A phonetic tehtar¹ mode

A proposition based on material by J. R. R. Tolkien

by "Mach" J. Wust, December 27th 2003

| 1. Introduction | 2 |
|--|----|
| 2. A proposition based on the <i>tehtar</i> modes | 2 |
| Consonants based on the <i>tehtar</i> modes | 3 |
| Abbreviations and consonant <i>tehtar</i> based on the <i>tehtar</i> modes | 5 |
| Vowel tehtar based on the tehtar modes | 6 |
| 3. Some thoughts on how to spell words | 8 |
| Pronunciation differences that should not be represented | 8 |
| Pronunciation differences that should be represented | 9 |
| 4. References and other acknowledgements | 10 |
| 5. Author | 11 |
| 6. Appendix | 12 |

A *tehta* mode is a mode where the vowels aren't represented by letters, but by *tehtar*, i.e. by accents or curls placed above or below the letters.

1. Introduction

Unfortunately, no published tengwar text allows an unambiguous reconstruction of an entire mode. That's because of two reasons: Most of the published texts, and after all the shorter ones, don't suggest any spelling for certain words; and most of the published texts, after all the longer ones, suggest more than one spelling for certain words. This is precisely the point where research starts. If a text doesn't suggest any spelling, we must search for a sufficiently similar text that does so; if a text suggests more than one spelling, we must search for a reason that explains these different spellings. I've done this, and here I'm presenting what I've found. Of course, these results of that research can be discussed because they don't simply represent what Tolkien wrote. Especially in cases where there's very little evidence, different people might come to different results.

2. A proposition based on the *tehtar* modes

This proposition is mainly based on the phonetic *tehtar* modes I know of (there might be more), four documents that date from the Sixties: DTS 39,² DTS 41,³ a document reported by Arden R. Smith,⁴ and DTS 58.⁵ These documents show only isolated words or short phrases. They lack the signs for some vowels that are distinguished in the *Bombadil* mode, but for the most part, the lacking vowel signs are well-attested in other *tehtar* modes, e.g. in the Sindarin mode of DTS 49,⁶ in the Quenya mode of DTS 19⁷ or in the orthographical English modes of DTS 5, DTS 10, and in the *Endorion Dedication* reported by D. Daniel Andriës.⁸ However, this proposition is still very speculative.

I've marked the signs in red that don't appear in the four mentioned documents of phonetic *tehtar* modes.

² cf. AI p. 188.

³ cf. AI p. 190.

⁴ cf. A. Smith in: elfscript 1875, 1884, and in a personal post reprocuced below in the appendix.

⁵ cf. http://search.sothebys.com/jsps/live/lot/LotDetail.jsp?lot_id=34NDT

⁶ cf. SD p. 131.

⁷ cf. R jacket front.

⁸ cf. D. Andriës in: elfscript 2424, 2498.

Consonants based on the *tehtar* modes

| | I | II | III | IV |
|----------------------|--|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| sign sound ex. | p /t/ toss | P | ပျ /tʃ/ <i>ch</i> ase ပျပ်၆ | ၂ /k/ coat |
| sign sound ex. | lass (q) qeel | /b/ but | (dʒ/ joy မျှင် | /g/ go EQÊ |
| sign sound ex. | الم الم راه اله اله اله اله اله اله اله اله اله ا | b /f/ fellow bốể | ් /ʃ/ shy ප්ස් | /x/ loch |
| sign sound ex. | /ð/ there | •• • | /ʒ/ measure | |
| sign sound ex. | (n/ nov | | /ny/ canyon quino | /ŋ/ hang |
| sign sound ex. | (note a /r/ here λick | /w/ was | (1) /y/ young cuta | |

Additional letters:

| sign sound ex. | Y | (note a) /r/ rainy yamj | <u>て</u> | /1/ | Cibo lead | 6 | /s/ | (note b) said | 9 | (note | us |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------|----------|-------|--------------|---|-----|---------------|---|-------|-----------|
| sign sound ex. | હ | (note b) /z/ ease | 3 | /z/ | (note b) | λ | /h/ | house λάς | d | | e c) hat |
| sign sound ex. | 1 | (short carrier) | 1 | (long | carrier) | C | /ə/ | real vcZ | | | |

Notes to the consonant chart:

(a):Before vowels, r is represented by $rómen \ \gamma$; after vowels, by $óre \ n$. Where the r is between two vowels, two cases must be distinguished: (a) words like $merry \ n \ n \ n$, sorry $\ n \ n \ n$ where $n \ n \ n \ n$ alone is used because the preceding vowel isn't affected by the $n \ n \ n$ where $n \ n \ n \ n$ and $n \ n \ n \ n$ is used because the preceding vowel is affected by the $n \ n \ n \ n$ where $n \ n \ n \ n \ n \ n$ and $n \ n \ n \ n \ n$ is used because the preceding vowel is affected by the $n \ n \ n \ n \ n \ n \ n$ (the vowels that are affected by a following $n \ n \ n \ n \ n \ n \ n \ n \ n$).

If a word ends with $\delta re \, \mathbf{p}$ and the next begins with a vowel, then a $r\delta men \, \mathbf{y}$ is added after the $\delta re \, \mathbf{p}$, e.g. wander in, here of need:

Óre is dropped if the first word is unstressed *or*, *are*, e.g. *for hours*, *are at my call*:

(b): *Silme* and *áre* are only used if no vowel *tehta* is placed on them, e.g. in *sea*, *zoo*, *trouser*, *peace*:

If there's a vowel *tehta*, then *silme nuquerna* and *áre nuquerna* are used, e.g. in *this, message, busy*:

(c): This sign should be used even by these who don't distinguish which from witch.

Some speakers may find the following representation of words like e.g. weary, touring more adequate: pjyi,

Abbreviations and consonant tehtar based on the tehtar modes

- This sign, extended *anto*, is used for the word *the*.
- This sign, extended ampa, is used for the word of.
- This sign, extended *ampa* with a bar below, is used for *of the*.
- A bar above indicates that the letter is preceded by a nasal of the same series, e.g. *Seventeen*, *under*:

A following consonantal y is expressed by two points below, e.g. in *perfumed*, *cute*, *rebellious*:

A following w is expressed by a modified left-curl below, e.g. in *between*, *quiet*:

An ending -s is most of the times expressed by an attached hook. It's only used where the s is a proper ending, not where it belongs to the stem of the word, this means it's not used in words such as his, house, but only in words such as knows, pools, Tom's.

¹⁰ As the *tehtar* need to accompany another letter, I've chosen any letter and marked it blue.

Vowel tehtar based on the tehtar modes

The vowel *tehtar* are placed on the following letter. Where no letter follows, they're placed on the short carrier. I've not indicated the vowel values, but only given an example word. Most of these words are the vowel "key words" used by Charles W. Kreidler (Kreidler 1997, pp. 70 - 79).

| | tehtar | • | 1 | * | ^ |) | ` | * | • |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|------|
| simple | sign sound ex. | chick | step Spp | | lock Gq | foot bp | nut pop | b <i>a</i> t | sofa |
| on a long carrier | sign sound ex. | i (c) tree* | | j _{spa*} ဝှေ ာ့ | law* | (d, e) true | | | |
| on anna | sign sound ex. | | day poci | tie på | toy* | | | | |
| on vala | sign sound ex. | | | now cocc | toe PÔ | | | | |
| on <i>óre</i> | sign sound ex. | ear | chair chair | star åqð | war â | tour aq | က် fur ြည် | | |
| on anna + óre | sign sound ex. | | | cin fire ban | | | | | |
| on vala + óre | sign sound ex. | | | sour ලේක ක්ක | က် door* ကြင်က | | | | |
| on stemless calma | sign sound ex. | real yec | င် jazz* လျင်မွ | | | | | | |

Notes to the vowel chart:

(a): The same sign is also used for initial schwa, while final and medial schwa are represented with a point below. Traditional Spelling might separate the initial schwa as a word on its own. Examples: *again*, *a game*, *gladiolus*:¹¹

(b): This sign is used for medial and final schwa, while initial schwa is represented with 1, e.g. a gondola, America, nationalist:

Note that the point below's not used to mark syllabic consonants such as in: *little*, wooden, draggeled, welcome, moment, better:

- (c): The same sign is also used for final weak -i, as in heavy, pretty: $\lambda \mathbf{b} \mathbf{j}$, $\mathbf{p} \mathbf{v} \mathbf{p} \mathbf{j}$
- (d): Instead of \hat{j} , \hat{j} you can use \hat{j} , \hat{j} e.g. law, true: $\hat{\zeta}\hat{j}$, $\hat{p}\hat{y}\hat{j}$ as well as $\hat{\zeta}\hat{j}$, $\hat{p}\hat{y}\hat{j}$.
- (e): The same sign is also used for final weak -u, as in value, issue: $\mathbf{b} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{j}$, $\mathbf{d} \mathbf{j}$

I recommend to transcribe only the vowels that you actually distinguish in speech. See also below "Some Thoughts on How to Spell Words". This means e.g.:¹²

- If you rhyme *luck* with *look*, you shouldn't use 1 but for initial schwa (see above note).
- If you rhyme *peak* with *pick*, you shouldn't use but for final weak -i (see above note).
 - If you rhyme *father* with *bother*, you shouldn't use $\ddot{\mathbf{I}}$ but only $\hat{\mathbf{J}}$.
- If you rhyme *caught* with *cot*, you shouldn't use \int but only \int .
- If you rhyme toy with tie, you shouldn't use $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ but only $\dot{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}$.

^{*} Some general remarks:

Actually, this is the suggestion I'm least sure about. I could also imagine that initial schwa would be represented by a simple short carrier 1 or by a *tehta* for the vowel of *bat*, or by a short carrier with a point below.

Note that this isn't a complete list of all possible vowel mergers, though I think that the most important differences between the standard pronunciations of Britain and the U.S. are covered.

If you rhyme *hoarse* with *horse*, you shouldn't use $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ but only $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$, except for words like *lower* 'make low' (only if your *lower* doesn't rhyme with *lore* or *lower* 'threaten').

If you rhyme can 'to put into cans' with can 'to be able to do something', you shouldn't use $\acute{\mathbf{c}}$ but only $\ddot{\mathbf{j}}$, except for words like yeah (only if your yeah doesn't rhyme with spa).

3. Some thoughts on how to spell words

The phonetic English mode I'm proposing here has two aims: It should be consistent with the attested samples of phonetic modes by J.R.R. Tolkien, and its use (in both writing and reading) should be as easy as possible for anybody who speaks English.

English pronunciation varies from region to region and from speaker to speaker. In order to allow any variety of English to be written in this mode, most of the differences in pronunciation aren't represented but for a few very specific exceptions. For those who know about the difference between phonology (phonemics) and phonetics: Grosso modo, this mode represents the English phonemes.

Pronunciation differences that should not be represented

Most of the variation in English pronunciation is of the following kind: A specific vowel sound is pronounced one way by some people but another way by others. Take as an example for this second kind of variation the different pronunciations of the vowel sound found in the word *bite*: For most speakers, it has a composed vowel, but in the southern part of the United States, it has a pure vowel similar to the one of the word *spa*, but more forwarded towards the vowel of the word *bad*. Among those that have a compound vowel in *bite* there are many who pronounce its first element with a vowel halfway between the vowel of *spa* and the vowel of *bad*; but in Canadian English, the first element rather corresponds to the vowel of *bird*; in the north of England, to the vowel of *bad*; in Cockney and in New York City, to the vowel of *spa*.¹³

Do these different representations have to be represented with different signs? No they don't, because all these different pronunciations can be referred to in one and the same sign with the meaning 'any pronunciation the vowel of *bite* can have'. For the transcription into the *tehtar* mode proposed here, this sign is *anna* with three points above $\mathbf{\ddot{c}}$.

¹³ According to Johnson/Roca (1999), p. 196.

Now someone who pronounces the word *bite* with a pure vowel might consider this sign $\ddot{\mathbf{c}}$ not to be adequate because it's composed by a sign for a and a sign for the following y \mathbf{c} . So the sign $\ddot{\mathbf{c}}$ supposed to represent any pronunciation of the vowel in *bite* points to a specific pronunciation. That's something we have to accept if we want to use the attested sign $\ddot{\mathbf{c}}$ and if we don't want to multiply the spellings.

After all, what would be the benefit of having different spellings of say the vowel in *bite*? Dialectological research could benefit (but who would need tengwar for that purpose?), and spelling might fit better with intuition for certain speakers, but every particular dialect of English would require a particular tengwar mode and since most vowel sounds have different pronunciations, the spelling of most words would be affected. So the mutual understanding would be complicated a lot. However, I'm trying to propose a mode that any speaker of English can use and understand, so I've chosen to represent any pronunciation of the vowel in *bite* with the same sign $\ddot{\mathbf{c}}$.

Pronunciation differences that should be represented

There's only two specific kinds of variation that I suggest to be represented. There's not much to say about the first: It's where certain words are pronounced one way by some people but another way by others. These cases are few and many of them are well-known, e.g. the words *either*, *can't* that are not pronounced the same way in England and in the United States.

The second case is more important: It's where some speakers distinguish two vowels that are not distinguished by others. If you make the distinction, you should represent it in tengwar; if you don't, you shouldn't. This idea is from the book "Describing Spoken English" by Charles W. Kreidler. Two attested examples: In J. R. R. Tolkien's pronunciation, the vowels that occur in the words *horse*, *torment* weren't distinguished from those in *hoarse*, *door*. In tengwar, this distinction isn't found either, cf. *torment* in DTS 23 and *door* in DTS 25. However, he distinguished the vowels occuring in the words *cot*, *what* from those in *caught*, *water* as well in his pronunciation as in tengwar, cf. *what*, *caught*, *water* in DTS 18.

Now why do I recommend to represent this kind of variation but not the other kind described above? On one hand, it's because of practical reasons of writing: Who among these that don't distinguish between the first vowels of *father - bother* (a well-attested distinction in J. R. R. Tolkien's phonetic English tengwar texts) would be able to distinguish these vowels in a tengwar transcription? Even if some could, they'd be very likely to make mistakes. On the other hand, this

-

¹⁴ cf. Kreidler (1997), chapter 5.

Assuming that he used Received Pronunciation, cf. Krieg (1978), p. 156, and consider that he was professor in Oxford.

doesn't affect many sounds. So even if a reader is expecting some distinctions that aren't made in the text he's reading, it's quite unlikely that he'll misunderstand that text because most of the word will be written the way he'd write them. (If you know possible reasonable misunderstandings, please tell me, I'd love to know such examples! Perhaps there could be one when the words *luck*, *look* aren't distinguished, but I couldn't find any.)

Be aware that only the variation in vowel pronunciation should be transcribed, not the variation in consonant pronunciation. Thus where some speakers don't distinguish two consonants in their pronunciation, they should distinguish them in tengwar nonetheless. This can be done quite easily because consonant distinctions are reflected in the Traditional English Spelling, while vowel distinctions often aren't. Again examples from Tolkien: In his pronunciation, he didn't distinguish the initial consonant in the words which, whither from the one in witch, weather, but nonetheless, he distinguished them in whither, weather in DTS 18. He didn't pronounce any /r/ in the words such as spar, art so that the ar in these words couldn't be distinguished by pronunciation from the a in spa, path, but nonetheless, he made that distinction by writing the word arts with the r-tengwa óre but path without (both in DTS 23).

In order to show what distinctions should be represented, I've made notes like the following on $\mathring{\mathbf{j}}$: "If you rhyme *father* with *bother*, you shouldn't use $\mathring{\mathbf{j}}$ but only $\mathring{\mathbf{j}}$ ".

4. References and other acknowledgements

Many thanks to Chris McKay.

The tengwar fonts I've used are TengwarSindarin.ttf and TengwarSindarinAlt.ttf (version 1.9e) from Dan Smith.

AI: Christina Scull/Wayne G. Hammond (1995): J. R. R. Tolkien. Artist & Illustrator. London: Harper Collins.

Andriës, D. Daniel: elfscript 2424: Re: Help with some words... ☐ Laugust 17nd, ☐ 003. See: http://groups.yahoo.com/group/elfscript/message/2424

Andriës, D. Daniel: elfscript 2498: Re: Help with some words... □ August 22nd, □ 2003. See: http://groups.yahoo.com/group/elfscript/message/2498

Johnson, Wyn/Roca, Iggy (1999): A Course in Phonology. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kreidler, Charles W. (1997): Describing Spoken English. An introduction. London/New York: Routledge.

Krieg, Laurence J. (1978): Tolkien's Pronunciation: Some Observations. In: Jim Allan: An Introduction to Elvish. Frome, Somerset: Bran's Head; pp. 152 – 159.

R: Donald Swann/J.R.R. Tolkien (1967): The Road Goes Ever On. A Song Cycle. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

SD: Christopher Tolkien (ed.) (1992): The Return of the Shadow: The History of The Lord of the Rings, Part Four. London: Harper Collins.

Smith, Arden R.: elfscript 1875: Re: odd tehta in DTS 41. March □ 4th, □ 003. See: http://groups.yahoo.com/group/elfscript/message/1875

Smith, Arden R.: elfscript 1884: Re: odd tehta in DTS 41, March 15th, 2003, see: http://groups.yahoo.com/group/elfscript/message/1884

5. Author

This document has been written by "Mach Hezan" J. Wust on December 27th of 2003. Its only intention is to spread the knowledge on tengwar. If you have comments, you may contact me at:

machhezan (at) gmx net

6. Appendix

Arden R. Smith sent me the following post on october 21th of 2003 (I've slightly edited the post so that in fits into the lines):

Dear Mach,

You wrote:

>I suppose your statement that we normally see this sound >represented by óre with a subscript dot refers to other unpublished >writing, right?

Not exclusively. I was also thinking of such published texts as the Book of Mazarbul (in _Pictures_) and the draft of the Moria-gate inscription at VI:450.

>The mentioned document seems to show a phonemical mode, because it >represents the "er" sound with a grave accent and not with the >vowel tehtar that correspond to Traditional Spelling. Nonetheless, >you write that there's a sign for 'silent _e_'. Am I right that >this is not the 'silent _e_' or Traditional Spelling but rather a >'silent _e_' before syllabic consonants (e.g. in _errAntry, womAn, >little, woodEn, welcome, momEnt, RonAld)?

The document in question deals with a mixture of phonemic and orthographic representations. Where "silent _e_" is mentioned, it is in fact the purely orthographic creature that is normally referred to as "silent _e_". The words with silent _e_ that Tolkien uses as examples are _bore_ and _bored_.

| Yours, | |
|---|--|
| Arden | |
| *********************************** | ************************************** |
| | aimaktur perperienta. |
| ******** | Elvish proverb |