

I am in need of some guidance with regard to the following: We normally say "sb is committed to sth" (e.g. she is committed to her family). All this makes perfect sense as a gerund functions as a noun. However, I have come across, much less frequently, "be (jointly) committed to do sth" or "have a commitment to do sth". Any ideas? I believe I have found a distinction, but prefer not to mention it so as not to bias any responses! Collins Cobuild English Dictionary: - If you commit yourself to a course of action or have it. - If you commit you co term one. Example: v Pron-refl "to" -ing "I would advise people to think very carefully about committing themselves to working Sundays." V pronoun-reflexive "to" -n You don't have to commit to anything." I hope it helps. Last edited by a moderator: Jul 24, 2010 We normally say "sb is committed to sth" (e.g. she is committed to her family) where sth may be a gerund (e.g. she is committed to do sth" or "have a committed to do sth". "sb is committed to do sth" or "have a committed to do sth" or "have a committed to be". They mean the same thing. "Sheila is committed to earning good grades." "You should be committed to taking care of your grandmother." Thanks Venus and toniga for your kind responses! Unfortunately, perusing the Collins Cobuild, Longman Dic of Cont Eng, the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary and the Webster have left me none the wiser on this issue! All confirm what I mentioned initially, i.e. that you can be committed... a) to sth (to + noun) b) to doing sth (to + gerund) What appears in only ONE example (but not in any grammatical directions) is: c) be committed to do sth (full infinitive) (the example is: Both sides committed themselves to settle the dispute peacefully.) Conclusion: though "be committed to + infinitive" is not recorded anywhere as a possible structure, it does appear occasionally in actual real texts. So, upon close examination of the few examples I've come across, my conclusion is as follows: It would seem to me that... a) "be committed to doing sth" refers to energy, effort and time binding one to an ongoing activity, one that is already in progress; b) "be committed to do sth" or "have a commitment to do sth" refers to a binding promise (can a promise be anything but binding?!) to do sth, to achieve sth not yet begun, only just outlined or proposed, to seek an outcome. Let me know what you think! (There's more to come!!) All confirm what I mentioned initially, i.e. that you can be committed... a) to sth (to + noun) b) to doing sth (to + gerund) What appears in only ONE example (but not in any grammatical directions) is: c) be committed to 4 infinitive" is not recorded anywhere as a possible structure, it does appear occasionally in actual real texts. I agree with your conclusions. a) The lawyer was committed to our contract. I am committed to my husband. b) My sister is committed to eating my nerves! c) Can you think of any examples of "be committed to drink water every day. d?) I have a committee to testing my nerves! c) Can you think of any examples of "be committed to eating a balanced diet. The children in my classroom are committed to drink water every day. d?) I have a committee to eating a balanced diet. uphold my promise. Our constitution has a committement to protect our civil liberties. To be on the safe side, I would go with the gerund form. "Committing to do something" sounds awkward to me. Thanks a million for your help, folks! I am reviving this thread has helped me solve the puzzle I have found in an article on Barclay's CEO in the Independent. I'll quote below the two sentences that appear in the same paragraph: I'm committed as CEO to being responsible, on showing restraint," Mr Diamond said. Mr Diamond said. Mr Diamond said he was committed to increase lending to businesses but they had to be "creditworthy". Hi, Nicholas. I had the same doubt some time ago, so I did some research, and I came to the conclusion that it is possible to set up an analogy with what happens with the expression "to be used to". I don't know how it works in English, so I ask you to think in Spanish (which I believe is the same as in Portuguese, my first language). For example: "I am used to going to the mall on weekends". In this sentence, "used" would be an adjective, and "to" would be a preposition in this case. And in English, after prepositions we use the verb in the gerund form. Now think about the next sentence: "I used to go to the mall on weekends". The situation is completely different from the former one Now you have "used" working as a verb, so what comes next is a verb in the infinitive. Now apply this reasoning to the expression "to be committed to providing the best service possible". You have "committed" as an adjective (once more, I don't know if this is how it works in English, my line of reasoning requires that you think in Spanish - or Portuguese), so next you have a preposition and the verb in the gerund. On the other hand, in the example you gave above - "Both sides committed" is a verb, which calls for a verb in the infinitive. Maybe that is not the most accurate reasoning (although it is very likely to be), but I always apply this method and it always works. I hope it will be of your help. OMG, I only saw the dates now. You probably don't even use this forum anymore. That's OK, Conor. Someone else could come along searching for a thread on this topic, and maybe your post will help him. Thanks Venus and toniga for your kind responses! Unfortunately, perusing the Collins Cobuild, Longman Dic of Cont Eng, the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary and the Webster have left me none the wiser on this issue! All confirm what I mentioned initially, i.e. that you can be committed...a) to sth (to + noun)b) to doing sth (to + gerund)What appears in only ONE example (but not in any grammatical directions) is:c) be committed to do sth (full infinitive" is not recorded anywhere as a possible structure, it does appear occasionally in actual real texts. So, upon close examination of the few examples I've come across, my conclusion is as follows: It would seem to me that...a) "be committed to doing sth" refers to energy, effort and time binding one to an ongoing activity, one that is already in progress; b) "be committed to do sth" or "have a commitment to do sth" or "have a to do sth, to achieve sth not yet begun, only just outlined or proposed, to seek an outcome.Let me know what you think! (There's more to come!!) The first 2 (be committed to do sth) has a transitive phrasal verbs, while the infinitive there (to do sth) functions as an adverb as it answers the question "why."A. I am committed to the company grow. (subject + transitive phrasal verb + direct object in the form of a gerund phrase, helping the company grow)c. We committed ourselves (in order) to settle the dispute. (Subject + transitive verb + reflexive pronoun as the direct object + transitive 3-part phrasal verb + direct object in the for of a gerund phrase)" and not "I commit myself to (gerund phrase)" because the reflexive pronoun is the direct object of the verb "to commit".Did I get this right or are both forms correct ? If so, I'm not sure I got the difference between the two structures at all...Or would it sound more natural to say "I commit myself to be doing sth" ? And what about the following sentence read in a publication of the Financial Conduct Authority FCA (UK) dated February 2015 ? "In this document we focus on the investment aspects of loan-based crowdfunding. Where platforms arrange consumer credit, additional rules (including those applicable to loan-based crowdfunding platforms) and will publish further information on this in due course. "Could there be something amiss in this sentence ? I think the sentence is fine as it has "a separate post-implementation review" as the object of "committed to". Now it makes sense to me. So you say that the sentence can as well be written as : "We committed to have a separate ... "instead of : "We have committed to a separate..." But would it still not be better to write : "We are committed to have a separate..." Anyway thank you very much Englishmypassion. An interesting case of both forms appearing in the same sentence (extract from Amber Rudd's resignation letter dated 07/09/2019) B I agree with your conclusions. a) The lawyer was committed to our contract. I am committed to my husband.b) My sister is committed to testing my nerves!c) Can you think of any examples of "be committed to testing my nerves!c) Can you think of any examples of "be committed to testing my nerves!c) and committed testing my nerves!c) and com committment to uphold my promise. Our constitution has a committement to protect our civil liberties. I agree with you. The "to" in the sentence is a preposition, thus it should be followed by a noun or a gerund, an "ing" form of a verb used as a noun. The structure: Be (is/am/are) committed to + "ing" for of a verb or a noun or a noun phrase. So could one sum up by saying that: We committed ourselves to working harder to catch up with the backload of work? (= in order to catch up) Any comments will be appreciated for the sentence below from an article in the Indepentent. It's in the form of "sb is committed to gerund". This sentence is mentioned above but I quess it is overlooked. I was normally expecting "sb is committed to infinitive". Thank you! Mr Diamond said he was committed to infinitive". Thank you! Mr Diamond said he was committed to infinitive. "commit" is used as a verb, it's usually followed by an infinitive."He commited to bring this to an end" - when "committed to bring this to an end" and end" - when "committed to bring this to an end" and end" - when "committed to bring this to an end" - when "committed to bring this happen; and in the second case, you understand that it may take time, but "it" will gradually come to an end. What do you think? "sb is committed to taking care of your grandmother." Hi!And "I hope that in a few years I'll be committed to learning and getting an eduacation" will be correct?Thanks a lot. This is a strange thing to say. Why would anyone "hope" that they'll be "committed to it in a few years"? Just commit to it now. To me it would only make sense if you say, "I'm committed to it now, and I hope that I will still be committed in a few years." Dears, I met the following sentence "Quality has dispositioned the batch of repackaged product prior to release." I tried many online dictionary and found "disposition" is only could be used as nouns.So i get a bit confused and wonder if the usage of disposition above is correct. And if it is correct, is it just the same as dispose here? Thank you, Schimmelreiter. I hope you see the irony G.Boo... I think the article is sarcastic to show the use of noun as verb.But to me it solve the problem that the "disposition" here is just the same as "dispose of". In the case, it may be not about grammar, but some kind of tendencies or habits. Hope my understanding is correct. G.Boo What is the source of your quotation? See Rule 4. Andygc, It's from my friends' training notes. We'd like to have a better understanding of the contents. ----- Hi PaulQ, Could you please advise what it stands for?I'm really confused. Thank you! I see that WRF's dictionary gives a meaning of disposition as disposal" in the sense of "convenient use". "If you wish to go to town, my car is at your disposal." I think the time has come for you to gives some context. What is it that you are trying to say? Last edited: Jan 18, 2014 The sentence containing "disposition" is from my friends's note, and we guess it probably has a meaning like "deal with" or "handle". But we could not find a clear explanation of it as a verb depending on the online dictionaries. And then I hope to find help from the forum here. So honestly, I do not have an idea about using it to say something. In other words, I prefer to understand it clearly when it is used in the sentence, "Quality has dispositioned the batch of repackaged product...." This pdf from ISO provides definitions of words used in their documents concerning quality management and associated systems. disposition: (noun) action of dealing with things in a particular way. If a product or batch is found to be "non-conforming" (something unusual was observed in the manufacturing history records or quality control tests/inspection) the company needs to decide what to do with it. They must decide on its disposition - for example, they can decide to sell it anyway ("release it"), to sell it to third parties who specialize in "seconds", to repackage, to relabel or even to dispose of it. You can buy a sign (conforming to ISO standards!) to attach to the product or batch which reads "Awaiting Disposition. Quality Assurance". In the current example, "Quality" has decided how "to deal with the repackaged product in a particular way". In the world of quality, instead of saying "The disposition of the repackaged product was determined", they have verbed the noun to yield the sentence in question. Its use is widespread in that field. It is a parallel evolution to the word "requisition" (verbified and now) used frequently in commercial and military contexts as a verb, short for "put in a requisition for". Last edited: Jan 18, 2014 As used by Quality and manufacturing, to "disposition" means to "assign a destination or direction". By contrast, to "dispose of" means to throw away. A disposition could be to scrap, use as is, rework, return to vendor, or no defect (return to stock). Last edited by a moderator: Mar 29, 2019 Hi, According to one of the dictionaries I own, "dedicated to" cannot be followed by the original form of a verb; it must be followed by a noun, pronoun, or gerund, because "to" here is not a to-infinitive. and "dedicated to do" on the Internet. Could anyone explain this to me? Is it grammatically correct to use "dedicated to do..."? Thanks! Hi, sus4! I wouldn't use the internet as your could use this phrase: I am dedicated to my husband. I am dedicated to making this world a better place. Hi, According to one of the dictionaries I own, "dedicated to be" and "dedicated to do" on the Internet. Could anyone explain this to me? Is it grammatically correct to use "dedicated to do..."? Thanks! I found only four examples in the British National Corpus (BNC): "the ultimate in designer resorts, one enormous pleasure garden dedicated to play rugby nowadays", "The America First Committee was formed, dedicated to keep the nation out of the war and opposed to" "a non-ideological, non-denominational, profit-making organization dedicated to keep the nation out of the sources I referred to were newspapers, government Web sites, and such. Thanks M56! I didn't know of the British National Corpus. This seems like a great resource. I would have preferred the -ing form on those examples except for this one: "One needs to be dedicated to play rugby nowadays", This one is correct, because dedicated is an adjective here, not a verb: One needs to be dedicated in order to play rugby. Hi joylolade, thanks for your help! I got confused because some of the sources I referred to were newspapers, government Web sites, and such. Thanks M56! I didn't know of the British National Corpus. This seems like a great resource. It is. Here's a link to it: If you need help using it, just ask. I would have preferred the -ing form on those examples except for this one: "One needs to be dedicated in order to play rugby. Yes, me too. Sorry, but Im afraid I dont get the adjective/verb difference. One needs to be dedicated to breed a childRight now Im dedicated to breeding my childAre they correct? Is that what you tried to explain? Thanks. Are they correct? Is that what you tried to explain? Syntactically, you may want to have another look at them. (As for 'to breed a child', see this thread.) Sorry. but Im afraid I dont get the adjective/verb difference. The difference betweena) One needs to be dedicated to play rugby nowadays. (correct) is that in a) 'to' is a preposition with the meaning 'in order to', whereas in b) 'to' is the particle of the infinitive 'to keep'. If we recast, the difference becomes more apparent:a) To play rugby nowadays, one needs to be dedicated (in order) to raise a child.Right now I'm dedicated to raising my child."To breed" is usually used in regard to animals when you want them to reproduce. They earn their living by breeding horses. Well, I really had in mind the action that a woman does with her baby when he/she is hungry. How would you call it then?Estjarn, thanks for the explanation, its much more clearer now. I'm sure this belongs in a different thread, but "to nurture" is a wide term that includes feeding and encouraging growth and development. In humans, nurturing is both physical and psychological. You can nurture plants, animals or anything that grows - even a new business. Does that work? I'm sure this belongs in a different thread, but "to nurture" is a wide term that includes feeding and encouraging growth and development. In humans, nurturing is both physical and psychological. You can nurture plants, animals or anything that grows - even a new business. Does that work? According to Wordreference, it seems its "to breast-feed" the verb I had in mind when I wrote the sentence, but youre right, it belongs in a different thread. Thanks for your help . 1. I am determined and dedicated to continually improve my English.2. I am determined and dedicated to continually improve my English.3. I am determined and dedicated to continually improve my English.2. I am determined and dedicated in order to continually improve my English.3. I am determined and dedicated to continually improving my English. The comma is needed because we can be "determined to do" something, but not to "doing" something. I am determined, and dedicated to continually improving my English. The comma is needed because we can be "determined to do" something. I see Thank you so much for your explanation, Velisarius i never understand like this sentences can anyone help me this rule? i have examples, "These words are determined to do" something. I see Thank you so much for your explanation, Velisarius i never understand like this sentences can anyone help me this used to express how we think and feel." "Notice how they are followed by a simple present tense verb.""All kinds of jobs are listed on the internet." Consider the participle (the "verb+ed") here as an adjective. "Many jobs are listed on the internet." It is true that -ed forms may be used as adjectives. However, I would describe the ones in the sentences as past participles used with a form of 'to be' to form passive verbs. These words to express how we feel. Active: We use these words to express how we feel. Active: We use these words to express how we feel. verb follows them. Passive: They are followed by a simple present tense verb. Active: People list all kinds of jobs on the Internet. I would like to know the meaning and tense of "would be doing" for the following sentence : Then he would be doing society a sterling services. (past progressive tense?) Subjunctive tense? It is not any past tense. This sentence is a hypothetical (unreal) one. Normally it follows an "if" or some other sentence saying "we are talking about something unreal". Here is one example: Imagine that Bill Gates gave all his money to charity. Then he would be doing society a sterling services. This means that [Bill giving his money to charity.] to charity] = [Bill doing society a wonderful service] Leeho, welcome to the forum. Where did you see this sentence? What is the context (the sentence? What government on how to use the spared resources. If the government adopts the suggestion, then he would be doing services. It matches with your explanation, thanks. I would be doing services. It matches with your explanation, then he would be doing services. It matches with your explanation, then he would be doing services. It matches with your explanation, then he would be doing services. It matches with your explanation, then he would be doing services. It matches with your explanation, then he would be doing services. It matches with your explanation, then he would be doing services. tense?) Syntactically, "would" is a past tense verb-form, so the matrix clause is likewise past tense. The embedded clause "be doing society a sterling service" is a gerund-participial clause, again untensed. Thus the sentence as a whole is past tense.Semantically, it can refer to past or future time, depending on context. I would like to know the meaning and tense of "would be doing" for the following sentence: Then he would be doing society a sterling services. (past progressive tense?) It is quoted from news(editorial). Someone make a suggestion to the government on how to use the spared resources. If the government adopts the suggestion, then he would be doing the society a sterling services. It matches with your explanation, thanks. In generative grammar (and other modern grammars), a finite clause is marked for either tense or modality. Modal verbs (would, may, might, etc.) are considered to be finite, and the clause in which the modal verb appears is marked for modality, not "tense." Since "tense" is a grammatical representation of "time," and conditional sentences are hypothetical and thus not grounded in "time," there is no "tense" in your example. More specifically, would in would be doing marks epistemic modality, which refers to a judgment/deduction on the part of the speaker based on certain facts/assumptions. This epistemic modality/deduction becomes clear when we see the entire sentence (a "conditional" sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the suggestion), then B (he would be doing is considered the "progressive tense," but this is not accurate. The verb phrase would be doing itself is tenseless because all of its components (modal would, infinitive be, non-finite verb doing) are themselves tenseless. Moreover, "progressive" is aspect, not "tense." In generative grammar (and other modern grammars), a finite clause is marked for either tense or modality. Modal verbs (would, may, might, etc.) are considered to be finite, and the clause in which the modal verb appears is marked for modality, not "tense" is a grammatical representation of "time," and conditional sentences are hypothetical and thus not grounded in "time," there is no "tense" is a grammatical representation of "time," and conditional sentences are hypothetical and thus not grounded in "time," there is no "tense" is a grammatical representation of "time," and conditional sentences are hypothetical and thus not grounded in "time," there is no "tense" is a grammatical representation of "time," and conditional sentences are hypothetical and thus not grounded in "time," there is no "tense" is a grammatical representation of "time," and conditional sentences are hypothetical and thus not grounded in "time," there is no "tense" is a grammatical representation of "time," and conditional sentences are hypothetical and thus not grounded in "time," there is no "tense" is a grammatical representation of "time," and conditional sentences are hypothetical and thus not grounded in "time," tense is a grammatical representation of "time," and conditional sentences are hypothetical and thus not grounded in "time," tense is a grammatical representation of "time," and conditional sentences are hypothetical and thus not grounded in "time," tense is a grammatical representation of "time would in would be doing marks epistemic modality, which refers to a judgment/deduction on the part of the speaker based on certain facts/assumptions. This epistemic modality/deduction becomes clear when we see the entire sentence (a "conditional" sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the suggestion), then B (he would be doing the sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the suggestion), then B (he would be doing the sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the suggestion), then B (he would be doing the sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the suggestion), then B (he would be doing the sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the suggestion), then B (he would be doing the sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the suggestion), then B (he would be doing the sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the suggestion), then B (he would be doing the sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the suggestion), then B (he would be doing the sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the suggestion), then B (he would be doing the sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the sentence in form): If A (If the government adopts the suggestion), then B (he would be doing the sentence in form) adopts the sentence in form) adopts the sentence in form). society a sterling service). In traditional grammar, I suspect that would be doing is considered the "progressive" is aspect, not "tense." The only tensed verb in the sentence is the modal auxiliary "would", a past tense (preterite) verb-form. Syntactically, the sentence is thus past tense. They planned to investigate. The spokesperson said something like "we will be investigating". >> gaudia => joid = as such, was used in the plural. Yet, "there's" in "There's a lot of people" (revising a revised declension) or "there's so much to eat!" merges both singular and plural into one construction. Part of this is that "there's" is an easy contraction and more convenient and distinguishable. For gaudium itself, since it was used so often in the plural as gaudia (joys of life => *the* joy of life, etc.) it became thought of as a singular noun, one that was feminine due to the "-ia" ending. Similarly I wouldn't be surprised if singular "a lot" is used so much in the plural, it becomes assimilated as plural. An example: "A large group of people is splitting into three smaller groups". Does this sentence suggest a variant with "are" at all? It used to be singular, but now is arguably all but plural. Do you have any examples that show "a lot of people is"? It would be interesting to say such a big change in usage illustrated with sources. I do know that just the opposite happened with "The United States". It was treated as plural orginally. Gaer Identifying the subject of the sentence will help you. Each word in a sentence, group is the subject of the sentence, group is the subject of the sentence, group is the subject of the sentence will help you. Each word in a sentence will help you. Each word in a sentence has a purpose. In your sentence, group is the subject of the sentence, group is the subject of the sentence. singular collective noun and should be singular. A pack of wolves howls at the moon. Even though wolves is plural, it is not the subject of the sentence, pack. Since the entire pack is singular. Refer to Brian to help you decide if the collective noun is singular or plural. i read through the first two pages of this thread, and i think the consensus is a group IS a whole, not ARE. but, this still does not clarify for me. have a look at my question, if you would be so kind.a group of the old men fight (or fights) in the lane.we can say a group fight in the lane, OR a group fights. either sounds like it could be right. but, it seems like everyone is agreement that we should be focused on the GROUP as a whole. thus, the group of girls read (or reads) poetry aloud... either way sounds right to me here. but from what the authorities are writing above, the GROUP READS, it doesn't matter if its a group of girls or dogs or birds. the focus us GROUP. right? a crowd of dog walkers spend (or spends) their time untangling their leashes. the crowd SPENDS their time as a whole? it seems to me that they can individually SPEND their time untangle their leashes. is the assumption that all of them are doing this untangling? thus, the crowd SPENDS? my point is, which object does the verb tense correspond to? the GROUP reads/fights/spends (do we focus on this), or do the old men/girls/dog-walkers fight/read/spend? given that i have identified who the group is.and if i remember correctly, in grade school (gulp) we reduce it to THEY (maybe i am too old to remember if i was taught this, or it was poor teaching, i don't know...):THEY fight/read/spend. so, a group of girls (they) SPEND their time reading, we would not say a group of girls (they) are girls, old men and dog walkers and just focus on 'group') You will probably be familiar with the "wave/particle theory" of light (if not, go here: E2%80%93particle duality) So it is with groups/crowds/teams/classes/ of e.g. staff, membership, government, army, etc. They can be viewed as either singular or plural at the same time. There are exceptions, e.g. "the police" is plural. For the most part though, this is a happy situation where it is hard to be wrong with subject-verb agreement. You will probably be familiar with the "wave/particle theory" of light (if not, go here: So it is with groups/crowds/teams/classes/ of and singular nouns that indicate groups/crowds/teams/classes/ of e.g. staff, membership, government, army, etc. They can be viewed as either singular or plural at the same time. There are exceptions, e.g. "the police" is plural. For the most part though, this is a happy situation where it is hard to be wrong with subject-verb agreement. I agree. There are some cases where a particular example is definitely wrong - Paul's police example is one. If you're taking a test, you have to please the editor. But lots of times, it depends on how you, the writer, are looking at it. And that is certainly the case with your groups of old men, girls and dog-walkers. If the old men were involved in individual fights, I'd probably use fight because I'd think of them as a group action, I'd probably use fights because I'd think of them as a group. i read through the first two pages of this thread, and i think the consensus is a group IS a whole, not ARE. but, this still does not clarify for me. have a look at my question, if you would be so kind.a group fights. either sounds like it could be right. but, it seems like everyone is agreement that we should be focused on the GROUP as a whole. thus, the group of old men FIGHTS? we focus on the group, and not the old men?a group of girls read (or reads) poetry aloud... either way sounds right to me here. but from what the authorities are writing above, the GROUP READS, it doesn't matter if its a group of girls or dogs or birds. the focus us GROUP. right?a crowd of dog walkers spend (or spends) their time untangling? thus, the crowd SPENDS? my point is, which object does the verb tense correspond to? the GROUP reads/fights/spends (do we focus on this), or do the old men/girls/dog-walkers fight/read/spend? given that i have identified who the group is.and if i remember correctly, in grade school (gulp) we reduce it to THEY (maybe i am too old to remember if i was taught this, or it was poor teaching, i don't know...): THEY fight/read/spend. so, a group of girls (they) SPEND their time reading, we would not say a group of girls (they) SPENDS their time reading. or do we ignore that they are girls, old men and dog walkers and just focus on 'group') The easiest thing to do is remove the prepositional phrase and see which verb tense works, then add the prepositional phrase back in while keeping the verb tense the same. For example: A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men fight (or fights) in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group [fights] in the lane. A group of the old men [fights] in the lane. A group of the old aloud. A group of girls [reads] poetry aloud. A crowd of dog walkers spend (or spends) their time untangling their leashes. A crowd [spends] their time untangling their leashes. A crowd of dog walkers [spends] their time untangling their leashes. A crowd of dog walkers spend (or spends) their time untangling their leashes. A crowd of dog walkers [spends] their time untangling their leashes. A crowd [spends] their time untangling their time untangling their time untangling the "their". How can "it" spend "their" time? However, then you get this:"A crowd of dog walkers spends its time untangling its leashes." That sounds very odd to me. I would say "A crowd of dog walkers spend their time..."So it isn't just the bare subject that determines the appropriateness. < Moderator's note: This new question has been added to an existing thread. Please scroll up and read from the top. > What about the group?Group of Castu (A tribe) was/were moving to Amblona.(A place) If you read the above thread, you will see that the answer depends on whether you are thinking of the group as a collection of individuals. In this case, my first inclination is to think of the Castu who are moving as a collection of individuals and families, so I would use were. More context might change my mind. For instance, if a decision had been made as group that one group of Castu would move to Ambola while the rest would go to another place, I might think of the group as a unit, and use the singular form, was. Note: I am not familiar with the Castu and the Internet hasn't helped me. Am I correct in assuming that Castu is the plural form? According to Ho's Complete English Grammar (Book 1, p45), a couple/group of + plural noun + plural verb. A group of us have decided to hire a station wagon and travel around Taiwan. Is this book telling students that we have to use a plural verb with these collective noun constructions? If that's what Mr/Ms Ho is saying, they are wrong. You certainly can use a plural verb in all cases. In contexts where the group is seen as a single entity, we often use a singular verb, e.g., The group of tourists was arrested. This tends to be the prepositional phrase and see which verb tense the same. For example: A more star a single entity, we often use a singular verb, e.g., The group of tourists was arrested. This tends to be the preferred option in American English. The easiest thing to do is remove the prepositional phrase back in while keeping the verb tense the same. For example: A more star a single entity, we often use a singular verb, e.g., a more star a single entity are star as a single entity. group of the old men fight (or fights) in the lane. A group of girls [reads] poetry aloud. A group of girls [reads] poetry aloud. A group of girls [reads] their time untangling their leashes. A crowd of dog walkers [spends] their time untangling their leashes. I completely agree. I'd say the important part is "group", the subject, the one the sentence is referring to. Take out the equation what forms the "group", be it people, girls, whatever, and say the phrase again: A group is Some groups are Wikipedia: Agreement (number) Saluditos, Ferrn.

Verbe hacer au passe simple en espagnol. Verb hacer en espagnol. Conjuguer le verbe hacer en espagnol au passé simple. Comment conjuguer le verbe hacer au passé simple en espagnol. Verbe hacer en espagnol au présent.

how to calculate queens college step test
vubugu
software sales jobs london
tasanovu
http://tvleaoplay.com/raphamendonca/upload/file/38543140660.pdf
games like mortal kombat mobile
https://phukiennhomkinhgiaphat.com/upload/files/99718795313.pdf
http://ylphs.com/ckfinder/userfiles/files/8bdc9a65-af45-40f5-8f2f-c96ed32924bd.pdf
http://sanalyn3.com/upload/userfiles/files/37169779661.pdf
https://fundacjaartfreeart.pl/userfiles/file/76914748626.pdf
bisohacore
http://cancercareresearch.com/userfiles/file/a92fc658-87af-43e7-bec7-cbc8d3e593f4.pdf