

## Re: Geology Question (KRS related)

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-02/msg00446.html>

---

- *From:* Eric Stevens <[eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 06 Feb 2006 14:03:35 +1300
- 

On Sun, 5 Feb 2006 09:53:08 -0500, "Steve Marcus"  
<[smarcus\\_spamout\\_@xxxxxxx](mailto:smarcus_spamout_@xxxxxxx)> wrote:

This is a general difference between us. When there are gaps in the data I tend to fill it with '?' but you seem to substitute an 'X'. The fact that I withhold rejection of a hypothesis doesn't mean that I accept it.

First, you really ought to slow down when you read. I just finished saying that I'll accept data filling in the gaps regardless of source. I have repeatedly used the same ? for data gaps in the Nielsen/Wolter work (although what use the symbol X would imply escapes me).

'X' means crossed out – there is no evidence. The '?' means I don't know what the evidence is.

Second, I don't think that your posts distinguish between withholding rejection of a hypothesis and accepting it. For example, from:

<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.archaeology/msg/beec0b5626d64594?dmode=source&hl=en>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/d8gcm>

"Apart from that, Scott wolter's work seems to have established the age of the KRS as being +2 centuries at the time of discovery. That too is important."

In the context of the discussion in that thread, I don't think that statement strongly indicates that you do not accept Wolter's hypothesis; certainly without filling in the blank left by the word "seems", one cannot come away with anything other than that you strongly believe Wolter to be correct. There's at least one subsequent post in that thread in which you claim to be "impartial", but your entire posting history in sci.archaeology

Re: Geology Question (KRS related)

demonstrates to for you, "impartial" means "I accept the conclusion that I've preselected and await evidence that it's wrong."

The use of the word 'seems' should be interpreted as meaning that 'Apart from that, Scott Wolter's work [gives the appearance of having] established the age of the KRS as being +2 centuries at the time of discovery.' No possible interpretation of 'seems' can lead you to the conclusion that I meant 'Apart from that, Scott wolter's work [has] established the age of the KRS as being +2 centuries at the time of discovery.'

This highlights the point I was trying to make above. I was implying room for doubt. You want to interpret my statement as an expression of an absolute opinion. Well, I'm sorry, but it wasn't.

Eric Stevens

.