

Re: "par coeur" origin

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-04/msg00908.html>

- *From:* "TOF" <fran_beta@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 20 Apr 2006 05:55:47 -0700
-

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

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

Re: "par coeur" origin

"off"
is
occasionally
omitted.)

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."

Re: "par coeur" origin

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.

You're entitled to your view but it's hardly dicta.

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
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.

That's a standard troll. No thanks.

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

Re: "par coeur" origin

Re: "par coeur" origin

No, but people speak of it as if it is. We both do it and speak of what is and is not done here and further, the rationales offered for the choices made.

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.

That was the claim, and I declared that I'd not heard one particular form of one.

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.

Anything's *possible* including things you and I might consider to be word salad. That "Jabberwocky" poem is damn near intelligible, but there are some contexts in which eccentric language use is undesirable or fails to meet some key aim, and thus ought to be discouraged. In this case, the eccentric construction was, in my opinion, pure contrivance to establish a point unworthy of being made.

TOF

.

Re: "par coeur" origin