

Re: Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2005-10/msg00719.html>

- *From:* "ranjit_mathews@xxxxxxxxxx" <ranjit_mathews@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 17 Oct 2005 20:48:50 -0700
-

Colin Fine wrote:

>> The poor/pour merger is also pretty common in British English; I
>> pronounce "pour", "poor", "pore" and (being non-rhotic) "paw"
>> identically in normal speech.
>
> I would put it more strongly: <poor> and <pour> are homophones in
> British English.

I have [pw@]; how would that sound to Brits?

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ **Re: Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention**
◇ *From:* Colin Fine
 - ◆ **Re: Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention**
◇ *From:* Peter T. Daniels
- *References:*
 - ◆ **Re: ASCII convention**
◇ *From:* Peter T. Daniels
 - ◆ **Re: ASCII convention**
◇ *From:* Ruud Harmsen
 - ◆ **Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention**
◇ *From:* Peter T. Daniels
 - ◆ **Re: Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention**
◇ *From:* Christian Weisgerber
 - ◆ **Re: Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention**
◇ *From:* Peter T. Daniels
 - ◆ **Re: Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention**
◇ *From:* andrew_woode
 - ◆ **Re: Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention**
◇ *From:* Colin Fine
- Prev by Date: **Re: Auld Scots Tongue and Esperanto**

Re: Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention

- Next by Date: ***Re: Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Barbara Bush Re: ASCII convention***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***