

Re: In the sci.arch Archives is it usual to get 237 Messages into a Thread?

Re: In the sci.arch Archives is it usual to get 237 Messages into a Thread?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2008-04/msg00458.html>

- *From:* Peter Alaca <p.alaca@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 23 Apr 2008 12:26:40 +0200
-

Eric Stevens wrote: on, 23/04/2008 11:34:

On Wed, 23 Apr 2008 08:13:07 +0200, Peter Alaca
<p.alaca@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

David wrote: on, 23/04/2008 01:52:

On Apr 22, 7:36 pm, Peter Alaca
<p.al...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Carl wrote: on, 23/04/2008 01:03:

There were only 12 authors
in the "Getting serious
about archaeological sites
starting with Mehrgarh"
Thread starting from Jul 11
2007.

No, not 12 but 7 authors, and not 237 but 39
messages,
starting not 11 but 14 July
A fine example of your research.

I ignore completely your erroneous information.

Of course you do, because you can't prove me wrong.

According to Google at <http://tinyurl.com/4s3jqw> there are 237
messages and 12 authors.

Re: In the sci.arch Archives is it usual to get 237 Messages into a Thread?

Re: In the sci.arch Archives is it usual to get 237 Messages into a Thread?

But not with the title "Getting serious about archaeological sites starting with Mehrgarh"
That 337 thread started on 12 July 2007 as
"Archaeological Evidence for Dating Kurukshetra War by Dr. S R Rao", and the title changed many times, mainly by Carl himself

I don't entirely trust Google groups but this is better than nothing.

Search GG with the title and you'll find 35 (or 34 or 36) messages. Via sci.tech-archive.net I found 39.

—
p.a.

.