

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-10/msg00255.html>

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 07 Oct 2007 05:45:34 -0700
-

On Oct 7, 2:18 am, "Brian M. Scott" <b.sc...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sat, 06 Oct 2007 23:10:20 -0700, "Peter T. Daniels" <gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
<news:1191737420.867869.256980@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
in sci.lang:

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

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

Piffle. Ask a literate American how to pronounce the
nonsense word <woz>; the odds that he will rhyme it with
<Oz> are excellent.

You claimed that <woz> represents something other than "stressed

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

<was>." If anything is going to be respelled, it's either _unstressed_
"was" or the stressed nonstandard [wvz] both = <wuz>

.