LIBRARY OF RICKANDRIA PRESENTS:
The Voynich Manuscript on /x/:
A Forensic Fact-Check of Cryptography, Conspiracy, Psychology & Scripture
CRYPTOGRAPHY
CONSPIRACY
PSYCHOLOGY
SCRIPTURE
4Chan Narrative Breakdown by VCG — September 2026

The Voynich Manuscript on /x/

A Forensic Fact-Check of Cryptography, Conspiracy, Psychology & Scripture

4CHAN NARRATIVE BREAKDOWN BY VCG | SEPTEMBER 2026

Library of Rickandria Presents. This edition reformats the research as a publication-style forensic paper. Historical claims, cryptological claims, psychological interpretation, and Scripture are kept deliberately separate so that the reader can see what each kind of evidence can - and cannot - establish.

Original publication: https://libraryofrickandria.com/voynich-manuscript/

> *Governing principle: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." - 1 Thessalonians 5:21, KJV*

Research cutoff: 25 September 2026
Thread reviewed: 4chan /x/ thread 43000855, through the visible replies discussed in this paper.
Method: claim reconstruction, source tracing, historical cross-checking, cryptological comparison, psychology-of-reasoning review, and Scripture correction where Scripture actually bears on the claim.

External source: Original 4chan /x/ thread 43000855

Scripture note. Bible quotations are from the Authorized King James Version. Scripture is used here to establish biblical teaching and principles of truthful judgment, not as a substitute for historical or cryptanalytic evidence.

External Scripture reference: 1 Thessalonians 5:21 (KJV)

Abstract

On 23-24 September 2026, an anonymous thread on 4chan's /x/ board began with a familiar mystery: the Voynich Manuscript. The opening poster reasoned from the manuscript's resistance to modern decipherment - including attempts involving artificial intelligence - to the possibility that its writing might be extraterrestrial. Replies quickly expanded into competing explanations: meaningless text, an elaborate historical hoax, a grille-generated system, Romani, 'Tartarian,' Old Turkish, religious allegory, a private biological journal, fairy language, and finally an alleged translation describing a murderous cult.

This paper treats the thread neither as authoritative scholarship nor as something to mock. It treats it as a case study in reasoning under uncertainty. The investigation proceeds along five separate evidentiary tracks: manuscript history and material evidence; linguistics and cryptology; standards of decipherment; psychology of uncertainty and online discourse; and Scripture. These categories are deliberately kept separate.

The principal finding is modest. The Voynich Manuscript is an authentic historical artifact whose parchment is medieval; its text exhibits substantial nonrandom structure; no generally accepted decipherment exists as of the research cutoff; natural-language, cryptographic, and deliberately generated-text models all remain subjects of serious investigation; and the thread supplies no positive evidence for extraterrestrial, fairy, hidden-Tartarian-supercivilization, or murderous-cult explanations. Recent cryptological work makes the problem more interesting rather than less by showing that historically plausible verbose substitution systems can reproduce some unusual Voynich-like statistical properties without yielding a verified plaintext.

External source: Bowern & Lindemann, 'The Linguistics of the Voynich Manuscript' (Annual Review of Linguistics, 2021)

External source: Greshko, 'The Naibbe cipher' (Cryptologia, 2025)

External source: Kinnison, Voynich positional entropy study (Cryptologia, 2026)

Contents

01	I. Why This Thread Is Worth Taking Seriously
02	II. Method: Keeping Five Different Questions Separate
03	III. Evidence Grades Used in This Paper
04	IV. Findings at a Glance
05	V. Before the Theories: What Is the Voynich Manuscript?
06	VI. The First Major Correction: Voynichese Does Have Rules
07	VII. The 2025-2026 Development: Cipher Models Became More Interesting
08	VIII. What Would Count as a Real Decipherment?
09	IX. Why Decipherment Claims So Easily Overfit
10	X. Steelmanning the Major Explanatory Models
11	XI. Line-by-Line Forensic Walkthrough of the /x/ Thread
12	XII. Master Claim Matrix
13	XIII. The Psychology of the Thread
14	XIV. The Anatomy of a Viral Mystery Narrative
15	XV. The Tartaria Case Study
16	XVI. AI Mythology and the Voynich Manuscript
17	XVII. Occultism: Evidence Versus Association
18	XVIII. A Biblical Epistemology for Investigating Claims
19	XIX. Scripture, Interpretation, and Historical Claims Must Not Be Blurred
20	XX. An Interesting Historical Note from the KJV Translators
21	XXI. Alternative Explanations Compared by Evidence
22	XXII. Falsifiability: What Could Make Each Theory Lose?
23	XXIII. Voynich Timeline: 1404-2026
24	XXIV. A Note on Scribal Hands
25	XXV. Source-Provenance Audit
26	XXVI. Open Questions We Should Refuse to Pretend Are Closed
27	XXVII. Reproducibility Appendix
28	XXVIII. Selected External Research Links
29	XXIX. Mystery Is Not Evidence: A Christian Discipline of Uncertainty

I. Why This Thread Is Worth Taking Seriously

It would be easy to dismiss an anonymous /x/ discussion as internet noise. That would miss something important. The Voynich Manuscript is exactly the sort of object that exposes weaknesses in human reasoning because it gives us enough structure to invite interpretation, but not enough understood meaning to constrain interpretation strongly.

Its pages look purposeful. Plants, circular diagrams, human figures, containers, stars, pools, tubes, symbols, and hundreds of lines of unfamiliar writing practically demand an explanation. Yet the usual corrective - simply reading the text - is unavailable.

That creates fertile ground for two opposite errors. One is credulity: we cannot explain this, therefore an extraordinary hidden explanation must be true. The other is dismissiveness: we cannot explain this, therefore there is nothing there to explain. The /x/ thread contains both.

> Working sequence used throughout: CLAIM -> EVIDENCE -> TEST -> RESULT -> SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLE

II. Method: Keeping Five Different Questions Separate

A recurring problem in discussions of the Voynich Manuscript is category confusion. Historical evidence, cryptanalysis, psychology, iconography, and theology get mixed together until a suggestive fact in one field is treated as proof in another.

History and material evidence concern what the physical manuscript is, when its constituent materials were produced, who possessed it, and what documents attest its existence.

Linguistics and cryptology concern statistical structure, glyph distribution, recurring tokens, entropy, positional constraints, possible encryption, and possible relationships to natural language.

Interpretation concerns proposed meanings: herbal manual, medical book, encoded journal, hoax, religious allegory, Turkish text, Romani text, and so forth.

Psychology concerns experimentally studied mechanisms such as confirmation bias, pattern detection, uncertainty reduction, repetition effects, and online disinhibition. These mechanisms are discussed as possible features of discourse, never as diagnoses of anonymous posters.

Scripture supplies theological and ethical principles concerning truth, testimony, judgment, speech, occult practice, and humility. Scripture is not used as a shortcut around manuscript research.

Finding an astrological-looking diagram does not prove demon worship. Finding language-like statistics does not prove readable prose. Demonstrating that a hoax could have been generated does not prove that it was. And showing that a biblical text condemns divination does not establish that the unknown author of MS 408 practiced divination.

III. Evidence Grades Used in This Paper

Grade	Meaning
Established	Supported directly by strong primary, institutional, or converging scholarly evidence.
Strongly Supported	Multiple substantial lines of evidence favor the claim, while some uncertainty remains.
Plausible	A workable mechanism or meaningful evidence exists, but historical demonstration is lacking.
Speculative	Possible, but positive evidence is weak or highly incomplete.
Unsupported	No adequate positive evidence was supplied or found.
Contradicted	Conflicts with substantial established evidence in the form asserted.

These grades apply to claims, not people. A person can make an unsupported claim without being dishonest. A mistaken claim may be based on partial information. Conversely, a skeptical claim is not automatically stronger merely because it sounds conservative.

IV. Findings at a Glance

Question	Finding
Is the manuscript a modern invention by Wilfrid Voynich?	Contradicted. It is documented centuries before Voynich and its parchment is medieval.
Does radiocarbon dating prove the writing itself was applied in 1404-1438?	No. That range dates sampled parchment, not the precise moment of inscription.
Is there 'no pattern' in Voynichese?	Contradicted. Extensive statistical structure is documented.
Does language-like structure prove ordinary plaintext language?	No. Cipher systems and generated text can also produce structured statistics.
Has the manuscript been conclusively translated as Turkish?	No. Genuine Turkish proposals exist, but no generally accepted decipherment has resulted.
Has a Romani solution been proposed?	Yes. A recent proposal exists, but it remains unconfirmed.
Is a hoax impossible?	No. Historically plausible pseudotext-generation mechanisms have been demonstrated.
Has a hoax been proved?	No. Demonstrating possibility is not proof that the historical author used that mechanism.
Did 'Tartary' exist historically?	Yes, as a broad European geographical/cartographic designation.
Do Tartary maps prove a suppressed advanced Tartarian civilization authored the Voynich?	No. That inference lacks evidence.
Does AI's failure imply extraterrestrial authorship?	No. That is an argument from ignorance.
Does Scripture identify the Voynich Manuscript?	No. Scripture supplies principles of discernment and teaching about actual occult practices, not a Voynich key.
Is there accepted evidence that the manuscript describes a child-killing cult?	No. The thread supplies no reproducible decipherment supporting this claim.

V. Before the Theories: What Is the Voynich Manuscript?

The object usually called the Voynich Manuscript is Beinecke MS 408, held by Yale University's Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library. Yale describes it as a richly illustrated manuscript written in an unidentified script by an unknown author. The writing remains undeciphered. Its images are commonly grouped into botanical, astronomical or astrological, bathing or 'biological,' cosmological, pharmaceutical, and largely text-oriented sections sometimes provisionally described as recipes.

External source: Yale Beinecke Library - Voynich Manuscript / MS 408

That description already tells us something important: unknown does not mean unexamined. Scholars can describe the manuscript's physical construction, identify recurring glyph forms, compare sections, reconstruct ownership history, analyze inks and pigments, and measure the statistical behavior of the writing without knowing what the writing says.

The parchment date - and what it does not prove

Radiocarbon work on sampled parchment produced an early-fifteenth-century range commonly reported as approximately 1404-1438 at 95% probability. This is one of the most important facts about the manuscript, but it is frequently misstated. Radiocarbon dating measures the animal material used to manufacture the parchment. It does not, by itself, date the instant when a scribe later applied ink.

External source: Rene Zandbergen - Radiocarbon dating of the Voynich MS (summary of University of Arizona testing)

That distinction matters. It makes a twentieth-century fabrication by Voynich extraordinarily difficult to reconcile with the evidence, especially because documentary records of the manuscript long predate Voynich. But the parchment date by itself cannot exclude every possibility that the parchment sat unused before being written on.

Materials analysis adds context. Laboratory examination has reported historical iron-gall-type writing ink and period-compatible mineral pigments. That does not decode the text, but it gives no obvious requirement for a modern-forgery explanation.

External source: Yale / material analysis dossier for MS 408

Provenance: incomplete is not nonexistent

The thread later claims that there is 'no chain of custody.' That is much too strong. A seventeenth-century trail links the mysterious volume to Georg Baresch (or Barschius), Johannes Marcus Marci, and Athanasius Kircher. The surviving Marci letter sent with the manuscript to Kircher reports an earlier story involving Emperor Rudolf II and a purchase price of 600 ducats; that reported story should not be confused with a surviving imperial sales receipt. Later ownership is much firmer: Voynich acquired the manuscript from a Jesuit collection in 1912; it subsequently passed through Ethel Voynich, Anne Nill, H. P. Kraus, and ultimately Yale.

External source: Yale Beinecke Library - Voynich Manuscript overview

There are gaps and uncertainties, especially toward the beginning. But 'we cannot reconstruct every transfer' is not the same proposition as 'there is no provenance.'

VI. The First Major Correction: Voynichese Does Have Rules

One of the thread's strongest skeptical claims is that if scholars cannot decipher the manuscript, then its writing must lack consistent rules. That proposition is contradicted by decades of research.

Researchers have studied recurring structural features in Voynichese: repeated token patterns, positional constraints within word-like units, section-specific vocabulary, long-range clustering, and other nonrandom regularities. Landini's work, later network/statistical studies, and the review by Bowern and Lindemann all treat the text as exhibiting substantial structure even though its semantic content remains unknown.

External source: Landini - Evidence of linguistic structure in the Voynich Manuscript (Cryptologia)

External source: Amancio et al. - Statistical properties of unknown texts (PLOS ONE, 2013)

External source: Montemurro & Zanette - Keywords and co-occurrence patterns (PLOS ONE, 2013)

External source: Bowern & Lindemann - Linguistics of the Voynich Manuscript

Yet there is an equally important complication: Voynichese is not statistically ordinary. Character predictability is unusually high in some analyses. Glyphs show strong positional constraints. Different sections behave differently. Those facts can be interpreted as unusual orthography, abbreviation, cipher mechanics, generated text, or some combination thereof.

> Best-supported formulation: The production process is strongly structured. What produced that structure remains unresolved.

VII. The 2025-2026 Development: Cipher Models Became More Interesting

Recent research makes simplistic conclusions even harder. Michael Greshko's 2025 Cryptologia work introduced the 'Naibbe cipher,' a hand-executable verbose substitution system designed using techniques intended to be historically plausible for the fifteenth century. The point was not that Greshko decoded the Voynich Manuscript. He did not. The point was that a plausible cipher mechanism could generate ciphertext with several Voynich-like statistical features.

External source: Michael Greshko - The Naibbe cipher (Cryptologia, 2025)

Rod Kinnison's September 2026 Cryptologia paper examines positional entropy and reports a pronounced pattern in Voynichese in which uncertainty behaves differently across token positions. A verbose substitution cipher derived from Latin reportedly reproduces the relevant entropy profile better than ordinary language controls in the tested comparison. Shuffling destroys the effect, indicating that the pattern depends on structured generation rather than mere character frequencies.

External source: Rod Kinnison - Voynich positional entropy study (Cryptologia, 2026)

Again, this is not a translation. It is evidence about the space of plausible mechanisms. There is no contradiction in saying that earlier studies found language-like organization while later studies show that

some cipher systems can reproduce unusual Voynich statistics. A ciphertext can contain a natural-language message beneath it, and different statistical tests examine different properties.

VIII. What Would Count as a Real Decipherment?

Voynich research is crowded with announced solutions. That makes methodological standards more important than enthusiasm. A convincing decipherment should establish stable glyph or token rules before translating convenient examples. The same rules should operate across large portions of the manuscript rather than a few selected labels. The proposed language or cipher should explain recurring words, rare words, positional restrictions, repeated phrases, section-specific vocabulary, and variant glyphs without constant improvised exceptions.

Most importantly, a serious method should survive held-out testing. A researcher could develop a system on one defined portion of the manuscript, freeze the rules publicly, and then apply them to previously untreated folios. Other researchers should be able to follow the method without consulting the inventor for each difficult word.

> Decipherment standard: reproducibility + broad corpus coverage + grammatical or cryptographic consistency + historical plausibility + low interpretive freedom + predictive success on unseen text.

Historical plausibility alone is not sufficient. A fifteenth-century language may be historically possible and still be the wrong language. A cipher may be technically possible and still not be the cipher used. A translated sentence may sound meaningful and still be the result of excessive interpretive freedom.

IX. Why Decipherment Claims So Easily Overfit

Imagine a proposed system in which one glyph may represent several vowels, another can be ignored as a silent marker, spaces may be moved when necessary, adjacent symbols may occasionally be transposed, medieval spelling variation is invoked whenever convenient, and cognates from neighboring languages can be substituted. With enough flexibility, meaningful-looking phrases become surprisingly easy to produce.

The danger becomes especially severe when the solver already knows what the picture depicts. A plant illustration encourages searches for leaf, root, herb, water, medicine, green, seed, flower, and similar words. An astronomical picture encourages sun, moon, star, heaven, year, zodiac, planet, and circle. If dozens of candidate substitutions are permitted, accidental semantic matches can begin to look impressive.

The antidote is constraint: declare the rules first, minimize discretionary choices, test passages that were not used to construct the method, measure failures as carefully as successes, and invite independent reproduction.

X. Steelmanning the Major Explanatory Models

Natural-language model

The strongest version does not claim that Voynichese is simply ordinary medieval Italian or Latin written in a funny alphabet. It proposes that underlying natural language may be represented through an unusual orthography, abbreviation system, transformation, or cipher layer. Linguistic-like distributions, recurring morphology-like patterns, section-specific vocabulary, and long-range organization support taking this family of explanations seriously.

Status: Plausible and seriously supported as a research family; no specific language solution is demonstrated.

External source: Bowern & Lindemann, 2021

Cipher model

A strong cipher model explains why the manuscript is systematically structured while remaining resistant to straightforward linguistic identification. Historically plausible verbose or homophonic systems can generate unusual distributions, and recent Cryptologia work strengthens this family of explanations.

Status: Plausible and increasingly technically interesting; not deciphered.

External source: Greshko, 2025

External source: Kinnison, 2026

Meaningless pseudotext or hoax

Gordon Rugg demonstrated that relatively simple historical methods involving tables of components and a Cardan-grille-like device could generate large quantities of Voynich-like text without requiring meaningful plaintext. That materially strengthened the possibility of a sophisticated historical hoax. But Rugg reconstructed a possible process; he did not discover the historical author's grille, source table, workshop notes, or confession.

Status: Plausible mechanism; historical use unproved.

External source: Gordon Rugg - An Elegant Hoax? (Cryptologia, 2004)

Mnemonic, technical, or constructed notation

The text could represent information through a system that does not map neatly onto ordinary prose: recipes, mnemonic forms, index-like notation, compressed technical material, or another specialized scheme. This can potentially explain unusual regularity without requiring meaningless content, but it remains highly underdetermined.

Status: Speculative but methodologically legitimate.

Random gibberish

Simple independent random characters do not fit the demonstrated recurrence patterns, positional constraints, section differences, and long-range organization.

Status: Contradicted in the simple form.

Extraterrestrial, fairy, or hidden-Tartarian language

These proposals would require positive evidence distinguishing them from human alternatives. None is supplied in the thread.

Status: Unsupported.

XI. Line-by-Line Forensic Walkthrough of the /x/ Thread

The following sections preserve the thread's sequence while separating what a poster said from what available evidence can support. Post numbers identify the anonymous claims under review; they are not treated as authority.

External source: Live /x/ thread 43000855

43000855 - 'Even AI can't decipher it ... alien language'

The opening inference has two steps: modern computational approaches have not produced a verified decipherment; therefore an extraterrestrial language is proposed. The first proposition is broadly fair with qualifications. The second has no evidentiary support in the post.

Computational methods have indeed been applied to Voynichese. A widely reported University of Alberta project used computational language-identification methods and proposed Hebrew under a particular anagramming/alphabetic hypothesis. Even there, identifying a candidate language was only one stage; it did not yield an independently validated, corpus-wide reading.

The leap to extraterrestrial authorship is an argument from ignorance. Failure to establish X does not supply evidence for Y. To make the alien hypothesis explanatory rather than decorative, it would need observations more expected under extraterrestrial authorship than under human language, cipher, notation, or pseudotext. The thread offers none. The physical object is entirely at home in medieval manuscript culture.

External source: University of Alberta - computational Voynich research

External source: Yale Beinecke - Voynich Manuscript

> Psychological note: uncertainty naturally encourages causal explanation. Research on conspiracy belief describes epistemic motives such as wanting to understand one's environment, but that is a population-level observation and not a diagnosis of this anonymous poster.
>
> Scriptural correction: Proverbs 18:13 warns against answering a matter before hearing it fully. Scripture affirms a supernatural world, but that does not turn every unexplained artifact into evidence of nonhuman intelligence.

External source: Douglas, Sutton & Cichocka - The Psychology of Conspiracy Theories

External source: Proverbs 18:13 KJV

43001287 - 'Maybe it's just nonsense'

This reply is logically possible and more economical than the alien claim, but it is still not established merely because decipherment has failed. A meaningless-text or hoax model has serious precedent: Gordon Rugg demonstrated a historically plausible method capable of producing structured pseudotext.

The important distinction is among random gibberish, systematically generated meaningless pseudotext, and meaningful enciphered or encoded text. Voynichese's known structure makes simple randomness a poor fit, while the second and third possibilities remain open.

Rugg's work demonstrated possibility, not historical provenance. Conversely, language-like statistics do not by themselves prove meaningful plaintext.

External source: Rugg - An Elegant Hoax?

External source: Amancio et al. - Statistical properties of the Voynich Manuscript

> Scriptural principle: skepticism is also a claim that must be tested. 'Prove all things' applies to skeptical explanations as much as extraordinary ones.

External source: 1 Thessalonians 5:21 KJV

43001307 - 'If it can't be deciphered, there isn't a pattern'

This is the thread's clearest factual error. The premise 'there isn't a pattern' is contradicted by published work documenting nonrandom regularity, recurring forms, positional restrictions, section differences, and long-range organization.

The error is conflating 'we see no regularity' with 'we see regularity whose mapping to meaning we have not recovered.' Those are fundamentally different. A ciphertext can obey strict rules while remaining opaque to someone lacking the key.

The 2026 positional-entropy work makes the problem sharper: the manuscript contains systematic constraints that require explanation. Whether the source is language, cipher, notation, or structured pseudotext remains disputed.

External source: Bowern & Lindemann, 2021

External source: Kinnison, 2026

> Result: Contradicted.
>
> Scriptural principle: Proverbs 18:13 fits the reasoning defect: the evidence should be heard before the conclusion is pronounced.

External source: Proverbs 18:13 KJV

43001439 - 'Maybe its rules are beyond human understanding' plus personal abuse

The first sentence correctly resists the previous false dichotomy, but it moves toward an explanation with weak falsifiability. Almost any unsolved puzzle can be declared 'beyond human understanding.' Unless that claim makes discriminating predictions, it becomes insulation rather than explanation.

Moreover, the manuscript is already partially understandable in the limited scientific sense: researchers can model distributions, identify repeated forms, detect section differences, and describe physical materials. That is not decipherment, but it means the object is not wholly outside human analysis.

The insults contribute no evidence. Research on the online disinhibition effect identifies anonymity, invisibility, asynchronicity, and reduced authority cues as factors that can intensify online behavior. This describes an environment; it does not diagnose the poster.

External source: Suler - The Online Disinhibition Effect

Scriptural correction: 2 Timothy 2:24-25 joins truth correction to gentleness, patience, and meekness. Correct information does not become stronger when wrapped in railing.

External source: 2 Timothy 2:24-25 KJV

43001464 - 'It is a hoax; no chain of custody; created to fleece a buyer'

This post mixes one true observation, one serious overstatement, and one unsupported motive claim. The author is indeed unknown. The provenance has gaps. But 'no chain of custody' is false in the form stated: seventeenth-century correspondence and later ownership provide real documentary anchors.

The claim that the manuscript was made specifically to fleece a buyer has no positive evidence attached. The key conceptual distinction is that authentic antiquity does not prove meaningful content. A fifteenth- or sixteenth-century hoax remains logically possible even though a twentieth-century Voynich fabrication is inconsistent with the historical and material evidence.

Rugg's work is important because it shows how a period-compatible hoax could theoretically be produced. It does not identify the fraudster, the victim, or the motive.

External source: Yale Beinecke - Voynich Manuscript

External source: Rugg - An Elegant Hoax?

Result: Unknown author - established. Incomplete provenance - established. No provenance - contradicted. Fraud motive - unsupported. Historical hoax - plausible.

43001483 - 'Stop sinning'

Repentance from sin is biblical. As an argument about the Voynich Manuscript, however, the post identifies neither a relevant sin nor an evidentiary question. A true theological statement does not automatically become a relevant cryptanalytic argument.

If the intended concern were lying, railing, divination, false accusation, or another identifiable behavior, the relevant biblical text could be applied carefully. Without that connection, the sentence does not advance the manuscript question.

Scriptural correction: Christian admonition is itself governed by patience and meekness in 2 Timothy 2:24-25.

External source: 2 Timothy 2:24-25 KJV

Result: Theologically general, evidentially irrelevant to the Voynich claim as stated.

43000855 - 'Even AI can't decipher it ... alien language'

The opening inference has two steps: modern computational approaches have not produced a verified decipherment; therefore an extraterrestrial language is proposed. The first proposition is broadly fair with qualifications. The second has no evidentiary support in the post.

Computational methods have indeed been applied to Voynichese. A widely reported University of Alberta project used computational language-identification methods and proposed Hebrew under a particular anagramming/alphabetic hypothesis. Even there, identifying a candidate language was only one stage; it did not yield an independently validated, corpus-wide reading.

The leap to extraterrestrial authorship is an argument from ignorance. Failure to establish X does not supply evidence for Y. To make the alien hypothesis explanatory rather than decorative, it would need observations more expected under extraterrestrial authorship than under human language, cipher, notation, or pseudotext. The thread offers none. The physical object is entirely at home in medieval manuscript culture.

External source: University of Alberta - computational Voynich research

External source: Yale Beinecke - Voynich Manuscript

Psychological note: uncertainty naturally encourages causal explanation. Research on conspiracy belief describes epistemic motives such as wanting to understand one's environment, but that is a population-level observation and not a diagnosis of this anonymous poster.

Scriptural correction: Proverbs 18:13 warns against answering a matter before hearing it fully. Scripture affirms a supernatural world, but that does not turn every unexplained artifact into evidence of nonhuman intelligence.

External source: Douglas, Sutton & Cichocka - The Psychology of Conspiracy Theories

External source: Proverbs 18:13 KJV

43001287 - 'Maybe it's just nonsense'

This reply is logically possible and more economical than the alien claim, but it is still not established merely because decipherment has failed. A meaningless-text or hoax model has serious precedent: Gordon Rugg demonstrated a historically plausible method capable of producing structured pseudotext.

The important distinction is among random gibberish, systematically generated meaningless pseudotext, and meaningful enciphered or encoded text. Voynichese's known structure makes simple randomness a poor fit, while the second and third possibilities remain open.

Rugg's work demonstrated possibility, not historical provenance. Conversely, language-like statistics do not by themselves prove meaningful plaintext.

External source: Rugg - An Elegant Hoax?

External source: Amancio et al. - Statistical properties of the Voynich Manuscript

Scriptural principle: skepticism is also a claim that must be tested. 'Prove all things' applies to skeptical explanations as much as extraordinary ones.

External source: 1 Thessalonians 5:21 KJV

43001307 - 'If it can't be deciphered, there isn't a pattern'

This is the thread's clearest factual error. The premise 'there isn't a pattern' is contradicted by published work documenting nonrandom regularity, recurring forms, positional restrictions, section differences, and long-range organization.

The error is conflating 'we see no regularity' with 'we see regularity whose mapping to meaning we have not recovered.' Those are fundamentally different. A ciphertext can obey strict rules while remaining opaque to someone lacking the key.

The 2026 positional-entropy work makes the problem sharper: the manuscript contains systematic constraints that require explanation. Whether the source is language, cipher, notation, or structured pseudotext remains disputed.

External source: Bowern & Lindemann, 2021

External source: Kinnison, 2026

Result: Contradicted.

Scriptural principle: Proverbs 18:13 fits the reasoning defect: the evidence should be heard before the conclusion is pronounced.

External source: Proverbs 18:13 KJV

43001439 - 'Maybe its rules are beyond human understanding' plus personal abuse

The first sentence correctly resists the previous false dichotomy, but it moves toward an explanation with weak falsifiability. Almost any unsolved puzzle can be declared 'beyond human understanding.' Unless that claim makes discriminating predictions, it becomes insulation rather than explanation.

Moreover, the manuscript is already partially understandable in the limited scientific sense: researchers can model distributions, identify repeated forms, detect section differences, and describe physical materials. That is not decipherment, but it means the object is not wholly outside human analysis.

The insults contribute no evidence. Research on the online disinhibition effect identifies anonymity, invisibility, asynchronicity, and reduced authority cues as factors that can intensify online behavior. This describes an environment; it does not diagnose the poster.

External source: Suler - The Online Disinhibition Effect

> Scriptural correction: 2 Timothy 2:24-25 joins truth correction to gentleness, patience, and meekness. Correct information does not become stronger when wrapped in railing.

External source: 2 Timothy 2:24-25 KJV

43001464 - 'It is a hoax; no chain of custody; created to fleece a buyer'

This post mixes one true observation, one serious overstatement, and one unsupported motive claim. The author is indeed unknown. The provenance has gaps. But 'no chain of custody' is false in the form stated: seventeenth-century correspondence and later ownership provide real documentary anchors.

The claim that the manuscript was made specifically to fleece a buyer has no positive evidence attached. The key conceptual distinction is that authentic antiquity does not prove meaningful content. A fifteenth- or sixteenth-century hoax remains logically possible even though a twentieth-century Voynich fabrication is inconsistent with the historical and material evidence.

Rugg's work is important because it shows how a period-compatible hoax could theoretically be produced. It does not identify the fraudster, the victim, or the motive.

External source: Yale Beinecke - Voynich Manuscript

External source: Rugg - An Elegant Hoax?

> Result: Unknown author - established. Incomplete provenance - established. No provenance - contradicted. Fraud motive - unsupported. Historical hoax - plausible.

43001483 - 'Stop sinning'

Repentance from sin is biblical. As an argument about the Voynich Manuscript, however, the post identifies neither a relevant sin nor an evidentiary question. A true theological statement does not automatically become a relevant cryptanalytic argument.

If the intended concern were lying, railing, divination, false accusation, or another identifiable behavior, the relevant biblical text could be applied carefully. Without that connection, the sentence does not advance the manuscript question.

Scriptural correction: Christian admonition is itself governed by patience and meekness in 2 Timothy 2:24-25.

External source: 2 Timothy 2:24-25 KJV

> Result: Theologically general, evidentially irrelevant to the Voynich claim as stated.

43001512 - agreement that the hoax answer is 'most likely'

Agreement adds confidence but not automatically new evidence. If several anonymous replies repeat the same premise without independent historical or cryptographic support, the evidentiary base has not multiplied.

This matters because repetition can increase perceived truth through familiarity. A 2026 meta-analysis of 182 studies reported a small but robust illusory-truth effect after correction for small-study effects. That does not imply that everyone who repeats a claim believes it for that reason; it simply explains why source independence matters.

External source: Nature Communications - systematic review and meta-analysis of the illusory truth effect

> Methodological rule: ten people repeating one unsupported claim do not create ten independent sources.

43001518 - 'fairy language'

No evidence accompanies the suggestion. As a folklore idea it can be studied historically; as a cryptanalytic hypothesis it provides no corpus, grammar, key, or physical evidence by which it can be tested.

A Christian correction is also necessary. Scripture contains angels, devils, unclean spirits, cherubim, seraphim, and other spiritual realities in specific contexts. It does not supply 'fairies' as a biblical explanatory category for mysterious manuscripts.

Result: Unsupported.

> Importing folklore into biblical demonology would be interpretation added to Scripture, not Scripture itself.

43001819 - parchment with holes / copying letters from existing texts

This is the most interesting technical contribution in the thread because it resembles a real scholarly proposal - but it is stated too confidently. Gordon Rugg experimented with a Cardan-grille-like generation method using tables of components. The point was not that investigators found the author's original perforated sheet or proved that the manuscript was produced by laying holes over existing prose.

Rugg's central accomplishment was methodological: demonstrate that historically plausible technology can generate large quantities of apparently structured pseudolanguage. That moved the hoax hypothesis from 'surely impossible' to technically plausible.

The thread upgrades 'one demonstrated possible method' into 'this is what the author actually did.' That step is not warranted.

External source: Rugg - An Elegant Hoax?

> Result: Partly grounded in real research; historical certainty unsupported.

43001857 - 'ancient language,' Romani, possibly 'Tartarian'

Three different hypotheses are bundled together. 'Ancient language' is too vague to test. Romani is a documented Indo-Aryan language family, not an occult or unknowable tongue. A 2026 Voynich-Romani proposal exists, but its existence is not the same as independent validation.

'Tartary' is a different historical issue. Tartary/Tartaria unquestionably appeared on European maps as a broad and shifting geographical designation for large regions of northern and central Asia. The existence of that toponym does not establish a single hidden advanced empire, much less a linguistic link to MS 408.

External source: Library of Congress - Tracking Tartary on Western Maps

External source: Council of Europe - Romani as an Indo-Aryan language

> Methodological correction: map label -> geographical category -> political entity -> civilization -> Voynich authorship. Each arrow requires independent evidence.

43001941 - 'Tartaria isn't real,' followed by abuse and a death wish

The factual correction is too broad. Tartary was real as a historical European cartographic and geographical term. What is unsupported is the modern narrative of a concealed technologically advanced global 'Tartarian Empire.'

The stronger rebuttal is therefore not 'the word never existed.' It is: the historical toponym existed; its historical use does not establish the later conspiracy narrative built around it.

External source: Library of Congress - Tracking Tartary on Western Maps

> The abuse contributes no evidence. A Christian investigator does not become exempt from biblical standards of speech because an opponent is wrong.

External source: 2 Timothy 2:24-25 KJV

43001984 - 'It was translated already; ancient Turkish'

There are genuine Turkish decipherment proposals. That part should not be dismissed. The crucial distinction is between 'someone has published a proposed reading' and 'the manuscript has been deciphered.'

A serious decipherment must supply stable mappings that independent researchers can apply across broad portions of the corpus, with grammatical and semantic coherence and preferably predictive success on previously untreated passages. The broader linguistic literature and Yale continue to treat the manuscript as undeciphered.

External source: Bowern & Lindemann - Linguistics of the Voynich Manuscript

External source: Yale Beinecke - Voynich Manuscript

> Result: A Turkish proposal exists; 'translated already' is an overstatement.
>
> Scriptural principle: Proverbs 18:17 reminds the reader that the first case can sound persuasive until it is searched by another.

External source: Proverbs 18:17 KJV

43002337 - 'pictorial religious allegory'

This is more cautious because it is offered as an alternative rather than announced as a solved translation. Religious allegory is historically conceivable: medieval scientific, medical, astrological, theological, and symbolic categories could overlap in ways that do not map neatly onto modern disciplines.

But the imagery alone does not establish that the entire manuscript is fundamentally a religious allegory. Yale's conventional description emphasizes botanical, astronomical/astrological, bathing, cosmological, pharmaceutical, and text-heavy sections.

External source: Yale Beinecke - Voynich Manuscript

> Result: Speculative. The healthy part of the post is the conditional framing: 'could this be X?' is a testable posture; 'this is X' requires evidence.

43002476 - 'How many languages and codes has AI already deciphered?'

This is a useful skeptical question. The OP's appeal to AI treats artificial intelligence as though it were an omnipotent cryptanalytic oracle. It is not. Computational systems depend heavily on problem formulation: substitution, transposition, syllabary, abbreviation, verbose cipher, constructed language, generated text, transcription scheme, and word-boundary assumptions all change the search space.

The University of Alberta project illustrates the point. Its system could rank candidate languages under imposed assumptions; it did not independently derive an indisputable plaintext from first principles.

External source: University of Alberta - computational Voynich research

> Result: Methodologically sound challenge to AI mystification. The mistake would be to turn it into the opposite absolute: 'AI has not solved it, therefore it cannot be solved.'

43003523 - 'Real?' in response to the Turkish claim

This is epistemically better than immediate acceptance or mockery. The concise answer is: real proposal, yes; accepted decipherment, no.

Every sensational Voynich headline should be read with this distinction in mind. 'Researcher claims a solution' describes the existence of a claim. 'Manuscript deciphered' describes an evidentiary conclusion.

External source: Yale Beinecke - Voynich Manuscript

> Result: Appropriate request for verification.

43003534 - Tartaria believers versus Atlantis

This is primarily social commentary and supplies no evidence about MS 408. It does, however, remind us that alternative-history beliefs do not necessarily form a single package.

Psychological research finds population-level correlations among some conspiracy beliefs and common epistemic motives, but that cannot establish the full belief system or psychology of a specific anonymous poster.

External source: Douglas, Sutton & Cichocka - Psychology of Conspiracy Theories

Result: Possibly interesting social observation; not evidence about the manuscript.

43003599 - 'cryptic biology journal,' intentionally clever code, eventually lost

This is one of the thread's more historically plausible classes of explanation, though still unsupported in its particulars. The illustrations justify investigating herbal, medical, anatomical, pharmaceutical, astrological, and natural-philosophical contexts. A private cipher whose key was later lost is entirely possible in principle.

Calling it a 'biology journal' is potentially anachronistic because fifteenth-century medical, astrological, pharmaceutical, botanical, cosmological, and religious knowledge did not observe modern disciplinary boundaries.

External source: Yale Beinecke - Voynich Manuscript

External source: Greshko - Naibbe cipher

Better formulation: MS 408 may encode practical or scholarly material - perhaps medical, pharmaceutical, natural-philosophical, astrological, or related knowledge - using a private writing or cipher system. Plausible; not proved.

43003972 - 'I can read it'

No method, transcription, mapping, or translation is supplied. Therefore the statement has no testable content. A serious decipherment claim should immediately trigger requests for a stable glyph mapping, grammatical or cryptographic explanation, untreated test passages, handling of variants, and independent reproduction.

Until those appear, 'I can read it' is testimony without demonstration.

Scriptural principle: 1 Thessalonians 5:21 supports testing rather than granting authority to the claimant merely because the claim is confident.

External source: 1 Thessalonians 5:21 KJV

43004291 - alleged consistent translation describing a child-killing cult

This is the thread's most sensational claim and among its least evidenced. What is missing is decisive: no link to the alleged translation, no glyph key, no source-post documentation for the method, no side-by-side corpus transcription, no demonstration of grammar, no predictive test, and no independent replication.

The statement therefore establishes only that one anonymous participant reports having seen another anonymous participant's purported translation. It does not establish what the manuscript says.

Because the claim involves horrific wrongdoing, the evidentiary standard should become more careful, not less. Scripture repeatedly treats false accusation and corroboration seriously.

External source: Bowern & Lindemann - manuscript remains undeciphered in linguistic review

Scriptural principle: Deuteronomy 19:15 belongs to Israel's legal context and is not a modern science manual, but its concern with corroborated testimony rather than unsupported accusation is directly relevant as an ethical principle.

Result: Unsupported.

External source: Deuteronomy 19:15 KJV

XII. Master Claim Matrix

Post	Core claim	Status	Principal problem	Scripture principle
43000855	AI failure suggests alien language	Unsupported	Argument from ignorance	Prov. 18:13; 1 Thess. 5:21
43001287	Text may be meaningless	Plausible in structured-pseudotext form	Possible does not equal proved	1 Thess. 5:21
43001307	No decipherment means no rules	Contradicted	Published statistical structure	Prov. 18:13
43001439	Rules may be beyond human understanding	Speculative	Weak falsifiability	Humility in judgment
43001464	Hoax; no provenance; scam	Mixed	Collapses separate propositions	1 Thess. 5:21
43001483	Stop sinning	Theologically general; evidentially irrelevant	No identified connection to manuscript	2 Tim. 2:24-25
43001512	Hoax likely because others agree	Unsupported as evidence	Agreement not independent confirmation	Prov. 18:17
43001518	Fairy language	Unsupported	No testable evidence	Do not add folklore to Scripture
43001819	Author used hole/grille process	Partly grounded / overstated	Possible reconstruction becomes asserted history	1 Thess. 5:21
43001857	Romani / Tartarian / ancient	Speculative bundle	Unrelated hypotheses conflated	John 7:24
43001941	Tartaria never existed	Contradicted if historical toponym	Overcorrection	John 7:24; 2 Tim. 2
43001984	Already translated as Turkish	Proposal real; conclusion unconfirmed	Proposal not validated solution	Prov. 18:17
43002337	Religious allegory	Speculative	Iconography alone insufficient	Avoid certainty beyond evidence
43002476	AI premise deserves scrutiny	Methodologically sound question	AI treated too generically by OP	1 Thess. 5:21
43003523	Is Turkish claim real?	Appropriate verification	Distinguish existence from validation	Prov. 18:17
43003534	Alternative-history communities differ	Possible social observation	Not manuscript evidence	-
43003599	Private coded scholarly notebook	Plausible general class	Specific content unknown	1 Thess. 5:21
43003972	Poster can read it	Unsupported	No method	1 Thess. 5:21
43004291	Cult/child-killing translation	Unsupported	Hearsay; no reproducible decipherment	Deut. 19:15; Prov. 18:17

XIII. The Psychology of the Thread

Psychology is useful here only if handled carefully. We do not know the identities, histories, mental health, sincerity, or motivations of the posters. Nothing in this paper licenses a diagnosis. What psychology can do is identify mechanisms demonstrated across populations that make certain conversational patterns understandable.

Uncertainty creates explanatory pressure

Douglas, Sutton, and Cichocka organize motivations for conspiracy belief into epistemic, existential, and social categories. People generally want explanations that make events understandable, preserve a sense of predictability, and fit broader models of the world. An undeciphered manuscript is almost a perfect uncertainty machine: clearly structured, visually suggestive, but semantically unavailable.

External source: Douglas, Sutton & Cichocka - The Psychology of Conspiracy Theories

Pattern perception is both necessary and dangerous

Humans survive by detecting patterns. Without pattern detection, there would be no language, science, history, or cryptanalysis. The danger is not pattern-seeking itself but unrestrained interpretive freedom. Voynich research offers thousands of glyph sequences, hundreds of illustrations, many candidate languages, uncertain segmentation, historical spelling variation, and broad semantic choice. Under those conditions, accidental matches become easier to find.

Confirmation bias

Raymond Nickerson's classic review describes confirmation bias as a widespread tendency to seek or interpret evidence in ways partial to existing beliefs or hypotheses. In Voynich work, the danger is obvious: a solver suspects a language; matching-looking words become memorable; failures are explained as spelling variation; pictures appear to confirm guessed vocabulary; and apparent successes reinforce the original premise.

External source: Nickerson - Confirmation Bias: A Ubiquitous Phenomenon in Many Guises

Repetition and familiarity

The illusory truth effect describes the tendency for repeated information to be judged as more true than novel information. A large 2026 meta-analysis covering 182 studies and 366 effect sizes found a small but robust effect after correcting for small-study effects. That matters in forum environments where a rumor can move from 'someone proposed X' to 'somebody proved X' through repeated retelling.

External source: Nature Communications - Systematic review and meta-analysis of the illusory truth effect (2026)

Online disinhibition

John Suler's work describes how anonymity, invisibility, asynchronicity, reduced authority cues, and related conditions can alter online behavior. The thread's rapid movement from technical disagreement to contempt and a death wish illustrates why epistemology cannot be separated from discourse norms.

External source: Suler - The Online Disinhibition Effect

XIV. The Anatomy of a Viral Mystery Narrative

The thread develops in a recognizable sequence. It begins with uncertainty: nobody has conclusively deciphered the manuscript. Uncertainty becomes an extraordinary suggestion: perhaps it is alien. That generates skeptical collapse: perhaps it is simply nonsense. The skeptic overstates his case: no decipherment means no rules. That invites a counter-mystery: perhaps the rules transcend human understanding.

A historical explanation then appears: hoax. The hoax receives a remembered mechanism: a grille. Alternative identities accumulate: Romani, Tartarian, Turkish. Once one proposed translation enters the discussion, the conversation shifts from what is it? to someone already solved it. Finally, a secondhand purported translation supplies emotionally potent content: a murderous cult.

> Key observation: the narrative gains specificity faster than it gains evidence.

This does not prove deliberate fabrication by participants. It shows how retelling, uncertainty reduction, familiarity, and narrative interest can produce increasing confidence even while source quality remains unchanged.

XV. The Tartaria Case Study: How a Real Historical Fact Becomes a Much Larger Claim

Tartaria provides an unusually clear lesson in historical reasoning. First: old European maps use 'Tartary' or 'Tartaria.' True. Second: the term referred broadly to regions associated by European cartographers with peoples they grouped as Tartars. Also true, though the boundaries and categories shifted.

Third: therefore all regions called Tartary belonged to one unified political state. That no longer follows automatically. Fourth: therefore this state represented one suppressed technologically advanced civilization. That requires a large additional body of evidence. Fifth: therefore the Voynich Manuscript is written in its language. That requires another evidentiary bridge again.

External source: Library of Congress - Tracking Tartary on Western Maps

Historical method: Proving the first proposition in a chain does not prove the later propositions. Each inferential arrow needs its own evidence.

XVI. AI Mythology and the Voynich Manuscript

The OP's phrase 'even AI' reflects a wider cultural misconception. Artificial intelligence is not a universal truth machine. A model does not approach an unknown text without assumptions. Researchers decide how glyphs are transcribed, which features matter, what candidate languages exist, what transformations are permitted, and what objective counts as success.

If the manuscript uses a cipher type absent from the model's search space, the correct explanation may never be considered. If spaces are deceptive, treating them as word boundaries can distort every measurement. If symbols encode syllables rather than letters, a letter-based model may ask the wrong question. If the text is pseudotext, a language classifier may still return a 'closest' language because ranking systems generally produce a ranking even when the true category is absent.

The University of Alberta project is useful precisely because it demonstrates both promise and limitation. Computation can search hypothesis spaces systematically; it cannot conjure ground truth where historical constraints and validation are missing.

External source: University of Alberta - AI/computational analysis of the Voynich Manuscript

Better question: What model, trained on what data, under what assumptions, optimized for what task, and validated how?

XVII. Occultism: Evidence Versus Association

The manuscript contains imagery that modern viewers may immediately call occult: circular astronomical or astrological diagrams, zodiac-like motifs, unusual human figures, strange plants, and unexplained structures. None of those observations, individually or together, proves ritual magic, demon worship, necromancy, sorcery, or satanic authorship.

Historically, astrology, medicine, astronomy, calendrical calculation, natural philosophy, herbalism, and religious cosmology overlapped in ways modern categories often obscure. That does not mean occult practices did not exist; it means the practice must first be identified historically before a theological judgment can be attached to it.

Scripture is explicit about divination, enchantment, witchcraft, familiar spirits, wizardry, and necromancy. Deuteronomy 18:9-11 condemns such practices. Isaiah 8:19-20 likewise rebukes resort to familiar spirits and wizards and directs the people to the law and testimony. Those texts tell us what Scripture says about actual practices. They do not tell us that an unidentified circular drawing in MS 408 is one of those practices.

External source: Deuteronomy 18:9-11 KJV

External source: Isaiah 8:19-20 KJV

Proper sequence: establish historically what the manuscript depicts; then, if the practice corresponds to something Scripture addresses, apply the biblical text accurately.

XVIII. A Biblical Epistemology for Investigating Claims

The Bible is not a cryptology textbook, but it repeatedly teaches habits relevant to truthful inquiry.

Hear before answering

> "*He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him.*" - *Proverbs 18:13, KJV*

External source: Proverbs 18:13 KJV

Hear the other examination

> "*He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him.*" - *Proverbs 18:17, KJV*

External source: Proverbs 18:17 KJV

Search

Acts 17:11 commends the Bereans because they searched the Scriptures daily to test what they were hearing. The immediate subject is apostolic preaching and Scripture, not medieval cryptography. Still, the text clearly commends examination rather than passive reception.

External source: Acts 17:11 KJV

Test

> "*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*" - *1 Thessalonians 5:21, KJV*

External source: 1 Thessalonians 5:21 KJV

Judge by reality rather than surface impression

John 7:24 says, "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." The original context should be respected, yet the contrast between appearance and right judgment is directly relevant to the temptation to treat visually mysterious things as automatically mystical.

External source: John 7:24 KJV

Seek corroboration where accusation is serious

Deuteronomy 19:15 requires multiple witnesses in Israel's legal process. It is not a modern peer-review protocol, but it reflects a biblical unwillingness to establish grave accusations on uncorroborated testimony.

External source: Deuteronomy 19:15 KJV

Correct without becoming contentious

Second Timothy 2:23-25 warns against foolish quarrels and commands gentleness, patience, and meekness in correction. That matters especially on anonymous forums, where contempt can masquerade as discernment.

External source: 2 Timothy 2:23-25 KJV

XIX. Scripture, Interpretation, and Historical Claims Must Not Be Blurred

For clarity, every Christian investigation should distinguish at least four levels.

Biblical statement: what the text actually says. Example: Deuteronomy condemns necromancy.

Biblical principle or application: a reasoned application of the text. Example: Christians should not seek occult divination.

Theological or historical inference: a conclusion requiring additional reasoning. Example: a particular historical ritual corresponds to biblical necromancy.

Empirical claim: a proposition established through history, science, linguistics, archaeology, or another evidentiary discipline. Example: the Voynich Manuscript depicts that ritual.

The first does not automatically establish the fourth. This distinction protects Scripture from being made responsible for conclusions Scripture never made, while also protecting research from pretending that neutrality requires ignoring Scripture.

XX. An Interesting Historical Note from the KJV Translators

The supplied Pure Cambridge Edition preserves the translators' historical preface, The Translators to the Reader. That preface is not inspired Scripture and should never be quoted as though it were. Yet its methodological humility is worth noticing.

The translators discussed places where words or senses were difficult and defended acknowledging uncertainty rather than dogmatizing where evidence did not permit certainty. They also defended careful study, comparison, and revision. Their own comments are historically useful precisely because they distinguish the authority of Scripture from the fallibility of human handling of language.

That attitude is relevant here. Intellectual humility does not mean truth is unknowable. It means the investigator should not pretend to possess what the evidence has not yielded.

External historical text: 'The Translators to the Reader' (CCEL transcription)

XXI. Alternative Explanations Compared by Evidence

Model	What it explains	Main difficulty	What would advance it	Status
Natural language under unusual orthography	Long-range organization; recurring morphology-like patterns; section vocabulary	Unusual entropy; no accepted reading	Reproducible grammar and held-out translation	Plausible
Natural language encrypted by verbose/homophonic cipher	Structure plus unusual statistics	No recovered key/plaintext	Historically coherent cipher yielding broad reproducible plaintext	Plausible
Constructed technical notation / mnemonic system	Rigid recurring forms; domain-specific organization	No external key or close comparison	Mapping that predicts unseen sections	Speculative
Meaningful text generated through tables/grilles	Could produce unusual systematic text	Historical method not identified	Physical/documentary evidence or successful consistent decoding	Plausible mechanism
Meaningless structured pseudotext / hoax	Explains undecipherability while preserving regularity	Some language-like organization; historical motive/process unknown	Documentary or physical production evidence	Plausible
Pure random gibberish	Explains unreadability	Fails to explain documented structure	Would require contrary statistical evidence	Contradicted in simple form
Turkish plaintext	Some researchers claim lexical/grammatical correspondences	No broad independent reproduction	Frozen corpus-wide method replicated by others	Unconfirmed proposal
Romani plaintext	Historically possible language family; recent proposal exists	Sparse early written corpus; independent validation needed	Independent historical-linguistic replication	Unconfirmed proposal
Religious allegory	Symbolic manuscript culture historically plausible	Pictures do not uniquely imply allegory	Correlated reproducible reading of text and images	Speculative
Alien / fairy language	Explains mystery only by adding another mystery	No positive discriminating evidence	Unique evidence impossible under human models	Unsupported
Hidden Tartarian language	Historical 'Tartary' term exists	No evidentiary bridge to Voynich	Actual linguistic/documentary connection	Unsupported

XXII. Falsifiability: What Could Make Each Theory Lose?

A good hypothesis should risk being wrong. An extraterrestrial theory needs some property that a human manuscript could not reasonably explain. If every unexplained feature is simply called 'alien,' the proposal is insulated rather than tested. A fairy-language theory has the same problem, compounded by the absence of an independently documented fairy-language corpus.

A specific Turkish or Romani solution is easier to test: publish a fixed reading system and apply it to substantial untreated text. Repeated failure outside handpicked passages would seriously weaken it. A meaningless-hoax model would be strongly weakened by a reproducible decipherment that consistently generates grammatical, historically appropriate plaintext across the manuscript.

A natural-language model would be weakened if increasingly powerful generative or cryptographic models reproduced the manuscript's detailed structure without semantic information while language-based solutions continued to require heavy ad hoc adjustment. A cipher model would be dramatically strengthened by discovery of a stable transformation yielding coherent plaintext, though failure to find a key cannot falsify every conceivable cipher.

> Discipline question: What evidence, identified in advance, would make me change my mind?

XXIII. Voynich Timeline: 1404-2026

Date	Event / evidence
1404-1438	Radiocarbon range commonly reported for sampled parchment; this dates parchment, not automatically the inscription.
15th century	Material evidence and manuscript scholarship place the object in a medieval/early Renaissance context; exact writing date remains debated.
Early 17th century	Reported Rudolf II / Jacobus Horcicky de Tepenec associations belong to the earlier, less secure portion of provenance reconstruction.
1630s onward	Georg Baresch/Barschius possesses or investigates the manuscript; correspondence enters the record.
1665-1666	Johannes Marcus Marci sends the manuscript to Athanasius Kircher with the surviving explanatory letter.
1912	Wilfrid Voynich acquires the manuscript from a Jesuit collection.
1961	Anne Nill sells it to H. P. Kraus.
1969	Kraus donates it to Yale's Beinecke Library.
2001	Landini publishes evidence of linguistic-type statistical structure.
2004	Gordon Rugg publishes a table/grille model demonstrating historically plausible pseudotext generation.
2009	Radiocarbon and materials investigations strongly anchor the physical object in historical production.
2013	Amancio et al. and Montemurro & Zanette publish statistical analyses showing nonrandom, language-compatible organization in important dimensions.
2018	University of Alberta computational work proposes Hebrew as a candidate under specific assumptions, without yielding an accepted decipherment.
2020	Lisa Fagin Davis publishes palaeographical work arguing for multiple scribal hands.
2021	Bowern & Lindemann publish a major linguistic review treating natural-language-based analysis seriously while the text remains unread.
2025	Greshko's Naibbe cipher reproduces multiple Voynich-like statistical properties with a historically motivated verbose substitution mechanism.
2026	Kinnison reports that a verbose-cipher model can reproduce the manuscript's unusual positional-entropy profile; no plaintext results.

External source: Radiocarbon dating summary

External source: Rugg, 2004

External source: Amancio et al., 2013

External source: Montemurro & Zanette, 2013

External source: Bowern & Lindemann, 2021

External source: Greshko, 2025

External source: Kinnison, 2026

XXIV. A Note on Scribal Hands: Apparently Settled Details Can Remain Open

Lisa Fagin Davis's palaeographical analysis argued that multiple scribes - commonly summarized as five principal hands - participated in producing the manuscript. Multiple hands would matter because they could imply collaborative or workshop-like production rather than one isolated author. The article is a serious palaeographical contribution, not a decipherment.

External source: Lisa Fagin Davis, 'How Many Glyphs and How Many Scribes?' (bibliographic discussion)

The broader methodological lesson is more important than forcing consensus: scribal attribution is an interpretation built from handwriting features, and such interpretations remain open to scrutiny. A later

challenge does not erase the earlier paper merely by existing; nor should the earlier paper become untouchable because it was published first.

> Responsible formulation: Multiple hands are a serious palaeographical interpretation. The exact scribal model should remain open to further evidence.

XXV. Source-Provenance Audit

Primary and institutional material includes the manuscript itself, historical correspondence, Yale's Beinecke descriptions and digital resources, and laboratory reports. These are strongest for what the object physically is and what surviving documents contain.

Peer-reviewed scholarship includes Cryptologia, Manuscript Studies, Annual Review of Linguistics, PLOS ONE, and relevant psychology journals. These are strongest for technical arguments, though peer review is quality control rather than a guarantee of final truth.

Specialist research sites and preprints can be valuable in a small field where ideas circulate quickly, but their claims need additional scrutiny.

University news and journalism can establish who claimed what and explain research for general readers; they should not replace the underlying paper when the paper is available.

Forums and anonymous posts are primary sources only for the discourse itself: they establish what was said, not whether the scientific or historical proposition is true.

The same principle applies to source independence. Five articles derived from one press release are not five independent confirmations. Twenty forum posts repeating one translation claim are not twenty decipherments. Source-counting must never replace source-tracing.

XXVI. Open Questions We Should Refuse to Pretend Are Closed

A rigorous investigation should preserve unanswered questions rather than conceal them. We still do not know with confidence who authored or commissioned the manuscript; the exact date its text was written; whether all sections were produced at the same time; the precise geographic place of production; whether Voynichese directly represents a natural language; whether it encodes natural language through a cipher; whether it represents specialized notation; whether some or all of it is deliberately generated pseudotext; the relationship between every image and neighboring text; or a generally accepted plaintext.

Those are not failures of the paper. They are findings. There is intellectual value in describing the boundary between the known and unknown accurately.

XXVII. Reproducibility Appendix

This investigation used 4chan /x/ thread 43000855 as the discourse object and reviewed the visible posts discussed above as available on 25 September 2026. The thread is used only to establish what anonymous participants claimed.

External source: 4chan /x/ thread 43000855

Each substantive forum statement was separated into smaller testable propositions. For example, 'it is a hoax with no chain of custody created to fleece a buyer' becomes three questions: Is a historical hoax technically possible? Is there documentary provenance? Is there evidence for a fraudulent sales motive?

Historical claims were checked preferentially against institutional manuscript resources, provenance evidence, material analysis, and specialist manuscript scholarship. Linguistic claims were checked against published statistical and cryptological work. Claimed 'solutions' were evaluated by separating the existence of a proposal from independent validation of the proposal.

Psychological concepts were drawn from population-level research and were not used as clinical diagnoses. Scripture was used to establish theological teaching and principles of truthful judgment, not to fill empirical gaps in the manuscript record.

Original source for this paper: https://libraryofrickandria.com/voynich-manuscript/

XXVIII. Selected External Research Links

1. Original Library of Rickandria source
https://libraryofrickandria.com/voynich-manuscript/

2. Original 4chan /x/ thread 43000855
https://boards.4chan.org/x/thread/43000855

3. Yale Beinecke Library - Voynich Manuscript
https://beinecke.library.yale.edu/collections/highlights/voynich-manuscript

4. Yale / Beinecke material-analysis dossier
https://beinecke.library.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/voynich_analysis.pdf

5. Radiocarbon dating of the Voynich MS - technical summary
https://www.voynich.nu/extra/carbon.html

6. Bowern & Lindemann - The Linguistics of the Voynich Manuscript
https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011619-030613

7. Amancio et al. - Probing the Statistical Properties of Unknown Texts
https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0067310

8. Montemurro & Zanette - Keywords and Co-Occurrence Patterns
https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0066344

9. Gordon Rugg - An Elegant Hoax?
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0161-110491892755

10. Michael Greshko - The Naibbe cipher
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01611194.2025.2566408

11. Rod Kinnison - Voynich positional entropy research
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01611194.2026.2697318

12. University of Alberta - computational / Hebrew proposal coverage
https://www.ualberta.ca/en/science/news/2018/january/ai-used-to-decipher-ancient-manuscript.html

13. Library of Congress - Tracking Tartary on Western Maps
https://blogs.loc.gov/maps/2025/06/tracking-tartary-on-western-maps/

14. Douglas, Sutton & Cichocka - The Psychology of Conspiracy Theories
https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417718261

15. Nickerson - Confirmation Bias
https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.2.175

16. Suler - The Online Disinhibition Effect
https://doi.org/10.1089/1094931041291295

17. Nature Communications - 2026 illusory-truth meta-analysis
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-026-70041-x

18. King James Bible - Bible Gateway
https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/King-James-Version-KJV-Bible/

XXIX. Mystery Is Not Evidence: A Christian Discipline of Uncertainty

The most important conclusion of this paper is not a proposed solution to the Voynich Manuscript. It is a method for living with something we have not solved.

Mystery is real. Mystery can provoke wonder. Mystery can motivate careful investigation. But mystery is not positive evidence for whichever explanation most excites or frightens us.

The fact that Scripture affirms a supernatural world does not mean every unexplained object is supernatural. The fact that hoaxes exist does not mean every mysterious object is fraudulent. The fact that historical conspiracies exist does not mean gaps in documentation are proof of conspiracy. The fact that artificial intelligence cannot solve a text does not make the text alien. The fact that a proposed translation produces a meaningful sentence does not prove the decoding system is correct. And the fact that somebody remembers another anonymous poster having solved the manuscript does not establish what the manuscript says.

The thread repeatedly invites two temptations: credulity and contempt. Credulity says, I want this extraordinary explanation to be true, so ambiguity becomes evidence. Contempt says, I find this explanation ridiculous, so I no longer need to examine it fairly. Neither is a good method.

Scripture points toward something more disciplined: hear before answering; search; test; allow a claim to be cross-examined; judge beyond appearances; demand appropriate testimony; correct error without becoming vicious; and hold fast only after proving.

> "*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*" - *1 Thessalonians 5:21, KJV*

As of 25 September 2026, the responsible conclusion remains that the Voynich Manuscript is a genuine historical manuscript containing highly structured writing whose production mechanism and semantic content have not been securely recovered. Natural-language explanations deserve serious investigation. Cipher explanations deserve serious investigation. Structured pseudotext and historical-hoax mechanisms deserve serious investigation. Specific claimed decipherments deserve fair testing.

Aliens, fairies, a hidden Tartarian civilization, or an alleged child-killing cult require evidence that has not been produced.

Where the evidence speaks, we should follow it. Where it contradicts us, we should correct ourselves. Where Scripture speaks, we should not soften it. Where Scripture does not speak, we should not put our speculation into its mouth.

And where the evidence ends, three honest words remain available:

> *We do not know.*
>
> *That is not surrender. Sometimes it is the beginning of wisdom.*
>
> *Soli Deo Gloria.*

Original source: Library of Rickandria - Voynich Manuscript

Scripture: 1 Thessalonians 5:21 KJV

Field Checklist for Any Future "Voynich Solution"

Before treating a new decipherment as established, ask whether it can answer all of the following without changing its rules midstream:

1. Is the transcription system fixed and published before the claimed translation is evaluated?
2. Do the same glyph values and segmentation rules work across large, non-selected portions of the manuscript?
3. Does the proposal explain repeated forms, rare forms, positional restrictions, section differences, and known statistical structure?
4. Can independent researchers reproduce the reading without private guidance from the original solver?
5. Does the language, cipher, or notation fit the manuscript's historical period and material context?
6. Has the method been tested on held-out folios that were not used to construct the key?
7. Are failures, ambiguities, and exceptions counted openly rather than explained away after the fact?
8. Does the proposal make predictions that could prove it wrong?

Rule of thumb: A solution becomes persuasive when its rules constrain the solver more than the solver can constrain the text.

This checklist operationalizes the paper's central method: claim -> evidence -> test -> result. It is intended as a reproducible audit tool, not as a verdict on any particular future claimant.