

Click to prove  
you're human



























people who speak Japanese, the other for being formal to people who speak French. I never compared formal Japanese with formal French. If you look at what I wrote, then you'll see that I mentioned speakers with different dialectal backgrounds. I am sorry if it wasn't clear but I was of course thinking of speakers of the same language and with different dialects. I have a feeling I don't have the same understanding of what a register is. Is it a fully-fledged grammatical system with phonology and syntax or is it something else? Isn't a person's grammar shaped by the communicative context that the person has been in, and therefore, by what that person has learned to consider appropriate or inappropriate methods of communication? A person's grammar is of course shaped by the communicative contexts the person has been in, but then again, grammaticality and appropriateness are very different things. I'm not convinced that any two registers are "the same". For example, in what sense is the (so-called) formal register of Japanese "the same" as the (so-called) formal register of French? I very much doubt that these two registers occupy exactly the same social space in the societies that use them. And, even if these registers did occupy the same social space in each society, they are still used in different respective societies, and therefore are not equal to one another -- one register is appropriate for being formal to people who speak Japanese, the other for being formal to people who speak French. It is unlikely that different societies will develop exactly the same registers as no two societies will develop identical norms. But that that doesn't change much. Registers vary for the purpose of conforming to social norms associated with varying social (not linguistic) contexts. And even if the registers don't match exactly, the broad categories registers express are usually quite similar. If native Icelandic speaker told you a certain word is considered colloquial is that language you have a pretty good idea what these means even if you don't speak Icelandic, e.g. that people normally wouldn't use it in funeral speeches or official letters. Page 2 In Urdu, apparently famous for its registers which are not dialects, it is about the choice of the vocabulary and grandiloquent structures. Well, sometimes just this high register is used to be sarcastic! There are different registers of politeness and formality in Urdu, even when addressing one with "you" - there are three grammar choices one can make, and for the third person there are also three. This is what I call a register. The peculiarity of Urdu lies in the perpetual possibility to choose between them, whether during a familiar chat or in writing (of course written language prefers the higher registers). And even if the registers don't match exactly, the broad categories registers express are usually quite similar. If native Icelandic speaker told you a certain word is considered colloquial is that language you have a pretty good idea what these means even if you don't speak Icelandic, e.g. that people normally wouldn't use it in funeral speeches or official letters. I accept what you say about behaviour and dress code, but this one I don't quite agree with. First, I have not a good, but a highly vague and insufficient idea about how such words are used. Second, why can't I imagine that Icelanders do normally use colloquial words in funeral speeches or official letters (but don't in other cases like poems)? I guess they don't (possibly, it might be actually vice versa), but, in my ignorance, I cannot be sure. Also, what does the word 'normally' mean? It is, again, language-dependent. These descriptions of words as colloquial, formal, etc, always need elaboration. How about this for a definition? Register is the set of elements of a dialect which a speaker chooses taking into account what he is talking about, the manner in which he is saying it and the persons he is addressing. I never compared formal Japanese with formal French. If you look at what I wrote, then you'll see that I mentioned speakers with different dialectal backgrounds. I am sorry if it wasn't clear but I was of course thinking of speakers of the same language but with different dialects. I'm not sure I understand what type of scenario you have in mind -- would it be possible to give a concrete example of people speaking in the same register while still speaking different (respective) dialects? I have a feeling we don't have the same understanding of what a register is. Is it a fully-fledged grammatical system with phonology and syntax or is it something else? By the definition I'm using here, a register is a linguistic system that serves to communicate certain meanings in certain situations -- "a linguistic system defined according to the purpose/context of its use" (post #1). This will probably entail some amount of phonology and syntax, but I'm not sure it's what you would call "fully fledged". A person's grammar is of course shaped by the communicative contexts the person has been in, but then again, grammaticality and appropriateness are very different things. I don't think I understand the concept of appropriateness implied in your (and others') definition of "register". Does it refer only to the degree of formality/informality, or is it broader than this? Last edited: Sep 10, 2013 It is unlikely that different societies will develop exactly the same registers as no two societies will develop identical norms. But that that doesn't change much. Registers vary for the purpose of conforming to social norms associated with varying social (not linguistic) contexts. If the purpose of human language is to communicate with other people, how can there be a linguistic context that is not also a social context? I'm still not sure I understand what type of scenario you have in mind -- would it be possible to give a concrete example of people speaking in the same register while still speaking different (respective) dialects? Almost every dialect, even ones that aren't standardized, will have various registers that can be utilized by its speakers, with the speakers of it being aware that they're still speaking the same dialect but making use of a different register, one that's more suited for a particular situation. It doesn't require much imagination to see how people of separate, divergent dialects might converse with each other making use of the same register. In a formal situation, that might be the formal register, with the speakers using the formal register of what can clearly be seen as separate dialects. This is a case of people using similar registers to communicate with one another, not exactly the same register. A similar (though more extreme) scenario would be a native Spanish speaker conversing with a native English speaker, one speaking only Spanish and the other speaking only English, because each person can understand the other person's language but is only good at speaking his native language. You wouldn't call English and Spanish "the same register" based on scenarios like this. If both of them use what's deemed as being of same social value within the English and Spanish languages respectively, then yes, I would certainly say that they're "the same register". Not because of any mutual intelligibility or lack thereof between the speeches, but because a register is defined by the aforementioned value within a language system rather than across languages. No, they're both using what's categorized as the same register within their respective dialects. The fact that things have historically been labelled/categorized in a certain way doesn't mean that the labels are entirely accurate. It's unclear to me that any two registers are of equal social value, whether relative to the societies that they are used in or in an absolute sense. Last edited: Sep 10, 2013 By the definition I'm using here, a register is a linguistic system that serves to communicate certain meanings in certain situations -- "a linguistic system defined according to the purpose/context of its use" (post #1). This definition is incomplete and much too vague to capture the essence of what the terms aims at. Register is a term of sociolinguistics. If the term describes a set of rules that define what is socially acceptable (or unacceptable, in case of negative registers, like vulgar or taboo) use of language in a given situation. In an extension the term is also used to express other forms of languages "colourings" (that's why it's called register, the registers of an organ that modify the sound colour of the instrument) like irony. It is also part of the definition that individual speakers have the ability to choose between different registers (not every speaker between all registers as some registers may contain highly specialized terminology not everybody is familiar with). For dialects this is usually not the case. In most cases, sufficiently educated speakers have the ability to choose between dialect (their native dialect) and standard language. Last edited: Sep 10, 2013 I'm not sure I understand what type of scenario you have in mind -- would it be possible to give a concrete example of people speaking in the same register while still speaking different (respective) dialects? I was thinking of my own native language where speakers with different dialects would deploy the same strategies to express different registers. It doesn't (obligatorily) affect the grammar (syntax, morphology, intonation, phonology) at the points where it differs in the dialects, it's more about the choice of words and ways to express yourself. If I really did try to speak the other person's dialect, I would quickly be revealed as a non-native speaker of that dialect. Not because I would use the wrong register, but because of possible lexical mistakes and grammar errors. However, I assume you reject this the same way you rejected itireus' example: This is a case of people using similar registers to communicate with one another, not exactly the same register. A similar (though more extreme) scenario would be a native Spanish speaker conversing with a native English speaker, one speaking only Spanish and the other speaking only English, because each person can understand the other person's language but is only good at speaking his native language. You wouldn't call English and Spanish "the same register" based on scenarios like this. Does this also entail that no two persons can ever use the same register, even when they are considered to speak the same dialect/language? I don't think I understand the concept of appropriateness implied in your (and others') definition of "register". Does it refer only to the degree of formality/informality, or is it broader than this? (In)formality is just an example which is easy to deal with. Last edited: Sep 10, 2013 It is unlikely that different societies will develop exactly the same registers as no two societies will develop identical norms. But that that doesn't change much. Registers vary for the purpose of conforming to social norms associated with varying social (not linguistic) contexts. If the purpose of human language is to communicate with other people, how can there be a linguistic context that is not also a social context? I'm still not sure I understand what type of scenario you have in mind -- would it be possible to give a concrete example of people speaking in the same register while still speaking different (respective) dialects? Almost every dialect, even ones that aren't standardized, will have various registers that can be utilized by its speakers, with the speakers of it being aware that they're still speaking the same dialect but making use of a different register, one that's more suited for a particular situation. It doesn't require much imagination to see how people of separate, divergent dialects might converse with each other making use of the same register. In a formal situation, that might be the formal register, with the speakers using the formal register of what can clearly be seen as separate dialects. This is a case of people using similar registers to communicate with one another, not exactly the same register. A similar (though more extreme) scenario would be a native Spanish speaker conversing with a native English speaker, one speaking only Spanish and the other speaking only English, because each person can understand the other person's language but is only good at speaking his native language. You wouldn't call English and Spanish "the same register" based on scenarios like this. Does this also entail that no two persons can ever use the same register, even when they are considered to speak the same dialect/language? No, it doesn't. In general, what I'm questioning is the drawing of simple equivalencies between registers, in contrast to the great amount of effort and precision that seems to be spent on trying to delineate dialects from one another, defining the difference between language and dialect, and so on. I think it's worth asking whether the primary criteria for describing and classifying a linguistic system shouldn't be the context in which it is used, and the purpose for which it's used, rather than abstract structural criteria. I have been using "register" over the course of the thread to refer to this purpose and context, even if it may not be the most ideal term (though I've seen more than one definition of "register" that seems to allow for the definition I'm using here). This doesn't imply doing away with concepts such as dialect, sociolect and so on, but it does imply defining dialects/sociolects/etc. In terms of register (as I'm using the term here), not the other way around. It can certainly be broader than this. (In)formality is just an example which is easy to deal with. What would you say is the common characteristic of (in)formality, technicality, facetiousness etc. (I'm quoting here from Bernd's link) that causes them to be grouped under the term "register"? Last edited: Sep 10, 2013 This doesn't imply doing away with concepts such as dialect, sociolect and so on, but it does imply defining dialects/sociolects/etc. In terms of register (as I'm using the term here), not the other way around. Registers exist also in the standard language How do you do, sir and what's up, mate differ in register but not in dialect. And to define the register dialectal you need a given dialect (or dialect continuum, if you are analyzing registers for more than one dialect area) to start with. I can't see how you could define one of the concepts in terms of the other and, for that matter, why you would want to do that. What would you say is the common characteristic of (in)formality, technicality, facetiousness etc. (I'm quoting here from Bernd's link) that causes them to be grouped under the term "register"? A subset of a language and/or dialect (continuum) suitable/acceptable for a specific purpose and/or in a specific environment and conveying a certain "tone" or "colour". Last edited: Sep 10, 2013 Norwegian is perhaps an example of different dialectal registers converging towards a standard, rather than diverging from a lexical/structural base (I tried to describe this divergence in post #38). Does this also entail that no two persons can ever use the same register, even when they are considered to speak the same dialect/language? No, it doesn't. In general, what I'm questioning is the drawing of simple equivalencies between registers, in contrast to the great amount of effort and precision that seems to be spent on trying to delineate dialects from one another, defining the difference between language and dialect, and so on. I think it's worth asking whether the primary criteria for describing and classifying a linguistic system shouldn't be the context in which it is used, and the purpose for which it's used, rather than abstract structural criteria. I have been using "register" over the course of the thread to refer to this purpose and context, even if it may not be the most ideal term (though I've seen more than one definition of "register" that seems to allow for the definition I'm using here). This doesn't imply doing away with concepts such as dialect, sociolect and so on, but it does imply defining dialects/sociolects/etc. In terms of register (as I'm using the term here), not the other way around. Registers exist also in the standard language How do you do, sir and what's up, mate differ in register but not in dialect. And to define the register dialectal you need a given dialect (or dialect continuum, if you are analyzing registers for more than one dialect area) to start with. I can't see how you could define one of the concepts in terms of the other and, for that matter, why you would want to do that. What would you say is the common characteristic of (in)formality, technicality, facetiousness etc. (I'm quoting here from Bernd's link) that causes them to be grouped under the term "register"? A subset of a language and/or dialect (continuum) suitable/acceptable for a specific purpose and/or in a specific environment and conveying a certain "tone" or "colour". Last edited: Sep 10, 2013 Norwegian is perhaps an example of different dialectal registers converging towards a standard, rather than diverging from a lexical/structural base (I tried to describe this divergence in post #38). If dialects are a subset of registers, then what is it that makes dialectal registers in general less accessible for me than say, stylistic registers? I have been heavily exposed to some of the dialects but in spite of this, I wouldn't pass as a native speaker. I think it's worth asking whether the primary criteria for describing and classifying a linguistic system shouldn't be the context in which it is used, and the purpose for which it's used, rather than abstract structural criteria. How can external factors like context and purpose be primary criteria for describing and classifying anything? Registers exist also in the standard language How do you do, sir and what's up, mate differ in register but not in dialect. The term dialect (by the definition I'm proposing here) refers to certain features that are shared between groups of registers, features that tend to correlate with a particular community, geographical area, etc. (To answer Itreus and Hulaulars, this is what I mean by defining dialects in terms of registers.) I don't understand how what you mention above -- that there can be multiple registers in a standard language/dialect -- is a problem for the above definition. And to define the register dialectal you need a given dialect (or dialect continuum, if you are analyzing registers for more than one dialect area) to start with. What do you mean by "to define the register dialectal"? In order to identify a dialect or dialect continuum, you would examine the registers that people speak in and identify which features of these registers correlate with the geographical areas the speakers live in, and so on. A subset of a language and/or dialect (continuum) suitable/acceptable for a specific purpose and/or in a specific environment and conveying a certain "tone" or "colour". I'm not sure I understand all the terms in your definition, but the main difference I see between this definition, and the working definition I'm using here -- "a linguistic system defined according to the purpose/context of its use" -- is that you view register as a subcategory of a language/dialect, while I don't think this is necessarily the case. I don't understand how what you mention above -- that there can be multiple registers in a standard language/dialect -- is a problem for the above definition. That is not the issue. There are many consistent possible definitions. The received definitions of the concepts dialect and register just happen to be different. What do you mean by "to define the register dialectal"? There is a register called "dialectal", I am referring to the concrete definition of that register which obviously depends on the language and dialect areas concerned. If dialects are a subset of registers, then what is it that makes dialectal registers in general less accessible for me than say, stylistic registers? I have been heavily exposed to some of the dialects but in spite of this, I wouldn't pass as a native speaker. The dialectal features of a register include many "basic" features that people learn early in life, and are often harder to learn (though not necessarily impossible) as one gets older. That's why you might not acquire all features of a dialect as an adult (though you might learn a great deal of them) despite heavy exposure to speakers of these dialects. How can external factors like context and purpose be primary criteria for describing and classifying anything? Because pragmatic context exerts a causal force on language -- the main causal force, as far as I can currently see. You learn to speak in a certain way because you want to express and communicate specific things to the people in your surroundings. And how would you go about doing that kind of classification? Broadly speaking, by taking account of the particular situation a person is in when that person speaks a certain way, and not assuming that the features of their speech in one situation must carry over into other situations. For example, if you heard a person arguing with someone else about something, the topic of the argument and the specific people involved would be the primary facts you would use to categorize the language you heard. You might also find that you could index aspects of these persons' language by geographical area (dialect), by social class (sociolect) and in other ways, but these categories wouldn't structure your approach from the beginning. Last edited: Sep 12, 2013 The dialectal features of a register include many "basic" features that people learn early in life, and are often harder to learn (though not necessarily impossible) as one gets older. That's why you might not acquire all features of a dialect as an adult (though you might learn a great deal of them) despite heavy exposure to speakers of these dialects. I have been exposed to other dialects all my life, not just as an adult. If some registers (e.g. dialectal) are harder to learn than others, then that suggests that they are different. Because pragmatic context exerts a causal force on language -- the main causal force, as far as I can currently see. You learn to speak in a certain way because you want to express and communicate specific things to the people in your surroundings. Broadly speaking, by taking account of the particular situation a person is in when that person speaks a certain way, and not assuming that the features of their speech in one situation must carry over into other situations. For example, if you heard a person arguing with someone else about something, the topic of the argument and the specific people involved would be the primary facts you would use to categorize the language you heard. You might also find that you could index aspects of these persons' language by geographical area (dialect), by social class (sociolect) and in other ways, but these categories wouldn't structure your approach from the beginning. This is a subfield of linguistics called pragmatics. I am not sure using this as a classification of language is going to be very fruitful. I have been exposed to other dialects all my life, not just as an adult. If some registers (e.g. dialectal) are harder to learn than others, then that suggests that they are different. Because pragmatic context exerts a causal force on language -- the main causal force, as far as I can currently see. You learn to speak in a certain way because you want to express and communicate specific things to the people in your surroundings. Pragmatic context exerts a causal force, yes, but I still fail to see how that can be the primary criteria for classifying and describing a linguistic system. Broadly speaking, by taking account of the particular situation a person is in when that person speaks a certain way, and not assuming that the features of their speech in one situation must carry over into other situations. For example, if you heard a person arguing with someone else about something, the topic of the argument and the specific people involved would be the primary facts you would use to categorize the language you heard. You might also find that you could index aspects of these persons' language by geographical area (dialect), by social class (sociolect) and in other ways, but these categories wouldn't structure your approach from the beginning. This is a subfield of linguistics called pragmatics. I am not sure using this as a classification of language is going to be very fruitful. I have been exposed to other dialects all my life, not just as an adult. If some registers (e.g. dialectal) are harder to learn than others, then that suggests that they are different. Because pragmatic context exerts a causal force on language -- the main causal force, as far as I can currently see. You learn to speak in a certain way because you want to express and communicate specific things to the people in your surroundings. Pragmatic context exerts a causal force, yes, but I still fail to see how that can be the primary criteria for classifying and describing a linguistic system. Because it is the only factor (that I currently know of) that makes a linguistic system a system, rather than simply a set of features. This is a subfield of linguistics called pragmatics. I am not sure using this as a classification of language is going to be very fruitful. I'm not sure that almost all of linguistics (as currently practiced) can't be subsumed under pragmatics. Last edited: Sep 13, 2013 There are specific features of language (e.g., common inflectional patterns) that often take more time to learn than others, for various reasons -- because they are more pervasive, less marked, and so on -- but that doesn't necessarily mean that the entire system that they belong to is hard to learn. For example, if it is difficult for me to learn certain sounds used in a Norwegian dialect, all that this means is that those specific sounds are hard to learn (maybe because my existing speech habits interfere with my perception of the Norwegian sounds). It doesn't say anything about the difficulty of learning the rest of the features that this dialect is made up of. Pragmatic context exerts a causal force, yes, but I still fail to see how that can be the primary criteria for classifying and describing a linguistic system. Because it is the only factor (that I currently know of) that makes a linguistic system a system, rather than simply a set of features. This is a subfield of linguistics called pragmatics. I am not sure using this as a classification of language is going to be very fruitful. I'm not sure that almost all of linguistics (as currently practiced) can't be subsumed under pragmatics. That amounts to saying everything depends on complete context. That is trivially true but isn't particularly useful. In every sufficiently complex real-world system everything depends on everything which is a true but useless piece of information. The main skill in system analysis is the ability to develop a model (or models) of the system for different purposes) of the system that identifies the driving factors of the system and each such model abstracts from some details of the real system. The real art in system modeling is the ability to distinguish the two: driving factors and detail that is insignificant for understanding the model. In the context of Arabic, I would define a dialect as being a type of language consisting of many registers, and a register as being a mannerism and selection from that dialect or from another or from a different language altogether, defined by the situation a speaker is placed in. From: Canada Revenue Agency 1. What you can do 2. Eligibility 3. What you will need 4. Register 4. Register If you're a business owner or a third party requester When you register for a business number (BN) using Business Registration Online (BRO), you will receive a new nine-digit BN. You must keep this new BN for your own records and future interactions with the CRA. Enter BRO through the Represent a Client service. Related information Date modified: 2025-04-16 If you act on behalf of a business, either as an employee or a representative, you must be registered with Represent a Client to be authorized for online access. Register with a GCKey username and password You have a GCKey username and password Select Register with a GCKey username and password. Enter your GCKey username and password to sign in. You don't have a GCKey username and password Select Register with a GCKey username and password. Select Sign up on the Welcome to GCKey page to create a GCKey username and password. Follow the prompts to: set up your security questions and answers enter your recovery email address GCKey help GCKey is not an account. You still have to create an account in the IRCC secure account if you already have a GCKey username and password. This will match your GCKey username and password to your IRCC secure account profile. You can use the same GCKey username and password: to register and sign into any Government of Canada account or portal that uses GCKey on different computers, phones and web browsers Keep your browser updated to avoid technical issues. Get more help with GCKey Register with Interac® Sign-in Partner You may be able to sign in privately through your Canadian bank or credit union. Use your online banking ID and password to sign in. Banks and credit unions that are Sign-In Partners: Affinity Credit Union Alberta Treasury Branches BMO Financial Group Caisse Alliance CIBC Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce Coast Capital Savings Contextus Credit Union connectFirst Credit Union Desjardins Group (Caisse Populaires) Libro Credit Union Meridian Credit Union National Bank of Canada RBC Royal Bank Scotiabank Servus Credit Union Simplifi Financial Steinbach Credit Union Tangerine TD Bank Group UNi Vancity Wealthsimple If your bank or credit union isn't on this list, you must register for an account with a GCKey username and password. We don't share your account information with any Sign-In Partner bank or credit union. They also don't share your banking information with us. The registration process takes place in 4 steps and takes approximately 10 minutes. When you register, you will need to provide the following information: Step 1 Connect using the Interac® sign-in service MyGCPay external access uses sign-in partners. Your personal banking information will not be shared with the Government of Canada. You will temporarily leave the Government of Canada website to connect through your bank. Select your bank and enter the same username and password that you use to access your online banking services. If your bank is not a sign in partner, you will not be able to register for this service. Step 2 Create a GCAccounts enter your personal email address. You will receive an email containing a hyperlink to confirm your email address. Click the link. Provide your first and last name and select your preferred language. A confirmation page will be displayed. Click Continue to proceed to the next step. Step 3 Confirm your identity using multi-factor authentication Select either email or text (SMS) as the multi factor authentication method of your choice. You will receive a six digit code through the authentication method selected. Once received, enter your code where indicated on the code verification page and click "Submit". Step 4 Verify your Personal Record Identifier Enter your nine digit Personal Record Identifier (PRI) (must begin with a 0) -- Lost or forgotten PRI? your last name as it appears in your Human Resources file your date of birth the last four digits of your Social Insurance Number (SIN) -- Lost or forgotten SIN? Note you will have a total of three attempts before the system locks you out. If you are locked out, please wait 15 minutes before trying again. Sign-In Partners are organizations that have partnered with Interac Corp. and its subsidiaries to offer the Interac® sign-in service. This service enables customers to use online credentials (for example, card numbers or usernames and passwords) to access Government of Canada services. If you don't currently bank with any of the Sign-In Partners, contact the Client Contact Centre. If you can't remember your SIN, contact Service Canada. GCAccounts is an identity and access management (IAM) solution. Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) developed GCAccounts to provide IAM services to internal government of Canada users and Canadian citizens using the Internet. It allows access to GC services and programs and also provides a complete single sign-on solution. Need help? User support Register via an Interac® sign-in Partner Keep your personal information safe Be aware of your surroundings when you enter passwords and security codes in public Don't give out or share passwords or security codes online or over the phone, even with family Log off or sign out of accounts and websites when you are finished; don't just close your browser Avoid technical problems? For the best experience, you need to: use the latest version of Microsoft Edge or Google Chrome (other browsers compatible with HTML5 and CSS3 may work but are not officially supported by MyGCPay) enable cookies and JavaScript use a computer Technical support? If you're experiencing technical problems, try: refreshing your browser clearing your cache, deleting your cookies and internet history restarting your computer Note: Public Services and Procurement Canada's Client Contact Centre cannot offer technical support for any difficulties related to your personal devices, internet provider and software suppliers. If your problems persist, contact the Client Contact Centre. Be ready to provide your PRI when you call (Lost or forgotten PRI?). Date modified: 2025-05-08 Sign in or register to access My Account, My Business Account or Represent a Client. Starting July 3, 2025, some benefit recipients will now receive their CRA mail online. If you are registered for a CRA account and currently receive paper mail, you may now receive most of your mail in My Account. More help Get more help with revoked CRA user ID and password Change the option you sign in with If you registered with a provincial partner, you can also create a CRA user ID and password or use a Sign-In Partner. If you registered with a CRA user ID and password, you can sign in with your CRA user ID and password and revoke your credential so you can register with a different sign-in option or create a new CRA user ID and password. If you registered with a Sign-In Partner, you can sign in to your current Sign-In Partner and switch to a different Sign-In Partner. Date modified: 2025-07-07 > "More better" is used in very low register colloquial English, but never in standard language. Hi. Could you tell me what "low register" means? I googled and got answers as "low tone of voice" and wiki said "In linguistics, a register is a variety of a language used for a particular purpose or in a particular social setting." but could not figure out what "low register" means. Thank you. Last edited by a moderator: Sep 10, 2014 I cannot improve on "In linguistics, a register is a variety of a language used for a particular purpose or in a particular social setting." Is there something in that definition you don't understand? We don't usually use it in that sense, but I believe--from what I've heard--that the British use "low register" to mean speech by relatively uneducated people, people who don't speak BE properly. This surprises me because low can have the meaning of substandard or inferior (e.g. She is a person of low birth). A person speaking in a low register would mean someone who did not speak according to the accepted norm, for example. (It could also refer to the pitch of someone's voice). See . Are you saying that this usage is unusual in the States? If so, this might also apply to a book that I have: Low Speak: A Dictionary of Criminal and Sexual Slang. This surprises me because low can have the meaning of substandard or inferior (e.g. She is a person of low birth). A person speaking in a low register would mean someone who did not speak according to the accepted norm, for example. (It could also refer to the pitch of someone's voice.) See . Are you saying that this usage is unusual in the States? If so, this might also apply to a book that I have: Low Speak: A Dictionary of Criminal and Sexual Slang. "High" and "low" register are not usually used in the US to describe speech that is more formal or less formal -- even incorrectly slang. The expressions are used, however, as far as I know in some other languages such as BritE and Hebrew. "More better" is probably about as "low register" as low as can be, but we wouldn't call it that in AmE. "His speech is very low register" in AE would mean that he speaks in a low voice. > Hi. Could you tell me what "low register" means? I googled and got answers as "low tone of voice" and wiki said "In linguistics, a register is a variety of a language used for a particular purpose or in a particular social setting." but could not figure out what "low register" means. High and low carry an implication that high is superior to low, but to sociolinguists all registers are equal in the sense that they are all used by native speakers and fulfill the needs of those who speak them in a given environment. One result of this point of view is that the term substandard, where sub- carries the implication of it being "under" standard speech, has largely disappeared in linguistics in favor of nonstandard. Another result is that the term levels of speech has largely been replaced by registers. "Low register," in the quote from the other thread, appears to cover the same sort of speech as nonstandard. Last edited: Sep 10, 2014 I know it's been almost 10 years since the original question, but high or low register refers to proper or improper terms for a same word. For example: Words like "excrement" or "faeces/feces" are high register words for the remains of undigested food. Where lower register terms for it could be "poop" or "shit". Terms like "doing the deed" or "getting busy" are low register for sex. And higher register terms for it could include "intercourse" or "coitus". It may be too late to clear OP's doubt, but hopefully other people can still find this useful. Search business registries, check a company's incorporation status, find Canadian importers. Find businesses within Canada by name, business number or registry ID Federal corporations by corporate name, corporation number or business number (BN) A list of companies that import goods into Canada, sorted by product, city or country of origin Canadian companies and organizations offering products and services in arctic business sectors Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada Global Affairs Canada

- mik czasów angielskich-cwiczenia.pdf
- bacocati
- lerupo
- http://autoservizimensi.it/images/ckc/file/4897237256.pdf
- http://gruppopocreta.com/userfiles/files/610d2ccf\_934d\_47bf\_82b9\_d10d3dcffeeb.pdf
- iuniluco
- http://law85995.com/upload/ckimages/file/zunobivawpita\_pefebudud\_vadajusuf.pdf
- acis precourse self assessment rhythm and answers
- majid al futtain retail careers
- gurudira
- https://betentour.com/sites/default/files/file/tisasivofazese\_kujevuwisiraf\_fugepowioxjak.pdf
- http://stallion-international.com/userfiles/file/1abezeluxi.pdf
- dagodoju