

Re: Plausibility Check

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-08/msg00176.html>

- *From:* "Franz Gnaedinger" <frgn@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 30 Jul 2006 23:19:01 -0700
-

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

That is not a quote; that is your recollection of what you (think you) heard (and it is translated as well, but the possibility of distortion in translation is here minimal).

How many times must I repeat myself? I is a quote, a direct quote from a brief radio program, 11:40 – 11:45 on DRS 1, and I remember it very accurately, since it was one of those fine confirmations of an insight of mine from 1974/75, when I not only defined language but stated a correlation between human made things and words. Which is the reason why I picked up that sentence, and why I remember it accurately.

That is not a "source." A source would be the date of the broadcast, and preferably it would identify the authority for the statement.

It is my source, I got that sentence from that radio program, and if you don't believe me you can ask them, as I proposed twice. Why don't you do that instead of wasting my precious time?

I gave you the link to the website, you

can contact the editors of the Mailbox, I even wrote a draft of a letter to them. Can you ask for more?

Petrarch wasn't a Renaissance man?

Eras are