

[Click to verify](#)



Hi, friends. Say, I am just an ordinary employee at a company, not at the top. I want to write an E-mail to everyone working at this company. Would it be appropriate, if I write "Dear fellow staff members" as the greeting at the beginning of the email ? Please help, thanks. You might want to consider 'Dear colleagues' as a shorter alternative. You might want to consider 'Dear colleagues' as a shorter alternative. Thanks. So I can take it that it is appropriate and correct to use this phrase Dear fellow staff members, when you are writing emails to your co-workers at a company? Because I seem to have seen this phrase used a lot at schools or universities. About 'Dear fellow staff members', I am not so sure. Because it seems it is not appropriate to address co-workers who are at a higher position than me as colleagues. What do you think? Thanks. So I can take it that it is appropriate and correct to use this phrase Dear fellow staff members, when you are writing emails to your co-workers at a company? Because I seem to have seen this phrase used a lot at schools or universities. About 'Dear fellow staff members', I am not so sure. Because it seems it is not appropriate to address co-workers who are at a higher position than me as colleagues. What do you think? Where I used to work, some people were in the habit of sending round emails addressed to "Dear everyone" but you may find that a bit informal? In which case, I don't see anything wrong with "Dear fellow staff members". As far as "colleagues" goes, I know of at least two UK supermarket chains who call all their employees "colleagues" in an apparent attempt to create the false illusion that everyone is equal regardless of their status or job title. I wouldn't use it in a company which takes a more realistic view of peoples' positions. Well, in less formal situations, I would write 'Dear all'; I do this if I am writing to everyone in my Department. I suggested 'colleagues' earlier because that means the same thing to me as 'fellow staff members'. If you want less 'false bonhomie', you could just use the name of the organisation. I suppose ('Dear members of the Arts Faculty'). After a new member joined a group, the group owner said, "You are warmly welcome." Dose it sound awkward to you? Grammatically, shouldn't it be "You are warmly welcomed" ? But that doesn't seem fit in the context? When someone says thanks, you may say "You are welcome." or "You are very welcome." ("welcome" as an Adjective) After someone joins a group, we say, 1. Welcome to join us. ("welcome" as a Adjective) 2. We warmly welcome you to join our group. ("welcome" as a verb) 3. A warm welcome to you. ("welcome" as a noun) Welcome to the forum. "You are warmly welcome" and "You are warmly welcomed" are both strange. We would just say "Welcome" or "We would like to welcome you to our group" or "Welcome to our group." If you were making an introductory speech, you might say, "We would like to extend a warm welcome to you. We're glad you could join our group." After someone joins a group, we say, 1. Welcome to join us. ("welcome" as a Adjective) We wouldn't say this because they have already joined you (the group). 2. We warmly welcome you to our group. ("welcome" as a verb) Same as above. 3. A warm welcome to you. ("welcome" as a noun) Just say "Welcome." The "warm welcome" and "we warmly welcome" are expressions that are best suited for a speech to an audience when introducing new members. On a person-to-person basis, they're a bit odd (for me). Note our own greeting in the first line of this post. It is OK to aspire to giving a warm welcome: I would like to warmly welcome you to the conference today. But to say that you are warmly welcomed sounds oddly self-congratulatory: Look what a great guy I am to give such a warm welcome! Back to speeches, you will also hear: "Let's give our newest members a warm welcome" -- which is a request for applause from the other members. Welcome to the forum. "You are warmly welcome" and "You are warmly welcomed" are both strange. We would just say "Welcome" or "We would like to welcome you to our group" or "Welcome to our group." If you were making an introductory speech, you might say, "We would like to extend a warm welcome to you. We're glad you could join our group." After someone joins a group, we say, 1. Welcome to join us. ("welcome" as a Adjective) We wouldn't say this because they have already joined you (the group). 2. We warmly welcome you to join our group. ("welcome" as a verb) Same as above. 3. A warm welcome to you. ("welcome" as a noun) Just say "Welcome." The "warm welcome" and "we warmly welcome" are expressions that are best suited for a speech to an audience when introducing new members. On a person-to-person basis, they're a bit odd (for me). Note our own greeting in the first line of this post. wow, thank you for your explanation. Great. I can get the picture. I would like to know if in this announcement it is correct to say any member/any members or both are right Will any member/any members of security staff please go to check-in-desk 11. Thanks any member - one of them any members - all of them Pero si yo me refiero al primero que aparece, es decir, tengo un problema que necesita un miembro de seguridad y necesito al primero que llegue, pero el aviso se hace para todos, aunque no quieres que se personen todos sólo uno ¿Cuál tendría que utilizar member or members? "Would a member of the security staff please...". Aunque creo que, coordinados, seguramente llegará el que esté más cerca. Pero espera más sugerencias. Saludos, L. "Would a member of the security staff please...". Aunque creo que, coordinados, seguramente llegará el que esté más cerca. Pero espera más sugerencias. Saludos, t. Conuerdo con esta traducción. Is this correct the translation?: Members at Large: Jane McDonald and David Sotomayor. Representantes del Grupo Mayor de Miembros: Jane McDonald y David Sotomayor. Esta traducción es parte de un membrete. Any ideas?? Thank you! Last edited by a moderator: Nov 9, 2015 Hola Carlos, "At large" significa libre, en general (y fugitivo, en el aspecto criminal). Así que la traducción de tu frase sería: Members at Large: Jane McDonald and David Sotomayor = Jane McDonald y David Sotomayor, Miembros Libres. Saludos, LN No me suena bien, estas son personas que forman parte de un Concilio Estatal, por tal motivo Miembros Libres, en este contexto no tiene sentido... Last edited by a moderator: Nov 9, 2015 Supongo por lo que pones que los members son miembros de alguna mesa directiva o algo por el estilo; de ser así "members at large" son los vocales o representantes que no representan a ningún subgrupo en particular, sino que representan al grupo en general. Eso, eso... y también visualiza este ejemplo hipotético donde estuvieras hablando de una organización (llamémosla "Liga de Trabajadores") cuyos miembros son todos integrantes de diversos sindicatos laborales ("Carpinteros de la Capital", "Plomeros del Sur", "Barrenderos sin Fronteras"). Ahora bien, otras personas de otros oficios que no estén representados por sindicatos también podrían ser miembros de la "Liga de Trabajadores" --como miembros libres/members at large-- tal como en el caso de María Pérez (escultora) o Juan Fernández (pintor). No sé si me expliqué bien o si acabo de confundiros más aún. Saludos, LN No sé si ayuda, pero en contextos legales se podría decir miembros plenipotenciarios, según el diccionario de Foughton Mifflin. ¡No es el uso de plenipotenciario diplomático! En inglés, 'at large' lleva el sentido de miembros sin oficio o cargo especial. saludos, Cuchuflete Hola: ¿Podrían ser miembros independientes? Solo una idea... Field and topic: Es la constitución (en inglés) del organismo mundial de deportes de sordos. Está describiendo a su Comité Ejecutivo, y entre el Presidente, vicepresidente, etc. nombra a tres "members-at-large". Quiero saber si hay una traducción al español que sea específica. ----- Sample sentence: 9.4.1.4 three members-at-large. Last edited by a moderator: Nov 9, 2015 Leí la dirección que me enviaste .. ¿Podría ser traducido,entonces, como Miembros Generales? Muchísimas gracias por su ayuda. Last edited by a moderator: Nov 9, 2015 Hola a todos: ¿Alguien sabe qué quiere decir en esta frase?: The Member-at-Large shall serve the same term of office as the officers. Es parte de los estatutos de una ONG. Podrá ser miembros permanentes, como opuesto a miembros suplentes. Muchas gracias a todos. Last edited by a moderator: Nov 9, 2015 "Members at large" se refiere a los directores (officers) de una organización que no tienen un papel específico (como presidente o director de servicios por ejemplo). Hope that helps. What does members at large mean? Last edited by a moderator: Nov 9, 2015 ¿Nos puedes dar más contexto? Saludos. Last edited by a moderator: Nov 9, 2015 Are you speaking of a legislative body? Members may either represent a specific district, or they may be elected by all the voters and not just those of a specific district. If the legislators are voted for by all the voters, they are "members at large". I'm wondering how far the grammatical principle of word order seen in "present" stretches. "Present members" means those who have the membership of the group whereas "members present" means people present at a particular meeting. The posterior adjective seems to me to counter the English grammatical principle of placing an adjective before a noun. Thank you! Can you think of any other examples with a single adjective instead of an adjectival phrase following a noun? In the example of "present," the one before a noun implies that it continues for longer and the one after a noun implies that the state of being in that condition is more temporary. "Members present" means "members who are present," and it's no different from the usage in "[the] people [who are] waiting," "[the] rivers [that are] flowing," etc. It's not clear what you want to know, but an example or two in a full sentence would help. According to a linguist, (1) means a previously owned car whereas (2) means a car that is used (for some purpose). Do you find this to be true? (2) is incomplete and doesn't make sense on its own. I'm wondering how far the grammatical principle of word order seen in "present" stretches. "Present members" means those who have the membership of the group whereas "members present" means people present at a particular meeting. The posterior adjective seems to me to counter the English grammatical principle of placing an adjective before a noun. Thank you! Can you think of any other examples with a single adjective instead of an adjectival phrase following a noun? In the example of "present," the one before a noun implies that it continues for longer and the one after a noun implies that the state of being in that condition is more temporary. You haven't provided sentences illustrating your question. However, in this case, the meaning of "present" is different. "Present members" means members who are currently members - e.g., they have paid their subscription - and is in contrast to past members or non-members. It refers to their status. "Members present" refers to physical presence, not membership status, and is reduced from "members who are present" as the newt noted. This is in contrast to some adjectives, often French in origin, where the adjective is posterior by historical convention. Attorney general and court martial are examples. Last edited: Jan 13, 2023 Literally, a used car is a car that has been used. The cars on a new car lot have been driven off at a truck/train and into wherever they have been parked. Many of them have been used by potential drivers test-driving them. They are all literally "used cars" although they are not "used cars (previously owned cars)". "Used car" for "previously owned car" is an idiom (like "kick the bucket" means "die"). The meaning cannot be strictly derived from the meaning of the two words by themselves. Since it's an idiom, you can't use it to form a pattern for other words. As always, thanks. Very much appreciated. To me, the correct phrase would be "current members". Hi everyone, I am working on the development of a website and we want to include an area that is reserved for registered members and that requires a log-in. I have searched the internet for the correct spelling, but, as is so often the case when an apostrophe might be involved, I have found various ways of spelling this: - member's area - members' area - members area Thinking the various options through, I can't rule any of them out for sure. What do you think? Any help and input would be greatly appreciated. (I personally tend towards members' area because it is the area reserved for members) Members' is correct as member's would mean that there is only one member. Also, re the correctness or otherwise of your third option, you might want to read this recent thread. I agree. It is an area reserved for/belonging to 'members, so members' area members area strikes me as a section set aside for arms and legs, collected at a jumbo jet crash site, until they find the torso to match. OK, I want to thank you very much for that image, MBK. I am trying to decide if this formula is different from "homeowners association" (for example), where we have an association of homeowners, but not one that belongs to them. No. 'homeowners' is being used as an adjective, describing the nature, the type of association. ratepayers association football association press association I can probably rationalise the use of either version - they each have different meanings. One is not necessarily correct over the others... - member's area = an area of a member, belonging to a member - members' area = an area of members, belonging to more than one member - members area = an area for members That is exactly the problem I have been having so far. At this point, I think I am happy to exclude member's area, since, as Cameljockey pointed out, this would imply one single member. So really not what we want to convey. As for the other two options, I agree that both are correct. Which makes it a question of preference. I guess. What do you all think? Do you have a preference for one over the other? Does one imply something specific (as mentioned by MilkyBarKid)? Would you be surprised (pleasantly or unpleasantly) to see one or the other? Thank you so much for all your help. No, 'homeowners' is being used as an adjective, describing the nature, the type of association. ratepayers association football association press association You say that 'homeowners' is being used as an adjective, but isn't the phrase actually two nouns forming a compound noun? 'Homeowners' may qualify 'association', but it doesn't describe it. This was argued in the 'pleasure experience?' thread recently, where I suggested that: 'An adjective must (by definition) describe its noun. Cold soup is cold, a hot girl is hot. A jewellery box is not jewellery, and a morning newspaper is not morning. So the qualifying noun in a compound noun fails this basic and most critical test of an adjective'. I'd be interested to get more views. Can I right: "In the convoy, there are 2 journalists, one interpreter and 12 Red Cross personnel"? Or shall write "12 Red Cross personnel members"? Yes, personnel can work. Other options may be workers or volunteers. Volunteers should only be used if they're volunteering and not getting paid. Cheers mate! "...12 Red Cross personnel" is fine, but you can't say "personnel members". Thank you, roxyca! "Workers" would be the best option, for I do not know if the team consisted only of RC personnel or included volunteers. Thank you, Donny! In fact, I do use the word combination "personnel members" sometimes. Is it definitely wrong? It sounds really peculiar to me, but other people may think it works if you want to wait for a second opinion on it.... "Personnel members" would suggest to me that they work in the personnel department of the Red Cross. Even then it would sound strange, though. Hi, King Charles and Queen Camilla have appeared on the balcony of Buckingham Palace to greet the crowds following the Coronation. They were joined by Prince William, Kate and other members of the Royal Family, but Prince Harry was absent. (source: Instagram account of BBC news) Here, if all the members of the Royal Family joined, "the other members" would be correct. But since Prince Harry was absent, so "other members" is the correct one. I believe what I think is correct so far, right? What about "some other members"? Would it change the meaning? Thanks! I agree with grassy on both counts. (On a point of detail, though, there were other members of the Royal Family who weren't on the balcony.) Thanks! I'll do more research into this event.☺ Yes, there are many royals at different levels. They could probably never all be up there at the same time. But the context tells you it's a reference to the ones in the most immediate family, of which Harry is one. The internet says there are 46 royals (2020). Are there any difference in meaning between the following two sentences? 1. All the members of the club are supposed to play at least one musical instrument. 2. All members of the club are supposed to play at least one musical instrument. It's hard to pinpoint. For me saying "all the members" identifies a particular set of members at some given time, whereas the second is more timeless, that is, it applies to any set of members throughout the whole of the club's existence, if that makes sense. In essence they mean the same thing though. They do mean the same thing, but I like the second sentence better. Snappy. It's more concise. Alan I had the same reaction as Tazzler. It's rather an elusive difference, and not really significant, but I like the second one better. Hi there, I was wondering whether there is any difference between the expressions founder member and charter member. Supposing I am referring to the partners that founded, that is, that gave life to a company (in my case a small, limited responsibility company), which one would be more appropriate and, most of all, acceptable to both BE and AE speakers? Thank you I would expect to see "founding member," but would certainly understand "charter member" as well. Also, (I went to Wikipedia to double-check) "responsabilitá" and "responsibility" are false friends in this context: the English name for that kind of organization is "limited liability company." I've heard these terms only in relation to membership organizations, and for me, too, the first would be founding member, or founder, rather than "founder member". Dictionaries say that the terms "founding member" and "charter member" are interchangeable, but in my experience, they've been used slightly differently: founding member, to mean one of those who first had the idea of forming the organization; charter member, to mean one of those who immediately signed on when the existence of the organization was announced. Thus, a founding member would be one of the charter members, but a charter member would not necessarily be one of the founders. I've heard these terms only in relation to membership organizations, and for me, too, the first would be founding member, or founder, rather than "founder member". Dictionaries say that the terms "founding member" and "charter member" are interchangeable, but in my experience, they've been used slightly differently: founding member, to mean one of those who first had the idea of forming the organization; charter member, to mean one of those who immediately signed on when the existence of the organization was announced. Thus, a founding member would be one of the charter members, but a charter member would not necessarily be one of the founders. Google founder member and you will see it used in many places. The BNC/COCA search results suggest there is a difference in preference between BE and AmE, but that 'founding member' is at least fairly common in both varieties: BNC founding member/members 65 founder member/members 210 COCA founding member/members 478 founder member/members 4 There are three quite distinct topics here. Founder member - means someone who was a member of an organisation when it began. Charter member - means something to some people, but means nothing to me. Limited responsibility company ... I assume to be the same as a UK limited liability company. I'm one of those. I have founder members. They are the people who had a stake in my company when it began. I have no charter members ... see above, I don't know what these are. Must be from this side of the pond only. Here it is straight from Wikipedia: A charter member of an organization is an original member; that is, one who became a member when the organization received its charter. Notice the spelling is obviously AE, so my guess is it was entered by an American. I can attest to the fact it is a commonly used term. I never cease to learn the differences between our AE and the queen's. Must be from this side of the pond only. Here it is straight from Wikipedia: A charter member of an organization is an original member; that is, one who became a member when the organization received its charter. ... "..., when the organization received its charter" Ah, well, if an organization has formally received a charter, I can understand the term "charter member". Limited liability companies in the UK do not have a charter. Must be from this side of the pond only. Here it is straight from Wikipedia: A charter member of an organization is an original member; that is, one who became a member when the organization received its charter. Notice the spelling is obviously AE, so my guess is it was entered by an American. . If you are referring to the z in the word organization, you would not always win a bet that it was written by an AE speaker! I know quite a few BrE speakers who follow the OED's recommendation and use the Greek rather than French spelling of the suffix -ize Do all institutions/companies that have "charter members" actually have charters?

• subawiju

- functional independence measure levels
- riwareda
- https://evrenmentese.com/upload/ckfinder/files/91484769596.pdf
- http://oitech.rzeszow.pl/userfiles/file/0749f917-9ca8-41ec-a9d3-e98c48fb9aae.pdf
- how to use opay ussd code
- sangean clock radio manual
- suelo franco arcilloso características
- http://dreamcatcherltd.com/userfiles/file/46950500141.pdf
- https://bovims.com/images/files/50576263584.pdf
- replacement shaver head for philips rq1250
- cekisu