

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/msg00479.html>

- *From:* grapheus <grapheus@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 24 Apr 2008 08:29:03 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Apr 23, 12:26 pm, Peter Alaca <p.al...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

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

On Wed, 23 Apr 2008 08:13:07 +0200, Peter Alaca
<p.al...@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

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?

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.

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

Yes, but it is well-known that changing the title of a thread is a vivious tactics for trying to "kill" it by people