

Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005–09/msg00494.html>

- *From:* Horace LaBadie <hwlabadiejr@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 14 Sep 2005 12:09:53 –0400
-

In article <uoggi155icremc3b71s27ebpcfaesf5i6o@xxxxxxx>, nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

> Apparently on date Wed, 14 Sep 2005 07:46:11 –0400, Horace LaBadie
> <hwlabadiejr@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> said:
>
>> In article <37nei1h7s8am1hp3ag7c8sn4dho5jn955b@xxxxxxx>,
>> nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
>>
>>> Apparently on date Tue, 13 Sep 2005 17:28:41 –0400, Horace LaBadie
>>> <hwlabadiejr@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> said:
>>>
>>>> In article <ab0di1p3pa51857farlk661olkfl0v8tq5@xxxxxxx>,
>>>> nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Apparently on date Mon, 12 Sep 2005 12:08:54 –0400, Horace LaBadie
>>>>> <hwlabadiejr@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> said:
>>>>>
>>>>>> In article <m19bi1liaajulbrp1hb7qetpng891k82g2@xxxxxxx>,
>>>>>> nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> SNIP
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Whatever you may think about ells, the ones in this translation are
>>>>>>>> definitely
>>>>>>>> not as large as you want them to be. You are wrong to correct the 3
>>>>>>>> – 4
>>>>>>>> foot
>>>>>>>> thickness of the ice, that's what it boils down to.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Just give up and move on.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> And your confidence in making that assertion stems from what, exactly?
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> From the document under discussion.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> It uses as a measure of distance a thing called an ell.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?

> > > > It describes a number of things in terms of their length.
> > > >
> > > > Including the specific item you are disputing, the thickness of the
> > > > ice.
> > > >
> > > > Although we can't go and measure the thickness of the ice in 1000.
> > > >
> > > > We can go and measure the other things that are described.
> > > >
> > > > Skis are described as 7 or 8 ells long.
> > > > The Porpoise is 5 ells long
> > > > Grampus = 12 ells
> > > > Beaked Whale = 25 ells
> > > > G'land Shark = 30 ells
> > > > Narwhal = 20 ells
> > > > Narwhal Horn = 7 ells
> > > > Humpback = 80 ells
> > > > G'land Whale = 90 ells
> > > > "Rorqual" Whale = 130 ells
> > > > Ice in question = 3 to 4 ells thick
> > > > Coarse seal = 4 ells
> > > > "Erken-seal" = 5 ells
> > > > Bearded seal = 7 ells
> > > > Saddleback = 4 ells
> > > > Walrus = 15 ells
> > > >
> > > > If you want the Ice in question to be 20 foot thick, you will need also
> > > > to
> > > > require:
> > > >
> > > > (a) the use of the word differs within the document when describing
> > > > thickness
> > > > of ice and other lengths
> > > > (b) the animals, skis were all massively larger than their modern day
> > > > equivalents
> > > >
> > > > which will it be?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > c) The information is second/third hand and was accepted by the author
> > > > as coming from a reliable source, but is not to be accepted by a modern
> > > > reader as literally accurate. The document also reports sightings of
> > > > mermaids.
> > > >
> > > > We do know, however, the various lengths of an ell. None is one foot.
> > > >
> > > > So when I "quoted" the translation and clarified what was obviously
> > > > "meant"
> > > > by
> > > > 4 to 5 ells – giving the quote and clarifying that in terms of modern
> > > > measurements.

Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?

>>>
>>> Was I right to call it 3–4 feet?
>>>
>>> Or are you right when you tell the world that it was, in fact, about 17
>>> feet?
>>>
>>> Or was I wrong to quote the actual author, should I be insisting the
>>> original
>>> was 4 to 5 "hands" or that the original meaning was 17 feet?
>>>
>>> Take your time.
>>
>>What about "not to be accepted by a modern reader as literally accurate"
>>do you not comprehend? If I were to quote to you from Colin Powell's
>>presentation to the UN Security Council about the absolute certainty
>>that Iraq possessed WMD in 2003, would you agree now that it was
>>literally accurate at the moment he made that presentation? By his
>>current account, he received information that he then accepted as
>>accurate because he deemed the source reliable. As it turns out, the
>>source was not reliable. I can quote that presentation forever, but that
>>does not make it accurate. The document in question is what it is, a
>>medieval travelogue, of which portions are mistaken, fanciful, and
>>grossly exxagerated, to be received as hearsay. We know that there were
>>no mermaids. We also know that the figures as given were mistaken. Get
>>over it, and move on.
>
> Walruses and whales are not fiction and the original author was describing
> real
> things and giving practical descriptions. When the book describes how skis of
> eight or nine "ells" long, can be used to travel swiftly across the ice and
> snow, I prefer to think that the author is describing skis as we, in the
> modern
> world, would understand them, as flat blades about six feet long.
>
> But, you are preferring the notion that the Speculum Regale is total fantasy
> and therefore the dimensions are all wrong because of that. The skis were, in
> your preferred position, described as thirty feet long and therefore just
> fantasy. I think I can leave you alone with that notion, as you can't cut
> yourself with it and it doesn't really matter to anyone else.
>
>

No, you are again misrepresenting. I have concluded that the book is in error, but I have not said that it is total fantasy. That is an outright lie. The book is in other places full of errors and exaggerations. There is no reason, therefore, to accept the measurements as literally correct. There is also no reason for you to misrepresent the text as having said something else, or to invent a new unit of measurement to justify this misrepresentation.

Sticking with the analogy, suppose that Colin Powell had said, "Iraq has

Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?

developed a SCUD missile that is capable of flying 10000 miles."
Suppose, further, that this was glossed by an editor, *Fewer than 200
km." This misrepresents the text. Suppose, too, that when it was pointed
out to the editor that 10000 miles does not equate to fewer than 200 km,
the editor were to reply that "Colin Powell was using a mile of 52.8
feet." What would one be justified in thinking of such an invention?

HWL

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
◇ *From:* Alaca

• *References:*

- ◆ **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
◇ *From:* nospam
- ◆ **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
◇ *From:* Horace LaBadie
- ◆ **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
◇ *From:* nospam
- ◆ **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
◇ *From:* Horace LaBadie
- ◆ **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
◇ *From:* nospam
- ◆ **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
◇ *From:* Horace LaBadie
- ◆ **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
◇ *From:* Horace LaBadie

- Prev by Date: **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
- Next by Date: **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
- Next by thread: **Re: Hines– Fool Or Fraud?**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**