Another phonetic confusion I have is this... I have 3 dictionaries (Oxford, Collins, Larousse) that describe Brazilian pronunciation on their first pages. I also use some online resources (thefreedictionary.com, forvo.com) to look things up or just listen to the pronunciation. Where the pronunciation (Brazilian Portuguese) is indicated in writing, it generally goes something like this: -o (final) : livro ó [ɔ]: óleo as in shop ó [o]: colônia as in pole o (unstressed) [o]: locomotiva as in pole o (stressed) [ɔ]: loja as in shop or [o]: globo as in pole So, this implies that "o" (that has no graphic accent over it) has two different pronunciations (besides , of course): 1. diphthongized [o]: locomotiva, globo as in pole 2. monophthong [ɔ]: loja as in shop Now, the confusion comes from the fact that I do not hear this diphthongized o in the aforementioned and many other words at forvo.com. Are the dictionaries wrong or outdated? Or do they cover a different dialect of Brazilian Portuguese than that demonstrated at forvo? Or am I deaf? Please help as I can't get my head around this. Update: I think there's a plausible explanation of the phenomenon. The dictionary authors likely tried to approximate the Portuguese "o" (a monophthong) with American English "o" (a diphthong, [aʊ]/[oʊ]) and weren't very elaborate, which made their pronunciation guide confusing. Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 Another phonetic confusion I have is this... I have 3 dictionaries (Oxford, Collins, Larousse) that describe Brazilian pronunciation on their first pages. I also use some online resources (thefreedictionary.com, forvo.com) to look things up or just listen to the pronunciation. Where the pronunciation (Brazilian Portuguese) is indicated in writing, it generally goes something like this: -o (final) : livro ó [ɔ]: óleo as in shop ó [o]: colônia as in pole o (unstressed) [o]: locomotiva, globo as in pole 2. monophthong [ɔ]: loja as in shop Now, the confusion comes from the fact that I do not hear this diphthongized o in the aforementioned and many other words at forvo.com. To me all these o's sound more or less the same, as monophthongs. Are the dictionaries wrong or outdated? Or do they cover a different dialect of Brazilian Portuguese than that demonstrated at forvo? Or am I deaf? Please help as I can't get my head around this. If your dictionaries say anything about diphthongs, they're just wrong. All those sounds are monophthongs. It's true that you have 3 different ways to pronounce the letter o, but none of them is a diphthong, which is always represented in writing. (1) bola - similar to o in off (2) dedo - similar to oo in book (3) coco - slightly similar to o in go In (3) I said "slightly similar" because, unlike English, in Portuguese you have a monothong, not a diphthong. So, while o in go has two vowels in its pronunciation -- [o] + [w] --, o in pole is simply [o]. Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 The only diphtongized "o" I know is the one from Rio, in the word doze (douze). Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 None of the above "o" sounds are diphthongs, as Ariel Knightly has explained, but they are not more or less the same either. In the final position, the "o" is always reduced to a "u" sound; when in the middle of the word, it can be either open, closed or nasal (you know the sound is nasal when "o" is followed by the letters "m" or "n" in the same syllable). Olho (eye): first "o" is closed, second "o" reduced to "u" Olhos (eyes): first "o" open, second reduced porto (port): first "o" closed, second reduced portos (ports): first "o" open, second reduced oxo (egg): first "o" closed, second reduced ovos (eggs): first "o" open, second reduced ônibus (bus): nasal "o" computador (computer): first "o" nasal, second "o" closed Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 If your dictionaries say anything about diphthongs, they're just wrong. All those sounds are monophthongs. It's true that you have 3 different ways to pronounce the letter o, but none of them is a diphthong, which is always represented in writing. Wow, unbelievable. The Oxford dictionary claims to be "most trusted" and "comprehensive reference work" (yet I've found typos and mistakes other than this in it), Larousse -- "ideal for all your language needs" and "providing fast and practical solutions to the various problems encountered when reading Portuguese" (yet its pronunciation guide lacks basic details, contained in the other too), Collins -- "fully revised", "authoritative" and "ideal for home/school/office". How come all three of them are so misleading? Is there any other Portuguese or any other Brazil the authors had in mind or did they never learn the language in the first place? Btw, do you know a better dictionary that is actually correct? And others to stay away from? None of the above "o" sounds are diphthongs, as Ariel Knightly has explained, but they are not more or less the same either. In the final position, the "o" is always reduced to a "u" sound; when in the middle of the word, it can be either open, closed or nasal (you know the sound is nasal when "o" is followed by the letters "m" or "n" in the same syllable). Olho (eye): first "o" is closed, second "o" reduced to "u" Olhos (eyes): first "o" open, second reduced porto (port): first "o" closed, second reduced portos (ports): first "o" open, second reduced oxo (egg): first "o" closed, second reduced ovos (eggs): first "o" open, second reduced ônibus (bus): nasal "o" computador (computer): first "o" nasal, second "o" closed I already know about the "u" sound at the end and nasalization. I'm trying to understand the pronunciation basics from the various incomplete and misleading sources. I don't know why it's that way with Portuguese. It's not that obscure/rare of a language with few speakers... Regarding the open/closed, especially in your examples: - is that something that occurs naturally with speech due to the word length in terms of syllables/sounds? - is there a way to figure out which is which based on the overall spelling, word form and knowledge of stress location? - how often is it important to make this distinction? I know, for example, that avó and avô mean different things and are pronounced differently, but the spelling clearly marks this distinction in these words, while in the words from your examples, there's nothing obvious at first glance and I think there're no other words to confuse p*rt@(s) and *vo(s) with due to a different pronunciation of o. There are no way to recognize the pronunciation by the spelling. Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 There are no way to recognize the pronunciation by the spelling. posto (position, placed): first "o" closed poste (pole): "o" open corte (cut): "o" open corte (court): "o" closed You actualy have to know the pronunciation. Nice. Like English. Good example, thanks. Regarding the open/closed, especially in your examples: - is that something that occurs naturally with speech due to the word length in terms of syllables/sounds? - is there a way to figure out which is which based on the overall spelling, word form and knowledge of stress location? - how often is it important to make this distinction? I know, for example, that avó and avô mean different things and are pronounced differently, but the spelling clearly marks this distinction in these words, while in the words from your examples, there's nothing to confuse p*rt@(s) and *vo(s) with due to a different pronunciation of o. In most cases, there's no telling if the o is open or closed from the spelling. The reasons for the different pronunciations go back to Latin (sometimes with irregularities along the way). The good news: Most times, it won't make a difference if you pronounce a vowel close instead of open, or vice-versa. Also, when the difference does matter, the vowel in question is always stressed. There are a handful of word pairs you should make an effort to distinguish, like avó/avô. Unfortunately, not all of them are differentiated in writing. By the way, the same kind of thing happens with é/ê/e. Those vowel changes were probably the hardest thing for me to learn, and even to this day I have some problems with it! I remember starting a similar thread which also may be of help. You can take a look at it here: Changes in vowel sounds Chris As a non-native speaker of Portuguese, I continue to have problems with all the ways to pronounce "o" in that language. I know the difference in meaning and pronunciation between avô and avó, but whenever I want to pronounce either word, I have to stop, think, and then continue. It has not become "naturalized" in my spoken Portuguese (although in written Portuguese, it's quite simple.) In the city I live in, Fortaleza, there is an even more complicated situation with a single spelling (but different accents) that results in three pronunciations and meanings, one of which is quite rude. The word, unaccented, is coco. Along side this is the vulgar cocô, and here in Fortaleza we have a river and a park named Cocó. I don't have a problem with the differentiating the unaccented coco, but believe me, I'm very careful when I pronounce the name of the park! I stop, think twice, confirm silently, and then carefully proceed. All to avoid those giggles and snickers from native Brazilian friends if I err. The only diphtongized "o" I know is the one from Rio, in the word doze (douze). Very good! Usually the same people that say cisne/for cisne. I know for sure from "EA" and "unit" indicate the number of products. Is there any difference between these two words? Where are you thinking of using these, or where have you seen them used? Each is by far the most common. Both of them are being turned into something else or reused wholesale. "Old processors can be recycled and used to make new modern components." New equipment can be made from recycled processors I was going to say they're very different. Recycling is a whole industry, the practice is very topical, and the word recycle is in constant use. The word reclaim is used in various contexts, not just this one, and it's more specific and therefore much less common. The term is applied especially in relation to land reclamation, and it's common when referring to the reclaiming of natural materials such as wood and building materials such as tiles for reuse. I associate it more with upcycling than with industrial recycling. Last edited: May 20, 2019 The final product in the below example is not of the raw material. Shelves are not the raw material. How to be with it? A shelf can be a way to use a board - the board itself is the shelf. The shelf is not a product but a use. Yes, the old boards are. You reclaim the old boards from something made of boards. Then you reuse the reclaimed boards as shelves. I found this forum searching for the right way to use the word reclaim. I want to advertise the bags I sew from reclaimed fabric. (The bolts of fabrics are leftover from theaters, designers, etc.) Do I understand correctly that the bags cannot be described as reclaimed? Would that be what is called upcycled? Or can I say "upcycled bags from reclaimed fabric." or is that redundant? Thanks. I don't think the fabric is reclaimed since it was never used before. Reclaimed would be reusing the fabric from the theater curtains that used to hang on the stage. It had an original use and now it has another. Your fabric never had a use. I would call those remnants. They are bags sewn from remnant fabrics, or something like that. I agree that a board used as a shelf is reclaimed. However, 'recyclin'; is such a vogue words these days that it is likely to be used of such things as a reclaimed board. I don't think the fabric is reclaimed since it was never used before. Reclaimed would be reusing the fabric from the theater curtains that used to hang on the stage. It had an original use and now it has another. Your fabric never had a use. I would call those remnants. They are bags sewn from remnant fabrics, or something like that. The question was more about the bags. Upcycled? Reclaimed? Hello, forum veterans. Let me ask you a question regarding prepositions. Today, while working on my TOEFL workbook, I came across the following conversation: Employee Well, first, you need to talk to the instructor. They have to assess your level and steer you to the right class – you know, beginner, intermediate. Student You mean, I have to swim for them, show them what I can do? Employee No, no, you just tell them a little bit about your experience and skill, so they know what level you should be in. Student Oh, OK. So, I guess I'll need an appointment. I have always thought that the preposition that is most commonly used for 'level' is at. However, Employee uses in instead. I visited some other threads like at/in/with different level Your English level is really good Vs Your level of English is really good in/on/at level and I learned that "I am on level number" is used in video games. I also found that at seemed to be the most frequently used preposition for 'level.' Could you explain what made Employee want to say "what level you should be in" here? Any comment appreciated "ex-avier." Can anyone help? It is greatly appreciated. "El español: saberlo es quererlo" I'm not sure, but I think the X spelling is from Catalan, in which it would have a different pronunciation. But in Castellano, I think both spellings are pronounced the same. We can say Mexico, the "x" is like a "j". For Xavier we can also say "x" like "j" ("sh" in English). I hope it will be helpful for you. Good luck. In modern Spanish, only mexican words have 'x' pronounced as 'j', (Méjico). All other uses of X instead of J come from other languages such as Catalán or Gallego, and in all those cases you can pronounce X as SH (Shavier, Shishón, Shátiva). I used to live in a town in the south where there was a bar with its name written in Asturian, called Xixón. Learning about the different languages and dialects in Spain, the teacher used it as an example saying we should pronounce it Shishón, but many people, not knowing this, called it 'Csicsón'! Good day! One of "to reclaim" definitions from cambridge.org: to reclaim — to get useful materials from waste: There are new techniques for reclaiming water from human waste. Idoceonline.com: You can reclaim old boards and use them as shelves. oxforddictionaries.com: a sufficient weight of plastic could easily be reclaimed One of "to recycle" definitions from cambridge.org: to recycle — to use a special industrial process in order to make materials and products ready to be used again: Equipment that is too old to repair is recycled. Music is separated into four different bins in order to recycle it. Plastic bottles can be recycled into a myriad of other products. So, concerning the above definitions: Are "reclaim" and "recycle" interchangeable? Do they mean the same or what the difference is there between them? Thanks! They're pretty close to me in meaning but there are nuances that prevent them from being totally interchangeable. When you reclaim materials from something, the final product is the raw material itself. "Intel reclaims substantial quantities of gold from recycled processors." Gold can be harvested from processors When you recycle something, the notion is that the material is being turned into something else or reused wholesale. "Old processors can be recycled and used to make new modern components." New equipment can be made from recycled processors I was going to say they're very different. Recycling is a whole industry, the practice is very topical, and the word recycle is in constant use. The word reclaim is used in various contexts, not just this one, and it's more specific and therefore much less common. The term is applied especially in relation to land reclamation, and it's common when referring to the reclaiming of natural materials such as wood and building materials such as tiles for reuse. I associate it more with upcycling than with industrial recycling. Last edited: Aug 13, 2009 Hi. I really do not want to upset our American foreros but sometimes things get so that one can only be told (without taking offense) by a well meaning friend. Only Monarchs and Popes have Regnal numbers and it causes no end of amusement (sorry) when US citizens style themselves thus. But then do we Anglos not have a multitude of quaint customs ourselves? We have to laugh at and celebrate/understand our different customs rather than retreat into tribalism. Wouldn't it because of a particular name be generally expressed as "John Smith Jr." in any case? Or does it switch to 'the Second' when 'the Third' arrives on the scene? (Those sorts of names are unusual in this part of the world as well, particularly anything beyond the 'junior'.) I'm not an AE speaker, so I too never use those styles - but even in AE writing I've never seen II or III written out in full for commoners' names like John Smith II. With monarchs, use a capital: James the Second. Thanks for these helpful answers. I agree it's not common to use these written out, but in my particular case, I want to write it out, rather than using the Roman numeral III. From what I can find using that link and others I've since found, it's proper when writing it out to do it this way: John Smith the 3rd. As for John Smith II. that would be a child whose named after a grandfather, for instance. This child would not be a junior unless he shares his father's name. If he shares both his father's and grandfather's name, then he would become the 3rd. AngelEyes Thanks for these helpful answers. As for John Smith II: that would be a child whose named after a grandfather, for instance. This child would not be a junior unless he shares his father's name. If he shares both his father's and grandfather's name, then he would become the 3rd. Good to know. Here I don't think you'd bother differentiating a grandfather and grandchild's names at all, they would both just be 'John Smith'. I suppose the idea is that you're unlikely to confuse the two. Hi. I really do not want to upset our American foreros but sometimes things get so that one can only be told (without taking offense) by a well meaning friend. Only Monarchs and Popes have Regnal numbers and it causes no end of amusement (sorry) when US citizens style themselves thus. How do Anglos differentiate then when a grandfather, father, and son all have the same name? I simply don't know anyone in this situation, other than one guy who comes into the place where we work who is a III but who has a Spanish-sounding name. And yeah, we kinda call him 'the third' in a bit of a mocking way behind his back... I do know a father and son (my uncle and cousin, respectively) with the same name, but they don't even call themselves jr. and snr. as a matter of course. Within our family we call them 'Big John' and 'Little John' but that's hardly standard practice lol. Traditionally, in important families, we used Elder and Younger - thus our politicians Pitt the Elder and Pitt the Younger. These are the direct equivalents of AE Senior and Junior. But BE families don't re-use names to the same degree AE does, certainly not to the third generation. In ordinary modern usage - well, I knew a family once where father and son had the same name, and it was just confusion when I tried to ring them. It's rare enough that there's no established convention. American name I'm aware of that classed as high as the fourth limb of the ordinal family tree is country/western singer George Hamilton IV. Wikipedia doesn't say whether the name is legitimate or contrived for stage purposes. Personally, I wouldn't (and didn't) tag any of my sons to be a "junior." we call them 'Big John' and 'Little John' but that's hardly standard practice lol. Oh I don't know, Gwan. I'm fairly certain that when my mother and her brother, who were both named after their parents*, were growing up they were known as Little V____ and Little J____. (Mind you, I'm not sure what happened when my uncle reached the 6'2" mark while his dad stayed put at 5'6" or so) *It was an accident, apparently: they just couldn't agree on any other names. Oh I don't know, Gwan. I'm fairly certain that when my mother and her brother, who were both named after their parents*, were growing up they were known as Little V____ and Little J____. (Mind you, I'm not sure what happened when my uncle reached the 6'2" mark while his dad stayed put at 5'6" or so) *It was an accident, apparently: they just couldn't agree on any other names. Maybe it's a Lancashire thing Ewie And yes, we 'Big John' and others like that link and others I've since found, 'Little John" is now a married police officer with 2 kids, doesn't quite work any more... Hi everyone! Recently, I wrote a long paper on words such as those in the title and how their meanings change according to intonation. My professor advised me to refer to them as utterances. But, having spoken with a college of his, he says that he misspoke and that utterances is not the correct term. He suggested interjections, then threw it out. I came up with mumblings, but it doesn't sound very correct to me. Does anyone know what to call these words/sounds/utterances/mumblings? Maybe grunts? - still thinking-: [An academic thesis I found] calls them non-lexical conversation sounds. Last edited by a moderator: Dec 31, 2023 From a sociolinguistic viewpoint they may well be "non-lexical conversation sounds." From the point of view of traditional grammar, they are interjections. Perhaps the grammatical term deserves to be scrapped, though, on the basis of being too vague. I remember watching a video on spoken English that called them "filler sounds". I thought that was an accurate description, if not very technical. expletive 2 any syllable, word or phrase conveying no independent meaning, especially one inserted in a line of verse for the sake of the metre. ,, I believe they are generally called vocal pauses. I've also heard them called (informally) "fillers." They are called vocalized pauses. My boyfriend, who is a journalist, once interviewed a writer he respected immensely — and, in the published transcript of the interview, he left in a few of the times the man said "you know," "like," "mmh" and "ah." It's pretty standard, since without that vivid information, my vote Which one is preferable – actually, do the two convey different nuances of meaning at all? "These representations are learnable inductively in certain conditions" OR RATHER: "These representations are learnable inductively under certain conditions" There is a difference but "These representations are learnable inductively under certain conditions" is a strange sentence: what is the source and context? There is a difference but "These representations are learnable inductively under certain conditions" is a strange sentence: what is the source and context? Thank you for your reply. It is a linguistics scholarly paper. So, are "in" and "under" equivalents? 'Under' is more strictly logical: if such-and-such is the case, 'in' is vaguer, and could include good lighting and lack of noise, as well as the logical prerequisites. Usually: "These representations are learnable inductively in certain conditions" - when certain conditions occur. "These representations are learnable inductively under certain conditions" - when certain conditions are applied. Hello! I wonder if scheme or schematic are different in the following example, or if they are synonyms... if so, which is most common? Usually: "These representations are learnable inductively in certain conditions" - when certain conditions applied. Hello! I wonder if scheme or schematic are different in the following example, or if they are synonyms... if so, which is most common? - figure 1 shows a schematic of the process described in section 1.1... or – figure 1 shows a schematic of the process described in section 1.1... elivaos When referring to a drawing or design of something (which it sounds like you are), then "schematic" is used. Hello aceo2nc, They are in fact some drawings illustrating steps that are taken in "the process described in section 1.1". When is scheme used then? Hi elivaos, At least in American English, scheme has almost exclusively come to be used in meaning 2 as seen here in the WR dictionary: a strategy or plan, often somewhat devious. We would usually not use it for charts, maps, diagrams and the like. This BE speaker agrees with kite. No doubt it was originally a schematic drawing, with schematic as an adjective, but now it is simply a schematic. In my head, a schematic is a visualisation of something. It is not representational in the sense that a map or a building plan is representational. For example, unlike a map or a plan, a schematic is not to scale. Thank you panjandrum! So to conclude the thread:- schematic is for drawings or similars that are used to illustrate something (as it is used in the example of the process in section 1.1) - scheme is more about plans and so on, as kitenok mentioned earlier. Hi, I understand that the adjective 'different' can be used before and after the noun in French. Can somebody explain to me what the difference in meaning is? Thanks Moderator note: Multiple threads have been merged to create this one. Last edited by a moderator: Oct 31, 2012 I would say before the noun, it means "various", "diverse" and after the noun, it properly means "different". J'ai vu différents modèles de shirts. J'ai choisi un modèle différent. I choose a different model. I'm afraid that's not always true, but more or less, (let's say 90 %) it is right. Thanks, that makes sense. SO what would be the difference between saying de differents enfants and des enfants différents? Thanks You need context to understand. So, I take some examples : J'ai besoin de l'avis de différents enfants pour savoir si ce livre leur plaira. I need the opinion of several children ... (more than one or two...) J'ai besoin de l'avis d'enfants différents... I need the opinion of different children...(children coming from different contries, différents social level, etc...) Hi! I was wondering when the word "différent" is placed before or after nouns? I've seen different things in different cases, like ces différents besoins, les différentes différences. Is there a way to tell? Thanks! "il y a des raisons / besoins / cultures différentes. Is there a way to tell? Thanks! "il y a des raisons / besoins / cultures qui expliquent cela ..." is it clearer ? Thanks! Hmmm.. but is there a more precise meaning for "différent" could mean something as "several" ; "different" could mean something...different" is close to: "not the same". But these differences between the two positions are quite small and certainly not always true... I hope it helps... TiTornade explains as I've thought of that, and can explain it this way wait for an expert in grammar ! ;-) Could it be that it's: un/une/des + noun + différent and le/la/les + différent + noun ? Last edited by a moderator: Apr 21, 2015 Hello, To me, the meaning is not exactly the same when you change the position of "différent". "Dans ce pays cohabitent des personnes de différentes cultures." the meaning is close to: "plusieurs cultures" ; "différent" could mean something as "several". "Ces pays ont des cultures différentes." the meaning of "différent" is close to: "not the same". But these differences between the two positions are quite small and certainly not always true.. True that's why examples seem to show But the other responses are probably more helpful Différent(e)s is less likely to mean various/plusieurs after the indefinite article. Some various/several cultures? Quelques différentes/plusieurs cultures? If you mean "different"/"not the same", I imagine you could say "les cultures différentes qu'on a mentionnées" (the [very] different cultures we were talking about). N'est-ce pas? Last edited by a moderator: Apr 21, 2015 Différent(e)s is less likely to mean various/plusieurs after the indefinite article. That's right. In fact, in such cases, différents functions as a determiner and the indefinite article is impossible.De(s) différentes cultures qu'on été mentionnées. Différentes cultures ont été mentionnées.See also the following thread: de différents X / différents X I am writing a french oral and would like to know if you would say "bâtiments de différentes époques" but I don't trust this. Les francophones prevent me corriger, mais il me parait que... If you want to stress the fact that the periods in question all differ from each other, you would place différentes behind the noun, but if you just mean various ages, then it would precede the noun; if you mean different, it should follow it. différentes époques = various eras époques différentes = different eras I am writing a french oral and would like to know if you would say "bâtiments de différentes époques" or "bâtiments de époques différentes". Google translate says "bâtiments de différentes époques" but I don't trust this. Bâtiments de différentes époques, but anyway différents are possible, provided you don't forget the elision of e in de before a word (here) beginning with a vowel. I'm so confused. I always thought the word "different" went after the noun. Hi, In this case, différentes is a determiner. It means various or different (These are the various/different parts of...). When it comes after the noun, it means "dissimilar". In this case, différentes is a determiner. It has the meaning you explained, but it can't be a determiner in this specific example example (since it is preceded by les). Différent(e)s can only be used as an indefinite determiner, as in the examples given earlier in this thread. Bonjour, Est-ce que l'adjectif "différent" change de sens lorsqu'il est placé avant le verbe? Je crois avoir appris cela dans un cour il y a quelques ans, mais je ne réussis pas à le confirmer dans mon dictionnaire. Par exemple: pour de différentes raisons/ pour des raisons différentes Dans le premier cas, je croyais qu'il s'agissait de plusieurs raisons, lorsque dans le second, je croyais que l'emphase était sur la différence entre elles. Mille fois merci. Tu as raison, dans le premier cas ça signifie "several reasons" et dans le deuxième cas "other reasons" (qui suppose qu'on a déjà parlé d'une certaine raison potentielle). I also have a question about the placement of 'différent'. Is 'deux domaines d'applications différents' translated as 'two different domains of applications' since 'domaines' is a masculine, plural noun and 'différents' is a masculine, plural category? If this is the correct translation, why does 'différents' not immediately follow 'domaines'? Tes, 'domaine d'application' is considered as one word ; you cannot seperate the elements of a compound word. Last edited by a moderator: Aug 8, 2017 I wouldn't go that far. It is possible – though much rarer and less natural – to split such noun phrases.