

Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005–12/msg00931.html>

- *From:* "Steve Marcus" <[smarcus_spamout @xxxxxxx](mailto:smarcus_spamout@xxxxxxx)>
 - *Date:* Mon, 26 Dec 2005 16:34:30 –0500
-

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:d0nuq11llevr23j91ram9ht01lvlpv5pg2@xxxxxxxxxx
> On Fri, 23 Dec 2005 17:24:33 +0100, "Peter Alaca" <P.Alaca@xxxxxxx>
> wrote:
>
>> Steve Marcus wrote: [w2Tqf.47769\\$415.28616@dukeread05](mailto:w2Tqf.47769$415.28616@dukeread05).
>>> <m_zalar wrote in
>>>> Steve Marcus wrote:
>>
>>>> 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??
>>
>>>> The practice of double dating an inscription does appear to have
>>>> been a practice in medieval time, as shown in Nielsen/Wolter (see my
>>>> post on the Easter Table). If so then this would tend to confirm
>>>> the KRS as a medieval document, a forger having no need to do so.
>>
>>> Sigh.... Is there nothing that these guys can't cook up? I'm certain
>>> that they can even find examples of triple dating, etc. So what? The
>>> point is that this newly discovered date is in a "code." Their
>>> theory is that is obtained by plugging the dotted runes in to an
>>> Easter table, something that not everyone would be familiar with or
>>> know how to use. Yet, the "coded" message is identical to the
>>> message plainly inscribed on the stone, presumably available to
>>> anyone who could read the runes. What in the world would the point
>>> of doing that be? By using the dotted runes, were the necessarily
>>> concealing the date from anyone not friendly to them? After all,
>>> knowledge of the Easter Table doesn't necessarily make anyone an ally
>>> of the inscribers.
>>> Again, it is amazing that someone could allege that the dots on the
>>> KRS were not observed previously. The stone had been repeatedly
>>> subjected to examination by Holand and experts in Europe. The
>>> allegations that runestones in North America bear "Easter Table"
>>> dates is not new, either. See:
>>> <http://www2.privatei.com/~bartjean/chap9.htm>
>>> I'll reserve judgement on the book until I read it. I expect to have

Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.

>>> a copy in 4–6 weeks. But the logic of the situation that is being
>>> reported by those who have read the book is beginning to have a bad
>>> smell. As does this sort of thing:

>>>

>>> http://wcco.com/specialreports/local_story_143121108.html

>>>

>>

>>I like this contradiction:

>> He [=Wolters] now believes the words on the stone
>> may not be the record of the death of 10 men, but
>> instead a secret code concealing the true purpose
>> of the stone.

>>

>> "We think, if it's the Templars, they confirmed the
>> date which is on the stone -- 1362 -- by using a
>> code in the inscription."

>>

>>Using a secret code in a false inscription
>>to confirm a part of the false inscription.
>>What is missing is a pointer to the existence
>>of a secret code and of course to the true
>>nature of the inscription.

>

> The pointers are there, on the stone.

>>

>>> See also:

>>> <http://www.unexplained-mysteries.com/forum/index.php?showtopic=41564>

>>>

>>> for this: "When we plotted these three things we got a year: 1362,"
>>> Wolter said. "It was like, oh my God, is this an accident? Is this a
>>> coincidence? I don't think so.

>>>

>>> "We think, if it's the Templars, they confirmed the date which is on
>>> the stone -- 1362 -- by using a code in the inscription."

>>>

>>> But why would Templars come to America, carve this stone and code the
>>> date? Particularly since by 1362, they had been wiped out _and their
>>> resources given over to others_? See:

>>>

>>> <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14493a.htm> and

>>>

>>> http://www.encyclopedia.com/html/section/KnightsT2_PersecutionandDestructionoftheTemplars.asp

>>>

>>> short version of 2nd link:

>>>

>>> <http://tinyurl.com/cds8w>

>

> Peter, I hope you are not going to continue arguing on the basis of
> news paper articles. There is much more to know about the KRS than
> that.

>

>

Those last links (and arguments) aren't Peter's. They're mine. And the fact that the Templars had been wiped out as an organization (both physically and economically) well prior to 1362 is an established fact that can be found in any number of history texts. To argue that a coded message was _left_ for Templars (by Templars) is a bit over-the-top.

>

> 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

• *References:*

- ◆ **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
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: Steve Marcus
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: m_zalar@xxxxxxxxxxxx
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: Steve Marcus
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**
◇ From: Peter Alaca
- ◆ **Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.**

Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.

◇ *From:* Eric Stevens

- Prev by Date: ***Re: KRS: Nielsen/Wolter – Goter***
- Next by Date: ***Re: KRS: Nielsen/Wolter – Goter***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: "Wolters" aka "Scott Wolter"***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Kensington Runestone – Nielsen and Wolters.***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***