

Re: Question re. Copper artifact Canadian Arctic formerRe:CopperCasting In America (Trevelyan)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-07/1327.html>

From: Seppo Renfors (*Renfors_at_not.com.au*)

Date: 07/16/04

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 2004 01:39:22 GMT

"Floyd L. Davidson" wrote:

>

> *Seppo Renfors <Renfors@not.com.au> wrote:*

> > *"Floyd L. Davidson" wrote:*

> >

> > > *Like I said, *anything* that could be traded for was by*

> > > *definition a "trade item".*

> >

> > > *It has already been rejected as nonsense – and it remains nonsense.*

>

> *Rejected by *you*! (Which is clearly bogus by definition...)*

>

> > > *What they thought was a trade item*

> > > *when they loaded the cargo is one thing; and what they thought*

> > > *was a trade item when they were shipwrecked and planning an*

> > > *overland trek is a different thing. And what was a trade item*

> > > *to the first Eskimo that picked it up off the beach is another*

> > > *thing too!*

> >

> > > *So you are suggesting Norse sailors wouldn't know the difference*

> > > *between essential tools and trade goods? Care to provide the proof, or*

> > > *do we just accept it as ignorance on your part?*

>

> *Where did I say that?*

you don't know? OH DEAR..... I suppose we have to opt for the last explanation of why you said it.

> *What I said is that circumstances change, and people adapt.*

>

> *Shipwrecked sailors, as one example, are *very* creative.*

Nothing at all to do with "trade goods"!

> *While*

- > *it is true that Europeans in general were known for their*
- > *hide-bound stubbornness as Arctic adventurers and Norwegians, in*
- > *particular those in Greenland, seem to have been true to that*
- > *form, it still doesn't follow that something useful as a trade*
- > *item is not going to be traded just because when sitting in the*
- > *home port while the ship was being loaded that item was*
- > *manifested as a maintenance tool rather than as cargo for trade.*

You have to learn the language, you still demonstrate your inability to grasp it. SALVAGE is not "trade items" you know. Look it up in a dictionary.

- > *>Something picked up "off the beach" doesn't qualify as "trade goods",*
- > *>you know. It is merely finding lost property.*
- >
- > *Such limited imagination!*

No, but a knowledge and understanding of the language – that which I point to you lacking, a demonstrated by your deliberate and continuing misrepresentation of terminology!

- > *It might not have been "trade goods"*

So what the bloody hell did you INSIST it was? Was that just for the same of heaping shit on other people, hmmm?

- > *to the ship from which it came, but that has *nothing* to do*
- > *with how the person who finds it washed up on the beach*
- > *classifies it.*

Of course it does, go learn English!!

- > *Perhaps that person, being particularly sharp of*
- > *eye, has found another tool just like it and therefore has no*
- > *need for a second one! Bingo, it is "trade goods" in the eye of*
- > *that particular beholder, and he proceeds very quickly to make a*
- > *deal to trade for something he does need.*

Go learn the language! How often does one have to say that before it sinks in? You attempting to justify your rubbish claims only puts your own credibility in question. The term "trade goods" has a VERY specific meaning and cannot be applied to salvage, or lost property which also have very specific meanings. If it wasn't so, then those terms wouldn't be needed and wouldn't exist. Stop trying to redefine the language.

It really is no point in dealing with the rest UNTIL you start using English properly – NOT with stacks of your personal private definitions.

[..]

--

SIR - Philosopher unauthorised

The one who is educated from the wrong books is not educated, he is misled.
