

Urth Digest, Vol 59, Issue 24

The Urth list — 3 messages, 3 voices, 30 Jul 2009

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/5475>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Robin Dunn — 30 Jul 2009, 21:25

The wikipedia article sites a number of sources, as in this 1:

^ Walsh, Bill (2000). Contemporary Books. ed. Lapsing into a comma : a curmudgeon's guide to the many things that can go wrong in print and how to avoid them. Lincolnwood, Illinois: Contemporary Books. pp. 112-113. ISBN 0809225352.

in this article:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Split_infinite#cite_note-Walsh112-1

I too learned that 19th century grammarians introduced the skepticism regarding the split infinitive. To my mind, it's not unlike the large number of words lifted directly from Latin and deposited in the English vocabulary in the 16th and 17th centuries as part of the Enlightenment's fascination with the ancient world. Anything Latinate had to be better than anything Anglo-Saxon.

The same can be said for words of French origin - as the language of the ruling class in England, it's words were seen as higher culture and therefore more preferable to the Anglo-Saxon roots.

As a usage question, that's exactly what it comes down to: how do people actually speak and write?

Our rules are like laws, they change over time, and rules are made to be broken.

To my mind, if a split infinitive severely hampers a sentence's clarity, it should be rewritten. Otherwise it's 100% kosher.

Them's my two cents.

-Robin Dunn

On Thu, Jul 30, 2009 at 2:11 PM, <urth-request at lists.urth.net> wrote:
Send Urth mailing list submissions to
? ? ? urth at lists.urth.net

To subscribe or unsubscribe via the World Wide Web, visit
? ? ? http://lists.urth.net/listinfo.cgi/urth-urth.net
or, via email, send a message with subject or body 'help' to
? ? ? urth-request at lists.urth.net

You can reach the person managing the list at
? ? ? urth-owner at lists.urth.net

When replying, please edit your Subject line so it is more specific

than "Re: Contents of Urth digest..."

Today's Topics:

? 1. Re: ?OT: split infinitive [was Re: torturing BTQ] (Milton Jackson)

Message: 1
Date: Wed, 29 Jul 2009 19:29:02 -0400
From: Milton Jackson <miltonwjackson at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) OT: split infinitive [was Re: torturing BTQ]

Daniel D Jones — 30 Jul 2009, 23:05 · in reply to Robin Dunn

On Thursday 30 July 2009 21:25:13 Robin Dunn wrote:
Our rules are like laws, they change over time, and rules are made to be broken.

To my mind, if a split infinitive severely hampers a sentence's clarity, it should be rewritten. Otherwise it's 100% kosher.

Them's my two cents.

I must disagree. Split infinitives are something up with which I will not put.

Dan

PS: :-)

David Duffy — 31 Jul 2009, 02:47 · in reply to Robin Dunn

On Thu, 30 Jul 2009, Robin Dunn wrote:
To my mind, if a split infinitive severely hampers a sentence's clarity, it should be rewritten. Otherwise it's 100% kosher.

to boldly split...