

Re: KRS: Final thoughts

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-06/msg01757.html>

- *From:* Erik Hammerstad <egeha.is.all.you.need@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 25 Jun 2005 01:11:29 +0200
-

m_zalar@xxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

In general a reasonably fair and complete story. A number of minor points could have been raised against parts of it, but to avoid being too repetitive I'll restrict myself.

I find it remarkable that the Larsson papers are not even mentioned by Michael, as they do show that all the KRS runes were known at least among some Swedes in the late 18th century, and that in no other place do we find the whole set of the KRS runes, of which approximately half are not common or even known to have been used in medieval times. And the KRS is certainly very different in style compared to the texts found on medieval runestones.

There is nothing except speculation linking any particular Norwegian, whether he is called Knutson or Bardarson, with the Inventio Fortunatae. Bardarson probably went to Greenland and back, Knutson may have, while many other Norwegians must have done so in the 14th century. The Inventio Fortunatae may have been based on a factual trip, but if so we do not know to where, and certainly what it was described to contain are pure myths.

It is quite clear that geological testing will never give definitive proof that the KRS is an authentic Norse medieval runestone nor will linguistics ever prove that it is a 19th century creation, believing otherwise is wishful thinking.

.