Click Here

Hello natives and nonnatives, "English Grammar in Use" by Raymond Murphy: We use afraid to do for things we do intentionally; we can choose to do them or not; because it is dangerous or the result could be bad. I am afraid of something happening = it is possible that something bad will happen (for example, an accident). We do not use afraid of -ing for things we do intentionally. So, You are afraid to do something because you are afraid of something happening as a result: I was afraid to go near the dog because I was afraid of being bitten. (not "afraid to be bitten") "Practical English Usage" by Michael Swan: To talk about fear of things that happen accidentally, we prefer afraid of+ -ing: Why are you so quiet? ~I'm afraid of waking the children. In other cases we can use afraid of+ -ing or afraid + infnitive with no difference of meaning: I'm not afraid of telling/to tell her the truth. So: They both agree that afraid of+ -ing is used to talk about (bad) things which are possible to happen: The path was slippery. We were afraid of falling. But Raymond Murphy didn't mention that afraid of+ -ing could be used in situations other than possible ones. In other words, Raymond's last sentence could be edited by Michael in this way: You are afraid to do/ of doing something because you are afraid of something happening as a result. I agree with Michael; What do you say? Last edited: Jun 18, 2013 I think Raymond's comments are helpful for most learners in most situations, but Michael adds a level of detail that does reflect how real people speak. Prepositions can often be swapped around, until you meet an example where native speakers will unite in saying, 'oh no, we don't say that!' Really?!! Thank you, suzi. In basic terms: Afraid of [noun, gerund, noun phrase] Afraid to [verb] Thanks Paul, but I asked about the usage (meaning) of afraid of [gerund] and afraid to [verb]. Last edited: Jun 18, 2013 The path was slippery. We were afraid to fall. Is the correct? Hello Nowrinsh - welcome to the forums! We were afraid to fall would mean We planned to fall, but we were worried about the results of that planned action. What you need in your context is We were afraid of falling. Last edited: Nov 30, 2019 A: Let's take a plane B: No, I'm afraid of flying/to fly. Are they interchangelble in this context? So in what context would you use the other one? Hello natives and nonnatives, "English Grammar in Use" by Raymond Murphy: We use afraid to do for things we do intentionally; we can choose to do them or not; because it is dangerous or the result could be bad. I am afraid of something happening = it is possible that something bad will happen (for example, an accident). We do not use afraid of -ing for things we do intentionally. So, You are afraid to do something because you are afraid of something happening as a result: I was afraid to go near the dog because I was afraid of being bitten. (not "afraid to be bitten") Maybe a better way to look at this (natives please correct me if I'm wrong) is that the thing or consequence you're afraid of is expressed through the gerund and the infinitive only expresses an action that could lead to that thing. So to take the same example as Murphy gave: "I was [too] afraid [of being bitten] to go near the dog." I don't know if that makes any sense to you, but that's how I see it. Not for me. I could only use "of flying". Similarly, I'd say I'm afraid of flying if I just felt uncomfortable on a plane, but if I were a pilot and a storm was forecast, I'd say I'm afraid to fly right now. Last edited: Oct 31, 2020 And if someone is afraid of Covid vaccination, does either work? I've been told you are afraid to get vaccinated? Is that true? I've been told you are afraid of getting vaccinated? Is that true? I would say “to get.” I think @hamlet’s post is spot on. To sum up, is it correct that: you use to be afraid to do sth when emphasis is put on the possibility of executing a specific action which causes you to feel fear, while you use to be afraid of -ing when you are talking about a general thing (action) you fear? E.g. : I'm afraid of flying (I fear boarding a plane and travelling by it) vs. I am afraid to fly that battered helicopter (I have the possibility and the knowledge to do it, but the helicopter's very bad condition makes me fear doing it). This explanation suits the vaccine example (it's up to you to get vaccinated or not) as well. And if someone is afraid of Covid vaccination, does either work? I've been told you are afraid to get vaccinated? Is that true? I've been told you are afraid of getting vaccinated? Is that true? I think both are fine. But you would find people use the infinitive version a bit more. The other version is also in use. And if someone is afraid of Covid vaccination, does either work? I've been told you are afraid to get vaccinated? Is that true? I've been told you are afraid of getting vaccinated? Is that true? "Afraid of getting vaccinating" suggests to me that someone's going to vaccinate you forcibly againt your will. You should never be afraid to tell the truth. You should never be afraid of telling the truth. I guess the first works, right? And does the second sound like telling the truth might hurt that person and thus they are afraid of it? You should never be afraid to tell the truth. You should never be afraid of telling the truth. I guess the first works, right? And does the second sound like telling the truth might hurt that person and thus they are afraid of it? Well, sticking to my rule, I'd go for the second one since it seems you are expressing a general statement. If you were to tell the truth in a specific situation that may hurt or contrast somebody, in that case I would go for the first one (so without saying "never"). But this is how I interpret it, I'm not a native speaker. Can you please let me know why you wouldn't use "to fly" in this situation? As is often the case, all I can answer is: "Because I've never used it and never heard the people around me using it." I can't quote a "rule" because we're not taught rules about this type of thing. As is often the case, all I can answer is: "Because I've never used it and never heard the people around me using it." I can't quote a "rule" because we're not taught rules about this type of thing. Thanks a lot. Can you please see this situation? I am in a car. I have to get to the airport. The road is busy. I'm afraid to miss/of missing the flight. Which one would be correct here, please? Re. #21 I would use "of missing" there. In the movie The Lighthouse (2019), Willem Dafoe's character said this when making a toast: "Should pale death, with treble dread, make the ocean caves our bed, God who hears the surges roll deign to save our suppliant soul." I have a vague idea what it means but I'm not 100% sure. Can somebody enlighten me on this? Thank you! It would be helpful if you would explain which parts are confusing you. You're asking about a total of four lines of verse, and we don't want to spend time explaining things you already understand. It would be helpful if you would explain which parts are confusing you. You're asking about a total of four lines of verse, and we don't want to spend time explaining things you already understand. I actually don't understand the whole thing. I think "...God who hears the surges roll deign to save our suppliant soul." means he hopes that God will help him when desperate times come. I understand it to mean that if we die we hope God will save our souls. Imagine commas before 'who' and after 'surges roll'. The speaker is asking for God to save his soul if he dies by drowning. If a horrible death sends our bodies to the ocean floor -- that is, if we drown -- then (addressing God) God, who is aware of the storm, save our souls, we beg you. I haven't seen the movie, so I may be misinterpreting this. It's a poem so it must have the requisite number of syllables in each line with rhymes. I would say that "who hears the surges roll" is sort of a "filler" (as really most of it is). God, being ubiquitous and omniscient, hears all the ocean waves and thus everything that happens at sea such as drownings. The thought is just: If I drown, I hope God takes my soul. Now I need to convert that into 28 syllables with 2 rhymes. All the dialogues in the film have a vaguely Shakespearean feel to them. This is a slightly changed version of the last verse of a poem by Lydia Sigourney, published in 1845, as part of a book of sea-related poetry called The Sea and the Sailor (although a later edition was published as Poems for the Sea.) The full poem may be read here: Poems for the Sea/Hymn at Parting - Wikisource, the free online library Each stanza of the poem asks God to help sailors in different situations. The final situation is death: the ship has been lost at sea, and everyone on it has drowned. Instead of being buried, the sailor's bodies lie on the ocean floor. The poet asks that even in that situation God will deign (look the word up if you don't know it...) to save the souls of those who pray to God for mercy ("suppliant soul.") Last edited: Jan 12, 2020 This is a slightly changed version of the last verse of a poem by Lydia Sigourney, published in 1845, as part of a book of sea-related poetry called The Sea and the Sailor. The full poem may be read here: Poems for the Sea/Hymn at Parting - Wikisource, the free online library Each stanza of the poem asks God to help sailors in different situations. The final situation is death: the ship has been lost at sea, and everyone on it has drowned. Instead of being buried, the sailor's bodies lie on the ocean floor. The poet asks that even in that situation God will deign (look the word up if you don't know it...) to save the souls of those who pray to God for mercy ("suppliant soul.") Now how did you know that? How did you happen to know of Sigourney? This is a slightly changed version of the last verse of a poem by Lydia Sigourney, published in 1845, as part of a book of sea-related poetry called The Sea and the Sailor. The full poem may be read here: Poems for the Sea/Hymn at Parting - Wikisource, the free online library Each stanza of the poem asks God to help sailors in different situations. The final situation is death: the ship has been lost at sea, and everyone on it has drowned. Instead of being buried, the sailor's bodies lie on the ocean floor. The poet asks that even in that situation God will deign (look the word up if you don't know it...) to save the souls of those who pray to God for mercy ("suppliant soul.") Great research! I Googled but couldn't find this, though I suspected a 19th century source. This verse follows the pattern of the ubiquitous children's prayer Now I lay me down to sleep I pray the Lord my soul to keep. If I die before I wake, I pray the Lord my soul to take. It's a standard prayer format. I am curious about the dialogue, if you say vaguely Shakespearean plus 19th century plus ocean adventure, it has to be filtered by through Moby Dick as well. "But doesn't everyone know about Sigourney?" To which I would have replied, "Yes, wasn't she the woman in "Alien"?" God, who hears the surges roll, - who hears the sea move deign to save - condescend (subjunctive) to save our suppliant soul." - our soul which prays for that salvation humbly and earnestly I like Collins, here: deign /deɪn/ vb (intransitive) to think it fit Wow, thank you everyone, I got it now! Hi everyone, I have the same question as aids4sale, but how about the first part: "Should pale death, with treble dread, make the ocean caves our bed" what do it mean by "Ocean caves our bed" or should i say what do the whole sentence mean by should pale death with treble dread, make the ocean caves our bed? To make (cause) the place where we sleep (our bed) to be ocean caves (underwater). To make ocean caves our bed = To make our bed be ocean caves. , but how about the first part: "Should pale death, with treble dread, make the ocean caves our bed" Note that the original line is "Should pale death with arrow dread/ Make the ocean caves our bed/ Though no eye of love might see/ Where that shrouded grave shall be,/ Thou! who hear'st the surges roll,/ Deign to save the suppliant soul." The concept of death is personified here as a pale warrior who kills us with an arrow. Death and sleep are often compared to each other, and the poet here is comparing death to an eternal sleep, and graves to a bed. In this case, the sailors have drowned at sea, and instead of being buried in graves on land where those who love them can see and visit their graves, the "bed" for their eternal sleep is the unseen floor of the ocean, and ocean caves. In old sailors songs and poems about the sea it's very common to refer to drowning as sleeping in a watery grave, sleeping on the bed of the ocean, sleep in a sailors grave, etc. Hola: ¿Qué diferencia hay, por ejemplo, entre estas dos frases? Si las traducimos a español, ¿en qué cambia el significado? Quizá no sean el mejor ejemplo para explicar las dieferencias de las formas advise to + infinitive / -ing. ¿Qué opináis? Your doctor advised giving up smoking. Your doctor advised you to give up smoking. Gracias. Thank you. La diferencia radica en la aparición o ausencia del "object". Cambia en que "advise + -ing" es un consejo generalizado, a nadie en particular; en cambio, "advise + object + infinitive" va dirigido a un destinatario en concreto ('you' en tu ejemplo). Tu primera frase quedaría mejor, quizá, así: Doctors advise giving up smoking. Ah, vale, vale. Ahora lo veo. Gracias!! Agró has given you a good answer, but I'll add that a third option is to use a subjunctive clause: Your doctor advised that you give up smoking. Gracias por el añadido, Agró. Agró has given you a good answer, but I'll add that a third option is to use a subjunctive clause: Your doctor advised you that you give up smoking. Gengo, don't you add an object? Then, how do you translate? ¿Tu médico aconsejó que dejes (?) de fumar? Gracias por el añadido, Agró. Gengo, don't you add an object? Then, how do you translate? ¿Tu médico aconsejó que dejes (?) de fumar? No, ese infinitivo "give" es en realidad un subjuntivo. Aplica la concordancia a la que obliga el verbo principal y tachán: Tu médico te aconsejó que dejaras de fumar. La diferencia radica en la aparición o ausencia del "object". Cambia en que "advise + -ing" es un consejo generalizado, a nadie en particular; en cambio, "advise + object + infinitive" va dirigido a un destinatario en concreto ('you' en tu ejemplo). Tu primera frase quedaría mejor, quizá, así: Doctors advise giving up smoking. "Your doctor advised giving up smoking" is perfectly fine, and would usually be understood to mean the same as "Your doctor advised you to give up smoking." It's not a general statement about what doctors say to all of their patients; the object ("you") is implied. The doctor advises that you give up smoking. It can't be known from this sentence whether he says this to you or about you. To make it clear that he said it to you a theoretical construction is the doctor advises to you that he give up smoking but this isn't really idiomatic and so I don't recommend it. The doctor advises that you give up smoking. It can't be known from this sentence whether he says this to you or about you. To make it clear that he said it to you a theoretical construction is the doctor advises to you that he give up smoking but this isn't really idiomatic and so I don't recommend it. "Advises to you" wouldn't be correct at all. For a third person you might say "your doctor advises you that your son should quit smoking." Tu médico te aconsejó que dejaras de fumar. Yes, and notice that while the past subjunctive is used in Spanish, there is no past subjunctive in English, so it stays the same (give). The doctor advised that you/he/I/they/we give up smoking. The doctor advises that you/he/I/they/we give up smoking. No, ese infinitivo "give" es en realidad un subjuntivo. Aplica la concordancia a la que obliga el verbo principal y tachán: Tu médico te aconsejó que dejaras de fumar. Yes, and notice that while the past subjunctive is used in Spanish, there is no past subjunctive in English, so it stays the same (give). The doctor advised that you/he/I/they/we give up smoking. The doctor advises that you/he/I/they/we give up smoking. Gracias. Es que con el subjuntivo me lío y no sé bien cuándo usar el verbo en inglés en pasado para que se vea la correspondencia con el pretérito imperfecto de subjuntivo español. "Your doctor advised giving up smoking" is perfectly fine, and would usually be understood to mean the same as "Your doctor advised you to give up smoking." It's not a general statement about what doctors say to all of their patients; the object ("you") is implied. Respecto a eso Chris K, es por ello que decía que quizá no fuera el mejor ejemplo. El determinante inicial confunde un poco. ¿Queda mejor expuesta la diferencia con estos otros ejemplos? Authorities advise staying at home during the storm. Authorities advise people to stay at home during the storm. ¿Queda mejor expuesta la diferencia con estos otros ejemplos? Authorities advise staying at home during the storm. Authorities advise people to stay at home during the storm. Yes, in that case, the first one is a general statement to no one in particular. But then, so is the second. Also: Authorities advise that people stay at home during the storm. I see, thank you. Hi, also is correct Authorities advise to stay at home during the storm.? 1."what a heavy rain!" 2."What heavy rain!" My question is "Are they both ok ?""Which one is better " Your help is greatly appreciated. No.2 is correct. The first one is not wrong, but a most unusual way of saying "What a heavy rainfall!" Thank you Keith! I like your answer .😄 I suppose it's because 'rain' is an uncountable noun in European weather, but even the tropical sort of 'rains' must be uncountable. So we don't talk about 'a rain'. We do say 'it's a hot day', because 'day' is countable. 1."what a heavy rain!" 2."What heavy rain!" My question is "Are they both ok ?""Which one is better " Your help is greatly appreciated. When you put an article, "a" before rain, then it seems to be referring to the rain as an event which took place and ended. It was a heavy rain we had yesterday, or this morning, or just now. Without the article, "what heavy rain" sounds to me like an exclamation you would make while the rain was occurring. When you put an article, "a" before rain, then it seems to be referring to the rain as an event which took place and ended. It was a heavy rain we had yesterday, or this morning, or just now. Without the article, "what heavy rain" sounds to me like an exclamation you would make while the rain was occurring. That's another facet. I can feel something subtle from your explanation .Thank you. When you put an article, "a" before rain, then it seems to be referring to the rain as an event which took place and ended. It was a heavy rain we had yesterday, or this morning, or just now. Without the article, "what heavy rain" sounds to me like an exclamation you would make while the rain was occurring. In that case ,I think "rain" is countable. If refers to a past event. Am I right ? I suppose it's because 'rain' is an uncountable noun in European weather, but even the tropical sort of 'rains' must be uncountable. So we don't talk about 'a rain'. We do say 'it's a hot day', because 'day' is countable. Thank you for your reply. I would interpret it as The first sentence is wrong as rain is uncountable . When you put an article, "a" before rain, then it seems to be referring to the rain as an event which took place and ended. It was a heavy rain we had yesterday, or this morning, or just now. Without the article, "what heavy rain" sounds to me like an exclamation you would make while the rain was occurring. That doesn't match my experience but it might be more common in tropical climates where "a rain" = a monsoon storm. I don't see the kind of distinction that Will is making between past and present tense. In that case ,I think "rain" is countable. If refers to a past event. Am I right ? I believe so. As in, "We only had three heavy rains this season. That's not bad." Or, "How many rains did you have last week?" In fact, I am not certain, you could also say, "What a heavy rain this turned out to be" and be commenting on a rain event as it was occurring just as well as "What heavy rain this turned out to be." It would be more common to say, "What a heavy rainfall this is." or "What a heavy rainstorm". Using the definite article "the" you can say "The rain is very heavy" too. Or, "the rain last week was very heavy." And now that I am thinking of it I must admit you could also say "What heavy rain we had last week," referring to a past event. And the plural, "what heavy rains we had last week." I am not a grammarian. I give up! Thank you very much for going this far. I enjoy reading it. Thank you for your take on it. Keith That doesn't match my experience but it might be more common in tropical climates where "a rain" = a monsoon storm. I don't see the kind of distinction that Will is making between past and present tense. yeah, i was thinking the same thing, about tropical clients. i almost wrote an example using the phrase "monsoon season". Thank you very much for going this far. I enjoy reading it. for some reason i really enjoy this forum. look in on it for a moment of recreation from time to time. who knew that grammar and word choice could be...enjoyable????? I wasn't exaggerating ,It actually sometimes make me laugh 😄 The first one is not wrong, but a most unusual way of saying "What a heavy rainfall!" In that case ,I think "rain" is countable. If refers to a past event. Am I right ? It seems like BE speakers use "a rainfall" for a single instance of (uncountable) rain. AE speakers may use countable "rain" with the same meaning: a single instance of rain. In the WR dictionary (AE part), that is the first countable meaning of "rain": a rainfall, rainstorm, or shower. But that is meaning 2. Meaning 1 is the uncountable "rain". It seems like BE speakers use "a rainfall" for a single instance of (uncountable) rain. AE speakers may use countable "rain" with the same meaning: a single instance of rain. In the WR dictionary (AE part), that is the first countable meaning of "rain": a rainfall, rainstorm, or shower. But that is meaning 2. Meaning 1 is the uncountable "rain". 😄 In BE if we do use countable "rain" it's usually to refer to " rains", plural, in the sense of "the rainy season", or " tropical rains". There was a drought for five months - and then the rains came. For me, What a heavy rain! What heavy rain! What a downpour! Please excuse my curiosity. In BE the reason why "rain" is uncountable is the rain in the U.K. does not have a specific starting point in most cases? I often hear that rain in London is something like a light shower which takes place many times a day so that people in London do not pay attention to when it starts and when it ends. Am I right? - The meeting will last 2 hours. - The effects will last for decades. Is there a difference between last and last for? Are there any rules regarding this? Are they always interchangeable? Is it a matter of formality? Many thanks! Last edited: Sep 29, 2011 There is no difference between your 2 sentences. They are both correct. However, You can use either "LAST" or "LAST FOR" if it is followed by a specific time period. THIS STORM WILL LAST WEEKS/THIS STORM WILL LAST FOR WEEKS. If anything else follows "LAST", you cannot use "LAST FOR". THIS LAW WILL LAST UNTIL THE PRESIDENT RESIGNS ...THIS LAW WILL LAST FOR UNTIL HE RESIGNS. In theory you could always ditch the "duration-for," but I would always include it. You're never wrong with it, but sometimes you might sound odd without it. Is it the same to say: 1) The movie didn't last two hours. 2) The movie didn't last for two hours. Is it the same to say: 1) The movie didn't last two hours. 2) The movie didn't last for two hours. I think both of those have the same meaning, but someone might have a stylistic preference or prefer to omit a "redundant" word. I wouldn't personally use (2). I'd have no objection to it in the positive: "The movie (or film) lasted for two hours" but I think it sounds a little bit odd in the negative for some reason. Oh, I see. What about the interrogative form: 3) Did it last for more than an hour? Does it sound ok to you? Last edited: Apr 26, 2018 Thank you all. You were very helpful >> #8: 3) "Did it last for more than an hour? Does it sound ok to you? I agree. That sounds OK. .