

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-05/msg00578.html>

- *From:* "IEJ" <Iejohansson@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 30 May 2005 07:09:11 GMT
-

"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> skrev i meddelandet news:o13l91de6bmmblvglfsferj9al7fpp46m9@xxxxxxxxxx
> On Mon, 30 May 2005 02:27:24 GMT, Philip Deitiker
> <Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> says in
> > news:cpqk919grm7rpgsshetksmghvqlan08ogu@xxxxxxx:
> >
> >>> There are people and there are times. She is arguing Norwegian
> >>> and Swede after 1350, not Norse during the 11th century.
> >>
> >> You seem to be equating Norse with Viking. They are not the same
> >> thing.
> >
> > The Viking period ended at the end of the 10th century. The
> > greenlanders were christianized thereafter and would have been Norse.
> > The swedish state with recognized borders did not begin until 1323,
> > however a partial definition was in place by the 12th century. Prior
> > to that people would have been informally called Swedes if they were
> > from eastern trading portion of the viking world, prior to 1323 there
> > was a contested claim over finland, so at that time the Swedish state
> > would have been Swedo-finnic.
>
> > All of which is correct.

Not at all correct. Sweden's borders were recognised in a tract between Sweden, Denmark and Norway in early 11th century. Officially the consensus refer to the 12th century meeting in Kongahälla 1101, but there are fragments left of the earlier meeting which was held in Olof Skötkongungs days. Sweden as a country is documented long before that. Unfortunately for the Icelandic Sagas which tried/tries to make believe that it started in Old Uppsala there are documents older than the mythical Brävallaslaget which confirms that there was a type of union between the Goths living in Wisigothia and Ostrogothia on one hand and the group living around Aros (Västerås, Västmanland) in Migration Age whenever enemies were attacking. The oldest mentioning of Sweden as a country goes back before migration age and stipulates that it starts on the eastern shore of Wigotha

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

Elf.....

They all come under the umbrella term

> 'norse'. See <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Norse>

Not in Medieval Age. That's a later fabricated word which assumes that the Roman Historians meant the same with the Latin words they used for 'Nordmen' and people living in the Nordic countries.

In Medieval Age up to 1390's there were a clear distinction between the three Nordic countries: Sweden, Norway and Denmark. Finland belonged to Sweden as it done most of the time since Hermaneric's days.(Roman and East European sources up to 1115 AD) What's also forgotten is that the real Kvens up to around same period were in majority north of a line from Gävle to Bergen.

>>

>>>>I certainly do. This groups is polluted with off–topic

>>>>alternative archaeology because of the belief of one or two

>>>>people.

>>>

>>> Either you have your tongue in your cheek or you are misguided.

>>

>>Me?

>

> Is there anyone else in the room?

>>

>>>>>>I see so that is the license to play loosely with the facts.

>>>>>

>>>>> So,you consider that she plays looseley with the facts is

>>>>> grounds to call her a racist?

>>>>

>>>>Playing loosely with facts can be an indication of many things,

>>>>in this case her statement of 'play homage to me' ...

>>>

>>> "play homage to me"?

>>

>>> Inger never said that. I've searched both

>>

>>' and ' indicate a paraphrasing. The first time you've seen

>>paraphrasing marks.

>

> I might have taken them as paraphrasing if you hadn't labeled it a

> 'statement'.

>

>>She was in essence implying that a person was

>>inadequate if they could not pay homage to her 'forthcoming' facts of

>>evidence. 'Pay homage to my people' means 'pay homage to me'.

>>Looks like we are back to the obfuscating Eric. Eric, you know damn

>>well what I mean, you have no need to play games, your offense at the

>>racism claim is a actually an attempt to defend her agenda from the

>>reality of her critics, true of false. Playing loosely with the facts

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

>>as you know she has been doing, might be explained by ignorance, but
>>she has so many times pulled out bovine excrement and wanted someone
>>else to do the homework, 95% of these so-called links between Canada
>>and the NE US are utter brain farts. And the excuses.
>> Truth or not, do you believe all her excuses? How about 50%, 25%.
>>And if you don't believe them how can you not see deliberacy. The so
>>called fauna picking, again one error, fine, but she has brought up a
>>half dozen animals and claimed these connect old world and new world
>>via the Norse. You be the judge, how many of these connections is a
>>solid link. So, therefore, consider whether or not this is deliberate
>>or just an inability to learn from past mistakes. Shall we go through
>>all the flora and fauna. Kettles, Clams, Horses, Let us
>>go through the Archaeology, the so called new studies, new native
>>american sites for Norse, all the reports that are supposed to be now
>>published or aired, where are they, how come none have appeared.
>>And let us not consider how many threads she started went in the
>>direction of false accusations, sex mail, viruses, claims about
>>supreme knowledge of the internet, etc. Certainly there is no
>>deliberacy there on diverting the discussion.

Philip once again tries to spread lies about me and what I have written. I have no problem with scholars or non-scholars not arriving to same conclusion as I have, but I have a lot of problems with those who like Philip starts from a prejudice view and don't think that they NEED to go back to the Prime Sources referred to because this or that scholar they believe in either forgotten to mention those sources or taken quotes completely out of the context contradicting the Prime sources they say they read but normally when checked at best only read what other scholars referred to without checking if the other scholars' conclusion and assumptions are in line of the Prime Source at all. It's a difference between doing one's homework and say you done it by referring to someone else you assume to have done his.

Inger E

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Eric Stevens

• *References:*

- ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Philip Deitiker

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

- ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Philip Deitiker
- ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Philip Deitiker
- ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Philip Deitiker
- ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Eric Stevens

- Prev by Date: **Re: Free Masons history**
- Next by Date: **Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
- Next by thread: **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**