

I'm not a robot

























I know 'right-hand side' can be hyphenated. Does the same rule apply here? I wouldn't have thought so but just checking... Thanks. Well, I hyphenate it, but if you write it without -- top right corner -- I don't think anyone will be confused. So I would say that it's up to you. What is the usual answer? right corner of the top ? For me, the usual answer is top-right corner, although top right corner is also fine, even for me. I think there is less of a connection between top and right than there is between right and hand -- I would always write right-hand drive rather than right hand drive. There are no rules for hyphenation, just lots of preferences and analogies. Adjective + Noun adjectival compounds tend to be hyphenated: first-rate, low-cost, high-maintenance, so right-hand. This analogy doesn't apply to top(-)right. Thanks for that, etc. While there will still be exceptions (maybe based on preference) to that, the Adjective + Noun adjectival compounds guideline is useful (for me, anyway). Thanks all for your time. Hey all! I have learned that if I use a bodypart as a tool I should use "with" preposition but now I'm confused because I have read "by" as well. Which sentence is correct? 1) I carry the luggage with my hands. 2) I carry the luggage by my hands. 3) I carry the luggage in my hands. (Luggage as a big object, I roll it.) 4) I carry the key in my hand. (Key as a small object, I lift it up and I actually carry it in/by/with my palm of hand.) 4) I prepare the meal with my hands. 5) I prepare the meal by my hands. Thanks in advance! #2 and #5 "By my hands" is wrong but "by hand" is all right. "By hand" is a standard phrase meaning without any machine or other help. #3. If the luggage is large and you roll it then you are not carrying it. However, "I carry the luggage with my hands" seems an odd thing to say. How else would you carry it? If you used a trolley then that is not carrying it. #4 is all right because you could carry the key in your pocket or handbag. 1) I carry the luggage with my hands. 2) I carry the luggage by my hands. 3) I carry the luggage in my hands. (Luggage as a big object, I roll it.) 4) I carry the key in my hand. (Key as a small object, I lift it up and I actually carry it in/by/with my palm of hand.) 4) I prepare the meal with my hands. 5) I prepare the meal by my hands. It's common to use "by hand" when you mean that something is done manually, not by a machine or computer. I carry the luggage with my hands. This does not sound natural English in most situations. It is grammatically correct, but it's hard to imagine when that would be a useful sentence. Do you want to emphasise that you are using your hands and not some other part of your body, or do you want to make clear that you are not using a vehicle? I carried my luggage to the taxi. (Why would you need to mention your hands specifically?) He carried the plates with both hands. (We mention both hands to emphasise the care that he was taking to avoid an accident.) She made this furniture by hand. He made the statue with his own hands. (These emphasise that manual methods and hand tools were used, not some kind of automated or mass production method.) I am carrying the key in my hand (not in my pocket) so that I cannot forget it. (That sentence seems OK.) I prepared the meal with my hands. (That seems strange - why do we need to mention "with my hands" - that is the normal way in most people's kitchens, isn't it? I prepared the meal by my hands. (That sounds even more strange. Why do we need to mention "my hands"? Would it make any sense to say "I prepared the meal with someone else's hands"? CROSS-POSTED. I have learned that if I use a bodypart as a tool I should use "with" preposition but now I'm confused because I have read "by" as well. That "rule" is a useful, but over-simplified generalisation. It's true that we often use "with" with a body part. He kicked the ball with his left foot. But there are many variations, such as: He delivered the letter by hand. (He delivered the letter himself instead of sending it through the post. ) The builder checked the wall by eye. (She did not use any special equipment.) Gregor went to the next village on foot. (ie not by car, bus, bicycle, etc.) ~~~~~ Learners often have some difficulty deciding when to include words like my/her/his when talking about a body part. He kicked the ball. (Obviously with his foot; "kicking" is always done with the foot, so it's usually not necessary to mention it at all. We could say: "He kicked the ball with his foot", but normally we don't need to mention "his" - he could not kick the ball with someone else's foot, could he? Last edited: Mar 18, 2017 It's common to use "by hand" when you mean that something is done manually, not by a machine or computer. I carry the luggage with my hands. This does not sound natural English in most situations. It is grammatically correct, but it's hard to imagine when that would be a useful sentence. Do you want to emphasise that you are using your hands and not some other part of your body, or do you want to make clear that you are not using a vehicle? I carried my luggage to the taxi. (Why would you need to mention your hands specifically?) He carried the plates with both hands. (We mention both hands to emphasise the care that he was taking to avoid an accident.) She made this furniture by hand. He made the statue with his own hands. (These emphasise that manual methods and hand tools were used, not some kind of automated or mass production method.) I am carrying the key in my hand (not in my pocket) so that I cannot forget it. (That sentence seems OK.) I prepared the meal with my hands. (That seems strange - why do we need to mention "with my hands" - that is the normal way in most people's kitchens, isn't it? I prepared the meal by my hands. (That sounds even more strange. Why do we need to mention "my hands"? Would it make any sense to say "I prepared the meal with someone else's hands"? CROSS-POSTED. I'd like to emphasize that I don't use any special equipment. I only use my hands. 1) I carry the shopping bag with hand. (I don't use trolley.) 2) I prepare the meal by hand. (I don't use mixer or any kitchen equipment.) 3) I pick up the litter with hand. (I don't use broom.) In this sense, do these sentences sound good? I carry things "in my hand". I carry a shopping bag. Nothing else needed, in my opinion. If I use a trolley, I'm not "carrying" it. I carry a shopping bag. Nothing else needed, in my opinion. If I use a trolley, I'm not "carrying" it. Yes, in "I carried the shopping bag" it is assumed that they used their hand or hands. But carry can also be used even when no hands are used, eg: He carried the child on his shoulders. She carried the child on her back. She carried the bucket of water on her head. She carried her clothes in her rucksack on her back. And figuratively: Mrs Merkel carries a lot of responsibility on her shoulders. Thank you for the answers! My wife does her ceramics by hand but want to emphasise... "The Ceramics are done with my hands, patience and love ». For me not exactly the same as «The Ceramics are done by hand, with patience and love ». Are the two sentences correct? and could you agree that the first emphasise the « personal » work (= not done by hand in China ☺)? 百度知道>提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了> - in hand". Ever since that conversation, I have been pondering over a thought, which is, would it be correct to say, "I'll be getting at/on hand?". Last edited: Sep 27, 2013 I have been pondering over a thought, which is, would it be correct to say, "I'll be getting at/on hand?". No, neither make sense. "... in hand" usually means "... in my hand" = money at his disposal (often cash and without deductions for tax, insurance, etc.) Money in hand = money paid to me Money at hand = money which is nearby Money on hand = money which is available for use They're all different. Cash in hand means you're given the cash. You can also say The situation's in hand - it's under control. Help was at hand - help was nearby. John was on hand to help us - we could ask him for help if we wanted. At hand and on hand are very similar in meaning. The difference, it seems to me, is that on hand implies a greater degree of purpose. John was there in order to help us, whereas at hand simply says that help was available. Cross-posted. Thank you so much everyone for the answers, they have solved my problem. I have framed some sentences to fully understand the usage of all these prepositions in this context. Can someone please verify them for me? 1. At hand- I always keep my alarm clock at hand before going to sleep. 2. On hand- I have an alarm clock on hand, if you want I can give it you. I have framed some sentences to fully understand the usage of all these prepositions in this context. Can someone please verify them for me? 1. At hand- I always keep my alarm clock at hand before going to sleep. 2. On hand- I have an alarm clock on hand, if you want I can give it you. These two sentences don't sound right. I don't think 'at hand' and 'on hand' go well when referring to small physical items like alarms clocks. I'd say 'I always set my alarm clock before I go to sleep.' I'd probably just say 'I've got an alarm clock.' I'd say 'The lifeboat was on hand to pick up survivors.' There's the colloquial 'handy'. 'I always keep a pen and paper handy in case I want to write anything down.' 'Bananas come in handy when you just want a quick bite to eat.' 'These two sentences don't sound right. I don't think 'at hand' and 'on hand' go well when referring to small physical items like alarms clocks. These two sentences are from Hand | Definition of Hand by Lexico: 'So you can put your passport and boarding card in there, conveniently at hand at all times.' 'It is also illegal to serve them more alcohol in that condition - and particularly as they have glass readily at hand.' Do they sound right? I feel they are small physical items as well. Hello, Here's my question. Which one should I use? I don't have your letter on hand/at hand. Thanks! Neither. I think that most people (AE-speakers, anyway) would say, "I don't have your letter handy". I suspect that "at hand" is used by BE speakers but I'm not sure that it's used much anymore. Neither. I think that most people (AE-speakers, anyway) would say, "I don't have your letter handy". I suspect that "at hand" is used by BE speakers but I'm not sure that it's used much anymore. I disagree with part of that. I'd be fine saying either "I don't have your letter handy" or "I don't have your letter at hand" I disagree with part of that. I'd be fine saying either "I don't have your letter handy" or "I don't have your letter at hand" Monkey, if you would use "at hand", I'm gobsmacked (as our BE confreres would say). My sense of "at hand" was that it was BE and rather outmoded BE, at that. In fact, I haven't heard it used in a natural way, in conversation, in decades. You didn't go to an old-fashioned BE boarding school or something, did you? By the way, in casual conversation, which would you be more likely to say? Thanks! How about the following sentence: I don't have cash on hand. (Does this mean available? In other words, I can say, I have some cash in my car. If this is so, I'm confused because it almost means the same as "at hand.") I don't have those photos handy/at hand. (Does this mean "close by"-physically?) Monkey, if you would use "at hand", I'm gobsmacked (as our BE confreres would say). My sense of "at hand" was that it was BE and rather outmoded BE, at that. In fact, I haven't heard it used in a natural way, in conversation, in decades. You didn't go to an old-fashioned BE boarding school or something, did you? By the way, in casual conversation, which would you be more likely to say? Honestly, I'd say "at hand" in casual conversation. I guess I'm an old British guy at heart. And no, I did not attend an old-fashioned British boarding school...as far as I know It's a long time since I have used at hand or to hand. These sound like the formal business language we were encouraged to forget. Handy is fine if informal is fine. Otherwise I'd choose to hand. I'd like to see the complete sentence and context. Someone asks me, "Can you show me the photos or the letter?" I will reply, "I don't have them handy/at hand." What if I say, "I don't have them on hand." ... I don't have them (it) here. ... I don't have them (it) with me. As I suggested above, I don't think either at hand or to hand expressions are part of my normal vocabulary. I could be peculiar, of course. What if it's under the situation that I can take some photos, but I have to figure out how to use my new camera first? This way, I can't say, "I don't have them here." What about all those examples in the dictionary? I don't understand them well. What if it's under the situation that I can take some photos, but I have to figure out how to use my new camera first? This way, I can't say, "I don't have them here." I'm confused. In that situation there are no photos. What's the difference between: I don't have any cash. I don't have cash on hand. Hi, I'm reviving this thread because I'd like to know if anyone (particularly British Eng. speakers) would make a distinction between to hand and on hand. E.g., which would be preferable in the following sentence? I didn't have any milk to hand/on hand, so I drank my coffee straight. I'm only familiar with "on hand" in this sort of context. Thanks, Gavril Hello, I couldn't say "I didn't have any milk on hand, so I drank my coffee straight." I probably wouldn't say "I didn't have any milk to hand, so I drank my coffee straight" either, because "to hand" is more than "available" to me; it's "available and within reach". I would most likely say simply "I didn't have any milk, so I drank my coffee black" (I don't use "straight" with coffee). Last edited: Feb 26, 2013 Hello, I couldn't say "I didn't have any milk on hand, so I drank my coffee straight." When would you say "on hand" (if you would say it at all)? I probably wouldn't say "I didn't have any milk to hand, so I drank my coffee straight" either, because "to hand" is more than "available" to me; it's "available and within reach". Hmm, so would you agree with the use of "to hand" in the following contexts (from post #2 in this thread)? I always like to keep some pasta to hand in my store cupboard in case I have extra guests for dinner. The police chief decided to keep a spare unit of police officers to hand in case the civil unrest became serious. In both these contexts, it seems like the thing that's being kept "to hand" is easily accessible, but not within (physical) reach. I would say "on hand" if I wanted to convey the idea of "close by", "present": I'll be on hand if you need me. I also prefer it to "to hand" in the police example. In the pasta example I don't think "to hand" adds anything to "in my store cupboard". In any case, I'd be more inclined to say I always like to keep some pasta by me in case I have extra guests for dinner: I haven't said I 'agree' or 'disagree' with anything here, because this is all about nuances, gradations and preferences (personal and regional). In the pasta example I don't think "to hand" adds anything to "in my store cupboard". In any case, I'd be more inclined to say I always like to keep some pasta by me in case I have extra guests for dinner. Interesting: if I were to say, by me, I think it would mean something closer to what you would mean by to hand. It's always interesting to learn about these British/American divides. Similarly, would I tell a friend, "When calling the IRS have your address and social security number handy." or "at hand" or "on hand"? I'm a British English speaker, and for me (just intuitively, not based on anything else), to hand implies objects, while on hand is more suggestive of people: To hand = I can easily reach out and pick it up. E.g. I had my camera to hand, so I took a photo. Make sure you have your documents to hand.On hand = available and ready to help. E.g. the paramedics were on hand in case of emergency. If you need help, an assistant will be on hand to guide you. BUT I have the impression my Canadian friends use "on hand" where I would use "to hand." Maybe there's a difference between UK, US, and Canadian English here? Also handy - if applied to an object, e.g. keep your passport handy, means the same as "to hand." If applied to a person, e.g. my sister's a bike mechanic, and she's pretty handy, it means "good at fixing things." Or, handy with a paintbrush = good at painting, etc. Having read this thread, looks like all of these are used by native speakers. But I guess "at hand" is the safest option, do you agree? I didn't have a screwdriver handy/ at hand / on hand / to hand so I couldn't tighten that up. Having read this thread, looks like all of these are used by native speakers. But I guess "at hand" is the safest option, do you agree? I didn't have a screwdriver handy/ at hand / on hand / to hand so I couldn't tighten that up. In this sentence I could say "on hand" or "at hand", or perhaps "to hand" but less likely so. I don't understand how you've reached that conclusion from reading this thread. I've just come across it most often and that's what I thought. But having read the Longman definitions, "to hand" and "handy" should work best in the screwdriver example. "At hand" seems to be used metaphorically, like in "There are a few good restaurants at hand here in Charles Street." I've just come across it most often and that's what I thought. But having read the Longman definitions, "to hand" and "handy" should work best in the screwdriver example. "At hand" seems to be used metaphorically, like in "There are a few good restaurants at hand here in Charles Street." Unfortunately, I think each sentence you make up could give vastly different results, and will depend on the speaker. It's about what sounds familiar and good to the ear. "There are a few good restaurants on hand here on Charles Street." All right. "There are a few good restaurants at hand here on Charles Street." Maybe... Or you could just avoid it all together. "Here on Charles Street, there are quite a few good restaurants available." A British person was not happy with a postbox that was erected in a street and asked in the comments to an article: "Anyone got a bulldozer to hand?" How would Americans put it? @Roxxxanne @kentix @elroy Anybody got a bulldozer handy? "to hand" is used here but not extremely commonly. And it would probably not be used for something like a bulldozer. Generally speaking, I've heard on hand, to hand, and at hand. But I'd use @Myridon's sentence if for some reason I needed the use of a bulldozer. A British person was not happy with a postbox that was erected in a street and asked in the comments to an article: "Anyone got a bulldozer to hand?" This is jocular, a question in search of a smile or a laugh: no one carries a bulldozer around with them. It's the kind of remark we BrE speakers make all day long in order to enliven the routine, if only a little. Anyone got a bulldozer handy? Yes, such a question can't be taken seriously. "To hand", although referring to bulldozers in this way makes no sense. 百度知道>提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了> - " would be used when someone wrote something up themselves (example, a will), and signed it; and -'Witnessed by my hand, " would be used when someone has drawn (written) something up, but a second person has signed it (eg a Certificate) But ah well, maybe it's an old convention. Some aspects of the legal convention has a long way to go to catch up with modern english. "Witness my hand and seal of said" ? Means the same as the first quote, except that they've added a seal in - normally something done by government departments, or people in official positions. Thank you. I see what you mean. "Firmato e autenticato dal sottoscritto" is in my opinion the best way to translate that. 百度知道>提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了> -