lord" become "After Christ"? It's obviously not de-Christianizing at all. Too many interesting cultural differences! Gracias, -Rebekah Aunque A.D. sea una expresión latina (anno domini) en español (en España) no la usamos. Siempre decimos "después de Cristo" o, "de nuestra era" aunque esta expresión es un poco más rara. Tiene lógica decir "después de Cristo". Vivimos en el año 2006 despues de Cristo, es decir, dos mil seis años después de que Cristo naciera. "Our Lord" es "Jesucristo"... lo que pasa es que en español lo traducen del latín en vez de conservar la expresión en latín. La referencia a Jesucristo se queda aunque sea más oculta para nosotros en el latín. Aunque A.D. sea una expresión latina (anno domini) en español (en España) no la usamos. Siempre decimos "después de Cristo" o, "de nuestra era" aunque esta expresión es un poco más rara. Tiene lógica decir "después de Cristo". Vivimos en el año 2006 despues de Cristo, es decir, dos mil seis años después de que Cristo naciera. Sé que ésta es la expresión que se usa...y que se refiere al nacimiento de Jesús y despues. (Pero siempre literalmente interpretaria "después de Cristo como "después de su muerte.) Esto es solo una observacion...no estoy tratando de entrar en discusiones The Western calendar (BC, AD) originated in the AD 500s when a monk attempted to count back to what he was sure was the year of Jesus Christ’s birth, which he designated as the year 1. That made the years 1 through 100 the first century AD (from the Latin Anno Domine meaning “the year of our Lord”), the years 101-200 the second century, the years 1901-2000 the 20th century and the years 2001-2100 the 21st century. The West designates those centuries before Jesus’ birth as BC (before Christ) and hence 1 to 100 BC is the first century BC, 101-200 is the second century BC, etc. Non-Western cultures have their own dating systems. For example, Muslims consider the year 1 what the West designates as AD 622. Teachers and authors of texts dealing with non-Western and world history frequently use the new designations of CE (Common Era or Christian Era) for AD, and they use BCE (Before the Common Era or Before the Christian Era) for what the West labels as BC. The BCE use still begins with the supposed year of Jesus’ birth as the dividing point. Hence, CE 1492 is the same as AD 1492, and 44 BCE is the same as 44 BC. The Western calendar (BC, AD) originated in the AD 500s when a monk attempted to count back to what he was sure was the year of Jesus Christ’s birth, which he designated as the year 1. That made the years 1 through 100 the first century AD (from the Latin Anno Domine meaning “the year of our Lord”), the years 101-200 the second century, the years 1901-2000 the 20th century and the years 2001-2100 the 21st century. The West designates those centuries before Jesus’ birth as BC (before Christ) and hence 1 to 100 BC is the first century BC, 101-200 is the second century BC, etc. Non-Western cultures have their own dating systems. For example, Muslims consider the year 1 what the West designates as AD 622. Teachers and authors of texts dealing with non-Western and world history frequently use the new designations of CE (Common Era or Christian Era) for AD, and they use BCE (Before the Common Era or Before the Christian Era) for what the West labels as BC. The BCE use still begins with the supposed year of Jesus’ birth as the dividing point. Hence, CE 1492 is the same as AD 1492, and 44 BCE is the same as 44 BC. I understand what you say, but as the original question was En español, ¿Qué usa para B.C. (Before Christ), B.C.E (Before Common Era), A.D (anno domini), and C.E (common era) cuando se referiendo a un siglo? I didn't even mention B.C.E or C.E. since these are not used in Spanish at all. Querido El Color Rojo, Veo que otras personas contestaron su pregunta de A.D., (y doy las gracias a ellos) pero quiero le digo a Ud. que Ud. no "es mal en español". Ud. ha aprendiendo y el hecho que Ud. tiene la motivación y la curiosidad para aprender comunicar muestra que Ud. es un parte excelente del mundo hispánico. Paz, Kim I guess its a big deal, this "politically correct" stuff... B.C.E. and C.E. used just so that the rest of the world who do not have the judeo-christian conviction can understand which year is being discussed... I'd never stopped for a minute to consider that I've haven't heard anyone say it in Spanish: "Antes de la Era Común", "Era Común". Surely it's done, I just haven't witnessed it. Sorry for the limp digression. Dan F I guess its a big deal, this "politically correct" stuff... B.C.E. and C.E. used just so that the rest of the world who do not have the judeo-christian conviction can understand which year is being discussed... I'd never stopped for a minute to consider that I've haven't heard anyone say it in Spanish: "Antes de la Era Común", "Era Común". Surely it's done, I just haven't witnessed it. Sorry for the limp digression. Dan F Nunca he leído un libro en español en el que se usen "Antes de la Era Común" o "Era Común". Si el año 2006 tiene sentido para los países de tradición cristiana, puesto que en los musulmanes cuentan a partir del año 622, los judíos a partir de otro año, los chinos a partir de otro, etc. etc. ¿Para quién es común esa supuesta "Era Común"? Para los países de tradición cristiana solamente, para el resto no es Común (puesto que tienen la suya propia). Gran avance el que se ha conseguido con cambiarle el nombre en inglés. I think that the whole B.C.E and C.E. is just science's world best effort at not involving religion in science, but at the same time making the new "politically correct" system a very easy transfer - the dates are the same, just don't include Christ in the abbreviations. Sure, this still uses the birth of Christ as a reference point, but B.C and A.D have been used for so long that a whole new reference point (first fossil, etc.) would get very confusing. It's kind of a compromise, and I sure can't come up with anything better - sorry to diverge from Spanish It's not really scientific; it's an example of "political correctness." I guess its a big deal, this "politically correct" stuff... B.C.E. and C.E. used just so that the rest of the world who do not have the judeo-christian conviction can understand which year is being discussed... I'd never stopped for a minute to consider that I've haven't heard anyone say it in Spanish: "Antes de la Era Común", "Era Común". Surely it's done, I just haven't witnessed it. Sorry for the limp digression. Dan F It isn't done at all, Daniel. My house is swarming with History books and magazines in Spanish, and I've only read/heard "A.C" (=antes de Cristo), "D.C." (=después de Cristo) and "de nuestra era" (= de la era cristiana). I've noticed that many Spanish expressions, which were originally related to religion, are now used by everyone without a real religious intent. Many non-practicents or atheists use "¡Madre mía!" as an interjection but they don't mean to invocate the Virgin. That's how it goes over here, at least. Saludos. I think that the whole B.C.E and C.E. is just science's world best effort at not involving religion in science, but at the same time making the new "politically correct" system a very easy transfer - the dates are the same, just don't include Christ in the abbreviations. Sure, this still uses the birth of Christ as a reference point, but B.C and A.D have been used for so long that a whole new reference point (first fossil, etc.) would get very confusing. It's kind of a compromise, and I sure can't come up with anything better - sorry to diverge from Spanish Perhaps it was an easy transfer for those accostumed to the Western calendar, but it didn't help those who use non-Western calenders (if that was the point). ¿No se usa ? A.D. es latín para (Anno Domini). No es inglés. Yo pensaría que podría ser lo mismo. Pero, Soy muy mal en el español. Por favor, me correcta si soy confuso. Muchas gracias por su ayuda, -Rebekah Creo que se usó A.D. (Anno Domini, "año del Señor") en español hay muchos siglos. Pero eso fue quando los intelectuales todavía escribían en latín. Cuando empezaron a escribir en español, traducieron la expresión para "Después de Cristo", y hoy toda la gente lo dice así. Sé que ésta es la expresión que se usa...y que se refiere al nacimiento de Jesús y despues. (Pero siempre literalmente interpretaria "después de Cristo como "después de su muerte.) Esto es solo una observacion...no estoy tratando de entrar en discusiones Pero mire que en inglés se usa también B.C., "before Christ", para el período anterior al inicio de nuestra era. Nota: algunos autores dicen que no es en la supuesta data del nacimiento de Cristo que se inicia la era cristiana, sino en la de su incarnación. I guess its a big deal, this "politically correct" stuff... B.C.E. and C.E. used just so that the rest of the world who do not have the judeo-christian conviction can understand which year is being discussed... Es que A.D. y E.C. son la misma cosa, en otras palabras. Si el resto del mundo conoce la primera, también conoce la segunda. Si no conoce la primera, también no conocerá la segunda... I guess its a big deal, this "politically correct" stuff... B.C.E. and C.E. used just so that the rest of the world who do not have the judeo-christian conviction can understand which year is being discussed... I just came to this discussion to find out how to say A.D. and B.C. in Spanish. I was fascinated by the ensuing discussion . However, to speak about "the judeo-christian conviction" is to miss the point of C.E. and B.C.E. One group who use C.E. and B.C.E. fairly frequently in the United States are Jews, who want to be able to refer to dates without making reference to Christ. There's nothing judeo-christian about this conviction. Do the US Jews know that Monday = Moon Day or Tuesday = Zeus Day, etc. and so they are using other (classical) religion-biased feature? I know this discussion ended two years ago, but I wish to point something out. In English language scholarship, B.C.E. and C.E. are often preferred to B.C. and A.D., because the latter terms are problematic for at least two reasons: 1) Both terms refer to Jesus in religious terms, either calling him the Messiah (Christ) or calling him Lord (Domini), and many people who use the western calendar (including Jews) do not agree with these statements. 2) B.C. and A.D. are actually quite inaccurate, since the general consensus of historians is that Jesus was born around 6 B.C.E., and it doesn't make a whole lot of sense to say that Jesus Christ was born 6 years before Christ. B.C.E. and C.E. are more inclusive of non-Christians, more accurate, and are still perfectly understandable to anyone accustomed to the western calendar. Como bien decia un post anterior, en castellano existe la expresión "antes de nuestra era". Tambien se utiliza la expresión "en el año X de la era de Nuestro Señor", aunque hasta dónde yo sé sólo es utilizada en textos teológicos - obviamente cristianos. Saludos, Lende Hola: ¿Se dice "DC" o "d.c."? (después de Cristo) Gracias Estas abreviaturas son las que propone la Academia, en el Apéndice 2 del DPD: d. C. = después de Cristo (también d. de C.; cf. a. C.) d. de C. = después de Cristo (también d. C.; cf. a. de C.) d. de J. C. = después de Jesucristo (también d. J. C.; cf. a. de J. C.) Saludos I know I'm resurrecting an old thread, but it seems the most logical place when I was searching for an answer. I put my BlackBerry in Spanish mode, and the calendar is including "de NI" at the end of dates now (example: "26, Miércoles de mayo de NI"). I'm not certain if the "de NI" relates to AD/CE etc., or something else (daylight savings time (although related threads don't mention "de NI" either)?) I asked a friend from Spain but he didn't know what it could be. Really curious, if anyone can shed some light.... ¡Gracias! Dave A topic from 5 years ago but just to add that Spain now seems to have adopted the BCE (Before Common/Current Era) and CE (Common/Current Era) system for dating. I picked up a leaflet in Spanish for a historical site today where dates was given followed by ANE (Ante Nuestra Era) and NE (Nuestra Era) rather than BC and AD. Hello. I have read carefully the threads on "middle name" ; however one of them is closed, and I still have a doubt: In The US many people have two first names (Joana Louise, Norma Jean) Others have a middle name, that may come from an originally surname (John. Fitzgerald Kennedy, Lyndon Baines Johnson, Richard Milhous Nixon) Could you, please, tell me in the following cases if the underlined is a second Christian name or a middle name? eg. Johh Fitzgerald Kennedy - surname Thomas Woodrow Wilson - surname Norma Jean Mortenson- 2 first names Barack Hussein Obama- 2 first names? Also, from what I see, middle names are more common with men names and double fisrt names are more common in women. Right? Thank you in advance. Last edited: Nov 22, 2013 John Fitzgerald Kennedy - 1 surname Thomas Woodrow Wilson - 1 surname Norma Jean Mortenson- 2 first names Barack Hussein Obama- 2 first names In all four cases, we call the first name a first name* or given name. We call the second the middle name (whether or not it was originally a surname). We call the third the last name or surname (it's usually, but not always or necessarily, the surname of the person's father). *In BE, I believe it's forename. This is more an American phenomenon, so I'll let them answer it. Usually in the UK people are known by their first and last name only, and no one knows people's middle names. Middle names are mostly redundant, but some people choose to use them instead. My aunt, for example is known by her middle name by all the family, but all her friends use her first name. Hyphenated first names are considered one name. "Double barreled" surnames are hyphenated and indicate either being posh or hoping to be, usually. At the risk of hijacking this thread into a discussion of how naming practices vary from country to country, the practice in the UK has traditionally been for a "middle" name to be synonymous with a second Christian name, although some people do have a "family name" as their middle name. Not everyone has a middle name (I don't, in fact) and some people have more than one. It's largely a matter of personal preference over here which name you choose to use and we don't follow the American practice of saying "John Fitgerald Kennedy" unless specifically asked to give our name in full. I agree Donny. My dad's middle name is his grandfather's surname. Some people - particular women - are commonly known and addressed by their first two names: they in effect form a two-word single name, and it might or might not be hyphenated. This is more common in the USA, with women called things like Bobbi Jo. The second element is often Jo, Jane, or Anne. Her friends say, 'Hi, Bobbi Jo.' But it is not exclusively US: the British conductor Sir John Eliot Gardiner is addressed as John Eliot, and the Doctor Who companion Sarah Jane Smith was commonly known as Sarah Jane. Otherwise, the middle name is a middle name whether it's of the type used as a forename or a surname. Chelsea Clinton's middle name is Victoria, a forename, but she's not addressed as Chelsea Victoria. To add to the confusion, take a look at . In the American South, double given names (forenames) are often used. See the section at the above-referenced page called "Double Names of the South." The name of the former bureau manager of the UPI news service in Portland, Oregon was "Billy Joe." Whether it was listed as a double given name or a given- +middle name on his birth certificate, I have no idea. The birth certificate is the defining document in all cases, regardless of what a person is called. Another note is that he importance of using a middle name has grown substantially in the U.S. because of security considerations. A passport must match a birth certificate and many states now demand that a driver's license match a birth certificate and/or passport as well. And, some airlines are getting sticky about the name on a ticket matching that of the traveler's identification, including any and all middle names. The same is true for banks and bank accounts. In The US many people have two first names (Joana Louise, Norma Jean) Others have a middle name, that may come from an originally surname (John. Fitzgerald Kennedy, Lyndon Baines Johnson, Richard Milhous Nixon) This distinction that you're making between "real" first names and names that were originally surnames is somewhat mistaken as well. Many "first names" come from surnames - Nelson, Wyatt, etc. First names and middle names are just names. A first (given) name can have two parts. I have a friend whose first name is Jo Ann. The "Ann" is not her middle name; she has one of those too, and it's different. It is the second part of her first name. Her name is almost the same as JoAnn, but her parents chose to spell it with a space. That does not make it two names. In this case each of its parts could be a name by itself, but here they're not. This is similar to the situation with family names, where something like "St. Clair," "von Weisel" or "de la Torre" is not unusual. All these have a space, but that does not make them two names. They are each one name with two or three parts. I agree with everything that has been said here. Sometimes a person will use three names and it is difficult to tell whether the second name is a middle name or part of a double, but unhyphenated, surname. For example, take the actor (who was a teen heart throb in the early '90s) Jonathan Taylor Thomas. Was Taylor his middle name? Or was Taylor Thomas his last name? (I think Taylor was his middle name but I don't really care.) To make matters even more complicated, a married woman will often use her maiden name as a middle name, like Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy. And to make matters still more complex, when a woman is married to someone famous but later marries someone else, the media will tack her first married name in the middle, like Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis, even though this is not correct. Could you, please, tell me in the following cases if the underlined is a second Christian name or a middle name? Johh Fitzgerald Kennedy - surname Thomas Woodrow Wilson - surname Norma Jean Mortenson- 2 first names Barack Hussein Obama- 2 first names? . Woodrow is a first name - it's where the nickname "Woody" comes from. Hussein can be either a first or last name in Arabic, I believe. "Middle name" is just the term for this second given name - it doesn't necessarily refer to the type of name it is. Whether it's normally a first or last name, if it's the second part of your name, we call it a middle name. There are no real rules about what a middle name should be. Some families use the mother's maiden name as the middle name, so that both the maternal and paternal families are represented. But more often, parents choose a second first name. Some parents do this so that the child can choose to use it if he/she doesn't like the first name. Often, parents try to choose a middle name that "sounds good" when you say the person's full name (first, middle, last) out loud. Certain names seem to get picked specifically as middle names frequently. For example, I've known many girls/women whose middle name was Marie, whereas it's not all that common of a first name in the United States (as opposed to francophone countries, where it's obviously extremely common). Last edited: Aug 11, 2014 I have seen various people use such phrases as “Yours in the Lord” or “God bless” at the end of their letters. Is it correct to use the phrase “With Christian love” at the end of a letter? With Christian love, John Brown If it is correct to use the above phrase, should the first character in the word “love” be lowercase or uppercase? (I know that in greetings at the beginning of letters, all words are capitalized, as in “Dear Friends.”) 1. You can write anything you like to your friends in a letter, if you are happy to reveal your religious beliefs. 2. You can write "With all my love", so why not "With Christian love". 3. Only use capitals when necessary (e.g. Christian). As Keith points out, you can write anything you like to your friends in a letter. However, while "Yours in the Lord" and "God bless" do not shock me, "With Christian love" does. Isn't "love" "love"? How does "Christian" love differ from "Jewish" love or "Muslim" love I have seen the first two closings used but never "With Christian love." I don't like it at all and would personally advise against it. If you ended a letter to me with that, I would find it offensive. I know what I believe, and I prefer not to know what you believe. . As an atheist I would find that enormously irritating. Surely everybody 'loves', quite apart from their religious beliefs? Why ram your beliefs down other people's throats? Thank you for the explanations. I can see now that it is not a mistake to use the phrase in a religious context. ... not a mistake to use the phrase in a religious context. In a Christian religious context, perhaps so. However, if you were writing to a fervent believer in another religion (or in no religion), it might well cause offence - it would depend upon the nature of your personal relationship and the precise context. You probably shouldn't be reading letters in the first place from someone whose views you disdain to know. Are you implying I shouldn't read my incoming mail in case it's from somebody who uses an offensive closing? That does seem rather extreme. Common courtesy would suggest that the writer/sender should avoid giving offence. . I need to the use this word in a translation and am hesitating between putting capitals and a hyphen. I looked at some websites and the number of google hits, but usage seems mixed. So, would it be Paleo-Christian, Paleo-christian, paleo-christian or paleochristian? The only one I don't accept is where paleo is capitalized, I can see no justification for this. As all the other variants appear to be accepted in fairly authoritative sources I think you choose whichever you prefer. However, if you writing were to be part of a body of work from a particular institution, series of publications, etc., then you should use the spelling accepted by them, if there appears to be consistent usage. You may wish to bear in mind that some may object to Christian not being capitalized. For such an audience I would choose paleo-Christian. The version I have found most often is in fact Paleo-Christian. Since the work is for an abbey, they may indeed object to my not capitalizing Christian. Bear in mind that the P is capitalized in many instances on the web because it is in a title (e.g. of a book or article) or sentence initial positin. It should not, in my opinion be capitalized otherwise: e.g. "paleo-Christian art". The Oxford English Dictionary supports this (but note British English spelling with the extra "a"): palaeo-Christian adj. (also with lower-case initial in the second element) of or relating to the early Christians, or to early Christianity. "paleo-" is given as a chiefly N. American variant spelling. I'm not an expert, but I am a nun, and erm... a translator. I use paleo-Christian (hyphenated, lower-case paleo, upper-case Christian). EDIT: And also an AE speaker. The only one I don't accept is where paleo is capitalized, I can see no justification for this. [...] You may wish to bear in mind that some may object to Christian not being capitalized. For such an audience I would choose paleo-Christian. Are there any circumstances in which "Christian" (or "Muslim", "Jewish", "Buddhist", etc.) would not be capitalized? Frankly, I can't think of any; I also can't recall any authoritative sources, either BrE or AmE, choosing not to capitalize "Christian" in all contexts. TriglavNationalPark said: Are there any circumstances in which "Christian" (or "Muslim", "Jewish", "Buddhist", etc.) would not be capitalized? Frankly, I can't think of any; I also can't recall any authoritative sources, either BrE or AmE, choosing not to capitalize "Christian" in all contexts. 大家好！ 我发现，在中国和新加坡很多人会把Christian和Protestant这两个概念混淆，把两个都叫做“基督教”。 在西方国家，所有信耶稣的，以旧约、新约为圣经的宗教都叫做Christian。 然后Christian又分很多分派，最主要的三大分派为：天主教（Catholic）、新教（Protestant或Evangelic）、东正教（Orthodox）。 可能由于新教在中国与新加坡最为普遍，所以普遍把新教叫做“基督教”。 甚至我会听见一些澳大利亚的华侨用英语说“I'm not Christian, I'm Catholic” 当时我第一反应就是：难道Catholic不是Christian吗？不仅仅是天主教的分派，而且还是最原始的分派，新教是后来分出来的。 或者一些新加坡人说：“So in Italy most people are Christian or Catholic?” 百度百科也承认这一点： 最早期的基督教只有一个教会，但在基督教的历史进程中却分化为许多派别，主要有天主教（中文也可译为公教、罗马公教）、东正教、新教（中文又常称为基督教）三大派别，以及其他一些影响较小的派别。中文的“基督教”一词有时被用于专指基督新教，这似乎是中文的特有现象。 你们一般见“基督教”这个词，把它理解为广义还是狭义呢？ 这个混淆有时候让我不知道怎么表达广义的“基督教”。 当大部分的中国人把基督教理解为新教时，你们觉得怎么称呼Christian为合适呢？广义基督教？耶稣教？ It's posible to think of 基督教 as having two meanings: Christian (general) and Protestant (specific). And so, for Chinese speaking people, 基督教 in the right context may be used to include both Protestant and Catholic, and in another context as the opposite of Catholic. It's therefore, for Chinese speakers, possible to say: “I'm not Christian, I'm Catholic” (Think of the word "dogs" in English: in one context it is a general term which includes both male dogs (= dogs) and female dogs (= bitches) but in another it is the opposite of "bitches". In spite of this, we don't seem to have problems in picking out the right meaning in real contexts.) Last edited: Dec 22, 2011 这个概念，无论在中国，还是在英语国家中，都有一定的混乱与争议。这主要是宗教本身发展时造成的混乱。 基本上，我也和你经验一样：在西方国家，只要信耶稣，就叫Christian。 如果有人用英文说：“I'm not a Christian, I'm a Catholic.” 我会当作是Chinglish...原因和你和xiaolijie的一样。 在中文里，“基督教”多做广义理解，但也常作狭义理解。 不要忘了，对华人而言，无论是哪一种Christianity，都是外来宗教，信仰比例很低，大众了解不够，这个词的概念从来就没有清楚过。即使你用中文说“新教”，很多人也会一头雾水。 也不要忘了，即使外人将信徒分类定义，很多信徒自己却不认同。 向人表明信仰时，你很少听到这样的自我介绍：I'm a Protestant. / 我是个新教徒。 所以你无法强行以学术定义要求大众……唯有英语或各教派在华人社会中进一步增大影响，才可能分得清楚吧…… 至于你问“中文怎么表达广义基督教”…… 其实“广义基督教”已经是很学术的term了。 这么说吧，“基督教”的英文真是“Christian”吗？不是。是Christanity。那三个主要教派是Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and Protestantism，这都是学术讨论才会用到的词。 同样，中文学术讨论时，要区分，就会用“广义基督教”，“新教”等区分。只要参与讨论的，都会明白。 我想，这是最清楚，也不违背英文的表达方法。 我认为，这个跟国家的主流宗教有关。 所以在英语国家，Christian在大部分情况下，如果不仔细区分，指的是新教。但是如果要讲天主教的事，会强调Catholic，为了跟自己的宗教区分。 比如天主教堂肯定会叫做Catholic Church，但是他们自己的教堂不需要什么Protestant Church，笼统的叫做Christian Church就可以了。 同样在天主国家，比如意大利，那些少数的新教教堂肯定会强调Protestante或Evangelica，为了跟其它的，主流的天主教堂区分。 但是天主教堂，为了更名明确可能会叫做Chiesa Cattolica，但是一般情况下就叫做Chiesa Cristiana，甚至仅仅Chiesa就行了。 比如，意大利罗马最大的华人“新教”教堂，意大利语名称是Chiesa Cristiana Evangelica Cinese di Roma，但是中文名称则是“罗马华人基督教堂” 另外，我的经验是新教教徒本身不喜欢自称Protestant，因为有点贬义，意为对抗罗马天主教而分割的宗教。他们更喜欢用Evangelic，至少这是意大利的情况，意味着他们才识真正遵守福音的宗教。 （英语中福音叫做Gospel，但是形容词为Evangelic，来自希腊语euangelion，经过拉丁语evangelium，跟意大利语的vangelo是同源词） 另外，关于SuperXW的这句话： 这么说吧，“基督教”的英文真是“Christian”吗？不是。是Christanity。那三个主要教派是Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and Protestantism 他是对的，我为了简单化，没有严格区分宗教名称和形容词。 但是，也可以叫做Christian religion, Catholic religion, Protestant religion, Orthodox religion。 但是中国官方在这方面的词汇用法不是很严谨，比如中国大陆的5大合法宗教为：基督教、天主教、伊斯兰教、佛教、道教。 这里很明显事实指的是新教。 (Think of the word "dogs" in English: in one context it is a general term which includes both male dogs (= dogs) and female dogs (= bitches) but in another it is the opposite of "bitches". In spite of this, we don't seem to have problems in picking out the right meaning in real contexts.) Yes, but it's not exactly the same, if you have some female dogs, you wouldn't say: they aren't dogs, they are bitches. (Although, I don't know if native English speakers use very much the term bitch for the real meaning, because of the other slang meaning as curse word) 另外，我像问以下，在普通话中，可以说“耶稣教”吗？这个词普遍吗？ 在温州话中，口语都会把“基督教”（包括广义和狭义）叫做“耶稣教”。 另外，在温州民间有一种更奇怪的词，就是把基督教徒叫做“信道理的”。 因为当初传教士在温州民间传教的时候，为了更方便让老百姓理解，把God翻译成“道”。就是用道了老百姓已经熟悉的，中国文化已经原有的概念。 一方面，这样字很容易与道教混淆……一般把道教叫做道教，把基督教叫做道理 但是另一方面，这样子传教挺成功的，现在温州20%的人口是基督教。 Last edited: Dec 24, 2011 聖誕節有這樣的討論，也挺有意思。 在香港（廣州話）： - 假如說某人是「信教」的，可以指「基督教」或「天主教」； - 「耶教」一詞有人會說，但帶貶義； - 去聽牧師講道，會說去「聽道理」 普通話不會說“耶穌教”。 至於“基督教”一詞帶來的混亂，只有另加說明了。 Btw, 在香港，“講耶穌”也是貶義。 那我必須改变我的习惯了 我讲普通话时，经常为了指广义的“基督教”而用“耶穌教”这个词（没办法，受到方言的影响） 假如有一天学会广州话，更不能用，因为时贬义的 Salut ! Comment peut-on traduire (de l'anglais en français) a God-fearing Christian woman dans le contexte suivant ? On that and other days, Rebeca Nurse, a God-fearing Christian woman of impeccable reputation, and 19 other innocent citizens were murdered by an unlikely weapon : the judge's gavel, which was actually a rock. Ma version : une chrétienne très religieuse d'une réputation irréprochable, ... A noter : je dois traduire d'une manière la plus idiomatique possible. J'ai trouvée une autre expression : "considérée comme une Sainte personne", mais je ne sais pas si elle est vraiment expression idiomatique et si avec elle le sens restera le même (si je disais: Rebecca Nurse, une chrétienne d'une réputation irréprochable, considérée comme une Sainte personne.) Corrigez-moi, s'il vous plaît. La réponse sera très appréciée ! une chrétienne qui respectait le Seigneur ? Bonjour à tous, Dans ce cas, puis-je dire ? □ - une chrétienne craignante Dieu Merci beaucoup ☺ craignante (adjectif), non, et ce n'est pas idiomatique en français de dire "craignant Dieu" une pieuse chrétienne une fervente chrétienne Quel est ton contexte ? Merci beaucoup OLN 😇 Puis-je formuler cet adjectif comme ça ? - une chrétienne qui a la crainte de Dieu. (contexte: sorcières de Salem) Une femme profondément croyante. On ne peut pas dire "craignante de Dieu", parce que le verbe "craindre" est un verbe transitif. Littéralement: une femme craignant Dieu, une femme ayant la crainte de Dieu. Toutefois cette traduction littérale ne s'utilise jamais. - Le terme "crainte" peut induire en erreur. (source: Encyclopédie) "La crainte de Dieu est une composante de la foi. Cette crainte est faite de respect et de soumission, de confiance en sa sagesse, en sa puissance et en son amour. Elle nous rend réceptif à l’action de l’Esprit Saint. La crainte de Dieu n’est pas synonyme de terreur, mais de profond respect envers Lui." - Il ne faut pas non plus confondre avec "les craignant-Dieu". Dans le christianisme, les Craignant-Dieu sont des non-Juifs attirés par le judaïsme. Les haredim, ou ultra-orthodoxes, ou craignant-Dieu sont des juifs orthodoxes ayant une pratique religieuse particulièrement forte. (source: Wikipedia) Archijacq, Tartopom je vous remercie infiniment pour votre aide □☺😻😻 Maintenant j’ai parfaitement compris.

- redox reaction practice test
- learn python in 2 days
- http://adance0112.com/upfile/editor/file/bupuvivoge.pdf
- http://straha.net/pics/page/files/50583111979.pdf
- http://gruppocreta.com/userfiles/files/d2a3be1a_90cf_4648_b1aa_e2b72d301957.pdf
- pisa
- https://xlquality.com/userfiles/file/89940931162.pdf
- http://phutungquanghieu.com/app/webroot/files/ckfinder/files/37161410629.pdf
- interesting facts about the sun's convection zone