

## Re: Vineland

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-02/1400.html>

---

**From:** Philip Deitiker (*Nopdeitik\_at\_att.net.Spam*)

**Date:** 02/18/05

Date: 18 Feb 2005 23:22:04 GMT

In sci.archaeology, Eric Stevens created a message ID  
news:12pc11d8jesjc0nhnle32r97ngjfbuvs2p@4ax.com:

> *On Fri, 18 Feb 2005 19:18:16 GMT, Philip Deitiker*  
> *<Donevenask@worlnet.att.net> wrote:*  
>  
>> *Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@sum.co.nz> says in*  
>> *news:3rcb11tqhdcrf8fkvqk3piv1k0uhdk2lh@4ax.com:*  
>>  
>>> *On Thu, 17 Feb 2005 23:45:59 -0700, "Tedd Jacobs"*  
>>> *<Jacobs@mail.boisestate.edu> wrote:*  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> *"Eric Stevens" wrote...*  
>>>>> *On Thu, 17 Feb 2005 05:23:45 -0500, "Steve Marcus"*  
>>>>> *<smarcus\_spamout\_@cox.net> wrote:*  
>>>>>  
>>>>> *--- snip ---*  
>>>>>> *stating that artifact X cannot have been produced later*  
*than*  
>>>>>>> *date Y \*is\* considered to be dating the artifact.*  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> *Sez who?*  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *it's called a typology eric. or were you baiting?*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> *All this started from Seppo's statement that " The ink*  
*hasn't been*  
>>>> *"dated" at all, ... " which as far as I know is perfectly*  
*correct.*  
>>>> *Merely assigning an upper and lower limit to a date range*  
*is not*  
>>>> *dating.*  
>>  
>> *But creating a confidence range based on probabilities is,*  
*for*  
>> *everything can be defined this way, and in doing so it makes*

- >> *precise dates and date ranges comparable.*
- >
- > *I thought you would have understood the difference between confidence*
- > *limits and dates set by boundary conditions.*
- >
- > *Mozart was born on January 27, 1756 and died on December 4, 1792.*
- > *These dates are known and there is no uncertainty about them. These*
- > *dates set absolute boundary conditions.*

Irrelevant.

- > *Clearly these dates can be used to assign a limiting date range for a*
- > *newly discovered manuscript score in Mozart's own hand. It has to have*
- > *been written between the range described between those two dates.*

You are comparing apples and oranges.

Do you know precisely when say the Declaration of Independence was written. You know when it was signed, but what about written. Can you tell me exactly when I wrote a manuscript that was published on a certain date. Can you tell from the birth record when a child was conceived, the exact date.

There are 'dates' for discrete events. There are dates for events. For example if I was born in the early part of 1951 I can date my conception to 1950. That is a date. If for instance I found a corpse under a battlefield with say civil war attire on and a bullet hole in the uniform, I could date that death to 1860s that is also a date, even though that individual did die on a specific date, I don't know that specifically.

The argument is not over whether a date can be represented by a date range that in many instances is treated as a date, since in many cases no specific date is expected so that the question of specific date is moot to begin with. The argument was over whether that date range is meaningful and how it is meaningful.

- > *Radiocarbon dating the paper will yield a specific date but because of*
- > *the confidence limits of the various steps of the process by which the*
- > *date was arrived at upper and lower dates can be assigned*

along with

> *their associated confidence limits. Change the confidence limits and*

> *the nominally upper and lower radiocarbon dates also change.*

In any

> *case, one cannot be absolutely confident that the age of the*

> *manuscript paper lies outside the upper and lower confidence limits.*

>

> *The fact that in both cases we use two numbers to describe the*

> *possible age of the manuscript does not mean that the meaning of the*

> *numbers is the same in both cases. That's why Steve Marcus's original*

> *denial of the Seppo's statement was wrong. He was trying to contradict*

> *chalk with cheese.*

Historical dates only apply to a small subset of historical timeline, they are convenient, and certainly useful in autobiographical means. However you are clouding this issue because a woman takes a few hours to birth a child at most a few hours, and death occurs in moments. The manufacturing of a map may take weeks and it may not be revealed in public for months, if not years later. Therefore your consideration of exact date is meaningless in this context. But there is no date for when this map was penned, not even an approximate date based on any historical document other than its first public appearance. It would be akin to the date of birth of a stone age person in which the anthropologist is trying to estimate based on oral traditions of a group. The only methods you have are interpretive in nature and are an approximation.

Chances are however if the child is 1 month old you will have a better estimate of the age than if the child is 14 years old. This is the relevance of relative dating. Relative dating can result in a date which is a day, a week, a month, a year, a decade, a century. Depending on its distance from the current will reveal meaning of that date. In most cases, and even some cases of birth, for instance, the birth of a child may not be recorded until the baptism, or for instance may be kept secret as a result of marital infidelity, exact dates are rarities in ancient history.

Can you tell me the exact date in a roman calendar that leif ericson stepped on continental america for the first time. When I left Japan it was the 9th, for a 30 minute period I crossed the international date line and it was the 8th, and then it was the 9th as I traveled further east. What is a date that you are so intent on distinguishing from dating?

And shall we use your same standard of critique for everything, and if so the VM does not have a precise date of

sci.archaeology: Re: Vineland

creation, therefore it is a fraud? Correct? Mercators map does  
not have a precise date of creation therefore it is a fraud?  
Shall I continue?

--

Philip

-----  
Mol. Anth. Group <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/DNAanthro/>  
Mol. Evol. Hominids <http://home.att.net/~DNAPaleoAnth/>  
Evol. of Xchrom.  
<http://home.att.net/~DNAPaleoAnth/xlinked.htm>  
Pal. Anth. Group <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Paleoanthro/>  
Sci. Arch. Aux  
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/sciarchauxilliary/>  
DNAPaleoAnth at Att dot net