

Re: Fr/lat/ru tu-vous/tu-vos/ - : etymology ?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-10/msg00247.html>

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 06 Oct 2007 23:10:20 -0700
-

On Oct 7, 12:07 am, "Brian M. Scott" <b.sc...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Thu, 04 Oct 2007 05:31:34 GMT, John Atkinson
<johna...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
<[news:WU_Mi.4898\\$H22.452@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:WU_Mi.4898$H22.452@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> in
sci.lang:

[...]

This is common in eye-dialect -- like <was> being spelled
<woz> to indicate a speaker of non-standard English, even
though <was> and <woz> are pronounced exactly the same
in all varieties of English.

Not true: many (most?) Americans have [wVz] for stressed
<was> and [wAz] for <woz>.

What does that mean? <woz> doesn't represent a word of Standard
English, so Americans don't have any pronunciation "for" it.

Standard American has stressed "was" and unstressed "was," just as it
has stressed "the" and unstressed "the," even though in Chicago
stressed "the" doesn't have a different vowel from unstressed "the."