

Unresolved Issues for the AHG and Advisors
Responses to a questionnaire sent out by Albert Bock and Benjamin Bruch
Michael Everson and Nicholas Williams
17 February 2008

The following are answers to the questionnaire sent out on 29 January 2008. The answers below have been discussed between us both and the text below reflects our agreed position on the questions posed. The text of the questionnaire is given in italic type. Our comments are given in roman.

The following details of the SWF agreement have not yet been fully resolved. Prior attempts at discussing and resolving them by e-mail have failed. We have therefore decided to summarise them and ask for further input and discussion from AHG members and advisors. Should it prove impossible to reach consensus on one or more of these points, the Arbiter will have to make a ruling.

In addition to describing the various outstanding issues, we have made suggestions about how these issues could be resolved, in keeping with the letter and the spirit of the SWF agreement of 15 December 2007 as we understand it. Other solutions are also possible, and we do not wish to discourage AHG members or linguistic advisors from presenting their own suggestions.

Issue I: Vocalic Alternation

It has been agreed by the AHG that Vocalic Alternation (VA) should be part of the SWF. There are several different ideas about how best to do this. Since it has already been agreed to incorporate VA into the SWF, we do not wish to open a linguistic debate about whether or not MC scribal practice indicates a difference in the quality and quantity of stressed vowels between monosyllables and polysyllables. Because we are concerned with RC users, it makes sense to concentrate on ways VA can be indicated as they relate to current RC usage.

Vocalic Alternation is a part of the phonology and orthography of UC, RLC, and UCR. It is therefore a part of the speech of UC, RLC, and UCR users. Vocalic Alternation is also a part of the speech of many KK users even though KK orthography does not write it.

There are several models available:

1) The UC model:

VA is lexical and for the most part restricted to stems which in KK have <y>.

While Vocalic Alternation is lexical, its distribution is unrelated to what KK writes. Nor is it restricted to front vowels. The word **scoodh** ‘shoulder’ pl. **scodhow** ‘shoulders’ shows Vocalic Alternation, for example: [sko:ð]/[sku:ð] ~ [ˈskɔðov]. This is also seen in other derivatives: **scoodhya** ‘to shoulder’, **cabmscodhek** ‘crooked shouldered’.

*While in KK <y> represents the phoneme /ɪ/, this is not considered a separate phoneme in UC, UCR, or RLC. Notable exceptions are the words KK spells *gwitha*, *hwilas*, *mires*, *skrif*, *tira*, *triga* which seem to be attested with both [i:] and [ɛ] in LC.*

It is admitted that KK users have a problem here. Because Ken George did not recognize Vocalic Alternation (or if he did, because he decided it “shouldn’t” be a feature of Revived Cornish), many learners of KK—those who had not previously learnt UC at least—have learnt a Cornish which omits an essential feature of the language. (Many KK users do speak with Vocalic Alternation.) The AHG agreement was to write Vocalic Alternation, not to suggest a scheme that both does and does not write it. This may be a challenge for KK users, but it is one to which their representatives agreed.

Consequences: VA must be written because it cannot be predicted.

Correct.

The class of affected stems should be defined by the advisors and if necessary refined by a future dictionary commission.

We are not able to provide an exhaustive list at this very moment. It seems to us that the immediate task is to define *how* to write Vocalic Alternation. We are prepared to draw up this list and would accept an appointment to do so once the outlines of the SWF are somewhat clearer.

This solution would fit UC practice perfectly, RLC practice rather well and UCR practice partially, but KK practice not at all in the affected class of polysyllables in [-e-]. It would however be representative of a majority of variants (those shown in bold type in the table below). It would also result in a balance of familiar word-forms between all groups.

SWF	KK	UC	UCR	RLC
<i>skrif</i> {c}	[skri:f]	[skri:f]	[skri:f]	[skri:f]
<i>skrif</i> a {c} {e?}	[ˈskriːfa]	[ˈskrifə]	[ˈskrifə]	[ˈskrifə], [ˈskrifə]
<i>gwydh</i>	[gwi:ð]	[gwi:ð]	[gwe:ð]*	[gwe:ð]*
<i>gwedhen</i>	[ˈgwiɾðɛn]	[ˈgweðɛn]	[ˈgweðɛn]	[ˈgweðɛn]

We think that this paradigm is misleading. Half length is in fact ignored by KK users, and so the forms [skri:f] ~ [skrifə] and [gwi:ð] (unless in error [gwið]) ~ [gwiðɛn] are the forms actually heard—with Vocalic Alternation, even if latent or nascent.

**If <y> is established as an umbrella graph for long stressed [ɪ:], [i:] (MC) and [e:] (LC), as suggested under Part IV below, this solution will fit almost all possible variant pronunciations.*

As you know, Agan Tavas rejects the proposal to use <y> as an umbrella graph for the *bys/bêz* words, as do we. The idea to use an umbrella graph for these words was originally Michael Everson’s during the development of KS, but since KK users cannot agree to the umbrella graph <ei> for these words, and since UC, RLC, and UCR users cannot agree to the umbrella graph <y> for these words, the attempt to write these words with an umbrella graph must be abandoned.

2) *The UCR/KS model:*

VA is phonological and happens in stems which have UCR /i/, a phoneme which can equate to <y> or <i> in KK.

We do not accept this analysis. UCR is a revision of UC, correcting errors and omissions in it. It has the same model as UC: that of the normalization of the texts. KS is a phonetic orthography, differing therefore from both UC and UCR. It is a mistake to consider KS to be “son of UCR” as the pairing here does. Further, Vocalic Alternation in KS is not restricted to stems with front vowels (as shown by **scoodh/scodhow** above).

Consequences: VA may be written; note, however, that in Welsh (where there is a parallel phenomenon) <y> is used for both [i] and [ə] in affected words.

The agreement is that Vocalic Alternation is to be written, and that agreement was made in exchange for the demotion of **c/q/wh** from variant forms to side forms. (We consider this horse-trading to have been offensive to authenticists, but we are stuck with it willy-nilly.)

There are three possible ways of implementing phonological VA:

a) *The Welsh model:*

e.g. *gwydh* ~ *gwydhen*, *skrif* ~ *skriffa* {*c*}

In this model, the graph <y> is used in roots which exhibit VA, while words spelled with <i> generally do not show VA.

- Minimal change for KK users. However, this model may require us to respell some stems with KK <i> for which LC attestations show short, lax [ɛ] in polysyllables.
- UC users would learn that stressed <y> represents [i:] in monosyllables and [ɛ] in polysyllables (c.f. the pronunciation rules for Welsh <y>).
- UCR and RLC users would learn that stressed <y> represents [e:] in monosyllables and [ɛ] in polysyllables. A class of side forms like {*skrefa*, *screfa*} could be added to accommodate UCR users.

It is difficult to imagine that anyone could seriously believe that this suggestion could be acceptable. First we agree to demote **c/q/wh** to side forms in exchange for written Vocalic Alternation, and now we are asked to use Vocalic Alternation without actually being allowed to write it!

We do not accept this as a possible way of implementing Vocalic Alternation.

b) *The strict UCR/KS model:*

e.g. *gwydh/gwedh* ~ *gwedhen*, *skrif* ~ *skrefa* {*c*}

- KK users would have to learn that <y>, <i> always represent /ɪ/, /i/, respectively, and that stressed <e> in polysyllables may sometimes represent /ɪ/, /i/ as well, since KK speakers pronounce these words as [ˈgwɪðən], [ˈskriːfə].

Few if any KK speakers pronounce these words with [r] or [ɪ]. The most common sound actually realized is [ɪ].

- No significant change for UCR users (apart from writing <i> instead of <y> in some stems).
- UC and RLC users would learn that stressed <e> sometimes represents [i] or [ɪ] in monosyllables and that <e> is always [e:], [ɛ].

If this model is chosen, it will fit UCR practice perfectly, UC and RLC practice partially, and KK practice not at all. This does not seem to be a satisfactory solution because there is no way of accounting for KK pronunciation, especially since the SWF may not make use of diacritical marks.

In this matter, it is our view that KK speakers who were taught Cornish without Vocalic Alternation were taught a Cornish with an important distinction missing. Similarly, UC users were taught Cornish without the /ø/ phoneme, e.g. **mür** [my:r]~[mi:r] ‘great’. Those UC users who adopted UCR had to learn **muer** [mø:r]~[me:r], and those who now will adopt the SWF will have to learn **meur** [mø:r]~[me:r]. Their pronunciation will improve. By the same token, the pronunciation of KK users who move to [ˈgwɛðən] from [ˈgwɪðən] or to [ˈskrifə] from [ˈskriːfə] (most probably say [ˈskrifə] already) will be improving their Cornish. One should not apologize for the fact of Vocalic Alternation nor ignore it because it was not present in KK—in the same way that we do not try to find ways of writing **meur** in a way which shields UC users from that change.

c) *An ‘umbrella graph’ solution: e.g.*

gweidh ~ *gweidhen*, *skrif* ~ *skreiffa*

The umbrella graph <ei> could be used in closed syllables to mean:

- [r:], [i:] for KK users
- [i:] ~ [ɛ] for UC users
- [e:] ~ [ɛ] for RLC and UCR users

While this solution would provide regular pronunciation guidelines for most speakers, it would require users of all systems to make great changes to their spelling habits. It would also clash with the use of <-ei> to represent LC [ɔɪ], which is part of the existing SWF agreement.

While we appreciate the lateral thinking, this isn't much of an option and we would not favour its introduction to the SWF. (We observe that there would be no "clash" with <-ei> because of the positional distribution of medial <ei> vs final <-ei> in the proposed solution; with no overlap there is no "clash".)

AB and BB personally recommend the Welsh model (2a) because it seems the most simple and the most inclusive of present-day variants. If that is unacceptable to the AHG (since it implies the acceptance of a number of 'inauthentic' spellings like *blydhen*, and since VA would not be immediately apparent from the written representation of a word), the UC model (1) is our preferred choice, as it closely resembles what was discussed during the AHG meetings.

Agan Tavas has passed a resolution specifically regarding Vocalic Alternation, stating that their acceptance of the SWF is contingent upon the SWF being "Written Vocalic Alternation compatible with that of current UC/UCR/RLC users". We have discussed this with Neil Kennedy, who agrees that written Vocalic Alternation should be based on its UCR implementation (and not the UC implementation), to be supplemented by comparison of etyma with Vocalic Alternation with the practice of RLC. This task will not be arduous, and the three of us offer to draw up the specification in due course.

In summary, however, Vocalic Alternation should be represented by <e> and <y> and <o> in the polysyllable where the monosyllable has <y/e> or <i> or <oo> respectively.

bydh/bedh	bedhaf	(not <i>bydhaf</i>)
gwydh/gwedh	gwedhen	(not <i>gwydhen</i>)
mir	myras	(not <i>miras</i>)
scrif	scryfa	(not <i>scryfa</i>)
gwith	gwytha	(not <i>gwitha</i>)
tryg	tryga	(not <i>tryga</i>)
scoodh	scodhow	(not <i>scoodhow</i>)

This regularization, therefore, would be the best way forward (since actual UC/UCR/RLC practice is a bit erratic):

y/e	e
i	y
oo	o

This regularization would be fairly easy to teach and to learn. (That is, *scrif/scryfas* is better because if it were *screfas* learners might think the root was a *bys/bes* word.)

Issue II: The Digraph <uw>

The introduction of this digraph has been discussed, and two different lists of affected roots have been suggested by Keith Bailey and the KS group, respectively.

<i>Keith Bailey</i>	<i>KS</i>
<i>Duw</i> ‘God’	<i>Duw</i> ‘God’
<i>duwon</i> ‘grief’	<i>duwon</i> ‘grief’
—	<i>buwgh</i> ‘cow’
<i>guw</i> ‘spear’	-
<i>guw</i> ‘woe’	-
<i>pluw</i> ‘parish’	-
<i>Gwennuwer</i> ‘Guinevere’	-
<i>ruw</i> ‘king’	<i>ruw ~ ruyv ~ ruy</i> ‘king’

AB and BB suggest introducing <uw> where the two lists are in agreement, i.e. in Duw, duwon, ruw and their compounds. The other cases should be considered by a future dictionary commission.

We believe that it would be appropriate (given the attested spelling *guw*) to add **guw** ‘spear’ to the list of words with <uw>; this permits the distinction of it from **gu** ‘woe’. We accept that it is correct to maintain the spellings **gu** ‘woe’, **plu** ‘parish’, and **Gwynnever** ‘Guinivere’, and both **ruyv** and **ruy** alongside **ruw** ‘king’. The word for ‘cow’, however, remains problematic. The spelling **bugh** implies the pronunciation [by:x]~*[bi:x] but the latter pronunciation is incorrect. In UCR and RLC the recommended pronunciation is [bi:ɔx] (cf. the attested spellings *yt’h anwaf bugh ha tarow* OM 123, *bugh offrynne my a vyn* OM 1185, *yth henwaf bewgh ha tarow* CW 403, *Bew leoyock ha leaw Bilbao* MS, *byuh* s.v. *bos* AB: 45a, *Byuh* s.v. *Vacca* AB: 168c, *Ese leath luck gen veu*.² ACB F f 2, and the RLC spelling *beuh*). We reiterate our proposal to re-spell the word as **buwgh**, but would accept the parallel forms **buwgh** and **bugh** if that were preferred by the KK members of the AHG. The plurals would be **buwhas** and **buhas**. (We do not think that a special rule saying “read **-ugh** as [i:ɔx], not [y:x]~[i:x]” is very helpful.)

Issue III: The Graph <z>

It has been agreed by the AHG that recent loans like zebra, Zanzibar, Zimbabwe will be spelt with initial <z> in the SWF. However, the SWF agreement also calls for ‘consideration of <z> for <s> in final position.’ A majority of AHG members have expressed a strong preference for conducting additional research before proceeding further, with a possibility of introducing <z> when the SWF and its role in education are evaluated in a few years’ time. There are many potential problems with introducing <z> at the present time. For example, when linguistic advisors were questioned about how <z> might be incorporated into the orthography of Revived Cornish, none of them responded in a way consistent with the wording of the agreement, and each presented a different proposal about where to introduce <z>.

Evidently “the agreement” stated only: “Consideration of <z> for <s> in final position”. Well, if that is the only thing to be discussed about the letter <z>, then our answer is an unequivocal “**No, <z> for <s> in final position should not be considered.**”

The question of the letter <z> is, however, not confined to final position.

If the AHG decides to include <z> in the SWF at the present time, we recommend choosing one of the following possibilities:

- 1) Revise the SWF agreement and reserve <z> for the LC variants of those words which have <z> in initial position, e.g. MC Sul ~ LC Żul.*

The word “reserve” here is vexing, as it suggests restriction of <z> from other uses. We will assume here, however, that <z> will continue to be used for loanwords with initial <z>. We suggest, as we did in December, the following uses for the letter <z>:

- a. As a Main Form Variant in the finite set of words with initial <s> in RMC and initial <z> in RLC: **Sadorn** and **Zadorn** ‘Saturday’, **sagh** and **zagh** ‘bag’, **sans** and **zans** ‘holy’, **sawyn** and **zawyn** ‘gap in cliffs’, **segh** and **zegh** ‘dry’, **sehes** and **zehes** ‘thirst’, **sira** and **zira** ‘father’, **Sows** and **Zows** ‘Englishman’, **Sowsnek** and **Zowsnek** ‘English’, **Sul** and **Zul** ‘Sunday’, **syger** and **zyger** ‘lazy’, **syly** and **zily** ‘eel’. There are others, but the list is finite. *We consider this to be a fundamental requirement for support of RLC under the SWF.*
- b. Where the permanent soft mutation of these sounds occurs, the mutated letter should be written: **fenten** > **penventen**; **sans** > **Penzans**. Nance was unwise not to have written the soft mutation of <s> and <f> to <z> and <v> as a matter of course.
- c. In loanwords, <z> should be permitted, *not* just in initial position: **Gaza**, **jazz**, **Nazara**, **Tanzania**, **Zambya**, **Zanzibar**, **zebra**, **Zion**, **zodiac**, **zynk**, **zyp** (though many of these words have <s> forms as well, as **Sion**, **synk**, **syp**). In loanwords based on Greek *zeta* and Hebrew *zain*, <z> should be allowed.

These three contexts appear to be completely uncontroversial. Point (a) is an absolute necessity for RLC support; point (b) follows naturally from the phonetic nature of the SWF; point (c) is simply more comprehensive than what Albert and Ben wrote above (evidently the AHG simply did not consider loans in <z> in other than initial position).

2) *Follow the letter of the SWF agreement and introduce final <z> in monosyllables and their compounds, but otherwise not medially nor at the end of polysyllables. There are two ways of distributing this graph:*

a) *Etymologically, to represent the reflex of OC /-d/. Although useful from a historical linguistic perspective, this may be confusing to learners because they would learn to write taz ‘father’ but nos ‘night’, even though both words are pronounced with [-z] by many speakers Revived Cornish. To determine which words should contain <z> and which <s>, users would need to know the Breton or Welsh cognates. e.g.*

taz ‘father’ plas ‘place’ from French place

tazow ‘fathers’ gweles ‘see’ polysyllable

kooz ‘wood’ poos ‘heavy’ from etymological [s]

byz (~ bez?) ‘world’ hwans ‘wish’ from etymological [nt]

roz ‘wheel’ nos ‘night’ from etymological [s]

Once again, we reject this proposal. Etymological spellings of this sort cause great confusion in learners, in our view. Even in Icelandic—where linguistic sophistication is high—such spellings were abolished: original **íslend-sk** was written **íslenzk** for a long time, but finally the unnecessary **z** was abolished and the word respelt **íslensk**. Does a learner need to know that <tas> was originally <tad>? He or she may find out when learning Breton or Welsh, but it hardly seems necessary to burden learners with this feature. It also does not seem to us that the RLC users were asking for this use of <z>, but rather a more general use.

b) *Phonetically, i.e. in places where RMC has [-z]. This would affect almost all monosyllables which contain a long vowel and are currently spelt with <-s>, with the notable exception of loanwords like plas and spas. As in the case of cita, etc., these contain voiceless [s] (< [ts], [tθ]) in both MC and LC. Although this [s] sound will be spelled <c> in the SWF when it appears in initial or medial position, we do not recommend using <c> in final position because plac, spac suggest [plak], [spak] instead of [pla:s], [spa:s]. We suggest keeping <-s> in this group of words. e.g.*

<i>taz</i> ‘father’	<i>plas</i> ‘place’ from French <i>place</i>
<i>tazow</i> ‘fathers’	<i>gweles</i> ‘see’ polysyllable
<i>kooz</i> ‘wood’	<i>pooz</i> ‘heavy’
<i>byz</i> (~ <i>bez?</i>) ‘world’	<i>hwans</i> ‘wish’ from etymological [nt]
<i>roz</i> ‘wheel’	<i>noz</i> ‘night’

Again, we oppose this suggestion very strongly. The massive change for users of all forms of Cornish which would be caused by implementing <z> for phonetic final [z] would be intolerable.

Regarding the loanwords for ‘place’ and ‘space’ however, it is clear that **plas** would regularly be pronounced as [plæ:z] and **spas** as [spæ:z]. George’s *Gerlyver Meur* gives both but says nothing about pronunciation; his *Gerlyvrik* omits both. The voiceless final can be written **plass** and **spass** since in this case anomalous vowel length is already an occasional feature of the SWF. (In materials for learners, as has been suggested, one might write **pláss** and **spâss** though some users do pronounce these words with a short vowel.)

Solution (1) would mean the smallest possible change for a maximal number of speakers. If it does not find universal approval among AHG members, solution (2b) would probably be easier for learners and current Cornish speakers alike, because it is in line with the practice of spoken Revived Cornish. However, more linguistically-minded users may complain that it will obscure the etymology (as, of course, does the current practice of using universal <s> in UC, UCR, and KK). It would also break the rules for sandhi in KK, although a majority of speakers do not follow them.

Under the circumstances, AB and BB recommend solution (1).

We find nothing acceptable about either solutions (2a) or (2b) and consider both to be unsupportable. We prefer solution (1) but note that as expressed by Albert and Ben it is incomplete, and so we recommend our (1a), (1b), and (1c) as shown above.

Issue IV: The Distribution of <i y e>

In order to arrive at the model of front vowel representation in stressed syllables which was discussed during the meetings, namely

- <i> for MC and LC [i:], [ɪ(:)],
- <e> for MC and LC [e:], [ɛ(:)], and
- <y> for MC [i:], [ɪ(:)]* ~ LC [e:], [ɛ(:)],
- * <y> could also represent [ɛ] if the ‘Welsh model’ for VA is accepted, as discussed in Part I (2a).

it would be necessary to respell a small number of words which contain <y> in UC, and UCR, as well as words in KK where <y> represents an etymological spelling rather than an [ɪ] that became [ɛ] in LC:

gwynn > gwinn ~ gwidn ‘white’; lynn > linn ~ lidn ‘lake’, etc.

Pro: This system would establish <y> as an umbrella graph in stressed syllables, and would involve only minimal change to the spelling habits of KK users. RLC users would retain the familiar graph <i> in a number of common words like gwidn. There is no risk of confusion to KK users because short <i> and <y> are pronounced identically in this environment, c.f. dillas ‘clothing’.

Con: Using <i> instead of <y> in these words runs contrary to the well-established practice in UC, KK, and UCR of spelling e.g. ‘white’ as gwyn or gwynn.

This far-reaching change is much too far-reaching. We do not believe that such a drastic change should be forced on users of UC, or KK, or UCR.

AB and BB hope that this suggestion is accepted by the AHG. If not, the SWF would have to include a number of exceptions to the clear, consistent rules for <i y e> discussed above, since a class of words like gwynn, lynn with intrinsically short [ɪ] would be written with <y> even though this [ɪ] is not lowered to [ɛ] in LC. This would make the SWF somewhat unsystematic but would preserve a number of familiar word-forms for MC speakers: gwynn, lynn...

This suggestion would have an disastrous effect on Revived Cornish. The “umbrella graph” <y> would have the effect of eliminating the [e:] pronunciation from the Revived language. Trond has said that it is a “good solution” but we suspect that this means “it is a good umbrella graph since we know that KK users have rejected <ei> as an umbrella graph”. While this may suit KK users, it does not suit other users, and <y> as an umbrella graph for the *bys/bêz* words will be rejected. In reality, <y> is not an umbrella graph for KK users; it is the default state. To suggest that English-speaking learners of Cornish, whether children or adults, could accept <y> for [e:] is to ignore everything about the use of the letter <y> in English orthography as well as Cornish. It was Michael Everson, within the UdnFormScrefys group, who urged the adoption of an umbrella graph (namely <ei>) for these words, but since the RMC and RLC groups cannot agree on what such a graph should be, he *withdraws* the suggestion *entirely*, as it is not workable. The class of *bys/bêz* words must be Main Form Variants for the aims of Inclusivity of RMC and RLC to be realized.

This may seem inconvenient, because umbrella graphs certainly do have advantages. However, in this case, freeing the letter <y> for other uses makes the transition to the SWF much easier for users of all orthographies, in particular users of KK (as will be seen below).

Agan Tavas has passed a resolution specifically regarding the *bys/bêz* words, stating that their acceptance of the SWF is contingent upon the SWF having “*Variant forms for <e> and <y> where UC/UCR/RLC/KK usage differs*”. Note that “Variant forms” means “Main Form Variants”.

*If both suggestions are thought unacceptable, a complete redistribution of <i> and <y> (as proposed by the designers of KS) would have to be considered, which would also necessitate the establishment of parallel forms in <y> and <e> in words like *bys ~ bes* ‘world’, or the introduction of more umbrella graphs like <ei> as discussed in Part I (2c).*

The whole issue of the distribution of <i> and <y> has been very difficult, and both of us wish here to express our understanding of how hard the members of the AHG, as well as the Arbiter and his two Facilitators, have worked on the problem. Our thinking too has evolved on this matter and we offer here what we believe is a robust and sensible distribution which would be easy for current users to use as well as easy for teachers to explain to learners.

a **The *bys/bêz* words.** The class of words which alternate [i:]~[e:] should be written with <y> and <e>. This includes those few words which the same vowel alternation in the diphthongs, as ***byw/bew*** similarly to ***bys/bes***—no umbrella graph!

b **Initial position.**

<i> is written in initial position: ***idhyn*** ‘birds’, ***idn, inn*** ‘narrow’, ***inclynacyon*** ‘inclination’, ***inclynya*** ‘to incline’, ***inressya*** ‘to increase’, ***injyn*** ‘stratagem’, ***inia*** ‘to urge’, ***inspyrya*** ‘inspire’, ***intendys*** ‘intended’, ***iredy*** ‘indeed’, ***isel*** ‘low’, ***iwys*** ‘indeed’. (Note final ***-ya*** is [jə] and final ***-ia*** is [i:ə]; there are minimal pairs.)

<i> is written with the preposition ***in*** ‘in’: ***in Kernow*** ‘in Cornwall’, ***i’n chy*** ‘in the house’, ***in y jy*** ‘in his house’, ***i’m breus avy*** ‘in my judgment’. It is used in its inflected forms, e.g. ***ino*** ‘in

him', *inhy* 'in her', *ina* (*inha*) 'in them'. It is also used in its derivatives: *in kerdh* 'away', *in mes* 'out', *in nes* 'near', *inwedh*, *i'wedh* 'also', *indelma* 'in this way', *indella* 'in that way', *inketelma* 'in this same way', *inketella* 'in that same way'.

<i> is written with the preposition *inter* 'among, between': *inter benenes* 'among women', *intredhon ny* 'among us'

<y> is written in the preverbal particle *y(th)*: *yth ov vy* 'I am', *y coodh dhybm*, *y coodh dhymm* 'I should' and in its variant *yn medh* 'says, said'.

<y> is used with the adverbial particle *yn*: *yn fas* 'well', *yn few* 'alive', *yn freth* 'fluently', *yn tâ* 'well'.

<y> is used with the possessive adjective *y* 'his': *y jy ev* 'his house'.

<y> is used with forms of the verb *to be*: *yma*, *ymowns*, *ymownjy*, *yw*, *ywa*, *yns*.

NOTE: The preposition *in* 'in' is written with <i> and the adverbial particle *yn* is written with <y>. This orthographic distinction will help learners remember that *in* 'in' is not usually followed by any mutation, whereas Type I Mixed mutation follows the particle *yn*. The word *kyn* 'although' has the same mutation.

c *Medial position.*

<i> is written for [i]: *gwin* 'wine', *min* 'mouth', *gil* 'guile'.

<y> is written for [ɪ]: *gwynn*~*gwydn* 'white', *jyn* 'engine', *myn* 'kid goat', *gyll* 'is able'.

d *Final position.*

<i> and <y> are used interchangeably as Variant Main Forms (see below for more on this).

e *Distinguish <ia> and <ya>.*

Both [i:ə] and [jə] are used in Revived Cornish, and should be distinguished as <ia> and <ya> in the orthography. It occurs in forms of the conditional of *bos* 'be', e.g. *bian* ['bi:ən] 'I would be, we would be', *bia* ['bi:ə] 'he would be', *bias* ['bi:əz] 'you would be', and *bians* ['bi:əns] 'they would be'. It is also found in *bian* ['bi:ən] 'small', *lias* ['li:əz] 'many', and in the name *Maria* [mə'ri:ə]. Note the distinction between *provia* [pɹə'vi:ə] 'provide' and *profya* ['pɹəfjə] 'offer'. Other words which are written with <ia> are *agria* [ə'gɹi:ə] 'to agree', *ania* [ə'ni:ə] 'to annoy', *aspia* [as'pi:ə] 'to spy', *cria* ['kɹi:ə] 'to call, to name', *destria* [des'tɹi:ə] 'to destroy', *dian* ['di:ən] 'entire', *gockia* [gɔ'ki:ə] 'to be foolish', *sians* ['si:əns] 'whim', *skians* ['ski:əns] 'wisdom', *trial* ['tɹi:əl] 'trial', *inia* [i'ni:ə] 'to urge'. In a few words, <ie> and <io> are used, e.g. *biowgh* ['bi:ouɣ] 'you (pl.) would be', *tiogow* [ti'jɔgou] 'farmers' (from *tiak* ['ti:ək] 'farmer'). The verbal adjectives of verbs in *-ia* are regularly *-ies*: *agries* [ə'gɹi:əz] 'agreed', *anies* [ə'ni:əz] 'annoyed', *aspies* [as'pi:əz] 'espied', *cries* ['kɹi:əz], ['kɹəjɹz] 'called, named', *destries* [des'tɹi:əz] 'destroyed', *inies* [i'ni:əz] 'urged'.

Issue V: Further side forms which were not in the original SWF document of 15 December

A few side forms which were not in the original document agreed by the AHG at our meeting on 15 December have subsequently been suggested by AHG members, and have been added to more recent versions of that document. There has been a bit of confusion because some AHG members thought that these points (which had been discussed during the first three and a half days of the AHG meetings, before the presentation and adoption of Bernard's compromise proposal) were implicitly subsumed under the terms of the agreement, while others thought the reverse. The additions requested were:

- <-y> for final unstressed <-i> (Andrew)
- <-ell> in nouns designating tools (Polin)

- optional diacritical marks to indicate unusual or unpredictable vowel quantity and quality (the KS advisors via Andrew)

There are two problems here. One is a matter of attribution and the other is a matter of a side-form which has been omitted. This list should read:

- a <-y> for final unstressed <-i> (Andrew)
- b <-ell> in nouns designating tools (Polin)
- c optional diacritical marks to indicate unusual or unpredictable vowel quantity and quality (Andrew)
- d <yw> for <iw> (Andrew)

Regarding point (c) here, we note that Albert and Ben have wrongly attributed the contribution of Agan Tavas' representative to the AHG as coming from "the KS advisors". We happen to agree with the position, of course. Andrew's draft was also passed by the Agan Tavas committee before he submitted it to Albert.

Regarding point (d) here, this was requested by Andrew in his contribution and should not have been left off the list here.

Any or all of these points can be added to the SWF if the AHG so desires. However, we (AB and BB) would like to advise against these additions, on the following grounds:

- In Norwegian (the language from which the AHG drew the idea of 'side forms' in the first place), side forms are used to reflect dialectal variation, rather than aesthetic preferences or historical spellings. Adding a large number of side forms which do not correspond to a meaningful difference in pronunciation is not a linguistically desirable idea. Allowing <wh> in place of <hw> and <c/k/q> allography alongside universal <k> is just about manageable, but extending this principle further raises the spectre of a scenario where there exist several vastly different co-official forms, and perpetuating the very problem which the establishment of a SWF was meant to alleviate. Hundreds of lexical items are affected by the <c/k/q/wh> alternation, and we feel that adding further side forms would put too great a strain on the teachers who would be required to learn and remember all potential side-form spellings.

We do not believe that the situation of Cornish is analogous to that of Norwegian, in particular in the matter of the use of graphs based on traditional orthographic forms. The SWF is linguistically satisfactory in its framework structure, but this does not mean that Traditionalists are willing to use unattested graphs where perfectly satisfactory attested graphs are available for use.

- <hw> is not traditional; a side-form of <wh> has been granted.
- <kw> is not traditional; a side-form of <qw> has been granted.
- <iw> is not traditional; a side-form of <yw> has been requested.
- <-i> is not traditional; a side-form of <-y> has been requested (though we note that Agan Tavas has requested <-y> as a Variant Main Form).

We therefore advise strongly against adding either <-y> or <-ell> as side forms. In our opinion, the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages, especially in the case of <-ell>, whose introduction would effectively destroy the link between spelling and pronunciation set down in the basic rules of the SWF (specifically, the principle that double consonants should only be written in stressed syllables, since in unstressed syllables all consonants are pronounced short).

In our opinion the disadvantages which Albert and Ben see here do *not* outweigh the advantages. The proposals to add <-y> for the controversial <-i> and <yw> for the controversial <iw> speak directly

to the Commission's recognition that "construed" forms will attract sustained and bitter criticism. The rationale for <-i> is that "Breton and Welsh use it"; the rationale for <iw> is that "Breton has <iv> for these words".

In the matter of <-ell> for tool words, while we do not prefer this suggestion (especially as no list of affected etyma has been drawn up), we do not strongly oppose it if it is a way of getting closure. There are plenty of examples of disyllables in final <-ell>. This suffix has been productively applied in Revived Cornish, particularly by KK users, and perhaps a unique graph for it could have some utility.

- *The situation with respect to <-y> is somewhat different, but while it could be argued that unstressed final <-y> (representing [-ɪ]) might make a good choice for the main form, the SWF agreement calls for <- i> to be used instead, following KK and RLC practice. We would prefer not to have to add hundreds of new side forms in <-y> (including the 3s. fem. of all prepositions and the 2s. pr. subj. of all verbs) to the lexicon. AB and BB therefore suggest that if the AHG decide to allow a side form in <-y> that this usage be limited to open unstressed final syllables, since otherwise the relationship between main forms and side forms will not be predictable, as is the case with <c/k/q/wh>.*

With regard to the suggestion that <-y> be restricted to unstressed final syllables, we cannot agree. Tens of thousands of houses across Cornwall are named "Chy Pons", "Chy war an Ton", "Chy", "Chy Gordon", "Chy Salvester", "Chy Noweth", etc., etc., etc. These are not village, town, or field names, but names proper. There is no question of abandoning "Chy" in these. Perhaps Albert and Ben feel that a **chi/chy/chei** alternation is inconvenient, but it will certainly not cause confusion in either readers or writers, as <-y>, <-ei>, and <-i> do not alternate with anything else, whether in stressed or unstressed position. Nor should there be any difficulty for the high-frequency personal pronouns, for which there are many variations already: **my/me/vy/ve/avy, ty/te/chy/che, ev, hi/hy/hei, ni/ny/nei, hwi/why/whei**, (***whi/hwy/hwei** are unlikely) **i/y/anjy/anjei**.

Agan Tavas has passed a resolution specifically regarding Vocalic Alternation, stating that their acceptance of the SWF is contingent upon the SWF having a "Variant form for final <-y> of the same status as <-i>". Note that "Variant form" means "Main Form Variant".

- *There may be a case for introducing optional diacritical marks, especially in materials aimed at learners, for the small class of lexical items which do not adhere to the normal vowel quantity rules.*

There is certainly a case for the introduction of optional diacritical marks. While the overwhelming majority of Cornish words follow the rules of vowel length set forth in the SWF, the number which do not is not so small as to be easily remembered by beginners: we have identified at least 55 of them,

We do not consider it desirable to use diacritics to mark vowel quality, however, even as a side form (e.g. by using <û> for [u:], as some KS advisors have suggested, since the SWF already has the graph <ou> to represent this sound).

Discussion with Albert subsequent to the publication of the Outline and Unresolved Issues documents led to the realization that this is a mistake: the introduction of optional diacritical marks can hardly be avoided.

The graph <ou> is only used for [u:] in Revived Cornish, never for [ʊ]. Nance and Williams distinguish <ü> /y/~i/ and <u> /u/ in their dictionaries. George seems to treat this class of words direct loans from Norman French and has [y] in all of them (though KK users tend to avoid these words for reasons of purism): **juj** [dʒy:dʒ], **usya** ['y:zyə], **frut** [fry:t], **luck** [lyk]. Albert has said that the SWF should continue to write these <u>; KK users would pronounce them as [y] and UC, RLC, and UCR users would pronounce it as [u] and KKers as [y]: **juj** [dʒʊdʒ], **usya** ['ju:zyə], **frut** [fru:t],

luck [ʊk]. <ou> would reserved for instances where all varieties have [u:]; the four words above would, if marked with optional diacritics, be written **jùj**, **ûsya**, **frût**, **lùck**. KK users prefer **breusyas**, **froeth**, and **chons** (which we recommend to be spelt **chauns**).

From the above it is clear that the SWF simply must allow diacritics as an option to indicate anomalous vowel quality. If Nance and Williams can distinguish <u> /y/ with **ü** and <u> /u/ as **u**, the SWF cannot possibly be worse and offer no mechanism for likewise distinguishing them. We request, as did Andrew, and along with Dan and Neil, that the following sentence appear in the SWF specification:

“Diacritical marks are permitted to be used, optionally, to mark words with anomalous vowel length or quality.”

Above all, we are concerned about limiting the amount of variation within the SWF to the point where it can still be considered a single orthographic system. The SWF already requires a number of variant forms just to accommodate the differences in grammar and lexicon which exist between speakers of UC, KK, UCR, and RLC. Any further variants should only be added for a very good (and linguistically sound) reason. Already there is a perception among some Cornish speakers that the SWF is a kind of ‘multiple choice’ Cornish which has no underlying system, and which is really three or four separate orthographies masquerading as one. We therefore feel that for the sake of the teachers, students, and writers who will work with the SWF, variation should be kept to a minimum, and that additional side forms should only be introduced where they are absolutely necessary and reflect a genuine linguistic difference between the different varieties of Revived Cornish.

We believe that <-y> for <-i> and <yw> for <iw> are as essential as <wh> for <hw> and <qw> for <kw>. Since every other graph we will use but <-i> and <iw> are authentic, it appears arbitrary and irrational not to allow authentic parallel graphs. Given that the “Main Form” is based on largely inauthentic graphs, which is already difficult enough for us to sell to our constituency, we feel justified in insisting on <-y> and <yw>.