

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-04/msg00449.html>

- *From:* Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 16 Apr 2005 11:54:01 +1200
-

On 15 Apr 2005 13:19:00 -0700, "Ken Towe" <ken.towe@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>David wrote:

>

>"I took that to mean that McCrone's evidence was suspect :-)"

>

>David is right! That's the correct interpretation. There was a feeling
>that McCrone may have made some mistakes (which he did) and that was
>part of the reason that Cahill et al. were retained by Yale to
>reevaluate the Map using a different approach.

It wasn't that it was thought that he had made a mistake but that there were practical limits to what he could achieve with optical microscopy.

>They could have shown
>that McCrone was wrong but, in fact, they provided him support even,
>though they got the quantitative aspects of their analysis wrong. They
>found Ti as the most common element in the ink (of the elements above
>sodium) and also that it was consistently present in higher amounts in
>the ink than on the parchment. In fact, only 5 of 33 ink-parchment
>pairs had Ti on the parchment above the minimum detectable limit. If
>there is any anatase on the parchment it is trivial compared with that
>in the ink. Brown & Clark subsequently reconfirmed this observation. It
>is difficult to see how this anatase with a modern appearance (free of
>clay minerals) and present in the yellow organic binder UNDERLYING the
>black carbon component, could have been added later, even if such a
>bizarre and atypical combination had been a medieval concoction.
>

Eric Stevens

.

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

- *Follow-Ups:*

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

- *References:*

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