Is it appropriate to use the phrase 'critique on' something, in terms of a critical discussion on a certain topic or theory? Or should it always be critique of? For example: "The goal of this research project is to employ the theory Adam's Fallacy as put forward by Duncan Foley (2008) in his book Adam's Fallacy, by analyzing its application among critiques on Smith's fin factory model, situating it among contemporary critiques on capitalism, as well as showing the fallacy's significance in the modern corporate life." Is this correct? I am clear. Sir, I want to know that...... The books are................the bookshelf.(use preposition... in,at,on) Please tell me that which is the correct answer. and also want to know that is the use of " in the shelf" incorrect ? The books are ___ the bookshelf. (use preposition: in, at, on) Please tell me which is the correct answer. Is the use of "in the shelf" incorrect? Welcome to the forum, Indtr. A shelf is a singular, horizontal surface. Do you think you could put books in it? OK, a nuance but I think it makes sense: If you have a bookshelf that has multiple shelves and you put a book on the top of the bookshelf, that would be ON the bookshelf. If you put the book in one of the shelves, that would be IN the bookshelf. Something with multiple shelves is usually called a bookcase, with the shelves often enclosed with top and sides and sometimes a glass door. bookcase - WordReference.com Dictionary of English You can put a book on a single shelf, or you can put it in the bookcase or you can put it on top of the bookcase (that's not considered a shelf). Here's a bookcase with several shelves . I've been wondering, for quite some time, what the difference is between these three words and I hope you can aid me in this quest. Last edited: Jan 23, 2010 Hello Dubbidub - welcome to WordReference I don't use any of these a great deal. Innate seems to be more about people/creatures and qualities they are born with (the "nate" giveaway). I can't immediately think of inherent/intrinsic differences - I assume you've checked dictionaries and there's little point in quoting definitions. Have you thought to look in a dictionary? Hi Dubbidub - welcome from me too Try clicking the "in context" button on the entry for inherent etc in the WRF English definition dictionary. That'll take you (via Google News) to examples of the words in context. OK If something is inherent it is something essential or permanent. It has been and always will be a feature of whatever you are describing. If something is intrinsic, it's inherent. They are synonyms in their general meaning, and I had to struggle a bit to find sentences where you could not replace one with the other. Inherent also has a legal meaning, but intrinsic doesn't. Innate is a synonym for inborn and can mean natural. Its meaning overlaps the other two. As panjandrum suggested, it applies to animate rather than inanimate objects. Elections are an inherent feature of democracy Elections are an intrinsic feature of democracy But Elections are an innate feature of democracy Maternal care for the young is an innate characteristic of mammals. Nest-building is innate behaviour in birds. Nest-building is inherent behaviour in birds. Nest-building is inherent behaviour in birds. Nest-building is innate in the behaviour of birds Nest-building is inherent in the behaviour of birds Nest-building is intrinsic to the survival of birds. Nest-building is inherent to the survival of birds. But most of the for the birds arise from the sentence structure rather than the meaning. Others may disagree Sorry, I didn't mean to make you unwelcome. It just wasn't clear if you had looked in a dictionary. OK If something is inherent it is something essential or permanent. It has been and always will be a feature of whatever you are describing. If something is intrinsic, it's inherent. They are synonyms in their general meaning, and I had to struggle a bit to find sentences where you could not replace one with the other. Inherent also has a legal meaning, but intrinsic doesn't. Innate is a synonym for inborn and can mean natural. Its meaning overlaps the other two. As panjandrum suggested, it applies to animate rather than inanimate objects. Elections are an inherent feature of democracy Elections are an intrinsic feature of democracy But Elections are an innate feature of democracy Maternal care for the young is an innate characteristic of mammals. Nest-building is innate behaviour in birds. Nest-building is inherent behaviour in birds. Nest-building is inherent behaviour in birds. Nest-building is innate in the behaviour of birds Nest-building is inherent in the behaviour of birds Nest-building is intrinsic to the survival of birds. Nest-building is inherent to the survival of birds. But most of the for the birds arise from the sentence structure rather than the meaning. Others may disagree Sorry, I didn't mean to make you unwelcome. It just wasn't clear if you had looked in a dictionary. Thank you, I now thoroughly understand innate, but the difference between inherent and intrinsic still perplexes me a little bit. If there is any difference for me between inherent and intrinsic I would say that intrinsic has a connotation of being an essential component. In other words, if something that is intrinsic is removed, the thing from which it is removed is no longer quite itself. "Elections are an inherent feature of democracy" means, to me, that all democracies, wherever or however they are formed, include elections. "Elections are an intrinsic feature of democracy" means, to me, that an essential characteristic of democracies is the election process and that if it were removed you would lose a critical component of what makes a democracy a democracy. If there is any difference for me between inherent and intrinsic I would say that intrinsic has a connotation of being an essential component. In other words, if something that is intrinsic is removed, the thing from which it is removed is no longer quite itself. Thank you, I was sitting here trying to find a clear example of the difference in meaning in response to Dubbidub's last post and had just got to much the same point. I was thinking why intrinsic factor (something required for the absorption of vitamin B12) could not be called inherent factor - it is inherent in the process of absorption because it is there, but it is intrinsic because without it the process must fail. If there is any difference for me between inherent and intrinsic I would say that intrinsic has a connotation of being an essential component. In other words, if something that is intrinsic is removed, the thing from which it is removed is no longer quite itself. "Elections are an inherent feature of democracy" means, to me, that all democracies, wherever or however they are formed, include elections. "Elections are an intrinsic feature of democracy" means, to me, that an essential characteristic of democracies is the election process and that if it were removed you would lose a critical component of what makes a democracy a democracy. With this response, I believe the question has been resolved. Intrinsic means inner, but also essential, while inherent just means inborn in something with it's importance not being described. Inherent, to me, does not necessarily mean "inborn". It could be a constructed characteristic, such as a procedure that is inherently safe. It couldn't be called a procedure that is innately ("inborn") safe. I know inherent also applies to inanimate things, but inborn was the only word I could come up with. Thank you, I now thoroughly understand innate, but the difference between inherent and intrinsic still perplexes me a little bit. Inherent refers to a principle that underlies or is in a manifest pattern: an inherent tendency of a hot-headed person to lose control in tense situation. Intrinsic for the most part applies to fundamentals that underlie a larger design: Intrinsic weaknesses that make heating appliances fire hazards. Keep in mind that this response is aimed at your expressed perplexity on the difference between intrinsic and inherent. Other comments could very well be valid. warmblood - I don't see much difference between those two examples and could easily see them reversed. I really don't think there's any significant difference these days, even if one were to have existed a while ago. They have certainly merged and are used with inherent/intrinsically the same meaning. Looking at the etymology, one might suspect that intrinsic had a more physical or literal meaning (spatial location inside some object) while inherent seems to have started as conceptual, but clearly they are both used conceptually. an inherent tendency of a hot-headed person to lose control in tense situation. Intrinsic weaknesses that make heating appliances fire hazards. I'm afraid I must disagree with warmblood on that attempt to differentiate meanings. Those distinctions do not exist in the way the words have been used, in my experience, for at least 40 years. They also do not reflect the British English dictionary definitions. I agree with JulianStuart. Those are examples where either word could be used with exactly the same meaning. However, returning to the original question, you could also say that the hot-headed person had an innate tendency to lose control in tense situations I think the etymologies help distinguish between these words. I certainly think of them when I use them: Innate means inborn, i.e. not acquired. Inherent means stuck in, i.e. not easily removed. Intrinsic means inner; extrinsic means exterior (adj.) This would suggest that things which are innate can easily also be inherent (you can't remove them because they are stuck in) and intrinsic (not extrinsic). And also that some intrinsic qualities are neither inherent, because they may be removed, or innate, because acquired. From the OED. intrinsic: 1. a. Situated within; interior, inner, inner. Obs. (exc. as in b.) 2. a. Inward, internal (in fig. sense); secret, private. Obs. (passing into sense 3). 3. a. Belonging to the thing in itself, or by its very nature; inherent, essential, proper, 'of its own'. inherent 1. Sticking in; fixed, situated, or contained in something (in physical sense). Const. in, rarely: to. Now rare or Obs. 2. fig. Cleaving fast, remaining, or abiding in some thing or person; permanently indwelling. Now rare or Obs. 3. Existing in something as a permanent attribute or quality; forming an element, esp. a characteristic or essential element of something; belonging to the intrinsic nature of that which is spoken of; indwelling, intrinsic, essential. Two comments. Only definition #3, in each case, is current. Each includes the other in its definition. Intrinsic seems to connote a level of deepness or entanglement, whereas Inherent seems to involve continuation in a more linear direction. I encounter Intrinsic when reading physics and Inherent when reading psychology (behavioral, developmental, etc). Perhaps each word is Implicated in the other... All these qualities can apply at the same time. To illustrate this I will use an example of a fruit bowl. (i) A fruit bowl has an innate nature that it is a fruit bowl. It has been designed to be as such and most likely to be used for that purposes (ii) A fruit bowl is made of wood or glass or plastic is its extrinsic nature (iii) inherently a fruit bowl may be red, blue, clear; heavy or light; small or large. In this instance these qualities are inherited from design (innate) or materials (extrinsic) nature. (iv) A fruit bowl is intrinsically a bowl as such it can be used for other purposes than just fruit. What makes this aspect intrinsic is that it will always be a bowl regardless of other qualities Madhoo I think warmblood is onto something, as ConnieM verifies. The difference isn't really in the meaning of the words exactly, but in the contexts where they fall naturally. This may be more American usage and not be as differentiated in British English, though. I think I may finally be starting to grasp the distinction between intrinsic and inherent... I realize this may not be the most adequate use of intrinsic and inherent, but for the sake of highlighting their contrast: Take a Magnesium-24 atom for example, which consists of 12 protons, 12 neutrons, and 24 electrons. If one of its electrons are removed, it will still be Magnesium (albeit a positively-charged Magnesium ion), whereas if one of its protons were to be removed, it would become a Sodium atom, which is an entirely different element, and thus seize to be Magnesium. So could we say Magnesium's protons are intrinsic to it while its electrons inherent? Last edited: Jan 21, 2023 Welcome to the forum, ee81ds. I believe you are right. I don't think that example works. A property which is inherent is permanent and can't be removed. A property which is intrinsic exists because the object exists. Many properties are therefore both inherent and intrinsic. It's more a question of what we want to emphasise. A saw the headlines that at Las Vegas, at least 59 people were shot dead by the terror attack. I am really shocked by this evil event. Firstly, I want express my condolence for the loss of the nation and also I want to pay my homage to the persons who lost their lives. I am with the humidity and I stand by the U.S.A as a human being. Now my question is do the two sentences below carry the same meaning. Please clarify it. I am confused. 1. 59 people were shot dead. 2. 59 people were shot to death. Yes, they mean the same thing. After seeing such a title "Bodycam Shows Cops Shooting Man After Pointing Airsoft Gun at Them", do we know if the suspect was shot to death or just wounded with a bullet? So these interpretations are correct, right? Three people were shot in a car race early morning. (They might have been wounded or killed) There people were shot dead in a car race early morning. (They were killed) No, because the meaning of the first one depends entirely on context. Three people were shot in a car race early this morning. They are recovering in hospital. Three people were shot in a car race early this morning. A man has been charged with their murder. (The) were charged with murder. If so, does it make sense? If so, what would that mean? If so, what would that mean for people who were launching an assault, but it is rare. "Gunned down" is far more common. where multiple shots are fired simultaneously or in quick succession (from one or many guns). And how do I interpret this sign? Will they be shot to death or just injured with a bullet so as to prevent them from approaching an aircraft? I hope it doesn't mean shoot to kill, but it could mean that a well. Of course it means shoot to kill. Shooting intruders to wound them is a fantasy of film makers - firearms training concentrates on hitting the part of the body most likely to result in a stop. This is the sort of target the military uses for practice. The warning is addressed to 'inmates'. I sincerely hope the military doesn't shoot its prisoners dead. ☺ My point was that aiming to wound is not what soldiers or police are trained to do. We don't know where this sign came from and we do not know who the "inmates" are. No doubt zaffy will in due course remember to provide source, context and background. No doubt zaffy will in due course remember to provide source, context and background. Sorry. It's a screen from a series "Prison Break". The action of the series takes place in a prison. I have no doubt the prison guards would feel perfectly justified in shooting a prisoner attempting to get to a helicopter and would not worry in the slightest if the shot prisoner died. Will they be shot dead or just injured with a bullet so as to prevent them from approaching an aircraft? It doesn't say. It merely says they will be shot. As has been pointed out, being hit by a bullet fired from a trained person often results in death. Both injured and dead people have difficulty approaching aircraft, so it doesn't matter. You might be wondering why I'm asking but we have two different meanings in Polish so if I hear in the news things like "Three people have been shot and during a police raid", I never know whether they're dead or wounded. In Polish it would be clear right away. The whole point of the sign is to deter anyone from trying. The real message is "If you do this, you might very well die." If that's not enough to deter someone you don't know what else they might be willing to do so to stop you then any way you can. Three people have been shot dead during a police raid. If they want to make it specific, they can. Lots of times when people are shot they are rushed away in ambulances and a reporter at the scene wouldn't know the outcome. Lots of people with gunshots, even if they die, don't die right away. Three people have been shot dead during a police raid. If they want to make it specific, they can. Lots of times when people are shot they are rushed away in ambulances and a reporter at the scene wouldn't know the outcome. Lots of people with gunshots, even if they die, don't die right away. In English we add separate words for clarity. when details are known: shot, shot dead, shot and killed, shot and injured etc. So these two words equally good, right? Three people have been shot dead during a police raid. Three people have been shot and killed during a police raid. So these two words equally good, right? Three people have been shot dead during a police raid. Three people have been shot and killed during a police raid. We know equally well. Presumably you have a word (the root word?) for shot when the speaker does not know whether the victim was killed or just wounded? Presumably you have a word (the root word?) for shot when the speaker does not know whether the victim was killed or just wounded? No, we don't. You need to know in advance whether the victim is dead or wound due to a gunshot. In English, shot, in reference to a gun, means a bullet left the gun and touched some part of the person in question's body. It could have gone into their head and killed them, it could have gone into their chest without causing fatal injuries, it could have gone through the flesh on their arm (in and then out the other side) or it could have just grazed them so it did a little damage to a limited part of their skin. Those all qualify as being shot because the damage was caused by a bullet fired from a gun. Whether the person who was hit died is really a separate question. No, we don't. You need to know in advance whether the victim is dead or wound due to a gunshot. So how would a reporter send a story to his newspaper if he did not know if the victim died or not? Enquiring minds need to know So how would a reporter send a story to his newspaper if he did not know if the victim died or not? Enquiring minds need to know They would say three people were 'shot', and he would use the verb that meant shot but not killed. They would say three people were 'shot', and he would use the verb that meant shot but not killed. But if the reporter did not know - they might have been killed - you use one that specifically means "not killed" - now I'm confused again. Presumably you have a word (the root word?) for shot when the speaker does not know whether the victim was killed or just wounded? No, we don't. You need to know in advance whether the victim is dead or wounded due to a gunshot. But if the reporter did not know - they might have been killed - you use one that specifically means "not killed" - now I'm confused again. Yeah, you find it as confusing as we do English. I guess we simply first assume someone is alive, always a safer option. They might say "Three people were shot but it's not known yet if they survived" Yeah, you find it as confusing as we do English - adding words for clarity (rather than prefixes) when there isn't a single word that carries the complete meaning. In a U.S. newspaper you might see, "Three people were shot but no information on their condition has been released." Exactly. That's how the media here always refer to gunfire incidents. "A man was shot downtown on Friday night." Then "He was pronounced dead at the scene" or "he was taken to hospital with undisclosed injuries" or "he is recovering from non life threatening wounds in hospital" or etc. So we don't know whether the victim and the mother were shot to death or just wounded with a bullet, right? Except that I Googled the incident and there was a give-away in the headlines, so I knew that there were injuries but no fatalities. So this what I find weird and dislike about the use of the verb 'shot' in English. That YT footage was released now in July, so they knew very well the victims were just wounded. So why don't they make it clear right away in the headline if you all know the verb 'shot' is ambiguous or, at least, not clear enough. Or you don't realise it? Again, if that news report was in Polish, I would know right away if the victim and the mother were dead or not. Wouldn't it be easier to distinguish between "she was shot" (wounded) and "she was shot to death" (dead)? Last edited: Jul 13, 2021 I don't think it is ambiguous - it works the same way as "she was stabbed". It describes what happened. It does not give us the result of what happened (minor injury, major injury, or death). But you always get the rest of the details in the news report, not necessarily in the same sentence that described what happened. The gunman shot ten people. Four are in critical condition, three died at the scene, and a further three died in the hospital. To add to the "shot" ambiguity, it is also the verb of choice for taking photographs. The context suggests that the police officer survives the "shooting". The Newsday photographer shot the police officer in the act of handcuffing the suspect. Let's try it this way - "Shot" is about the fact that the result of "shooting at something" is "hitting it". It's not about the result of "hitting it". It's about the result of "hitting it". Again, if that news report was in Polish, I would know right away if the victim and the mother were dead or not. Again, if the reporter doesn't know, how can you know? And the point of a news headline is to grab your interest sufficiently to make you want to read the whole article - for example, to find out what happened to the person who was shot. We use words to match the message we want to convey. It is very easy to say that someone shot and killed someone else, as I have just done. There are other ways of saying the same thing, but "shot to death" is not one of them. People write and say things for all sorts of reasons. Perhaps person A fired a shot at person B, and the bullet grazed their ear. This isn't a very serious injury, but someone might well choose to say that A shot B to indicate that it was a very close thing to B being killed. Alternatively, someone else might say that A shot B to sensationalise the situation. In a different situation, perhaps person M fired a shot at person N and killed them. It is clear that N has been shot but it might not be clear to a speaker/writer that they were killed. Perhaps the writer or speaker knows that N is dead but does not want to reveal the fact at this stage. Perhaps the writer or speaker is more concerned that a shot was fired than whether the person was killed or not. It is very easy to say that someone shot and killed someone else, as I have just done. There are other ways of saying the same thing, but "shot to death" is not one of them. I agree. "Shot to death" isn't a phrase you'd see the media use. That wouldn't say "he was shot to death". I'd say "he was killed". But your context sentence does refer to reaching out: ...shot, stabbed or shot repeatedly until death. Stabbed to death conveys the same thing - stabbed multiple times until dead. Not stabbed once and died from one wound. And does this work? "He was shot and injured". We just don't see it as the role of the verb shot to give that information since in many situations it can't. When someone is shot it means a bullet hit them. That's really all it can mean since getting hit by a bullet has many potential outcomes. English is not an agglutinative language where you take a base word and merrily add prefixes and suffixes to refine meaning. You add words to refine meaning. It's a basic difference between language forms. English puts separate ideas in separate words and others them in a way to convey meaning. Word order is critical. In many other languages it's not very critical since the meaning comes from adapting the base words in different ways to mean the same thing no matter their position in the sentence. So in English shot means "hit with a bullet" (in the gun context) and nothing more fundamentally. There is no prefix or suffix available to express it. Last edited: Jul 13, 2021 He was shot, but the wound was superficial. He was treated at the scene and released. He was shot, but the wound was not critical He was transported to the hospital, treated and released. He was shot and the wound was critical; he later succumbed to his wound at the hospital. He was shot and declared dead at the scene. Say a murderer is being questioned. We know the victim was shot and killed. Died instantly. One bullet was enough. Any chance 'shot' would be used on its own? "Did the victim say anything before you shot him?" Or would 'killed' or 'shot and killed' be used? Slightly/very killed? That's like being a bit pregnant, Mr P. Say a murderer is being questioned. We know the victim was shot and killed. Died instantly. One bullet was enough. Any chance 'shot' would be used on its own? "Did the victim say anything before you shot him?" In that context, there is zero remaining ambiguity in the meaning. Page 2 Say a murderer is being questioned. We know the victim was shot and killed. Died instantly. One bullet was enough. Any chance 'shot' would be used on its own? "Did the victim say anything before you shot him?" Or would 'killed' or 'shot and killed' be used? In this context, the police person and the suspect would know the victim been killed, and so there's no need to mention it. And if he or she was, as you say the murderer, we know the victim died. so again there's no need to mention it. "Did the victim say anything before you shot him?" Or would 'killed' or 'shot and killed' be used? In this context, there is zero remaining ambiguity in the meaning. I grasped his hand and pulled him to safety. Figuratively, "grasp" can mean to understand. I read the maths book carefully but could not grasp how to solve quadratic equations. With regard to memory, I read the maths book carefully but could not grasp how to solve quadratic equations. With regard to memory, I would most likely use "recall" or "remember" rather than "grasp". But your context sentence does refer to reaching out: ...there are still some words out of reach, that you cannot grasp. So, I suppose grasp is appropriate here, in a figurative sense different from the usual figurative sense. Last edited: Jan 23, 2020 Usually, "grasp" in its literal meaning means to take hold of, especially in a critical situation such as rescuing someone. I grasped his hand and pulled him to safety. Figuratively, "grasp" can mean to understand. I read the maths book carefully but could not grasp how to solve quadratic equations. With regard to memory, I would most likely use "recall" or "remember" rather than "grasp". But your context sentence does refer to reaching out: ...there are still some words out of reach, that you cannot grasp. So, I suppose grasp is appropriate here, in a figurative sense different from the usual figurative sense. I searched the Internet and several dictionaries in order to find the meaning of "BS'ing", but I could'nt find anything. Can someone please help me? Thanks a lot, Macek34 Hi, macek, I'm not an AE speaker, so my answer may be unreliable, but I'll chuck it in anyway, as it may be a while before time zones gives us the natives. In BE 'BS' stands for 'bullshit' (which came to us from AE and means 'nonsense'. Used as a verb, it's often used to describe people who are lying. However, in the kind of friendly, non-judgmental context you've given, it can simply refer to what old fashioned people would describe as 'yarning' or 'telling tall tales'. Amongst younger people, it just means 'meaningless conversation that passes the time', eg chatting about nothing in particular, swapping anecdotes etc. The AE expression involving the sh*t' seems to mean much the same thing. I hope that works in your context. However, let's hope a native can come along and confirm it - or tell me gravely that I am speaking BS... Louisa Thank you Louisa, it's perfect and matches the general meaning of the document! Have a nice day, Macek Louisa's pretty much got it right, good work! To bullshit is to lie, invent things, tell tall tales... It means bullshitting Yes, but cursing is part of any language, and here we consider it a topic that is open for discussion. We cannot just pretend these words don't exist, they are part of English. BS Yes, but cursing is part of any language, and here we consider it a topic that is open for discussion. We cannot just pretend these words don't exist, they are part of English. That happens, I guess, in each language. Even linguists deal with such words. All of them. In many languages, even linguistic value is rather low. This is not so common, but I use it from time to time. You're quite correct about the second part, but as always it all depends on context. Of course. I was agreeing with Hockey about the one particular context. Thanks for clarifying things! I'm not bullshitting with your friends sounds like a natural social activity, though I would have expected it to involve conversation rather than playing video games or just sitting. But it would be unfortunate to leave the impression that bullshitting does not ever have the sense of telling tall tales. You're bullshitting me, for example, is a common expression meaning something like I think you are deliberately lying to me either with exaggerated stories or manipulatively. Cursing are very vulgar and I don't like it Alexia Cursing is a part of English whether you like it or not. Nobody I've met outside of the church-goingest church-goers would ever utter the phrase "bull poop." The "nicest" way to say this is "BS" which can be a noun or verb and the letters are pronounced...BeeEss. Incidentally, I also once heard someone dare use BS with its equivalent in the phonetic alphabet (Bravo Sierra). That person did not live that down for a very long time. I don't think the descriptions thus far have been quite on the money. Sitting around and bullshitting with one's friends essentially means to while away the time being unproductive. It is usually used by someone who is critical of a person sitting around and bullshitting with his friends. You could be chatting, you could be playing video games, you could be literally just sitting around, etc. I don't think the descriptions thus far have been quite on the money. Sitting around and bullshitting with one's friends essentially means to while away the time being unproductive. It is usually used by someone who is critical of a person sitting around and bullshitting with his friends. You could be chatting, you could be playing video games, you could be literally just sitting around, etc. I agree with this. I don't think it has to do with "telling tall tales." I agree with this. I don't think it has to do with "telling tall tales." I'm sure that's right in this context - sitting around bullshitting with your friends sounds like a natural social activity, though I would have expected it to involve conversation rather than playing video games or just sitting. But it would be unfortunate to leave the impression that bullshitting does not ever have the sense of telling tall tales. You're bullshitting me, for example, is a common expression meaning something like I think you are deliberately lying to me either with exaggerated stories or manipulatively. I'm sure that's right in this context - sitting around bullshitting with your friends sounds like a natural social activity, though I would have expected it to involve conversation rather than playing video games or just sitting. But it would be unfortunate to leave the impression that bullshitting does not ever have the sense of telling tall tales. You're bullshitting me, for example, is a common expression meaning something like I think you are deliberately lying to me either with exaggerated stories or manipulatively. Another great phrase that means pretty much the same thing is "shootin' the shit." This is as common, but I use it from time to time. You're quite correct about the second part, but as always it all depends on context. But would it be unfortunate to leave the impression that bullshitting does not ever have the sense of telling tall tales. You're bullshitting me, for example, is a common expression meaning something like I think you are deliberately lying to me either with exaggerated stories or manipulatively. Ah, the problems of "bad words". BSing, in my opinion, is just idle chatting. But BSing SOMEONE is something else. This is about deliberately misleading someone. Two difference meanings for one verb that may not officially exist. Cheer The AE expression 'shooting the sh*t' seems to mean much the same thing. I hope that works in your context. However, let's hope a native can come along and confirm it - or tell me gravely that I am speaking BS... Louisa Another great phrase that means pretty much the same thing is "shootin' the shit." This is not as common, but I use it from time to time. Thanks for confirming it, Hockey! Louisa Ok, I agree with you on this HOckey, in this context, bullshitting is basically shooting the shit or, as old-timers really say: "Shooting the breeze", which must be the idiom that gave rise to the more vulgar version. But as opposed to shooting the breeze, bullshitting does suggest some sort of "goofing-off" or talking about things that are not important, untrue, rumored to be, or bragging of some sort... as opposed to expounding on the theory of relativity. But your point is well-taken in this context, it is not just telling of tall tales. Cursing is a part of English whether you like it or not. Nobody I've met outside of the church-goingest church-goers would ever utter the phrase "bull poop." The "nicest" way to say this is "BS" which can be a noun or verb and the letters are pronounced...BeeEss. Incidentally, I also once heard someone dare use BS with its equivalent in the phonetic alphabet (Bravo Sierra). That person did not live that down for a very long time. I don't think the descriptions thus far have been quite on the money. Sitting around and bullshitting with one's friends essentially means to while away the time being unproductive. It is usually used by someone who is critical of a person sitting around and bullshitting with his friends. You could be chatting, you could be playing video games, you could be literally just sitting around, etc. 2# 发表于 2025-3-26 10:26 | 只看该作者 本帖最后由 于 2025-3-26 10:30 编辑 Critical Warning: This field indicates critical warnings for the state of the controller. Each bit corresponds to a critical warning type; multiple bits may be set. If a bit is cleared to '0', then that critical warning does not apply. Critical warnings may result in an asynchronous event notification to the host. Bits in this field represent the current associated state and are not persistent. Bit Definition 00: If set to '1', then the available spare space has fallen below the threshold. 01: If set to '1', then a temperature is above an over temperature threshold or below an under temperature threshold. 02: If set to '1', then the NVM subsystem reliability has been degraded due to significant media related errors or any internal error that degrades NVM subsystem reliability. 03: If set to '1', then the media has been placed in read only mode. 04: If set to '1', then the volatile memory backup device has failed. This field is only valid if the controller has a volatile memory backup solution. 07:05: Reserved source : ... smart_attribute.pdf 3# 发表于 2025-3-26 17:51 | 只看该作者 本帖最后由 于 2025-3-27 11:25 | 只看该作者 本帖最后由 于 2025-3-27 11:52 编辑 我自己没有一次不对让错误的页面 怎样怎样这样... 这个的准备和源相关 验证一下是不是这个字段的 用HWINFO可以查看超过着色温度和持续温度的时间 Which preposition is correct with "failure" as a name? EX: In case of failure to get the license, they will .... or In case of failure in getting the license, they will .... or In case of failure of getting the license, they will .. "Failure to get" sounds best, although all are grammatically correct. "Failure in" is very uncommon. In case of failure to get the license, they will .... - probably OK, but odd. or In case of failure of getting the license, they will .... In case of failure of getting the license, they will .. I assume the following sentence is correct: Thus, Failure in winning the license will .... to such case, we have to retrieve whatever we supplied and provided company X with and look for another area to transfer our operations too. According to the New Oxford Dictionary of English anaesthesia is the British spelling, while anesthesia is the American variant. Other dictionaries I referred to do not differentiate between the two words. So I wonder whether the Oxford Dictionary is correct in stating the above. Do native speakers make a distinction between both spellings? Thanks. I would spell it 'anaesthesia', but there are numerous words spelt differently in BE and AE. It's not a big deal. The WR Collins dictionary describes "anesthesia" as the usual US spelling of anaesthesia. The two WR Random House dictionaries list both spellings without qualification. I spell the word "anaesthesia". cross-posted - I agree with heypresto I was going to show off by promoting the spelling "anæsthesia", but apparently it's 'obsolete'. I'd spell it like that if I could be bothered to find a 'æ' somewhere. I'd happily bung one in 'encyclopædia' too. I'd spell it like that if I could be bothered to find a 'æ' somewhere. I'd happily bung one in 'encyclopædia' too. (I finally learnt about shortcuts on my iPad and when I type xxx it shows Θ a æ and I select the appropriate one. Learnt, spelt and bung are other examples of BE preferences) This is off the website of the Boston Children's Hospital (which is in the U.S.). It's about Doctor David Waisel, who was recently testifying in a legal case and how I found his name in a web search. Senior Associate in Perioperative Anesthesia, Department of Anesthesiology, Critical Care and Pain Medicine [at BCH] Associate Professor of Anaesthesia, Harvard Medical School If you go to the Boston Children's Hospital website you'll see they have a Department of Anesthesiology and if you go to Harvard Medical School's website you'll find they have a Department of Anaesthesia department for pediatrics. I think you're far more likely to see someone in the U.S. spell anaesthesia with an ae than you are ever to see anyone spell pediatrics that way. Another Brit who spells it anaesthesia. This is off the website of the Boston Children's Hospital (which is in the U.S.). It's about Doctor David Waisel, who was recently testifying in a legal case and how I found his name in a web search. Senior Associate in Perioperative Anesthesia, Department of Anesthesiology, Critical Care and Pain Medicine [at BCH] Associate Professor of Anaesthesia, Harvard Medical School If you go to the Boston Children's Hospital website you'll see they have a Department of to Harvard Medical School's website you'll find they have a Department for pediatrics. I think you're far more likely to see someone in the U.S. spell anaesthesia with an ae than you are ever to see anyone spell pediatrics that way. Harvard is definitely the one out of step in the US on that Just like anyone using pediatrics would be marked as AE Collins: paediatrics, chiefly us paediatrics /,pi:dɪ'ætrɪks/ Do native speakers make a distinction between both the two spellings? You mean "ae" vs. "e"? Not very much, in the US. Almost every English word with "ae" in it is a word from ancient Greek, which is one of the languages that scientists have used for many years. You see these words mostly in medicine. Changing "ae" to "e" is modern, so "ae" is more traditional. You sometimes see "æ" in English, instead of "ae", so there are 3 common spellings: "ae", "e", and "æ". Hi, Dear friends. Can you please explain the difference between "be prone to" and "be subject to"? While googling i got one result, Subject: Likely or prone to be affected by "These dates may be prone to changing." - So this means that there is uncertainty as to whether or not the dates could change. "These dates are subject to change." - Indicates that you know the dates could change, and that they might. Source: "Subject to Change" Usage But still i couldn't understand it well enough. Can you please write some similar examples sentences showing how using one rather than other would change the meaning? Regards. Subject to change is fine - it's more or less a set phrase. If you did use prone (I wouldn't!), it should also be prone to change, not "changing". Subject to change is fine - it's more or less a set phrase. If you did use prone (I wouldn't!), it should also be prone to change, not "changing". Thanks for reply. So can we use those words interchangeably? If so, when and when not ? They are not generally interchangeable, although they are in a few constructions/contexts. And I don't agree with the post you're quoting. As I implied, "prone to changing" is a very poor substitute for "subject to change" in a formal context. Sometimes either word might be used, but in most contexts only one works. Children, when infected, are somewhat less prone (= likely) than adults to infect others.He is prone (= tends) to jump to conclusions and is by nature highly critical. Strawberry plants are prone (= susceptible) to attack by a number of pests.Metal components are prone to corrosion. / Metal components may be subject to corrosion.She was prone/subject to headaches throughout her childhood. This type of income is subject (= liable) to tax at the higher rate. They are not generally interchangeable, although they are in a few constructions/contexts. And I don't agree with the post you're quoting. As I implied, "prone to changing" is a very poor substitute for "subject to change" in a formal context. Sometimes either word might be used, but in most contexts only one works. Children, when infected, are somewhat less prone (= likely) than adults to infect others.He is prone (= tends) to jump to conclusions and is by nature highly critical. Strawberry plants are prone (= susceptible) to attack by a number of pests. Metal components are prone to corrosion. / Metal components may be subject to corrosion.She was prone/subject to headaches throughout her childhood. This type of income is subject (= liable) to tax at the higher rate. This type of income is subject (= liable) to tax at the higher rate. Thanks Sir, for your great examples. But i am afraid i still couldn't get the point According to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Subject : ~ to sth likely to be affected by sth, especially sth bad: ◆Flights are subject to delay because of the fog. ◆ Smokers are more subject to heart attacks than non-smokers. Prone : ~ to sth / to do sth likely to suffer from sth or to do sth bad, ◆ Working without a break makes you more prone to error. ◆ Tired drivers were found to be particularly prone to ignore warning signs. Definitions are too close too make any distinction. Examples are too I think i need to come across to those terms in different contexts so many times, so that my brain will unconsciously learn to differentiate between two. Otherwise still i couldn't find any rules which help me seperate two in terms of their usage. Last edited: Oct 17, 2020 There is no cut-and-dried distinction between the two words, in that sometimes their possible usage overlaps, but usually it doesn't. If a rule applies to a certain person, that person is subject to, i.e. affected or bound by, that rule. (the word prone is irrelevant to this context) If someone tends to take offence at the slightest hint of criticism, they are prone to do that / prone to that behaviour. (the word subject can't express this – it would imply something done to them) But both mean the same when the context is being vulnerable/susceptible to some kind of attack (see examples in #4). There is no cut-and-dried distinction between the two words, in that sometimes their possible usage overlaps, but usually it doesn't. If a rule applies to a certain person, that person is subject to, i.e. affected or bound by, that rule. (the word prone is irrelevant to this context) If someone tends to take offence at the slightest hint of criticism, they are prone to do that / prone to that behaviour. (the word subject can't express this – it would imply something done to them) But both mean the same when the context is being vulnerable/susceptible to some kind of attack (see examples in #4). Thanks