

# Re: The language of the KRS

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-01/msg00214.html>

---

- *From:* "Steve Marcus" <[smarcus\\_spamout\\_@xxxxxxx](mailto:smarcus_spamout_@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 6 Jan 2006 17:37:44 -0500
- 

"Eric Stevens" <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:l7ptr19sgh015avf9d3bjdk1v61gpdblpl@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:l7ptr19sgh015avf9d3bjdk1v61gpdblpl@xxxxxxxxxxx)  
> On Fri, 6 Jan 2006 07:00:33 -0500, "Steve Marcus"  
> <[smarcus\\_spamout\\_@xxxxxxx](mailto:smarcus_spamout_@xxxxxxx)> wrote:  
>  
>>  
>>  
>>"Eric Stevens" <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
>>[news:3lrr1hhq41fa53uc3nogd5tgrjb3muki6@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:3lrr1hhq41fa53uc3nogd5tgrjb3muki6@xxxxxxxxxxx)  
>>>I have been sent a video of an address given by Scott Wolter and Dick  
>>> Nielsen at a book-signing on Dec 10-05.  
>>>  
>>> Dick Nielsen made an interesting comment. I didn't note the exact  
>>> words but I can loosely paraphrase him as saying that according to  
>>> Henrik Williams 'it is now more difficult to categorise the language  
>>> of the KRS as being from the 19th century than it is to categorise it  
>>> as being from the 14th century'.  
>>>  
>>  
>>Why don't you watch the video again (and again and again, if that's what  
>>it  
>>takes) and reproduce the exact words, rather than loosely paraphrasing the  
>>source.  
>  
> What is the point of exactly quoting someone else's paraphrase?

Better question: What is the point of asking you a simply question. Try to follow along, Eric:

1. You report that you were sent a video of a book signing address at which Nielsen made a comment.
2. You further report that you didn't note Nielsen's "exact words", but that you can "loosely paraphrase what Nielsen said.
3. I asked you why you don't watch the video sufficiently to note Nielsen's exact words, and reproduce \*those words\* here, rather than loosely paraphrasing the source (which in this case would be Nielsen).

Re: The language of the KRS

Is there some part of my question that you now do not understand (not that it could by any stretch of anyone's imagination that I ever requested you to quote someone else's paraphrase)?

>>

>>>Even better, perhaps you can report the "why" behind Nielsen's statement.

>

> It wasn't stated, although it might be possible for you to deduce it

> after you have read the book.

Were \*you\* able to deduce it after \*you\* read the book?

>

>

>

> Eric S