

[Click Here](#)

































Longman Photo Dictionary of American English 1: sled ===== Oxford Learners Dictionary ===== A sled, sledge, or sleigh is a land vehicle that slides across a surface, usually of ice or snow. In British English, sledge is the general term, and more common than sled. Sleigh refers to a moderate to large-sized, usually open-topped vehicle to carry passengers or goods, and typically drawn by horses, dogs, or reindeer. In American usage sled remains the general term but often implies a smaller device, often for recreational use. Sledge implies a heavier sled used for moving freight or massive objects. Sleigh refers more specifically than in Britain to a vehicle which is essentially a cold-season alternative to a carriage or wagon and has seating for passengers; what can be called a dog-sleigh in Britain is known only as a dog-sled in North America, Sled - Wikipedia ===== I am having trouble distinguishing between these terms, "sled", "sledge" and "sleigh". Are the information provided correct to you? Please share your ideas with me. Yes. In BE, we tend to use 'sledge' more than 'sled', and Father Christmas drives a sleigh. In the US, I don't think we use "sledge" much, if at all. I agree with heypresto about "sleigh." I can remember being puzzled by the word "sledge" the first time I read The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe (not to mention being very disappointed when I finally found out what Turkish delight is). It's not used in my part of the US, but perhaps the people up north who get snow more than a few days per year might be more familiar. When I grew up reading about Arctic and Antarctic explorers using sledges I got the impression that a sledge was specifically a large, specialized contraption pulled by dog teams. I never directly connected it with the little thing called simply a sled that we rode down hills on in our neighborhood in the winter, pulled only by gravity. It would be the difference between hauling things in a little red wagon and a pickup truck. If it's simply the British word for a sled of any size or sophistication, count me disappointed, too. I guess many of those explorers were British. View attachment 41322 Longman Photo Dictionary of American English 1: sled ===== View attachment 41323 Oxford Learners Dictionary ===== Sled - Wikipedia ===== I am having trouble distinguishing between these terms, "sled", "sledge" and "sleigh". Are the information provided correct to you? Please share your ideas with me. I This information is correct for NA. The more snow you have in your area the more meaningful these words would be. The only sleigh I have seen in real life is in Santa Claus mall decorations. I have seen photos of horse drawn sleighs in use as recreation in colder areas. A sleigh is a large passenger vehicle drawn by animals, like a Russian troika. When it does snow here the children use small toy sleds, toboggans, or just sheets of plastic to slide down hills. In the North, husky dogs pull sleds as well. It is a significant recreation and tourist activity that was a real means of transportation in the past. I have only seen sledge in print referring to old-fashioned farm equipment also called a stone boat. If it's simply the British word for a sled of any size or sophistication, count me disappointed, too. Prepare to be disappointed. This is a sledge, and not dissimilar to the one I had as a wee lad: Off topic, perhaps, but 'sledge' is also a verb used in cricket, meaning to insult a player, usually the batsman, of the opposing team in order to put him off. It appears to be accepted by players and aficionados, but to me it seems very unsporting, ungentlemanly, and just not cricket. Among clamdiggers in Maine, a sledge is a device like the pink object in the OP, but bigger and with slightly higher, vertical sides. It's used to pull gear to and from the area where one is digging on the clam flats (the muddy bottom of a bay, exposed at low tide), and also to pull buckets of clams back to one's truck. This is a seldge hammer, if that's of any help. ... and then we have the bobsleigh. We call it a bobsled in the U.S. Hello, I'd like to make sure that the word "training" is uncountable and that it is always used in the form of "training (without 's') or "a training". 1. Training can be done in various ways. 2. A training can be done in varioius ways. 3. Trainings can be done in various ways. I think 1 and 2 are correct, and 3 is incorrect. Am I right? If 3 is a mistake, is there any chance that a native speaker of English make such a mistake? (Actually, it is described in a document from Australia.) Replies from native speakers would be appreciated. Hello SS. As far as I (personally) am concerned, training is only an uncountable noun ~ which would make only your sentence 1 correct. To make it countable you need to add words here and there: A course of training can be done ... Training periods are held ...etc. It's a failing in English. Native speakers make all kinds of weird and wonderful mistakes ~ anything's possible! It's a failing in English. Not at all. It's just the way things are. I have seen "training" used as a shorthand for "a training session", and therefore "trainings" becomes possible. I don't like this though, it doesn't sound good at all :S Thank you for your reply, ewie and Welsie! So... let me confirm. ~ Although one of online English-Japanese dictionaries, which is called "Excite", says that "training" is used in the form of "training" or "a training", it is wrong. "Training" is never used with "a" unless it is used with other words, like "a course of training" or "a training course". It's unlikely that a dictionary is wrong, but I believe if native speakers says so. - In the document from Australia, "trainings" is used many times, so it is not a careless mistake. The author wrote it intentionally. But it is still possible the author is not a native speaker. What "document"? Again, we need some context and preferably some sample sentences to understand and explain. Even if native speakers use "trainings", it shouldn't be used in a formal document (based on the fact that a native speaker feels it doesn't sound good). I know of no native-speakers who use "trainings". Hello everyone, I am wondering if this doesn't come down to regionalism or personal preference. A number of my coworkers were lamenting that even though we went to "a week-long training" ("a training") last year, we are obliged to attend "another training" this year for the same job. I even heard someone say they didn't know why we needed "multiple trainings." It seems that people use the word "training" as a shorter alternative to "a session/course of training (for a job or profession)." Perhaps this sounds wretched to native English speakers of other regions, but it sounds okay to me. However, if the "training" in question were the sort of training that an athlete does before a competition, I would say that this sort of training is not a noun, but a gerund form like "dancing" and is therefore not to be counted or pluralized; to make it a noun I would talk about the training as divided into sessions and the duration of these sessions. "Katherine went to five training sessions a week before the triathlon" is possible, but not "Katherine went to five "trainings a week." (Personally, I would just say "Katherine trained five times a week.") Maybe whether or not "training" is a count or non-count noun comes down to semantic distinctions between different types of training. Well, I have to say I was a little surprised to find over 4 million hits for the google search "trainings -training" and over 12 million for simple "trainings" The use as a countable is quite well established - mainly, it seems, in the context Tacocat mentions it, as a shortened version of "training course" or "training session". We must move in the wrong circles - or we just move in circles while others move on Hello Tacocat, thank you for your reply. Your explanation is easy to understand and very helpful. How about using "a training" or "trainings" in an official document? Does it still sound okay to you? Hello Dimcl, thank you for your reply. Could you please provide some samples of "a training" as used by this and or other Japanese dictionaries or English teaching books? If you are relying on such a dictionary, I wonder why you asked the question that you did - you must have some doubts about this... This is the dictionary I wrote about, and this is the only dictionary I can find which says "a training" is okay. At first I didn't post the URL because this is "English Only" forum (and I don't think many people here read Japanese). It says [U] [or a -], which means it is an uncountable noun but it can be used in the form of "a training" too. I do have doubts about the dictionary. That's why I asked here. I mean dictionaries are in general reliable, but I have doubts about this one. What "document"? Again, we need some context and preferably some sample sentences to understand and explain. I mean the document in my first post. It's a business document from Australia. This document describes how to conduct and record staff training in the company. I don't know whether this is written by an Australian because there are many non-native speakers in an multi-national company. In the document, it is written that "Trainings can be done in various ways." as I wrote in my first post as Example 3. And in the same document, the author uses "trainings" many times. So it's not a careless mistake. This person thinks "trainings" is okay. So, although you wrote "not" in red letters, what I meant is opposite. In response to ewie's "Native speakers make all kinds of weird and wonderful mistakes", I wanted to confirm that native speakers do make such a mistake (using "trainings"), not as a careless mistake. Hi again, Hmmm... although I have no problem with the colloquial usage of "another training" and "multiple trainings," I would hesitate to use "training" and a count noun in any official context. I would sooner write something like: "A number of Tacocat's coworkers complained of having to attend multiple courses of training/complained of having to repeat their training a second time/complained that they would have to repeat the training (sessions/course) of the previous year." So, basically, since it is perhaps too informal (even for me, an American) to pluralize or count "training" in a formal document, and because several other native speakers from different regions didn't like the way it sounds at all, I would avoid it altogether in official writing and use a formulation like the ones I proposed above. Sometimes there are hard and fast rules for usage of a language, but sometimes the choice is up to the person producing speech or text and is simply a question of style. I suspect that this is more the latter than the former! I see. Thank you very much! JulianStuart, yes, I was surprised when I did the Google search too. Thank you for your help! Last edited: Jul 26, 2009 Hi I also just have a question about whether or not training with s. Now I find the following sentence from The National Immigration Law Center's organizers, attorneys, and analysts perform trainings on myriad issues affecting immigrants, ranging from immigrant access to safety net services to know-your-rights trainings for immigrant worker advocates. Check this page to find out about upcoming trainings and events. Because the website contact () is in US, so it seems like US English use training with s. Thanks Your example reminds me of just how complicated the question actually is. While it is true that the site is a US government site and should be upholding usage of correct English, there are plenty of native speakers who say things in English that look and sound awful to me. People these days say things like "The decision impacted the company," which is a usage that I cannot stand, since "impact" is what one object does to another in a collision. I think they should say "affected" or "made an impact on." There's also the matter that people use made-up words like "conversate" unwittingly, persuaded that they are real and useful (what about "converse?"). People also make typos, or simply make mistakes in grammar and usage. Not everyone who writes and puts something on the Internet is correct. You should be aware of this when doing research on the Internet; this also applies to researching language use. Just because it's there doesn't mean that it's right. I am something of a formalist and believe that there is a correct way to speak and an incorrect one. While many people use "training" in the plural, and you will certainly be understood if you do the same, some people, like me, think it sounds wrong. However, people like me (I'm a Ph.D. student) may be educated, but we don't represent the majority of speakers. The thing about language is that it is often in flux, shifting from one model of usage to another, with different groups of people disagreeing about which usage is correct. Language tends to evolve away from old, prescriptive usage into newer forms that reflect how some groups of people speak. For this reason, I am not going to say that "trainings" is wrong, even though I don't think it sounds good, and even though my spell-checker just underlined it in red, indicating that the word with an S isn't in the dictionary. I would recommend using "training sessions" or even "training meetings" or "training courses," or orienting the expression away from "training" altogether. However, I do not represent all English speakers, as you can see from the examples where you found people using it that way. It is your choice as to whether you want to avoid using "trainings" because learned native English speakers like me think it is wrong, just as it is your choice to go ahead and use it because a certain percentage of native speakers use it, even if the rest of us don't agree that it's correct. Probably simpler to stick to "training." I am wondering if this doesn't come down to regionalism or personal preference. A number of my coworkers were lamenting that even though we went to "a week-long training" ("a training") last year, we are obliged to attend "another training" this year for the same job. I even heard someone say they didn't know why we needed "multiple trainings." It seems that people use the word "training" as a shorter alternative to "a session/course of training (for a job or profession)." Perhaps this sounds wretched to native English speakers of other regions, but it sounds okay to me. I have used "training" to mean "a training session" many times ("Don't bother hitting the rack - we have training in ten minutes"), but I would never consider using "trainings" as a plural form, but I would never consider using "trainings" as a plural form. Neither would I. Do not assume, camlearner, that everything you read on U.S. websites is good English, especially when the writers are starry-eyed bureaucrats tending to lapse into jargon and gibberish. Last edited: Jan 22, 2013 The page to which you linked (which doesn't have the word "trainings", although it may be somewhere on the site) is that of a law firm. Lawyers are not necessarily grammar authorities. "Trainings" is wrong. Thanks everyone. Ok, so it's either training or training courses. I still have another relevant question. Can I say: I have a/one/another/(nothing) training to take next week? For plural form, I now understand that I should say: I have 2 training courses to take next month. Tacocat's suggested 'training meetings' reminds me of someone who says 'training seminar o training workshop'. Can I say: I have a/one/another/(nothing) training to take next week? In my opinion, none of them, since training is either an adjective or an uncountable noun. The following would be possible: I have a training session next week. I have training sessions next week. I have more training next week. I have a training seminar (if it is a lecture) / training workshop (if you will be performing activities) next week. I have training next week. Thanks Parla. I now complete my training in/on how to use the word 'training'.