§3 Crawling Towards Integrity

A Historical

A1 The 1995 May issue of the *Journal for the History of Astronomy* contains (at p.164) a historic item: the JHA has there actually (for the first time ever) cited DIO. Moreover, the 1991 May author, Muffia-protégé Alex Jones, has explicitly stated that there were three errors in his 1991 May JHA lead paper and that the correct math was first published in *DIO* 1:2-3’s “Muffia Oribtuary”.

A2 Whatever the shortcomings of this JHA notice, it is nonetheless an event which (we are obliged & glad to acknowledge) DIO predicted would not happen at all.

A3 However, what JHA Ed. Michael Hoskin has done so far is depressingly minimal2 — and even this only occurred after Eliot Marshall of *Science* (Amer Assoc Adv Sci) placed a phonecall to Jones’ home and another to the Cambridge Univ-trained mathematician Hugh Thurston (who had directly informed the JHA of its benders) — a phonecall also known to Muffissi (notice at *DIO* 4.2 77 §B38).

A4 So, it has taken [a] years, [b] independent-method Cambridge-math-verification, & [c] two AAAS phonecalls even to get the JHA to own up to errors of elementary arithmetic. And there has not been the slightest indication of Muffia-JHA interest in going beyond this slim concession. (To the contrary: §§D6, §§E3, §§G, §§H, & *DIO* 4.3 15 §F4.) The consistent, regrettable suggestion is: for JHA & Muffia finally to acknowledge their manifold errors of post-highschool math will presumably require even greater stimulation than that cited in §§A3. Well, we at DIO will do what we can, to provide what is needed.

A5 But one must crawl before walking. So this JHA correcting-note is encouraging; and we must cheer&chide the Muffia along, as it snails down the long road towards integrity.

B Three Muffs Down, Three Dozen Retractions to Go

B1 But, besides the Muffia Oribtuary affair, there have been several other JHA disasters. Like forty-odd. (See, e.g., fn 1, reminder at *DIO* 2.1 42 §§M, & compact itemization of Muffia muffs at §§A of “Casting Pearls Before Pyglets”, *DIO* 4.1 44.) There has been no Hist.sci notice of any of these miscues, though officers of all the erring journals are now aware of them. Evidently, simply not reading (or acknowledging or citing) the corrections is considered acceptable behavior in Hist.sci (§B2 & fn 3): a curiously dishonest way of protecting one’s reputation for honesty.

B2 From DR’s 1995/3/14 letter to a Hoskin-circle Hist.sci figure (footnotes in orig):

Why is it that I want refereeing of the ancient astronomy controversy — while, by contrast, the Muffia has fled it for decades? (Why has Hist.sci condoned this?) … JHA’s Hoskin will not [even] look at *DIO* (see *DIO* 4.2 §7 §B6) . . . . Perhaps some think that this ploy will help excuse a deliberate policy of nonciting2 *DIO*. Moegaard has told3 DR directly (1994/5/6) that he swore over 10 years ago to have nothing to do with DR, so his noncitation-policy [see bizarre instance remarked parenthetically at *DIO* 1.2 fn 56] is deliberate by his own account. Is this honest scholarship? Is it considered ethical in Hist.sci to fake the nonexistence of existing discoveries by Unapproved scholars, and [b] to fake the nonexistence of existing ironclad5 refutations of Approved scholars’ attacks on heresy6 — attacks which are then cited (e.g., *Centaurus* 37:97, p.149 n.1) . . . without informing the reader of DIO’s demonstration of these attacks’ fatal blunders. . . .

B3 [In the ancient astronomy controversy, one] side (*DIO*) is citing all Mufa’s “Muffa Orbituary”. Moreover, the 1991 May author, Mufa-protégé Alex Jones, has explicitly stated that there were three of Muffia's demonstration of these attacks’ fatal blunders. . . . errors in his 1991 May JHA paper, the Mufa's devastating criticism of its blunders. . . .

B4 Why would a cult insist upon going right on evading honest parties in such a haughty fashion, thereby inviting the continuation of a running-sore disgrace to academe? Well, if you want to know, you’ll have to ask the cultists themselves.

C Thurston’s Proof

C1 In the summer of 1994, Hugh Thurston (Prof. Emeritus, Univ Brit. Columbia Math Dep’t) found, by geometric (ancient) means, the orbit which t’s the Almajest 4.2 solution is impossible), DR had unthinkingly presumed that the solution would be iterative. However, what (the ancient astronomy controversy, one) side ([In the ancient astronomy controversy, one] side(*DIO*) is citing all Mufa’s “Muffa Orbituary”. Moreover, the 1991 May author, Mufa-protégé Alex Jones, has explicitly stated that there were three of Muffia's demonstration of these attacks’ fatal blunders. . . . errors in his 1991 May JHA paper, the Mufa's devastating criticism of its blunders. . . .

C2 Thurston quickly solved the problem — noniteratively. He sent his result to the JHA, adding a note which pointed out that it confirmed the (iteratively-derived) DR results published at *DIO* 1.1 26 §§eqs.17-18.

1 I gather that JHA requested & received the article’s title, for the Jones note’s bibliography — but then broke the journal’s own luthero-sacredly-rigid style-rule by omitting this title, since Hoskin personally disapproved of its mention of “Muffia”. (He has printed [& never apologized for] highly insulting Muffia charges against R.Newton’s competence [*DIO* 1.1 11 §C7], which was of the highest order; but JHA cannot print DR’s use of the word “Muffia” for the Neugebauer clique, which actually has published dozens of muffs: forty-five catalogued at *DIO* 4.1 44 §§A; more here at 11 fn 1. Enjoy also the Muffia’s inadvertent gross slander of its own godtop: *DIO* 1.3 25 fn 15.) This censorial comedy recommends the approach announced in DIO’s inside-back-cover publisher’s statement: DIO authors can use any style they like. Their choice, not DIO’s.

2 Are Muffissi hoping onlookers will conclude that DR is as Impossible as pre-labelled (Rawlins 1991W §B1), from his failure instantly to assume the proper footkissing-gratitude-prostrate-position (§C5), at the JHA’s amazingly small&utmiddly concession? (Compare fn 7 [1995/3/14 letter] vs. §§D6, G, & H.) Note: the Muffia’s utter inability to understand DR will continue so long as Muffissi insist (§C5, §E, fn 15, §H) upon noncommunication.

3 See *DIO* 1.2 §C11 [d] end, *DIO* 2.1 13 §§f 15, *DIO* 4.1 44 fn 1, & *DIO* 4.2 57 p.5.7 & §7 fn 12.

4 Most bizarre: Moegaard’s words showed anger at DR! So did an unexplained crack by OG (also 1994/5). Is this the first case in history where the muggers affected haughty moral outrage at the muggee’s choice to resist? There has been no Hist.sci notice of any of these miscues, though officers of all the erring journals are now aware of them. Evidently, simply not reading (or acknowledging or citing) the corrections is considered acceptable behavior in Hist.sci (§B2 & fn 3): a curiously dishonest way of protecting one’s reputation for honesty.

5 Heresy may not be published or cited until proper refutation has been concocted [even if this takes many years (e.g., *DIO* 4.3 15 §§J, K), and the eventual “refutation” collapses from freshman-math botchery (e.g., *DIO* 2.3 §f 24&31); thus, the citation can & must] be immediately followed by counter-citation of an anti-thoughtcrime source. [E.g., van Dalen 1994: see here at §DIO 1.1 fn 31.] See also [*DIO* 4.3 15 §§H and] *DIO* 1.2 fn 15.

6 *See, e.g., lists of examples at *DIO* 1.2 fn 16 & fn 17. I am also preparing to publish an exceedingly generous note if the JHA openly admits (what it now knows, to its chagrin) that the 3 Hipparchan Greek-style orbits, which its lead 1991/5 paper decreed undeniable, have been found & published by *DIO* 1.1 13 — where all 3 orbits have been related to Hipparchan data. (This doesn’t mean DIO will cease criticizing the Muffs & others. But, the more Muffia credits we can admire, the better.) [Note added 1995/12: This message (& *DIO* 4.2 §7 §B42) towards JHA’s incommunicado conductance had no effect upon the 1995/5/8 mini-retraction — one more measure of JHA educability & remorse-depth.

7 *E.g., *DIO* 1.1 13 §§C, fn 36, *DIO* 2.2 fn 98, and more to come in upcoming issues, e.g., [here at §C1 & p.2]. [Note added 1995/12: See also §§C1-C2, §§C5, & *DIO* 4.3 12 fn 2.]
C3 While DR was glad that the JHA replied at all to Thurston, it must be said that JHA’s reception of the Thurston note was atypical from the start: Hoskin did not acknowledge receipt until after refereeing. At that point, Hoskin said that the JHA would publish a version that was agreeable to Jones. (Note that, had Jones been a completely dishonest scholar, this policy could have given him the power to squelch the note. It’s happened.) No thought of checking with JHA-shunned DR, who had caused the entire proceedings — not to mention having indisputably first arrived at (and published: DIO 1.1 §6) the orbit which fit trio C.

C4 Now, when a journal has published an erroneous paper by scholar J, whose errors are corrected by scholar x, it might seem to you and me that the party whose advice should be sought is the latter. But that is not the way the JHA operates, since this journal’s prime measure of authors is personal rather than substantial. Despite the strong hint at DIO 4.2 (p.54 News Note C), neither Hoskin nor the Mufia communicated with DR during the refereeing, composition, & publishing of the JHA correction.

C5 I quote further from the 1995/3/14 DR letter excerpted at §B2:

What kind of journal publishes a correcting note based on scholar x’s revelation of . . . errors in a lead paper in the journal, illustrating the journal’s refereeing derelictions, but refuses to see refereeing by or even [communication] with scholar x? (Hoskin’s condition for publishing the correction was that the note must be approved by the [erroneous author], not the corrector. Do you seriously regard DIO as over-reacting, when we treat the Hist.sci community as a zany cult?) It seems that DR is the only party who [DIO 2.3 §6 [F3]] doesn’t want the Mufia-DIO war to continue. (I prefer concentrating on historical discoveries, not modern flubaddubs.) However, the Mufia insists on keeping its lordly nose in the air (see Black Affidavit, DIO 1.3 §10, end of §4 [also at DIO 4.3 §15 §2]), and its critics are delighted to watch DIO keep bloodying that nose.

C6 If a cult keeps cheating scholars, some naive souls may object. A few extreme-nonrealists (DIO 4.3 §15 §C11) may even do so out in public.

D Secrecy’s Costs, or: How Not to Publish a Retraction

D1 Though the main initial referee report on Thurston’s paper was something of a credit to the JHA, Hoskin’s close-to-the-approach then undermined the opportunity for progress — and even (§D8) needlessly graded accuracy a bit.

D2 The JHA’s referee report on Thurston’s note commented:

Are the parameters for the eccentricity and apogee historically supported? . . . some verification of any historical use of these parameters apart from this derivation would be necessary in order to reach any conclusions.

D3 Can this theory [the DR&Thurston Greek-trig solution of trio C] explain the discrepancies between Hipparchus and Ptolemy in the eclipse trio observations? [I.e., trios A&B of Jones 1991 & DIO 1.2-3.] If the author can explain these as well, then the case for Hipparchus using a “Ptolemaic” solar motion will be much stronger, since it is the eclipse trios that led Jones to the Babylonian model [as an explanation for Hipparchus’ solar positions].

D4 Had the JHA merely possessed the emotional calmness to seek input from an exiled (§3 & DIO 1.2 §B3) party, Hoskin would’ve had the answers to these comments.

D5 As to ref-comment §D3: DIO 1.3 §8 [M4 & K9] contained (fn 21) the very Greek-trig solutions, for both trio A & trio B, which the JHA’s own referee recommended be brought to bear on the issue. (Not only solar orbits but lunar orbits as well: ibid eqs.6, 8, 9, 19, & 20.) However, JHA readers are not informed of that — i.e., of the cohesive breadth of the DIO achievement, which used the same Greek-trig-orbit idea to solve all three of Hipparchos’ eclipse trios.

D6 Regarding ref-comment §D2, on historical support of Greek-trig solar solutions: [i] All three orbits (fitting trios A, B, & C) are shown to be founded upon season-length data which are historically connected to Hipparchos. See ibid §M5 (trio A), §§K4-K9 (trio B), & DIO 1.1 §6 [§C6f] (trio C). [ii] Moreover, the long-mysterious amplitude of the error curve of the zodiacal stars of the (late Hipparchos) Ancient Star Catalog is perfectly matched by the amplitude of the error curve of the (late Hipparchos) trio C orbit. (See ibid §§F3-F5.) [iii] Finally, the Almajes 5.5 mean longitude of the uncomputed 2nd position of trio C agrees on the nose with the DIO solution for trio C. (See the astonishing match at ibid §H5.) Again, JHA readers are not informed of any of this — despite the urging of Hoskin’s chosen referee that such material be brought in.

D7 Evidently fearing that further interaction might produce requests for adding such — which would reveal just how powerfully & consistently the historical & mathematical evidence favors the DR solutions — Hoskin instead: [a] continued the JHA’s immature refusal to communicate with DR (whose corrections were, after all, the cause of the entire Thurston article & Jones retraction!), and [b] failed (uncharacteristically) to send Thurston the article’s proofs.

D8 The results of Hoskin’s behavior (which placed accuracy not quite atop the JHA’s list of priorities [§I]): [a] A potentially confusing slip’ never got corrected. [b] An astronomical immortality’s name was mis-spelled. [c] The 2nd observation’s time of day was 5 2/3 hours, but the JHA printed it as 5 hours. (Such errors will create problems for any JHA reader who tries to check the math of the situation. But, then, as Thurston has often pointed out, I would’ve had the answers to these comments. (Not only solar orbits but lunar orbits as well: ibid eqs.6, 8, 9, 19, & 20.) However, JHA readers are not informed of that — i.e., of the cohesive breadth of the DIO achievement, which used the same Greek-trig-orbit idea to solve all three of Hipparchos’ eclipse trios.

D9 In Thurston’s ms as submitted, the 2nd paragraph begins: “There is in fact a simple eccentric solar motion . . . that accounts for [the trio C observations].” However, in an attempt to save Mufa face, Hoskin made an astounding, uncomprehending, and invertedly false insertion — without even asking the author’s (or Jones’) permission! — and altered the above passage to read (insertion italicized): “As Jones shows, there is in fact a simple eccentric solar motion . . . that accounts for [the trio C observations].”

D10 The foregoing details are provided partly as a warning to those scholars who are trusting enough to send material to the JHA. Lesson: you never know how it’s going to come out. . . . (It’s an Art Levine satire-fantasy,11 come to life.)

11 I prefer concentrating on historical discoveries, not modern flubaddubs.) However, the Mufia insists on keeping its lordly nose in the air (see Black Affidavit, DIO 1.3 §10, end of §4 [also at DIO 4.3 §15 §2]), and its critics are delighted to watch DIO keep bloodying that nose.

D11 The whole point of the 1991/5 JHA paper (which the Thurston note undoes) is the claim that Greek eccentric motion will NOT account for the data.

11 A. Levine (ContribEd., WM) “Have You Got What It Takes to Write for the Washington Monthly?,” WM 21.1:54. (Editor Chas. Peters not only had the integrity and self-critical humor to run this in 1979 — he then re-ran it in the 1989/2 issue, “Writers for the Washington Monthly sometimes complain that we’re a little too, shall we say, unbiased, about urging our point of view upon them — and their manuscripts. . . . Are you sitting at home wondering: How can I become a Washington Monthly writer? . . . Could I get published in your magazine? Welcome aboard! Our top-notch editors will be glad to add [to your ms] . . . loads of thought-provoking opinions without troubling you with the dreary task of doing it yourself. Many contented writers have said that there’s no surprise quite like seeing a manuscript of the their end up as an article in The Washington Monthly. Often they find themselves espousing ideas they’ve never even heard of, much less agree with.”
E How to Throw Away a Chance for Progress

In addition to Hoskin’s continuing silence towards DR:

E1 At the 1994/5/6-8 Dibner Inst conference (M.I.T.), DR spoke amicably to a number of Muffa scholars. But no communication has come from any side. (To the contrary, no unenunciated Hist.sci scholar dares submit papers to DIO, for fear of cult ostracism.)

E2 We understand that K.Moesgaard (Univ Aarhus, Denmark) is reluctant to review our Tycho star catalog (DIO 3. 1993) — which he privately deems valuable — so long as it contains anything displeasing to the Muffa. (Some Hist.sci scholars — even Danes — regard political game-playing as more important than doing justice to Denmark’s Tycho and to accurate history.) However, Annals of Science and Isis have recently requested & received review copies of the DIO Tycho catalog. (Predictably, the J.Hist. Astronomy has not been heard from.) Good to see; however, in an ongoing context of archon aloofness & conference-exclusion (and years of Hist.sci’s total-blackout-nocitation of the DR discovery [DIO 2.1 [4 Tables 1&2] that Tycho faked 10 stars], DIO will, until the reviews appear, maintain a skeptical wait-see attitude: reasonable in light of the boilerplate negative 1995/6 Isis 86:309 Muffa review of the work of H.Thurston, who’d disobeyed Muffa orders not to support or even cite DR: DIO 4.3 §15 [E3].

E3 As I have made known to several scholars recently, the Muffa&mio seem to have no wish (fun 7&22, 71 §2) to make any essential change in their habits. (All right, all right, so we made a few technical slips, but nothing here upsets orthodoxy or hegemony.) A unilateral refusal to communicate is an obvious sign of this. (E.g., §§1, 71 fn 31.) As also is the very recent Isis-Muffa attempt (§E2) to harm a DIO sympathizer. (DR has written and/or phoned several Neugebauer-clan-Muffosi over the years. [See, e.g., DIO 1.3 fn 280.] Nothing has come back. After two decades of such, I’m catching a trend here.)

E4 By this time, Muffosi know just as well as DR that: [a] their horrid behavior will be embarrassingly repulsive to future historians & [b] Muffa-proscribed RN-DR work will be regarded as of value (as will some Muffa work). Question: knowing that, sooner or later, we’re going to end up at [b] (probably sooner — unless recent Hist.sci gesturelets are just cynical pretenses), what sort of scholars need to be tediously dragged, kicking & snarling, millimeter by millimeter, to our presumed eventual state of fairness & tolerance? Why not just go straight there without more decades of bloodletting?


E6 I remain (as always)17 prepared to sit down with Muffosi (not in terrified-Mufosi I remain (as always) [c] Direct communication (1992?). [d] Acknowledgement of some heresies’ truth (20??). [e] Acknowledgement of their value to the field (20???)).

F The Positives

But I’ll end on the upbeat aspects of the Muffa-Orbituary incident. While the JHA appears to have done little more than the bare minimum [this consistent strategy becomes crystal clear at §H] (so that, knowing AAAS-Science to be watching [^[A3-A4], JHA can appear nonetheless: some slight improvement is visible.

F1 First, Hoskin’s promise to publish the Thurston & Jones note was kept. (A similar Hoskin promise to DR has not been kept: DIO 1.1 fn 25 & Rawlins 1991W §O8. DR continues to await its consummation — and Hoskin’s attainment of sufficient maturity to communicate with DR.) Further: the following §F2&F3 compliments reflect some credit also upon Hoskins since the JHA: F2 Second, Alex Jones (Isis Board) deserves commendation for going somewhat beyond Wolfe & Pedersen, offering to [a] publish the DIO Tycho catalog, [b] distribute thousands of advertisements, & [c] make DR famous. [Curious. DR never sought such spectacular intercession. Index Librorum Prohibitorum Vat City 1948 p.xv: It is the faithful’s duty to report dangerous (fn 13) literature.) Contracting for this Imprimatur would risk: [i] “editing” at the hands of those who will condone no delinquent of Muffa majesty (§E2), & [ii] removing [credit from DIO & control (see DIO 2.1 §3 fn 8) of the work’s date [or even act] of publication into said hands. (DR just went with iminest distribution of the uncensored DIO 3 rendition of the Tycho catalog.) DR had already been through this process before (again: instant DR-assent requested), with Moesgaard & JHA, as regards the latter’s written 1981/9/17 acceptance of a paper now known as Rawlins 1999: see DIO 1.1 fn 25. (On the former, see: JHA 1.2 fn 176 & DIO 4.3 §15 fn 41.) Over 10 years later, the paper remains unpublished. (General rule: don’t rush into publication-offers connected to cliques who’ve spent years ignoring and/or slandering everything you’ve already published.) Approaches are more convincing when they aren’t flagrantly cart-before-horse [e.g., DIO 1.1 [A9, DIO 4.4 §7 [B42]: i.e., partial-respect citations come first, & then later we get to publication-cooperation.)

F3 Third, Hugh Thurston was the sole participating scholar who possessed the specialized math knowledge and the sheer nerve that were required to compose his correcting note and then to send it to the JHA. For these deeds, he merits the gratitude and admiration of every ancient-astrology scholar — and, as well, of all academics who value open thinking and free speech in the scholarly community.
G  Postscript A: Un-Re-Evaluating

G1 A Hist.sci scholar of the highest credentials & international esteem wrote Thurston (1994/12/29, with copy to DR):

I am so very pleased to see that your article will appear in JHA [26:164; 1995/5], as it deserves . . . . I am glad both that the meanderings of Jones’ argumentation can be set aside, and that Rawlins will have a little bit of recognition for the discovery of UH [Hipparchos’ long-lost solar orbit, used by him for his solar-obs trio C] . . . . I have checked [Rawlins’] calculations and found nothing to quibble about. I hope your article will trigger some important re-evaluations.

G2 In the many months since, nothing has been re-evaluated.¹⁹

H  Postscript B: Biggie’s Smallness Confuses Even Him

H1 On 1995/6/2, Thurston sent the following to Hoskin, asking that it be printed as a correction to Thurston’s JHA 26:164 note:

The phrase “As Jones shows” which starts the second paragraph is not part of the original note and was added without my knowledge. It was Rawlins, not Jones, who showed that a simple eccentric motion fits the data . . . . What Jones did was to try but fail (as his addendum openly and honestly acknowledges) to show that no continuous motion fits the data . . . . Hugh Thurston

H2 On 1995/6/20, Hoskin responded by: [i] transmitting an incredibly complicated attempted explanation for JHA’s inexcusable behavior, and [ii] refusing to publish Thurston’s very brief §H1 notice, instead publishing Hoskin’s own ultra-brief correcting note (pleading carelessness,²⁰ contra §§C3-C5 and §§D7-D9), thus, directly refusing to publish an unambiguous notice that DR has contributed significantly to scientific history. (JHA can hardly claim that it has made DR’s contributions clear, when its own Editor pleads so much confusion about the matter, that JHA has had to correct itself!) The latest JHA note could’ve simply said that “As Rawlins shows” was meant. But Hoskin sees black at the middle word: after years of Hoskin attempts to banish & damn DR into nonexistence (for which JHA will never express regret), the JHA just can’t bring itself to frankly admit an important DR achievement. I.e., the most vital shortcoming here is not of math but of character.

H3 Hoskin’s §H2 gyrations add to those described earlier here — and have the same bottom lines: embarrassment-minimization, & the JHA’s squandering yet another opportunity to partake of the bracing & cleansing experience of honest, open, uninhibited generosity. (In extenuation: [i] Even though posing as the type of deity known as “editor”, Hoskin is human; no one enjoys self-emarrassment. [ii] He has, for years, had untrustworthy advice from archeons whose eminence superficially implied trustworthiness, and whose hefty censorial bigotry constrained editorial options.) Plain facts: [a] Hoskin tampered with Thurston’s text in a way that tended to cover JHA shame. [b] JHA then prevented correction of this inexcusable alteration by failing to send proofs to Thurston. [c] Now, it must prevent publication of the further §H1 embarrassment — failing yet again to print (as DR repeatedly urged: fn 7 & DIO 4.2 §B42; see also §§D5-D6) clear JHA acknowledgement of DIO’s undeniable priority in proving that (contra JHA’s lead paper) Greek-style continuous-function solutions fit all the 3 trios of Almajest data under discussion in the JHA paper and (§D5) that all 3 of these orbit-solutions are derived & presented²¹ in DIO 1.2-3.

H4 Adding to these credits, the Journal for-the-History-of-Astronomy has also refused even to inform its readership of the existence of DIO’s 1993 Tycho star catalog, published by DR, with whom Hoskin still insists on total noncommunication — a unilateral breach that persists (it’s been over 12 years) only & entirely because Hoskin is afraid that ending it under criticism might create a Wicked-Witch-style meltdown of a long-nurtured image of: Bigness. He remains sadly short of understanding the deeper meaning of the word.

H5 It’s inspirational to realize that (contra the naive mild optimism²² of §A5), despite the daunting challenges presented by the JHA’s ghastly “Mufa Orbituary” (DIO 1.2-3) episode, nonetheless, that curious journal’s degree of devotion to integrity, impersonal equity, and astronomical history has overcome all — and thus (§E3) miraculously emerged essentially intact.²³

I  Postscript C: Priorities & Sentences

I1 Hoskin’s last letter (1983/3/3) before condemning DR (3/21) to an indeterminate²⁴ sentence of exile:

. . . . I devoutly hope that in future you will honour other editors with your contributions. Your undoubted talents are bought at too high a price.

I2 I urge that Hoskin issue a public (not [typically] behind-the-back, thus uncheckable) explanation of the mysterious priorities underlying that revealing final sentence.

¹⁹ Indeed, despite the Mufa Orbituary disasters (and DR’s perfect-fit Hipparchos-based solutions to all the 3 data trios involved: §H3), Muffiosis continue lockstep-swearning that the solar data of eclipse-trios A&B are Babylonian: DIO 4.3 §15 fn 26. See DR-vs-Mufia comparisons at Rawlins 1991W fn 209. Similarly, see ibid §§P1-P2.

²⁰ JHA 26:274 (1995/8): “In the Note by Hugh Thurston that appeared on p.146 of our May issue, the opening words of the second paragraph ‘As Jones shows’ were an incorrect editorial gloss and should be deleted. The Editor pleads incuria.”

²¹ See DIO 1.2 fn 33.

²² See the more prescient suggestion at DIO 1.2 fn 30: “In reaction to Hist.sci’s current [‘Mufia Orbituary’] incident, no Hist.sci institution will effect any changes beyond the cosmetic.”

²³ The standing causes of Mufia niggardliness & non-motion are discussed at DIO 4.3 §15 §§E4&E7.

²⁴ DIO-JHA 1.2 §B3. Note: Hoskin hasn’t many more years left in which to fulfill the JHA’s written 1981 agreement (fn 12) to publish Rawlins 1999.