

Re: "par coeur" origin

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-04/msg00905.html>

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 20 Apr 2006 12:43:35 GMT
-

TOF wrote:

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

TOF wrote:

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

TOF wrote:

Paul J Kriha wrote:

I
doubt
it.
Where
I
come
from
(Australia)
I've
not
heard
someone
split
"off"
from
"by"
(although
the
"off"
is
occasionally
omitted.)

Re: "par coeur" origin

Oh really?
"By now,
you must be
able to
recite it off,
you bloody
drongo, by
heart."

That's cheating. A
parenthetical aside can go
most anywhere, though I
stand by my claim. Why not
put the "you bloody drongo"
at the end or
after "By now,"?

Oh, puh-leez. Some of Jim McCawley's
most notorious early work showed
that "parenthetical asides" are very, very
strictly rule-governed. The
"printable" standard example is
"abso-bloomin'-lutely."

No frickin' way they're as frick the rule bloody governed as
you

from "they're" through "governed" is technically known as "word salad."

Indeed. It can be done, but it doesn't mean that it should be done.
It's what should be done that is on topic here.

No, it cannot be done. There is no "should" in linguistics.

contend. In any event, the natural place to put the aside
would have
been where I suggested, rather than inserted in someone's
back door
hard enough to make Cartman squeal.

don't know what that means, either, but the very fact that you have an

Re: "par coeur" origin

Re: "par coeur" origin

intuition as to "the natural place" shows that it's rule-governed.

That's true in the sense that the rules are stylistic conventions rather than the result of some ancient linguist's pronouncement, as the phrase "very strictly rule-governed" would imply. You departed from that stylistic convention in trying to separate the elements of the phrase we were discussing.

I apologize for assuming you had the slightest idea of what you were talking about. Please find out what linguistics is.

Basically, human language is not a batch of conventions that some "ancient grammarian" "pronounced on" at some point.

Human language is a very rigorously controlled neurological phenomenon, and its workings are all but impervious to introspection; all we can go by is attested utterances, and attested utterances show (in this case) that there are very specific spots where "parenthetical asides" can be interpolated.

Your
rules are evidently far more restrictive than Paul's, too.

—

How so?

Because you claimed that one of those "parenthetical asides" could only go in a particular spot in a sentence, and that Paul's example is not possible for you.

—

Peter T. Daniels grammatim@xxxxxxx

.