

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-10/msg00291.html>

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 08 Oct 2007 04:44:22 -0700
-

On Oct 8, 12:29 am, "Brian M. Scott" <b.sc...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sun, 07 Oct 2007 21:01:12 -0700, "Peter T. Daniels" <gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
<news:1191816072.782792.112310@xx>
in sci.lang:

On Oct 7, 10:35 pm, "Brian M. Scott" <b.sc...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sun, 07 Oct 2007 14:00:29 -0700, "Peter T. Daniels" <gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
<news:1191790829.370603.23110@xx>
in sci.lang:

On Oct 7, 3:49 pm, "Brian M. Scott" <b.sc...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sun, 07 Oct 2007
12:18:42 -0700, "Peter T.
Daniels"
<gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in
<news:1191784722.180511.321930@xx>
in sci.lang:

[...]

You're mad,
sir. "Was"
and "Oz"
are a perfect
rhyme.
(Whatever
symbol you

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

choose to
use to
represent
the
vowel.)

They aren't. It isn't the
Wizard of Oz. It *is* 'we
wuz
robbed'.

Maybe in rural outskirts of Cleveland.

I rather doubt that Joe Jacobs grew up in the rural
outskirts of Cleveland.

Who?

Max Schmeling's Jewish–American manager, who famously said
'We wuz robbed!'.

M–W has [az] and [w@z, waz] (s.v. be!)

M–W OnLine has, using its symbolism, /'w&z/ and /'wäz/. Its
/&/ represents both [V] and [@] ('\&\ as a and u in abut'),
and stress mark in /'w&z/ suggests that they're talking
about the stressed form of the word: [wVz], then [wAz].
Does the printed version use other symbols, or did you
simply misunderstand them?

<a> is for their a–umlaut, <@> is for their shwa. Both was's have the
stress mark, they do not show pronunciations for unstressed or
contextual varieties.

AHD3 s.v. <be> gives the vowel as u–breve or o–breve (in
that order) when stressed and as @ when unstressed; this
also is [wVz] or [wAz], with unstressed [w@z].

I retract my earlier statement that no common U.S. variety
has [A]; I do not retract the claim that [V] is common,
quite possibly more common than [A].

The order of pronunciations in M–W does not indicate frequency unless
"also" vel sim. appears.

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

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