

Re: the "Roman" figurine former SV: Precolumbian artifacts in Mexico....

Re: the "Roman" figurine former SV: Precolumbian artifacts in Mexico....

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2007-05/msg00265.html>

- *From:* Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 21 May 2007 22:37:52 +1200
-

On Sun, 06 May 2007 23:46:57 +0200, Erik Hammerstad
<egeha.is.all.you.need@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Alan Crozier wrote:

"johansson" <1732johansson@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:HDq%h.40270\\$E02.16326@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:HDq%h.40270$E02.16326@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

It's typical Erik H not to tell the full story only chosing the few

who have

same opinions as Erik H.
I guess Alan that you haven't this information:
In 1994 the "Roman" head of Calixtlahuaja, Mexico made news especially

after

Hristov Romeo H.'s article: 'the little "Roman" head of Calixtlahuaja, Mexico: some reflections' (easiest read here: <http://www.neara.org/CARLSON/romehead.htm>)

At that time the "Roman" head was thought to be the only artifact

found

during for most archaeologists acceptable excavations etc.
To the ones

found

Re: the "Roman" figurine former SV: Precolumbian artifacts in Mexico....

during later years I return under own subjectline.

Then again in this case as in other there are naysayers
believing in

the

brickwall that make any contacts over the Atlantic before
Columbus

voyages

impossible give or take a few contacts by Vikings with
Indians in

northern

America. Such a scholar can be read at
<<http://www.public.asu.edu/~mesmith9/tval/RomanFigurine.html>>
How

someone

who isn't specialist studying the subject can maintain a
brickwall

against

new information, that's incredible.

Thus I would like to give you more ref for Romeo H Hristov:
<<http://www.unm.edu/~rhrstov/RHH.html>>
<<http://www.unm.edu/~rhrstov/>>

More support for Hristov's precolumbian contacts can be
read about at:
<<http://www.andrewcollins.com/page/articles/romanbust.htm>>
<<http://migration.steinwender.co.uk/archaeology11.htm>>

Because I doubt that you will mention it, I think I should cite this
admission from the article by Hristov and Genovés in Ancient
Mesoamerica:

"Hristov (1994:69), based on the imprecise chronological placement of
the context in which the piece was found, explored the possibilities of
relating it with a probable arrival of Vikings to the Atlantic coasts of
Mesoamerica between the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D. The results of
the thermoluminescent age test make both hypotheses untenable."

Re: the "Roman" figurine former SV: Precolumbian artifacts in Mexico....

Even more untenable is the Quetzalcoatl hypothesis mentioned by that dreadful website loosely associated with the University of Guadalajara (which doesn't teach any archaeology).

And the dating that Rhistov finally used (1800 ybp) is also quite dubious:

<http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg16622337.600-hole-in-the-head.html>

See the response I have just made to Alan Crozier.

Eric Stevens

.