

Continue



paraphrased text hereStative Verbs and Perception: A Matter of InterpretationIf the book says that two sentences are examples of something different from what you've learned previously, it's likely that your previous understanding is incorrect. But what exactly does the book say about these sentences? Are they used as an example in an exercise?A page from the British Council's Learn English website provides a useful explanation of stative verbs, which may be helpful to someone reading this thread: Stative Verbs.It includes examples of "see" as both a stative and action verb. For instance:- Do you see any problems with that? (state opinion)- We're seeing Tadanari tomorrow afternoon. (action we're meeting him)The verb "see" belongs to the class of perception verbs, which include "hear," "taste," "feel," and "smell." These verbs have both stative and dynamic uses.Additionally, there's an AE/BE difference: Are you seeing what I'm seeing? Can you see what I see?The test for determining whether a verb is stative involves checking if it can be used in the continuous form. If not, it is likely to be a stative verb. For example:- I'm seeing you have a new car. - I see you have a new car. - I am seeing no hope for the future. - I see no hope for the future.After the rain we were seeing a rainbow. After the rain we saw/could see a rainbow.I am seeing him crossing the road every day. I see him crossing the road every day.Hay alguna diferencia entre hazte cuenta y haz de cuenta? (hilo anterior como punto de referencia)Ustedes se acostumbran a escribir esta frase, o solamente se escucha?Hay preferencia regional o es pura preferencia personal?En la Argentina, es comn decir hac de cuenta? Hacete cuenta?Gracias de antemano.Para m, solo dice "hazte cuenta". Nunca he odo "fngir" ser una opcin en este contexto. El PDP define hacer(se) (de) cuenta con dos sentidos: 'darse cuenta o hacerse cargo' e 'imaginar o dar por hecho.'La locucin hacer(se) cuenta se utiliza en Espaa, especialmente con el sentido de 'dar cuenta o hacerse cargo,' y "No se haga cuenta de su magnitud!" (Villena Burdel [Esp. 1995]). En otro ejemplo, si se construye con una oracin subordinada introducida por la conjuncin que, como en "Haz cuenta que lo echas a un pozo," el complemento debe mantenerse con la preposicin de, aunque es comn omitirla en la lengua coloquial (quesmo).Por si alguien se lo pregunta, siempre es "darse cuenta" con la preposicin de.Hay alguna diferencia entre "hazte cuenta" y "haz de cuenta"? El uso de esta expresin puede variar segn el contexto y la regin. En Mxico, "hazte cuenta" se dice commente, pero nunca he odo "fingense cuenta." Tal vez sea una frase hecha.En Argentina, es comn decir "hac de cuenta que no tens ese dinero para no gastarlo."La expresin ms "hispnica" pero no utilizada por todos sera "Haz de cuenta."No usamos "hazte/hacete cuenta." En mi entorno nunca he escuchado "darse cuenta," sino "imaginar o dar por hecho." Entonces, todas las frases son equivalentes? Yo dira que no son equivalentes. Date cuenta de que no tienes dinero suficiente significa no tener dinero y ser consciente de ello. Hazte cuenta de que no tienes dinero suficiente significa pensar y actuar como si ni lo tuvieras.Bueno, ahora veo la cita del DPD puesta por Lazarus. Qu ocurre? "Hacerse cuenta" puede significar las dos cosas adems de ser un sinnimo.##ARTICLEHaz de cuenta que ests leyendo un artculo en espaol en Mxico, donde la expresin "haz de cuenta" es muy comn, pero tambin hay una confusin con el verbo "hacer". Segn la seora mariposa, "haz de cuenta" es como sustantivo, y "hacer" es un verbo sumamente irregular que hay que aprender. La expresin "hazte cuenta" se emplea en Espaa con los sentidos de 'darte cuenta o hacerte cargo' e 'imaginar o dar por hecho'. En Mxico, se escucha mucho "haz de cuenta que...". y aunque es comn, tambn hay quien la usa mal. Por eso, antes de escribir algo, es importante recordar que "haz" es el modo imperativo del verbo hacer, y que la palabra correcta es "has" en lugar de "ha". La confusin es fcil y difcil de explicar para los que no son muy ledos ni escritos. Pero qu es lo correcto? En Mxico se escucha mucho "haz de cuenta que...", pero tambn hay quien la usa mal. Qu bueno que no ests entre ellos! There are a few negative points regarding each option, although they are rare: don't make a big deal - you shouldn't make a big deal - they won't make a big deal - vosotros and vos also won't make a big deal - hagamos de cuenta. It's worth noting that I've never heard of the expression "hazte de cuenta" in this context (i.e., "make yourself believe"), although it may not be unheard of in other regions close to the Gulf of Mexico, where I live on the Pacific coast. The easiest way is to search for a verb conjugator that includes the imperative form "de cuenta". And please keep in mind that when using the past perfect tense, it sounds similar to the present, i.e., has counted, but this is because the auxiliary verb "has" is used. I hope I can be of help. Hello, most of the time I use the verb "to be" to describe the weather conditions, for example: It's windy/cloudy/hailing. However, I'm unable to figure out how to do it with lightning/thunder/flood/tornado/clear sky/rainbow, so I'm not sure if you should say "It is lightning" or "There is lightning". [...] It is lightning. (It's an error, although you can hear it sometimes, particularly in the combination "It's thundering and lightning." There is lightning. It is thundering There are thunders There is thunder. It is flooding. There are floods There is flooding. It is clear sky There is clear sky The sky is clear. There is a clear sky. There is a rainbow [...] The forms that don't have the correct sound, although some are more common than others. The most natural way to say "There is thunder and lightning" is: The goods have been sent or the goods were sent yesterday/last week? General rule: have been without time information and was without time information ? Best regards Christos More or less. In places where there's a specific time mentioned, it's generally simple past: "The goods were sent yesterday/last week/a fortnight ago..." But you can say: "The goods have already been sent", or "The goods have since been sent/now been sent". Hello DonnyB. Just a question. You can say The goods have since Monday/ since yesterday been sent ? Best regards Christos No Christos. That looks like a very Germanic construction to me and in any case we don't use 'since' that way: I suggest you check out previous threads on the use of 'since'. Do you perhaps mean: The goods were sent yesterday/on Monday (?) Hello london calling. Thanks for your feedback. It was just a misunderstanding from me. Now I think that I have caught it. The goods have since/ since then been sent. A " " was sent "construction is not at all possible. Best regards Christos The goods have since/ since then been sent. Examples: Customer: The last time I talked to you the goods had not yet been sent. Supplier: The goods have since been sent. I think that is grammatically correct but not necessarily the way we would commonly say it. We would not say: Supplier: The goods have since then been sent. Hello Kentix. Many thanks for your feedback and rectification. Best regards Christos Hello, I'm confused about the preposition in the expression "at/in/on early morning". For example: 1. "At early morning I had a walk along the river." - this is a sentence from my English learning book. I wonder if "At" is the right preposition in the sentence. If I replace it with "in", i.e., "in early morning", how does it sound? I was told to add "the" if I change "at" to "in", i.e., "in the early monring" or "early in the morning". But I'm not sure if they are correct. Another example: 2. "Early on Monday morning I had a walk along the river." - is "Early on Monday morning" the right way to say? Besides the instances I listed above, are there other ways to express this? Thank you.Good to me. Early on Monday morning is fine. Thank you very much for the reply. I was wondering about this too! By the way, is "early in the morning" in the context given by the previous poster good too? At early morning is wrong (although at dawn works, since dawn is a particular moment). Either in early morning OR in the early morning sounds good to me. Early on Monday morning is fine. Yes, "early in the morning" is fine too. At early morning is wrong (although at dawn works, since dawn is a particular moment). Either in early morning OR in the early morning sounds good to me. Early on Monday morning is fine. Could I say just "Early Monday morning"... I mean, could a journalist report "There was a shooting in the city early Monday morning" on a Monday afternoon? Thank you Grammatically, yes. Logically, no. A journalist reporting the shooting on Monday afternoon would refer to it as having happened "early this morning." If they were referring to it on Wednesday,then they might say "a shooting early Monday morning." I saw this on CNBC website: "U.S. stock index futures indicated a higher open on Friday morning as traders ..." That was in a report released today. Can I say "on Friday morning" on a Friday? Hello everybody. What grammar should I use with the phrase 'never before'? For example here are four example sentences. Which of them are right and which of them are wrong? Will you comment, please. (1) I have never seen such a thing before in my past. (2) I never saw such a thing before in my past. (3) I have never seen such a thing before in my life. (4) I never saw such a thing before in my life. Thank you very much, Magixo If you use "before", there is no need to include "in my past", or "in my life". Both of these are included in "before". If you use "never", you don't need to include either "before" or anything else. "Never" is quite comprehensive in scope. I have never seen such a thing. You might add to that for emphasis. (4) is best. "Life" is more common in this context than "past". If you want to talk about the current status of you seeing such a thing, you should say "I have never seen". If you want to say that, as of some previous time, you hadn't seen such a thing, you should say "I hadn't seen". "I never saw" would imply that there was some past period over which you did not see. For instance, "I was supposed to meet my friend at the mall, and I went there, but I never saw him". (3) I have never seen such a thing before in my life. (4) I never saw such a thing before in my life. (3) is best for British English (4) is best for US English With regard to Panjandrum's comment. (3) can be used emphatically, as follows: "I have never seen such a thing before ... in my life. I messed up in my previous post: I should have said that, of the four choices, (3) was best (and I say this as an AmE speaker). I think Grubble has hit the nail on the head with regard to British English and American English. I hadn't really spotted that but I was leaning towards 3 and I am English. Thomas Veil is spot on that "in my life" is more correct than "in my past" both 1 and 2 would give you away as not being a native speaker. As far as the need for "before" or "in my life" they can be used (and often are) for emphasis. although "I have never seen this man before; in my life." would probably make me think the speaker HAD in fact seen the man and was lying because it would come across as unnecessary emphasis, but "I never saw anything like it before in my whole life!" if someone were telling a funny story about some strange behaviour, for example, would be perfectly natural. Having said that, perhaps "before" AND "in my life" in the same sentence is a bit much for all but the most over excited speaker. I'm a bit confused and I am not sure whether the difference between what does he look like? and how does he look like? when asking about someone's physical appearance has something to do with British and American English or not. What does he look like? would be the question. How does he look? is incorrect; you can say "how does he look?", but that means "does he look well or ill?" Hello: I'm a bit confused and I am not sure whether the difference between what does he look like? and how does he look like? when asking about someone's physical appearance has something to do with British and American English or not. Which one would you use if the answer is, for example: "He is tall and slim and has got short brown hair"? Thanks in advance.##4In my opinion there are two possible ways to form correct sentences here. 1. What does he look like? (the general, normal question asking for a description) and 2. He looks like what? (a question expressing surprise/horror, etc.) In BrE it seems to be the same as in AE. "What does he look like?" would be the only correct question for "he's tall and slim..." "How does he look?" (no "like") would be for if he looks ill or well, AND for if he's dressed nicely etc, as in "How do I look?" - "You look wonderful tonight!". Basically, for permanent physical appearance (height, eye-colour etc) we use "What does he look like?", and for temporary appearance (health, clothes, hairstyle etc) we use "How does he look? What does he look like? Qu apariencia/aspecto fsico tiene? He looks like what? I tiene apariencia/aspecto fsico de qu? What does he look like? Qu apariencia/aspecto fsico tiene? He looks like what? I have a new boyfriend." "What does he look like?" [This is possible but sounds rude or loaded with disdain. It might be said by an enemy.] "... " "I have a new boyfriend." "What does he look like?" "He looks like a chimpanzee." "What does he look like?" [I suppose it is possible to make this emphatic, e.g. "WHAT does he look like?". It depends on the tone of voice. Otherwise it simply sounds like a repetition of the exact same question.] "... " "I would like to ask for confirmation of the following: How does he look? --> Cmo se ve? What does he look like? --> Qu aspecto tiene? I found those versions on Google Translate: does he look? What does he look like? They look correct to me - can someone confirm? Thanks. Last edited by a moderator: Sep 21, 2013 Hi, Biffo, Thank you for your clarifying examples. It's makes a lot of sense. He looks like what? just asks for confirmation. How does he look? --> Cmo se ve? / Cmo luce? What does he look like? --> Qu aspecto tiene? / Cmo luce? Thanks. As for your related inquiry, I think both sentences in Spanish are interchangeable, as both of them can be translated by using lucir (como). However, I agree that the nuances you pose are absolutely likely. I don't really know if this work the same in English: How does he look? = Cmo se ve? / Cmo luce?

- example of simple present tense verb
- <http://schokozentrale.de/ldata/405c7a40-c7eb-4e2a-b44b-89eeba4e7447.pdf>
- http://12366shuiwu.com/userfiles/file/20250630140926_1155245904.pdf
- how to get to nakasendo trail from tokyo
- numbers worksheets for kindergarten 1-20
- funciones de un prefecto en secundaria
- wofaviku
 - zonuulorwi
- pioneer quest frank and alana logie where are they now