

Re: Geology Question (KRS related)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-02/msg00423.html>

- *From:* "Inger E.Johansson" <inger_e.johansson@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 05 Feb 2006 04:40:30 GMT
-

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> skrev i meddelandet
<news:erdau1hjvh220s5khth3aihj6i5d1ietbo@xxxxxxxxxx>

On Sat, 4 Feb 2006 23:54:55 +0100, "Peter Alaca" <P.Alaca@xxxxxx>
wrote:

Eric Stevens wrote: im5au1p2p60jfnemmd0j8jke223g4bueo8@xxxxxxxx,

On Sat, 4 Feb 2006 11:28:50 +0100, "Peter Alaca"
<P.Alaca@xxxxxx>
wrote:

Eric Stevens wrote:
4lo8u1hmpd271b3jvi9bqrc2ovnbh37msf@xxxxxxxx,

"Steve Marcus" wrote

"Eric
Stevens"
wrote

"Steve
Marcus"
wrote

[...]

The
KRS
was
found
near
the
top

Re: Geology Question (KRS related)

of
a
hill
and
I
have
never
previously
heard
the
point
of
discovery
discovered
as
either
swampy
or
boggy.

Blegen, for
example has
it that the
KRS was
discovered
on a knoll
"above
swampy
ground."

See – when provoked, you
can provide a source. Do
you really think
that this is evidence that the
knoll itself is boggy? I very
much
doubt that it is.

To use your own tactics: so you don't know
yourself.

Of course I don't know, but if I exercised my common sense
I would not conclude that a hill of glacial till would be
boggy.

Re: Geology Question (KRS related)

Perhaps you are right in this case, but in general your common sense is not reliable.

For some basics on bogs see
<http://tinyurl.com/7acuc>

For a good (Minnesota) soil course, see
<http://tinyurl.com/a45jy>
there e.g.
Unit 10 – Organic Matter, Peatlands, & Soil Erosion
Chapter 2 – Peatlands
<http://tinyurl.com/7muln>

Those are both good sites. My comment about the KRS site not being a swamp or bog was based on several photographs I have seen. One of them was taken at about the time of the finding and shows that the hill was only sparsely populated by not very large trees. This is somewhere on the web but I have not yet been able to find it. I have more recent photographs which show the hill to now be grassy parkland. There is no evidence of the hill being bog or swamp in any of these. The foot of the hill is another matter.

Plate 1 in the WN book shows an aerial view of the Ohman farm and gives a good idea of the general topography.

Eric,

it's noted that the area around what might have been an island had clay close to the surface and that the swamp which is marked for all the field on a map from 1890's was a swamp. The exact place where the stone was found had clay which had included and surrounded the stone making it hard to see that there was a text on the side facing ground. As Barry Hanson in short words wrote in his chapter 'Studying the Stone, a brief early history'(Hanson Barry, Kensington Runestone volume 1)

"With clay still clinging to it in places the stone was put on display in the bank window in the small village of Kensington for a couple of weeks."

That it happened like this is supported from affidavits and early articles where the first documentation regard KRS is to be read.

Inger e

Eric Stevens

Re: Geology Question (KRS related)