

EMBARGO: Strictly NOT for publication or dissemination without the prior written approval of the copyright holder

CVpedia More

A repository of essays, independently authored, and other scholarly resources offering supplementary information to that available in The National CVpedia of Britain. Whilst items are subject to editorial input and the firm obligation is placed upon authors to articulate the truth as they see it, no responsibility is taken for the accuracy of the information presented.

More 26

6 April 2012

English was in Britain before the Romans

By **Michael Goormachtigh**

In contrast to what is mentioned in every schoolbook worldwide, English never was imported into Britain by the Anglo-Saxons. Official history is simple. It goes like this: after the fall of the Roman Empire the Anglo-Saxons, who were initially hired as mercenaries by the Britons to protect them against marauding Picts and Scots, eventually took over Britain and imposed their Germanic language on the defenceless inhabitants.

What is stunning is that this story lacks any form of evidence. For instance, no contemporary writer mentions a language transition in Britain; not on the Continent, nor in Britain itself. One of the most important sources for the epoch is Gildas [see CVpedia Sources]. He was an abbot who lived in the sixth century and clearly hated the Anglo-Saxons. Gildas was the one who gave them a bad reputation for the next 1400 years. He certainly would have used a forced language imposition to prove his point that these devils were really unspeakably bad. Yet he never reported any such forced language imposition. This, despite the fact that he wrote some 100 years after the alleged take-over by the Anglo-Saxons. The imposed language switch must have been in full swing as barely one century after Gildas, his successor, the Venerable Bede, mentions the first poems in English. Evidently, the majority of the population had taken over what we now recognize as Old English in a record breaking time, an achievement unseen since. This alleged phenomenon is the more exceptional when one appreciates that the Anglo-Saxons had no written language, no literature and barely any culture. After the departure of the Romans in AD 410, most of the British cities became void of their inhabitants and the vast majority of the population lived spread across the land. How were the Anglo-Saxons able to reach them and then to force them to learn a new language, while the natives were obliged to farm or starve? Despite all that, the new language is said to have overcome the native tongue, as well as the far more cultured Latin, without apparent hindrance.

Over in Gaul a real language transition was still happening at the time of Bede. What the Gauls could not do in less than one thousand years, the British achieved in less than two centuries. Bear in mind that Latin was considered to be a highly prestigious language at the time, while English... you see the picture. The much better organized Franks were not capable of imposing their language in Gaul. Even the most fervent adepts of the idea that English was imported by the Anglo-Saxons are amazed that the language transition could have happened so swiftly in Britain and so profoundly that even Ancient British place-names disappeared. A full-sized genocide hypothesis was

EMBARGO: Strictly NOT for publication or dissemination without the prior written approval of the copyright holder

proposed to explain this unparalleled phenomenon, but modern genetics eventually contradicted that.

What supposedly happened in Britain contrasts with what happened in Gaul: there, fifth century Roman writers like the Christian Sidonius Apollinaris wrote about the Celtic-Latin language transition. Apollinaris wrote five centuries after the language transition in Gaul began and in his letters to Rome he complains about the fact that half the Gaulish population could not understand his Latin sermons.

In Gaul we have more evidence: most ancient place-names are of duly Celtic origin. In Britain, the origin of place-names is much different. While to the west of the Pennines many place-names are indeed Celtic, once one crosses the Pennines to the east, such Celtic place-names are almost entirely missing. Even famous modern etymologists are amazed that in some regions, such as Norfolk and Suffolk, no evidently Celtic place-names are found. It was as if the Anglo-Saxons had changed all place-names. But weird enough, the original Roman place-names were left untouched by the Anglo-Saxons. How contrasting with the supposedly uncivilised nature of the Anglo-Saxons.

A third and well known problem is the virtual complete absence of Celtic words in the English language. Such a problem does not exist in French. That language counts many words of Celtic origin. Actually, English has more words from Australian Aborigines than from its supposed own Celtic origin.

Let us be serious: what is written above is already more than sufficient to doubt about the official version of history of how English came to Britain. And there is far more to tell. The only reasonable alternative is that English was native to Britain.

To short-cut a long scientific explanation: proto-English was imported into southeast England around 4700 BC when the first Germano-Belgic speaking farmers crossed the English Channel and settled in east Britain. The Celtic speaking farmers came later, found the best land in the east already occupied and were forced to content themselves with the much less fertile western part of Britain. The reality is that Britain was a bilingual region when the Romans conquered it. The east, most of modern England without the Southwest, spoke proto-English and in the west, Wales, greater Cornwall, Scotland and Ireland, a Celtic language was spoken. Pockets of Celtic would continue to exist in west England until the tenth century AD. Confused? The reality is always more complicated.

Michael Goormachtigh