

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

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

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-05/msg00600.html>

- *From:* Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 31 May 2005 09:17:48 +1200
-

On Mon, 30 May 2005 10:49:38 GMT, "IEJ" <Iejohansson@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>
>"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> skrev i meddelandet
>news:gpl191t2rmi6uu58m6p8j1chjmqedsovd@xxxxxxxxxx
>> On Mon, 30 May 2005 07:09:11 GMT, "IEJ" <Iejohansson@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> skrev i meddelandet
>>>news:o13191de6bmmblvglfserj9al7fpp46m9@xxxxxxxxxx
>>>> On Mon, 30 May 2005 02:27:24 GMT, Philip Deitiker
>>>><Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> says in
>>>>>news:cpqk919grm7rpgsshetskmgvhvqlan08ogu@xxxxxxxx:
>>>>>
>>>>>>>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

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

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

>> >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 Bråvallaslaget 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
>> >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.
>>
>> You will have to argue with the dictionary. It says " Of or relating
>> to medieval Scandinavia or its peoples, languages, or cultures."
>
>English Dictionary I presume, not Scandinavian ones. There is a distinct
>difference from Migration Age up between the different Scandinavian groups
>and countries.

Inger, we are all writing in English. I'm using english words with english meanings.

>> >
>> >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.
>>
>> But what are Nordic countries if not Norse?
>
>Norse is your way of placing four eggs that used to be three eggs under one
>and the same hat. But we aren't in a hat. There are and have always been
>very strong borders between our different groups. Skane has belonged to
>Sweden since mid 1600's but many Skåningar as well as many here doesn't look
>upon them as Swedes.

But in the english world we tend to look on them all as norse.

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

Eric Stevens

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

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

 - Prev by Date: **Re: info to 'little johnnyboy'**
 - Next by Date: **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
 - 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**