

## Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-04/msg00329.html>

---

- *From:* Philip Deitiker <[Nopdeitik@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Nopdeitik@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 12 Apr 2005 14:34:46 GMT
- 

In sci.archaeology, Tom McDonald created a message ID [news:4IH5e.85\\$562.54@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:4IH5e.85$562.54@xxxxxxxxx):

> Eric Stevens wrote:

>> On Fri, 08 Apr 2005 09:54:40 +0200, Thomas Zahr

>> <[ThomasZahr0503@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ThomasZahr0503@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

>>

>>

>>>I.E\_Johansson posted:

>>>

>>>

>>>>David,

>>>>you and Ken are making a hugh mistake believing that an

>>>>assumption from which you start your argumentation in

>>>>anyway could and can be used as proof. What's been done

>>>>from your side as well as from others who believe the VM  
to

>>>>be a forgery, is to forget that nothing what so ever has

>>>>been put on the table which can be used against VM no

>>>>matter if you refer to anatase – which exists in same size

>>>>in nature for example in parts of Norway, outside a

>>>>monestry in England as well as in two areas in the Alps

>>>>close to monestries; or it's your fictive trying to argue

a

>>>>double ink – as long as the ink hasn't been identified,

>>>>AND

>>>>as long as double ink hasn't been proven to exist,

>>>>there is no way anyone using scholarly methods can use

that

>>>>against VM! That's basic argumentation methods limits you

>>>>are trying to 'walk over'. You can't.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>I'm sorry, but all this is besides the point.

>>>>

>>>>There are two possible scenarios:

>>>>

>>>>a) the map is authentic

>>>>

## Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

>>>If the map is authentic, it must be possible to describe  
the  
>>>process followed to produce it, taking all it's properties  
>>>into account.  
>>  
>>  
>> Hmm. Would you go so far as to say then that the Great  
Pyramid is a  
>> fake?

Do the great pyramids lack provenance? Does Eric try to create  
diversions when he is losing his argument?

Back on topic, logically. The Vinland map appears in the late  
50's

1. It lacks provenance
2. It is out of place in the book which it was found which  
dates to 1400s
3. Its parchment can be defined as out of synch with the  
original page orientations in the book.
4. There are 'out of period' errors in the writing on the  
parchment.
5. The VM map, by radiocarbon dating was clearly doctored, and  
unless someone at Yale admits to it, it was most likely done  
before it was publically revealed.
6. There are inconsistencies and irregularities in the Ink.

IOW, because of the irregularities in the document the  
definition and construction are germane. The making of  
parchments and inks for the PERIOD are well known, they are  
from the historic period. The pyramids were built at the  
prehistoric/historic boundary and our written record of how  
megaliths were built from that period is not clear.  
If the vinland map was from the 14th century its ink and  
other illustrative properties should match

1. The ink and properties of the rest of the Tartar  
Relationship.
2. The map elements should be similar to other map elements  
from the period arranged in similar fashion, the wording and  
such should be similar.
3. There should be no 'ink' elements that come from a later  
period, and these elements should be found in other  
illustrations on other parchments from the period.

The pyramids of Egypt are not one but three, and their  
archetecture is similar to other pyramids and megaliths in the  
region. The VM map represents a single instance of.

1. A map written into an unobviously related book in which the

pages were scrambled

2. Ink lines that are inconsistent with other maps of the period, and ink elements that are not found in other illustrations on parchment for the period.

IOW there is no precedence in Map elements, no precedence in illustrative mechanics for that period. Ergo it draws itself into question. Eric is once again throwing squink.

--

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

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***  
◇ *From:* Alaca

• *References:*

- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***  
◇ *From:* Steve Marcus
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***  
◇ *From:* Ken Towe
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***  
◇ *From:* Eric Stevens
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***  
◇ *From:* Tom McDonald
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***  
◇ *From:* Ken Towe
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***  
◇ *From:* Martyn Harrison
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***  
◇ *From:* Ken Towe
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***  
◇ *From:* David Johnson
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***  
◇ *From:* I.E\_Johansson
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***  
◇ *From:* Thomas Zahr
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

◇ *From:* Eric Stevens

◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***

◇ *From:* Tom McDonald

- Prev by Date: ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
- Next by Date: ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
- Next by thread: ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***