

[Click Here](#)



I'd like to know How I would say the following in Spanish?: 'Be My Valentine.' 'Happy Valentine's day.' In colombia we say " Feliz dia del amor y la amistad" for Happy valentines day. About "be my valentine", depends if is just a friend, we call "amigo secreto" but maybe you tray to say something romantic, actually . I think it doesnt have translation....You can say " Quiero que seas my novia /o" Okay thanks, but how about in countries like Puerto Rico?? Okay thanks, but how about in countries like Puerto Rico?? Well, in that case you can say , "Feliz dia de San Valentin" and just say " Quiero que seas my Valentin " , but maybe if someone from Puerto Rico can tell you. My friends from Puerto Rico , they talk sometimes Spanglish, so maybe you can say in the way I just tell you, and She or He will understand. Good Luck with your valentines In colombia we say " Feliz dia del amor y la amistad" for Happy valentines day. About "be my valentine", depends if is just a friend, we call "amigo secreto" but maybe you tray to say something romantic, actually , I think it doesnt have translation....You can say " Quiero que seas my novia /o" I thought Dia Del Amor was in September in Colombia, is February 14 celebrated as el Dia de San Valentin? Thanks Corey Sorry... I'm a bit late...
:/ About Spanish from Spain (in case someone wants to know it): "Happy Valentine's day" = "Feliz día de San Valentin" (as Palittas said) "Be My Valentine" = I think we don't have an equivalent expression in Spain. Where I live nobody calls anybody "her/his Valentine"... I'd say something like: "Be my lover" or "Be my love". In that case I'd say "Sé mi amante", "Sé mi amor". Lots of love from Spain!!!! I've heard this, more or less, in a novel translated as: ¿Vas a ser mi enamorada el día de hoy?" This was said by a boy to a girl...they were on the topic of Valentine's day... 百度知道>提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了> > Wherefore Hanun took David's servants, and shaved them, and cut off their garments in the midst hard by their buttocks, and sent them away. Then there went certain, and told David how the men were served. And he sent to meet them: for the men were greatly ashamed. And the king said, Tarry at Jericho until your beards be grown, and then return. You might also ask any soldier who has served in Afghanistan whether American and European military regulations that require soldiers to be clean-shaven result in a physical appearance that many Afghanis regard as effeminate and disgraceful, and whether as a result those regulations are often unenforced by some commanders. Last edited by a moderator: Oct 17, 2009 Eye-opening! I just always thought that whoever wrote the stuff needed a rhyme for the word, "in"! Hi! I know that 'chinny-chin-chin' is a cute way of saying 'chins'. But I do not quite understand the part - 'not by the hair'. Could you make this line in red clear? What does 'Not by the hair on my chinny-chin-chin' mean? Many thanks. My understanding of this phrase is that the hairs on the pig's chin, though tiny, would not even let the wolf in. This folktale, as all folktales are, is a fantasy, so the extent to which the fantasy will go is left to your imagination. I would say that the hair on the pig's chin has being animated like a cartoon, in the pig's thinking, to actually refusing to open the door for the wolf in support of the pig. "Little pig, little pig, let me come in!" "Not by the hair on my chinny-chin-chin!" "Then I'll huff, and I'll puff, and I'll blow your house in!" No, I think the little pigs are swearing on their beards, (as one does), and I would say that this little touch is meant to make children laugh since they know pigs don't have beards, and in fact have very little chin to speak of. I don't think it's necessary to suppose the original animals were goats. No, I think the little pigs are swearing on their beards, (as one does), and I would say that this little touch is meant to make children laugh since they know pigs don't have beards, and in fact have very little chin to speak of. I don't think it's necessary to suppose the original animals were goats. There is a phrase in spanish (It may not make much sense in english) that may explain what the pigs intend to say... > (By a tiny hair of a bald frog), meaning that something was that close to happen.... Well, just a thought! Anyway, is the moral of Three Little Pigs that counts (What was that BTW?) Regards! Last edited by a moderator: Dec 5, 2013 "Not by the hair on my chinny- chin-chin!" The line is well-known. It is from the story 'Three Little Pigs'. Well, the meaning is sort of clear. The sentence means 'No way I am going to do it.' But how does it work? What does 'by' mean in that sentence? Could you give other examples of that usage of 'by'? Many thanks. It's being used to swear a mild oath. It can be seen as a milder version of "By God". By my beard (I won't let you come in.) By my mother's life By X. X being any valued object. It's the by used in oaths, such as "I'll do it, by God!", "By Jove, I think he's got it!", or "I swear by the souls of my children." Cross-posted Azz, I've merged your question, and the replies it received, with an earlier thread that addresses this topic. If you have any further questions, you're welcome to add them to this thread. JustKate English Only moderator Thank you very much. This is really interesting. I knew about 'by my beard' and all that. My problem is that he says: 'NOT by the hairs of my chin'. I believe it should be: 'By the hairs of my chin, I will not let you in.' It is the first 'not' that throws me off. You might say 'By all that is sacred, I will not let you in.' But would you say 'NOT by all that is sacred'? Many thanks. You're right that it really is flawed logically, but I think it's just a rhythm thing. It is part of a little rhyming couplet, so it has to fit the meter. What it means is 'By the (sacred/powerful thing), I will not let you in.' I think that there is some ellipsis here: "Little pig, little pig, let me come in!" "[I will] Not, [I swear] by the hair on my chinny-chin-chin, [let you in]!" That works too. I also now see that the Wikipedia page has "No, no, not by the hair on my chinny chin chin." but then the words of the story are not set in stone. Hi! I know that 'chinny-chin-chin' is a cute way of saying 'chins'. But I do not quite understand the part - 'not by the hair'. Could you make this line in red clear? What does 'Not by the hair on my chinny-chin-chin' mean? Many thanks. [The Three Little Pigs] The Three Little Pigs - Wikipedia "Little pig, little pig, let me come in!" "Not by the hair on my chinny-chin-chin!" I'm not sure Pigs have any hair on their chin being as how they grub in the dirt. It may be like saying "fine as a frogs hair" when Frogs have none to begin with: thats how "fine" is is. "Then I'll huff, and I'll puff, and I'll blow your house in!" In Egypt and Arab countries , it is widely popular to say "this is my chin" to dare someone if he can do a particular action. 百度知道>提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了> No, I don't think so, redshade I think all we've got here is possible AmE/BrE differences. And I'm not totally sure about those... No, I don't think so, redshade I think all we've got here is possible AmE/BrE differences. And I'm not totally sure about those... Hi Loob I am probably exposing my naivety (or naiffness using the 'street' vernacular). If 'lit' is the past tense then surely one could not use it to refer to a future occasion ? I expect, that I will be deafened by the hoots of derision from the grammarians.(Hi chaps/chapesses , be gentle with me). One might say 'I'm going to prepare a candlelight dinner', and it would be understood that one is planning on including the sort of things that are associated with candlelight dinners (roses, romantic music, etc.). On the other hand, if one were to say "I'm going to prepare a candlelit dinner", that wouldn't make as much sense, because it's not candlelit until it's lit be candles. For me, it's a candlelit dinner but I would understand candlelight, although it wouldn't sound BE. Since you're in Canada though no-remedy, you should probably use the American one. Hi Loob I am probably exposing my naivety (or naiffness using the "street" vernacular). If "lit" is the past tense then surely one could not use it to refer to a future occasion ? No, in this case it's not the past tense, but the participle. The dinner was lit, the dinner is lit, the dinner will be lit. It might help to consider a verb in which the past tense and the particple are different. For instance, the past tense of "to run" is "ran", while the particple is "run". The race was run, the race is run, the race will be run. From my perspective the only difference is that a candlelit dinner is using an adjective (candlelit) to modify my dinner, a candlelight dinner is using a noun (candlelight) attributively to modify my dinner. I don't have any sense that one is more romantic than the other. Perhaps I lack soul. Hello Thomas Veil. Thank you for being gentle with me. I was an absolute duffer at "English Language" , much preferring "English Literature " lessons. (Although I preferred Maths and became an accountant , a job in which you would not believe the convoluted English that we have to put up with/up with we have to put.) I still have a slight leaning towards "candlelit" being the past tense but that of course is my own preference and has no bearing whatsoever on others' usage. Regards. R. From my perspective the only difference is that a candlelit dinner is using an adjective (candlelit) to modify my dinner, a candlelight dinner is using a noun (candlelight) attributively to modify my dinner. I don't have any sense that one is more romantic than the other. Perhaps I lack soul. Panj. What would Mrs P. think reading this? I strongly suggest that you treat your good lady to a romantic dinner as soon as possible. R. Last edited: Jan 28, 2009 Hello I know that the preposition most often used after spend money is on. My question is whether the preposition can also be replaced by for? If so, do you think this is generally possible or only in certain situations? example: I think we should spend the money on/for a sports club with new gym and bar facilities. Hi tigerduck. When it comes to use on/for with spend money they give different meanings. I'll try to explain that by the sentence you've provided: 1- I think we should spend the money on a sports club with new gym and bar facilities. I understand from this that you're considering to buy a sports club with new gym and bar facilities. 2- I think we should spend the money for a sports club with new gym and bar facilities. And from this I get the idea that you're considering to invest on a sport club already exist and run by someone else. Last edited: Jan 28, 2010 I think we should spend the money on/for a sports club with new gym and bar facilities. As usual, the absence of context allows us to invent intentions for the speaker or writer, and from these inventions or assumptions flow our interpretations of the meaning of the sentence. Here are some assumed intentions, and the resulting meanings of the sentence. I think we should spend the money on a sports club with new gym and bar facilities. Assume: A conversation among people trying to decide how to use the money from a bequest. Among the choices under discussion is a sports club. If the money is not spent on a sports club, it will be used for some other purpose. Interpretation: "On" simple connects the money to an intended use. Let's spend it on this. If not, let's spend it on that. On points to the destination of the funds. -----> I think we should spend the money for a sports club with new gym and bar facilities. All of the above, both assumptions and interpretation, can be used again with for. New assumption: Money has been budgeted or allocated previously. It will be spent to create a sports club. Interpretation: The sports facility should have, in the opinion of the speaker, a new gym and bar facilities. The speaker is advocating that the new sports club, in contrast with whatever facility it will replace, will have features not previously present. The second assumption and interpretation might also work with on. Conclusion: without more context and background, the two prepositions are interchangeable in this sentence. Neither one restricts the meaning. Money should be spent, according to the speaker. Either preposition can point at the use to which it should be put. So, that's official now that one (like me) shouldn't jump on the conclusions where a foreign language is in question. But really thanks cuchuflete, for both explanation and correction and sorry tigerduck for misleading. So, that's official now that one (like me) shouldn't jump on to the conclusions where a foreign language is in question. But really thanks cuchuflete, for both explanation and correction and sorry tigerduck for misleading. It is very difficult, and often misleading, to try to generalize about grammar or style from an isolated sentence or fragment. There may very well be contexts or example sentences in which substituting on and for completely changes the meaning. I've just come across the question again whether spend has to be followed by on or whether it can also be followed by for. While doing my research, I realized that I have posted this question before (in this thread) and I've also come across this thread: In both cases the answer is that yes, for can be used as well (at least in the two sentences given in the two threads) and my partner, who is from the United States, also says that both on and for is possible. However, ABC of Common Grammatical Errors, which is based on British English, considers the following sentence as wrong: On St Valentine's Day some Japanese girls spend almost half their salary for chocolate. (sentence labelled as incorrect in ABC of Common Grammatical Errors) ABC of Common Grammatical Errors says that "[w]e spend a sum of money on the things we buy". Therefore, it should be: On St Valentine's Day some Japanese girls spend almost half their salary on chocolate. I now wonder whether in American English spend for is acceptable but not in British English. Hello again, as the discussion ended with "I now wonder whether in AE spend for is acceptable but not in BE", I think that: - I spend plenty of money on traveling. OK in both AE/ BE - I spend plenty of moeny for traveling. OK in AE only Is that correct? Thank you! Hello, I don't know if "I spend plenty of money for travel(l)ing" is OK in AE; I doubt it. It's not OK in BE. A bit late ... thanks a lot for your help, sound shift I'll stick to on . Hello, I don't know if "I spend plenty of money for travel(l)ing" is OK in AE; I doubt it. It's not OK in BE. It's OK in AE. spend something for something. I spent nearly forty dollars for that vase! How much did you spend for this house—if I may ask? See also: spend McGraw-Hill Dictionary of American Idioms and Phrasal Verbs. © 2002 by The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. Hey everyone, maybe someone can give me a quick answer: Context, Liz is a girl with a lot of money. She receives a letter from her friend in which the friend gives her some advice on how to spend it. "You can spend your money for a charity organisation." vs "You can spend your money on a charity organisation." Does it work or do you need to construct a different sentence like "you can donate your money to a charity organisation." The one who wrote the 1. sentence doesn't know the word "donate". So he/she couldnt construct a sentence with this word on her/his own. "You can spend your money for a charity organization." -> it sounds as if you were going to be the head of that organization - i.e, to take up all the responsibility of that organization to work for. "You can spend your money on a charity organization. -> it sounds as if you were going to spend your money for the benefit of that organization so it could work efficiently. I could be wrong. Wait for a native's answer. This really needs to say "You can donate/give your money to a charity organisation." "You can spend your money for a charity organisation." suggests to me that you're spending money on behalf of a charity organisation. "You can spend your money on a charity organisation." carries the inference that you're buying the organisation. [cross-posted] DonnyB's advise is sound, but I'd additionally point out that the need to restructure the sentence doesn't come from any special properties of charities. The issue is that a charity, like any other organization, is generally not something one can purchase. An equivalent (and incorrect) sentence would be: "You can spend your money on/for a grocery store." We don't normally buy grocery stores. We buy groceries. You can "spend your money on groceries." Likewise, "you can spend your money on a charitable cause" - just not on a charity.