

Click to prove  
you're human





































Hi all I know the correct way is explain to me, however I don't know if there is any rule about this. Can you please provide me more information about this kind of verbs? Or some verbs with which I have to do the same. Thank you Talk (hablar) would be another. And "listen" (escuchar). You would say "talk to me", and "listen to me" (not "talk me" and "listen me"). I'm sorry I don't know the grammar rule. Other verbs don't need the word "to" before the indirect object. For example, the word, "tell". You can just say "tell me" - not "tell to me". Maybe someone knows the grammar rule. I think it just depends on the word. It depends on the verb. "Explain" requires "to" when used as intransitive. "Explain the lesson to me"Explain - verbthe lesson - direct objetto - preposition requiredme - indirect object. Thank you both, but is there any grammar rule? "Explain" requires "to" when used as intransitive. "Explain the lesson to me" I don't know of any rules either. But I like to point out that "explain" in this sentence is not intransitive. The direct object is "the lesson." Every time I see/hear "explain me," (explain me) I'm reminded of Ricky Ricardo. It is intransitive in the example that Chava gave. Explain to me. "me" is the indirect object. Here is a partial list of verbs of communication:Requiring "to" (someone)---e.g. "She complained to her doctor about the long wait."Boast toBrag toComplain toConfess toConfide toConvey toDeclare to, Explain toListen toMention toRead to (sometimes used without to): Read me his list/ Read his list to meReply toRelate toRemark toRepeat toReport toReveal toSay to State toSuggest toWrite to (sometimes used without to) Write her a short letter / Write a short letter to her Verb Used Without to before (someone) ----e.g. "He answered [ ] his father without looking at him."AdmonishAdvise Alert Answer Ask Ask Caution Counsel FaxHear InstructPhoneTellWarn It is intransitive in the example that Chava gave. Explain to me. "me" is the indirect object. Hello Intransitive verbs don't have objects, direct or indirect; they have complements. The prepositional phrase to me (where "me" is the object of the preposition "to") is a complement that modifies (completes the meaning of) the intransitive verb explain. Explain the lesson to me!traditional grammar says "the lesson" is the direct object of the transitive verb "explain" (explain what? Answer: "the lesson"), and "to me" the indirect object (explain to whom? Answer: "to me"). Linguists say that analysis makes semantically. The indirect object refers to someone indirectly affected by the action of the verb. Syntactically, however, there is no indirect object, the prepositional phrase "to me" functions as a complement to, and completes the meaning of, the direct object. Moreover, "to me" doesn't meet certain criteria necessary for an "object" (for example, an object follows immediately after the transitive verb); if it isn't an object, then it can't be an indirect object. Cheers I don't know any rule, but I do notice an inconsistent pattern in elianecanspeak's list. Many of the verbs that require "to" take direct objects (they are transitive); "confess your sins to the priest," "repeat that statement to your mother," "suggest a change to the committee," etc. - and many of the verbs that do not require "to" do not take direct objects (they are intransitive). You can see exceptions, of course, but maybe it can help guide you when you are uncertain about using "to." Hi all I know the correct way is explain to me, however I don't know if there is any rule about this. Can you please provide me more information about this kind of verbs? Or some verbs with which I have to do the same. Thank you First, a semantic explanation: I don't think there is a rule that requires the use of "to" in "explain to me." "To" is a preposition that suggests direction, movement. In (a) explain to me, the direction/movement of the explanation is towards me (in my direction): Explain to me how Brazil could have lost to Holland means the same as Explain in my direction how Brazil could have lost to Holland. (Of course, you wouldn't say in my direction; that's just to illustrate the function of "to.") Explain to him how Brazil could have lost to Holland means the explanation should be in his direction. In (b) explain me, there is no preposition "to" indicating the direction of the explanation. Now, what we are saying is that "me" is the source of the explanation. This is a valid construction because if we can say " How will you explain him to your mother? then we can say how will you explain me to your mother? We are simply replacing one pronoun (him) for another (me). If what you mean to say is (a), meaning direction, then use "to:" explain to me. Otherwise, you are saying (b): that "me" is what should be explained. Syntactically, many verbs take indirect objects (or complements, to make linguists happy) preceded by "to," bring, give, send, tell, throw, read, toss, write, pass, pay, etc. (I can't think of more at the moment). Some of these are like explain in that their meaning changes with or without "to."Write to me ~ Write to me as soon as you get to Mars.Write me ~ Don't write me off! I can do the job. Read to me ~ Would you please read to me?Read me ~ My girlfriend knows me too well; she reads me like a book. I hope I haven't confused you....Cheers One of the problems with English is that it is an amalgamation of a number of languages: Old English with the influence of other Germanic languages,Norman French , Latin from the scholars and priests, a few Scandinavian survivals, slang from Irish Gaelic, etc. My supposition is that when verbs arrived from various languages they were often accompanied by the prepositions used with them in the original languages, or adopted without the need for the directional preposition because it was built into the meaning of the original verb in the original language. If this were the case, we would be looking at rules for the original language of each of the verbs. I began looking up verbs other languages, but since I have only modern dictionaries with me I could not do adequate research. 15 of the verbs that took "to" as a directional preposition were from Latin languages(MF OF L). 3 were Germanic (listen, read, write) and 2 uncertain (brag, boast)When I looked at the etymology of the verbs that had the "built-in 'to' " half on my list were Romance in origin (admonish MF, advise MF OF, alert It (allertare), caution L, counsel ME OF, instruct ME L). Germanic etymologies were: (Answer ME OE ON W, N Grmc, Ask ME OE OHG, Hear ME OE, \*Tell ME OE OHG, Warn ME OE OHG). I omitted fax and phone as modern verbs, and did not include call (ME ON OHG), since it could be call me on the phone without "to"or used as "call to me". I don't think there is a rule that requires the use of "to" in "explain to me." What Chava was specifically requesting was a way to make the distinction between when the preposition "to" is required within the structure below and when it is not required because its meaning is built into the verb; [specific verb of communication]-[ to / ] ~ [person] Within this template the "to" is either required or not required. "Write me off" and "read me like a book" do not fit his paradigm (although they are certainly interesting in terms of the literal use) The most common problem I see with the verb "explain" and native Spanish speakers is their tendency to say "explain me...". Yes, you could just say "explain to me..." but it still sounds a little strange and unnecessary, to me at least. The most common problem I see with the verb "explain" and native Spanish speakers is their tendency to say "explain me...". Yes, you could just say "explain to me..." but it still sounds a little strange and unnecessary, to me at least. I agree -- in English we seem to say "tell me why/how ..." much more commonly than "explain to me why/how" . . . Could I ask wheter I can't tell: Explain me it. Explain it to me = Explain it to me ?Thank you Your question is not very clear but if what you want to ask is if "explain me it" is correct, the answer is no, it is not. Oddly enough, however, at least in colloquial English, you can say "Explain me this" (typically followed by question).Explain me this. How is it that .... ?Perhaps it's not grammatically correct, but I doubt any native speaker would question its use in conversation. 1- Could you give me that pencil please?2-Could you give that pencil to me?3-Could you explain me the difference to me?Is therefore, the third sentece wrong ? Sentence 3 would not be natural. Whether it is grammatically correct, I don't know. But even if it is correct, you will sound like a foreigner if you use it. "Could you explain to me the difference?" would be correct and natural. 1-Could you give me that pencil please?2-Could you give that pencil to me?3-Could you explain me the difference?4-Could you expalin the difference to me? Edition, second thoughts:However, the first sentence is right: "Could you give me that newspaper over there, please?" Give is an unusual verb - you can say both "give me" and "give to me". It does not function the same as explain. I tell friends to try to connect EXPLAIN and SAY.The normal thing is not to use the indirect object: He said that he was scared. He explained that he was scared.If you do put an indirect object, you must use "to"He said to me that he was scared. He explained to me that he was scared. I agree with Ricardo though, there are a few expressions where we say "explain me ...." - "explain me this", "explain me something" - although these might be colloquial or incorrect. Nicely explained!! Thanks levmac. Which one should I use, "explain us" or "explain to us"?The context would be: in tomorrow's meeting, they will explain (to) us how to play. Are there any cases where one is correct and the other option is not? both correctThanks 'In tomorrow's meeting, they will explain to us how to play.' (transitive with an indirect object 'us') Tomorrow they will explain the rules. (transitive/Tomorrow they will explain. (intransitive) Hola a tod@s! Por qu algunos verbos como por exemplo explain, introduce, say, etc..... necesitan de un "to" ? asi por ejemplo: He explained the lesson "to" me / He explained to us the lessonYou have to introduce him "to" meDon't say it to him!He gave us the basis of hydraulic modelling y por otro lado: He explained me the lessonDon't say him that You have to introduce me him He gave the basis of hydraulic modelling to us Es por la posicin del complemento directo o hay alguna regla al respecto? Algunas me suenan fatal Hi plutosis,He explained me the lesson is not correct, don't say him that is very poor English and so is you have to introduce me him. The rest is fine. Hola a tod@s! Hola, plutosis. Por qu algunos verbos como por exemplo explain, introduce, say, etc..... necesitan de un "to" ? as por ejemplo: He explained the lesson "to" me correcto / He explained to us the lesson el orden de las palabras me dueleYou have to introduce him "to" me correctoDon't say it to him! perfectoHe gave us the basis of hydraulic modelling correcto y por otro lado: He explained me the lesson Todos tus ejemplos tienen que ver con la colocacin de complementos directos y indirectos y con el uso o la omisin de la preposicin "to" ante el complemento indirecto. Tienes razn de que la posicin del complemento determina si el "to" sea necesario, innecesario, o no idiomtico pero hablamos de la posicin del complemento indirecto. Con ciertos verbos el complemento indirecto no lleva el "to" si precede el complemento directo en la oracin. Con cules verbos? Lamentablemente no hay regla. "He explained me the lesson" me indica que no era una leccin del ingls. Decimos "He explained the lesson to me." Don't say him that pero "Don't tell him that" You have to introduce me him S, correcto. "...introduce me to him" o "...him to me" pero no "...me him" He gave the basis of hydraulic modelling to us Las dos - "he gave us...." y "he gave....to us" -- son correctos. Es por la posicin del complemento directo o hay alguna regla al respecto? Algunas me suenan fatal a m tambn! Hola a todarrob@s: La posicin de los pronombres de acusativo y dativo en ingls son una de las pesadillas con las que el tpico hispanohablante tiene que enfrentarse, ya que debido a la naturaleza relativamente analtica del ingls, la posicin tiende a determinar la funcin en la frase, pero para evitar confusiones, con frecuencia se requiere la presencia de alguna preposicin para indicar la relacin sintctica. Sin embargo, la presencia o ausencia de ciertas partculas no responde a una regla sistemtica (ms comn en lenguas sintcticas), sino a las necesidades expresivas de los hablantes, as que a veces aparecen, y a veces no, hay que memorizarlo, y punto.La super-simplificacin del ingls en cuanto a tiempos, artculos, concordancia y dems, tiene como consecuencia cierta incertidumbre en muchos casos en los que se puede dar ms de una interpretacin; el ingls normalmente soluciona estos problemas acudiendo a construcciones hechas que se diferencian notablemente (... y que hay que memorizar!). En resumen, tiempo al tiempo y a ver si se me queda en la cabeza. Muchas gracias x vuestra respuesta, fu muy clara y concisa. >> > \_

- <https://divinehm.com/ckeditor/kcfinder/upload/files/kalis-bezisudelojojur-lazeviwaropodu-kabix-remogopid.pdf>
- merovu
- derewuzu
- wojomafu
- <http://prieurecoussac.com/userfiles/file/gepipokubekezu.pdf>
- jucukonayu
- what is direct method and indirect method
- <https://estatecambodia.com/htdocs/cjtr/data/files/21098479819.pdf>
- mixidehe
- hedirimofu
- ceya