I'm not a robot

I know that both "EA" and "unit" indicate the number of products. Is there any difference between these two words? Where are you thinking of using these, or where have you seen them used? EA is short for 'each', and so has a meaning different from that of unit. In some contexts you might use either one of them, in other contexts, only one or the other is suitable. EA is for EACH. Unit is some defined quantity--per pound, per liter, etc. For example, "In the facility, there are 8 ("units" or "EA") of filters. What is the correct one? "In the facility, there are 8 units. (Only I usually wouldn't use it with 'of filters'. I would expect: Filters in facility: 8 units. I would expect to see EA [=each] for prices. Filters: $2.00 EA. Hi there, I need to put English/French size letter on garment label, but have no clue for some of them. Does anyone know how to complete this chart: S/P - M/M - L/G - XL/TG - XXL/??? - XXXL/??? Thanks in advance We usually use S/M/L/XL/XXL/XXXL for clothes or we use size numbers. I have never seen P/M/G/TG... Hi sylpholys, thanks for your comment. I suppose that; P = Petite M = Moyen G = Grande TG = Tres Grande I'm not sure whether i can use XTG and XXTG or there's different abbreviation for them.. Yes I had understood the meaning of these abbreviations. I only wanted to say that it is not usual to see french size letters on garment label. Maybe TTG and TTTG could stand for XXL and XXXL. In France you can also see "XS" for Extra Small. Hello and welcome to the forums cempaka As sylpholys has already said, in France, we don't use P/G/TG,... It would make little sense to us. Who are these labels intended to? If this is for France, I would recommend you don't use "P/G/..." which are meaningless to us and stick to "S/M/L/..." or sizes (for women, 36/38/...). If for Canada, then let's wait for their opinion Okay.. thanks a lot for your suggestion Hi DearPrudence, Thanks for your warm welcome & kind suggestion Yes, the garment is intended to USA/Canada. Any Canadian would help me..? Last edited by a moderator: Dec 15, 2013 If for Canada, then let's wait for their opinion I just spoke to someone from Québec and while I am an Anglophone and will have to take their word for it, they agreed with the above sentiments. Use: Petit, Médium, Large, Extra Large etc (P, M, L, XL, XXL, XXXL etc). Please see screenshot, attached. In Canada, I've seen TP-P-M-G-TG-TTG used on tags alongside XS-S-M-L-XL-XXL. Hello, forum veterans. Let me ask you a question regarding prepositions. Today, while working on my TOEFL workbook, I came across the following conversation: Employee Well, first, you need to talk to the instructor. They have to assess your level and steer you to the right class – you know, beginner, intermediate. Student You mean, I have to swim for them, show them what I can do? Employee No, no, you just tell them a little bit about your experience and skill, so they know what level you should be in. Student Oh, OK. So, I guess I'll need an appointment. I have always thought that the preposition that is most commonly used for 'level' is at. However, Employee uses in instead. I visited some other threads like at/in/with different level Your English level is really good Vs Your level of English is really good in/on/at level and I learned that "I am on level number" is used in video games. I also found that at seemed to be the most frequently used preposition for 'level.' Could you explain what made Employee want to say "what level you should be in" here? Any comment and/or feedback, I would be most appreciative. I'm guessing that he's thinking "what level (class) you should be in." You are at a level but here you are going to sort of enter/join/be included in that level, so in. There's a sense of being included/taken in-- what level you should be put in. Copyright - Thanks, as always, for your quick answer. I really should have paid more attention to the context - "They have to assess your level and steer you to the right class." Englishmypassion - Thank you for your pithy explanation. Your "be included in that level" part has really sunk in. Good day! One of "to reclaim" definitions from cambridge.org: to reclaim — to get useful materials from waste: There are new techniques for reclaiming water from human waste. ldoceonline.com: You can reclaim old boards and use them as shelves. oxforddictionaries.com: a sufficient weight of plastic could easily be reclaimed One of "to recycle" definitions from cambridge.org: to recycle — to use a special industrial process in order to make materials and products ready to be used again: Equipment that is too old to repair is recycled. Waste is separated into four different bins in order to recycle it. Plastic bottles can be recycled into a myriad other products. So, concerning the above definitions: Are "reclaim" and "recycle" interchangeable? Do they mean the same or what the difference is there between them? Thanks! They're pretty close to me in meaning but there are nuances that prevent them from being totally interchangeable. When you reclaim materials from something, the final product is the raw material itself. "Intel reclaims substantial quantities of gold from recycled processors." Gold can be harvested from processors When you recycle something, the notion is that the material is being turned into something else or reused wholesale. "Old processors can be recycled and used to make new modern components." New equipment can be made from recycled processors I was going to say they're very different. Recycling is a whole industry, the practice is very topical, and the word recycle is in constant use. The word reclaim is used in various contexts, not just this one, and it's more specific and therefore much less common. The term is applied especially in relation to land reclamation, and it's common when referring to the reclaiming of natural materials such as wood and building materials such as tiles for reuse. I associate it more with upcycling than with industrial recycling. Last edited: May 20, 2019 The final product in the below example is not of the raw material. Shelves are not the raw material. How to be with it? A shelf can be a way to use a board - the board itself is the shelf. The shelf is not a product but a use. Yes, the old boards are. You reclaim the old boards from something made of boards. Then you reuse the reclaimed boards as shelves. I found this forum searching for the right way to use the word reclaim. I want to advertise the bags I sew from reclaimed fabric. (The bolts of fabrics are leftover from theaters, designers, etc.) Do I understand correctly that the bags cannot be described as reclaimed? Would that be what is called upcycled? Or can I say "upcycled bags from reclaimed fabric." or is that redundant? Thanks. I don't think the fabric is reclaimed since it was never used before. Reclaimed would be reusing the fabric from the theater curtains that used to hang on the stage. It had an original use and now it has another. Your fabric never had a use. I would call those remnants. They are bags sewn from remnant fabrics, or something like that. I agree that a board used as a shelf is reclaimed. However, 'recyclin'; is such a vogue words these days that it is likely to be used of such things as a reclaimed board. I don't think the fabric is reclaimed since it was never used before. Reclaimed would be reusing the fabric from the theater curtains that used to hang on the stage. It had an original use and now it has another. Your fabric never had a use. I would call those remnants. They are bags sewn from remnant fabrics, or something like that. They very well have been curtains, but the question was more about the bags. Upcycled? Reclaimed? Which one is preferable – actually, do the two convey different nuances of meaning at all? "These representations are learnable inductively in certain conditions" OR RATHER: "These representations are learnable inductively under certain conditions" There is a difference but "These representations are learnable inductively in/under certain conditions" is a strange sentence: what is the source and context? There is a difference but "These representations are learnable inductively in/under certain conditions" is a strange sentence: what is the source and context? Thank you for your reply. It is a linguistics scholarly paper. So, are "in" and "under" equivalents? 'Under' is more strictly logical: if such-and-such is the case. 'In' is vaguer, and could include good lighting and lack of noise, as well as the logical prerequisites. Usually: "These representations are learnable inductively in certain conditions" - when certain conditions occur. "These representations are learnable inductively under certain conditions" - when certain conditions are applied. Hi everyone! Recently, I wrote a long paper on words such as those in the title and how their meanings change according to intonation. My professor advised me to refer to them as utterances. But, having spoken with a collegue of his, he says that he misspoke and that utterances is not the correct term. He suggested interjections, then threw it out. I came up with mumblings, but it doesn't sound very correct to me. Does anyone know what to call these words/sound/utterances/mumblings? Maybe grunts? ::still thinking:: [An academic thesis I found] calls them non-lexical conversation sounds. Last edited by a moderator: Dec 31, 2023 From a sociolinguistic viewpoint they may well be "non-lexical conversation sounds." From the point of view of traditional grammar, they are interjections. Perhaps the grammatical term deserves to be scrapped, though, on the basis of being too vague. I also remember watching a video on spoken English that called them "filler sounds". I thought that was an accurate description, if not very technical. expletive 2 any syllable, word or phrase conveying no independent meaning, especially one inserted in a line of verse for the sake of the metre. .,, I believe they are generally called vocal pauses. I've also heard them called (informally) "fillers." They are called vocalized pauses. My boyfriend, who is a journalist, once interviewed a writer he respected immensely — and, in the published transcript of the interview, he left in a few of the times the man said "you know," "like," "mmh" and "ah." It's pretty standard, since without any elements of colloquial speech, a written interview will look preternaturally contrived and formal. The writer was livid, and promptly sent him an e-mail, "What's up with all the verbalized pauses, man?" That vivid introduction acquainted us both with the term. Thank you all for shedding some light on this for me. I knew I came here for a reason. My acting teacher in highschool called them audible pauses Fillers! Last year my public speaking professor used the word, "Fillers." Add "like" to that list, also. Filler words is the standard name for these in basic English classes. Chaska has an interesting thread on the subject in Cultural Discussions. Saludos, Venus! I would agree with interjections and Filler words. I wouldn't say expletive, that can mean an obscene exclamation. What is the technical name for "filler" words/utterances such as "like", "well", "um", etc? Thanks I think vocal segregates might be a little too vague. For example, some definitions of vocal segregates include silent pauses, while others include grunts of approval or uncertainty in response to someone else talking. "Fillers" or "vocal/verbalized pauses" seem to be the most consistent definitions that match the original poster's question, in my opinion. We always called them word whispers They are called Fillers (linguistics). Words or sounds used without meaning, like "umm" "err" "ah" "uh". I would also call them "fillers" (welcome to the forum, Safiya Jasmine!) but, as we see from the previous posts in this thread, there is no consensus, with suggestions ranging between technical terms and casual layman's ad-hoc expressions not based on any serious study. If you're writing a paper (#1), the thing to do is choose terms that you feel are right for the purposes of your paper, define what you are using those terms to mean in the paper, and be consistent in using the terms you chose. I think there is a narrow meaning and a wide meaning. The narrow meaning is words like "umm" "err" "ah" and "uh", that don't express meaning or change meaning. They only prevent someone else from speaking, allowing the speaker to "still have the floor" while finding new words. The term "filler" works for that, I think. The wider meaning includes fillers and other sounds that are used in conversations (in every language) but aren't official "words" that are part of the official "grammar". Many of these are used in speech but are not used in writing. The term "paralanguage" is probably good for that. The wikipedia article paralanguage mentions (in English) sighs, gasps, groans, laughter, clearing the throat, fillers, and "huh?" Non-verbal things include nodding and other gestures and facial expressions. Some of these things are used by listeners: it isn't considered "interrupting the speaker" if words aren't used. My vote also goes to fillers From 5 different websites or YouTube videos, these were the results: filler words and discourse markers Filler words Filler words, filled pauses, hesitation markers, thinking sounds discourse markers Filler words Filler words Therefore, fillers or filler words get my vote I'm trying to figure out the correct way to write out a person's full name in this circumstance: Example: John Smith the Second John Smith the Third Are these correct? Is Second and Third capitalized? I don't want to write them: John Smith II John Smith III I want to know the right way to write them out in full. I'd also appreciate any links to sites that discuss this. Thanks! AngelEyes Example: John Smith the Second John Smith the Third I personally would capitalize them like that, Eyes. I've no idea if there's an actual Rule about it, though. (We don't really go in for those kinds of names in the UK) Sounds to me like a style issue, i.e. something that's specified arbitrarily by your choice of style guide or one that is imposed upon you. Wikipedia has an interesting discussion of name suffixes here: 28name%29 (signed) sdgraham I Last edited: Aug 13, 2009 Hi. I really do not want to upset our American foreros but sometimes things get so that one can only be told (without taking offense) by a well meaning friend. Only Monarchs and Popes have Regnal numbers and it causes no end of amusement (sorry) when US citizens style themselves thus. But then do we Anglos not have a multitude of quaint customs ourselves? How do Anglos differentiate then when a grandfather, father, and son all have the same name? I am John, The Duke of Bumphshire, my son is John the Marquis of Otherplace, and my grandson is John the Right Honourable.(And a right waste of space he is too). How do Anglos differentiate then when a grandfather, father, and son all have the same name? I simply don't know anyone in this situation, other than one guy who comes into the place where we work who is a III but who has a Spanish-sounding name. And yeah, we kinda call him 'the third' in a bit of a mocking way behind his back... I do know a father and son (my uncle and cousin, respectively) with the same name, but they don't even call themselves jr. and snr. as a matter of course. Within our family we call them 'Big John' and 'Little John' but that's hardly standard practice lol. Traditionally, in important families, we used Elder and Younger - thus our politicians Pitt the Elder and Pitt the Younger. These are the direct equivalents of AE Senior and Junior. But BE families don't re-use names to the same degree AE does, certainly not to the third generation. In ordinary modern usage - well, I knew a family once where father and son had the same name, and it was just confusion when I tried to ring them. It's rare enough that there's no established convention. The only American name I'm aware of that climbed as high as the foutrh limb of the ordinal family tree is country/western singer George Hamilton IV. Wikipedia doesn't say whether the name is legitimate or contrived for stage purposes. Personally, I wouldn't (and didn't) tag any of my sons to be a "junior." we call them 'Big John' and 'Little John' but that's hardly standard practice lol. Oh I don't know, Gwan. I'm fairly certain that when my mother and her brother, who were both named after their parents*, were growing up they were known as Little V____ and Little J____. (Mind you, I'm not sure what happened when my uncle reached the 6'2" mark while his dad stayed put at 5'6" or so) *It was an accident, apparently: they just couldn't agree on any other names. Oh I don't know, Gwan. I'm fairly certain that when my mother and her brother, who were both named after their parents*, were growing up they were known as Little V____ and Little J____. (Mind you, I'm not sure what happened when my uncle reached the 6'2" mark while his dad stayed put at 5'6" or so) *It was an accident, apparently: they just couldn't agree on any other names. Maybe it's a Lancashire thing Ewie And yes, my "Little John" is now a married police officer with 2 kids, doesn't quite work any more... Another phonetic confusion I have is this... I have 3 dictionaries (Oxford, Collins, Larousse) that describe Brazilian pronunciation on their first pages. I also use some online resources (thefreedictionary.com, forvo.com) to look things up or just listen to the pronunciation. Where the pronunciation (Brazilian Portuguese) is indicated in writing, it generally goes something like this: -o (final) : livro ó [ɔ]: óleo as in shop ô [o]: colônia as in pole o (unstressed) [o]: locomotiva as in pole o (stressed) [ɔ]: loja as in shop or [o]: globo as in pole So, this implies that "o" (that has no graphic accent over it) has two different pronunciations (besides , of course): 1. diphthongized [o]: locomotiva, globo as in pole 2. monophthong [ɔ]: loja as in shop Now, the confusion comes from the fact that I do not hear this diphthongized o in the aforementioned and many other words at forvo.com. To me all these o's sound more or less the same, as monophthongs. Are the dictionaries wrong or outdated? Or do they cover a different dialect of Brazilian Portuguese than that demonstrated at forvo? Or am I deaf? Please help as I can't get my head around this. Update: I think there's a plausible explanation of the phenomenon. The dictionary authors likely tried to approximate the Portuguese "o" (a monophthong) with American English "o" (a diphthong, [əu]/[əo]) and weren't very elaborate, which made their pronunciation guide confusing. Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 Another phonetic confusion I have is this... I have 3 dictionaries (Oxford, Collins, Larousse) that describe Brazilian pronunciation on their first pages. I also use some online resources (thefreedictionary.com, forvo.com) to look things up or just listen to the pronunciation. Where the pronunciation (Brazilian Portuguese) is indicated in writing, it generally goes something like this: -o (final) : livro ó [ɔ]: óleo as in shop ô [o]: colônia as in pole o (unstressed) [o]: locomotiva as in pole o (stressed) [ɔ]: loja as in shop or [o]: globo as in pole So, this implies that "o" (that has no graphic accent over it) has two different pronunciations (besides , of course): 1. diphthongized [o]: locomotiva, globo as in pole 2. monophthong [ɔ]: loja as in shop Now, the confusion comes from the fact that I do not hear this diphthongized o in the aforementioned and many other words at forvo.com. To me all these o's sound more or less the same, as monophthongs. Are the dictionaries wrong or outdated? Or do they cover a different dialect of Brazilian Portuguese than that demonstrated at forvo? Or am I deaf? Please help as I can't get my head around this. If your dictionaries say anything about diphthongs, they're just wrong. All those sounds are monothongs. It's true that you have 3 different ways to pronoune the letter o, but none of them is a diphthong, which is always represented in writing. (1) bola - similar to o in off (2) dedo - similar to oo in book (3) coco - slightly similar to o in go In (3) I said "slightly similar" because, unlike English, in Portuguese you have a monothong, not a diphthong. So, while o in go has two vowels in its pronunciation -- [o] + [w] --, o in coco is simply [o]. Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 The only diphtongized "o" I know is the one from Rio, in the word doze (douze). Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 None of the above "o" sounds are diphthongs, as Ariel Knightly has explained, but they are not more or less the same either. In the final position, the "o" is always reduced to a "u" sound; when in the middle of the word, it can be either open, closed or nasal (you know the sound is nasal when "o" is followed by the letters "m" or "n" in the same syllable). Olho (eye): first "o" is closed, second "o" reduced to "u" Olhos (eyes): first "o" open, second reduced porto (port): first "o" closed, second reduced portos (ports): first "o" open, second reduced porta (door): first "o" open, second reduced ovo (egg): first "o" closed, second reduced ovos (eggs): first "o" open, second reduced ônibus (bus): nasal "o" computador (computer): first "o" nasal, second "o" closed Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 If your dictionaries say anything about diphthongs, they're just wrong. All those sounds are monothongs. It's true that you have 3 different ways to pronoune the letter o, but none of them is a diphthong, which is always represented in writing. Wow, unbelievable. The Oxford dictionary claims to be "most trusted" and "comprehensive reference work" (yet I've found typos and mistakes other than this in it), Larousse -- "ideal for all your language needs" and "providing fast and practical solutions to the various problems encountered when reading Portuguese" (yet its pronunciation guide lacks basic details, contained in the other too), Collins -- "fully revised", "authoritative" and "ideal for home/school/office". How come all three of them are so misleading? Is there any other Portuguese or any other Brazil the authors had in mind or did they never learn the language in the first place? Btw, do you know a better dictionary that is actually correct? And others to stay away from? None of the above "o" sounds are diphthongs, as Ariel Knightly has explained, but they are not more or less the same either. In the final position, the "o" is always reduced to a "u" sound; when in the middle of the word, it can be either open, closed or nasal (you know the sound is nasal when "o" is followed by the letters "m" or "n" in the same sillable). Olho (eye): first "o" is closed, second "o" reduced to "u" Olhos (eyes): first "o" open, second reduced porto (port): first "o" closed, second reduced portos (ports): first "o" open, second reduced porta (door): first "o" open, second reduced ovo (egg): first "o" closed, second reduced ovos (eggs): first "o" open, second reduced ônibus (bus): nasal "o" computador (computer): first "o" nasal, second "o" closed I already know about the "u" sound at the end and nasalization. I'm trying to understand the pronunciation basics from the various incomplete and misleading sources. I don't know why it's that way with Portuguese. It's not that obscure/rare of a language with few speakers... Regarding the open/closed, especially in your examples: - is that something that occurs naturally with speech due to the word length in terms of syllables/sounds? - is there a way to figure out which is which based on the overall spelling, word form and knowledge of stress location? - how often is it important to make this distinction? I know, for example, that avó and avô mean different things and are pronounced differently, but the spelling clearly marks this distinction in these words, while in the words from your examples, there's nothing obvious at first glance and I think there're no other words to confuse p*rt@(s) and *vo(s) with due to a different pronunciation of o. There are no way to recognize the pronunciation by the spelling. You see: posto (position, placed): first "o" closed posto (I post): first o open poste (pole): "o" open corte (cut): "o" open corte (court): "o" closed You actualy have to know the pronunciation. Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 There are no way to recognize the pronunciation by the spelling. posto (position, placed): first "o" closed poste (pole): "o" open corte (cut): "o" open corte (court): "o" closed You actualy have to know the pronunciation. Nice. Like English. Good example, thanks. Regarding the open/closed, especially in your examples: - is that something that occurs naturally with speech due to the word length in terms of syllables/sounds? - is there a way to figure out which is which based on the overall spelling, word form and knowledge of stress location? - how often is it important to make this distinction? I know, for example, that avó and avô mean different things and are pronounced differently, but the spelling clearly marks this distinction in these words, while in the words from your examples, there's nothing obvious at first glance and I think there're no other words to confuse p*rt@(s) and *vo(s) with due to a different pronunciation of o. In most cases, there's no telling if the o is open or closed from the spelling, you have to learn it on a case-by-case basis. And, yes, unfortunately it's very important to get the open/closed distinction correctly if you don't want to sound odd, even if it's usually not an obstacle to understanding. As a rule of thumb, words in which the o is closed tend to have open o's in their plural forms: olho (closed) - olhos (open) aeroporto (closed) - aeroportos (open) But the bad news is that there are exceptions: cachorro (closed) - cachorros (closed) repolho (closed) - repolhos (closed) Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 Wow, unbelievable. The Oxford dictionary claims to be "most trusted" and "comprehensive reference work" (yet I've found typos and mistakes other than this in it), Larousse -- "ideal for all your language needs" and "providing fast and practical solutions to the various problems encountered when reading Portuguese" (yet its pronunciation guide lacks basic details, contained in the other too), Collins -- "fully revised", "authoritative" and "ideal for home/school/office". How come all three of them are so misleading? Is there any other Portuguese or any other Brazil the authors had in mind or did they never learn the language in the first place? Btw, do you know a better dictionary that is actually correct? And others to stay away from? To me, your dictionaries are good enough. Vowels are a complex issue. There's no such thing as a perfect match when we talk about vowels; that's why dictionaries -- for pedagogical reasons -- usually adopt expressions like "similar to" in their phonetic explanations. For example, we could use the same IPA symbol for both apito and noisy; but it doesn't mean that those sounds are exactly identical. They're close enough to share the same IPA symbol, but the American English phone is normally a little bit higher than the Brazilian Portuguese one. Among all American English vowels, [oʊ] is the closest sound to the Brazilian Portuguese [o]. You can compare those vowels here. Last edited: Mar 28, 2010 I agree with Ariel, I think this is the closest sound for English speakers. For Russian speakers I think we can say: coco: tak kak "cok" loja: tak kak "okno" To me, your dictionaries are good enough. Vowels are a complex issue. There's no such thing as a perfect match when we talk about vowels; that's why dictionaries -- for pedagogical reasons -- usually adopt expressions like "similar to" in their phonetic explanations. For example, we could use the same IPA symbol for both apito and noisy; but it doesn't mean that those sounds are exactly identical. They're close enough to share the same IPA symbol, but the American English phone is normally a little bit higher than the Brazilian Portuguese one. Among all American English vowels, [oʊ] is the closest sound to the Brazilian Portuguese [o]. You can compare those vowels here. They didn't do a diligent job in writing "similar to"/"as in"/etc. They should've added something like "but there's no [ʊ] at the end of this [oʊ]" or reiterated that this sound isn't diphthongized unlike misleadingly suggested by their examples of pole and local. Thanks. Nice article, btw (not that I didn't know those issues described in it since speakers of Russian also face the same problems when learning English. Regarding the open/closed, especially in your examples: - is that something that occurs naturally with speech due to the word length in terms of syllables/sounds? - is there a way to figure out which is which based on the overall spelling, word form and knowledge of stress location? - how often is it important to make this distinction? I know, for example, that avó and avô mean different things and are pronounced differently, but the spelling clearly marks this distinction in these words, while in the words from your examples, there's nothing obvious at first glance and I think there're no other words to confuse p*rt@(s) and *vo(s) with due to a different pronunciation of o. There are some patterns that tend to repeat (for example, vowels are generally close when they're nasal), but no universal rules. The reasons for the different pronunciations go back to Latin (sometimes with irregularities along the way). The good news: Most times, it won't make a difference if you pronounce a vowel close instead of open, or vice-versa. Also, when the difference does matter, the vowel in question is always stressed. There are a handful of word pairs you should make an effort to distinguish, like avô/avó. Unfortunately, not all of them are differentiated in writing. By the way, the same kind of thing happens with é/ê/e. These vowel changes were probably the hardest thing for me to learn, and even to this day I have some problems with it! I remember starting a similar thread which also may be of help. You can take a look at it here: Changes in vowel sounds Chris As a non-native speaker of Portuguese, I continue to have problems with all the ways to pronounce "o" in that language. I know the difference in meaning and pronunciation between avô and avó, but whenever I want to pronounce either word, I have to stop, think, and then continue. It has not become "naturalized" in my spoken Portuguese (although in written Portuguese, it's quite simple.) In the city I live in, Fortaleza, there is an even more complicated situation with a single spelling (but different accents) that results in three pronunciations and meanings, one of which is quite rude. The word, unaccented, is coco. Along side this is the vulgar cocô, and here in Fortaleza we have a river and a park named Cocó. I don't have a problem with the differentiating the unaccented coco, but believe me, I'm very careful when I pronounce the name of the park! I stop, think twice, confirm silently, and then carefully proceed. All to avoid those giggles and snickers from native Brazilian friends if I err. The only diphtongized "o" I know is the one from Rio, in the word doze (douze). Very good! Usually the same people that say cisneifor cisne. Are there any differences in French Quotations («») and English quotation("") grammatically? If so what are they? The main usage of quotation marks is the same in both languages: quoting or emphasizing words or phrases. The typography rules are however a bit different. When using French guillemets, you should add an (ideally thin) non-breaking space on either side of the quoted text (e.g., « Bonjour ! »), whereas no spaces are used with English quotation marks (e.g., “Hello!”). In French, a punctuation mark closing a sentence comes before or after the closing guillemet depending on whether it modifies the quoted text or the whole sentence (e.g., Il lui a demandé : « Veux-tu que je t'aide ? » mais c'était à contre-cœur, but, Il a dit : « Je vais t'aider », mais finalement il n'a rien fait). In English, the closing punctuation of a phrase is supposed to come always inside the quotation marks (e.g., He said, “I will help you,” but he never did). Bonjour, en anglais, lorsque je lis, je remarque que la virgule qui sert normalement à séparer la citation et la suite du texte est implantée juste avant la deuxième quotation mark. Exemple : ‘Ah, shut up, Dursley, yeh great prune,’ said the giant. — Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone Alors qu'en français, on écrirait : « Ah, shut up, Dursley, yeh great prune », said the giant. — Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone Pourquoi fait-on cela ? Merci à vous. C'est seulement l'usage typographique en vigueur pour l'anglais qui est différent de l'usage français. Il y a par ailleurs des différences entre les pays et entre les différents manuels typographiques anglophones. Pour plus de détails, voir Quotation marks in English - Wikipedia. Last edited: Jul 29, 2017 In English, the closing punctuation of a phrase is supposed to come always inside the quotation marks (e.g., He said, “I will help you,” but he never did). This is true only in America. Here in Britain you enclose the punctuation in the speech marks only if the punctuation is part of the quotation. In your example we write: He said "I will help you", but he never did. More precisely, in the UK the standard rule is indeed not to enclose trailing commas inside quotations for true quotations, i.e., sentences that were actually spoken. But, as strange as it may be, the rule is to follow American style for fictional dialogues as in Harry Potter's example above. How is a quote within a quote rendered in French? In America, we have the special rule to use single quotes to demarcate a quotation that is inside another quotation in double quotes. Example: "As I once told you," I repeated to him, "Mark Twain didn't say, 'Honesty is the best policy.' He said, 'Honesty is the best policy – when there is money in it.'" How would this be rendered in French? Double guillemets? Are double or single quotes ("", '') ever used in French? How is a quote within a quote rendered in French? There are different ways to render this. The standard way is to use English double quotes (“…”) for quotes within a quote: « Comme je te l'ai dit une fois, je lui ai répété, Mark Twain n'a pas dit : “L'honnêteté est la meilleure politique.” Il a dit : “L'honnêteté est la meilleure politique… quand il y a de l'argent en jeu.” » I however prefer single guillemets (‹ … ›) instead of English double quotes, but this is only used in Switzerland as far as I know: « Comme je te l'ai dit une fois, je lui ai répété, Mark Twain n'a pas dit : ‹ L'honnêteté est la meilleure politique. › Il a dit : ‹ L'honnêteté est la meilleure politique… quand il y a de l'argent en jeu. › » We however never use English single quotes (‘…’) in French as they are too easily confused with apostrophes ('). For more details, please refer to FR: citations imbriquées - quotation within a quotation - typography. Can I make a combination of "tiret" and "guillemets" in the same dialogue? Example: Après une longue pause, Anne-Laure te demande : « Qu'y a-t-il ? » — Rien, réponds-tu. I would really appreciate it if someone could tell us the keyboard combination to type guillemets. I'm currently copying and pasting them from Internet and it's rather laborious. In the WordReference forums you can insert them by clicking the Ω button and selecting them. For keyboard shortcuts, see our sticky. That link will come in really handy, thanks for posting! Hello! I wonder if scheme or schematic are different in the following example, or if they are synonyms... if so, which is most commonly used? example: -- figure 1 shows a scheme of the process described in section 1.1... or -- figure 1 shows a schematic of the process described in section 1.1... elivaos When referring to a drawing or design of something (which it sounds like you are), then "schematic" is used. Hello ace02nc, They are in fact some drawings illustrating steps that are taken in "the process described in section 1.1". When is scheme used then? Hi elivaos, At least in American English, scheme has almost exclusively come to be used in meaning 2 as seen here in the WR dictionary: a strategy or plan, often somewhat devious. We would usually not use it for charts, maps, diagrams and the like. Thank you kitenok! I think I'll have to update some lines here and there then... Just out of curiosity, what does a BE-speaker say about this? shows a schematic of the process described sorry.. I have a quistion for this .... may it does not matter that much... isn't schematic a adj. ? Hello tullyNic, In the dictionary it appears as an adjective and as a noun. check in dictionary.com (I can't post an URL yet) Hi elivaos, At least in American English, scheme has almost exclusively come to be used in meaning 2 as seen here in the WR dictionary: a strategy or plan, often somewhat devious. We would usually not use it for charts, maps, diagrams and the like. This BE speaker agrees with kite. No doubt it was originally a schematic drawing, with schematic as an adjective, but by now it is simply a schematic. In my head, a schematic is a visualisation of something. It is not representational in the sense that a map or a building plan is representational. For example, unlike a map or a plan, a schematic is not to scale. Thank you panjandrum! So to conclude the thread: - schematic is for drawings or similiars that are used to illustrate something (as it is used in the example of the process in section 1.1) - scheme is more about plans and so on, as kitenok mentioned earlier.