Click Here

Hello. One question: What verbs can I use with "presentation"? "Make" and "give" are ok, but is it possible to say "do a presentation"? Would it sound too strange? Hi Deliver is used a lot. Provide Perform (if you're pretty enthusiastic about your subject) Make wouldn't be used. Give however is used a lot. Do would be used - but only informally. Cheers Neal Mc "Prepare and give a presentation" is all I hear. In all the reference material that I'm using it seems that "make" is the most usual verb for "presentation". Is this maybe the American usage? What kind of presentation are you talking about? If this is the presentation of a gift to someone in a formal context then I would expect make. If this is a powerpoint presentation of information to an audience, I would expect give. What kind of presentation are you talking about? If this is the presentation of a gift to someone in a formal context then I would expect make. If this is a powerpoint presentation of information to an audience, I would expect give. I am more interested in the second type of presentation. I would say either give a presentation or do a presentation although the latter is more informal. I've got to do a presentation. Using 'give' is better english but the use of 'do' is fine. Thank you all for your help! Make a presenation or give a presentation. Both are correct but I'm just wondering which one you say. I say to give a presentation I agree with you that give sounds better, but I would not correct someone who said make. To me, make a presentation sounds like what you would do to prepare the presentation. Then you would give the presentation. By "give a presentation" I assume you mean give an expose (possibly using Powerpoint or something similar). If you were presenting somebody with a gold watch upon his retirement, you would say "make a presentation". Yes, I suspect most of us feel we know which meaning of presentation you have in mind. However, it would be good for you to say which you mean, so we can be certain. Yes, I suspect most of us feel we know which meaning of presentation you have in mind. However, it would be good for you to say which you mean, so we can be certain. When I asked the question (for than 4 and a half years ago!), I had in mind a presentation with the meaning of a lecture, or a public talk on a subject. Hello Cecilio, Thank you for responding. I should have made clear that my question was directed to sweet caramel, who most recently revived this thread. As you can see, your question is good one, and has been useful to other people since. Hi Deliver is used a lot. Provide Perform (if you're pretty enthusiastic about your subject) Make wouldn't be used. Give however is used a lot. Do would be used - but only informally. Cheers Neal Mc After a Google search: - "Make a presentation" has 10,200,000 results (probably because it has more than one meaning...) - "Give a presentation" has 8,720,000 results - "Do a presentation" has 4,450,000 results When I asked the question (for than 4 and a half years ago!), I had in mind a presentation with the meaning of a lecture, or a public talk on a subject. I too had the following in mind: I had in mind a presentation with the meaning of a lecture, or a public talk on a subject. To be honest I'm a bit confused, I thought we could say "to make a presentation" when we talk about Powerpoint presentations and that kind of things. Look here: How to make presentations , it comes from a British university and the title on the tab says "how to make presentations"...and they're not talking about gifts. Any thoughts? ...And the first sentence of the article reads: As part of an extended interview/selection centre you may be asked to give a short presentation. Both are possible; give is better for all the reasons stated above. My understanding is that "make a presentation" refers to "creating" a presentation (although we wouldn´t use the word "create") and that "give a presentation" refers to the actual talking. ...And the first sentence of the article reads: As part of an extended interview/selection centre you may be asked to give a short presentation. Both are possible; give is better for all the reasons stated above. Dear Keith: Is it correct to say: "The teacher gave an exposition. It lasted one hour." I can't think of any examples where you wouldn't use the article. I tried searching for it in dictionaries and all i found was it with the article. However, i saw some people writing it without the article and some were speaking without using it too. So i wanted to make sure... is it correct to write it without the article? I tried searching for it in dictionaries and all i found was it with the article. However, i saw some people writing it without the article and some were speaking without using it too. So i wanted to make sure... is it correct to write it without the article? Can you give a couple of examples where the article is not used? I would say it is wrong not to use it, but I may be missing something. Were the people who said "make presentation" native English speakers? That looks as if they've just abbreviated it. Have you got any examples of full sentences where the article is omitted? Obviously, you can use it without an article in the plural: "The human resources department gave presentations on a variety of subjects". But, if it's singular, it needs an article: "The human resources department gave a presentation on the code of ethics". Yes, it's obvious thay we remove the article in the plural form. But here is an example i found: "I feel you should give presentation on soft skills". And i found it here On which topic should I give presentation in communication skill class? So, it's like i thought, right? That it's wrong to write it without the article in the singular form. I guess people right it like that like... in an informal way? But looks like it's grammatically incorrect? Yes, it's obvious thay we remove the article in the plural form. But here is an example i found: "I feel you should give presentation on soft skills". And i found it here On which topic should I give presentation in communication skill class? So, it's like i thought, right? That it's wrong to write it without the article in the singular form. I guess people right it like that like... in an informal way? But looks like it's grammatically incorrect? I think the sentences you quote without the article are wrong. They neither look nor sound right (at least in my English). I suspect that Ashu Kaul (the author of that post) is not a native speaker of English. In another of her posts, she suggests buying a weighing machine to an overweight person. We generally call that a scale in English. Just looked him up in Google. He's Indian so would speak Indian English, which differs from AE and BE. Hello. One question: What verbs can I use with "presentation"? "Make" and "give" are ok, but is it possible to say "do a presentation"? Would it sound too strange? A British Council business English studying website uses the verb "make a presentation" clearly in the same context as "give a presentation" in their description of the content of episode 6, which is "Daniel and Sarah make their presentations. Will they impress the interviewers?". I had a similar problem when I learned that an English textbook for secondary schools in Poland only accepts "give" or "do", but never "make" in the answer key section for their student progress measuring tests. Does this prove the course authors were wrong when they excluded an evidently correct answer or is it just academics tailored student testing for you? Episode 06 I'd like to ask a more precise question. Would 'make' be wrong or acceptable if we talked about the preparation step, creating a PowerPoint presentation on a computer? Can we also describe this step using the verbs 'do', 'put together', 'prepare', or 'create'? 'Put together', 'prepare', or 'create' are the activities you carry out the week before the presentation. On the day itself, you give the presentation to your audience. Better still, you can be more precise and say that you presented a talk on . In general, you will achieve better style (more precise, more concise, more concrete) if you use than if you use . 'Put together', 'prepare', or 'create' are the activities you carry out the week before the presentation. On the day itself, you give the presentation to your audience. Better still, you can be more precise and say that you presented a talk on . In general, you will achieve better style (more precise, more concise, more concrete) if you use than if you use . Thank you, I need the right verb to collocate with the word 'presentation' to describe the prosess of using PowerPoint sofware or similar software while working on my computer. An expected result of this work is a pptx file, which is called a presentation. I'll use this file during my actual speech. What verbs can describe what I'm doing using my computer? Can I say 'I'm creating / preparing / doing / putting together a presentation'? Or, if a student is asked 'What to you use your computer for?', can they answer ''I use it to create / prepare / do / put together presentations''? And would 'make' be ok in these situations? ... Can I say 'I'm creating / preparing / doing / putting together a presentation'? ... And would 'make' be ok in these situations? No. Do and make are both too vague, and are also ambiguous: they can mean present to the audience. Write, prepare, create, construct, compile are all possible; it depends at least partly on the precise method you're using. Do and make are both too vague, and are also ambiguous: they can mean present to the audience. Write, prepare, create, construct, compile are all possible; it depends at least partly on the precise method you're using. Thank you very much. That's exactly what I wanted to know. Can you please tell me which one is correct? It's so nice to hear from you after long time It's so nice to hearing from you after long time Can you please tell me which one is correct? It's so nice to hear from you after long time It's so nice to hearing from you after long time Although this could be used if you omit "to". I think number 1 is better though. Can you please tell me which one is correct? It's so nice to hear from you after long time It's so nice to hearing from you after long time Murphy's corrections are correct. Corrected, # 2 sounds less formal to my native ear. Can you please tell me which one is correct? It's so nice to hear from you after such a long time It's so nice to hearing from you after long time you can't use an 'ing' verb after the word 'to' I think "It's nice to hear from you (now) after such a long time" more natural, but "It was nice hearing from you (then) after such a long time" sounds okay to me, and even preferable. Another example of this pattern is "Nice to meet you", when we are being introduced to someone, and "(It was) nice meeting you", when we are taking our leave. Well, I might be wrong, as I've never been taught this. It's just a pattern of usage I have picked up. Let's wait for a native speaker's opinion. Let's wait for a native speaker's opinion. Macunaíma, everyone who has contributed here so far is a native speaker. I agree with your two points, though. "It's so nice hearing from you after such a long time", sounds a little strange, to me. Not because it's wrong, but because I don't often hear the -ing ending in sentences like this (mostly, I use and hear the auxiliary 'nice', calling for the infinitive of the main verb - "It's so nice to hear from you...", "It's so good to see you again..."). My $0.02 GEmatt It seems to fit better in the past tense. "It was nice hearing from you" "It was nice talking to you" "It was nice spending time with my folks over the holidays" In the present, it sounds better to me as "to (infinitive)" "It's nice to hear from you" "It's nice to talk to you" "It's nice to spend some time with my folks over the holidays" Macunaíma, everyone who has contributed here so far is a native speaker. Yes, I was aware of that. But I was "talking" to ADMP, and warning her/him not to take my word for it. I'm glad to hear my observation makes sense. Thank you. It seems to fit better in the past tense. "It was nice hearing from you" "It was nice talking to you" "It was nice spending time with my folks over the holidays" In the present, it sounds better to me as "to (infinitive)" "It's nice to hear from you" "It's nice to talk to you" "It's nice to spend some time with my folks over the holidays" I agree. Or like Macunaíma observed, '-ing' when taking our leave. GEmatt He took to drinking when he lost his job. I look forward to hearing from you again soon. Most people, however, would think of drinking and hearing as nouns, or at least functioning as nouns. But, majlo's argument makes sense. He took to drinking when he lost his job. I look forward to hearing from you again soon. Most people, however, would think of drinking and hearing as nouns, or at least functioning as nouns. But, majlo's argument makes sense. Good point - I should have mentioned "in this context, you can't use to with the -ing form of the verb". So, if we don't write -ing after TO, why do we write ''I'm looking forward TO hearING from you''? Is it just an exception? Thanks! No, the difference is in the funtion of "to" in the sentence. It's nice / to hear from you after such a long time. ("to" is part of the infinitive "to hear", not part of the phrase "it's nice") It was nice / hearing from you..... I look forward to / hearing from you. ("to" is part of the phrase "look forward to" and functions purely as a preposition; as such it's followed by the -ing form "hearing".) He took to drinking when he lost his job. I look forward to hearing from you again soon. Most people, however, would think of drinking and hearing as nouns, or at least functioning as nouns. But, majlo's argument makes sense. I look forward to hearing updates from you again soon. CLICK Other verbs are possible as well, but I can't think of one right now. Thank you for your advice! Can I ask one more question? if "Hearing updates" sounds strange, does "hearing news" also sound strange? I look forward to hearing news from you. Please advise, thank you. Hi, As the saying goes, “East or west, home is the best”. (Quoted from an online article) Should the saying” be replaced by “a saying”? Maybe both versions are right? I’m not sure. Many thanks! It makes no sense if you use a rather than the (idioms can rarely be changed). How about “As an old saying goes”? Yes, that works — but it’s not the set phrase, which is similar to “as they say”. When we say, "As the saying goes ... " there is an assumption that the saying is familiar to everyone. We will all recognise it because we have heard it before. That's why we use "the". However, if we do not expect the hearer to recognise the saying, we might say "a". Examples As the well-known saying goes ... As an old Buddhist saying goes ... As a little-known saying goes ... I see. Thanks very much! hi all! how are the abbreviations for the week days?? Monday:M Tuesday: T Wednesday:W Thursday:? Friday:F Saturday:S Sunday:? thank you very much Hey there, If I was abbreviating the days of the week I usually would use more than just one letter. ie Mon Tues Wed Thu Fri Sat Sun But if you have to use just one letter then M T W T F S S will do I think because any confusion will be avoided due to the sequence of days. Hope that helps, Cat yes!! thank you again I've found the following. Any US native can confirm them? Sn = Sunday; M = Monday; T = Tuesday; W = Wednesday; Th = Thursday; F = Friday; S = Saturday Well, there are a variety of abbreviations to choose from. I use TH for Thursday, but I've seen R as well, when there's only room for one letter (ThuRsday). But R is not so common. Saturday and Sunday can both be S, or Saturday = Sa and Sunday = Su. But I think the most common abbreviations are the longer ones: Mon. Tues. Weds. Thurs. Fri. Sat. Sun. Right, as jinti stated, R as an abbreviation for Thursday is possible but not so common. Actually, the first time I ever saw it was when I went to sign up for graduate courses, and I was born and raised here in the States! The list of courses used a one-letter system for abbreviating days: M, T, W, R, F. I don´t know how they would have dealt with Saturday or Sunday had there been classes offered on those days . Here are the "short" abbreviations I use, followed by the "long" ones: M T W Th F S (or Sa) Su (I, personally, have never seen Sunday abbreviated as Sn, which is what Iararo has found. That´s not to that Sn is wrong, I´ve just never seen it before today) Mon Tue (or Tues) Wed (I, personally, don´t use "Weds", which is what jinti uses. Again, it´s not to say that Weds is wrong--I don´t know if it is--but I just don´t use it) Thur (or Thurs or Thu, the latter of which I use very infrequently) Fri Sat Sun Hope this helps! Monday → Mon Tuesday → Tue Wednesday → Wed Thursday → Thu Friday → Fri Saturday → Sat Sunday → Sun Thursday" →Thur /Thurs ? Right? I personally think it's neater and more consistent to keep the 3 letter abbreviation for Thu, like all the other days. The same for months: Jan, Feb, Mar... If you are creating Excel columns for the days of the week, also means the columns will be the same size (width) without too much playing about. I thought I'd add my two cents: I'm a college student in Florida and we use this convention for abbreviating the days of the week: M = Monday T = Tuesday W = Wednesday R = Thursday F = Friday S = Saturday U = Sunday (That's right, U for Sunday). 74 yo native USA. I have never ever seen Sn or U for Sunday. Any single or double letter abbreviation is not standard. You can use 3 letter abbreviations, as suggested below, but many people will use Tues, Weds, Thurs for those days. Hope this helps someone. Spanish does not abbreviate days - lun, mar, mié, jue etc. - does it? I've been told no. In Spanish, abbreviations of any kind are far less frequent than in English. I think very few people around here, if any, would think of abbreviating the names of the days of the week. In airline schedules you will find LMXJVSD (if there's a flight every day) syd I'm a native of the USA and am 37 years old. I don't ever remember seeing 'R' used as an abbreviation for Thursday. Single letter abbreviations are very uncommon, but the few places i've seen them, have only used Monday thru Friday, thus excluding the weekend days. In those instances, i have seen both 'M T W T F' and 'M T W H F' in use. When all are beside each other, it's okay since there's no ambiguity. But when a single letter is used without a context of other letters, then I only remember having seen 'H' used for Thursday, not 'R'. But i also repeat that i have very rarely seen only single letter abbreviations for days of the week. 3 letter abbreviation are used enuf that i believe almost everyone around me have seen them: Sun, Mon, Tue, Wed, Thu, Fri, Sat. Also not that where I'm at (Kansas and Missouri), our weeks start with Sunday and end with Saturday. But on the job, some places change this around. Most i've experienced have used the normal Sunday thru Saturday week, but maybe 10% of places change that. My current job for instance is one of those 10% who used a different work week, in this case, they use Wednesday thru Tuesday, but this is not any more common than another choice, in my experience. I have seen Monday thru Sunday as the 2nd most popular week cycle, but Sunday thru Saturday is by far most common in the Midwest, where i am from. I estimate 90% of the time, our work week is Sunday-Saturday. maybe 5% of the time Monday thru Sunday is used. and maybe the other 5% of the time, any other week cycle is used. But that's only a rough guess from my experience, which may be different from the real statistics. For days of the week, to be clear, if you can use 3 letter abbreviations, use that. It's rather common. If you must use one letter abbreviations, there's no real rule and i don't think it's done enuf to be able to claim that there's any sort of standard for that, except to say that the common standard is to use 3 letter abbreviations. I normally use: M/Mon = Monday T/Tue = Tuesday W/Wed = Wednesday Th/Thurs = Thursday F/Fri = Friday S/Sat = Saturday S/Sun = Sunday I thought I'd add my two cents: I'm a college student in Florida and we use this convention for abbreviating the days of the week: M = Monday T = Tuesday W = Wednesday R = Thursday F = Friday S = Saturday U = Sunday (That's right, U for Sunday). You are correct. If you want to use a single letter for each day of the week, the standardize version is: M, T, W, R, F, S and U. You are correct. If you want to use a single letter for each day of the week, the standardize version is: M, T, W, R, F, S and U. You shouldn't generalise too much. Perhaps it is standard form in some places but I don't think this is true worldwide. I have never seen R for Thursday nor U for Sunday and out of context I would have no idea which day they referred to. R for Thursday was standard at my university in the course selection catalog, where it described the days of the week on which the class met. This was in the '80s, in the US. I have never seen U for Sunday. I am writing an email to my customer, we haven't contacted each other for a long time. So, at the beginning of this email, can I write this?1) It has been a long time since we contacted each other. Or3) It has been a long time since we contacted last time.I prefer the number 1, for number 2, maybe a little informal.Please give me your advice. If you find any mistakes above, please help me correct.I really appreciate your reply. 1) It has been a long time since we contacted each other. 2) Long time no see. Too informal 3) It has been a long time since we contacted last time. . Although #1 is correct, I prefer: It's been a long time since we've corresponded. We haven't been in contact for a while. Please don't use #2 I don't think using "... we contacted ..." in #1 and #3 sounds idiomatic. There are many, many ways to say something like this, a lot depends on how informal you want to be. Here are some suggestions: "It's a long time since we've been in touch ... ... " "It's a while since we've spoken ... ... " "It's some time since we were in contact ... ... " Thanks for your replies. How about " I havn't heard from you for a long time" ? Thanks for your replies. How about " I havn't heard from you for a long time" ? Fair enough, but look at sunkitty's and my other suggestions and note that we both go for something very neutral. "I haven't heard from you for a long time," suggests that this lack of communication is your customer's fault. You don't want to do that Panjandrum, Thanks for your detailed explaination, it is really helpful. It is late here. I'll leave. Cheers, Runnery Sorry, I still have two more questions: 1) I have come across both these two versions " it is a long time since", "it has been a long time since". Which is correct? 2) since+past tense or since+present perfect? I am looking forward to your reply. Thanks a lot. It would be "it has been a long time since," not "it is a long time since." It would be "it has been a long time since," not "it is a long time since." Thanks. The "been" was left out, I have corrected. After I search the goole with "It has been a long time since", I find that most examples are this: it has been a long tiem since+past tense. Could you tell me what's the difference between "since +past tense" and "since+perfect sense"? Thanks again. There have been many previous threads on since with various combinations of tenses. In the WR dictionary I found a long time and since There should be some useful information there. Hallo, Leute, Ich habe da nicht so viel Ahnung, was der Untershied zwichen suchen und suchen nach ist. Vielleicht könnte es mir jemand erklären. Danke. Hallo, für mich gibt es da keinen wirklichen Unterschied. Inhaltlich ist es egal welche Form man benutzt,z.B.Ich suche dich vs.Ich suche nach dir. Aber du solltest auf den Fall achten: Ich suche dich (Akkusativ) Ich suche nach dir (Dativ) "Suchen" nimmt man, wenn man genau weiß, was man sucht. "Ich suche ein (bestimmtes) Buch." "Nach etwas suchen" würde man eher nehmen, wenn man etwas Unbestimmtes sucht, z. B. bei Gold, Wasser oder anderem. "Ich suche nach Büchern." Bei Substantivierung ist "nach" eh Pflicht. If I understood correctly, then the difference is in definiteness. If so, are both possibilities acceptable, e.g. Ich suche die Bücher Ich suche nach den Büchern And if yes, what would be the difference between the two? There is actually no difference, but "suchen nach" is rather rarely used. "Suchen nach" just sounds to me as if you make a huge effort to find something (in this case: the books). And if yes, what would be the difference between the two? Henryk explained it in post #4. Welcome to the forums, by the way. Thanks, folks, for the cordial welcome to this newcomer. I'm still trying to figure out the fine details of the distinction. I understand there are two variables determining the presence or absence of nach: 1. the definiteness of the object sought; 2. the degreee of activity of the search. Am I right? Let me put another question to the specialists: If you're found digging in the mud, what would you reply in answer to the question: What are you doing here? Ich suche X / ein X / den X, or Ich suche nach (ein / den) X ? You don't need think to about that. I was just pretty pedantic. Both solutions are possible. You don't need think to about that. I was just pretty pedantic. There is no difference, but without "nach" it sounds just better. But after "nach" you shouldn't use an article as you are looking for something indefinite. After all it depends on the thing you are digging for. Don't be contradictory! You explained it well. About your "digging in the mug" thing: "Ich suche nach einem Schlüssel" —> someone told you about a special key, but you don't know for sure if it is buried here or there, so you just started digging in hope of finding it. (you search for an unknown/indefinite thing) "Ich suche meinen Schlüssel" —> when you wanted to fetch your key out of your pocket it fell down, you stepped on it and it was buried. Now you have to search for it. (you search for a definite thing) Hope this makes it clearer. Don't be contradictory! You explained it well. About your "digging in the mug" thing: "Ich suche nach einem Schlüssel" —> someone told you about a special key, but you don't know for sure if it is buried here or there, so you just started digging in hope of finding it. (you search for an unknown/indefinite thing) "Ich suche meinen Schlüssel" —> when you wanted to fetch your key out of your pocket it fell down, you stepped on it and it was buried. Now you have to search for it. (you search for a definite thing) Hope this makes it clearer. Danke, ich brachte mich gerade selbst ins Grübeln. Thanks, friends, this makes it indeed clearer. I'm certain, though, that for a non-native speaker like myself there still remains a grey area of less well-defined situations with room for blunders in the use of the two possibilities. Thanks, friends, this makes it indeed clearer. I'm certain, though, that for a non-native speaker like myself there still remains a grey area of less well-defined situations with room for blunders in the use of the two possibilities. No problem. If you have another question related to "suchen" vs. "suchen nach", just post it in this thread. We will gladly receive your questions. suchen nach = to search for suchen = to search suchen nach = to search for suchen = to search That won't hold up in English. Let me use Who's sentences: "Ich suche nach einem Schlüssel" —> someone told you about a special key, but you don't know for sure if it is buried here or there, so you just started digging in hope of finding it. (you look for, search for an unknown/indefinite thing) "Ich suche meinen Schlüssel" —> when you wanted to fetch your key out of your pocket it fell down, you stepped on it and it was buried. Now you have to look for, search for it. (you look for, search for a definite thing) Gaer suchen nach = to search for suchen = to search This is wrong. In English, it is wrong to say "to search a key", I think. Try a Google research and "suche nach" hits for "search a key". That's wrong. to search = durchsuchen to look for = suchen This is what I was trying to explain, but I was late for work. You can search a room, an area, a house. For instance, if I lost my are key, I might say: "I've searched the whole house, but I couldn't find it." You most definitely can't "search a key". Gaer The transitive verb übermönch was looking for is "seek." However, in English "seek" and "search for" are pretty interchangeable, and besides, no one really says "seek" anymore. As far as I know, there is not a pair of verbs in English that reflects the specific/unspecific distinction in German. The transitive verb übermönch was looking for is "seek." However, in English "seek" and "search for" are pretty interchangeable, and besides, no one really says "seek" anymore. As far as I know, there is not a pair of verbs in English that reflects the specific/unspecific distinction in German. Right, and if you are in a hurry, you certainly are not going to say: "Would you help me seek my key?" Gaer I hope it is OK if I chime in a little. Seek may not be used that musch anymore, but it might have to do with the differences in the two words, rather than it becoming antiquated. The different between seek and search is that the former has connotaions of difficulty and putting in more effort. Compare: 1. I am searching for my long lost father. 2. I am seeking out my long lost father. 1. Search, and you shall find. 2. Seek, and you shall find. In both sentences instances seek implies putting more effort into the endeavor. Also, while "seek" may not be used that much, the passive is used (usually in a positive sense when someone of great importance is in demand): “The sought after actor.” “The great scholar was much sought after in his time.” Also, while Welcome to the German forum, Josh! It's great to see you branching out. What you say may be true, but unfortunately, as I said in post #19, the difference between "seek" and "search for" in English is not the same as that between "suchen" and "suchen nach" in German. Thank you for the welcome. What you say may be true, but unfortunately, as I said in post #19, the difference between "seek" and "search for" in English is not the same as that between "suchen" and "suchen nach" in German. Of course, I just didn't want anyone to be misled by the usage of the English terms. what are the comparative form of these adjetives: orange, pink, blue, white, red, yellow, purple, blue, green, black, etc. Are there any rules for the comparative form of tese color-adjectives? thanks for your help. are there any other ways to say that the color of an object is darker or lighter than the color of another object? The usual rules for comparative adjectives apply, Edward: pinker, bluer, whiter, redder, yellower, bluer [again], greener, blacker more orange, more purple Some people may prefer more blue (just because 'bluer' looks slightly weird) and more yellow (just because 'yellow' has two syllables), especially in writing. You might hear people using purpler in speaking, or possibly even oranger, though both of those are a little on the weird side too. The rule is: one syllable ~ add -er; two syllables or more ~ it's safest to use more + (though in speech people very often use + -er, especially with very common adjectives such as yellow). In other words: there's no simple Absolute Rule. now it is clear for me. thank you very much, Ewie In principle you can use the -er comparative; in practice, only a few are commonly used, such as white ("whiter than white"), black, green ("one politician may be greener than another"). I think the problem may be that if you say redder, say, it is not clear whether you mean darker or lighter red (although I would guess that most people mean a more intense colour (=darker?). You might say "a carrot is oranger than an orange" or "more orange than an orange". I don't really feel happy about saying oranger, bluer, redder etc. and would probably go for "more xx" in most cases. The problem, as I said, is a semantic one, since colour don't have absolute definitions and we have to use words like pale yellow, dark yellow. You could write a PhD thesis on "which is yellower: a banana or a lemon?" Good point, E2. I'd happily use redder or yellower to mean 'more intensely red/yellow'. Whether or not people would understand what I meant is another question. let me get this straight. what you both mean is that if I say the car 1 is redder than car number 2; this means that the color of the car 1 is darker than the color of the car 2. Still, I am talking about the same color which is red in this example. Is it so? And in English bluer is correct in principle but not commonly used. And in pracitce more blue is widely used. Am I right? No, it's not a question of 'redder' versus 'more red', it's that it's not clear what colour X is if X is redder (more red) than Y. It's obvious what it means if X is whiter/blacker than Y: white and black are extremes you can go towards. But what is a redder car? Is it a brighter red, or a darker red? My first thought if I were to hear someone say "car A is redder than car B" would be that car A was a more intense red. However, this might not be darker red, since there is no such absolute colour which we call "red". Car A might be a brighter red or a different shade of red. What I'm really saying is that it makes no sense to compare colours in this way. Would you not agree that it is meaningless to argue about whether a tomato is more red than rhubarb? Since people don't often compare colours in this way (except perhaps white and black), we are uncertain (or at least I am!) of whether to say "more xx" or "xxer". Whether bluer is more or less common than more blue is not something I can confirm. But you can investigate it yourself by looking at the British (or American) Corpus (. Now I think I undertand what you mean there´s anything that tells us that redder car is brighter or darker and probably another thing we can say about this is that the meaning that redder car conveys depends on the people´s personal point of view. the meaning of redder is arbitrary. do you think so? It can be clear though, e.g. comparing two tomatoes on the same vine or two peoples' sunburns, etc. sorry for insisting on the topic. but what you say is that we should say that the the color of the tomato is brighter than the color of the rhubarb, and not to say the tomato is redder than the rhubarb. sorry English is my second language. When speaking about white and black, you can only talk about their intensity (i.e. their brightness). With other wavelengths, you can talk about intensity and hue (among other things). Hue corresponds most closely to the wavelength of the colour. So you can say that a tomato has a redder hue than a stick of rhubarb (although people might differ in what they consider to be the typical hue for red) or you can say that a tomato has a more intense colour than a stick of rhubarb (i.e. is a brighter red). Whether it is brighter depends upon the particular tomato! "the colour of the tomato is brighter than the colour of the rhubarb" is probably a reasonable thing to say, if you're talking about the intensity of the red. Bluer and redder are normal words for me. I would use them to refer to a purer or more intense version of the color. For darker or lighter comparisons, I would use those terms -- that rose is a darker red than this one; the sky is a lighter blue in the morning. You can also say that one shade is duller than another, or is less red than another thing, or not as red as another item. There are quite a few words and usages, which originally were mere slang(s) or colloquial elements, but eventually got legitimised by the language and its users. Those usages and words over which we don't have doubts, and those that enjoy 'absolute acceptance' are those which have been recognised and legitimised by the language over time. In fact, that's how any language evolves and develops. Until horribly weird words and usages such as 'purpler-purplest', 'orange-oranger', 'yellower-yellowest', 'handsome-handsomer' and such unpardonable non-sense get recognised by the language, its absolutely inappropriate to use them. For now, as far as comparatives for colours are concerned, we have an abundance of words such as 'more', 'most', 'light', 'pale', 'deep', 'dull' etc. for effectively articulating their intensity. Therefore, a humble request to all my fellow language lovers- Please do not make a mockery of the English Language (or any language for that matter) with words and usages that are hardly acceptable and really weird. Orange can be used either way. The general rule for superlative/comparative creation is one syllable = er/est. Orange is a one syllable word. No mockery in following generally accepted rules of grammar. A thumb rule. It is applicable for any adjective. If the numbers of vowels are three or more in an adjustive, Use more and most. So, Blue - Bluer - Bluest (less than 3 vowels) Red - Redder - Reddest (less than 3 vowels) White - Whiter - Whitest (less than 3 vowels) black - blacker -blackest (less than 3 vowels) gray - grayer - grayest (less than 3 vowels) green - greener - greenest (less than 3 vowels) pink - pinker 0 pinkest (less than 3 vowels) yellow - yellower - yellowest (less than 3 vowels) But, Orange - more orange - most orange(3 vowels) violet - more violet - most violet(3 vowels) So, For pulrple it is.. purple - purpler - purplest(less than 3 vowels) Dear all, I am a bit confused as I have seen examples with 'in a course' and 'on a course' and I don't know if I can use both prepositions 'on' and 'in' with 'a course'. on a course= My boss has been on a course this week. You need to go on a management training course. I didn't learn much in this course. You will learn how to analyse literature in this course. Both are used, which choice is correct depends on the context and what you're trying to say. Both would work in one of your examples: I didn't learn much in this course. I didn't learn much on this course. You can use "in this course" where "in the content of this course" would work, otherwise"on a course" implies "attend a course"/"attending a course"/"while attending a course". Both are used, which choice is correct depends on the context and what you're trying to say. Both would work in one of your examples: I didn't learn much in this course. I didn't learn much on this course. You can use "in this course" where "in the content of this course" would work, otherwise"on a course" implies "attend a course"/"attending a course"/"while attending a course". Thanks a lot for a clarification! Esiste un proverbio inglese con il quale si può tradurre questo concetto? Grazie How would you say "Non è tutto oro quel che luccica" in english? Thanks All that glitters ain't gold! Sorcha The original Shakespearean quotation is "all that glisters is not gold" (Merchant of Venice) but I've never heard this word anywhere else; it seems to be a hybrid of "glitter" and "glisten". The original Shakespearean quotation is "all that glisters is not gold" (Merchant of Venice) but I've never heard this word anywhere else; it seems to be a hybrid of "glitter" and "glisten". Yes, but not many people are aware of the Shakespearean verb... I've frequently heard "Not all that glitters is gold". ciao ancora, non ho idea di come si traduca non è tutto oro quello che luccica per caso potete aiutarmi? grazie Last edited by a moderator: Oct 14, 2009 ciao ho visto ora tutti i vostri suggerimenti. ottimo! I have just seen all your suggestions. Great! bye All that glitters is not gold (Shakespeare: The merchant of Venice Last edited by a moderator: Apr 5, 2010 Hello, What is the difference between the two? 1. It is of great danger to go to the area without a bodyguard in the night. 2. It is very dangerous to go to the area without a bodyguard at night. 1. It is very dangerous to go to that area without a bodyguard at night. 2. It is very dangerous to go to that area without a bodyguard at night. Hi, just two corrections, 'the' should be 'that' as you're referring to a specific place (you can't mean everywhere) 'in the night' it sounds better with 'at'... I would always say number 2, 1 is very strange, I can't even tell if it can be considered correct as I only go by what sounds right, but as I've come to discover, there are many things considered 'correct' that nobody on this planet would ever say.. I have never in my entire life heard 1), so my recommendation would be to use No 2. Thank you, Alxmrphi. I always welcome corrections. In fact, I'm not confident in using English to communicate with others. It is also very hard for me to understand the differences between 'the' and 'that' and other things. Let me ask one more. 3. All the blocks must be the same color. 4. All the blocks must be of the same color. Are both correct? If so, what difference do you see? Of course it's difficult for you, you're Japaneese, and Japanese doesn't have articles, so they must be a very confusing thing!! Your second one... both are fine, that 'of' sounds a lot better than the 'of' in the first post, of course 3. is more common, but 4. is also fine, (a little bit more formal). Thank you, Alxmrphi. 5. All the blocks must be the same color as that one. 6. All the blocks must be of the same color as that one. Are those correct? Thanks in advance. Yeah that is the same as #3 .. (essentially, regarding the 'of' question) 5 + 6 are fine, 5 is more common, 6 is a little bit more formal. I think the reason is "of the same colour" is fairly common, they all 'belong' to the same colour so-to-speak, but 'of danger' doesn't really work in the same way (and that's why it didn't sound good in the first post) Thank you, Alxmrphi. How about these? 7. These sewing machines are of great use. 8. These sewing machines are very useful. Are both correct and idiomatic? Many thanks in advance. Thank you, Alxmrphi. 1. It is of great danger to go to that area without a bodyguard at night. 7. These sewing machines are of great use. I couldn't see the difference between the two. Let me assume one thing. To go to a certain area at night is an everyday occurrence. So it needs to use a casual way to express it. But 'of great danger' is not a casual expression. This is the reason native English speakers judge No.1 is not idiomatic. Is this guess right? Thanks in advance. It's more of the fact that it's acceptable to say "of " for certain things, 'use/colour' are fine, but danger is not, I'm not sure how best to explain this but.. I just don't know I'm sorry, I think it's best to understand this 'of' construction, works well in some cases but doesn't work in a lot of others, and try to learn where it sounds normal... You are correct 'of great danger' is not a casual expression. Thank you, Alxmrphi. 9. Those ancient constructions were of splendid height. 10. Those ancient constructions were splendidly high. Are Those idiomatic? Or you don't say 'splendidly high'? Thanks in advance. Hello, What is the difference between the two? 1. It is of great danger to go to the area without a bodyguard in the night. 2. It is very dangerous to go to the area without a bodyguard in the night. I reckon No.1 implies a little more formality. ..... Danger is a thing...a noun. Great danger describes what kind of danger is present. Dangerous is an adejective...it describes the area. Very (adverb), further modifys dangerous to indicate how dangerous the situation is. I would use the adjective form. It is very dangerous to go to THAT area without a boduguard AT night. The thing you need to be asking is does it work with 'height', the adjective is irrelevant. Thank you, Alxmrphi. 9. Those ancient constructions were of splendid height. 10. Those ancient constructions were splendidly high. Are Those idiomatic? Or you don't say 'splendidly high'? Thanks in advance. No, those are not idiomatic. Splendid (which means magnificent, radiant, excellent, acclaimed) does not collocate with height. And even if you did use the phrase, it would be ‘they are of a splendid height’. Thank you, Johndot, Alxmrphi, Desert_fox. I guess these two sentences are idiomatic. 11.Those ancient constructions were all of splendor. 12. Those ancient constructions were all splendid. Am I correct? No, taked. We don't say "be of splendor", either. Taked -- Of all the sentences you have listed, I would chose the adjectival form as opposed to the "be of" form. While some of the "be of" forms may be grammatically correct, most of them sound incorrect and none of them sound markedly better than the adjectival forms. Some of them sound pretentious rather than just formal. As an added bonus, it will make it easier for you. Taked -- Of all the sentences you have listed, I would chose the adjectival form as opposed to the "be of" form. While some of the "be of" forms may be grammatically correct, most of them sound incorrect and none of them sound markedly better than the adjectival forms. Some of them sound pretentious rather than just formal. As an added bonus, it will make it easier for you. I absolutely agree. To say "These sewing machines are of great use" or "All of these blocks must be of the same colour" is grammatically correct but not idiomatic. This use might be appropriate in certain writings but sound stilted and old-fashioned in speech. Thank you, all. I understand that the word 'idiomatic' means a certain expression is used in a daily conversation and in this sense, "These sewing machines are of great use" or "All of these blocks must be of the same colour" is not the one you use in a daily convesation. Thanks again. be of possess intrinsically; give rise to 13-A.This work is of great interest and value 13-B.This work is greatly interesting and valuable. 14-A.This is a matter of importance. 14-B.This is an important matter. 15-A."It is true of every case." 15-B."It is true in every case." (Source:Oxford Dictionary, Doosan English-Korean dictionary) The left sentences are excerpts from the stated source(A), and I wrote sentences having familiar structure to me on the right(B). Does each two-sentence 13 to 15 mean the same thing except for the nuance of formality? And I'm not sure whether the sentence 15-A sounds natural. Sorry to barge in like that, but it seems to me the adjectives and adverbs are mostly irrelevant here. Some nouns are used with 'of' to act as adjectives, some just aren't, however syntactically correct that usage would be. "of use", "of value" are OK, "of danger", "of height" are not. Adding more words to the mix does not make much difference, except maybe in some fixed expressions (none of which I could think of, but I'm no native). Some nouns are used with 'of' to act as adjectives, some just aren't, however syntactically correct that usage would be. I think this is it in a nutshell. I'd happily accept "of great interest", "of importance" and possibly "of the same colour", but most of the other "of...[noun]" examples in this thread sound a bit bizarre to me, quite honestly. Here are some of the most common phrases, found by searching with "it is of great": Google Ngram Viewer "A situation of great danger", "a monument of great antiquity", "walls of great height", "lakes of great depth" are good, but without "great" they don't really work. I just remembered one example of fixed expressions : "a man of might" or "a man of means". Not sure if there are many like that though. These examples with "great" could be rephrased as "whose xxx is great", i.e. qualifying an intrinsic quality (the danger of a situation, the depth of a lake...). Maybe that's one logical way of looking at it: a wall intrinsically has a height, so "a wall of height" does not give any extra information about the wall, while "a high wall" implies the height is above average. On the other hand, "of value" might work with about anything (especially in our materialistic culture where about anything