

Re: "par coeur" origin

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-04/msg00927.html>

- *From:* "TOF" <fran_beta@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 20 Apr 2006 15:22:11 -0700
-

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

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)

Re: "par coeur" origin

I've
not
heard
someone
split
"off"
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

Re: "par coeur" origin

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

Re: "par coeur" origin

"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.

Seldom is such intransigence found in one so ignorant.

I suppose that explains what motivates your own arrogant posturing
then. You imagine that your grasp of your special subject reduces all
other matters to trivia. Now perhaps you really do have a strong grasp
of your special subject, or perhaps you merely adopt the pose, but at
this point, I'm losing interest in working out which of these is the
more reasonable inference.

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.

Re: "par coeur" origin

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.

Why not simply and concisely put what it is you believe I'm unaware of?

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

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

Re: "par coeur" origin

Re: "par coeur" origin

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).

The analogy is poor, although I'd accept the claim that people have no special knowledge of the development of rules of language, merely in virtue of their use of them.

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.

That was a key part of what I 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.

No, it was an opinion on what would or would not be regarded as normative in Australia, based on my own experience of local usage.

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

--

Re: "par coeur" origin

Re: "par coeur" origin

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.

Consider this other classic example:

(3) Colorless green ideas sleep furiously.

The question is about fitness for purpose. One may use any lexicon or syntax one likes, but if one's choices are less efficient in achieving one's purpose than some other choice, then one should adopt that choice, or one still better in preference.

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.

You must have an eccentric definition of "fact" in that case.

TOF

.

Re: "par coeur" origin