

Click to verify























百度知道>提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了?> 提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了? - [kən.ɛ] - [kə.nɛ] [kə.sa] - [kə.sa] Last edited: Jan 24, 2016 I was obviously referring to geminate consonants in my previous post. No other language has as many geminate consonants as Italian and Finnish in Europe. True, I was only pointing out that spoken Finnish is different from the written one. In Italian double consonants are possible only in intervocalic position. The same occurs in Scandinavian Languages (Norwegian and Swedish), but in this latter case, the distinction is phonemic. [kən.ɛ] - [kə.nɛ] [kə.sa] - [kə.sa] Yes, the same thing happens in Icelandic. In Italian and Icelandic vowel length is not phonemic. The Italian consonant clusters at the beginning of a word sound very unromance to me and Slavic-like. Strega Silitta Svegliare Sdraio Sgranato Sbrigare Sbagliare Svizzera Schiuma The Italian consonant clusters at the beginning of a word sound very unromance to me and Slavic-like. In Latin there were schola, stadium, not escuela, estadio. Anyway, in Italian we use lo, uno before these nouns, so lo stadio and el estadio sound pretty similar. If I had to forget for the moment that I speak some Romance languages (to a certain degree), then my answer could be: Does French with vowels ù, ô sound like a Romance language? It doesn't sound typically Romance. A "non-Romance-native person" spontaneously expects the vowels ù, ô rather in Finno-Ugric, Turkish, Germanic, etc ... languages, but not in the Neo-Latin ones. The Italian consonant clusters at the beginning of a word sound very unromance to me and Slavic-like ... Not only the clusters themselves, but also the pronunciation [z] of the initial s- before voiced consonants (e.g. svegliare, sdraio, smarrire, svenire, .... ) sounds "very Slavic". Even more, the Slavic prefixes s-/z- do often have a very similar meaning/function as the Italian prefix s-. In Latin there were schola, stadium, not escuela, estadio. Anyway, in Italian we use lo, uno before these nouns, so lo stadio and el estadio sound pretty similar, this cluster is always in intervocalic position. Yes, but the Italian initial s- is very frequent and it produces often non-Latin sounding clusters/words. (In old Italian written documents we find sporadically also solutions similar to Spanish, i.e. with initial i- before the s impura). All in all, I think that the subjective feeling of the non-Romance natives/speakers about what sounds and what doesn't sound Romance, is given/influenced by the image (experience/impression/knowledge) of the medieval Latin. From this point of view, I'd say that the Italian is phonetically perhaps the more Romance-sounding language, followed by the Spanish. (E.g. Hannibal ante portas, amantes amantes, das ut des, etc. ... sound almost Spanish, but not Italian). Last edited: Jan 26, 2016 Yes, European Portuguese sounds like Polish to me. (I know no one will agree, but I am not making this up, it really sounds like Polish to me) I sometimes say that Polish is French of Slavic languages, because of the nasal vowels and complex grammar. French Mount Blanc is pronounced (writing in Polish characters) like ma błą (interesting that we actually pronounce the name as mount blank, for some reason). Spanish people call Catalones polacos, and it is probably not because those languages are similar, but because of the Catalanian being really difficult. ^I don't think French grammar is particularly harder than that of other Romance languages (the same for Catalan). In my view, French grammar is very very similar to the Italian one and Romanian or Literary Portuguese are way harder than French. As for the Slavic languages, are you sure that Polish grammar is more complex than Czech, Slovak or, say, Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian. Sorry, I meant spelling Rz could be confused for Z or sz, ô and u sound the same, ch and h sound the same... There are rules for these homophonic letters, but each of them has a lot of exceptions. The easiest way to write them correctly is to know a foreign Slavic language, to see the etymological changes (although some words are not 100% "etymological"). Most other Slavic languages don't have such homophonic letters, except Slovak e and á (they should be different, but they aren't nowadays Slovak). French is well known for confusing spelling, svaria, sbaglia, sgrava, sgrida, sdraia, sbrana ... (with the voiced s- they sound a bit Slavic to me, like e.g. the existing Slovak words zvaria, zbalia) But it happens also in Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese and Catalan, for example esgrima [ɛzˈɣima] (Spanish), [izˈɣimɐ] (Brazilian Portuguese), [ɛzˈɣima] (Catalan), so you have "la scrima (the common word for this sport is scherma in Italian), la esgrima, a esgrima, a esgrima, all in intervocalic position. I don't say that the voiced s- doesn't appear in other Romance languages. I only wanted to say that according to my (subjective) opinion these word initial clusters with voiced s- do not sound Latin but rather Slavic to me. I'd say that the voiced /s/ before voiced consonants is normal in both Romance and Slavic languages, but it's unvoiced in Germanic languages, see the English slip, small. I'd say that the voiced /s/ before voiced consonants is normal in both Romance and Slavic languages, but it's unvoiced in Germanic languages, see the English slip, small...that Italians pronounce /zliɲ/ and /zmo/ like snow (/zno/) and slow (/zlo/) I think it is a bit silly to grade a language's difficulty without a criteria to define "hardness to learn." Every language has characteristics about it that make it the "hardest to learn" in some aspects. For example, as a learner of Spanish, I find it especially difficult to master the numerous dialects and regional varieties. This would not be nearly as big of a problem, say, in Romanian, since there are only about 20 million speakers almost exclusively centered around one country. In that regard, I think Spanish would top the list. Just think of how many ways you can say "cool" in Spanish. Every country has their own way, most have multiple unique ways, and Mexico in particular seems to have dozens of possibilities. And whoever said Spanish has a simple spelling system has never been to Central and South Mexico, where Aztec and Mayan words are notoriously difficult to read and pronounce. My friend's last name is Zempoatecl, and that is a rather easy to pronounce last name compared to many others that are much more complicated. What's more, in order to master Spanish you must learn multiple cultures (European, Amerindian, African, etc.), multiple types of governments and political and legal systems and how they work, cautious amounts of history and names of geographical locations, and little bits and pieces of other languages like "Guarani" in order to really know what people are saying. In that regard, I think Spanish tops the list in difficulty, or comes in the top two at the very least. It is also important to take into account the availability of media and what not to learn the language. Here in the States, Spanish is probably by far the easiest to immerse yourself in for a number of reasons. There are millions of immigrants throughout the country, almost all libraries have a Spanish section (some better than others), almost all movies have a Spanish dub or subtitles, most regions have a Spanish radio station, and the amount of content available online is huge, especially from Spain (for example). Because of this, Spanish in some ways becomes the easiest to learn, at least from an American standpoint. So, I think this ranking business is a bit pointless, since there is no criteria defined here. Even within my post, Spanish goes from hardest to easiest, depending on what we're talking about. So, I think this ranking business is a bit pointless, since there is no criteria defined here. I used grammatical and phonetic criteria. It seems you're extending the matter to the different varieties a language can have. In this respect, European and Brazilian Portuguese are more different, both phonetically and grammatically, than, for example, European and Rioplatense Spanish. For example, as a learner of Spanish, I find it especially difficult to master the numerous dialects and regional varieties. Really? Do you think that a person from Madrid or, say, Buenos aires is able to master numerous dialects and regional varieties? Not to mention a non-native speaker of Spanish. Italian or Catalan also have various regional or local varieties, this does not mean that we need to know all the varieties. There are continuous discussions about different regional words or phrases in the Italian or Catalan forums. Please read Posts number 13 and 25. I did define the criteria.... (essentially, taking into account grammar, phonology and spelling). Last edited: Feb 10, 2016 This does not mean that we need to know all the varieties. I know I'm referring to my own experience here in the States, where there is a mesh of immigrants hailing from every Spanish-speaking country in the world. In order for me to understand what they are all saying, I personally have to master every dialect, and Spanish, if I'm not mistaken, has the most. Certainly, I'm not saying that I know British or Australian English as an English native, but if I were to go to those countries, I can assure you I would feel very lost for quite some time. It is the same in Spanish. What I mean by no criteria is that there is no criteria established at the beginning of the thread, nor by the person who opened the thread (that I could tell). It simply says, "based on what I find difficult." Every person, then, seems to have their own individual criteria and so ranks things differently. I used grammatical and phonetic criteria. It seems you're extending the matter to the different varieties a language can have. In this respect, European and Brazilian Portuguese are more different, both phonetically and gramatically, than, for example, European and Rioplatense Spanish, when compared only to Madrid Spanish and Rioplatense Spanish, but if you account for the difference between the Spanish in Madrid, Spain, Buenos Aires, Argentina, Mexico City, Mexico, San Juan, Puerto Rico, and, say, Spanish from Equatorial Guinea, then I think I could argue that overall there is greater difference than in Portuguese. I once had a Mexican friend ask me (a complete gringo) to interpret for him when we went to visit a Puerto Rican family since he was unable to understand what they were talking about. What's more, in order to master Spanish you must learn multiple cultures (European, Amerindian, African, etc.), multiple types of governments and political and legal systems and how they work, cautious amounts of history and names of geographical locations, and little bits and pieces of other languages like "Guarani" in order to really know what people are saying. It's the first time I hear somebody saying that you must learn history, geography, politics or even the basics of surrounding languages to really master a language. Naturally you must take into account these factors if you immerse yourself in a foreign country, but they're included in a different "pack", which are the cultural barriers. If you go abroad you must overcome linguistic and cultural barriers. And I wouldn't include dialectal differences as well as ease of immersion when trying to measure the difficulty of a given language. It is true that Brazilian Portuguese is more different than European Portuguese, when compared only to Madrid Spanish and Rioplatense Spanish, but if you account for the difference between the Spanish in Madrid, Spain, Buenos Aires, Argentina, Mexico City, Mexico, San Juan, Puerto Rico, and, say, Spanish from Equatorial Guinea, then I think I could argue that overall there is greater difference than in Portuguese. Yes, greater difference, but we are speaking about difficulty. Take the most difficult, complicated, variety of Spanish language and then compare it with European Portuguese or French, both phonetically and grammatically. I don't say that the voiced /s/ before voiced consonants is normal in both Romance and Slavic languages, but it's unvoiced in Germanic languages, see the English slip, small. I'd say that the voiced /s/ before voiced consonants is normal in both Romance and Slavic languages, but it's unvoiced in Germanic languages, see the English slip, small...that Italians pronounce /zliɲ/ and /zmo/ like snow (/zno/) and slow (/zlo/) I think it is a bit silly to grade a language's difficulty without a criteria to define "hardness to learn." Every language has characteristics about it that make it the "hardest to learn" in some aspects. For example, as a learner of Spanish, I find it especially difficult to master the numerous dialects and regional varieties. This would not be nearly as big of a problem, say, in Romanian, since there are only about 20 million speakers almost exclusively centered around one country. In that regard, I think Spanish would top the list. Just think of how many ways you can say "cool" in Spanish. Every country has their own way, most have multiple unique ways, and Mexico in particular seems to have dozens of possibilities. And whoever said Spanish has a simple spelling system has never been to Central and South Mexico, where Aztec and Mayan words are notoriously difficult to read and pronounce. My friend's last name is Zempoatecl, and that is a rather easy to pronounce last name compared to many others that are much more complicated. What's more, in order to master Spanish you must learn multiple cultures (European, Amerindian, African, etc.), multiple types of governments and political and legal systems and how they work, cautious amounts of history and names of geographical locations, and little bits and pieces of other languages like "Guarani" in order to really know what people are saying. In that regard, I think Spanish tops the list in difficulty, or comes in the top two at the very least. It is also important to take into account the availability of media and what not to learn the language. Here in the States, Spanish is probably by far the easiest to immerse yourself in for a number of reasons. There are millions of immigrants throughout the country, almost all libraries have a Spanish section (some better than others), almost all movies have a Spanish dub or subtitles, most regions have a Spanish radio station, and the amount of content available online is huge, especially from Spain (for example). Because of this, Spanish in some ways becomes the easiest to learn, at least from an American standpoint. So, I think this ranking business is a bit pointless, since there is no criteria defined here. Even within my post, Spanish goes from hardest to easiest, depending on what we're talking about. When I was studying Hispanic filology at the university here in Europe (Germany), I had contacts to native (and near-native) Spanish speakers from Spain (different regions), Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, Chile and Argentina. I had no difficulties talking to them in Spanish, although sometimes - particularly in translation classes and, of course, in dialectology classes, we discussed specific vocabulary used in the various Spanish-speaking countries: lápiz de memoria for USB stick, common in Spain, was not familiar to the Americans (I mean the Spanish native speaers from the Americas). You can learn much vocabulary through context, like "echar de menos" (Spain) = "extrañar" (American Spanish) and the Peruvian use of "de repente" like "por supuesto" (meaning "of course"), while in European Spanish "de repente" means "suddenly". As for the bits and pieces of other languages, I think you exaggerate their importance somewhat. Yes, the influence of Arabic on Spanish is well-known, but Black Africa doesn't play (linguistically!) that big a role (unless I'm heavily mistaken). However, African influence becomes a topic when you study Brazilian Portuguese. Amerindian influence is more manifest, that's true, but, however, not in every country and not in equal degree. E. g. in Argentina you most probably will find Italian more useful than Guaraní, while Guaraní is more important for Paraguay, given the country's bilingual society. As to slang, that's notoriously one of the most difficult registers to master, because much of it doesn't appear in dictionaries and because it's a register that's particularly subject to rapid evolution. Governments, political & legal systems, history and names of geographical locations, aren't strictly related to "language learning", but rather to "intercultural competences", as has been pointed out previously. Well, I would say... (from hardest to easiest) 1.Romanian 2.French 3.Portuguese 4.Italian 5.Spanish Romanian - from my experience, I can say that Romanian is hard, due to the- cases plural -genes First of all, the cases are difficult, but they're not impossible. However, there are the plurals, which can be hard, too. For example: sg. masă (table) pl. mese (tables) sg. ceas (clock) pl. ceasuri (clocks) And there are the genres, which can be complicated, too... You can recognize the genres by its ending, for example: o masă (the á is mostly used for the feminine, but NOT always, as in: o bere (a beer)) un băiat (the rest of the endings are mostly used for the masculine) The other thing is that you can recognize them by the indefinite articles as well ("un" for masculine and "o" for feminine) And there is the neuter genre, for example: un deal ("un" for sg.) două dealuri ("o" for pl.) Beside the grammar, there is the phonology, that can be easy for the English speakers... The "á" is like the "a" in "about" The "r", is like the "r" or "rs" (for Italians this sound is familiar, it's like the "z" in "Ezio") Yes, I said EZIO. The "s", is like the "sh" in "sheep" The "r", is the hardest sound for English speakers... there's no equivalent sound for this, but it resembles to the sound that accompanies a consonant. And I'm not talking about "bi, si, di", (like in the alphabet), but about the casual spell: "bí, sí, dî". Note that the "á" is spelled the same as the "i", but used in the middle of the words, NOT at the beginning or at the end of it. French - The French is still something new to me, but I can confirm that the phonology is quite hard, and the grammar is not easy. Portuguese - All I know is that the phonology is hard, but I did not have any contact with it I've heard that the Italian grammar is quite hard, but still an easy romance language, however I don't know much about it. I think Spanish is the easiest, because of its simple phonology and easier grammar. I sometimes say that Polish is French of Slavic languages. Because of the nasal vowels and complex grammar. French Mount Blanc is pronounced (writing in Polish characters) like ma błą (interesting that we actually pronounce the name as mount blank, for some reason). Spanish people call Catalones polacos, and it is probably not because those languages are similar, but because of the Catalanian being really difficult. The Slavic languages with the most atypical grammar are actually Bulgarian and Macedonian. Im sure it's not because Catalan is that difficult, but for some other reasons, like the overall "strange" phonetics. ^I don't think French grammar is particularly harder than that of other Romance languages (the same for Catalan). In my view, French grammar is very very similar to the Italian one and Romanian or Literary Portuguese are way harder than French. As for the Slavic languages, are you sure that Polish grammar is more complex than Czech, Slovak or, say, Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian. Does Polish retain the dual (like Slovenian) or the Imperfect tense like Croatian? I think that the combinations of clitic pronouns in Catalan are particularly complex, at least more complex than the clitic pronominal system of any other Romance language I know. It is true, Catalan clitic pronouns are not easy but on the whole I find European Portuguese ones even more difficult, but that's probably just me. As for the phonetics, I don't find it to be particularly hard, either. It is one of the few languages whose phonemes I'm able to reproduce almost perfectly, even the different consonant clusters. Once again European Portuguese Pronunciation is trickier to me: it's got a few weird vowel sounds. I find European Portuguese ones even more difficult The tricky thing of European Portuguese is to know which adverbs are atrators. If we exclude subordinating conjunctions, negation, relative pronouns (which are atrators), and coordinating conjunctions (that, generally, are not atrators), you have to learn which adverbs, pronouns are atrators. For example: todos o fazem, como se chama, aqui se come bem (indefinite/interrogative pronouns, some adverbs) but ainda/já vi-o, sempre/talvez/jamais faço-o, também/só digo-te (some adverbs) and so on. On the other hand, many Spanish and Portuguese speakers have some problem with ci and ne, and often use them in the wrong way. Not to mention the usage of two auxiliary verbs and the past participle agreement. Pronominal verbs are also tricky in Italian, such as: averci, avercene, farcela, mettercela, esserci, essercene and so forth. Ci, vi, ce, ve ne also lack in Romanian. In my previous posts, it was pointed out that in order to learn a language it is not reasonable to need to know all the dialects to be considered fluent. I agree; however, in the US, things are a little different. For example, I have friends here from every Spanish-speaking country (excepting Equatorial Guinea). Despite living in a small city of 50,000, I have frequent contact with those from virtually every major Spanish variety. In order for me to communicate with them, I need to be at least familiar with their individual dialect and regionalisms. I would like to share just one example of a word that represents the great difficulty of learning Spanish, at least in the US where there are so many Spanish-speaking immigrants. That word is Popcorn. There are over 30 ways to say it in Spanish, but I could find only one way to say it in Romanian (I admit I didn't search very hard in Romanian). In this case, Spanish is up to 30 times more difficult for me to learn than Romanian. Here is the list of words I know for popcorn: Palomitas (de maíz), palomas, crispetas, crispetas, rosetas, rostitas, pururú, ancuá, pororó, pipoca, pochoclos, cotufas, esquite, cabritas, maíz pira, cangul, rosas, flores, bufas, pajaretas, cocalecas, poscon, pocorn, popcon, canchita, cancha blanca, millo, pacón, poporopo, gallitos, maduritas. This is but a taste of the immense variety and complexity of learning Spanish in the US. Many speakers understand palomitas, but many do not. I could easily share thousands more examples like this with simple words like avocado, pineapple, jacket, cake, chile, beans, young lad, kid, and the list goes on and on. This also applies to grammar, albeit to a lesser degree. Spanish is hard simply for its immense size and regional differences in vocabulary. At least in the US, could I be considered fluent in Spanish if I can only communicate fluently with the Spaniard family living two houses down, my Puerto Rican friends down the street, or my co-worker from Uruguay? I would lose my job as a translator for the US Spanish-speaking market if I was only familiar with one dialect, as I must select the words that the majority of Hispanics here in the US will understand. I must chase after that illusive and perhaps non-existent "universal Spanish" that everyone here seems to be referencing when they unanimously list "Spanish" as hands down the easiest language to learn. In some regards, it is the easiest. But if you take into account what learning the language is like for a poor gringo like me, then I believe it is reasonable to say, when it comes to learning vocabulary in the US in order to speak fluently with everyone I see, Spanish is by far the most difficult of all. Here is the list of words I know for popcorn: Palomitas (de maíz), palomas, crispetas, crispetas, rosetas, rostitas, pururú, ancuá, pororó, pipoca, pochoclos, cotufas, esquite, cabritas, maíz pira, cangul, rosas, flores, bufas, pajaretas, cocalecas, poscon, pocorn, popcon, canchita, cancha blanca, millo, pacón, poporopo, gallitos, maduritas. To begin with, some could simply be removed from that list. Crispetas is Catalan, not Spanish. Popcorn (or phonetic deviations) is English. In most of the cases where a local variation is used, or a native word such as pororó from Guaraní or cancha from Quechua, people are also acquainted with another of the general ones, which usually is palomitas/rosetas (de maíz). This is but a taste of the immense variety and complexity of learning Spanish in the US. Many speakers understand palomitas, but many do not. I could easily share thousands more examples like this with simple words like avocado, pineapple, jacket, cake, chile, beans, young lad, kid, and the list goes on and on. As with popcorn, there are usually two or three which are the most common, and usually one or two are perfectly understood by most speakers, even if they may not be the one used by them locally. Often one of the general ones is used in the country too, only less frequently. Saying speakers will not understand you is like thinking that you'll experience big problems with English speakers just because sidewalk is pavement in Britain or footpath in Australia. This also applies to grammar, albeit to a lesser degree. Spanish is hard simply for its immense size and regional differences in vocabulary. At least in the US, could I be considered fluent in Spanish if I can only communicate fluently with my Mexican neighbor, but only brokenly with the Spaniard family living two houses down, my Puerto Rican friends down the street, or my co-worker from Uruguay? I would lose my job as a translator for the US Spanish-speaking market if I was only familiar with one dialect, as I must select the words that the majority of Hispanics here in the US will understand. I must chase after that illusive and perhaps non-existent "universal Spanish" that everyone here seems to be referencing when they unanimously list "Spanish" as hands down the easiest language to learn. In some regards, it is the easiest. But if you take into account what learning the language is like for a poor gringo like me, then I believe it is reasonable to say, when it comes to learning vocabulary in the US in order to speak fluently with everyone I see, Spanish is by far the most difficult of all. If that was so, companies and organizations would hire dozens of Spanish interpreters and translators for each country. There is no "universal Spanish", just like there is no "universal X" of any language (except constructed ones like Esperanto), but that does not mean that there isn't a clearly standardized language working as one at an educated level, which acquires a certain range of lexical and grammar diversity at a local level. Unlike in English, there is an association of all academies working on it. Moreover, while it is true that each country prefers to hear their variety in such things as dubs (specially true for Spain and Mexico), the exchange of cultural products is continuous and many words from a different country are easily learnt or deduced. If anything, the real big challenge is only in the slang. At a personal level, I can understand that it might look frustrating at times, even from a native point of view, but that does not really add that much to the inherent difficult of a language in particular. Besides, it is not true that a language is more dialectal just because it is bigger in size. Less spoken ones can have just as much variation in many terms too. Hello This job is a- easier b- more easy c- more easier What I know is that English favors economy, so I would go for a. But are b and c downright wrong? Thank you Both b and c are wrong, however, c is sometimes used accidentally when someone wants to say an adjective with more but decides to use one which takes -er. Stressing would make this clear, though. Thank you So, we should never use more with -er adjectives? Is it a rule? And could you please tell me your source? "Easier" is a comparative. It means "more easy" - so "more easier" is wrong. Indeed, [more adjective-er] is wrong. No, you shouldn't. As for the rest of your questions, there is no such ting as a rule when it comes to learning a language. In English, only usage is truly authoritative. When you say something's wrong, it means that only an insignificant fraction of speakers use it. As it's been pointed out many times, justifying usage with rules is putting the cart before the horse. There is only usage and advice derived from usage. Advice and observation combine to form a grammar rule, which tries to generalize usage in a way that is easy to understand and memorize. A rule like this says that the comparative of an adjective is formed either using adjective + -er or more + adjective. There is no clear rule explaining when to use which (there are a lot of exceptions to the rule you might find in an ESL textbook). The rule I've just mentioned implies that more and -er cannot be used at the same time. We could go down a different path and justify not using both with redundancy but that would still be beside the point. [cross-posted] Both b and c are wrong, however, c is sometimes used accidentally when someone wants to say an adjective with more but decides to use one which takes -er. Stressing would make this clear, though. b - "more easy" is not wrong. Whilst "easier" is by far the more usual form, "more easy" is a valid variant. I've always thought that disyllabic adjectives ending with -y cannot be used with more, no matter what. b - "more easy" is not wrong. Whilst "easier" is by far the more usual form, "more easy" is a valid variant. Have you got an example of that, though? I'm struggling a bit to envisage a context in which it would sound natural. Not true! Take hardy, for example. And more easy is also possible, as Andygc says. However, you are more right than wrong. One of the essential characteristics of English is that it is never inflexible. There is perhaps one rule - the one structure you can't say when discussing usage is "cannot ..... no matter what". You can access the British National Corpus at and the Corpus of Contemporary American English at . In both you will find many examples of "more easy". Not all of them mean "easier", but several do. Naturally you will find many, many more of "easier". Yes, I regretted writing no matter what the second I sent my reply, it just seemed to be a usage so obscure that I doubted it was used in written English. Thanks for the links and the explanation, I stand corrected. Thank you all for your responses. So, to sum up: "easier" is the usual form used "more easy" can be used but not preferable "more easier" is quite unacceptable and considered as exaggeration Can any native speaker confirm that, please? "easier" is the usual form used "more easy" can be used but not preferable - for occasional use only, and best to be avoided by learners of English "more easier" is quite unacceptable and considered as exaggeration Thank you Andy. I'm sorry I can't see the emoticon next to the last point. Is it a "thumbs up"? 百度知道>提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了?> 提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了?> \_

百度知道>提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了?> 提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了? - [kən.ɛ] - [kə.nɛ] [kə.sa] - [kə.sa] Last edited: Jan 24, 2016 I was obviously referring to geminate consonants in my previous post. No other language has as many geminate consonants as Italian and Finnish in Europe. True, I was only pointing out that spoken Finnish is different from the written one. In Italian double consonants are possible only in intervocalic position. The same occurs in Scandinavian Languages (Norwegian and Swedish), but in this latter case, the distinction is phonemic. [kən.ɛ] - [kə.nɛ] [kə.sa] - [kə.sa] Yes, the same thing happens in Icelandic. In Italian and Icelandic vowel length is not phonemic. The Italian consonant clusters at the beginning of a word sound very unromance to me and Slavic-like. Strega Silitta Svegliare Sdraio Sgranato Sbrigare Sbagliare Svizzera Schiuma The Italian consonant clusters at the beginning of a word sound very unromance to me and Slavic-like. In Latin there were schola, stadium, not escuela, estadio. Anyway, in Italian we use lo, uno before these nouns, so lo stadio and el estadio sound pretty similar. If I had to forget for the moment that I speak some Romance languages (to a certain degree), then my answer could be: Does French with vowels ù, ô sound like a Romance language? It doesn't sound typically Romance. A "non-Romance-native person" spontaneously expects the vowels ù, ô rather in Finno-Ugric, Turkish, Germanic, etc ... languages, but not in the Neo-Latin ones. The Italian consonant clusters at the beginning of a word sound very unromance to me and Slavic-like ... Not only the clusters themselves, but also the pronunciation [z] of the initial s- before voiced consonants (e.g. svegliare, sdraio, smarrire, svenire, .... ) sounds "very Slavic". Even more, the Slavic prefixes s-/z- do often have a very similar meaning/function as the Italian prefix s-. In Latin there were schola, stadium, not escuela, estadio. Anyway, in Italian we use lo, uno before these nouns, so lo stadio and el estadio sound pretty similar, this cluster is always in intervocalic position. Yes, but the Italian initial s- is very frequent and it produces often non-Latin sounding clusters/words. (In old Italian written documents we find sporadically also solutions similar to Spanish, i.e. with initial i- before the s impura). All in all, I think that the subjective feeling of the non-Romance natives/speakers about what sounds and what doesn't sound Romance, is given/influenced by the image (experience/impression/knowledge) of the medieval Latin. From this point of view, I'd say that the Italian is phonetically perhaps the more Romance-sounding language, followed by the Spanish. (E.g. Hannibal ante portas, amantes amantes, das ut des, etc. ... sound almost Spanish, but not Italian). Last edited: Jan 26, 2016 Yes, European Portuguese sounds like Polish to me. (I know no one will agree, but I am not making this up, it really sounds like Polish to me) I sometimes say that Polish is French of Slavic languages, because of the nasal vowels and complex grammar. French Mount Blanc is pronounced (writing in Polish characters) like ma błą (interesting that we actually pronounce the name as mount blank, for some reason). Spanish people call Catalones polacos, and it is probably not because those languages are similar, but because of the Catalanian being really difficult. ^I don't think French grammar is particularly harder than that of other Romance languages (the same for Catalan). In my view, French grammar is very very similar to the Italian one and Romanian or Literary Portuguese are way harder than French. As for the Slavic languages, are you sure that Polish grammar is more complex than Czech, Slovak or, say, Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian. Does Polish retain the dual (like Slovenian) or the Aorist or the Imperfect tense like Croatian? As for the Slavic languages, are you sure that Polish grammar is more complex than Czech, Slovak or, say, Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian. Sorry, I meant spelling Rz could be confused for Z or sz, ô and u sound the same, ch and h sound the same... There are rules for these homophonic letters, but each of them has a lot of exceptions. The easiest way to write them correctly is to know a foreign Slavic language, to see the etymological changes (although some words are not 100% "etymological"). Most other Slavic languages don't have such homophonic letters, except Slovak e and á (they should be different, but they aren't nowadays Slovak). French is well known for confusing spelling, svaria, sbaglia, sgrava, sgrida, sdraia, sbrana ... (with the voiced s- they sound a bit Slavic to me, like e.g. the existing Slovak words zvaria, zbalia) But it happens also in Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese and Catalan, for example esgrima [ɛzˈɣima] (Spanish), [izˈɣimɐ] (Brazilian Portuguese), [ɛzˈɣima] (Catalan), so you have "la scrima (the common word for this sport is scherma in Italian), la esgrima, a esgrima, a esgrima, all in intervocalic position. I don't say that the voiced s- doesn't appear in other Romance languages. I only wanted to say that according to my (subjective) opinion these word initial clusters with voiced s- do not sound Latin but rather Slavic to me. I'd say that the voiced /s/ before voiced consonants is normal in both Romance and Slavic languages, but it's unvoiced in Germanic languages, see the English slip, small. I'd say that the voiced /s/ before voiced consonants is normal in both Romance and Slavic languages, but it's unvoiced in Germanic languages, see the English slip, small...that Italians pronounce /zliɲ/ and /zmo/ like snow (/zno/) and slow (/zlo/) I think it is a bit silly to grade a language's difficulty without a criteria to define "hardness to learn." Every language has characteristics about it that make it the "hardest to learn" in some aspects. For example, as a learner of Spanish, I find it especially difficult to master the numerous dialects and regional varieties. This would not be nearly as big of a problem, say, in Romanian, since there are only about 20 million speakers almost exclusively centered around one country. In that regard, I think Spanish would top the list. Just think of how many ways you can say "cool" in Spanish. Every country has their own way, most have multiple unique ways, and Mexico in particular seems to have dozens of possibilities. And whoever said Spanish has a simple spelling system has never been to Central and South Mexico, where Aztec and Mayan words are notoriously difficult to read and pronounce. My friend's last name is Zempoatecl, and that is a rather easy to pronounce last name compared to many others that are much more complicated. What's more, in order to master Spanish you must learn multiple cultures (European, Amerindian, African, etc.), multiple types of governments and political and legal systems and how they work, cautious amounts of history and names of geographical locations, and little bits and pieces of other languages like "Guarani" in order to really know what people are saying. In that regard, I think Spanish tops the list in difficulty, or comes in the top two at the very least. It is also important to take into account the availability of media and what not to learn the language. Here in the States, Spanish is probably by far the easiest to immerse yourself in for a number of reasons. There are millions of immigrants throughout the country, almost all libraries have a Spanish section (some better than others), almost all movies have a Spanish dub or subtitles, most regions have a Spanish radio station, and the amount of content available online is huge, especially from Spain (for example). Because of this, Spanish in some ways becomes the easiest to learn, at least from an American standpoint. So, I think this ranking business is a bit pointless, since there is no criteria defined here. Even within my post, Spanish goes from hardest to easiest, depending on what we're talking about. When I was studying Hispanic filology at the university here in Europe (Germany), I had contacts to native (and near-native) Spanish speakers from Spain (different regions), Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, Chile and Argentina. I had no difficulties talking to them in Spanish, although sometimes - particularly in translation classes and, of course, in dialectology classes, we discussed specific vocabulary used in the various Spanish-speaking countries: lápiz de memoria for USB stick, common in Spain, was not familiar to the Americans (I mean the Spanish native speaers from the Americas). You can learn much vocabulary through context, like "echar de menos" (Spain) = "extrañar" (American Spanish) and the Peruvian use of "de repente" like "por supuesto" (meaning "of course"), while in European Spanish "de repente" means "suddenly". As for the bits and pieces of other languages, I think you exaggerate their importance somewhat. Yes, the influence of Arabic on Spanish is well-known, but Black Africa doesn't play (linguistically!) that big a role (unless I'm heavily mistaken). However, African influence becomes a topic when you study Brazilian Portuguese. Amerindian influence is more manifest, that's true, but, however, not in every country and not in equal degree. E. g. in Argentina you most probably will find Italian more useful than Guaraní, while Guaraní is more important for Paraguay, given the country's bilingual society. As to slang, that's notoriously one of the most difficult registers to master, because much of it doesn't appear in dictionaries and because it's a register that's particularly subject to rapid evolution. Governments, political & legal systems, history and names of geographical locations, aren't strictly related to "language learning", but rather to "intercultural competences", as has been pointed out previously. Well, I would say... (from hardest to easiest) 1.Romanian 2.French 3.Portuguese 4.Italian 5.Spanish Romanian - from my experience, I can say that Romanian is hard, due to the- cases plural -genes First of all, the cases are difficult, but they're not impossible. However, there are the plurals, which can be hard, too. For example: sg. masă (table) pl. mese (tables) sg. ceas (clock) pl. ceasuri (clocks) And there are the genres, which can be complicated, too... You can recognize the genres by its ending, for example: o masă (the á is mostly used for the feminine, but NOT always, as in: o bere (a beer)) un băiat (the rest of the endings are mostly used for the masculine) The other thing is that you can recognize them by the indefinite articles as well ("un" for masculine and "o" for feminine) And there is the neuter genre, for example: un deal ("un" for sg.) două dealuri ("o" for pl.) Beside the grammar, there is the phonology, that can be easy for the English speakers... The "á" is like the "a" in "about" The "r", is like the "r" or "rs" (for Italians this sound is familiar, it's like the "z" in "Ezio") Yes, I said EZIO. The "s", is like the "sh" in "sheep" The "r", is the hardest sound for English speakers... there's no equivalent sound for this, but it resembles to the sound that accompanies a consonant. And I'm not talking about "bi, si, di", (like in the alphabet), but about the casual spell: "bí, sí, dî". Note that the "á" is spelled the same as the "i", but used in the middle of the words, NOT at the beginning or at the end of it. French - The French is still something new to me, but I can confirm that the phonology is quite hard, and the grammar is not easy. Portuguese - All I know is that the phonology is hard, but I did not have any contact with it I've heard that the Italian grammar is quite hard, but still an easy romance language, however I don't know much about it. I think Spanish is the easiest, because of its simple phonology and easier grammar. I sometimes say that Polish is French of Slavic languages. Because of the nasal vowels and complex grammar. French Mount Blanc is pronounced (writing in Polish characters) like ma błą (interesting that we actually pronounce the name as mount blank, for some reason). Spanish people call Catalones polacos, and it is probably not because those languages are similar, but because of the Catalanian being really difficult. The Slavic languages with the most atypical grammar are actually Bulgarian and Macedonian. Im sure it's not because Catalan is that difficult, but for some other reasons, like the overall "strange" phonetics. ^I don't think French grammar is particularly harder than that of other Romance languages (the same for Catalan). In my view, French grammar is very very similar to the Italian one and Romanian or Literary Portuguese are way harder than French. As for the Slavic languages, are you sure that Polish grammar is more complex than Czech, Slovak or, say, Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian. Does Polish retain the dual (like Slovenian) or the Imperfect tense like Croatian? I think that the combinations of clitic pronouns in Catalan are particularly complex, at least more complex than the clitic pronominal system of any other Romance language I know. It is true, Catalan clitic pronouns are not easy but on the whole I find European Portuguese ones even more difficult, but that's probably just me. As for the phonetics, I don't find it to be particularly hard, either. It is one of the few languages whose phonemes I'm able to reproduce almost perfectly, even the different consonant clusters. Once again European Portuguese Pronunciation is trickier to me: it's got a few weird vowel sounds. I find European Portuguese ones even more difficult The tricky thing of European Portuguese is to know which adverbs are atrators. If we exclude subordinating conjunctions, negation, relative pronouns (which are atrators), and coordinating conjunctions (that, generally, are not atrators), you have to learn which adverbs, pronouns are atrators. For example: todos o fazem, como se chama, aqui se come bem (indefinite/interrogative pronouns, some adverbs) but ainda/já vi-o, sempre/talvez/jamais faço-o, também/só digo-te (some adverbs) and so on. On the other hand, many Spanish and Portuguese speakers have some problem with ci and ne, and often use them in the wrong way. On the other hand, many Spanish and Portuguese speakers have some problem with ci and ne, and often use them in the wrong way. Not to mention the usage of two auxiliary verbs and the past participle agreement. Pronominal verbs are also tricky in Italian, such as: averci, avercene, farcela, mettercela, esserci, essercene and so forth. Ci, vi, ce, ve ne also lack in Romanian. In my previous posts, it was pointed out that in order to learn a language it is not reasonable to need to know all the dialects to be considered fluent. I agree; however, in the US, things are a little different. For example, I have friends here from every Spanish-speaking country (excepting Equatorial Guinea). Despite living in a small city of 50,000, I have frequent contact with those from virtually every major Spanish variety. In order for me to communicate with them, I need to be at least familiar with their individual dialect and regionalisms. I would like to share just one example of a word that represents the great difficulty of learning Spanish, at least in the US where there are so many Spanish-speaking immigrants. That word is Popcorn. There are over 30 ways to say it in Spanish, but I could find only one way to say it in Romanian (I admit I didn't search very hard in Romanian). In this case, Spanish is up to 30 times more difficult for me to learn than Romanian. Here is the list of words I know for popcorn: Palomitas (de maíz), palomas, crispetas, crispetas, rosetas, rostitas, pururú, ancuá, pororó, pipoca, pochoclos, cotufas, esquite, cabritas, maíz pira, cangul, rosas, flores, bufas, pajaretas, cocalecas, poscon, pocorn, popcon, canchita, cancha blanca, millo, pacón, poporopo, gallitos, maduritas. This is but a taste of the immense variety and complexity of learning Spanish in the US. Many speakers understand palomitas, but many do not. I could easily share thousands more examples like this with simple words like avocado, pineapple, jacket, cake, chile, beans, young lad, kid, and the list goes on and on. This also applies to grammar, albeit to a lesser degree. Spanish is hard simply for its immense size and regional differences in vocabulary. At least in the US, could I be considered fluent in Spanish if I can only communicate fluently with the Spaniard family living two houses down, my Puerto Rican friends down the street, or my co-worker from Uruguay? I would lose my job as a translator for the US Spanish-speaking market if I was only familiar with one dialect, as I must select the words that the majority of Hispanics here in the US will understand. I must chase after that illusive and perhaps non-existent "universal Spanish" that everyone here seems to be referencing when they unanimously list "Spanish" as hands down the easiest language to learn. In some regards, it is the easiest. But if you take into account what learning the language is like for a poor gringo like me, then I believe it is reasonable to say, when it comes to learning vocabulary in the US in order to speak fluently with everyone I see, Spanish is by far the most difficult of all. If that was so, companies and organizations would hire dozens of Spanish interpreters and translators for each country. There is no "universal Spanish", just like there is no "universal X" of any language (except constructed ones like Esperanto), but that does not mean that there isn't a clearly standardized language working as one at an educated level, which acquires a certain range of lexical and grammar diversity at a local level. Unlike in English, there is an association of all academies working on it. Moreover, while it is true that each country prefers to hear their variety in such things as dubs (specially true for Spain and Mexico), the exchange of cultural products is continuous and many words from a different country are easily learnt or deduced. If anything, the real big challenge is only in the slang. At a personal level, I can understand that it might look frustrating at times, even from a native point of view, but that does not really add that much to the inherent difficult of a language in particular. Besides, it is not true that a language is more dialectal just because it is bigger in size. Less spoken ones can have just as much variation in many terms too. Hello This job is a- easier b- more easy c- more easier What I know is that English favors economy, so I would go for a. But are b and c downright wrong? Thank you Both b and c are wrong, however, c is sometimes used accidentally when someone wants to say an adjective with more but decides to use one which takes -er. Stressing would make this clear, though. Thank you So, we should never use more with -er adjectives? Is it a rule? And could you please tell me your source? "Easier" is a comparative. It means "more easy" - so "more easier" is wrong. Indeed, [more adjective-er] is wrong. No, you shouldn't. As for the rest of your questions, there is no such ting as a rule when it comes to learning a language. In English, only usage is truly authoritative. When you say something's wrong, it means that only an insignificant fraction of speakers use it. As it's been pointed out many times, justifying usage with rules is putting the cart before the horse. There is only usage and advice derived from usage. Advice and observation combine to form a grammar rule, which tries to generalize usage in a way that is easy to understand and memorize. A rule like this says that the comparative of an adjective is formed either using adjective + -er or more + adjective. There is no clear rule explaining when to use which (there are a lot of exceptions to the rule you might find in an ESL textbook). The rule I've just mentioned implies that more and -er cannot be used at the same time. We could go down a different path and justify not using both with redundancy but that would still be beside the point. [cross-posted] Both b and c are wrong, however, c is sometimes used accidentally when someone wants to say an adjective with more but decides to use one which takes -er. Stressing would make this clear, though. b - "more easy" is not wrong. Whilst "easier" is by far the more usual form, "more easy" is a valid variant. I've always thought that disyllabic adjectives ending with -y cannot be used with more, no matter what. b - "more easy" is not wrong. Whilst "easier" is by far the more usual form, "more easy" is a valid variant. Have you got an example of that, though? I'm struggling a bit to envisage a context in which it would sound natural. Not true! Take hardy, for example. And more easy is also possible, as Andygc says. However, you are more right than wrong. One of the essential characteristics of English is that it is never inflexible. There is perhaps one rule - the one structure you can't say when discussing usage is "cannot ..... no matter what". You can access the British National Corpus at and the Corpus of Contemporary American English at . In both you will find many examples of "more easy". Not all of them mean "easier", but several do. Naturally you will find many, many more of "easier". Yes, I regretted writing no matter what the second I sent my reply, it just seemed to be a usage so obscure that I doubted it was used in written English. Thanks for the links and the explanation, I stand corrected. Thank you all for your responses. So, to sum up: "easier" is the usual form used "more easy" can be used but not preferable "more easier" is quite unacceptable and considered as exaggeration Can any native speaker confirm that, please? "easier" is the usual form used "more easy" can be used but not preferable - for occasional use only, and best to be avoided by learners of English "more easier" is quite unacceptable and considered as exaggeration Thank You Andy. I'm sorry I can't see the emoticon next to the last point. Is it a "thumbs up"? 百度知道>提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了?> 提示信息 知道宝贝找不到问题了?> \_