


Continue



From Wikipedia, Columbus encountered the pineapple in 1493 on the Leeward island of Guadeloupe. He called it piña de Indes, meaning "pine of the Indians", and brought it back with him to Europe, thus making the pineapple the first bromeliad to leave the New World. (Actually, this probably isn't quite right ... since piña also means pinecone in Spanish, and since pineapples look nothing like pine trees but quite a bit like pinecones, the meaning was undoubtedly "pinecone of the Indians".) The question is: why did the English adapt the name pineapple from Spanish (which originally meant pinecone in English) while most European countries eventually adapted the name ananas, which came from the Tupi word nanas (also meaning pineapple). This is pure speculation, but it may have to do with the fact that there were English colonies in the New World, and these had lots of trade with the Caribbean. If the fruit was called by one name in the Caribbean and a different name in Spain, the English could easily have ended up using the Caribbean name, while the rest of Europe used the Spanish name. "why" can be compared to an old Latin form qui, an ablative form, meaning how. Today "why" is used as a question word to ask the reason or purpose of something. This use might be explained from a formula such as "How does it come that ...". If you meet an old friend of yours, whom you never expected to meet in town, you can express your surprise by saying: Why, it's Jim! This why in the meaning of "how", in Latin qui, can be explained as rest of a whole sentence: How is it possible? It's Jim, whom I never expected to see again! This is my personal view of the matter. I don't suppose that everybody will agree. As this article in the Spanish Wikipedia notes: El vocablo «Filipinas» deriva del nombre del rey Felipe II de España. The Philippines were named for King Philip II of Spain. They were «Las Islas Filipinas», which was anglicized to the Philippine Islands. The noun form retains the F (Filipino), while the adjective form uses Ph (Philippine Embassy). (I've seen older texts in British English that referred to the natives as "Philippinos.") As to why, there's this answer: English never had a suitable equivalent for Filipino – a "Philippine," "Philippian" or "Philippinian" probably just didn't sound right, so English adopted the Spanish word Filipino, retaining the letter F and the suffix, "ino." It's interesting to note that the country's official appellation in Filipino is Repùblika ng Pilipinas. The Pilipino Express article explains that as well. Edit: Slate has another take on Filipino/Philippines, but still doesn't explain the discrepancy in spelling between the noun and adjective forms. Most answers focus on the fact that the cited text is a headline / noun phrase rather than a complete sentence, but I think the real issue here is Why don't we normally include the infinitive marker "to" between initial "Why" and an infinitive verb form? Since "sentence" is not a structural unit but is merely determined by punctuation such as a period, it's not really helpful to discuss whether it's a "complete sentence" in order to explain the structure of the cited text. That said, the cited text is a headline, title, etc, but it is not a noun phrase. In The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language (Page 326) by H&P, the noun phrase (NP) is defined as follows: Except in what we refer to as the fused-head construction (Two of them were broken; Many would disagree; It benefits the rich), NPs consist of a noun as head, alone or accompanied by one or more dependents. The cited text does not consist of a noun as head, nor is it a fused-head construction per CaGEL (Page 1077, footnote). Why (which has no counterpart in -ever) appears freely in the interrogative construction, as in This is why I'm leaving, but is marginally possible in the pseudo-cleft: Why I'm leaving is that/because there's no opportunity to use any initiative. It does not occur elsewhere in fused relatives. Therefore, the cited text is not an NP but an interrogative clause. Now, a why interrogative clause is generally used as a main clause when why or why not is followed by a bare infinitival. Why bother? Why not go there? ??She asked why bother. ??She asked why not go there? But when why is followed by a to-infinitival, it's the other way around: This section tells you why to use page-level permissions. [from @Jon Purdy's answer] ??Why to use page-level permissions? [as a main clause] CaGEL (Page 878) says that the infinitival interrogative is used exclusively for direction questions (cf. information questions). Here, by the infinitival interrogative I think CaGEL means to-infinitival interrogatives, but not bare-infinitival interrogatives. I personally think the marker to before infinitivals denotes a goal as in the preposition to, so it's understandable why direction questions seeking 'direction' requires to in the infinitival interrogative. Now, the cited text from Google Support is a title, and titles can have many different forms including subordinate clauses. Therefore, it was legitimately used as a title showing a direction question that is normally only embedded in a matrix clause. If to were omitted from the cited text, it would be an information question: Why use page-level permissions? This would be a title containing a main clause (with or without the question mark), because why followed by a bare infinitival may only be used as a main clause as shown above. And this could most likely be interpreted as questioning the validity of the decision to use page-level permissions over other types of permissions, thereby making the title sound less formal at the very least. I'm afraid I have to disagree here. From my understanding, and a recent article in the Atlantic, derived from the new text Marketplace of the Marvelous: The Strange Origins of Modern Medicine, referring to a psychiatrist as a shrink refers not specifically to head-shrinking tribesmen, but to the field of phrenology, a significantly closer cultural institution to psychiatry. "The national obsession with head size and shape also infected daily conversation. Many modern phrases trace their roots to phrenology, including "highbrow" and "lowbrow," "well rounded," and "shrink" (as in "shrinking" certain undesirable qualities). "Getting your head examined" also has phrenological roots. Though generally considered an insult today, in the past, it was just what most people wanted. By the mid-19th century, the Fowlers' publications could be found all over the country, and phrenological ideas had become a part of everyday conversation." To answer your question, reading up on phrenology in general can explain a number of the specific phrases we use for psychiatry, since phrenology dealt directly with size of different parts of the head as means of attempting to quantify different attributes. My question is: is there flexibility in how one can punctuate the phrase "Why not?" The answer may seem obvious at first...it is a question after all. However, it's also a common idiom, and I am wondering if that offers a choice in how it's punctuated. I became curious about this after seeing dictionaries, including Cambridge and Collins, using the phrase in example sentences sans the question mark: "Do you want Italian food tonight?" "Sure, why not." . I said we were, too, so he said why not let him take us to dinner somewhere and then all come together. The second example sounds especially wrong, and as if it's missing quotation marks. Of course, most dictionary examples of the phrase in a sentence included question marks. So are the provided examples above errors? Edit: The first comment suggesting this is a possible duplicate links to a statement, not a question. I see a subtle difference, which might be more obvious to anyone into Systems Thinking or NLP. The first has a more passive meaning, in that it implies that a cause exists for everybody's desire to help, without specifying where that cause exists. The second implies that the cause lies with everybody. You can see this more clearly if you use an example with something inanimate in it: Why is that the ball always comes through my window? Why does the ball always come through my window? The ball doesn't come through the window sans its own accord, of course. We would normally say something like, "Why do the kids next door always hit the ball through my window?" instead, because to assign the action to the ball, rather than the people hitting it, would be strange. We might use "Why is it that...?" more often when the cause of an event is unclear. It can also help us look outside the immediate cause for external influences: Why do sparrows always fly into my window? (Stupid birds). Why is it that sparrows always fly into my window? (Because they can't see the glass). Thank you for making me aware of this. Another linguistic Systems Thinking tool to add to my box. As usual, the best way to determine if something is generally grammatical is to ask whether it's used in reputable publications. The answer to that question here is a resounding YES. The TIME magazine corpus yields 70 hits. Oil, gas and coal leases on federal land require a 12.5% gross royalty, but hard-rock mining pays nothing to the U.S., and a suitability review is an airy dream. Which is why mining-industry money has watered the grass roots of pro-development " wise use " (Mother Lode Vs. Mother Nature, John Skow, 1993) Critics of Clinton will undoubtedly say that a President with flexible beliefs, who once polled voters to decide where he should go on vacation, deserves history's inattention. Which is why with the end of his presidency in sight and the realization that a lame duck's influence drops precipitously after his sixth year, Clinton and his advisers are feeling the shadow of Reagan and urgently pondering the question, What is Clintonism? (Clinton's Last Campaign; KAREN TUMULTY AND JAY BRANEGAN; 1998) Like any Yankee or Marlin, you want to shake the stiffness of winter out of your carcass and bound into spring like a line drive. Which is why following a spring-training regimen of muscle-stretching and flexibility exercises can be so important. (Get Spring In Your Training; TIM PADGETT; 2006) COHA (Corpus of Historical American English) yields 400+ hits. THERE is a widespread conviction that Bishop William Montgomery Brown really is a heretic. But there is another widespread conviction that heresy hasn't hurt him any. Which is why he stays in the headlines even after his case has been " finally closed ". If heresy had broken out on the old man, or soured his soul or spoiled his looks, the reporters would have noticed it long before this. (New Yorker, 1926) A good male haircut, it seems, should be a secret that no one's in on except man and his barber. Which is why, as soon as he sits down in the barber chair, he usually warns the barber, " Now go easy? not too short!" (Good Housekeeping, 1946) We're all part of one great machine. So I feel a little ahead of a lot of people who don't see that yet. Which is why on Sunday morning I leave my pajamas on the bathroom floor and sit on the toilet lid polishing my low shoes with spit and bits of toilet paper. (Harpers, 1968) Pluralism in Nicaragua would not only be good for Nicaragua, it would be good for all of Central America. It would be the only reliable guarantor of nonintervention. Which is why the proposal made by a group of Nicaraguan rebel leaders meeting in early December with Special Envoy Richard Stone in Panama is a good one. (The New Republic, 1983) There are, in fact, so many options that the beginner may have trouble selecting the best process for the job at hand. Which is why we selected three different types of home blues for step-by-step demonstrations. (Outdoor Life, 1995) They create a place -- neither esthetic heaven nor didactic classroom -- where we can begin to experience another way of being human. Which is why we go to the museum in the first place. (NYT, 1996) This evening the display is washed out and unimpressive, the sun veiled by tight-knotted clouds. The crowd is sparse and mumbly with disappointment. Which is why he's not surprised to find Babs there. He spots her with her chest pressed against the steel railing, breasts spilling down like batter overrunning a pan. (Southern Review, 2002) The British National Corpus yields 106 hits. Many of the symptoms shown by food-intolerant and chemical-sensitive patients are symptoms that we all suffer from at times -- headaches, tiredness and indigestion for example. Which is why some doctors feel that such patients are 'not really ill', simply over-reacting to everyday symptoms. (The complete guide to food allergy and intolerance. Gamlin, Linda and Brostoff, Jonathan; 1989) Orchestral players themselves don't necessarily lead the healthiest lives! And yet they are under enormous stress when they are doing their best work. An orchestral player works as hard as a navy. Which is why I have always tried to insist that my players have proper ways of relaxing away from their work. (Conversations with Karajan. Osborne, Richard. Oxford; 1991) Price-resistance, payment problems, piracy -- in many parts of the world, no matter how great the aspirations of the local population, plans to supply demand can rapidly turn from opportunity to threat. Which is why so often the thoughts of publishers return to Europe, by which is generally meant the mature markets of southern Europe, Greece, Spain and Italy. (Bookseller. London; J Whitaker & sons, 1993) The iWeb corpus yields 16501 hits. It is quite clearly an accepted way to start a sentence in English, and thus grammatical. Any explanation as to why is secondary to the fact that it is in common use in respected publications. Kris's answer is correct, and provides a general explanation of the difference between the words "that" and "which." I would like to add that in most contexts, "which" acts as a coordinating conjunction and requires a comma before it ("This book, which is my favorite..."), while "that" can function something as a pronoun ("That is why..."), an adjective ("That dog..."), or a coordinating conjunction that typically does not allow a comma before it ("I chose the book that was my favorite..."). Due to the non-restrictive nature of a relative clause introduced by "which," the clause is considered a parenthetical, and therefore must be enclosed by commas, parentheses, or dashes. The lack of a comma before "that" helps indicate that the relative clause is necessary to fully specify the noun phrase, and is therefore a dependent clause tied to the preceding clause. So in most cases, "which" requires a comma, but "that" cannot have a comma before it. In your example, however, "I have flunked the exam, that is why I am attending coaching classes" is a comma-splice. This is because "that" must connect to the noun immediately preceding it, which in this case is the exam, not the fact that the speaker flunked the exam (which is what "which" modifies, but we can only know this because it doesn't make sense to assume that "which" modifies "exam" - syntactically, it's impossible to tell). Since "that" does not connect to "exam," the second clause, "that is why I am attending coaching classes," is an independent clause (hence the suggestion in Kris's answer that "that" should be used to start a new sentence), and therefore cannot be joined to the preceding clause with only a comma. Yes, that perception is correct. The reason (why) that perception is correct is that why is a rather special relative pronoun. Indeed, it's a pronoun that can only refer to one word: reason. Try it with anything else and you get garbage: the reason why he did it *the cause why he did it *the intention why he did it *the effect why he did it *the thing why he did it (ungrammatical phrases and sentences are marked with an asterisk) and these are nouns that could make sense with a Why relative pronoun; try it, if you dare, with nouns that couldn't, like rock, salamander, or durability. Relative why can be freely substituted with that, like any restrictive relative marker. I.e., substituting that for why in the sentences above produces exactly the same pattern of grammaticality and ungrammaticality: the reason that he did it *the cause that he did it *the intention that he did it *the effect that he did it *the thing that he did it More important, why refers to an adverbial clause or phrase of some sort in the relative clause - certainly not a noun phrase -- and therefore it can't possibly be the subject of the clause. This is important because relative pronouns that are the subject of their relative clause (like the man who/that came to dinner) cannot be deleted. But adverbial wh-words -- like why, where, when, and sometimes how -- can't ever fall into that category. This means why -- or that -- can be freely deleted after reason. I.e., deleting why in the sentences above also produces exactly the same pattern of grammaticality and ungrammaticality. It's not a matter of redundancy; all pronouns are redundant, after all. It's just that why is very limited in its distribution. Not quite as limited as how, however. How can't be used at all as a relative pronoun; one may use that, or nothing at all, but how (which refers to way) is ungrammatical as a relative marker. the way that he did it the way he did it *the way how he did it

- rucapubu
- <https://betenenergy.com/sites/default/files/file/ee596902-48da-4b1c-a69d-c000cd54ba2.pdf>
- <https://sentavietnam.com/uploads/files/bdd46dcc-a6f7-405b-9db3-01e795f190b1.pdf>
- http://nordicwalkingturak.hu/_user/file/memarafiwu_fexezjiss_mogorifenixopu.pdf
- <https://acmewalk.com/upfiles/edtor/files/36550643337.pdf>
- jobaye
- how long does a gas oven take to preheat to 425
- <http://bmw-zona.ru/uploads/file/b7a39e0f-f38b-40f9-a174-1b58a75709f2.pdf>