

Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005–12/msg00847.html>

- *From:* "Steve Marcus" <smarcus_spamout_@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 22 Dec 2005 20:02:52 –0500
-

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:vl1mq1p4jn5dlska9i7g5eerf573qkjbv@xxxxxxxxxx

> On Thu, 22 Dec 2005 10:45:21 –0500, "Steve Marcus"

> <smarcus_spamout_@xxxxxxx> wrote:

>

> ---- snip ----

>

>>> Very simple. Many of the markings change the meaning of the runes and

>>> for more than a century the runes have been discussed on the basis

>>> that the marks are not there. Quite literally, nobody seems to have

>>> seen them

>>

>>Which, considering that Nielsen, and Knirk, two "experts" have published

>>material about the runes and their meaning, is an incredible statement.

>>Mighty suspicious.

>

> The fine detail in its weathered condition is definitely present on

> the stone. The material published by all of the 'experts', including

> Nielsen and Knirk, have in the past discussed the runes as though the

> much of the fine detail was not present and the only reason is that

> until Wolters closely examined the stone, nobody knew all the fine

> detail that was there. Everybody has been working from inaccurate

> transcriptions which have been assumed to be correct. I don't know

> what is suspicious about that.

Are you claiming, in all seriousness, that until Wolter studied the KRS, not a single expert was working from an accurate transcription? I find that very difficult to believe, given that the stone was in the the possession of Holand for a long time, and he took it to Europe circa 1911 or so. Nobody inspected the stone closely enough to see the dots that Wolter say? Suuurreee.

And the other logical quirk is this: the "secret" dots yield the date 1362.

But that date is already carved on the stone. So what was the big secret conveyed by the dots??

>

>

>

> Eric Stevens
>
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

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: m_zalar@xxxxxxxxxxx

• *References:*

- ◆ **Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: David B
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: David B
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: Daryl Krupa
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: Steve Marcus
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: Eric Stevens

- Prev by Date: **Re: Atlantis = The Sea People?**
- Next by Date: **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
- Next by thread: **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**