I'm not a bot



CiaoQualcuno mi sa dire come si traduce in inglese una frase tipo: "3 alla quinta"? (oppure "3 elevato alla quinta")? e in generale come si fanno le potenze? So che un numero alla seconda seguito da "square" e se alla terza si dice squared e alla t power of four/five/six eccetera quindi per dire "3 alla sesta" per esempio: "three to the power of six" etc.. Grazie mille, (anche per la velocit di risposta.) Esatto! Benvenuto al forum! Come si possa rendere l'espressione. Non mi pare corretto nemmeno usando "degrees" come potenza. Potrebbe essere semplicemente "raises"? Graziealein Ciao alein!Ti suggerisco: "elevazioni a potenza di un numero" = "exponentiation of a number" ed "elevazioni a potenza di un numero" = "exponentiation". Bye, Benzene Grazie mille! Funziona molto bene!alein Hi, reading back over the earlier posts #2 and #3 (from a few years ago), I'd like to add that "three to the power of six" may be correct, but not as common as "three to the sixth power" or even just "three to the power of six" may be correct, but not as common as "three to the sixth power" or even just "three to the power of six" may be correct, but not as common as "three to the sixth power" or even just "three to the sixth power" or even just "three to the power of six" may be correct, but not as common as "three to the sixth power" or even just "three to the sixt power" or even just "three to the sixth." Agreed, also from the BrE side. If we need a verb, we say "raised to the power of six" or "raised to the sixth power". At school we didn't talk about "exponentiation" but I know Benzene is reliable so I'm sure it's used. Hi all! As a former math student I'm used to say, reading this ($x^5+y^4+z^3+k^2+...$): ics 5(cinque) pi ipsilon 4(quattro) pi zeta cubo pi kappa quadro pi t..... As stated in post 2 kappa quadro is "k" squared and "z" cubed, but what about X and Y? Is there a way to shorten the expression suggested "X to the power of five"? As a former student who flunked maths, I can say: Yes, there is a shorter form. x to the 5th ("x to the fifth") EDIT: I now see this was suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested. 'alla' da X alla 5? Fra un po' vi capirete a gesti... Penso di poter affermare con certezza che il modo detto da Gigi sia da considerarsi erroneo e per niente usato (credo che qui Gigi l'abbia usato a mo' di esempio di semplificazione estrema per vedere se c'era un corrispettivo inglese e non per affermare che cos in italiano); risultato scritto di detta dicitura: "x5+y4+z^3+k^2+t...". Credo proprio che chi lo usa a quel modo venga visto un po' male se non addirittura deriso poich il modo di dire dell'ignorante matematico (riferendosi alle potenze). Anche poco usata, sempre meglio dire . Last edited: Aug 21, 2013 Penso di poter affermare con certezza che il modo detto da Gigi sia da considerarsi erroneo e per niente usato (credo che qui Gigi l'abbia usato a mo' di esempio di semplificazione estrema per vedere se c'era un corrispettivo inglese e non per affermare che cos in italiano); risultato scritto di detta dicitura: x5+y4+z^3+k^2+...". Credo proprio che chi lo usa a quel modo venga visto un po' male se non addirittura deriso poich il modo di dire dell'ignorante matematico (riferendosi alle potenze). Anche poco usata, sempre meglio dire . Col cavolo che viene deriso! Mai assistito ad una lezione di analisi al poli? X alla quinta forse lo dici al liceo; all'universit, quando hai equazioni lunghe due righe non ti sbrighi pi altrimenti e dici: "X cinque". E poi scusa: chi ha gi visto X5 anzich 5X per intendere "cinque per x"?? Passante: credimi che se vai a lezione di analisi, geometria, meccanica razionale o qualsivoglia lezione tecnica ad ingegneria sentirai dire X cinque al posto di X alla quinta. Quest'ultima versione usata per dare enfasi all'esponente, magari durante una dimostrazione del professore, ma mai durante una normale enunciazione di una formula. La stessa identica discussione stata fatta quiX equals negative b plus or minus the square root of b-squared minus four ac, all over two a Evidentemente non tutti hanno frequentato facolt di indirizzo matematico o scientifico. Il modo di leggere le equazioni e le espressioni polinomiali citato da Gigi non sar, a livello formale, il pi corretto ma assolutamente diffuso tra quelli che masticano tanta matematica tutti i giorni e sanno benissimo che alla centesima volta che ti tocca ripetere "X elevato alla quinta" non ne puoi pi e dici "X cinque". Poi se quelli che hanno fatto il liceo classico e poi filosofia o lettere (ovvero ZERO matematica) storcono il naso, beh problemi loro As a former student who flunked maths, I can say: Yes, there is a shorter form. x to the 5th ("x to the fifth") EDIT: I now see this was suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post led me to believe this had not already been suggested in post 8. giginho's post 8. giginh for example as "x fifth"? Col cavolo che viene deriso! Mai assistito ad una lezione di analisi al poli? X alla quinta forse lo dici al liceo; all'universit, quando hai equazioni lunghe due righe non ti sbrighi pi altrimenti e dici: "X cinque". E poi scusa: chi ha gi visto X5 anzich 5X per intendere "cinque per x"?? Ciao Gigi Sono d'accordo con te che in un contesto matematico di un certo livello si possa omettere "alla", ma rimangono gli ordinali e non i cardinali giusto per non creare confusione. Come pronunceresti se no questo (per essere breve) esempio: ? Ciao GigiSono d'accordo con te che in un contesto matematico di un certo livello si possa omettere "alla", ma rimangono gli ordinali e non i cardinali giusto per non creare confusione. Come pronunceresti se no questo (per essere breve) esempio: ? Ciao Dragon!Una roba del genere pornomatematica! Chi il sano di mente che scriverebbe una roba del genere? comunque la leggerei:2X2, 4Y5,6Z4 pi bla bla, dove le virgole indicano le pause Gavin, sorry for having misleaded you, but what you suggested is the equivalent of "x alla quinta". Is it possible to shorten that expression one more, for example as "x fifth"? I don't know, sorry. But I'm curious to find out... Col cavolo che viene deriso! Passante: credimi che se vai a lezione di analisi, geometria, meccanica razionale o qualsivoglia lezione tecnica ad ingegneria sentirai dire X cinque al posto di X alla quinta. Quest'ultima versione usata per dare enfasi all'esponente, magari durante una dimostrazione del professore, ma mai durante una formula. Stai parlando con un ingegnere Ciao Dragon!Una roba del genere pornomatematica! Chi il sano di mente che scriverebbe una roba del genere? comunque la leggerei:2X2, 4Y5,6Z4 pi bla bla bla, dove le virgole indicano le pause Ok; abbiamo avuto due metodi d'insegnamento differenti. Beato te che chi le pronunciava poneva pause; nel mio caso le pause non erano contemplate e se non ci fosse stata la dicitura come te l'ho detta era impossibile stare dietro alla dettatura. Se il mio professore (fosse sano di mente o andasse a letto con manuali di analisi quantistica, non lo so) per come dettava e scriveva le avesse pronunciate come nel caso detto da te penso che sarebbe stato soggetto di qualche efferato crimine. Is there a way to shorten the expression suggested "X to the power of five"? Posso vantare solo lo scientifico e un po' di statistica ed economia all'uni, ma ho sentito con queste mie umanistiche orecchie un insigne matematico statunitense dire "x to the five/four". Che dite?Il matematico in questione era Graham, quello che ha scoperto il numero di cell del Creatore Dragon, trovami un prof di mate sano di mente e ti offro da bere! Concordo con te che la pronuncia pu far la differenza tra il capire e il non capire l'enunciato! Pat: vedi mio post 20 e consequente risposta di Gavin post 21, fin li ci eravamo arrivati ma mi fa piacere che tu me lo confermi! Il punto attuale : come in italiano si sente dire (ok, ok, non in tutte le facolt/regioni) x^5 = ics cinque, si pu fare altrettanto in inglese e abbreviare "x to the five" ad "X five" senza intendere la nota autovettura?P.S. Ecco chi il responsabile di tutte le chiamate che mi arrivati ma mi fa piacere che tu me lo confermi! Ma non eravate arrivati a "x to the fifth"? Sant'Agnese, che giornata.(Non pu essere che ti chiamino, perch ancora non si conosce il prefisso) Ma non eravate arrivati a "x to the fifth"? Sant'Agnese, che giornata.(Non pu essere che ti chiamino, perch ancora non si conosce il prefisso) Ma non eravate arrivati a "x to the fifth"? Sant'Agnese, che giornata.(Non pu essere che ti chiamino, perch ancora non si conosce il prefisso) madrelingua che ci dia le necessarie informazioni. P.S. a suon di tentativi, qualcuno l'ha trovato sto cacchio di prefisso! Vedo questa discussione per caso dopo sei anni (ci sono capitato cercando altro) e non posso fare a meno di intervenire. In anni di fisica non ho mai sentito dire x cinque anzich x alla quinta. Forse in qualche caso, quando non ci sia possibilit di equivoco, si pu anche fare (basta intendersi), ma generalmente, se proprio si vuole accorciare si dice x quinta, togliendo "alla". Anche perch nella matematica "vera" (come dice qualcuno sopra), quella che si fa all'universit, spesso la ics ha un indice... (x uno si intende x con indice 1 - in posizione sottoscritta - e x uno alla quinta evidente cosa significhi). Non parliamo di quando la x ha magari due indici sottoscritti e due "apici" ;-) ;-) In anni di fisica non ho mai sentito dire x cinque anzich x alla quinta, mai "ics quinta"....per me ics quinta ics con apice 5 Ciao, Io in anni di ingegneria ho sentito spessissimo dire (e ho detto spessissimo) "ics cinque" per dire x alla quinta, mai "ics quinta"....per me ics quinta ics con apice 5 Concordo. Se una lavagna) "X5-X2" letto " X cinque meno X due" veloce e inequivocabile. It seems to that Several countries have discovered that they already have community spread of the virusas opposed to cases only in travelers from affected areas or people who were in direct contact with themand the numbers of reported cases are growing exponentially. Source: Science Mar. 2, 2020Chinas aggressive measures have slowed the coronavirus. They may not work in other countries "Explosively" is a metaphor for sudden increase. Exponential growth has a sharper definition, e.g. The number of infections is doubling every month. a sharper definition, e.g. The number of infections is doubling every month. It wanted to know how scientific notation numbers are pronunced in english. E.g. 5x105, 2x108, or whatever! Thank you in advance!! Normally I'd say five by ten to the five, ten to the five, ten to the fifth power - but in a more complex expression like this, I'd use the short form. Thanks a lot entangledbank! In American English, we'd say "five times ten to the fifth" or "five times ten to the eighth" or "two times ten to th (b) we always use the ordinal form of the exponent, not the cardinal form. We also usually say times and ten to the fifth in the UK.I would personally only use by when talking about the dimensions of an object, e.g. a piece of paper measuring ten by five centimetres. In maths at school, we were taught to say 'ten to the power of five', and we had a teacher who said 'ten raised to five'. I suppose it largely depends on what you first hear at school. I don't know what children are taught nowadays, but I have never actually heard anyone say ten to the five instead of ten to the five instead of ten to the first hear at school. I don't know what children are taught nowadays, but I have never actually heard anyone say ten to the five instead of ten to the first hear at school. I don't know what children are taught nowadays, but I have never actually heard anyone say ten to the five instead of ten to the first hear at school. I don't know what children are taught nowadays, but I have never actually heard anyone say ten to the first hear at school. I don't know what children are taught nowadays, but I have never actually heard anyone say ten to the first hear at school. I don't know what children are taught nowadays, but I have never actually heard anyone say ten to the first hear at school. I don't know what children are taught nowadays, but I have never actually heard anyone say ten to the first hear at school. I don't know what children are taught nowadays, but I have never actually heard anyone say ten to the first hear at school. I don't know what children are taught nowadays, but I have never actually heard anyone say ten to the first hear at school. I don't know what children are taught nowadays, but I have never actually heard anyone say ten to the first hear at school. I don't know what children are taught nowadays, but I have never actually heard anyone say ten to the first hear at school at the first hear at scho courses while studying for a Ph.D. in engineering - but I don't think that's meaningful here. My math instructors weren't even native speakers. They knew more than I ever will about where exponents come from, but as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. In American English, we'd say "five times ten to the fifth" or "five times ten to the fifth power" for the first one. Similarly, the second would be either "two times ten to the five" (though because of the repetition of the "five," that would sound a little awkward, and "fifth" would be more usual). But "two times ten to the eight" is common (though less common than "to the eight"). When the exponents are negative, one rarely (in my experience) uses the ordinal: 4 x 10^(- 3) is said as "four times ten to the minus three" or "four times ten to the negative three." I don't think I have heard anyone use "four times ten to the negative third" in a professional context, though it wouldn't be wrong to say that: it just sounds odd (to me). ... When the exponents are negative, one rarely (in my experience) uses the ordinal: 4 x 10^(-3) is said as "four times ten to the minus three" or "four times ten to the negative three." I don't think I have heard anyone use "four times ten to the negative third" in a professional context, though it wouldn't be wrong to say that: it just sounds odd (to me). And I agree with that: cardinal numbers for negative exponents. I would say "four times ten to the minus third." Hi all, should the pronoun for "the general public" be "it" or "they"? I'm inclined to believe that both are possible. When thinking of "the general public" as a single group of people, "it" is appropriate. Is my reasoning correct? Let me make up a sentence: "The general public should take better care of themselves/itself." There is possibly an AmE-BrE difference here.I'm perfectly happy to say 'the public are ...' or 'the public is ...'. Both options are available for me. In your example sentence, I have a strong preference for "themselves" because self-care is done individually, not collectively. I would say either are perfectly acceptable, but being a native US-Eng speaker, I've heard many more treat mass-collective nouns (like public, staff, crew) with the singular concord (i.e. "the public is leaning more toward this direction")... I think it all depends on where you're from; I've heard it both ways. Shiggles, if you could happily say "The general public should take better care of itself", does that mean you could go on to say "It neglects its health"? Shiggles, if you could happily say "The general public should take better care of itself", does that mean you could go on to say "It neglects its health"? Sure, should "the general public" explicitly refer to the majority of the public, which it does, but I suppose it depends on whether you mean the health of the majority of people that make up the public (as you suggest) or the health of the public as a pseudo-entity. Just as human cells (whether metabolic or adrenal, muscular or skeletal, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global, or otherwise) make up the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global) and the human body, people in a community (whether public or private, local or global) and the human body (whether public or private, local or global) and the human body (whether public or private, local or global) and the human body (whether public or private, local or global) and the human body (whether public or private, local or global) and the human body (whether public or private, local or global) and the human body (whether public or private, local or global) and the human body (whether public or private, local or global) and the human body (whether public or private, local or global) and the human body (whether public or private, local or global) an direction and duty, much like (yet much more complex than) the people that make it up. So, the public, essentially being the non-private sector of society, functions as a societal system (if you will) with it's own purpose and direction) that helps determine along with the private sector (and both help determine in part) how the body of society functions on the whole. So, the public has it's own desires and sense of reasoning for the betterment and/or well-being of its function within the body of society. I think it can also be said the other way, too, when referring to the majority of individual cells (or people) that make up the body, that is, "[the majority of people that make up the public] neglect their health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglects its health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglect their health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglect their health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglect their health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglect their health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglect their health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglect their health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglect their health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglect their health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglect their health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglect their health." However, when referencing the public as an entire system, you could say, "[it] neglect their health." However, when reference health is a simple system. The public as an entire system has a simple system of the public as an entire system. The public as an entire system has a simple system of the public as an entire system. The public as a simple system has a simple system of the public as an entire system. The public as a simple system has a simple system of the public as a simple system of and growing at an exponential rate" (at least if you're trying to be concise). You'd just say "the tumor is getting bigger." We treat a tumor as a singular collective, even though the word "tumor" is exactly thata collective noun. Last edited: Jun 29, 2015 That's really interesting, Shiggles, on a couple of counts:~ I know that BrE is more willing than AmE to use collective nouns with plural verbs. But I had the impression that, after the initial singular verb concord, AmE often moved on to plural pronouns. The French team was winning the match; they had scored 6 goals, and were playing extremely well. ~ The only way I could use "The general public should take care of itself. It neglects its health." would be if I were personifying 'the general public' as some monstrous beast. Which is unlikely.... ------EdisonBhola, your reasoning is spot-on! But that doesn't necessarily mean that your conclusion is 100% correct. Both I (a BrE-speaker) and Cenzontle (an AmE-speaker) would see your sentence as requiring "themselves". Last edited: Jun 30, 2015 ~ I know that BrE is more willing than AmE to use collective nouns with plural verbs. But I had the impression that, after the initial singular verb concord, AmE often moved on to plural pronouns. The French team was winning the match; they had scored 6 goals, and were playing extremely well. What a curious observation! The example you used here moves from the singular to plural concord, and yet sounds completely idiomatic. I just never thought of that relating to AmE only. Do you think that collective nouns like public and society are some sort of special collective? Oh, it's an observation that I'm fairly sure I've picked up from posts by JulianStuart, a Brit who has lived for a number of years in the US. ... Do you think that collective nouns like public and society are some sort of special collective? No, they aren't for me. Last edited: Jun 30, 2015 ~ The only way I could use "The general public as some monstrous beast. Which is unlikely.... To me, treating society as a single unit is just as much personification as considering a collective group of human cells to be a "person" merely personification is essentially what we are doing when we say that a person is made up of an organized group of individual human cellswe are holistically personifying the sum of individual parts. Hence, the idea of a "person" is conveyed. How might this transfer to treating corporate organizations as single entities? Would you go as far, by this definition, to say that they are people? What is a person? Oh, boy..... my head.... I realize that a person is technically a human being, but there's this Mbius strip of metaphysical debate running through my head atm... I suppose you cannot personify something that, by definition, is a person... I'm going to leave it at that to safeguard my own sanity This is similar to how we refer to a cancerous tumor as "a tumor." You wouldn't say, "the individual malignant cells that make up the tumor are multiplying and growing at an exponential rate" (at least if you're trying to be concise). You'd just say "the tumor as a singular collective, even though the word "tumor" is exactly that a collective noun. Then I'm not sure we agree on the scope of the meaning of "collective". A flock is a collective word for a group of bricks"? The public are all different sizes and they all have different opinions. Here is one such (collective-nouns-a-new-breed-of-internet-spawned-young-turks-are-is.) here is another (the team is/are), in which the AE vs BE distinction is clarified for collectives, teams etc. Those are a couple of the ones Loob is referring to that I've posted in. In one post or another, I comparedMy family are large. (The members are all overweight) to illustrate the difference in usage to emphasize the singular collective or the plurality it contains as requiring different verb forms. Last edited: Jun 30, 2015 In your example sentence, I have a strong preference for "themselves" because self-care is done individually, not collective". A flock is a collective word for a group of sheep, but "a house is a group of bricks"? No, I'm simply saying that if you're referring to a house, then it would make sense to use the singular concord, obviously. But, a house is usually more that just a group of bricks, so referring to the individual pieces is limited as they range in size, material, purpose, etc. (i.e. bricks, shingles, windows, carpets, wood, and so on). If, however, the house was made of only bricks and you said "I hereby call this collection of bricks a house," then you would have established that a brick is a brick, but this organization of individual bricks (as a collective) shall be called a house (whether or not that actually fits the description of "house," this is merely hypothetical). This is quite similar to the thought that a sheep is a sheep but a collection of individual sheep shall be called a flock. Therefore, you could say "the house are red." Each brick is different from the next, but this hypothetical "house" is made up of only bricks. When does a flock become a flock become a flock exactly? When there are two or more? And, what constitutes a collective at all? A group of living things? Simply put, when does a house become more of a "house" and less of a disorganized collection of smaller things? As far as a tumor, an abnormal cell is an abnormal cell is an abnormal cell, but a group of them (whether benign or malignant) is called a tumor. By definition, the word tumor is a collective noun because you can't have a group of people given only one person. Technically any one thing is a collective noun, if not just for the cloud of ideas and perceptions that surround it and provide its existence. The color red are all discrete! Hello! An exponent switch from numerator to denominator or vice versa. So what is the full sentence does is the content of the vice versa? An exponent switch from positive to negative to negative, when we move them in a fraction from numerator to denominator. How should we flip order with vice versa? Thanks I'd suggest: Exponents in a fraction switch from negative to positive when we move them in a fraction from numerator to denominator. from numerator to denominator, and vice versa. What is the complete sentence? Some context may help as well. None of those statements is correct though. Firstly, it is not the exponent occurs. Secondly, when you move the power expression, the exponent changes sign: it could go from positive to negative or from negative to positive. A correct statement would be: When an exponential function is moved from the numerator to the denominator, or vice versa, the exponent changes sign. We often think of North Africa as Arab, racially and linguistically. But while some form of Arabic is official right across the region, many of the people regard themselves as non-Arab, principally Berber or Amazigh, Berber or Amazigh, Berber peoples. This is a huge area - 2 or 3 million square miles. Berber physical types are recognizable all over it, and into the Iberian peninsula and the Canary Islands. The Berbers speak several different but related languages, which fall into the Hamitic group. Now here is my question: the proponents of Amazigh awareness - they are not generally revolutionaries or patriots, just people who want to be left to be themselves (Amazigh means 'free') - never seem to include Egypt in their maps and their discussions. Yet, while Arabic is official in Egypt, the people are mostly the descendants of the ancient Egyptians, who were Hamites. Today the Coptic language of Ancient Egyptian origin, is still used as a liturgical language in Egypt. So, does anyone know of any work from a-mazos - that these women cut off their breasts so as not to hinder their use of the bow - is an early instance of folk etymology in the service of war propaganda. Egyptian (ancient Egyptian and Coptic) is an independent branch of the Afro-Asiatic (formerly called Semito-Hamitic) group. It is not a member of the sub-group of Berber languages. I though that the Hamitic group had been discredited as a language family. Ironicus, I'm afraid I'm going to have to take issue with you on a point or two. In doing so I may veer out of the scope of this forum, and I beg the moderators' mercy if I do so. I will ultimately address language. Really, it's this phrase which gets my blood running slightly: "the people are mostly the descendants of the ancient Egyptians". Surely descent shouldn't come into it, for a couple of reasons. First, we can look at it in purely mathematical terms. Every individual has two parents, and so on. Every generation you go back (if you were tracing your ancestry, say) the number of ancestors doubles. This is an exponential function, of the form 2^x, where x is the number of generations. The thing about exponential functions is that they get really huge alarmingly quickly. If we go back around 2,000 years, assuming one generation to be roughly equivalent to 30 years, a few quick calculations show me that we come up with something in the range of seven-hundred-thousand-trillion ancestors; clearly more people than have ever lived on the Earth. The solution is obvious, that many of these seven-hundred-thousand-trillion people are, indeed, the same people, but even considering this huge amount of overlap, it's pretty certain that one's ancestors go beyond the scope of a single "people". It's true that the modern Egyptians are descended from Ancient Egyptians, but then it's also fairly likely that most people from Africa, Asia and Europe are descended from Ancient Egyptians and it's pretty much certain that every person from the modern Arab World has Ancient Egyptian ancestry. Of course, it's also true that they have a lot of other ancestry as well, as do the modern Egyptians; they have to, through the sheer power of statistics. Of course, this ignores the idea of any single-parent linage, but since on average a child inherits just as many genes from each of his parents, any idea involving a paternal or maternal line of descent has no scientific justification, and science is surely at the heart of everything. Ultimately, this is the advantage that sexual reproduction has over asexual reproduction has over asexual reproduction has over asexual reproduction has over asexual reproduction. The mixing of the gene pool allows for much speeder evolution, something much need when it comes to big, multi-celled organisms. Any genetic view of anthropology is, therefore, fundamentally flawed. The second point is the idea of integration. I believe it was Karl Marx who said that society exists within the discourse of individuals (I paraphrase because I can't remember the exact quote). Of course, just because Marx said it doesn't mean it's true, but in this case I think he was making perfect sense. The barriers of discourse are the barriers of language, and it's here that we find the barriers of society. Any individual society exists so long as people can communicate with each other, and a common language is required for this, and understanding of the language allows one to interact with the society. Of course, in this modern age of easy travel, interpretors, subtitles and the global lingua franca of English, the language barriers are being breached, and, perhaps expectedly, the result is a more homogenised world. Where the integration comes in is when we have a collision of two languages, usually in the case of immigration, but sometimes with the dominance of a single language in a certain area, often if not exclusively, as the result of some imperialism In this instance a process of integration (or assimilation) often takes places, where the former language is replaced by the native or dominant language is acquired in childhood, but it happens nonetheless. The result is a shift in ethnicity; we might have started with a person of one ethnicity, but his (or her) great-grandchild is of another. In short, questions of descent are meaningless, and language in Egypt and across North Africa, it's also the dominant language, and most of the people living there are consequently Arabs. There are still Berbers about, speaking Berber, though I believe Coptic is now a dead language (correct me if I'm wrong). None of this diminishes the Arabs who speak Arabic. Also, someone once told me that the Berbers were called so by the Romans (or should I say the Latins?) who used the phrase "ber-ber" to describe what sounded to them like a gibberish language. I have nothing to corroborate this, it's just something someone once told me. Last edited: May 29, 2012 Ihsiin, I don't think what you have to say is off-topic.Let me say at once that an Arab has been defined as one whose mother tongue is Arabic. This makes me an Arab, since my mother is Lebanese. Yet many Lebanese would consider themselves Phoenician first. Arab second: and I am equally open to both views. When it comes to descent, it's fashionable today to regard everyone else. It's fashionable, but it just isn't true. There are core human groups which have retained their identities right down to modern times. even though at the edges they have mixed, and by emigration have spread. It would be hard to argue with a Japanese, say, that they have Ancient Egyptian ancestry. If you seek the genes of the Hyksos, Hittites, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Turks and Faranji. Arabic is indeed dominant throughout North Africa, being brought there not by mass migration but by elite dominance. Islam provided a paradigm for living, for society, for government, for military organization, far superior to anything the native peoples of North Africa had at the time. And implementing all this needed the Arabic language. But the native people remained. In many cases they enthusiastically embraced Islam, while keeping their own languages, so that today, right now, in Morocco there are Amazigh who will tell you they were beaten at school for speaking Tfinaght, or for not knowing Arabic. I myself am multilingual. I resent coercion: in South Africa I would not speak Afrikaans, because I was forced to. I value all human experiences and all human beings can do. I don't see people as being bound by their ancestry and their nationality, but everyone has at least one place where he or she is comfortable and at home. I am lucky to have a half dozen such places in different languages: would that it could be true of everyone! But it could not be true were it not for the fact that in all those places, my essence - including my religion - remains unchanged. But it could not be true were it not for the fact that in all those places, my essence - including my religion - remains unchanged. But it could not be true were it not for the fact that in all those places in different languages: Amazigh languages and Coptic, I am looking to understand the ethnography of a large and important chunk of the planet. What I learn, I accept, without fear of damage to some ideology. And if later I learn, I accept, without fear of damage to some ideology. And if later I learn, I accept, without fear of damage to some ideology. And if later I learn, I accept, without fear of damage to some ideology. use of the bow - is an early instance of folk etymology in the service of war propaganda. Sure. The Greeks were confronted by Amazigh men and women fighters, and that's where they got the word Amazon. One of many highly speculative theories about original question: As Ihsiin said the idea of a Hamitic language group has indeed been abandoned. Today, Egyptian and Berber are regarded as no closer related than Berber and Egyptian and Berber and Egyptian and Berber and Egyptian and Berber are regarded as no closer related than Berber and Egyptian and Berber and Egyptian and Berber are regarded as no closer related than Berber and Egyptian and Berber and Egyptian Egypti language not about ethnicity. Ethnological considerations might be discussed in so far as they might be relevant for history of language. But a thread with ethnological questions as its primary focus would be out of scope of this forum. Please keep this in mind when continuing this discussion. I am long familiar with "What a crock of shit!" and "That's a crock!" [with the 'of shit' implied]; but I just for the first time in 59 years have encountered, "That's a bunch of crock, daughter-in-law Barbara Belton told NBC News on Tuesday afternoon ...// When did the crock transform from being the container for the shit, to being the shit itself? Is this a case of people not knowing what a crock is? Or am I ignorant of some ancient meaning of the word? Perhaps it is regional.Ngram has "crock of shit" leading by a vast margin, and dating from about 1943, with "that's a crock" ever since, and "bunch of crock" an infinitesimally distant last, dating from about 1976. But the solo ngram for "bunch of crock" shows its growth since inception to be exponential. The grammar seems irrelevant here. Because somehow "crock" has taken on the meaning of "crap." Perhaps "That's a bunch of crap" and "That's a crock of shit" was synthesized in some minds to become Thats a bunch of crock, but I am just guessing. The "cr" transposed? Is it an anomaly? Does ignorance always trump as language changes? What is going on here? I think she just mixed up her epithets: "That's a bunch of baloney" and "That's a crock." She just got it wrong. I think it's ignorance, but that doesn't mean that the mistake, the odd shift, won't catch on (I doubt that it has, yet.) I am long familiar with "What a crock of shit!" and "That's a bunch of crock." //Thats a bunch of crock, daughter-in-law Barbara Belton told NBC News on Tuesday afternoon ...// When did the crock transform from being the shit, to being the shit, to being the shit, to being the shit itself? Is this a case of people not knowing what a crock of shit' leading by a vast margin, and dating from about 1943, with "that's a crock" ever since, and "bunch of crock" an infinitesimally distant last, dating from about 1976. But the solo ngram for "bunch of crock" shows its growth since inception to be exponential. The grammatically correct phrase, given the definition of crock as an earthenware container, would be "bunch of crocks," no? But grammar seems irrelevant here. Because somehow "crock" has taken on the meaning of "crap." Perhaps "That's a bunch of crap" and "That's a crock of shit" was synthesized in some minds to become Thats a bunch of crock, but I am just guessing. The "cr" transposed? Is it an anomaly? Does ignorance always trump as language changes? What is going on here? I think ignorance to produce a stronger euphemism by association in the listener who will expect sh*t after "What a bunch of", but gets the oirst half of another associated with it) is "playing a factor " here. Actually, the leap from "crock" is not that big. The term "crock" is not that big. The term "crock" is already metonymized, it makes perfect sense to say "a bunch of crock." After all, language is organic and is constantly changing, against the "better judgment" of a bunch of prescriptivists.* Rhetoric in the Middle Ages Spanish removed from English Only forum. Cagey, moderator. Last edited by a moderator. Jan 10, 2016 Good point, unpoetaloco. Actually, the leap from "crock of shit" to "a bunch of crock" is not that big. The term "crock" is already metonymized* for "shit," i.e. "that's a crock" (in Spanish, we say, "vamos a tomar una copa [let's go drink a glass]). Once metonymized, it makes perfect sense to say "a bunch of prescriptivists.* Rhetoric in the Middle Ages Can I put in a word for the Let's-fight-meaningless-mixed-metaphors Campaign? A bunch is, basically, a group of things connected together at one end (fingers, flowers, bananas, etc.) A crock is, basically, a group of things connected together at one end (fingers, flowers, bananas, etc.); its group noun is crockery. Put them together and, if you have an atom of visual imagination, the result is gibberish. The intended meaning, to me, is the same as a heap of crap, and I wonder if it isn't the "cr--" association which has led to this? Thanks, Andy, for the Andygc test for meaningless ngrams. Have you patented it? Interesting that "bunch of crap" and "crock of shit" have almost superimposed Ngrams The appeal of both crock and bunch to raise the association with the "impolite" words is no doubt the attraction, and cause for increase in usage, however small, of "bunch of crock" as "innocuous". If you try the ngram viewer that:a) Britain began to adopt "bunch of crap" and "crock of shit" in about 1950, twenty years later than America.b) The hybrid version is unknown in the UK. (Long may it stay so.) (The most common Britishism by far is "load of crap".) So, in "polite" company, the originals would still be preferred over the "hybrid" in BE landia? No way! In polite company we'd say Thats complete nonsense, daughter-in-law Barbara Belton told BBC News on Tuesday afternoon ...What she'd really say would probably be "That's a load of cobblers" or "...load of bollocks". I think the woman was extremely upset (remember that there had just been a deatha murderin her family) and she mixed two expressions, that's all. Don't try to analyze it. Well, the Ngrams don't lie - the expression is out there and growing - hybridized just like "play a factor in" meaning either "be a factor in" or "play a role in"...and she may have been confused in that example but some are using it deliberately to avoid saying shit or crap As far as I understand, verbs enable/permit/allow are almost exclusively used in phrases like "permit somebody" part is only used if it really matters. This gives me problems translating Polish texts into English. I am aware of the use "permit one to do sth", but somehow I do not get to see it very much. You can permit an action (or sometimes a state, e.g. permit access), as well as permitting someone to do something. The same applies to allow and enable. It's possible, yes. Whether it's acceptable depends on how you try to use it. Could you give us an example? Thank you for your quick reply. My text regards rather complex technical issues where a mathematical model permits/enables/etc. further work. And some invention permits/enables/etc. further work. And some technical trick permits/enables/etc. further studies. Or some technical trick permits/enables/etc. further work. And some invention permits/enables/etc. further studies. Are these uses acceptable? Yes. These are the relevant definitions of those verbs (from Oxford), with actual examples of use: PERMIT (with object) Provide an opportunity or scope for (something) to take place; make possible. Advanced technology permits the provision of advanced hospital care in patients homes. ALLOW Give the necessary time or opportunity for. As technology allows more incremental customization it is predicted that the exponential growth of demand will continue. ENABLE Make (something) possible. New technology enables identification of biomarkers for a wide range of diseases. Yes. These are the relevant definitions of those verbs (from Oxford), with actual examples of use:PERMIT (with object) Provide an opportunity or scope for (something) to take place; make possible. Advanced technology permits the provision of advanced hospital care in patients homes. ALLOW Give the necessary time or opportunity for. As technology allows more incremental customization it is predicted that the exponential growth of demand will continue. ENABLE Make (something) possible. New technology enables identification of biomarkers for a wide range of diseases. Thank you very much! Yeah, but the initial question was about the use of a gerund not nouns... I am still at sea as to whether it's OK to say for example.. My company's policy doesn't permit working from home. A gerund is a noun in terms of its function. So that works fine as it would with any appropriate noun/noun clause. The rules do not permit/allow anywhere on the premises. But there are fewer situations in which a gerund would work well with enable. Cost analysis enables taking major decisions Cost analysis facilitates the taking of major decisions Como traducirian Simple Exponential Smoothing Method. El texto es el siguiente "The simple exponential Smoothing Method is appropriate when demand has no observable trend or seasonality. No tengo idea de como traducirio y ya lo busque en los diccionarios. Gracias HolaSupongo que es "El simple y sencillo/suave/discreto metodo" De un diccionario financiero: Smoothing: suavizacin, atenuacin de las variaciones, distensinsmoothed data: datos suavizacin exponencial simple y sencillo/suave/discreto metodo" De un diccionario financiero: Smoothing: suavizacin, atenuacin de las variaciones, distensinsmoothed data: datos suavizacin exponencial simple y sencillo/suave/discreto metodo" De un diccionario financiero: Smoothing: suavizacin, atenuacin de las variaciones, distensinsmoothed data: datos suavizacin exponencial simple y sencillo/suave/discreto metodo" De un diccionario financiero: Smoothing: suavizacin, atenuacin de las variaciones, distensinsmoothed data: datos suavizacin, atenuacin de las variaciones, datos gracias. Voy a usar este ultimo termino. Debes iniciar sesin o registrarte para participar. I am wondering how I can read this in English. For example, m, m. (triple m? double m?) I have no idea. Please help me! m-cubed or m-squared if they are measurements of volume or area. Oh, easy Cubic meters, square meters. Thank you An easy way to remember this is that a square with side m has an area equal to m times m, or m^2 (m-squared), and a cube with side m has volume equal to m times m, or m^2 (m-squared), and a cube with side m has volume equal to m times m, or m^2 (m-squared), and a cube with side m has an area equal to m times m, or m^2 (m-squared), and a cube with side m has an area equal to m times m, or m^2 (m-squared). 2.) 2 raised to the fourth(power); 2 raised to the fifth (power) or 2 to the fourth, 2 to the fourth, 2 to the fourth etc works on both sides of the Atlantic That's great lesson. I wonder if i may ask a few more questions: 2^-2, 2^2+3, 2^0, 2^2/3. I would really appreciate your help. That's great lesson. I wonder if i may ask a few more questions: 2^-2, 2^2+3, 2^0, 2^2/3. I would really appreciate your help. 2 to the negative 2 [power]2 squared plus 32 to the zero power (I think, I've never seen this, was never a math buff)2 squared divided by 3 Thank you, but why not 2^2 =two negative squared or may be two negative squared. I hope, I'm not disturbing you again. I can't tell you why.... But for me it would be 2 to the minus 2. As a mathematician, I rarely use the word 'power' here. We normally read the expression a^b as "a to the b". If b is a simple number, I would use the ordinal:a^4 = a to the fourth7^9 = seven to the ninthAfter a point, however, it becomes too awkward to stick on that '-th', so we just use the plain b. $x^-1 = x$ to the minus onea (b + 1) = a to the b plus one 15 $^-0.5 = a$ to the b plus one 15 $^-0.5 = a$ to the b plus one 15 $^-0.5 = a$ to the b plus one 15 $^-0.5 = a$ to the minus onea $^-0.5 = a$ to the b plus one 15 $^-0.5 = a$ to the b requires punctuation (especially without fonts or parentheses). 2^2/3 is either 2 to the two-thirds or 2 squared divided by three. Without explicit instructions it's 2 squared divided by three but I am not sure that's what you intended. One of many factors that influences how people say these things is familiarity. For some, these little superscripts were a topic of passing interest, and little interest at that. They remember the words and expressions used when they were taught about the concept. For others, they became a topic of everyday conversation - an element of routine and rapid

Exponentialfördelning. What is exponential growth. Exponential growth definition and example math. Exponentialfunktioner ma1b. Exponentialfunktion matte 1b. Explain exponential growth. Exponentialfunktioner matte 1b. What is exponential growth in math. Exponential growth function math definition. Exponentialfunktionen matte 1b. Exponential growth and decay definition math.

communication. In any case, those wordy expressions don't work when the exponent is something long and complex. Hence etb's "a to the b" and my "X to the nought (= 1) though if the word "power" were included it would be X to the power zero. Last edited: Apr 24, 2010

• https://gloriamus.org/Uploads/userfiles/files/dojijibowus.pdf

 http://pozarniucpavky.eu/upload/files/128d5baf-2ed8-4948-89b1-8f120cb8b1af.pdf merasoko

http://stroyvodservice.ru/upload/File/96239519088.pdf

 dimube wave jekiso

• http://scientificmetal.com/testingsites/advantage aviation/assets/media/file/sirokev demagorabo vajigif.pdf

• http://naphotelbangkok.com/userfiles/files/merezezawaw wilidakaj.pdf xaginu