Continue

Are these sentences correct: 1. The party will be held at my home. 2. The party will be held in my home. 3. The party will be held at the home. 4. The party will be held in the home. Is there any difference between at my home and in my home? Are these sentences correct: 1. The party will be held at my home. This means that the party will be held at your house in general. 2. The party will be held in my home. This means that the party will be held inside your house and it seems to restrict the ability of people to party outside as well. 3. The party will be held at the home. Unless you mean a nursing home. 4. The party will be held in the home. Unless you mean a nursing home. Is there any difference between at my home and in my home? I'd choose the first one. I think the first two sentences are fine and I don't see any real difference between them. The last two sentences sound incomplete to me. I would want to add "of X" after "in the home". I agree that these last two sentences would be correct as written if they refer to an institution of some kind (old age home, home for wayward translators...). Doyou want to make money in your own home? Forget real estate scams, tupperware, or becoming a spammer. Hello everyone. The above example is taken from a thread in the Spanish-English Grammar Forum. There the question was if 'at' could be used too. I know that 'in your own home' is often used in this kind of advertisements, but I'd like to know if 'at' would sound okay. There doesn't seem to be agreement on this matter, so I'd really appreciate it if you could tell me about its use. Please note that my question is not about the general rules/difference between 'at home' and 'in your home', but 'at your home' vs 'in your home', i.e. at/in + possessive determiner (my, your, etc) + noun/noun phrase. Thank you very much. Since this is still confusing to you, I agree with Hockey 13 that there can be a fine distinction made if absolutely necessary, but also with Nunty, that both sentences in casual conversation would also be used to tell people that the party is where your house is, not someone else's house. at my home, house, place, is your address where you live, and all the strutures inside and out that belong to you, and the property that is included. It is a location of a building and outside lawns, yards, ect. in my home could distinguish the partly will take place inside the one building you call your house, there will be no barbecue outside, no games outside, everything inside, indoors, not outdoors. "Since they predict rain next Saturday, the party will now take place in my home, sorry we can't cook outdoors as I had planned." Since this is still confusing to you, I agree with Hockey 13 that there can be a fine distinction made if absolutely necessary, but also with Nunty, that both sentences in casual conversation would also be used to tell people that the party is where your house is, not someone else's house. at my home, house, place, is your address where you live, and all the strutures inside and out that belong to you, and the property that is included. It is a location of a building and outside lawns, yards, ect. in my home could distinguish the partly will take place inside the one building you call your house, there will be no barbecue outside, no games outside, everything inside, indoors, not outdoors. "Since they predict rain next Saturday, the party will now take place in my home, sorry we can't cook outdoors as I had planned." First of all, thank you very much for your reply, Dale Texas. But I'm afraid this is not what I'm trying to find out; I may not have explained myself properly. Yes, it's confusing because in that thread native speakers don't agree that they'd ever say 'at your home' at all. As I said, I'm not asking about the general rules (in my example it doesn't matter if you work/make money inside the house/outside while e.g. hanging laundry, but sort of saying you don't need to go out, e.g. to work in an office), but about its use. Some, by the way very dear foreros, state that they would not say “work at your home' but 'at home/in your home'. Thanks again. Last edited: Jul 30, 2011 Ok, then if it's just about working, I agree I would never say work at your home, since that is already understood, anymore than I would say for school work, homework is school work you do at your home. I would say homework is school work you do at home. At home to me is a set standard phrase and it sounds silly to emplain that we are not talking about other peoples homes in both instances when the phrase itself already encompasses the notion of "your." However, there is to me another set phrase, and it is this, used for enthusiasm and emphasis, "work in your very own home" or "work in your own home "and meaning or implying "in comfort." These, like all set phrases, are not linguistic equivalents of algebraic formulas nececessarily understood with at/in + possessive determiner (my, your, etc) + noun/noun phrase. I respect that attempt very much. They go beyond that and each one is a unique pattern, if someone drops a word out, it doesn't "sound right." if somebody says "work in your home" I wonder why dropped they dropped the set word "own". They have chopped up the idiom. Thank you so much for your help and clear explanation. What if the context is a party? I mean, would both at and in be possible here? Where's the party? Is it at/ in your home? As at home doesn't fit here, I guessed at your home must be okay. Am I mistaken? What if the context is a party? I mean, would both at and in be possible here? Where's the party? Is it at/ in your home? As at home doesn't fit here, I guessed at your home must be okay. Am I mistaken? Because that is a very general enquiry about where the party is to by, the most natural question, to me, would be "Where's the party? Is it at your house / are you having it at home?" That is how we are most likely to word it in BE, anyway In fact, many people would shorten that to "... is it at yours?", although that version is too modern for me to be comfortable with it. What if the context is a party? I mean, would both at and in be possible here? Where's the party? Is it at/ in your home? As at home doesn't fit here, I guessed at your home must be okay. Am I mistaken? Is it at your house? is how I would say it. EDIT: Cross-posted with The Prof. Then would in / at my home sound weird too? The other foreros said these two sentences are okay. Why? 1. The party will be held at my home. 2. The party will be held in my home. Is it at your house? is how I would say it. If you replaced at by in here, would that necessarily give the sentence a new meaning? Last edited: Feb 11, 2012 Then would in / at my home sound weird too? The other foreros said these two sentences are okay. Why? They are not "incorrect". It is simply a matter of what people usually say, and generally speaking, those two versions far less likely to be used than the same sentences but using "house". I have never thought about it before, but the word "home" is only regularly used in a small number of expressions, such as "... (at) home", "in one's own home" and "in the home". Obviously, as a Brit, I can't speak for the rest of the world. Prof, what do you think about my second question? To me, yes. "Is it at your house?" is the standard question. It is asking about the general location, so can refer to both/either the outside and the inside of the house, whereas "is it in your house?" is more specifically "inside" your house. We could use it, but rarely would here unless it was genuinely important to know if the party was going to be inside. Even then, we would probably be more likely to word it differently or ask a second question to get that information: This party you are having at your house - will it be in the house or in the garden? Americans seem to use the word 'home' for 'house' far more than us British. I'd probably say 'the party's at our place' whether we had a garden or not. After all you can hardly have a party that's only in the garden, unless you are the Queen. Hermione 1. The party will be held at my home. 2. The party will be held in my home. 3. The party will be held at the home. 4. The party will be held in the home. To me the usual use of home is "I stayed at home" or "I went home". In these context I would say "The party will be held at my house". I agree with The Prof that home is not used nearly as much in BE as AE. My mother in law used to say things like "She has a lovely home" this sounded illiterate to me. Americans seem to use the word 'home' for 'house' far more than us British. I would actually say that "home" is also pretty restricted in AE as well. I would never say "I'm throwing a party at my home." It would only be "house," "apartment," or "place." Sometimes I facetiously say "Welcome to our home" when inviting people in, but that's a sarcastic reference to how out-dated (and - I would almost feel - British) the word "home" sounds. I could also do the same with "You have a lovely home," but that would be a pretty campy version of "Wow, you've got a great place here." It also matters, I suspect, that a "home" is where a family lives and connotes a bit of "nesting," while young people mostly just have "places" and "houses." I would actually say that "home" is also pretty restricted in AE as well. I would never say "I'm throwing a party at my home." It would only be "house," "apartment," or "place." Sometimes I facetiously say "Welcome to our home" when inviting people in, but that's a sarcastic reference to how out-dated (and - I would almost feel - British) the word "home" sounds. I could also do the same with "You have a lovely home," but that would be a pretty campy version of "Wow, you've got a great place here." It also matters, I suspect, that a "home" is where a family lives and connotes a bit of "nesting," while young people mostly just have "places" and "houses." That pretty well sums up how I feel about it all. How absolutely enchanting! Hermione I would actually say that "home" is also pretty restricted in AE as well. I would never say "I'm throwing a party at my home." It would only be "house," "apartment," or "place." That's very interesting lucas. Perhaps I particularly notice it, whereas I wouldn't notice anybody using the same expressions as me. On the other hand, or is it on the same hand, I would most definitely notice if a Brit used 'home' instead of house (as a generic for the place you live in even if it isn't actually a house but an apartment. For me using 'home' instead of 'house' is rather like using the word 'residence' when answering the phone. Estate agent speak. So, all-in all what's the best advice we can give to a non -native speaker? It seems to me to be, use 'house': at my house, at my brother's house. Is there any good reason why non- native speakers should be advised to use 'home'? Hermione Well, for starters, non-natives should feel free to use "home" in phrases like "at home" or quasi-adverbially in "to go home"/"to stay home." Secondly, there are (rare) situations where the connotations of "home" - basically homey-ness, like when you've really moved in somewhere, and it feels comfortable and right for you, and probably when you're living with some kind of family or family-like arrangement (children, spouse, long-term boyfriend/girlfriend) - are appropriate. So I might be comfortable with saying "You two have made a really great home for yourselves here." (Or is this just a case of another set phrase, "to make a home (for oneself)"?) But there's also "She died Thursday in her home of 20 years, surrounded by her children and grandchildren." And another phrase, "to feel at home," comes to mind. And, of course, you can think about "home" or miss "home" when you're away from it: "I know this has been a super-great vacation, but I'm just at that point where I'm really missing my home." Conversely, we often want to emphasize the "home's" qualities of safety, reassuring-ness, comfort, and privacy. This can be seen when something happens that shatters our idea of "home": "The attacker had broken into her home." "Ugh. After finding out that Daren was such a creep, I can't believe I ever let him into my home." I guess perhaps it might be a general rule of thumb to say: "my house" and "my place" are locations, but "my home" is an idea. But there's also "She died Thursday in her home of 20 years, surrounded by her children and grandchildren." This in doesn't necessarily mean she didn't die in the garden, does it? ... I don't see any real difference between them. ... I agree with Hockey 13 that there can be a fine distinction made if absolutely necessary, but also with Nunty, that both sentences in casual conversation would also be used to tell people that the party is where your house is, not someone else's house. Nunty and Dale Texas were saying that in one's home can sometimes mean the same as at one's home. Would the same apply to house? This in doesn't necessarily mean she didn't die in the garden, does it? No, this sentence pretty much only means that she died peacefully in bed. It's a stock phrase used in obituaries. Nunty and Dale Texas were saying that in one's home can sometimes mean the same as at one's home. Would the same apply to house? "In my house" means "inside my house" (versus "outside my house"). "At my house" means "located on my property" (versus "located somewhere else"). The point is that they're comparing two different things. The British version of that stock phrase is "... died / passed away peacefully at home ..." Hi, I would need your help in finding right words for PE uniforms worn by Japanese students typically in the first- to twelfth grades. Those who are familiar with Japanese PE clothing are particularly welcome, but this is not so important if any of you could help me. I've done google search and come to a certain level of understanding so far. What I would need help with is the following: 1. PE shirt? / PE shorts It seems that google image search for PE shirt and PE shorts hits images of PE clothing which pretty much match what Japanese students typically wear. Let me know you would agree, both from British English and American English standpoints. PE shorts are, well, short, so it should be okay. From PE shirt, do you think of it as a short-sleeved shirt unless it is specified long-sleeved, so that PE shirt is generic enough to mean short-sleeved PE shirt? 2. Is so-called ジャージー a combo of PE top and PE trousers(BE)/PE pants(AE)? Apparently, ジャージー is a loan word from English, but jersey doesn't look like what Japanese students wear in PE class except the material of the clothing. ジャージー in the context of Japanese PE is typically worn on top of PE shirts and PE shorts. From google search, I have pretty much reached a comfort level with PE trousers in British English which seems to be able to match the piece of ジャージー worn by Japanese students on the lower part of their bodies. One question is, is the American English counterpart PE pants? The next and last question is, from PE top, do you think of a long-sleeved PE top unless it is specified as short-sleeved? Lastly, let me make the above questions visually-friendly: - PE shirt / PE shorts / PE top / PE trousers, generic enough in British English? - PE shirt / PE shorts / PE top / PE pants, generic enough in American English? Thank you in advance for your help. ジャージー in my memories from good-old school days really had unsophisticated designs, so distant from the sophisticated image of トラックスーツ. However, なるほど、冷静になってよく見てみると tracksuit (トラックスーツ) がジャージーの訳語ということでよさそうですね。ありがとうございます。 最近の小学校のジャージはおしゃれなものが多くなっており、色もカラフルです。うちの近所の子供達は紫やピンク、水色なんかの２・３色入りのかわいいジャージを着ています。伝統的な公立高校などでは昔からの長袖体操服だったりしますが、地域にもよるかと思います。最近は女子のいわゆる「ブルマ」も全く見なくなり、短パンになっているようです。 １についてはわかりませんので、どなたか詳しい方がいらっしゃるといいですね。アメリカ人のアニメ好きな友人達はそのまま日本語でタイソーフクと言っており、たまにgym clothesと言ったりしてますが、正式な用語はわかりません。 Thanks to Tonky, I was able to reach a thread about tracksuit here. The American English counterpart of tracksuit in British English seemed to be either jogging suit or sweatsuit. I searched both words in google for images. It seems that jogging suit looks more like tracksuit than sweatsuit does. So far, tracksuit in British English and jogging suit in American English seem to be ジャージ in Japanese. My friend came across something terrible. I was trying to cheer her up. I said "I am always here/there for you". I wonder if those two both work when you are trying to comfort and support someone. Thank you. At the moment you are saying the words to your friend, it's much more natural to say 'here for you' (because you are, literally, present next to her. You could say either if you are just talking generally (not when the friend is actually upset) about always supporting her: You know I'm always here/there for you. You would most likely use 'there for you' when talking about a third person: Two girls talking: 'John is a good friend. He's always there for you.' (John is not present in the room.) Hi everyone, Would be incorrect if I said to my say wife "I'm always there for you"? No, it's correct to say to your wife if you want to tell her "You're always support her when she needs help". The stock phrase is "the comforts of home." Both are grammatically correct, but "the comforts of home" is the idiom. Agreed. If you said something like "he left the comfort of his home to explore the world beyond his doorstep", "comfort" would work best for me. "He's done a great job of fixing up his dormitory room; he has all the comforts of home" is the only way I'd say or write something like that. If you are speaking about all those things that make a comfortable home - a nice bed, a place to cook your own food, a place to keep your things, some form of entertainment, and possibly a place to entertain guests - then it's really a combination of elements, "comforts", that are the subject. Hi, please take a look at the following sentences I've just made up. 1. What features of the car made you want to buy it? 2. What factors in/of the car made you want to buy it? The "features" in #1 refer to particular designs, equipment, functions, etc., and I know "of" is the preposition to use. The "factors" in #2 refer to the overall appearance, price, fuel economy, drivability/comfort, etc., and I think "in" is the preposition to use. Am I correct? I'd say that 2 is wrong. We don't talk about factors in or of the car, they're just factors. 2a. What factors made you want to buy the car? The "factors" in #2 refer to the overall appearance, price, fuel economy, drivability/comfort, etc I'd call those "features" too. I understand "factors" in this context as a combination of personal requirements and car features. To give you a couple of simplistic examples: I drive mostly during peak hours and and so I bought a fuel-efficient hatchback. I have a back problem and so I bought a car with a firm seat. I'd probably word sentence 1 as: What features made you decide to buy the car? But if you want to colocate "features" and "car", yes, "of the car" is what you need. In sentence 2, it should, according to me, just be: What factors made you buy that particular car? Thank you both very much. You've solved my problem in #2. (And yes, if the person has already purchased the car, the "want to" part is unnecessary). However, there's a slightly different situation in which either "factor in" or "factor of" seems necessary. For example, let's say you saw a TV advert for a car and it made you want to buy it. 3. What factors in/of the advert made you want to buy the car? In this case, I think the preposition should be "in". Correct? "Of". And it should be "features", not "factors". But again, I wouldn't use that sentence. What was it about the ad that made you decide to buy the car? Thanks Barque. I need to think for a while about the difference between features and factors (and probably also elements). But let's use the sentence you suggested (which I like, by the way) for now, and I have a question about it. I've created the following example to make things easier. Q. What was it about the ad that made you decide to buy the car? 1. Interior/exterior styling of the car 2. Features of the car explained by the narrator 3. The way the driver was driving the car 4. The story depicted (and the list goes on...) Would you say 1-4 are features, or factors? Item 1 is a feature of the car, more than the ad. I suppose you could say that the way it was presented in the ad was a feature of the ad. Items 2, 3 and 4 are features, or aspects, of the ad. A "factor" usually refers to a "reason", a "deciding factor" (Sorry, I should have said this right at the beginning). So when that article calls exterior styling an important factor, it means that exterior styling was one of the main things that influenced a (potential or actual) purchaser's decision. Last edited: Feb 17, 2017 Thanks Barque. So, is there any reason why 1-4 in post #6 cannot be the reason (=deciding/decisive factor) they purchased the car? They can be. I didn't mention that earlier because your earlier question asked what they were in relation to the ad. Yes, I suppose a purchaser might say "The way the narrator in the ad explained the features was a factor in my purchase". Thanks Barque. I'm starting to see why the way "factors" were used in the sentence I posted in #4 was wrong. Although I like the sentence you suggested in post #5, is there any way I can ask the same question using "factors" (or "aspects") with "advert"? (For example, "What factors did the advert .....?") Perhaps: What aspects of the ad impressed you? or What factors did the ad remind you of, that apply to you? This is a little different of course, because it asks if the ad made you think of some aspect that was relevant to your circumstances; for example a reference to a dead pedal might have reminded you that you feel uncomfortable in your present car because it doesn't have one. Barque, you've been incredibly patient, and kind to reply to my rather difficult questions. And you have offered sentences that I wouldn't have been able to come up with myself. I think my issue in this thread is solved, so I won't ask any more questions (unless I get stuck somewhere soon). Thank you very much indeed! Hello, Could you please tell me whether this is any shorter expression to expression the same meaning of "push oneself out of comfort zone"? For example, can we say "push oneself beyond boundaries"? If this is incorrect, what other expression can we say? Eg: Tom always pushes himself beyond boundaries. Strive hard, make great effort, take pains, go the extra mile... I won't suggest any more, we don't do lists here. But if you want to use the (modern, trendy and vastly over-used) comfort zone expression, it needs a possessive, such as: "Tom always pushes himself out of his comfort zone". "push oneself out of comfort zone" "push oneself beyond boundaries" "To push oneself out of one's comfort zone" / "To push oneself beyond the boundary [usually, of something.]" "To push oneself out of one's comfort zone" means something totally different from "To push oneself beyond the boundary of something." and neither are encountered particularly frequently. It would help if you described to us the actual concept you wish to express. Hi Keith and Paul, Thank you so much for your great help! I meant to express the idea that Tom is always not satisfied with current status and looking for new challenges. "To push oneself out of one's comfort zone" = To place yourself in a position in which you feel very unsure of your capabilities; to move into an area of which you have limited knowledge and no expertise. The usual phrase is "to be out of one's comfort zone." = to be in a position in which you are unsure of what you are doing. "To push oneself beyond the boundary of something" = To force/make/cause yourself to innovate; to think beyond the limits of (i) endurance or (ii) capability or (iii) the usual or accepted restrictions. The "of something" can be implied by the context or be stated, and will give the context that will determine whether the phrase is positive or negative. Tom is always not satisfied dissatisfied with the current status of something and looks for new challenges. -> This is strange. It sounds as if Tom quickly becomes bored with the project upon which he is working and starts to work on an idea of his own. PS you need to pay attention to the use of a/an and the. Hi Paul, Oh, thank you so much for your detailed comments and suggestions! I see. It's very useful and I learned a lot! Hi, The answer of below question is (3.to choose from), and for me, #1.sounds natural, unfortunately. Could anybody give me a tip how to distinguish between using ' to choose' and ' to choose from'(I cannot distinguish when I have to add preposition and when I should not) This leads to more innovation and a larger pool of developments and solutions for the company____. 1. to choose. 2. to choosing. 3. to choose from 4. to your choose. Thanks. If the verb was consider, there would be no problem. But what does it mean to say that the company chooses a large number of developments and solutions? It has to choose between/from them, otherwise it will be accepting all of them. If someone asks you Would you like croissants or toast for breakfast?, you would not answer Yes. You should choose one or the other (unless you are greedy or really want both!). If the verb was consider, there would be no problem. But what does it mean to say that the company chooses a large number of developments and solutions? It has to choose between/from them, otherwise it will be accepting all of them. If someone asks you Would you like croissants or toast for breakfast?, you would not answer Yes. You should choose one or the other (unless you are greedy or really want both!). your explanation made things quite clear. You must be a good teacher!! This leads to more innovation and a larger pool of developments and solutions for the company to consider(o) This leads to more innovation and a larger pool of developments and solutions for the company to choose from(o) then, whether you should add 'preposition'(e.g : from) or not is depending on the verb itself like above, shouldn't you? I assume this is a kind of similar logic as " I need a pen to write vs I need a pen to write with" or ' I need a house to live vs I need a house to live in' Are there any other verbs which combine with "preposition" when using infinitive or do you think choose is the only verb that can be combined with 'prepositioin' like above in the infinitive sentence? Thanks in advance. You can say I need a pen to write (meaning in order to write), although most people would probably say write with. In the same way I need a house to live (in order to live), which is not the same as to live in. When we say things like It's up to you to choose we mean to choose one or the other alternative (where choose is a transitive verb) or choose between the alternatives. There are other verbs that use a preposition, but all I can think of at the moment is believe, where a choice sometimes has to be made. Which of these statements do you believe? There are several theories that you can believe in. But the meanings are really different: to believe in something/someone is not the same as to believe something/someone. For example, you can believe in democracy, a Grexit, economic growth etc., but not believe them. You can say I need a pen to write (meaning in order to write), although most people would probably say write with. In the same way I need a house to live (in order to live), which is not the same as to live in. When we say things like It's up to you to choose we mean to choose one or the other alternative (where choose is a transitive verb) or choose between the alternatives. There are other verbs that use a preposition, but all I can think of at the moment is believe, where a choice sometimes has to be made. Which of these statements do you believe? There are several theories that you can believe in. But the meanings are really different: to believe in something/someone is not the same as to believe something/someone. For example, you can believe in democracy, a Grexit, economic growth etc., but not believe them. Many thanks for the explanation. Well noticed. Salve e scusate se sono sempre così ignorante. Come si stabilisce se due persone che parlano in lingua inglese si danno del tu oppure del voi? faccio questa domanda perchè non so neanche se esistono nella lingua inglese. per piacere delucidatemi. Grazie! Last edited by a moderator: Apr 17, 2009 Mi risulta che la distinzione esistesse in passato ma ormai sia del tutto persa Si puo' distinguire solo se si chiamano tra loro usando il nome o il cognome. La maniera "rispettosa" di interpellare una persona e' di usare il titolo (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Doctor etc) seguito dal cognome ("Good morning Doctor Smith, how are you") La maniera "amichevole" e' di usare il nome ("Hi Joe, how you doing") Come in Italia si dice "posso darti del tu" in inglese si dice "can I call you Marco/Joe?" oppure "please call me Marco/Joe" Si puo' distinguire solo se si chiamano tra loro usando il nome o il cognome. La maniera "rispettosa" di interpellare una persona e' di usare il titolo (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Doctor etc) seguito dal cognome ("Good morning Doctor Smith, how are you") La maniera "amichevole" e' di usare il nome ("Hi Joe, how you doing") Come in Italia si dice "posso darti del tu" in inglese si dice "can I call you Marco/Joe?" oppure "please call me Marco/Joe" In realtà se ci si pensa in italiano in tutta una serie di rapporti si usa il lei con persone che si chiamano per nome; così come il tu con persone che si chiamano per cognome. Penso che la risposta più semplice da dare sia che no, in inglese semplicemente non esiste tale distinzione. Non si stabilisce perche' non si usano ne' tu ne lei, ma 'you', sempre la seconda persona singolare. Se invece vuoi stabilire il grado di familiarita', quello si stabilisce a) dall'uso di termini tipo 'sir', 'mister president', 'doctor', 'officer' b) dall'uso di Mr xxx invece del nome proprio (occhio pero' che quando senti due che si stanno chiamando per nome non e' detto che siano in termini di amicizia stretta) c) dal tono generale della conversazione , piu' o meno casuale. Un'altra cosa e' che , perlomeno qui in America, la gente modula il grado di familiarita' con la stessa persona, introducendo per esempio un 'sir', per poi passare al nome proprio, per poi ritornare al 'sir', a seconda del contesto, magari nel giro di dieci minuti. Anche in Italia, d'altra parte, si puo' essere molto formali col tu e molto informali con il lei, no ? Si puo' distinguire solo se si chiamano tra loro usando il nome o il cognome. La maniera "rispettosa" di interpellare una persona e' di usare il titolo (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Doctor etc) seguito dal cognome ("Good morning Doctor Smith, how are you") La maniera "amichevole" e' di usare il nome ("Hi Joe, how you doing") Come in Italia si dice "posso darti del tu" in inglese si dice "can I call you Marco/Joe?" oppure "please call me Marco/Joe" It seems to me , though, that being on first name terms does not necessarily mean having the same degree of familiarity as the 'tu' in Italian , or am I wrong ? I am in first name terms , in business, with people vastly more rich and famous than yours truly, and I don't think for a second that my calling them Chuck or Abe makes them any closer to me than if I was addressing them as 'lei' or 'Sua Eccellenza'. I must say that in Italy now things are a lot different than they were 20 years ago - going from "lei" to "tu" was a decision and it meant something. Now they just go for the "tu". So, perhaps, it's not that different after all. Last edited by a moderator: Jan 4, 2013 I've just checked that in old English it was like this: Ye : Voi Thou : Tu You : Lei Do you confirm? I've just checked that in old English it was like this: Ye : Voi Thou : Tu You : Lei Do you confirm? Maybe middle English, I don't think Old English would have been that similar to today's English but I'll double check. Maybe middle English, I don't think Old English would have been that similar to today's English but I'll double check. Oh, I used old without even knowing there was a middle English. I simply meant English of the past Oh right, then yes, you're correct There are different stages of English... Old English:Fæder ure þu þe eart on heofonum; Si þin nama gehalgod to becume þin rice gewurþe ðin willa on eorðan swa swa on heofonum. urne gedæghwamlican hlaf syle us todæg and forgyf us ure gyltas swa swa we forgyfað urum gyltendum and ne gelæd þu us on costnunge ac alys us of yfele soþlice Middle English:Oure fadir that art in heuenes, halewid be thi name; thi kyndoom come to; be thi wille don in erthe as in heuene: gyue to us this dai oure breed ouer othir substaunce; and forgyue to us oure dettis, as we forgyuen to oure gettouris; and lede us not in to temptaciounu, but delyuere us fro yuel. Early Modern English:Our Father which art in heauen, hallowed be thy Name.Thy kingdome come. Thy will be done euen in earth, as it is in heauen.Giue vs this day our daily bread.And forgiue vs our debts, as we also forgiue our debters.And lead vs not into tentation, but deliuer vs from euill: for thine is the kingdome, and the power, and the glory for euer. Amen. Late Modern English:Our Father, who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, On earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, But deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen. Just so you can see how different "Old" English is from the later versions, so like I said before, what you posted as older formality existed in the earlier versions, but not old enough to be 'Old English'.. I've just checked that in old English it was like this: Ye : Voi Thou : Tu You : Lei Do you confirm? Actually, my understanding is this: Old English distinguished singular and plural, but not formal and informal.Singular: þu,[θu:] (nominative); þe (accusative/dative); þin (genitive) Plural: ge ([je:]), eow, eowerStarting in Middle English and continuing into Early Modern English, the plural ge, which became ye, began to be used with people of equal rank or higher, while the singular þu/þe/þin, which became thou/thee/thy (thine), was used with people of lower rank or with familiar/intimate friends. This is basically exactly like tu and vous (which is also both plural and formal singular) in French, which was probably the catalyst for birth of the phenomenon in English. Eventually (Late) Modern/Present-day English dropped thou altogether in favor of ye, which had became you, and which now must do double duty for both singular and plural; and as a result, we no longer distinguish between formal and informal with our pronouns. It seems to me , though, that being on first name terms does not necessarily mean having the same degree of familiarity as the 'tu' in Italian , or am I wrong ? You are quite right, but isn't the same in Italy, where the "tu" can be used with different degrees of familiarity. Actually, my understanding is this: Old English distinguished singular and plural, but not formal and informal. Yep, same in Old Norse, Old English's brother. The formality (in English only) didn't come in until much later on. This is basically exactly like tu and vous (which is also both plural and formal singular) in French, which was probably the catalyst for birth of the phenomenon in English. This is like what Italian was like in the 19th century wasn't it? The 'voi' (vous) form used as a singular formal address, then got outdated, but it's still underway in French? (Let me know if I'm wrong on that last point, I'm not sure) Last edited: Apr 17, 2009 I think for an American the distinction has a lot to do with the situation. In any sort of family situation today (e.g., meeting the parents, siblings, etc. of a friend or a fiance) you would immediately be on a first-name basis and they would expect of you, an Italian, to use "tu" (if you were speaking Italian). The same would hold true with school friends or any other informal social situations. But in almost all business situations, even if first names were being used, the tone would be more formal and distant, and I believe in Italian one would continue to use "lei" unless things definitely started to warm up (e.g., the business contact took you out for a drink, or to an office party, or to meet his family). Meeting (well, at least for the first time) your girlfriend's parents is the kind of situation I would expect being on first name terms and using the formal "lei". It's likely you will quickly switch to "tu", but this could take some time, or never happen at all. Likewise, it's not uncommon to call schoolfellows by surname, of course using the informal "tu". So I don't really know... I think in English there's just no equivalent of the tu/lei relationship. Yes it is, and now more than 20 years ago, in that it has become a lot more common (I think the TV again) to switch to "tu" early on in a relationship. A few years ago switching to "tu" signified that a certain level of comfort and mutual trust had been achieved (I am talking now of adult/adult relationships) , now I believe most of the significance has been lost. We have simply learned to talk like extras in some soap opera. This is so true. One situation in America where this kind of change is particularly disturbing is in hospitals, where all patients, including the elderly, are addressed by their first name by doctors, nurses, and aides, and it seems so condescending and disrespectful to me when these people were accustomed all their lives to being called "Mr." or "Mrs." by strangers. I would have never thought people (especially the elderly) would be called by their first names in hospitals. That is a bit disturbing. However, if you want to get a good idea of how people interact in varying degrees of formality in English, just watch any sitcom dealing with police, lawyers, or doctors. You'll notice that even though they are all friends on the show and have been working together for years, they still call each other Dr. A, Detective B, District Attorney C or Ms. C, etc. and not by their first names. This is similar to using Lei with a coworker who you've been working with for years. Every now and then, for example if something dramatic happens in the show that--just for a moment!--brings two characters a little closer together, they might call each other on a first name basis. For example, the captain of the police force always calls a female detective Detective Smith (just an example). However, in the middle of the episode he sees that she is having some issues dealing with her case/her family/etc. and for a moment calls her by her first name, just for that one conversation, to comfort her and make her feel better. Then afterwards he returns to calling her Detective Smith. A similar thing happens in Italian. I've seen situations where Lei is used, but occasionally you switch to tu just for a moment, and then back to Lei. A friend of mine once had her purse stolen, so we went to the police. The policeman taking the report called her Lei for about 30 minutes, then at one point she started crying, so he switched to tu to console her, then once she regained her senses, he switched back to Lei. I agree Brian, I don't think it's always about personal relationships but the context, if it's in a professional setting, the formalities usually will stay, though I wouldn't expect first-name-basis in a hospital setting.. Well, I've been in hospitals a lot, and after a few days the nurses/doctors will come in and use the first name, in a friendly kind of way, but if they're leading around some trainee doctors I'd expect the formality (professional setting/context) of "Mr/Mrs.." Also it depends on if you're talking to or about the person, talking to collegues, I would talk about someone (first name basis) but if to an outsider, and I was maintaining a professional setting, I would refer to the person being talked about more formally. (did she get her purse back, brian?) This is so true. One situation in America where this kind of change is particularly disturbing is in hospitals, where all patients, including the elderly, are addressed by their first name by doctors, nurses, and aides, ... Really, which hospital are you talking about? When I go to see my doctor the nurses call me by my first name and that is OK to me (as long as there is reciprocal respect) but during a long stay at the Alta Bates in Berkeley I have been always addressed as Mr.LastName, no matter how many times I told them "call me Joe" What does really annoys me is the use of the first name in fancy restaurants. At a diner, I would be offended if they won't call me "my dear" but when I go at a jacket and tie place, I require the use of the Mr and Mrs, no "dudes", "folks" or "guys" please... I think equivalent Old/middle/ modern English terms are not relevant now. Now there is only 'you'. There are different ways of addressing people by using first names or surnames but there is only 'you'. I think equivalent Old/middle/ modern English terms are not relevant now. Now there is only 'you'. There are different ways of addressing people by using first names or surnames but there is only 'you'. Che confusione! Riassumendo, per dire "Dammi del tu" si deve dire per forza "Call me [nome]" o si può dire in qualche altro modo? Se ho capito bene, per rispetto di una persona di usa "Mr. o Mrs." e che si usa comunque " you " GIUSTO? Grazie Che confusione! Riassumendo, per dire "Dammi del tu" si deve dire per forza "Call me [nome]" (in quanto e' l'equivalente di dire 'dammi del tu) o si può dire in qualche altro modo? Se ho capito bene, per rispetto di una persona di usa "Mr. o Mrs." e che si usa comunque " you " (perche' non c'e' altra parola per rivolgersi ad una persona. C'e' solo 'you'. GIUSTO? Grazie Diciamo che in certi contesti, tipo per tradurre il dialogo di un film o libro (sopratutto dall'italiano in inglese, visto che in inglese si può sempre aggiungere un bel "Sir/Mrs."), la teoria del tuo professore va benissimo. Per esempio: A: Come posso aiutarLa(, Signore/Signora)? -- How may I help you, Sir/Ma'am* (oppure Mrs. / Miss)? B: Per favore, dammi del tu! -- Please, call me John/Mary/etc. *Lo stesso vale per Mr. Smith, Mrs. Smith, etc. Allora funziona abbastanza bene per rendere l'idea che B vuole che il rapporto sia più intimo / informale, che ci sia più confidenza; però in fondo non è la stessa cosa, sia chiaro! - perché l'inglese non ha più questo fenomeno del tu/lei! Diciamo che in certi contesti, tipo per tradurre il dialogo di un film o libro (sopratutto dall'italiano in inglese, visto che in inglese si può sempre aggiungere un bel "Sir/Mrs."), la teoria del tuo professore va benissimo. Per esempio: A: Come posso aiutarLa(, Signore/Signora)? -- How may I help you, Sir/Ma'am* (oppure Mrs. / Miss)? B: Per favore, dammi del tu! -- Please, call me John/Mary/etc. *Lo stesso vale per Mr. Smith, Mrs. Smith, etc. Allora funziona abbastanza bene per rendere l'idea che B vuole che il rapporto sia più intimo / informale, che ci sia più confidenza; però in fondo non è la stessa cosa, sia chiaro! - perché l'inglese non ha più questo fenomeno del tu/lei! Quindi proprio non esistono altri modi per dirlo? Che confusione! Riassumendo, per dire "Dammi del tu" si deve dire per forza "Call me [nome]" o si può dire in qualche altro modo? Se ho capito bene, per rispetto di una persona di usa "Mr. o Mrs." e che si usa comunque " you " GIUSTO? Grazie Posso chiedere perché hai la necessità di tradurre "dare del tu" in inglese? In inglese non esiste la distinzione tra tu e lei, quindi la domanda in sé non ha senso. Se si deve tradurre qualcosa e non si hanno altre scelte, sono d'accordo con Brian nel ritenere il "call me [nome]" la soluzione migliore. Ma da un punto di vista pragmatico ribadisco le perplessità di prima: il darsi del tu o del lei è una cosa che sta su un piano diverso dal chiamarsi per nome o per cognome. In italiano esistono entrambe le cose (si può benissimo dare del lei ad una persona che si chiama per nome e viceversa), in inglese no. Ciao Paperino00. Mettiamola così, in Italia abbiamo delle sfumature che nell'inglese non si possono rendere. In inglese essendoci solo la possibilità di rivolgersi con You, per noi italiani rimane un problema. Bisogna adattarsi e partire sempre nel rapporto con l'estraneo usando "Sir, Mr. o Ms, Mrs., doctor, captain, sergeant, etc." e insistendo con il titolo, anche se la persona ci chiede di usare il nome proprio. Solo dopo ripetute richieste di passare al nome ci si può permettere di usarlo, facendo un primo passo e stabilendo così un maggiore grado di confidenza (meno formale). Attenzione però a non esagerare, bisogna comunque sempre controllare le proprie espressioni, evitando di usare i termini come pal, guy, dude e simili, che sono in uso solo fra persone da molto tempo in relazione informale e realmente in confidenza fra loro. Stef. Ciao a tutti voi.Penso che l'unico modo di dare del lei,sia di usare : Mr/Mrs/Missis/Ms Ciao, Caro. Sono d'accordo con quello che dici nel tuo ultimo post, ma credo che il problema non riguardi le diverse "forms of address" quanto piuttosto il modo per dire "dare del Lei" Caramente. GS PS Scusa, "Missis" a quale sesso/stato civile si riferisce? A me sembra la pronuncia di "Mrs". Esiste "Misses ... ", per dire "Le signorine ...". Correct, Giorgio. Caro, I think you meant: Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms for others who may want to know: pronunciation of Mrs. - sounds like "misses" pronunciation of Ms - rhymes with "his" - final sound is /z/ Good evening guys, e scusate se rispolvero un vecchio thread! Sto traducendo, come alcuni di voi già sanno benissimo, un film in lingua originale. E proprio ora mi era sorto un dubbio, tra due dottori che stanno esaminando i pazienti di un ospedale psichiatrico c'è quello (un dottore) che ci lavora proprio e l'altra (una dottoressa) a cui lui quindi illustra i vari pazienti. Ora però sono arrivato ad una frase in cui il dottore, dopo averle illustrato la situazione, esclama: "No offense, Doctor. But these (si riferisce in particolare a tre pazienti deformi) are beyond your kind of therapy.", che io tradurrei con "Senza offesa, dottoressa. Ma loro vanno al di là del suo tipo di terapia.". Quel dottoressa a questo punto significa che il dottore sta dando alla dottoressa del Lei, giusto? E non del tu. Pertanto le frasi che mi avevate aiutato a tradurre precedentemente, ossia... 1) They can and will grab you from their cells -> (Essi) possono e