

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 "cube" ma in generale come si fa? Grazie mille Alla seconda si dice squared e alla terza si dice cubed - con la d finale. Poi, to the 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 veloci di risposta.) Esatto! Benvenuto al forum! Come si fa, pi in generale, a dire che un numero elevato a potenza?Devo tradurre "elevazioni a potenza" ma non so proprio come si possa rendere l'espressione. Non mi pare corretto nemmeno usando "degnation a potenza". Potrebbe essere semplicemente "raising" ? Grazie! Ciao alein!Ti suggerisco: "elevazioni a potenza di ..." = "exponentiation". Bye, Benzene! Grazie mille! Funzioni molto benelenati! X^5 =ics cinque, 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 sixth." 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 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^2+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^2 squared and t^2 cubed, but what about X and Y? Is there a way to shorten the expression suggested "X to the power of five"?Thank you all! As a former math student ... 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. Gigi scusa ma davvero stato tolto anche '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: "x^5+y^4+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 polì? X alla quinta forse lo dici al liceo; all'universit, quando hai equazioni lunghe due righe non ti sbighi 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 quì equals negative b plus or minus the square root of b-squared minus four ac, all over two e 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. Gavin, sorry for having misleded 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"? Col cavolo che viene deriso! Mai assistito ad una lezione di analisi al polì? X alla quinta forse lo dici al liceo; all'universit, quando hai equazioni lunghe due righe non ti sbighi 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 Dragon!Una roba del genere pomatematica! Chi il sano di mente che scriverebbe una roba del genere? comunque la leggerrei: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 vantarmi solo lo scientifico e un po' di statistica ed economia all'unì, ma ho sentito con queste mie umanistiche orecchie un insigne matematico statunitense dire "x to the three". Penso che non ci siano problemi a 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, trovani un prof di mate sano di mente e ti offro da bere! Concoro con te che la pronuncia pu far la differenza tra l'enunciare e il non capire l'enunciato! Pat: vedi mio post 20 e conseguente risposta di Gavin post 21, fin lì 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 autovetturà?P.S. Ecco chi il responsabile di tutte le chiamate che mi arrivano!! Last edited: Aug 21, 2013 Pat. vedi mio post 20 e conseguente risposta di Gavin post 21, fin lì ci eravamo 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 ) X to the fifth? Sant'Agnese, che giornata.(Non pu essere che ti chiamino, perch ancora non si conosce il prefisso ) No, noi siamo avanti e quello ce l'aveva confermato anche Gavin...ora speriamo che arrivi qualche fiorero madrelingua che ci dia le necessarie informazioni.P.S. a suon di tentativi, qualcuno l'ha trovato sto caccchio 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.Ciao,Io in anni di ingegneria ho sentito spessissimo dire (e ho detto spessissimo) "ics cinque" per dire x cinque, mai "ics quinta"....per me ics quinta ics con cinque 5 concordo.Se una persona legge rapidamente un'espressione ad alta voce che tutti possono leggere (come su una lavagna) "X5-X2" letto "X cinque meno X due" veloce e inequivocabile. It seems to that "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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.An explosion could be a short spur; the get equivalence, one might say, "a continuing explosion of cases." Hi everyone!! I wanted to know how scientific notation numbers are pronounced in English. E.g. 5x105, 2x108, or whatever! Thank you in advance!! Normally I'd say five by ten to the five and two by ten to the eight. The power can be expressed by longer forms - we say ten to the five, ten to the power of five, or ten to the fifth power - but in a more complex expression like this, I'd use the short form. Thanks a lot entangledbank! I would 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 eighth" or "two times ten to the eighth power."The two differences between that and the BE version that entangledbank gave earlier is (a) we say times, not by, and

(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 fifth.But I didn't study mathematics at university! ... But I didn't study mathematics at university! I did, though graduated level courses while studying for a Ph.D. in engineering - but I don't think that's meaningful here. My math instructors weren't chosen for their knowledge of English. Some of them 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 eighth" or "two times ten to the eighth power."(snip) I agree, though one also hears "five 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 eighth").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. When thinking of "the general public" being consisting of different people, "they" 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 did ...". Both options are viable 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 one perfectly acceptable, but being a native US-Eng speaker, I've preferred many more times "the public" over "the people". 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"? 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 societal body. Some believe that society is a complex conscious machine with it's own sense of 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 sub-systems and societal organs (all made up of individual cells and each 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."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 is getting bigger." We treat a tumor as a singular collective, but the word "tumor" is exactly that: 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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 give 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 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.... 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."So, is not calling someone a "person" merely personifying the complex system of organs and subsystems made of up individual cells? I mean, personification is essentially what we are doing when we say "growing exponentially" and "growing explosively" are interchangeable in the context. But I am not very sure. Are they interchangeable here? \*\*\*\*\*The report comes at a critical time in what many epidemiologists now consider a pandemic. Just as a group they were not good role models for the right way to say them. 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