

Re: Spirit Pond, Maine

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-10/1054.html>

From: Steve Marcus (*smarcus_spamout__at_cox.net*)

Date: 10/19/04

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 05:36:26 -0400

"Michael Zalar" <m_zalar@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:a458909b.0410172159.689445eb@posting.google.com...
> "Steve Marcus" <smarcus_spamout__at_cox.net> wrote in message
news:<ZOMbd.4504\$EZ.3125@okepread07>...
> > *I might direct your attention to the Kingigtorsuaq stone, a 14th
> > century stone found in Greenland:*
> > [http://xoomer.virgilio.it/fucina2001/ Images/rune12.jpg](http://xoomer.virgilio.it/fucina2001/Images/rune12.jpg)
> >
> > *The Kingigtorsuaq stone list the names of three Norse hunters known to
be
> > in the area (Greenland) at the end of the 13th century. Please cite a
> > peer reviewed source for the claim that it is "a 14th century stone."*
> >
>
> *I note immediatedly that although requiring a peer reviewed source,
> there is no source given countering this claim. Mr. Marcus is, of
> course, requiring me to do work that his is unwilling to do himself.*

The difference is, of course, that I do have a peer reviewed source. Try:

"Vikings: The North Atlantic Saga", Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000,
pages 320, 321, article by Hans Christian Gullov (Danish National Museum,
Copenhagen) entitled "Natives and Norse in Greenland"

>
> *Without checking to far, just the few things I have at hand:*
>
> *Thalbitzer, William (Two Runic Stones from Greenland and Minnesota,
> Smithsonian Misc Collections, 1951) gives the date as about 1300 AD.*

> *Udoubtably Mr. Marcus will state that this does not necessarily mean
> that it is 14th century, only that it could be 14th century.*

Well, "about 1300AD" seems to agree with Gullov's "at the end of the 13th
century." You might wish to consider that in the absence of a specific date
or broad statement of a date on the stone itself, the King. runestone would
seem to be most easily dated by noting information available about the

people who inscribed it, again as indicated in the Gullov article.

- > *Perhaps*
- > *that is not enough for him, but seems to be the only "peer reviewed"*
- > *work I have at hand. The earliest date that I have seen is actual*
- > *about 1250, and the latest 1333. However, it does appear that calling*
- > *it a 14th century stone is reasonable.*

Particularly if it fits one's agenda. :)

> *Elsewhere:*

- >
- > *Kare Prytz in Westward Before Columbus gives the stone a date of 1333.*
- >
- > *Richard Nielsen in Barry Hanson's book Kensington Runestone: A Defense*
- > *of Olof Ohman... Vol II, gives the suggested date of 1314.*
- >
- >

http://64.233.167.104/search?q=cache:BkH92GOSEZYJ:www.yukoncollege.yk.ca/~agraham/nost202/1300_1399.pdf-

> *gives the 1333 date.*

- >
- >

<http://64.233.167.104/search?q=cache:0NDW2Alr7pcJ:www.personal.utulsa.edu/~marc-carlson/history/grontime.htm>

> *gives 1250–1333.*

- >
- >

<http://64.233.167.104/search?q=cache:LfivNolpmMwJ:www.mnsu.edu/emuseum/prehistory/vikings/vikgrn.html+king>

> *gives 1333 in a rather short piece, in which he gives two references.*

- >
- > *I will check Viking, the North Atlantic saga later.*
- >
- >

- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >

>> *Also, the stone was found on Disko Island, which is not "in Greenland"*
in

>> *the sense that the Settlements were "in Greenland", but lies midway up*
the

>> *western coast of Greenland and nowhere near where the expedition*
allegedly

>> *involving Paul Knutsen would have been in Greenland had it in fact*
actually

>> *left Norway and arrived in the Settlements. See:*

>>

>> <http://www.abc.net.au/science/greenland/maps.htm#greenland>

>>

>> *and compare:*

>>

- > > <http://www.mnsu.edu/emuseum/prehistory/vikings/vikingnw.gif>
- > >
- > > *You should also note from the first map that Disko Island is substantially north of the Hudson strait.*
- > >
- >
- > *Yes, I know where Kingigtorsuaq is and it is a part of Greenland, and is considered a Greenland runestone by every authority that I have read. The Norse Greenlanders of this time did travel far north along the coast, obviously as far north as Disco Bay (and perhaps farther, I can check on this if you really want me to).*
- >
- > *There is not specific knowledge as to where the Knutson expedition went.*

Or if the "expedition" ever lifted an anchor from Norway or dropped an anchor anywhere else, including Greenland. In short, there's no evidence for any such "expedition" or for any similar expedition led by Knutson.

- > *If we presume that the voyage was, at least in part, to find the lost member of the Western Settlement, then an expedition up the western coast of Greenland would be a reasonable first step.*

"If we presume..." Well, at least you are honest (a refreshing trait that distinguishes you from the Ingers and the Stevens of the world).

Nevertheless, I'm constrained to point out that what we have is a presumption of a date that would seem very late for a presumed expedition that ended up at a presumed destination (Minnesota), wherein the expedition, instead of directly following the presumed script of seeking "missing Greenlanders" in North America, first took a side trip along a Norse hunting route that took it well north of the route that the Greenlanders would have customarily followed to North America.

- > *How far north is obviously unknown, but due dilligence would suggest they may have gone as far north as the known fishing (whaling?) grounds of Disco Bay, if not further.*
- >
- > *Is it your presumption that they went directly from the Eastern Settlement to Hudson Bay...??*

My sole presumption is that there is no evidence at all to support your presumptions. My analysis of your presumption, presented above, is based upon the relatively little we know for sure, and the application of Occam to your presumption.

- >
- >
- >
- >

>
>> *You will note that the stone is laid out in straight lines, and uses*
>> *runes which were curved and rounded. It is also a memorial stone,*
>> *being found on, and referring to cairns raised on the island.*
>>
>> *Imprecise, and yet very telling. The King. runestone isn't a memorial*
stone
>> *in the sense that the Kensington Runestone is purported to be; it*
doesn't
>> *memorialize anyone's death. It simply explains that the cairn on which*
the
>> *King. runestone was found was **built by specific people on a specific*
*day***
>> *(and not a specific date). It's purpose is to "memorialize" the people*
who
>> *built it in the sense of their *deed* of having traveled so far north*
(on
>> *their hunt). The conspicuous absence of names on the Kensington*
Runestone
>> *and the specific absence of any *deeds* other than "we made camp and*
then we
>> *fished" is very telling when comparing the two runestones.*
>>
>> *But hey, why confuse the issue with facts.*
>>
>
> *I didn't say that the KRS was a memorial stone. I noted the the King--*
> *stone was a memorial stone, as you seem to admit.*

Indeed. And the King. stone being a memorial stone puts paid to Inger's lie that after the 11th century, memorial stones weren't raised by the Norse, as well as calling into question why the KRS didn't follow the well known format (that obviously continued to at least the dawn of the 14th century, (if not into that century per your dating) for such memorial stones.

>
>
> *Michael*

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

>
>> I
>>> consider it possible, if unlikely, that the KRS expedition came across
>>> this stone, and that it provided the 'inspiration' for the Kensington
>>> Stone.
>>>

sci.archaeology: Re: Spirit Pond, Maine

> > > I should like to further note that runes were frequently used by
> > > common individuals for leaving mundane messages, though these were
> > > usually carved in wood. The runes found in Bergen are a prime example
> > > of this type of inscription.
> > >
> > > Also, Runes were used in text documents on paper. Indeed, Dr Nielsen
> > > suggests that the person who prepared the inscription was acquainted
> > > with such documents. This would further explain the use of macrons
> > > above some vowels (the double dotting), as macrons were frequently in
> > > use in documents of that era.
> > >
> > > Perhaps, at least in terms of semantic analysis, one should call the
> > > KRS a runic document carved in stone, rather than a "runestone".
> > > Although there are certain similarities to runestones, there is no
> > > specific evidence that suggests that the primary purpose of the
> > > document was to be a runestone in any narrow sense of the word.
> > > Indeed I find the dissimilarities between the KRS and runestones can
> > > be used as an argument to suggest that the former is not a forgery. A
> > > forger setting out to copy a runestone would have been far more
> > > careful to follow traditional forms.
> > >
> > > Michael
> > >
> > > Steve Marcus