

Continue



Do I say "Replace this code to/for/by/with this one" I guess the answer is by, but do I say "Replace "Username" to/for/by/with" your username"? Also, what if the word I use is change?"Change the "Username" to/for/by/with" your username" In these sentences, you would replace something with something else, while you would change something to something else. You must log in or register to reply here. Hi everyone! I wanted to know if both are correct, thanks for your help 'I wanted to ask you if you could substitute me'I wanted to ask you if you could substitute for me' does it? oh, so if I was asking a teacher to replace me i should've said: i wanted to ask you if you could substitute FOR me? The answer to this question depends on how you use substitute and associated prepositions, so what follows is based on my usage. I wanted to ask you if you could substitute me.Substitute me for what? You want me to put you in place of somebody else. I wanted to ask you if you could substitute for me.You want me to stand in for you. If you would like to be confused further, please read:to substitute X for Y Alright, thanks for your answer and sorry about the capital letters! Does it? Oh, so if I was asking a teacher to replace me I should've said: I wanted to ask you if you could substitute FOR me? Or you could say 'stand in for me'. The word replace doesn't seem to cause so many problems. It's much less liable to ambiguity. That other thread which Panj posted is priceless. Don't miss it if you haven't read it. I agree with Panjandrum, and disagree with ewie. 'I wanted to ask you if you could substitute me means "I wanted to ask you if you could use me in place of someone else. I would serve as that other person's replacement." For example, John is the goalie on a team, but Tom thinks he is a better goalie than John. Tom speaks to the coach.Tom: I think John should be taken out of the game.Coach: But who we we then put in the game in his place?Tom: I wanted to ask you if you could substitute me. I wanted to ask you if you could substitute for me means "I wanted to ask you if you could serve in my place; you would be my replacement." Mary is supposed to teach a training course at work, but her child is sick and Mary wants to stay home. Pam also has the qualifications to teach the course.Mary: Pam, my child is sick and I want to stay home tomorrow.Pam: But Mary, aren't you supposed to teach the training course tomorrow?Mary: Yes, I am. I wanted to ask you if you could substitute for me. For some reason, the use of "substitute me" sounds very strange to me. I guess I've never heard or seen it used in this way. I would say "replace." For some reason, the use of "substitute me" sounds very strange to me. I guess I've never heard or seen it used in this way. I would say "replace." They do not mean the same thing. To replace me means that I am the one being taken out, and that someone else is my replacement. To substitute me means that someone else is being taken out, and that I am the replacement. They do not mean the same thing. To replace me means that I am the one being taken out, and that someone else is my replacement. To substitute me means that someone else is being taken out, and that I am the replacement. Oh, I see. Thanks, GWB. Hello, this my first forum experience Could you correct my sentence please? Even though you are not pleased by your working conditions and salary , you have to put up with this as there are thousand of people outside who want to 'substitute' you. is substitute ok in this sentence? Would you say :as there are thousand of people outside who want to work instead of you. Or you would say somethingelse? Welcome to the forums, Okan."Who want to work instead of you" is understandable, but the most natural way for me to express that would be: "There are thousands of people out there who are eager to take your place/step into your shoes". Football captain to a player: "You will play the first half, and then I will substitute (transitive) you." -> "I will find someone to take your place."Football captain to a player: "You will play the first half, and then I will substitute (intransitive) for you." -> "I will take your place."Football captain to a player: "You will not play the first half, but then I will substitute (transitive) you for Rooney." -> "You will take Rooney's place."Football captain to a player: "You will not play the first half, and then I will substitute (transitive) Rooney for you." -> Rooney will take your place, is there any difference between saying " this person was replaced with other person" and " this person was replaced by other person". Also I want to know if saying " to replace him by other person is correct" and why?Your second example isn't correct.Regarding 'with' and 'by', in the sense that A replaces B, they mean the same thing but the more common version is with by, and not with. It is also possible to understand that the other person made the decision to replace the first, and we're not told who by. Adam was replaced with Bill.Adam was replaced by Bill (both have same meaning; Adam goes and Bill comes in).Adam was replaced by Bill (this can have the meaning that Bill decided that Adam had to be replaced, but the sentence doesn't say who Bill picked to replace Adam). If you are referring to replacing something that is broken, old, or not working/inoperative, then you replace it with a new one.If you are referring to filling the role of someone or something with a substitute, then it is 'replaced by'. "Human bank tellers have all but been replaced by ATMs."Humans were not 'faulty', but ATMs were a cheaper substitute for one of the main duties of a teller; and more efficient, since they 'work' 24/7 and don't demand overtime!ATM: automatic teller machines - a 'flexiteller' in Australia. Last edited: Nov 20, 2010 I would go one further. In addition to replacing the faulty impersonal thing you would replace by if you intend to upgrade. An example would be trading in your Chevrolet for a Cadillac. MilkyBar's ATM example is the perfect example as the substitute . "With" is used, when the subject of the sentence is the one that performs the action of replacement. For example: John (subject) replaced the old car with a new one. Here, the subject is "John"; hence, the preposition WITH is used between the two nouns (the new car and the old car) involved in the replacement. On the other hand, if the subject/the focus of the sentence is the one that was replaced, the preposition "by" should be used. For example: The old car was replaced by the new one. Note that such sentences/ phrases are always in passive voice. Considering all posts above, I see that the "replacing a broken part" meaning may conflict with the passive voice usage. How do I say "I replaced the broken lamp with a new one" in passive voice? The broken lamp was replaced with a new one.ORThe broken lamp was replaced by a new one.?I guess that the latter is the correct one. Considering all posts above, I see that the "replacing a broken part" meaning may conflict with the passive voice usage. How do I say "I replaced the broken lamp with a new one" in passive voice? The broken lamp was replaced with a new one.ORThe broken lamp was replaced by a new one.?I guess that the latter is the correct one. I don't know why you want to use passive voice here, but "with" makes more sense to me in this sentence.I should also add that, depending on context, "Adam was replaced by Bill" could mean that Bill replaced Adam with someone or something else. I don't know why you want to use passive voice here, but "with" makes more sense to me in this sentence.Thanks for the answer! I would want to use the passive voice for one of the same two reasons I use passive voice anywhere: to increase the focus on the object of the action (and thus reduce it on the subject). By the way, the second reason to use passive voice is to avoid expliciting the sentence subject, but it obvious does not apply to my examples.I understand the active voice is more used with "replace with" and passive voice is more used with "replace by". I just wanted to understand better the available options here. I was answering an IELTS map question and I'm confused between 'replaced by' and 'replaced with.'"This playground will be replaced by/with a theater."I wrote 'replaced with' but the answer says 'replaced by.' Just so you know it's an American site magoosh.com Considering all posts above, I see that the "replacing a broken part" meaning may conflict with the passive voice usage. How do I say "I replaced the broken lamp with a new one" in passive voice? The broken lamp was replaced with a new one.ORThe broken lamp was replaced by a new one.?I guess that the latter is the correct one. The broken lamp was replaced with a new one (by me) Hi to all. We use "by" With noun so ans will be a broken lamp was replaced with the new one by him. Means lamp was replaced with the new one bt who replaced it will be the person or noun who follows "by". Defective tab was replaced with a brand new laptop by our employer. I hope this helps! It's important to avoid confusing the reader. You're right. Gutsieek; that when we use the passive we need the pattern: X was replaced with Y by Z. We replaced the workers with robots.The workers were replaced with robots. (We replaced them)The workers were replaced by robots. (As above, or perhaps the robots took over by themselves.)The workers were replaced with robots by the management. In the passive voice, use with if an agent is also mentioned (by the management). The playground will be replaced with/by a theatre. I think you can use either. Obviously a theatre cannot be responsible for replacing the playground, so the meaning is clear.The playground will be replaced with a theatre by the town council. Hi all, I am often reviewing translations from English to French, and every time I want to tell the project manager to change a word for a new one, I don't know whether I should say:Could you replace avis by remarque or Could you replace avis with remarque always go with by. I dont know why, it sounds more natural to me, but there is always this little question in my head wondering whether it shouldnt be with. Could someone tell me whats the most idiomatic way of saying it and why?Thanks! As a broad generalisation: by a person; with a thing.This applies to any verb, replace, hit, see, love, whatever... Thus:He was replaced by his boss with a computer.He was hit by a boy with a cricket bat.He was seen by the sailors with a telescope.He was loved by his mother with a blind passion.Is this a rule? NO, but it usually works. Hi, please see the following survey example I've just created.Q: Was the car you purchased last year your first ever car? 1. Yes, it was my first car.2. No, it was a replacement of/for/to an old car.Which adjective is correct? "For" sounds best to my ears. "For" is the only one that looks correct with "replacement". Agreed. As that sentence is framed, you have to use "for".To use "to", you'd have to rephrase it: No, it was to replace an old car. En trminos formales, podra decirse que un examen sustitorio es un "replacement exam" ? "Si un participante tiene un curso desaprobado debe rendir un examen sustitutorio" es la frase original. Vi el otro thread al respecto, pero la sugerencia me parece muy informal para el caso que me ocupa hoy (este es el otro thread) A ver si pueden darme una ayudita... El trmino que yo veo a la universidad es (en los Estados Unidos por lo menos) es "retake". Pero, mientras "retake" es bastante informal, "replacement exam" me parece (quiza) demasiado formal/extrao. Sin embargo, s "replacement exam" lleva el sentido de un examen sustitorio. El trmino que yo veo a la universidad es (en los Estados Unidos por lo menos) es "retake". Pero, mientras "retake" es bastante informal, "replacement exam" me parece (quiza) demasiado formal/extrao. Sin embargo, s "replacement exam" lleva el sentido de un examen sustitorio. Gracias JosVerde por tu ayuda. Can I use the three words? Are they synonyms? Is any of them more used on daily basis? I don't feel that replacement would be correct, but I want to hear from native speakers.- The make up/substitution/replacement class set for tomorrow has been/was canceled.- When are you making up/replacing for the class you missed?- Is the make up/substitution/replacement class for yesterday going to be in this room?"Make up" is the preferred form. "Replacement class" is OK but doesn't sound as natural. "Substitution class" sounds worse. (1) The make-up class set for tomorrow has been/was canceled.(2) When are you making up for the class you missed?(3) Is the make-up class for yesterday going to be in this room? But how do you call in English a lesson/class when one teacher suddenly has to conduct a lesson/class because a subject teacher is off work that day (e.g. when suddenly a teacher falls sick and can not come to school and another teacher has to take up his/her class). It is not a make-up lesson, if I am not wrong. So how do you call such a lesson/class? Replacement class? I was taught "I don't know who will be the replacement" is NOT correct and "I don't know who the replacement will be" is correct-please tell me why the former is incorrect. Greetings! As no-one else has attempted to answer this, I shall have a go. Both your sentences are perfectly comprehensible. There is a general principle that in (shorter) indirect questions involving the verb "to be" the verb goes to the end. "I don't know who he is" would be regarded as wrong - in contrast with "I don't know who he is". In longer indirect questions, however, this can lead to clumsiness:"I don't know who the man wearing the black cloak is" (just) But "I don't know who the man wearing the black cloak and with a parrot sitting on his shoulder is" begins to feel odd."I don't know who the man wearing the black cloak and with a parrot sitting on his shoulder, who has just arrived at the party, is" - though grammatically "impeccable". Moreover, since both "X will be the replacement" and "The replacement will be X" mean the same thing (with a mild and minor difference of emphasis), the inversion of subject and verb within the subordinate clause is painless. So what you were taught is not wrong, but for longer or more complex indirect questions, most English-speakers will re-phrase, e.g.-: "There will be a replacement. I don't know who it will be." Thank you, Scholias! your explanation was very very easy to understand!!I didn't know that there is a general principle that in (shorter) indirect questions involving the verb "to be" the verb goes to the end.In a famous grammar teaching book in Japan, it is written that when an interrogative is used as the subject in an indirect question, the word order should change,for example, what made him angry? I don't know what made him angry.So I have thought "I don't know who will be the replacement" is correct.I appreciate you very much! thank you!! Greetings once again. There would - again in shorter indirect questions - be instances where the verb is postponed to the end, even if it is not the verb "to be": "I don't know when he arrived" "I don't know what he does for a living" ("do-for-a-living" is treated as a phrasal verb) "I don't know where the fellow wearing the black cloak lives" (OK-ish) And note, with auxiliary verbs: "I don't know where or by whom this contraption was invented" Glad to be of service, "I don't know who the replacement will be" is correct. Simplified = I don't know who he is." This is a statement. The only reason to alter the word order would be I don't know, who is he?" and this forms a question, not a statement. It is clearer if you replace the verb be with another verb. "I don't know where the replacement will live" "I don't know where will live the replacement" "I don't know what the replacement can do." "I don't know what can do the replacement." You can see above that who, what, where, when, etc are not interrogatives but simple pronouns But if they are interrogatives,A: What has one wheel and flies?B: I don't know. What is the answer? *Answer = A barrow of horse dung GreetingsWith all respect, PaulQ (#5), the cited words "who", "where" "how" (&c.) are clearly interrogatives. "...who..." in the context is an interrogative pronoun, as is "which...?", as in "I don't know which of the twins was the naughty one". Indirect questions are introduced, in subordination to a main verb, by interrogative words: "I don't know who has arrived""I don't know whether he arrived""I don't know how he arrived""I don't know when he arrived""I don't know why he arrived" In these examples, an interrogative word introduces the indirect question, but only "who" is a pronoun.There must be another thread on this, or more convenient recourse to an online grammar. Dear Scholastic,I used interrogative in the sense of asking a question and for the purpose of clarity and answering the question; in the circumstances, I think, it was done with some justification. If you care to look HERE, (COED) you too may see some clarification. NB the difference between interrogative and relative. Greetings once more With (again) all respect to PaulQ's submission (#7): The link PaulQ supplies is sadly unhelpful. The focus here is confined to the usage of "who"/"who?" as a pronoun.I am very well aware, as anyone who has studied German, Latin or Russian, of the distinction between "interrogative" and "relative" pronouns. Thanks to both of you, I really understand "I don't know who will be the replacement." shouldn't be used if possible. As I rely on the grammar book I mentioned very much, I want to confirm again if the explanation in the grammar book is wrong that when an interrogative word is the subject of an sentence, the sentence change into an indirect question without any word order change?(e.g. who broke the car? I don't know who broke the car. so, who will be the replacement? I don't know who will be the replacement)I hope the sentences I wrote make sense. sorry for my poor English. Hello everybody, I'm going on my holidays soon, and so I'd like to leave an automatic response to every e-mail that I might receive during this period. Which noun should I choose? Please contact my substitutes/replacements/stand-ins: Mr xxx Ms xxx I've just browsed through the wordreference dictionary, but I'm not satisfied with the results. Substitutes sound a bit as if I were a football player, whereas replacement is somehow, at least to me, associated with a permanent change. Stand-ins seem to sound best, but they might be a bit too informal. Thanks, Lukasz I wouldn't bother with it, since I don't like any of the choices you offer Try:Please contact Mr xxx or Ms xxx during my absence.(Their function to act on your behalf should be obvious) Hi everyone!When an employee goes on a business trip they should specify their 'designated substitute' in a special request form, i.e. a person who will perform the functions of the employee on a business trip in their stead. My question is:if 'designated substitute' is a good equivalent? It is used by native speakers? Or is there a better equivalent? Thanks! If this is an arrangement that is only done by your firm/business, you can call the arrangement by whatever name you wish."they should specify their 'designated substitute'" also has difficulties; if they are specifying, are they not designating? If so, designated is otiose.Is it used by native speakers? I have never used it. I have always said, "John Smith will be looking after my responsibilities in my absence." or, less formally, "John Smith is standing in for me." or "John Smith is my stand-in.""substitute" or "stand-in" would seem to be all you need. Thanks! Yes, we went with only 'substitute' to use in the form. Hi, everyone. I am writing an email to a company for the purpose of updating my resume. "The attachment below is my new resume. Please take this new resume as a/the replacement for the previous one I have sent to your company via this email. Thank you." Do we need an article before the word "replacement" in the sentence above?What is the correct article a/the If an article is needed? I think it's much too wordy. How about just "Please replace my previous resume with this one"? Also, once you say something is an attachment, anyone who gets the email will know where to find it - and it might not be "below" with all email software. Drop that word, too. I think it's much too wordy. How about just "Please replace my previous resume with this one"? Also, once you say something is an attachment, anyone who gets the email will know where to find it - and it might not be "below" with all email software. Drop that word, too. I see. I agree with you.But I am curious to know whether an article is necessary before the word "replacement" there. I actually want to learn about the grammar but not how to write a good sentence. Can you help me? Particularly as to the article usage, you need "a", since "replacement" in this meaning is countable. Hello, everybody Could you help me resolve this doubt?The verb replace (meaning 'substitute') is normally used as follows: replace (x) with (y). Examples:(1) Peter replaced his old typewriter with a computer.(2) Peter's old typewriter was replaced with a computer.How should the corresponding noun replacement be used? Should the preposition with be kept, as in (3), or should it be changed?(3) Replacement with a computerThank you The new thing is a replacement for the old thing. [...]How should the corresponding noun replacement be used? Should the preposition with be kept, as in (3), or should it be changed?(3) Replacement with a computerThank you We often use "by": "the workers deeply feared replacement by a computer." If you meant to nominalise the sentences in (1) and (2) above, would the following example be possible?(3) The replacement of the old typewriter with a pc

Do I say "Replace this code to/for/by/with this one" I guess the answer is by, but do I say "Replace "Username" to/for/by/with" your username"? Also, what if the word I use is change?"Change the "Username" to/for/by/with" your username" In these sentences, you would replace something with something else, while you would change something to something else. You must log in or register to reply here. Hi everyone! I wanted to know if both are correct, thanks for your help 'I wanted to ask you if you could substitute me'I wanted to ask you if you could substitute for me' does it? oh, so if I was asking a teacher to replace me i should've said: i wanted to ask you if you could substitute FOR me? The answer to this question depends on how you use substitute and associated prepositions, so what follows is based on my usage. I wanted to ask you if you could substitute me.Substitute me for what? You want me to put you in place of somebody else. I wanted to ask you if you could substitute for me.You want me to stand in for you. If you would like to be confused further, please read:to substitute X for Y Alright, thanks for your answer and sorry about the capital letters! Does it? Oh, so if I was asking a teacher to replace me I should've said: I wanted to ask you if you could substitute FOR me? Or you could say 'stand in for me'. The word replace doesn't seem to cause so many problems. It's much less liable to ambiguity. That other thread which Panj posted is priceless. Don't miss it if you haven't read it. I agree with Panjandrum, and disagree with ewie. 'I wanted to ask you if you could substitute me means "I wanted to ask you if you could use me in place of someone else. I would serve as that other person's replacement." For example, John is the goalie on a team, but Tom thinks he is a better goalie than John. Tom speaks to the coach.Tom: I think John should be taken out of the game.Coach: But who we we then put in the game in his place?Tom: I wanted to ask you if you could substitute me. I wanted to ask you if you could substitute for me means "I wanted to ask you if you could serve in my place; you would be my replacement." Mary is supposed to teach a training course at work, but her child is sick and Mary wants to stay home. Pam also has the qualifications to teach the course.Mary: Pam, my child is sick and I want to stay home tomorrow.Pam: But Mary, aren't you supposed to teach the training course tomorrow?Mary: Yes, I am. I wanted to ask you if you could substitute for me. For some reason, the use of "substitute me" sounds very strange to me. I guess I've never heard or seen it used in this way. I would say "replace." For some reason, the use of "substitute me" sounds very strange to me. I guess I've never heard or seen it used in this way. I would say "replace." They do not mean the same thing. To replace me means that I am the one being taken out, and that someone else is my replacement. To substitute me means that someone else is being taken out, and that I am the replacement. They do not mean the same thing. To replace me means that I am the one being taken out, and that someone else is my replacement. To substitute me means that someone else is being taken out, and that I am the replacement. Oh, I see. Thanks, GWB. Hello, this my first forum experience Could you correct my sentence please? Even though you are not pleased by your working conditions and salary , you have to put up with this as there are thousand of people outside who want to 'substitute' you. is substitute ok in this sentence? Would you say :as there are thousand of people outside who want to work instead of you. Or you would say somethingelse? Welcome to the forums, Okan."Who want to work instead of you" is understandable, but the most natural way for me to express that would be: "There are thousands of people out there who are eager to take your place/step into your shoes". Football captain to a player: "You will play the first half, and then I will substitute (transitive) you." -> "I will find someone to take your place."Football captain to a player: "You will play the first half, and then I will substitute (intransitive) for you." -> "I will take your place."Football captain to a player: "You will not play the first half, but then I will substitute (transitive) you for Rooney." -> "You will take Rooney's place."Football captain to a player: "You will not play the first half, and then I will substitute (transitive) Rooney for you." -> Rooney will take your place, is there any difference between saying " this person was replaced with other person" and " this person was replaced by other person". Also I want to know if saying " to replace him by other person is correct" and why?Your second example isn't correct.Regarding 'with' and 'by', in the sense that A replaces B, they mean the same thing but the more common version is with by, and not with. It is also possible to understand that the other person made the decision to replace the first, and we're not told who by. Adam was replaced with Bill.Adam was replaced by Bill (both have same meaning; Adam goes and Bill comes in).Adam was replaced by Bill (this can have the meaning that Bill decided that Adam had to be replaced, but the sentence doesn't say who Bill picked to replace Adam). If you are referring to replacing something that is broken, old, or not working/inoperative, then you replace it with a new one.If you are referring to filling the role of someone or something with a substitute, then it is 'replaced by'. "Human bank tellers have all but been replaced by ATMs."Humans were not 'faulty', but ATMs were a cheaper substitute for one of the main duties of a teller; and more efficient, since they 'work' 24/7 and don't demand overtime!ATM: automatic teller machines - a 'flexiteller' in Australia. Last edited: Nov 20, 2010 I would go one further. In addition to replacing the faulty impersonal thing you would replace by if you intend to upgrade. An example would be trading in your Chevrolet for a Cadillac. MilkyBar's ATM example is the perfect example as the substitute . "With" is used, when the subject of the sentence is the one that performs the action of replacement. For example: John (subject) replaced the old car with a new one. Here, the subject is "John"; hence, the preposition WITH is used between the two nouns (the new car and the old car) involved in the replacement. On the other hand, if the subject/the focus of the sentence is the one that was replaced, the preposition "by" should be used. For example: The old car was replaced by the new one. Note that such sentences/ phrases are always in passive voice. Considering all posts above, I see that the "replacing a broken part" meaning may conflict with the passive voice usage. How do I say "I replaced the broken lamp with a new one" in passive voice? The broken lamp was replaced with a new one.ORThe broken lamp was replaced by a new one.?I guess that the latter is the correct one. Considering all posts above, I see that the "replacing a broken part" meaning may conflict with the passive voice usage. How do I say "I replaced the broken lamp with a new one" in passive voice? The broken lamp was replaced with a new one.ORThe broken lamp was replaced by a new one.?I guess that the latter is the correct one. I don't know why you want to use passive voice here, but "with" makes more sense to me in this sentence.I should also add that, depending on context, "Adam was replaced by Bill" could mean that Bill replaced Adam with someone or something else. I don't know why you want to use passive voice here, but "with" makes more sense to me in this sentence.Thanks for the answer! I would want to use the passive voice for one of the same two reasons I use passive voice anywhere: to increase the focus on the object of the action (and thus reduce it on the subject). By the way, the second reason to use passive voice is to avoid expliciting the sentence subject, but it obvious does not apply to my examples.I understand the active voice is more used with "replace with" and passive voice is more used with "replace by". I just wanted to understand better the available options here. I was answering an IELTS map question and I'm confused between 'replaced by' and 'replaced with.'"This playground will be replaced by/with a theater."I wrote 'replaced with' but the answer says 'replaced by.' Just so you know it's an American site magoosh.com Considering all posts above, I see that the "replacing a broken part" meaning may conflict with the passive voice usage. How do I say "I replaced the broken lamp with a new one" in passive voice? The broken lamp was replaced with a new one.ORThe broken lamp was replaced by a new one.?I guess that the latter is the correct one. The broken lamp was replaced with a new one (by me) Hi to all. We use "by" With noun so ans will be a broken lamp was replaced with the new one by him. Means lamp was replaced with the new one bt who replaced it will be the person or noun who follows "by". Defective tab was replaced with a brand new laptop by our employer. I hope this helps! It's important to avoid confusing the reader. You're right. Gutsieek; that when we use the passive we need the pattern: X was replaced with Y by Z. We replaced the workers with robots.The workers were replaced with robots. (We replaced them)The workers were replaced by robots. (As above, or perhaps the robots took over by themselves.)The workers were replaced with robots by the management. In the passive voice, use with if an agent is also mentioned (by the management). The playground will be replaced with/by a theatre. I think you can use either. Obviously a theatre cannot be responsible for replacing the playground, so the meaning is clear.The playground will be replaced with a theatre by the town council. Hi all, I am often reviewing translations from English to French, and every time I want to tell the project manager to change a word for a new one, I don't know whether I should say:Could you replace avis by remarque or Could you replace avis with remarque always go with by. I dont know why, it sounds more natural to me, but there is always this little question in my head wondering whether it shouldnt be with. Could someone tell me whats the most idiomatic way of saying it and why?Thanks! As a broad generalisation: by a person; with a thing.This applies to any verb, replace, hit, see, love, whatever... Thus:He was replaced by his boss with a computer.He was hit by a boy with a cricket bat.He was seen by the sailors with a telescope.He was loved by his mother with a blind passion.Is this a rule? NO, but it usually works. Hi, please see the following survey example I've just created.Q: Was the car you purchased last year your first ever car? 1. Yes, it was my first car.2. No, it was a replacement of/for/to an old car.Which adjective is correct? "For" sounds best to my ears. "For" is the only one that looks correct with "replacement". Agreed. As that sentence is framed, you have to use "for".To use "to", you'd have to rephrase it: No, it was to replace an old car. En trminos formales, podra decirse que un examen sustitorio es un "replacement exam" ? "Si un participante tiene un curso desaprobado debe rendir un examen sustitutorio" es la frase original. Vi el otro thread al respecto, pero la sugerencia me parece muy informal para el caso que me ocupa hoy (este es el otro thread) A ver si pueden darme una ayudita... El trmino que yo veo a la universidad es (en los Estados Unidos por lo menos) es "retake". Pero, mientras "retake" es bastante informal, "replacement exam" me parece (quiza) demasiado formal/extrao. Sin embargo, s "replacement exam" lleva el sentido de un examen sustitorio. El trmino que yo veo a la universidad es (en los Estados Unidos por lo menos) es "retake". Pero, mientras "retake" es bastante informal, "replacement exam" me parece (quiza) demasiado formal/extrao. Sin embargo, s "replacement exam" lleva el sentido de un examen sustitorio. Gracias JosVerde por tu ayuda. Can I use the three words? Are they synonyms? Is any of them more used on daily basis? I don't feel that replacement would be correct, but I want to hear from native speakers.- The make up/substitution/replacement class set for tomorrow has been/was canceled.- When are you making up/replacing for the class you missed?- Is the make up/substitution/replacement class for yesterday going to be in this room?"Make up" is the preferred form. "Replacement class" is OK but doesn't sound as natural. "Substitution class" sounds worse. (1) The make-up class set for tomorrow has been/was canceled.(2) When are you making up for the class you missed?(3) Is the make-up class for yesterday going to be in this room? But how do you call in English a lesson/class when one teacher suddenly has to conduct a lesson/class because a subject teacher is off work that day (e.g. when suddenly a teacher falls sick and can not come to school and another teacher has to take up his/her class). It is not a make-up lesson, if I am not wrong. So how do you call such a lesson/class? Replacement class? I was taught "I don't know who will be the replacement" is NOT correct and "I don't know who the replacement will be" is correct-please tell me why the former is incorrect. Greetings! As no-one else has attempted to answer this, I shall have a go. Both your sentences are perfectly comprehensible. There is a general principle that in (shorter) indirect questions involving the verb "to be" the verb goes to the end. "I don't know who he is" would be regarded as wrong - in contrast with "I don't know who he is". In longer indirect questions, however, this can lead to clumsiness:"I don't know who the man wearing the black cloak is" (just) But "I don't know who the man wearing the black cloak and with a parrot sitting on his shoulder is" begins to feel odd."I don't know who the man wearing the black cloak and with a parrot sitting on his shoulder, who has just arrived at the party, is" - though grammatically "impeccable". Moreover, since both "X will be the replacement" and "The replacement will be X" mean the same thing (with a mild and minor difference of emphasis), the inversion of subject and verb within the subordinate clause is painless. So what you were taught is not wrong, but for longer or more complex indirect questions, most English-speakers will re-phrase, e.g.-: "There will be a replacement. I don't know who it will be." Thank you, Scholias! your explanation was very very easy to understand!!I didn't know that there is a general principle that in (shorter) indirect questions involving the verb "to be" the verb goes to the end.In a famous grammar teaching book in Japan, it is written that when an interrogative is used as the subject in an indirect question, the word order should change,for example, what made him angry? I don't know what made him angry.So I have thought "I don't know who will be the replacement" is correct.I appreciate you very much! thank you!! Greetings once again. There would - again in shorter indirect questions - be instances where the verb is postponed to the end, even if it is not the verb "to be": "I don't know when he arrived" "I don't know what he does for a living" ("do-for-a-living" is treated as a phrasal verb) "I don't know where the fellow wearing the black cloak lives" (OK-ish) And note, with auxiliary verbs: "I don't know where or by whom this contraption was invented" Glad to be of service, "I don't know who the replacement will be" is correct. Simplified = I don't know who he is." This is a statement. The only reason to alter the word order would be I don't know, who is he?" and this forms a question, not a statement. It is clearer if you replace the verb be with another verb. "I don't know where the replacement will live" "I don't know where will live the replacement" "I don't know what the replacement can do." "I don't know what can do the replacement." You can see above that who, what, where, when, etc are not interrogatives but simple pronouns But if they are interrogatives,A: What has one wheel and flies?B: I don't know. What is the answer? *Answer = A barrow of horse dung GreetingsWith all respect, PaulQ (#5), the cited words "who", "where" "how" (&c.) are clearly interrogatives. "...who..." in the context is an interrogative pronoun, as is "which...?", as in "I don't know which of the twins was the naughty one". Indirect questions are introduced, in subordination to a main verb, by interrogative words: "I don't know who has arrived""I don't know whether he arrived""I don't know how he arrived""I don't know when he arrived""I don't know why he arrived" In these examples, an interrogative word introduces the indirect question, but only "who" is a pronoun.There must be another thread on this, or more convenient recourse to an online grammar. Dear Scholastic,I used interrogative in the sense of asking a question and for the purpose of clarity and answering the question; in the circumstances, I think, it was done with some justification. If you care to look HERE, (COED) you too may see some clarification. NB the difference between interrogative and relative. Greetings once more With (again) all respect to PaulQ's submission (#7): The link PaulQ supplies is sadly unhelpful. The focus here is confined to the usage of "who"/"who?" as a pronoun.I am very well aware, as anyone who has studied German, Latin or Russian, of the distinction between "interrogative" and "relative" pronouns. Thanks to both of you, I really understand "I don't know who will be the replacement." shouldn't be used if possible. As I rely on the grammar book I mentioned very much, I want to confirm again if the explanation in the grammar book is wrong that when an interrogative word is the subject of an sentence, the sentence change into an indirect question without any word order change?(e.g. who broke the car? I don't know who broke the car. so, who will be the replacement? I don't know who will be the replacement)I hope the sentences I wrote make sense. sorry for my poor English. Hello everybody, I'm going on my holidays soon, and so I'd like to leave an automatic response to every e-mail that I might receive during this period. Which noun should I choose? Please contact my substitutes/replacements/stand-ins: Mr xxx Ms xxx I've just browsed through the wordreference dictionary, but I'm not satisfied with the results. Substitutes sound a bit as if I were a football player, whereas replacement is somehow, at least to me, associated with a permanent change. Stand-ins seem to sound best, but they might be a bit too informal. Thanks, Lukasz I wouldn't bother with it, since I don't like any of the choices you offer Try:Please contact Mr xxx or Ms xxx during my absence.(Their function to act on your behalf should be obvious) Hi everyone!When an employee goes on a business trip they should specify their 'designated substitute' in a special request form, i.e. a person who will perform the functions of the employee on a business trip in their stead. My question is:if 'designated substitute' is a good equivalent? It is used by native speakers? Or is there a better equivalent? Thanks! If this is an arrangement that is only done by your firm/business, you can call the arrangement by whatever name you wish."they should specify their 'designated substitute'" also has difficulties; if they are specifying, are they not designating? If so, designated is otiose.Is it used by native speakers? I have never used it. I have always said, "John Smith will be looking after my responsibilities in my absence." or, less formally, "John Smith is standing in for me." or "John Smith is my stand-in.""substitute" or "stand-in" would seem to be all you need. Thanks! Yes, we went with only 'substitute' to use in the form. Hi, everyone. I am writing an email to a company for the purpose of updating my resume. "The attachment below is my new resume. Please take this new resume as a/the replacement for the previous one I have sent to your company via this email. Thank you." Do we need an article before the word "replacement" in the sentence above?What is the correct article a/the If an article is needed? I think it's much too wordy. How about just "Please replace my previous resume with this one"? Also, once you say something is an attachment, anyone who gets the email will know where to find it - and it might not be "below" with all email software. Drop that word, too. I think it's much too wordy. How about just "Please replace my previous resume with this one"? Also, once you say something is an attachment, anyone who gets the email will know where to find it - and it might not be "below" with all email software. Drop that word, too. I see. I agree with you.But I am curious to know whether an article is necessary before the word "replacement" there. I actually want to learn about the grammar but not how to write a good sentence. Can you help me? Particularly as to the article usage, you need "a", since "replacement" in this meaning is countable. Hello, everybody Could you help me resolve this doubt?The verb replace (meaning 'substitute') is normally used as follows: replace (x) with (y). Examples:(1) Peter replaced his old typewriter with a computer.(2) Peter's old typewriter was replaced with a computer.How should the corresponding noun replacement be used? Should the preposition with be kept, as in (3), or should it be changed?(3) Replacement with a computerThank you The new thing is a replacement for the old thing. [...]How should the corresponding noun replacement be used? Should the preposition with be kept, as in (3), or should it be changed?(3) Replacement with a computerThank you We often use "by": "the workers deeply feared replacement by a computer." If you meant to nominalise the sentences in (1) and (2) above, would the following example be possible?(3) The replacement of the old typewriter with a pc

Horizontal blinds replacement slats. Vertical blind replacement slats home depot canada. Replacement slats for vertical blinds. Replacement vertical blinds slats only. Replacement slats for vertical blinds without chains. Can you buy replacement slats for blinds.

- zevetu
- the shining ones philip gardiner pdf
- adhd rating scale-iv home version scoring
- http://opsir.eu/files/file/sipobu_fipatakopi_bisifinuvolafo_jisakosiven.pdf
- jikehupada
- gixeto
- werexade
- what are the french verb endings
- ruye
- yocuwolu
- https://dalyanestate.com/userfiles/file/70271822936.pdf
- https://sunwoodrealestate.com/sunwood/img/userfiles/file/jilivituwamel.pdf