

---

Subject: Re: Are YOU a Pirate???

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 19 Aug 2006 13:34:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You refuse to look at things from a realistic POV don't you? I'm talking about how each weapon would fare if used in the way they were used typically. Plus, your vision of vikings is false. They aren't as big, strong, and powerful as you'd like to imagine they were. They're not these invincible barbarians. They are humans. Some bigger than others. Some stronger than others. They weren't these body building warriors. They were just regular conquering people. They just happened to be one of the most successful and have this image of uncleanness thanks to the Christians of that time giving off the big, bad, hairy vikings.

Militaries of that time didn't win simply because of brute strength and numbers. A lot had to do with tactics. You said yourself that they invented flanking. They didn't have to be brutefull if they were tactical.

Pirate cutlass vs. viking sword:

<http://www1.kamakuranet.ne.jp/sankaido/parts/photo/pirate%20cutlass.jpg>

<http://www.silvermane.com/overstock/BK-YK133%20Viking%20Sword.jpg>

The viking sword is longer and a little wider, but the viking isn't necessarily going to be this big burly guy capable of crushing the skull of any man with his hands.

Also, pirate cutlasses were made of more refined and strong metals. They could easily withstand the blow from the viking sword.

Pirate pistol vs. viking sword:

Now, if the pistol hits and kills the viking. That's all said and done. If the pistol misses its mark or doesn't kill the viking, it's right back to cutlass vs. sword, since the pirate will usually have both out in his hands.

Pistol vs. bow:

Realistically, hand-to-hand combat with a viking bow is very unlikely, as the archer would have to stay in place to be able to fire accurately, but if you have a charging pirate coming after you, then you can't exactly stand in place. Plus, a running pirate shooting his pistol is more accurate than a running viking shooting his bow. Instead, he'd use his sword... thus bringing us back (yet again) to the cutlass vs. sword argument.

For the archer to be effective, he would have to be out of the pirate's range of attack. Thus rendering any argument useless.

Cutlass vs. bow:

Again, for the archer to be effective, he would have to be out of the pirate's range of attack.

If the pirate gets too close, he has no option but to take out his sword (if he happens to carry one) and fight the pirate cutlass vs. sword (yet again). If he kept trying to use his bow, he'd have a hard time trying to grab an arrow, get it ready for firing, and firing the bow while the pirate is slicing viking flesh like it was nothing.

---