

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-08/msg00499.html>

- *From:* analyst41@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Mon, 11 Aug 2008 17:14:09 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Aug 11, 7:47 pm, "benli...@xxxxxxxxxxxx" <benli...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Aug 12, 11:11 am, analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Aug 11, 5:42 pm, "benli...@xxxxxxxxxxxx" <benli...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Aug 12, 8:05 am, analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Aug 11, 3:04 pm, Adam Funk
<a24...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 2008-08-10, Brian M.
Scott wrote:

On Sun, 10

Aug 2008

07:18:29

-0700

(PDT),

<analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote in

news:47020cff-57cc-4340-9bd7-2956455923af@xxxxxxxxxxxx

in sci.lang:

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times

start
quote:

Overnight,
Russia
landed
ground
troops
off
of
warships
into
the
disputed
territory
of
Abkhazia
and
broadened
its
bombing
campaign
to
the
Georgian
capital s
airport.

end
quote.

Whats
next
–
"I'm
like"
for
"I
said"
?

Different
category

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times

altogether.
See, for
instance,
<<http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/errors/nonerrors.html>>
(search
for 'off of').

I agree with you. There are
plenty of other "compound
prepositions"
in English: "He came down
from the top of the hill
while we were
walking up to it."

Of course, "off of" doesn't
seem to add any information
in comparison
with "off", but I'm not
convinced that's much of an
objection to
adding just one syllable or
two letters.

--

Bob just used 'canonical' in
the canonical way. [Guy
Steele]– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Would you use it serious writing?

Why not? You still haven't explained why it's "dumb".

You are obviously posturing

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times

No, in fact it was a serious question. The one you continue to evade.

(have you ever used it in serious> writing?)

You are being seriously dishonest here.

Have you used 'off of' in serious writing?

It is just slovenly speech and inexcusable writing.

You continue to do nothing but apply derogatory labels. The analytical level remains at zero.

How many times can it be said that the 'of' is unnecessary?

There cannot be a shadow of a doubt that the NY Times has started using it to make its bourgeoisie readers feel at home, who it thinks

"bourgeois"?? You really ought to check a dictionary, for both spelling and meaning.

Sad.

You assume your "sad" face whenever you have no answer. Someone who rails about "slovenly speech" ought to be more careful how they use words.

Thats so dishonest and infantile at the same time.

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times

would be put off by too strict an adherence
to the rules of proper
usage and therefore occasional "down home"
expressions like this would
be a good marketing ploy.

"down home"?? Try to avoid using terms like this that just
make you
look silly.

It is a scientific socio-linguistic observation –

;-D;-D;-D!!!!

Alas, you would not know a scientific sociolinguistic observation if
it walked up and asked you where the men's shoes were.

Oh, that was so mature.

Im beginning to feel sorry for you. Problems in real life?

how a journalistic

product is changing to keep up with the linguistic changes (it thinks
is) going on among it target audience.

<http://cjrarchives.org/tools/lc/fused.asp>

says

start quote:

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times

(And while in technical land, we should note
that "off of" is a
barbarism; drop the "of.")

end quote.

So you found some journalist who shares your prejudice and
thinks
"barbarism" makes him sound learned.
You still haven't explained what's wrong with "off of".

I am sure you understand what 'drop the 'of' means.

Of course I do. That is not the problem.

quit the enigmatic crap. If you have something to say in support of
'off of" say it or STFU.

And what makes

the redundancy worse is the unintended rhyme.

- 1) It's not redundant.
- 2) It doesn't rhyme.

I think that covers everything.

I am gald you think so. Will you please stop embarrassing yourself
further on this topic?

Here is what the online dictionary says

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times

start quote:

Usage Note: The compound preposition off of is generally regarded as informal and is best avoided in formal speech and writing: He stepped off (not off of) the platform. Off is informal as well when used to indicate a source: formal style requires I borrowed it from (not off) my brother.

end quote.

That's wonderful. So the online dictionary, just like you and just like Mr Columbia Journalism Review, makes no attempt to explain why this expression is "best avoided". At least it doesn't call it "dumb", "slovenly" etc.

You seem to have developed a learning disability in this regard.

At any rate "off of" has a legitimate use

"In a war characterised by such atrocities as the hacking off of civilians limbs and the widespread use of rape to"

That's not "off of" anyway, so it's not a "use" of anything.

Genuine "off of" is attested from the 15th century on.

Where?

King James Bible? Shakespeare? Milton?

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times

Shakespeare, Andrew Marvell, *Pilgrim's Progress*, Steele in the *Spectator*, as well as lesser known writers.

OK let us see the attestation from Shakespeare.

While "where are you at" is equally inappropriate, somehow it is cute whereas "off of" is preternaturally annoying.

I'm sure you could regale us with a recital of your likes and dislikes all day long. Some might find this cute, and some annoying. But unless you can explain rationally what's wrong with "off of", take it to a.u.e.

This is sad also.

Sad face again. No answers.

But it is sad. You seem not only disinclined (like most prescriptivists) to analyze your judgments, but really totally unequipped to do so. I guess this is the same gung-ho, can-do, what-the-hell spirit that led you to think you could overthrow Indo-European with your bare hands. Sad.

Something bad must have happened recently in your personal life for you to be displaying such dishonesty and slimy vituperation.

Have you used 'off of' in serious writing?

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times

Ross Clark– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text — Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –