

Re: -ire words

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2004-07/1949.html>

From: Aaron J. Dinkin (*dinkin_at_babel.ling.upenn.edu*)

Date: 07/17/04

Date: Sat, 17 Jul 2004 23:19:28 +0000 (UTC)

On Sat, 17 Jul 2004 22:48:44 GMT, Peter T. Daniels <grammatim@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

> *Aaron J. Dinkin wrote:*

>

>> *As I indicated elsewhere ("I have no desire to call the vowel in "cut"
>> schwa"), I'm not tying myself to Smith-Trager. I'd rather use a
>> phonemicization that actually fits my dialect. (In particular, having to
>> use /@/ for [V] and /@r/ for [R] would make "burrow" and "burro"
>> indistinguishable, and I for one can tell an ass from a hole in the
>> ground.)*

>

> *The words, however, are homophonous,*

Ain't so, so there.

> *as is "borough" as well (but not "borrow"),*

I have "borough" like "burrow", but not "burro".

> *unless of course you use a Hispanicizing "b/uw/rro."*

Nope. They're ['bVrow] and ['bRow].

> *If you don't recognize "cut" as a stressed shwa, then you are*

> *multiplying entities -- there is no need for a /V/ ~ /@/ contrast.*

You and I have been through this before. If you have the "hurry"/"furry" vowel merger it's your loss, but there's no need for you to impose it on the rest of us.

(I used "burrow"/"burro" for my example because they're both monomorphemic, and because I like the "ass from a hole in the ground" joke; but I can't say for certain whether other people without the "hurry"/"furry" merger make this particular distinction in the same way as I do. We were talking about my own personal phonemic system, however, so nothing is lost by my choice of example.)

sci.lang: Re: -ire words

-Aaron J. Dinkin
Dr. Whom