

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/msg00502.html>

- *From:* "benlizro@xxxxxxxxxx" <benlizro@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 11 Aug 2008 17:36:15 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Aug 12, 12:14 pm, analys...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

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

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

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

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

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

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

On
Sun,
10

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

Aug
2008
07:18:29
-0700
(PDT),
<analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
news:47020cff-57cc-4340-9bd7-2956455923af@xxxxxxxx
in
sci.lang:

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.

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

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

Different
category
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

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

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

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

Re: observable language change – "off of" makes it to the NY Times
(have you ever used it in serious> writing?)

You are being seriously dishonest here.

No I'm not. Stop being such a pompous ass.

Have you used 'off of' in
serious writing?

Probably not. It's not part of my normal English, spoken or written,
formal or informal. So?

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?

You could keep on saying it and find out.
After you had said it as many times as possible, we would still be
none the wiser.
How "necessary" is the "to" in "according to" or "next to"? Or the
"of" in "out of"?

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

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

Sad.

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

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

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.

You don't agree?

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?

You seem to have expanded your repertoire from just the "sad" face to
quite an assortment of trite moralizing. Why not examine your own
absurdities?

how a journalistic

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

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

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

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

says

start quote:

(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.

enigmatic?????

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

If you have something to say in support of
'off of' say it or STFU.

You see? You don't really understand the problem even at its most
basic level.

You made the derogatory comments about "off of". We are waiting for
you to explain why it is "dumb", "slovenly" etc. Therefore it would
be incumbent upon *you* to STFU if you are unable to do so.

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 glad you think so. Will you please stop embarrassing yourself
further on this topic?

I am not embarrassed in the slightest. I am freshly amazed at every
turn at your inability to recognize any of your errors.

Here is what the online dictionary says

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)

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

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

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.

Let's see, another vacuous insult, which means that we move on to the next item...

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.

Check the OED, s.v. "off".

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.

Are you really incapable of anything but moralizing projections of
your own personality problems onto others?

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

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

Have you used 'off of' in
serious writing?

Answered above. Still no answers from you on anything of substance.

Ross Clark

.