

Re: Modern Historians And Gildas

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-04/msg00433.html>

- *From:* Robert Stonehouse <ew65@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 23 Apr 2006 22:54:46 +0100
-

On Sun, 23 Apr 2006 04:35:19 -0500,
kenney@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

In article <%dv2g.53991\$d5.208479@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
inger_e.johansson@xxxxxxxxxx (IE J) wrote:

Alan when I write Britain it should be Briton which definitely
not went beyond Humber. I have seen many different maps of
Briton before Migration Age. All constructed of course.

Inger here you have to distinguish between Briton as a
geographic term which is short for the British Isles. Roman
Britain, An Great Britain which was the result of the union of
Scotland, Wales and England. Unfortunately all of these including
Roman Britain went beyond the Humber.

I take this as parody, but we must not get Great Britain
wrong. In French it becomes clear: Bretagne (Brittany)
versus Grand'Bretagne (Britain), which has a larger area. In
particular, the 'great' has nothing to do with patriotism or
power, though people (including King James) often use it to
sound that way.

England may not have existed but it is useful as a term to speak
about the areas of Anglo-Saxon influence.

Vortigen if he existed was not an Anglo-Saxon and was native to
(post Roman) Britain. He is traditionally said to have invited
Hengest and Horsa to come into Britain. He was later associated
with Merlin see Geoffrey of Monmouth.

—
Robert Stonehouse

Re: Modern Historians And Gildas

To mail me, replace invalid with uk. Inconvenience regretted