

Re: Vineland

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-02/1399.html>

From: Steve Marcus (*smarcus_spamout__at_cox.net*)

Date: 02/18/05

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 18:21:44 -0500

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> wrote in message
news:vpfc11pjj7oggn6g00p15vh5j4hnbb09sn@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 18 Feb 2005 05:44:47 -0500, "Steve Marcus"
> <smarcus_spamout__at_cox.net> wrote:
>
>>
>> "Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> wrote in message
>> news:5tra11plhrkn2kuhqu6mkdjm5s9nq183qj@4ax.com...
>>> On 18 Feb 2005 03:23:00 GMT, Philip Deitiker <Nopdeitik@att.net.Spam>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> I don't know that the parchment is 17th century.
>>>>
>>>> I understand that it is generally accepted that the parchment comes
>>>> from this period.
>>>>
>>>>> It doesn't
>>>>> seem to me conclusive. Troubling with this document is the
>>>>> nature of the Ink and differences in the inks used in the
>>>>> document.
>>>>>
>>>>>> I would quibble with the word "necessry", saying instead
>>>>>> that the the
>>>>>> failure to provide provenance should alert the interested
>>>>>> purchaser to an
>>>>>> increased possibility that the document **may not** be
>>>>>> authentic. Nota bene
>>>>>> the qualifier "may not."
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Right, may not, but you are not a buyer, you are looking at
>>>>>>> this from a scientific point of view, should it be added to
>>>>>>> the knowledge database or rejected.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Agreed, but that wasn't the burden of Seppo's original post,
>>>>>>>> or my reply
>>>>>>>> thereto, or Eric's reply to my reply.

>>>>
>>>> *It doesn't matter what the burden of Seppo's post was, the
>>>> reality is that there are independent factors that create
>>>> reasoning for not entertaining this map as of scientific
>>>> value.*
>>>>
>>>>> *No. At least I'm not. I'm participating in this branch of
>>>>> the thread
>>>>> because of Seppo's obviously erroneous post, and Eric's
>>>>> equally obvious
>>>>> attempt to cloud the issue regarding the meaning of the
>>>>> anatase crystals
>>>>> that are present, solely in the yellow lines, on the VM.*
>>>>
>>>>> *I don't think this time he is clouding it, and in any case I
>>>>> am unclouding the issue by arguing that the map lacks proper
>>>>> historical documentation to take seriously. In any case there
>>>>> are scenarios in which it was forged, and that is a great
>>>>> matter for a historical group to discuss, but this is
>>>>> archaeology and the map pertains to settlement, and in this
>>>>> regard it becomes a bit impertinent.*
>>>>
>>>>>> *So we can heed Eric's
>>>>>> point for the moment,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I think not, since Eric's point was that saying that the ink
>>>>>> hasn't been
>>>>>> dated is an absurd statement. It certainly has been dated
>>>>>> in the sense that
>>>>>> many archaeological/anthropological artifacts have been
>>>>>> dated. (See * below)
>>>>>> Specifically, it was dated to a range: not older than the
>>>>>> 20th century. As
>>>>>> per info provided by Doug McDonald, I'll generously claim
>>>>>> the range to be
>>>>>> not older than the 17th century.*
>>>>
>>>>> *I don't disagree with that but the papers I read did not set
>>>>> an exact date,
>>>>
>>>> That was the point made by Seppo.
>>
>> *But since setting an exact date is something that quite often isn't done
>> when dating an artifact (dating is often given as a range of dates), and
>> is
>> wholly irrelevant to the present scientific evidence quite clearly
>> demonstrating that the VM is a fake, what precisely was the value or
>> purpose
>> of Seppo's point other than to mislead??
>
> You now seem to be conceding that Seppo's statement was correct. I**

- > *find it difficult to see how even you can claim to be misled by*
- > *correct statements.*

You have even more trouble reading for comprehension than I had given you credit for.

Seppo's post said nothing about "exact dates." Seppo wrote: "The ink hasn't been "dated" at all, contrary to the claim, is a good starting point." This statement is incorrect. The ink on the Vinland Map has been dated, the dating has been in terms of a range of dates.

There is nothing unusual about an artifact being dated in terms of a range of years. Many artifacts that are C14 dated to "X years before present, plus or minus Y years", like many fossils or other artifacts (say arrow heads) that are dated by reference to geological strata and are dated to "year X, plus or minus Y years". So notwithstanding that the date may be a range of dates, the ink on the Vinland Map has in fact been dated. It was dated by McCrone and Brown/Clark's work to circa 1920, and the upper range for the VM would be the date that it was shown to Witten, 1957. Assuming that one wanted to allow for the 17th century existence of technology by which one could have produced small quantities of anatase of the sort found in the ink on the VM, the range would be 1600 CE – 1957 CE. That still is "dating" the ink, and the range is far smaller than is often given for fossil finds, as one example.

- >
- >>*For that matter, what was the*
- >>*value or purpose of your defense of Seppo's point, other than to mislead??*
- >
- > *Seppo's statement was correct. Your argument against it wasn't.*

That's both wrong, and dishonest. In the field of archaeology, in the field of anthropology, in the field of geology, and with respect to artifacts in general, dating is quite often in terms of ranges of dates. No one speaks of the necessity of having an "exact date", and Seppo surely did not do so.

- >
- > *Why should you use an incorrect argument for any reason other than to*
- > *mislead?*

You are the one doing that, not I. The difference is that I know why you are doing it. As previously posted, you just can't stand it that the present state of the evidence clearly establishes that VM is a fake. So, as previously predicted, you are generating reams of squink to divert attention (principally your own attention) from that fact.

- >
- >
- > *Aaaagh never mind.*
- >
- > *You are back on ignore for the time being.*
- >

Right. Sure I am, Eric.

>

>

>

> *Eric Stevens*

>

Steve

--

The above posting is neither a legal opinion nor legal advice, because we do not have an attorney-client relationship, and should not be construed as either. This posting does not represent the opinion of my employer, but is merely my personal view. To reply, delete `_spamout_` and replace with the numeral 3