

Re: 'fiske' answer to Alan and others

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-12/0801.html>

From: Alan Crozier (alan.crazier_at_telia.com)

Date: 12/18/04

Date: Sat, 18 Dec 2004 12:56:30 GMT

"I.E_Johansson" <inger_e.johansson@telia.com> wrote in message
news:teTwd.124708\$dP1.447297@newsc.telia.net...
<snip> I hope this will make my thoughts understandable.

None of this does, unfortunately. You have cited a load of sources and examples but none of them say anything in favour of your arguments. I'll try to explain. Read carefully what I say below.

> *First of all the sentence I put forward for discussion was and still is:*
'We
> *war ok fiske.'*
>
> *In order to explain why the 'fiske' word is correct I start with a short*
> *discussion round the words 'We war'.*
> *The two words were used for 'we were' in some Birgittiner monestries's*
> *documents in first part of 15th century. That I will not comment here due*
to
> *the fact that I neither can show it to have been used before 1400 nor*
intend
> *to discuss when it first was used in Swedish.*

This is the most crucial point, so it is understandable why you don't want to discuss it. You are admitting that you have no case.

> *All I would like to point to*
> *in that question is that the '-um' form was dropped earlier than what some*
> *non-Swedish scholars assumed.*
>
> *" § 205 Imperfektum.*
> ..
> *b. Plural. Den fsv. Böjningen var '-um', '-in' och '-u' eller '-o'*
beroende
> *på vokalbalans.*
> *'-o' genomfördes hos alla starka verb, även de kortstaviga. Så i*
1500-talets
> *bibelspråk. Utanför detta förekommer under 1500- och 1600-talen*
synnerligen

- > ofta '-e': *de ginge, droge, sloge, äre o.s.v. Troligen beror detta på en*
- > *försvagning av 'o' till 'e' (§159).."*
- > *Quote from [Wessén, 1962, page 227]*

All this shows is that "we were" in medieval Swedish could take a variety of forms: varum, varo, vare. But not a single example where the ending is lost completely (var), as on the KRS.

<snipped irrelevance>

- > *You can't expect to find same form and same spelling used over all of King*
- > *Magnus Eriksson's land in mid 1300's.*

This is another strawman. Nobody sensible has claimed that spelling was uniform in the 14th century. It wasn't standardized in any vernacular language.

- > *Back to 'fiske'. One thing that normally is forgotten when discussing the*
- > *stem 'fisk' is the differences between Östergötland Småland on one hand*
- and
- > *most of other parts of Sweden in 14th century on the other. While the*
- plural
- > *'r' still remain up to the time when it was re-introduced the 'r-'*
- dropping
- > *were in regular use. Example:*
- > *"R-bortfallet är i fsv. Mest konsekvent genomfört i vissa östgötska och*
- > *småländska texter(Östgötalagens äldsta fragment, Smålandslagen, Birgittas*
- > *autografer). Ex.: pl. fiska, biskopa.." (Wessén 1962, sid 42).*

These examples concern the loss of -r in plural nouns. The "fiske" on the KRS is not a noun, and even if it was it would not be in the plural form. Some days you want it to be a noun, some days a verb. Now you are back to making "fiske" into a noun. Your thinking is very muddled here. Are you suggesting that the phrase on the KRS means "wi war ok fiskar", i.e. "we were fish too"? I agree that there is something fishy about the stone, but I don't think the carvers were claiming to be fish.

I don't know how long it took you to dig out these quotations and examples and type it all up. In any case it was wasted time because the arguments are all irrelevant diversions. What you need to do to prove your case is:

Find a genuine medieval example of the use of a singular verb form after a plural subject. It doesn't have to be "wi war", any subject and any verb will do.

Find a genuine medieval example of the construction "vara ok göra" (to be doing something).

Concentrate on these two tasks and if you succeed you will have found your first real linguistic evidence to back your case. I warn you, though: you will have to search for a very long time. And it still won't prove that the

sci.archaeology: Re: 'fiske' answer to Alan and others

stone is genuine.

Alan

--

Alan Crozier
Lund
Sweden