

## Re: Khoisan is very old

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-04/msg00204.html>

---

- *From:* Richard Herring <junk@[127.0.0.1]>
  - *Date:* Thu, 5 Apr 2007 09:43:11 +0100
- 

In message <1175697237.022036.8980@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Darkstar <darkstar100@xxxxxxxx> writes

On Apr 4, 4:35 pm, Richard Herring <junk@[127.0.0.1]> wrote:

In message  
<1175687856.989260.106...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,  
Darkstar <darkstar...@xxxxxxxx> writes>On Apr 3, 11:50 am, Richard  
Herring <junk@[127.0.0.1]> wrote:

>> In message  
<1175564019.846117.287...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,  
>> Darkstar <darkstar...@xxxxxxxx> writes

>> >All I'm saying is this. If a set of phenomena {A1, A2, A3} all have  
>> >property S, then phenomenon A4 from the same set will also be  
>> >characterized by property S.

>> That's called "guilt by association". Fallacy of accident, if you want  
>> it more formally.

[please don't quote signatures]

Okay. Noted.

>Why a fallacy? I was thinking in probabilistic terms.

Then you should state your thoughts in probabilistic terms, not as a  
syllogism.

Sincerely, I don't really understand what was wrong with that  
syllogism.

You said:

Re: Khoisan is very old

>> >All I'm saying is this. If a set of phenomena {A1, A2, A3} all have  
>> >property S, then phenomenon A4 from the same set will also be  
>> >characterized by property S.

It implies that if any three elements of a set have some property, then all elements of the set also have it. That's not true unless possession of the property happens to define the set, in which case you have a circular argument instead.

> If two unique  
>events coincide, it's quite probable they are connected.

Of course, it's unknown. Nothing is known. Is the cognation of the IE family an ultimate truth? No, it's just a plausible conjecture. Maybe I'm a creature from Mars, but it's more plausible to suppose that I'm a bilingual from a different country. All thinking is probabilistic.

No, at this stage the probability of a causal connection is unknown. Don't confuse correlation with causation.

I'm not confusing. I'm merely stating that correlation is *often* the result of causation. Consider this example from detective stories. Two similar murders happened at Main Street. Would detectives suppose it's a mere coincidence

Quite possibly. How many murders happen there per year?

or a work of the same hitman?

>They may not,  
>but thinking otherwise has better chances of being "testable by  
>experiment".

So state your hypothesis,

The thesis was that the Khoisan (or Khoisan) clicks are archaic (have a great time depth of many thousands of years), and it's highly improbable they're a recent innovation acquired from an unknown source.

and describe the experiment that will test it.

Re: Khoisan is very old

Re: Khoisan is very old

So which experiments test the cognation of the IE family?

Hey, you're the one talking about "testable by experiment".

We assume  
that the IE languages come from the same source because it's logical  
to assume so. I can't think of any experiments which can test it.

--

Richard Herring

.