

# Re: "par coeur" origin

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-04/msg00909.html>

---

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <[grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 20 Apr 2006 13:10:32 GMT
- 

TOF wrote:

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"

Re: "par coeur" origin

from  
"by"  
(although  
the  
"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"

Re: "par coeur" origin

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.

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

Re: "par coeur" origin

Re: "par coeur" origin

Seldom is such intransigence found in one so ignorant.

You are going among linguists; you are pretending to discuss linguistics; but you reject the fundamental assumption of linguistics -- that human language is an object of study, and not a collection of \_obiter dicta\_ from some (nonexistent) "authority"?

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.

You have demonstrated even less awareness of linguistics than most naive persons who have been brainwashed by their fourth-grade teachers and never gone through recovery.

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.

Linguists really don't care what "people" speak of it as. "People" have no special knowledge -- any more than, say, George W. Bush is equipped to speak of the inner workings of an iPod (as he tried to do yesterday in Tuskegee).

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.

No, that's not what you declared.

If you had indeed been referring to some specific, sizable corpus, your claim could have been evaluated objectively. What you declared was your opinion of what could or could not be said.

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 is not one ungrammatical feature in all of "Jabberwocky." Only the vocabulary is unfamiliar.

Re: "par coeur" origin

Re: "par coeur" origin

Consider this other classic example:

(3) Colorless green ideas sleep furiously.

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.

At least you now recognize that it was an opinion. The opinion, however, is not based in fact.

—

Peter T. Daniels [grammatim@xxxxxxx](mailto:grammatim@xxxxxxx)

.