

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-04/msg00339.html>

- *From:* "Steve Marcus" <smarcus_spamout_@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 13 Apr 2005 05:31:42 -0400
-

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:5too51112lastbhch9ojmf2il6rfdvrh18@xxxxxxxxxx
> On Tue, 12 Apr 2005 18:28:41 -0400, "Steve Marcus"
> <smarcus_spamout_@xxxxxxx> wrote:
>
>>
>>"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>>news:epco51pa0r77suck4kdgukhv3h526co8t8@xxxxxxxxxx
>>> On 12 Apr 2005 17:55:54 GMT, Philip Deitiker <Nopdeitik@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>In sci.archaeology, Alaca created a message ID
>>>>>[news:425c01b6\\$0\\$14492\\$dbd4b001@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:425c01b6$0$14492$dbd4b001@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx):
>>>>>
>>>>>> Iron-gall inks came into use in the 9th century and by
>>>>>> the 11th century had largely replaced carbon inks as
>>>>>> a writing medium.
>>>>>> <http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/don/dt/dt0583.html>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Examination of parchment manuscripts from the 9th
>>>>>>> to 15th centuries indicate that all were written with
>>>>>>> iron-gal inks in which no trace of carbon could be found.
>>>>>>> Carbon inks, however, continued to be used for
>>>>>>> documents...
>>>>>>> <http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/don/dt/dt1849.html>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Probably almost all later medieval manuscripts are
>>>>>>>> written with iron gall
>>>>>>>> <http://www.ceu.hu/medstud/manual/MMM/ink.html>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>My point to Eric is that the properties of the pyramids do not
>>>>>>>>>draw their stipulated origins into question. The properties of
>>>>>>>>>the Vinland map given the history of the period and its
>>>>>>>>>'deviant properties' do draw it up for questioning. And thus
>>>>>>>>>the question about the processes of how it was assembled
>>>>>>>>>deserves more attention than other cross-corroborating
>>>>>>>>>documents of the period.
>>>>>>>>>

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

>>> My point to Philip is that I was questioning the original logic of Ken
>>> Towe. I no more believe that it is essential to know exactly how the
>>> VM was done to establish it's authenticity (if that's what it is) than
>>> it is necessary to know how the pyramids were built to establish their
>>> authenticity.
>>
>>Except, of course, if you are discussing the issue with me. Then you were
>>demanding that unless every aspect of how every feature of the VM was
>>known,
>>one couldn't establish that it was fake. Sauce for the goose, and all
>>that
>>jazz.
>
> I doubt that it is accidental that you fail to acknowledge that the
> discussion was taking place in the context which culminated in Ken
> Towe writing:
>
> "HOW TO MAKE A VINLAND MAP...
> A scribe living in the 15th century took a clean piece of parchment
> and.....then what happened? I'm waiting.
>
> Anyone who is going to meet Ken's criteria has to be able to offer a
> hypothesis which is consistent with the facts. My criticism has always
> been that we do not have enough facts.
>
> Now, stop bothering me with distortions.

What distortions? Even a blind man following this discussion understands the context of; some of us are even able to remember the posts that were made two weeks ago.

It appears that you really don't like getting caught out in your intellectual dishonesty? Well Eric, there is simply no way out of the box you have (yet again) painted yourself in to. And so, having "ignored" me for less than a day, you are reduced to claiming that I'm distorting your position. Try to read the following slowly and carefully, Eric. It might be that you will learn something:

The lack of facts that you are going on about cuts two ways. It has the same effect on hypotheses that purport to explain how the Vinland Map could have been created circa 1440 and is, therefore, an authentic 15th century document as it has on hypotheses that purport to explain how a forger created a modern fake.

Yet, you have expressed no concerns with hypotheses that have been advanced which might explain the VM as authentic, such as Enterline's latest one (as reported by you, namely the Olin's carbon separation ink followed by a cleaning with bleach applied through a modern anatase bearing paper). On the other hand, with respect to hypotheses that might explain how the VM was faked, you piously state that we haven't enough facts to even advance a hypotheses, let alone one that might be satisfactory.

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

The reason for this is simple enough: as things stand now, it appears to a high probability that the VM is a modern fake. Therefore, you are grasping at any hypothesis that cuts the other way; if only we give Enterline and/or Olin and or anyone else who chimes in sufficient time to investigate their particular hypothesis all will be well and the VM will be demonstrated to be at least as likely to be real as not. At the same time, you are taking potshots at any hypotheses that explain how the VM might have been faked; indeed, you are claiming that such hypotheses shouldn't even be advanced because we lack sufficient facts about the VM. The dirty little not-so-secret secret to all of this is that you are either confused (or, more likely you are intentionally confusing) about how science works and what a hypothesis is.

To date, there are certain established facts (observed data) about the VM. A hypothesis that explains all of those facts and is consistent with what we *do* know about the VM is an acceptable hypothesis, right up until the time that additional facts (observed data) renders it unacceptable and requires that it be either modified or discarded. That *is* how science works; it is unnecessary to know everything about a given subject in order to advance a working hypothesis about it. And most often, scientists do not know all that there is to know about a given issue when a working hypothesis is first advanced to explain it. What is amazing is that you don't appear to be smart enough to understand that to date, no one has come up with a hypothesis as to how the VM might have been created circa 1440 which even fits all of the facts we do know about it, so the paucity of fakes that you have now taken to prattling endlessly on about is, if anything, even more devastating to those hypotheses than to any hypothesis which is at least consistent with what is known about the VM.

In short, you might discover that people don't have to dismantle your positions, (and what passes for your reasoning), quite so much if you would stop bothering them with clouds of squink.

>

>>

>>>>

>>>> In a court of law one does not try everyone for every crime
>>>>ever committed to see which one committed the crime, one
>>>>selects among those who might have or probably committed a
>>>>crime. This is the same thing, we don't need to question every
>>>>historic documents origin just those that stand out as
>>>>excessively deviant relative to the putative contemporary
>>>>counterparts.

>>>> The process by which the VM was made is both germane to its
>>>>authenticity and if so disproven germane to the mode of
>>>>disengenuine behaviors and mechanics that produced it.

>>>

>>> I agree with that too. But I still hold that first we must know much
>>> more about the nature of the ink before we start worrying about how it
>>> was made and applied.

>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Eric Stevens
>>
>>Steve
>
>
>
>
>
> 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

• **References:**

- ◆ **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**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: The Vinland Map's Ink**
◇ From: Tom McDonald
- ◆ **Re: The Vinland Map's Ink**
◇ From: Philip Deitiker
- ◆ **Re: The Vinland Map's Ink**
◇ From: Alaca
- ◆ **Re: The Vinland Map's Ink**
◇ From: Philip Deitiker
- ◆ **Re: The Vinland Map's Ink**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: The Vinland Map's Ink**
◇ From: Steve Marcus
- ◆ **Re: The Vinland Map's Ink**
◇ From: Eric Stevens

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

- 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*](#)