

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-05/msg00662.html>

- *From:* Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 01 Jun 2005 08:08:12 +1200
-

On Tue, 31 May 2005 07:23:27 GMT, "IEJ" <Iejohansson@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>
>"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> skrev i meddelandet
>news:n19n9191qa6i8bohtvigvo0icrsul4tot3@xxxxxxxxxx
>> On Mon, 30 May 2005 22:11:44 GMT, "IEJ" <Iejohansson@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>"Eric Stevens" <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx> skrev i meddelandet
>>>news:32vm91lh0n6btaui52str87javcgg1k93v@xxxxxxxxxx
>>>> 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:cpqk919grm7rpgsshetksmghvqlan08ogu@xxxxxxxxxx:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>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

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

>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 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."
>> >> >> >>

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

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

>> >> >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 norske.
>> >
>> >Well what I was trying to tell you in the English speaking world was that
>> >you use this in a wrong way. It's like saying that NZ was Aussie.
>> >
>>
>> >Its like talking about Australasians.
>
>> >I guess you would LOVE to be called that. Wouldn't you?? :-)
>Inger E

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

I don't know about LOVE but I have absolutely no objection when the collective activities of the two countries are under discussion. It's quite common usage.

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