



## Re: Celtic Origins

>>>>

>>>> So you would have to consider a migration (small numbers)  
>>>> instead of an invasion (large number of peoples). Consider the  
>>>> spread of the Islam, there  
>>>> were both options and both options were taken. Most interesting  
>>>> for the topic considered is the spread of Islam with the trans  
>>>> Sahara trade. Plenty  
>>>> of people adopted the new religion and the arabic language for  
>>>> the benefits  
>>>> it would provide in trading.

>>>>

>>>> If that does not clarify the issue consider the following.  
>>>> Since the megaliths at least times with strong cross-channel  
>>>> ties and times with little ties came and went. The Armorican  
>>>> Early Bronze age is nearly indistinguishable from its  
>>>> cross-channel counterparts. Late Bronze Age artefacts are very  
>>>> close over far greater distances. Early Latène scrollwork  
>>>> is a common feature on both sides.

>>>>

>>>> There is presumably a local part of 'culture' and a 'non-local'  
>>>> part. If burial customs, providing the mass of archaeological  
>>>> data, are local based,  
>>>> what chance do you have of deciding who is a mainland celt and  
>>>> who isn't? People would be buried according to local customs,  
>>>> no matter where they were  
>>>> born. OTOH if burial customs rely on customs that were  
>>>> widespread, again there would be little data to separate locals  
>>>> from immigrants.

>>>>

>>>> So only in those cases, where burial customs were transported  
>>>> with people, in cases of massive invasions of whole populations  
>>>> or the consideration of personal preferences, would archaeology  
>>>> be able to distinguish between locals and Celts. The warriors  
>>>> would marry local women, they would have to use local products,  
>>>> and they would be buried according to local customs.

>>>>

>>>> The grave of the archer found at Stonehenge (Avebury?) was  
>>>> according to local customs, only analysis of the teeth showed,  
>>>> that he had been born in Switzerland. Absence of proof is not  
>>>> proof of absence.

>>>>

>> It's not just a continuation of burial practices. Small  
>> migrations, as I have already said, would certainly have  
>> happened, but no invasions, either mass or of elite rulers. The  
>> people making the products were locals, they pretty much kept  
>> everything as it was. An invasion of an elite ruling class  
>> would have changed more than just the language surely. They  
>> would have brought their own artesans, burial practices (at  
>> least for themselves), dwelling types, modes of transport, etc.  
>> In this case, it's not a case of there being an absence of  
>> evidence of an invasion, it is a case of there being quite a bit

Re: Celtic Origins

## Re: Celtic Origins

>> of evidence that there was no invasion. That is a different  
>> situation altogether.  
>  
> Your starting to sound like Doug, some of the evidence is  
> interpretively either way.

And what evidence is that?

> To say the evidence suggests the opposite  
> you have to also include the potential that subjectively interpreted  
> evidence is negligible in favor of continuity.  
>  
> I am intrigued by some of the haplotypes in the UK British, enough  
> so that I want to see a resolution of the northern coast of France  
> and Belgium. Although timing is a big question. If the history of GB  
> is correct and all the indigenous peoples were pushed into Wales,  
> then it is possible you are correct, but HISTORY reflected on by  
> genetics has a POOR track record. Historians tend to exaggerate  
> effects 2 or 3 fold in favor of whoever is writing the history. I am  
> still kind of pissed by this concept that the 'Grecan' Celts was  
> nothing more than confused understanding of language and culture,  
> further confounded by the Romans.  
> I have to say, I need to see the genetics, I need to see for fact  
> that some pocketed groups of Northern Europeans did not migrate with  
> some density during the Neolithic period. The only thing that I trust  
> are the CwB and A Cw B haplotypes.

The genetic studies have already shown that there is a cutoff line that can be drawn in western England. There is also a north-south divide apparently. However, the evidence does not show that the original population were all crammed into Wales. IIRC the evidence showed that the Anglo-Saxons (and later, the Vikings) mixed with the locals. They just didn't do it to the same degree in Wales, Cornwall, or Scotland for some reason. Way back when, there was a long discussion about that study carried on here. Can anyone remember the thread(s)?

>

.

---

### • References:

- ◆ [Celtic Origins](#)  
◇ From: Peter Alaca
- ◆ [Re: Celtic Origins](#)  
◇ From: Doug Weller
- ◆ [Re: Celtic Origins](#)  
◇ From: JMB
- ◆ [Re: Celtic Origins](#)

Re: Celtic Origins

◇ *From:* Alan Crozier

◆ ***Re: Celtic Origins***

◇ *From:* JMB

◆ ***Re: Celtic Origins***

◇ *From:* Hayabusa

◆ ***Re: Celtic Origins***

◇ *From:* JMB

◆ ***Re: Celtic Origins***

◇ *From:* Uwe Müller

◆ ***Re: Celtic Origins***

◇ *From:* JMB

◆ ***Re: Celtic Origins***

◇ *From:* prd

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Celtic Origins***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Celtic Origins***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Celtic Origins***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Celtic Origins***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***