

---

Subject: Humble request

Posted by [Pavel A. Romashkin](#) on Wed, 28 Nov 2001 17:28:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi guys 'n gals,

Would it be too much to ask that some of us go to our NewsReader preferences and change an option to "Insert your reply ABOVE the quoted message"? For some threads, a one-line reply can be tucked into the very end of a 200-line quote that we read before. Kind of inconvenient.

Thank you so much,  
Pavel

---

---

Subject: Re: Humble request

Posted by [Bhautik Joshi](#) on Fri, 30 Nov 2001 03:41:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

> Would it be too much to ask that some of us go to our NewsReader  
> preferences and change an option to "Insert your reply ABOVE the quoted  
> message"? For some threads, a one-line reply can be tucked into the very  
> end of a 200-line quote that we read before. Kind of inconvenient.

In some newsgroups, this little issue has sparked what has come close to apocalyptic flame wars. There's an interesting little FAQ about quoting in newsgroups here:

<http://www.uwasa.fi/~ts/http/quote.html>

I'm not taking sides on the issue, but here is what the FAQ has to say about it:

Where is the best place to put quoted text? Above or below my comments?

Above! Some more recent standard email and newsreader programs have assumed a very problematic feature. They include the message which you are responding to below your message. Don't allow that to happen. The proper order is

>Quote 1 (properly pruned)

    Your response 1

>Quote 2 (properly pruned)

    Your response 2

In other words

\* Put each, appropriately trimmed item that you choose to quote

before each of your own comments, respectively.

- \* Remove any remaining "postquoting". Let me emphasize. Do not leave the entire earlier posting, which you have been responding to, at the end of your own posting.

Some (often obscure) Usenet newsgroups and Microsoft's own newsgroups (hardly surprising!) may show and have developed different preferences and practices as to the order and extent of quoting. This definitely is not what to go by in general on the Usenet news. Also, one of the arguments that has been posed in favor of the excessive quoting is that threads may be broken and full quoting is therefore imperative to be able to follow what is going on. No, that is what the news repositories are for. Besides, in well-planned quoting it is amply sufficient to give the essence. Concise and at the same time informative quoting indeed is a skill to be practiced.

Of course it is fair to ask why

```
>Quote 1 (properly pruned)
  Your response 1
  >Quote 2 (properly pruned)
    Your response 2
```

is better than

Your entire response

```
>All old quoted
```

Email and Usenet news are typically used for modern, often almost real-time exchanges which can closely resemble a verbal discussion rather than a correspondence by snailmail where the time between the letters is days or weeks. In a good discussion one interacts, rather than keeps up separate monologues. Thus it is very natural to quote a point, respond, quote the second point, respond and so forth.

Adapted from an advisory posting by Bob Gootee: Answering above the original message is called top posting. Sometimes also called the Jeopardy style. Usenet is Q & A not A & Q. (The name obviously comes from the game of Jeopardy, where the competitor is given the answer before the question.)

As for the Microsoft's public newsgroups even there the official policy warns against quoting below your answer and against excessive quoting!

So, for all the purists out there, there you go :)

Cheers,  
B.

--

/-----( )-----\  
| nbj@imag.wsahs.nsw.gov.au | phone: 0404032617 |..|--\ -moo |  
| ICQ #: 2464537 | http://cow.mooh.org | |--| |  
\-----\OO/|| -----/

---

---

Subject: Re: Humble request  
Posted by [Robert Stockwell](#) on Fri, 30 Nov 2001 14:12:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I wholeheartedly agree!  
-bob

PS yes its just a joke

Bhautik Joshi wrote:

>> Would it be too much to ask that some of us go to our NewsReader  
>> preferences and change an option to "Insert your reply ABOVE the quoted  
>> message"? For some threads, a one-line reply can be tucked into the very  
>> end of a 200-line quote that we read before. Kind of inconvenient.  
>>  
>  
> In some newsgroups, this little issue has sparked what has come close to  
> apocalyptic flame wars. There's an interesting little FAQ about quoting  
> in newsgroups here:  
>  
> <http://www.uwasa.fi/~ts/http/quote.html>  
>  
> I'm not taking sides on the issue, but here is what the FAQ has to say  
> about it:  
>  
> Where is the best place to put quoted text? Above or below my comments?  
>  
> Above! Some more recent standard email and newsreader programs have  
> assumed a very problematic feature. They include the message which  
> you are responding to below your message. Don't allow that to happen.  
> The proper order is  
>  
>> Quote 1 (properly pruned)  
>  
> Your response 1  
>  
>> Quote 2 (properly pruned)

>  
> Your response 2  
>  
> In other words  
> \* Put each, appropriately trimmed item that you choose to quote  
> before each of your own comments, respectively.  
> \* Remove any remaining "postquoting". Let me emphasize. Do not  
> leave the entire earlier posting, which you have been responding  
> to, at the end of your own posting.  
>  
> Some (often obscure) Usenet newsgroups and Microsoft's own newsgroups  
> (hardly surprising!) may show and have developed different  
> preferences and practices as to the order and extent of quoting. This  
> definitely is not what to go by in general on the Usenet news. Also,  
> one of the arguments that has been posed in favor of the excessive  
> quoting is that threads may be broken and full quoting is therefore  
> imperative to be able to follow what is going on. No, that is what  
> the news repositories are for. Besides, in well-planned quoting it is  
> amply sufficient to give the essence. Concise and at the same time  
> informative quoting indeed is a skill to be practiced.  
>  
> Of course it is fair to ask why  
>  
>> Quote 1 (properly pruned)  
> Your response 1  
>> Quote 2 (properly pruned)  
> Your response 2  
>  
> is better than  
>  
> Your entire response  
>  
>> All old quoted  
>  
> Email and Usenet news are typically used for modern, often almost  
> real-time exchanges which can closely resemble a verbal discussion  
> rather than a correspondence by snailmail where the time between the  
> letters is days or weeks. In a good discussion one interacts, rather  
> than keeps up separate monologues. Thus it is very natural to quote a  
> point, respond, quote the second point, respond and so forth.  
>  
> Adapted from an advisory posting by Bob Gootee: Answering above the  
> the original message is called top posting. Sometimes also called the  
> Jeopardy style. Usenet is Q & A not A & Q. (The name obviously comes  
> from the game of Jeopardy, where the competitor is given the answer  
> before the question.)  
>  
> As for the Microsoft's public newsgroups even there the official

> policy warns against quoting below your answer and against excessive  
> quoting!  
>  
> So, for all the purists out there, there you go :)  
>  
> Cheers,  
> B.  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Humble request

Posted by [mole6e23](#) on Fri, 30 Nov 2001 17:39:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

> Would it be too much to ask that some of us go to our NewsReader  
> preferences and change an option to "Insert your reply ABOVE the quoted  
> message"? For some threads, a one-line reply can be tucked into the very  
> end of a 200-line quote that we read before. Kind of inconvenient.

Pavel - I have to agree with the people who support the quote then answer format. I think that it gives a context from which to understand the answer. So you don't have to read the answer and try to remember what the question was.

As said in one of the other posts, I think it comes down to making sure to only quote what you need. If you're responding one line to a 200 line post, I can't see a single reason why you'd have to quote the whole post. If one insists on quoting the whole post then, yes, putting the reply at the beginning is better than at the end. I've had to resort to using google groups to read my newsgroups (since our school newsserver is so unreliable and only gets about 20% of comp.lang.idl-pvwave articles) and it just cuts off long articles by default. If all I see is quoted text, I generally don't even click on it to read the entire response.

Todd

---

Subject: Re: Humble request

Posted by [Pavel A. Romashkin](#) on Sat, 01 Dec 2001 16:22:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"Pavel A. Romashkin" <pavel.romashkin@noaa.gov> wrote in message news:3C051EC7.F6004E82@noaa.gov...

> Hi guys 'n gals,  
> Would it be too much to ask that some of us go to our NewsReader

- > preferences and change an option to "Insert your reply ABOVE the quoted
- > message"? For some threads, a one-line reply can be tucked into the very
- > end of a 200-line quote that we read before. Kind of inconvenient.
- > Thank you so much,
- > Pavel

Ok, case withdrawn. I will just follow Todd's policy and not read those posts where the first two screenfulls are nested quotes. The original request originated from the fact that I read *\*all\** posted messages, not only the replies, and needed no quoted text at all.

Thank you,  
Pavel

---