

THE
NATIONAL REVIEW.

VOL. IV.

JANUARY AND APRIL 1857.

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

LONDON:
CHAPMAN AND HALL, 193 PICCADILLY.

MDCCLVII.

ART. V.—LATHAM AND GRIMM ON THE ETHNOLOGY
OF GERMANY.

The Germania of Tacitus. By Dr. R. G. Latham. Walton and Maberly, 1851.

Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache. By Jacob Grimm. Leipzig, 1848.

THE battle concerning the unity of the human races has not yet been fought out: the adverse combatants are as confident as though nothing had been said to the purpose on the opposite side. In part, this has been owing to a Mosaic and to an anti-Mosaic bias; but still more, we suspect, to that mist of obscurity which all controversies fomented by religious passion are apt to diffuse, far beyond the region in which that passion dwells. One school uses words in a different sense from another; in which case each is liable to erroneous reasoning by the inveterate ambiguity of terms. In this controversy there is, as it appears to us, also a tendency to mistake the question really at issue; and although we are about to address ourselves to the races of ancient Germany, it will give clearness to our remarks if we prefix some thoughts concerning the wider argument.

In speculating on the earlier history of man, especially in respect to the propagation of human races, it may be maintained that they *have*, or that they *have not*, sprung out of a single homogeneous and narrowly localised race. To determine which of these two hypotheses is true, if it can be determined by science, is of course matter of scientific interest. But there is a second question, which is ordinarily confounded with the first,—we mean, whether human races *did* or *did not* spring from a single pair of progenitors, male and female—an Adam and an Eve. To prove that all mankind are of one race, and diffused from one locality, will never prove that all came from a single pair; which, though capable of being received as a doctrine of specific revelation, seems impossible to be proved by science, and loaded with considerable improbability as soon as one begins to reason about it, from whatever presumption we start concerning the origin of man. For if, *on the one hand*, we believe man to have been created by a strictly supernatural process (by the “immediate hand” of God), yet, unless an infinite series of miracles is imagined to follow, the utter helplessness of an isolated man and woman, whose lives—and with them all the hopes of the future species—are in daily extreme danger, would make every merely scientific inquirer take for granted that the wisdom of the Creator would produce mankind *in mass* at once, both

for physical security and for moral development. It is an old remark, how the divine wisdom is displayed in the fecundity of feeble animals on which the powerful ones prey; and to expose one pair of human beings to all the risks of such a world as this, would be by no means in harmony with that arrangement. But even this is not the strongest argument. It is a familiar thought that gregarious animals are in an unnatural state when isolated; and even on that account,—to say nothing of danger from wild-beasts,—no man speculating on the origin of cows or horses would imagine that they are derived from a single pair. Gregariousness being their nature, we take for granted that they were created in troops, in order that that nature might at once have its gratification and its development. Now in man the same argument is of tenfold strength: for to his moral nature a varied society is essential; and for moral development he was created. A wife fills the largest share in the heart of a husband; but a single married pair cannot afford to one another the whole moral interest and moral exercise which is demanded for the culture of the heart and development of the powers. As, then (not knowing the contrary), we presume that gregarious animals were from their origin gregarious, much more would one who did not know the contrary presume that man, being a social, political, and moral being, was from his origin furnished with the varied companionship of his fellows.

But if, *on the other hand*, we could suppose that (whether by the will and design of an Infinite Governor, or by the undirected unintelligent powers of Nature) man and other animals were generated mediately, by influences eternally acting whenever physical conditions permit, it is then nearly unimaginable that a single pair of any animals ever any where exhausted the whole productiveness of Nature. The same influences which produced one man and woman, would simultaneously produce hundreds: for no locality large enough for human life can have been so small as to allow but two births. On the whole, we conclude that the derivation of mankind from a single pair ought not to be regarded as any matter of contest between men of science. Those who think that they are arguing for it on scientific grounds, are really arguing to prove a different proposition, namely, that which we stated first—the derivation of all human races from one race; and if they can prove this, they have indeed *left room* for the further opinion that the original race came from a single pair, but that is all.

Those who (on whatever grounds) regard the testimony of the book of Genesis as indecisive in this argument, must probably always start from the presumption of a multiplicity of human races: a presumption which may be either disproved or

confirmed, but which is to be held until disproved; for the differences of climate manifestly require an adaptation in every human race; and it is beyond dispute that the change of races, so as to make them thoroughly fitted to a foreign climate, is an extremely slow process. Let us allow that a negro race might at length be possessed of full vigour in Canada, and an English race in India; still (until we have evidence to that effect) we do not easily believe that one climate was (so to say) made a favourite for human origination; that the constitution of the race was primitively adapted in perfection to that one group of physical circumstances, and was then left by slow and painful degrees to acquire aptitude for other circumstances. This *may* have been the process. There *may* have been excellent reasons for it. But prior to any specific information on the point, all will assume the opposite presumption, that many human races had independent origin, each being from the beginning fitted to its own climate and conditions. Such was the meaning attached by the ancients to the word 'indigenous,' which was popularly paraphrased by saying that each race sprang from its own soil.

But there is yet another question, far more important than this, which is liable to be obscured in the controversy. On both sides it is too apt to be asserted or implied that *to hold a multiplicity of human origins is to deny the unity of the human species*; and we judge this confusion to be the worst by far of all which the heat of the contest has engendered. No one would for a moment allow that the naturalist held *horses* to consist of an indefinite number of species because he believed their origin to have been from an indefinite number of individuals, and not from a single pair. Every body's meaning and test of unity of species in the horse is found in present fact—in the likenesses and unlikenesses of nature now existing; but whether the origin was from two or from two thousand individuals is not to the purpose. So also, whether the original individuals came to life all in Africa, or some in Africa and some in Tartary, has nothing to do with the question whether the Tartar horse and the African horse are of the same species: that, again, must be judged by other considerations, especially from the sameness or diversity of powers and instincts, and from the capacity of fusing themselves into a mixed race which retains all the powers of the progenitors. The same considerations must be applied to human races. One theorist believes that Englishmen, Papuans, Hottentots, Aztecs, are of four different origins; another that they are all from one forefather: but the disputants need not be the less agreed that all four races are strictly of the same species—man. The great variety of faculties, passions, affections, and tendencies, as well as of instincts, bodily powers, and peculiarities, found in

human races, give far greater severity to the test of a common manhood, and proportionate facility of rejecting intrusive pretenders. Science is not needed. Common sense as infallibly teaches man to distinguish man, as dog to recognise dog; and it is deplorable that the prominent and notorious certainty of the unity of the human species should ever have been supposed at stake in a question on which probable opinions may be held, but which can never become a scientific certainty of the same order,—the question, under what circumstances human races had their origin.

Thus, we apprehend, on the unity of the human species all are agreed; the question is settled by common sense, and is one of the substantial facts on which science has to build, but which no science can root up. The derivation of that one species from one pair of progenitors is a doctrine for which no *scientific* reasons are ever adduced by those who think they are maintaining it. Finally, the question whether that one species has always existed in many races, or once existed as only one race—this is the real matter about which, and about which alone, there is scientific dispute.

And here the facts of history, recent as is our knowledge, are such as to show the dangers of that most necessary process, *à priori* argument. Who that looks upon Germany, England, even Northern Italy, could, without history, have conjectured that three to four thousand years ago, when Egypt and China, India and Babylon, abounded with dense population and elaborate civilisation, our lands were covered with forest or morass; and if not absolutely without human population, yet were only wandered over by almost savage men? So much, indeed, Tacitus and Livy and Herodotus knew; but they did not know—what since the English conquest of India has been brought to light by the labours of grammarians, beginning from Sir William Jones—that the language spoken by the British, the German, the Cisalpine, the Scythian savages, *proves* them to be emigrants from the same centre of population as the people of Persia and of Bengal. The proof is of the highest degree of cogency, and admits of no evasion; nor are there two opinions about it among learned men, whatever in other respects their doctrines or tendencies. Thus, *à priori*, we should have expected Britain, Germany, Gaul, Italy, Greece, to have been peopled as early as Babylonia, Egypt, India, and China: *à posteriori*, we find this to be contrary to the fact; and that it is a doctrine not merely of religion, but also of history and of science, that Europe has been entirely, or almost* entirely, peopled from the East and South-

* We say *almost*, because of the yet uncertain relations of the Iberian or Basque population.

east. Again, the physical constitution of a Brahmin is so different from that of an Englishman, that, *but* for the phenomena of language, it is scarcely probable that the advocates of many original human races would have admitted it as an open question whether both were of one descent. We are aware that the gap between the lower races of India and the Brahmin is considerable; and so is that between the Pariah and the Negro. There may be adequate scientific reasons for rather believing in several than in a single origin; but when, resting on physical diversities, men talk dogmatically on the "absolute impossibility" of Negrillos, even in the ages of time given us by geology, becoming modified into Egyptians, or Pariahs into Brahmins,—whatever the eminence of such men, they do but make us regret that science is not always modest.

The discovery of the intimate early relation between Gauls, Britons, Germans, Slavonians, Latins, Greeks, and Indo-Perians, ought materially to affect many of our opinions and reasonings concerning the tribes and nations mentioned in Greek and Roman authors. It being admitted that there once was a time when the Gaulish, the German, the Lithuanian tribes differed very little in language, it is irrational to assume that two or three thousand years ago there were the same chasms between European languages as now. The phenomena of great continents thinly overspread with an unstable and barbarous population are known to us in modern times; and we can pronounce that when it has proceeded from one source, there will be a vast development of imperfect languages, connected by partial agreements, so as (if we could see and know the whole) in all probability to have nowhere any abrupt and violent diversity. The effect of great kingdoms, empires, and civilisation, is to perfect the imperial language, and extinguish by the dozen those dialects or languages which exist by its side: whence, as time goes on, gaps are produced in the series. Side by side with this, under the operation of political causes, national characters are brought out into sharper contrast; and by the long operation of habits, food, and climate, even physical peculiarities arise which were not always in the race.

Grimm, the very first authority concerning the old German languages, in the reasonings of the work before us, distinctly treats the ancient Danes as one people with the Germans;—as undoubtedly Pliny and Tacitus supposed them. We accept this as an assurance that Grimm believes the vast chasm now separating the Danish and German tongues to have been generated by the history of 1800 years. At this moment the process is rapidly going on, which, by exterminating the various shades of dialect that are named Platt Deutsch, will leave a chasm be-

tween the Dutch and the German. It is inevitable to infer that in the time of Cæsar, when neither did the Britons talk exactly the modern Welsh, nor the people of Celtica exactly the modern Breton; when neither the Frisian, nor the Dutch, nor German, nor Danish, were what they now are;—it is within possibility that many tongues existed intermediate to those of the great families now known—tongues which have since perished, exaggerating the gap between nations. At any rate, we ought not to wonder at the hesitation and contradictions of ancient writers, when they endeavour to mark sharply the limits of languages. Rather, without involving the case of mixed nations, we ought to expect that even to the best-informed it would be impossible to refer their languages to so few heads as those which the moderns recognise. Nevertheless, the tendency of modern writers who mean to be particularly scientific is generally towards hardening and intensifying the separation of races. They discuss whether Belgians or Ligurians were of Celtic or of German stock in a tone which implies that there cannot have been any thing between, and as though Gauls and Germans were original, permanent, eternal existences. It must be admitted that ethnologists have yet much to do in clearing their first principles and justifying their nomenclature.

The two works at the head of this article are in such startling contrast concerning the extent of the ancient *German* tribes as to be almost ludicrous. The real contrast is, indeed, not so great as the apparent, since it is pretty clear that Grimm, with us, believes that in those days the languages were less sharply divided, and gives a very undesirable vagueness to his use of the word "German." Still, with all such allowance, we must repeat, the contrast is startling. In the opinion of Latham, all the Slavonian population of modern Poland and Germany were already in their present sites in the days of Tiberius Cæsar; and, in fact, were spread over large tracts, which have since been more or less invaded by an *eastward* movement of the Germans. In his map, the entire basin from which the Elbe and the Saale are fed is Slavonian, and Germany is shut up to the *west* of this region. Between Bohemia and the Danube he does give to the Germans a narrow strip of land, as also the banks of the March, the Waag, and the Gran; but if they had no footing in Mecklenburg, Magdeburg, Saxony, Silesia, nor any where beyond the Elbe except at its very mouth, one wonders whence came the powerful Germans who overthrew the Roman empire, especially when we know how full of forest and swamp, and how thin of human population, was all western Germany. We should add, every thing south of the Mayn and of the Danube was occupied by a population foreign to Germany (Helvetian, Gaulish, Rhætian),

and was under Roman rule; so that at this corner also Baden, Wurttemberg, two-thirds of Bavaria, Styria, and the greater part of Austria, are agreed to have not been German at that time. Dr. Latham's Germany, in recent days, had the following population:

Dutch provinces	2,600,000
Westphalia	1,211,000
Rhenish Prussia	2,168,000
One-third of Austria	700,000
One-third of Bavaria	1,400,000
Hanover	1,550,000
The two Hesses	1,419,000
Nassau	370,000
	<hr/>
	11,418,000

If, therefore, we allow one to two millions for the same districts in the days of Tacitus, we are probably over the mark; since cattle were the principal sustenance of the Germans, agriculture was capricious and changing, town populations did not exist, and vast districts were kept desert by the policy of the strong tribes and the fears of the weaker. Indeed, it may reasonably be doubted whether Dr. Latham's Germany then contained one million inhabitants.

Jacob Grimm, on the other hand, not only includes in Germany all Bohemia, Thuringia, Saxony, Silesia, Mecklenburg, and Pomerania, but Poland and eastern Prussia, Galicia, and *probably* Lodomiria, Transylvania, Wallachia, and Moldavia. Moreover, with Tacitus, he sees over Denmark and Scandinavia a properly German people: nor only so, but in the far east he claims the Tyrigetæ on the Dniester, the Massagetæ on the Don (or on the Sir-deria!), as well as the Sacæ on the frontier of Bactria, as indirectly German; and indicates his strong suspicion that the Tectosagæ of Gaul and of Asia Minor were more German than Gaulish. In such views there does appear a strange greediness to exalt the outspread of the German people, — a people who had no common name or national consciousness of unity. The nucleus, however, of Grimm's novelties is found in his advocating as truth the doctrine of all the later Romans, and of the Gothic historians Cassiodorus and Jornandes, that the Goths and the Getæ are the same people and the same name. It will therefore conduce to clearness, if we first expound briefly the facts which here meet us.

Herodotus tells us of a people called Getæ, who lived in the north of "Thrace," that is, between the Balkan and the Danube; whom he calls the justest and the bravest of the Thracians, and whom he represents to be vehement believers in the immortality

of the soul. But in the time of Alexander the Great the chief strength of the Getæ is north of the Danube. An army of 10,000 foot and 4,000 horse tried to prevent his crossing that river, B.C. 335, but in vain. Though they were temporarily defeated by him, his successor Lysimachus, who endeavoured, in B.C. 292, to reach (it seems) the heart of their country, was surrounded, and forced to surrender with his army, in a vast region naturally deprived of water,* which was then called "the wilderness of the Getans." Soon after this, the great Gaulish movement, which issued in the invasion of Greece and of Asia Minor, brought about a war of Gauls and Getans; in which it is said a great number of Getans were captured and sold as slaves into Greece, where they received two prevalent names—viz. Geta and *Davus*. . And now first it comes out that Davi and Getæ are either exchangeable names, or two parts of the same great race. The Greeks in general called them all Getæ; from the Romans we hear the name *Daci* also. Strabo says that the western branch, toward Germany, is the Daci; the eastern, on the Black Sea, is Getæ. Under Augustus, Dacian and Getan wars begin; the same continued, on and off, until Trajan, having concentrated the entire forces of the empire against them for near five years together, at length totally subdued them, and reduced their country to the form of a Roman province. Its limits were great. The province reached from the Teiss to the Pruth, from the Danube to the Carpathians; and comprised Moldavia, the Bukovina, Transylvania, Hungary east of the Teiss, the Banat, and Wallachia. The best part of a century passes, and the province of Dacia is filled with Roman colonies, is Latinised and emasculated, like Roman Britain. In the reign of Antoninus Pius "the Germans and Dacians" rebelled, but were crushed again. At length, in the reign of Caracalla, it appears that Dacia is partly in possession of a people called Gothi, who actively assail the Roman dominion, and are repelled by Caracalla.† Such is the account in Spartian. Dion Cassius has nothing of this in his book on Caracalla; but in a fragment of the next book he states that "the *Dacians*" ravaged some parts of Dacia, in order to recover the hostages which Caracalla had exacted of them. Since this historian elsewhere uses the terms Getæ and Daci as equivalent, we must suppose that he regarded the Gothi of Spartian to be unconquered or revolting portions of the Dacian people. Alexander Severus found them most dangerous and persevering

* This is supposed to be the steppe of Bessarabia.

† It was jocosely proposed to surname Caracalla *Geticus*, in allusion to his murder of his brother Geta. The witticism implies that the Goths (on this first appearance of their name in history) were at once popularly identified with the *Geta*.

enemies, who spread their arms over all Dacia, which they had thoroughly conquered in the reign of Philip. The invaders (or insurgents?) are called Getæ, or Gothi, indifferently, by many writers of those days,—by Procopius, Capitolinus, Trebellius Pollio, Spartian, Vopiscus, Philostorgius, Augustin, Jerome (the most learned of all the fathers in languages and in ethnology), and by the Gothic bishop and abridger of history Jornandes. Many ancient writers called the Goths Scythians; not one, we believe, doubted their being the same people as the Getæ of Herodotus. The diversity of name between Getæ and Gothi, according to Grimm, is only what we ought to expect in passing from high German into a southern tongue; much as *kuni, muns, tunthus, hund*, become *genus, mens, dens, centum*. Further, Grimm urges,—when, three and four centuries before Christ, the Getæ were notoriously a powerful people on the Danube and Black Sea, it is too much to suppose the whole nation annihilated. Its south-western part was weakened by Trajan's conquest of Dacia; but apparently the north-east portion not only held its ground, but acquired fresh strength. We cannot believe that the Getans were entirely rooted up, and that the Goths exactly took their place,—spreading along the north of the Black Sea and to the Crimea, where we find such names as *Tyrigete* and *Massagetæ*.

Nevertheless all the learned men of modern times until Grimm forbid us to believe that the Goths are the old Getæ. Gibbon speaks of it as Gothic credulity. Crevier says on this subject (*Histoire des Empereurs*, xxiii.) that when the Goths first possessed themselves of part of Dacia, "the Romans knew them so little, that they called them Getæ, from the name of the people who occupied the country anciently." Yet he clearly does not himself believe that they came from Sweden. In a very recent work, dated July 1853 (*Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*), the learned writer, E. B. J., five years after Grimm's great work had appeared, did not hesitate to say (under DACIA): "*It need hardly be added, that the theory which regarded the Getæ and the long-haired Goths of Scandinavia as equivalent names is entirely void of foundation.*"

On matters so delicate we dare not utter any thing dogmatic; but the dogmatism of learned writers does surprise us. Why call this identification a *theory*, when every ancient writer makes it a *fact*? We grant, that what men think to be facts are not so always; but we submit that the modern view which contradicts them is, even if correct, still a theory. Well: what is the ground of this great confidence of the moderns against the identification of Goths and Getans? It rests on the following argument: "The Goths were notoriously Germans;

the Getans were notoriously Thracians : but the Thracians cannot have been Germans ; therefore neither were the Goths Getans."

On this it is to be remarked : 1. That when ancient writers associate the Getans with Thracians, it need not indicate more than their intimate political relations ; in fact, we know that the Getans south of the Danube were at one time conquered by the Odrysan dynasty of Thrace. 2. When Herodotus says that, except the Indians, the Thracians are the greatest nation known to the Greeks, it is manifest that he extended the word Thracian very widely ; just as did later writers extend the word Scythian, which Herodotus confines to the Scoloti. 3. No ancient author but Strabo says that the Getans and the Thracians had the same language. If such a writer as Jacob Grimm holds that the word of Strabo as to the identity of the language is insufficient to outweigh other probabilities, he certainly seems to deserve a respectful refutation, and not the cool contempt of E. B. J. 4. It is far from clear that the Gothic language could have been understood by a native of Germany in the days of Tacitus the historian, or of Tacitus the emperor. Grimm testifies to the strong diversity of the tongues ; nor are we aware that the ancients by any means identified Goths and Germans as the moderns do. Perhaps if the Getan and the Thracian languages differed only as much as the Gothic and the German, the facility with which a Getan would understand a large part of the Thracian tongue may have been a sufficient foundation for Strabo's statement. It does seem to be resting too much upon it, if, for this sole reason, we are required to disbelieve the universal and absolutely unanimous agreement of the ancients that the Goths were the Getæ. As to the opinion of Crevier (which Dr. Latham has adopted), that a German people, not previously called Goths, received this name (Gothi or Getæ) from the nation whose land they conquered,—it would have plausibility if they had been called Goths by the Romans only ; but very little indeed, when we find it was the name by which they called themselves. On the whole, the opinion of Grimm seems *primâ facie* sober, and not contradicted by any known facts and testimonies, that the old German, the Gothic or Getan, the Dacian, the Thracian, the Macedonian languages, were a series of which no two were identical, and the extremes very remote ; yet the whole so related, that no great chasm existed between the nearer links. We may quote his general result, p. 799 :

"The German language lies between Greek, Latin, and Keltic, on the one side, and Slavonian, Lithuanian, Finnish, on the other ; and is related to each of these, though in different degrees of nearness. But since Slavonians and Lithuanians do not reach to Greece, there would

be a gap in the chain of nations, were it not closed by Thrace, which is linked to Greece by Macedonia, and to Germany and Sarmatia by Dacia and Getica."

Undoubtedly Grimm plunges into a sea of uncertainty (nor do we intend to plunge after him), when he proceeds to use his vast learning and ingenuity to trace the double family of *Dacians* and *Getans*, in the far west and far east alike, by mere similarities of names. According to him, *Dani* means *Dacini*; so the Danes and Goths of Denmark and Sweden are Dacians and Getans. Indeed (he urges) Ptolemy expressly places the *Gothi* and *Dauciones* on his insular Scandinavia. From the tenth to the thirteenth century Latin writers used to say *Dacus*, *Dacia*, for Dane, Denmark; while to this day the Lapps call a Dane *Dazh*; and the Russians say *Dattschanin*, *Datskoe*, for the Danish people and language. When he proceeds to quote Servius, who says that the Danes are called from the Dahæ of the Caspian, and shows that he believes it, and claims the Sacæ of Independent Tartary as Germans, he certainly lowers our confidence in him as a safe guide.

Let us come back to Germany proper. According to Pliny, there were five classes of Germans: 1. the Vindili, beyond the Elbe; 2. the Ingævones, or people of the sea-coast and islands—the greatest of the "islands" being Sweden and Norway; 3. the Istævones, or inhabitants of the basin of the Rhine; 4. the Hermiones, or interior Germans of the highland; 5. the Bastarnæ, along the limits of Dacia, branches of whom touched the Black Sea, at the mouths of the Danube and Dniester. It is remarkable that Tacitus (in a passage quite inconsistent with the general tenor of his treatise) makes the second, third, and fourth branches of Pliny to be the *only* true Germans; and alone to be descended from "Mannus," the old German Adam. We think it a fair inference, that the population west of the Elbe talked a language peculiar to itself, and felt something decidedly *foreign* in the Vindili and Bastarnæ: how great the chasm, remains uncertain. But it is a signal rebuke to our linguistic attainments, that though the words Ingævones, Istævones, Hermiones, so clearly meant *sea-coasters*, *river-sidemen*, and *highlanders*, the German tongue, as now known, does not suffice for the explanation. The Vindili, or Pliny's first branch, are regarded by Dr. Latham as wholly un-German, being either old Prussian (*i. e.* Lettish) or Lithuanian, or Polish; especially the Lygii of Tacitus, on or about the Vistula, with much ingenuity he maintains to be (name and people) the same as the modern *Lekhs*, *i. e.* Poles; and though the earliest mention of the Lekhs is less* favourable

* The Lygii invaded Gaul in the reign of the Emperor Probus, by whom they were repulsed; after which their name disappears from history, unless the Lekhs

to his view than he represents it, we are disposed to acquiesce in this result until disproved. In fact, the argument is similar to that of Grimm about the Goths and Getæ. The names (Lygii and Lekh) are about as like. We have no evidence that the older people was destroyed* or migrated; hence the presumption is, that the newer are the descendants of the older.

But Latham goes further. The Gothones of Tacitus (Gut-tones of Pliny), in east Prussia,—who are by nearly all other writers unceremoniously accepted as Goths, from similarity of name,—he maintains to have been “old” Prussians, of Lettish stock. Indeed Ptolemy, who as an astronomer is eminently precise in his statements, calls them *Sarmatians*. Latham ingeniously adduces, that in quite modern times the country people round Königsberg were reproached by the German population as Pagans, under the name *Gudda*. This subject is curious enough to deserve closer attention, as many of our readers may scarcely know who the “old Prussians” are. We will here give a condensed extract from Prichard’s great work, vol. iii. p. 451: “The old Prussians, the Prutheni or Pruzii, had a peculiar system of religion and a hierarchy, which distinguishes them both from the Slavic and from the Germanic† nations. Of all Europeans, they made the most obstinate resistance to Christianity—in part, it would appear, from the influence of their priests, who were governed by a pontiff,—at once legislator, supreme judge, and high-priest. His station has been compared to that of the grand-lama of Thibet. Monkish writers called him the *pope* of the northern pagans. He lived retired in a dark forest, and was approached only by priests and priestesses, who interpreted his will to the profane laity.”

The Teutonic knights of Prussia dedicated their arms to the task of extirpating the paganism of that region; but at the era of the Reformation the work was not complete. Dr. Latham informs us that Prætorius, a Pole, writing (A.D. 1688) a book called *Orbis Gothicus*, devoted a section to answer the question, “Why is the name *Gudda* a word of contempt in Prussia?” and his reply virtually is, that *Gudda* was the name of the old Pagans of that country: “Guddarum infidelium nomen existit, adeo ut

be the same; but of these we do not learn till the sixth or seventh century after Christ. This is the weak side of Dr. Latham’s theory.

* Gibbon, chap. xii., supposes that the *power* of the nation was broken by the great defeat it received from Probus, and that the name vanished in consequence. It is evident in Tacitus, that Lygian was the name of a confederacy, as well as of a tribe; and the tribe may have remained obscure to history for several centuries, until it reappeared (in the same country) with the name Lech.

† Should not this be limited to the later ages? The German Semnonnes of Tacitus had a mysterious and sanguinary cultus; so had the Herodotean Scythians, whom Prichard holds to have been Slavonian. The temptation to intensify these supposed distinctions of races is great.

Gothus sive *Guddus* idem iis, qui Paganus et Ethnicus hostisque Christianitatis audierit." This passage is doubly remarkable, as coming from one who had no theory to serve. First, it identifies the ancient Gothones of those parts with the modern Gudda (for *-ones* is notoriously added at pleasure instead of *-i* in these national names); secondly, it identifies the Gudda with the old Prussian paganism. But Dr. Latham has another striking quotation to the same effect from a modern historian of the Lithuanians: "Sunt autem Pollexiani *Getharum seu Prussorum genus*"—where *Gethæ* must be the people called *Gothi* by Prætorius above, and *Gothones* by Tacitus. The recurrence of the element "Goth" in so many forms is not as yet satisfactorily explained (as far as we see) by any hypothesis. There is another people in south-eastern Germany called *Gothini* by Tacitus, who, he says, talked a Gaulish tongue,* and were in vassalage. Latham asserts that they were not *Gauls*, but *Gallicians*. The similarity of name to Goth (riddle as it is) warns us not to trust on mere name that the Gothones were Goths; and somewhat aids our acquiescence in Latham's bold theory (which in all other respects is satisfactory) that the Gothones were the progenitors of the old Prussians.

Three principal languages of this stock survive to modern knowledge—the Lettish, the old Prussian (now a dead language), and the Lithuanian. Of these the Lithuanian retains its ancient words and forms in the highest perfection. The Lettish is extremely interfused with German vocables, and has lost its inflexions nearly as English has. The old Prussian is judged to be intermediate in these respects between the Lettish and the Lithuanian. From want of a generic name, we entitle all the languages and peoples of this group, collectively, *Lithuanian*; and the result of Dr. Latham's argument, if acquiesced in, is, that already in the times of Tacitus east Prussia was inhabited by a Lithuanian population. He supposes it (with its name *Goth*) to have been diffused into Sweden also, where the name Gothland remained, after the population of Lithuanic Goths had been overwhelmed and merged in other races.

* We cannot understand the stubborn incredulity of so many learned men as to Gaulish races on German soil, when it is universally admitted that the region immediately north of Greece had many powerful Gaulish tribes, who at length invaded Greece itself. The Gaulish Boii, in Germany, are also notorious, and they were perhaps the last to be subjugated by the Germans. Grimm, with his usual zeal for Germanic population, arbitrarily rejects this testimony of Tacitus concerning the *Gothini*, and claims them as Goths. The statement of their vassalage, equally as of their foreign tongue, is too pointed for us to disbelieve. We think the *serfs* in old Germany were probably conquered Gauls, who in most districts lost their language: but in the mountainous regions of Germany, though forced to political vassalage, they occasionally kept their tongue, and were thus known to the Romans as foreign to the Germans.

In passing we will make a query; for we dare not make more, in our ignorance of the Lithuanian and Mæso-Gothic tongues. We believe it is admitted that Lithuanian is of all European tongues the nearest to Sanscrit; and we have read the assertion that Mæso-Gothic is nearer to Sanscrit than Anglo-Saxon to English. We would ask, has it been duly investigated whether, making allowance for possible diversity between the modern and the ancient Lithuanian tongue, it is absurd, *on the ground of language*, to identify the progenitors of the Lithuanians with the western Goths? If this would *not* be absurd, we should be able at once to account the Gothones or Guttones of east Prussia to be both Lithuanians and Goths.

We may here warn the reader that the discrimination of the Lithuanian tongues is a discovery of very modern times; and among the ancients nothing of the kind is to be looked for. Under the word *Sarmatian* their most accurate and widely-informed writers of necessity confounded at least three very different stocks of population: 1. the Slavonic (Poles, Serbs, Slovacks, Russians, &c.); 2. the Ugrian (Magyars, Finns, Huns, &c.); 3. the Lithuanian. In short, the inaccessibility of the vast plain of north-eastern Europe forced them to comprise all its population under the vague name Sarmatian or Scythian.

That in the earliest times the country east of the Elbe was inhabited by a Slavonian, not a German, population, is argued by Latham from the names of the places (p. xviii.): "*Saxon* as is England, the oldest geographical terms are *Keltic*; some of the original names of the rivers and mountains remaining unchanged. The converse is the case in Transalbingian Germany: the older the name, the more surely it is Slavonic."

We do not propose to follow Dr. Latham in his discussion whether the Vandals are really Venedi (or Wends)—which would bring on a fresh question, whether these are Lithuanian or Slavonian. It suffices to say, that his argument (to our mind) shows the received notion of the Vandals being proper Germans to rest on so extremely slight evidence,* that, as soon as any one is convinced that several branches of Pliny's *Vindili* are un-German, the chances are that he will believe the same of the Vandals. On the whole, we think Dr. Latham has struck a hard blow against the belief that the ancient inhabitants of the *north-east* of Germany—*i. e.* Pomerania and Poland—can be rightly entitled German. We are disposed to give up to him

* Such evidence, as that a king of the Vandals is called *Gensenrich*, proves very little to one who remembers how often Saxon and Irish people have had Norman chieftains; and moreover, that if *rich* is German for "king," so is *rex* Latin, and *righ* Irish. The vocable must have been common to very many languages. It is notoriously the Indian *rajah*.

Pliny's *first* branch entire; but when we approach the *fifth* branch, we more readily go along with Grimm, and accept the Bastarnæ and Getæ as, if not purely German, yet certainly Germanic. This is, indeed, nearly the view taken of the Bastarnæ by Strabo and Tacitus. Strabo does not call the Bastarnæ outright "Germans," but says of them—"being themselves also *nearly* (σχεδόν τι) of German race;" the cautious tone of which seems to imply close inquiry. So Tacitus doubts whether to account the Peucini Germans or Sarmatians, and adds: "though the Peucini, whom some call Bastarnæ, in language, mode of life, situation,* and the nature of their houses, live as Germans (*ut Germani agunt*)." The ground of his hesitation was, that through the intermarriages of their nobles they had contracted something of Sarmatian degradation; yet on the whole he concludes them to be German. His testimony to their German *language* is very striking, when he has marked out the Gothini, the Osi, and the Æstyī (on German soil), as *not* German in language. At the same time, in this general question, we are disposed to give some weight to other circumstances, which, if they cannot in themselves prove any thing, yet in combination may reinforce a part of Grimm's Geto-Gothic doctrine.

First, we observe that the *names* of the Danube, the Dniester, the Dnieper, the Tanais (or Don), and Donetz, have sensibly something in common. In fact, Dnieper (Danapris) and Danubius are so alike, that Jornandes says Danubius for Danapris. *Dan* seems to be a common element; and it is surely probable that the names were given by a people speaking the same language. Again, the Dniester (Danaster) has for its second element *Ister*, the old Greek name for the Danube, which name belonged to the confessedly *Getic* era; as indeed also the names Danubius and Tanais are far too old to be ascribed to the Goths by those who teach that the Goths *displaced* the Getæ. The Dniester was called Tyras, and the Dnieper Borysthenes, by the classical writers; and we cannot find any account of the change of name, except that it seems to mark *Gothic influence* on the Roman nomenclature; that is, we seem to have a right to infer that the Goths of those parts so called the rivers. The Scythia of Herodotus (*i.e.* the northern basin of the Black Sea) was ruled over and roamed over by a people whose true name (he says) was Scoloti. But he not only broadly distinguishes the agricultural Scythians of Podolia and of Kharkov from the roaming people, but speaks in particular of the Budini (apparently on the Don

* "Situation" (*sede*) must refer to those who were in contact with Germany—perhaps in the Little Carpathians, a district which he would regard as German. Latham thinks to refute Tacitus out of his own mouth, by this word *sede*. Surely not successfully.

or Volga) as a nation with grey eyes and red hair,*—qualities regarded by the ancients as emphatically German, and clearly, in his view, un-Scythian. “When you have seen one Scythian,” says he, “you have seen all.” The Budini and Geloni dwelt together in a vast wooden city; and, according to him, the Geloni were the descendants of Greek colonists, who had introduced Greek religion and arts.

We cannot think it a far-fetched hypothesis that the fixed and agricultural population of the Herodotean Scythia was the nucleus whence the later Goths of those parts descended. This is not even a deviation from the account of Cassiodorus in Jordanes; for the *eastward* migration of the Goths from Sweden, in which he believed, was placed by him long before the time of Cyrus the Great. We do not now move the question, whether the Goths of the Ukraine and of the Crimea came thither from the *west*, or from the *east*; we merely mark the high probability that they were already in the interior of Scythia in the days of Herodotus. Nothing can be more natural, or more reasonably to be expected, than that an agricultural population in the highly fertile soil of Podolia and Kharkov,—if once it so take root (by good-will or by its own strength) as to develop itself side by side with the roaming tribes,—should outgrow them in numbers, intelligence, and resources; more especially since Herodotus is careful to inform us that the Scythians of Podolia raised corn; not merely for food, but *for exportation*—a clear mark of social advance. Also the Callippidæ and Alazones between the Boug and the Dnieper raised vegetables as well as corn; and in his view the Callippidæ, as well as the Geloni, were of Greek origin; though, while bringing to Scythia Greek arts, they had adopted Scythian manners themselves. Our present and provisional opinion is, that the Goths of the Ukraine and of the Bosphorus are the children of Herodotus’s agricultural Scythians,† and perhaps of his Budini; and that such words as Don, Danapr, Danaster, Ister, Danube, all belong to their ancient language; while Tyras was perhaps the Scythian (Scolotan) name of the Dniester.

One who has gone with us thus far, and who remembers that Europe, in rather late days, has been peopled from the east, will perhaps take one more step in our company—*i. e.* he will think it probable that the Goths of the Ukraine and Bosphorus repre-

* We unhesitatingly so understand his statement, *γλαυκόν τε πᾶν ἰσχυρῶς ἰστί καὶ ὑψηλόν*. A man must have a hypothesis to serve, before he will interpret Herodotus to mean that the Budini *painted themselves grey and red*.

† It is no objection, that Herodotus makes no remark on the physical aspect of the agricultural Scythians, as he does on that of the Budini; for the Budini seem to have been particularly known, because they lay in the track of the Greek merchants who travelled towards the Ural mountains for gold. His notion also that the Callippidæ were of Greek extraction implies that their aspect was not that of Scythians.

sent the Gothic element in its *westward*, rather than in an *eastward*, movement; and, in short, that the forefathers of these Goths had never been in Germany. We do not hereby intend to lay down that no German people has moved eastward: in fact, there is pretty clear evidence that the Bastarnæ migrated in that direction. When first named in history (in the Roman wars with Philip and Perseus), they appear in the Little Carpathians, from the March to the Theiss. Afterward a part of them is found in the delta of the Danube, and in Bulgaria; and the later geographers place the Bastarnæ between the Dniester and Dnieper. If the Goths, overpowering the Scythians, moved down toward the sea-coast, the Bastarnæ may have filled parts vacated by them. But although partial migrations in this direction are imaginable, it is a violent hypothesis, and directly contradicted by Gothic historians, that the great Gothic nation came out of Germany *after* the classical era of Rome, moved in mass as far east as the Crimea, and then recommenced migrations westward.

At the same time, we may add that the relations of the Goths of the S.E. to Germany are likely to have been by the course of the Danube. All agree that the Gothic tongue is eminently *high* German; and the high German is the language of *southern* Germany, but the low German that of maritime Germany,—as the very words ‘low’ and ‘high’ express. If, then, the connection of the Goths of the Black Sea was closer with southern than with northern Germany, the probability is that the Danube was the high road of connection. Again, all the tribes, as far as we are aware, whose migrations were between the Black Sea and the Baltic, had the equestrian habits which the Romans characterised as Sarmatian,—a result almost inevitable where the keep of a horse costs nothing, and where a pastoral nation must perpetually shift its grazing-grounds; and as the Goths were not an equestrian people, it is not likely that they ever lived long in Sarmatia, except as agricultural settlers and river-sailors. It was in small river-boats that they swarmed across the Black Sea, to the amazement of the Romans. We may add, that the Goths and the southern Germans were more monarchical than the other* Germans,—another point of connection.

When we attempt to follow Dr. Latham into the details of his German races, we find in him, as usual, much fertility of combination and freshness of thought; but we cannot often feel confidence in his novelties, most of which indeed seem to us gratuitous, highly unplausible, or even false. Such are his notions that the Suevi of Tacitus *end* where those of Cæsar begin;

* We ought to add,—*except* the Gothones, who had constitutional monarchy like the historical Goths.

that Suevi is the same word as Sorbi or Servians; that most of the Suevi—even the Semnonēs—were Slavonic; that the Gothini were Gallicians (in the modern sense); that the Bohemia of Maroboduus was Bavaria; that nothing at all is to be believed about Cimbri in Jutland and Denmark; and that it is an open question whether the Cimbri were not Slavonians (p. 135); that Chatti and Suevi* are different names for the same people (p. xlix. of *Prolegomena*); that Suevi merely means “non-Celtic;” that migrations were so rare and difficult, that we must not have recourse to this topic to explain the changes of the map of Germany at different eras (pp. xxx. xxxi.). In a less learned or less energetic writer we should pass by such an opinion as the last, without thinking it to deserve refutation. It is in compliment to Dr. Latham that we now reason against it.

He himself admits a migration of the Goths, with wives and families, from Germany to the Crimea, and from the coasts of the Black Sea and Danube into Italy and Spain. He entitles the Goths the most migratory of the Germans. But surely if the Goths could migrate on such a scale, other tribes might move through a quarter or a tenth part of the distance; and when we have distinct and positive declarations by the first writers of antiquity that this was their habit, it is highly unreasonable to be incredulous. Indeed, the evidence in this matter—analogueal, collateral, and direct, *à priori* and *à posteriori*—is quite overwhelming. We find facilities for migration, motives for it, compulsion enforcing it, and multiplied evidence of the fact. Of course, while men live by cattle and by game, they have little attachment to the soil. Strabo on this point says (vii. 1, p. 64 of Tauchnitz): “What is common to all the people of this country (Germany) is, the ease of migration, by reason of the simplicity of their living, and their not tilling the ground nor laying up treasures, but dwelling in huts which contain provision for the day. The chief part of their substance is tame cattle, as with the Nomades; so that, imitating them, and putting their household substance on waggons, they turn with their herds whithersoever they please.” That “they give no care to agriculture, live on milk, cheese, and flesh, and have no fixed private rights in land,” is attested by Cæsar (*De Bello Gallico*, vi. 22); who also mentions, with all detail, the case of two tribes (the Usipetes and Tenctheri), who were driven† across the Rhine in vast multitudes

* This appears to be a needlessly paradoxical form of statement. If Ariovistus, a Suevian, extended his power westward to the Rhine, and invaded Gaul, embracing the Chatti in his league, this does not imply any displacement of the centre of Suevian power, or that the name Suevian has a new meaning.

† Though unable to defend themselves against the Suevi, they were able to overpower the Gauls. This is so attested by Cæsar, as to be proof against Latham's sarcasm, that the best qualification for invading one's neighbour's land, according to some historians, is inability to defend one's own.

by the Suevi systematically ravaging their fields. Moreover, he tells us that the Suevi followed this method of ravage on *principle*, since they "regarded it as the greatest of public honours to have as large a desert as possible round them." Migration must therefore often have been *enforced*. Indeed several cases are known in which whole tribes have changed their abode to escape the danger of enslavement by the Roman arms. Dr. Latham complains that writers confound mere movements of German *armies* with *migrations*, and forget that unless men carry the females and children with them, it does not deserve the latter name. But on this we may remark—1. that mere armies of men often suffice to carry the name of the nation, and affect the aspect of the map—as the Saxons in Britain, and the Normans in France; 2. that the Cimbri subdued by Marius had large numbers of women in their waggons; so had the Goths defeated by Claudius (Gibbon, ch. xi.). Moreover, the movement of the Gauls into Greece and into Asia Minor was not only a most sudden and rapid event, but is attested (at least as to Asia Minor) to have been a real national migration, by the purity of the language and race in later times. Upon this also Dr. Latham chooses to throw doubt, without one particle of evidence.

His mode of dealing with Bohemia and the Cimbri appears to us to deserve a rather vehement protest. In regard to Bohemia, the testimony of the ancients is perspicuous, positive, and consistent. Tacitus evidently thinks it needless to dwell on what was notorious, and rather alludes than asserts. Velleius Paterculus, who had marched with the army of Tiberius to the Elbe, and remained some years in Germany, is an eminently valid authority as to the events within those limits of space and time; and he, in describing the proceedings of Maroboduus, says that he *fled into the interior* to escape the notice of the Romans, and conquered Bohemia, within the depths of the Hercynian forest. But Dr. Latham (following, we believe, an eccentric Bavarian* author) would persuade us that this *meant* the modern Bavaria! Why, of Bavaria, the southern half was contained in the Roman province of Rhætia; what remained of it was so far from being an interior and secluded district, that it was immediately on the Roman frontier, and pervaded by Roman influences. In the days of Tacitus it was occupied by the Hermunduri, to whom (says the historian) "we freely open our homes and our villas, without exciting their covetousness. They cross the Danube

* During the great Napoleonic wars, Bavaria sided with France; and, to justify her unnatural treason to the cause of Germany, rejoiced to believe herself more Gaulish than German in blood. It might have sufficed for this to recall the fact that old Rhætia was Celtic; but the *name* of Bavaria (Boiaria) gave an impetus to the doctrine that Bavarians are *Boii*, and may be identified with Bohemia.

without passports or guards, and enter our most splendid Rhetian colony," &c. And while writing thus, he simultaneously alludes to Bohemia, without a hint that the old kingdom of Maroboduus is not this Bohemia, but is the district now occupied by the Hermunduri. In fact, Velleius is far from indefinite in his description of the site of Bohemia. "It had Germany," says he (ii. 109), "at its left and in front, Pannonia at its right, Noricum at its back;" and he represents Tiberius Cæsar as invading it from Carnuntum, "which place of Noricum was nearest to the kingdom (of Maroboduus) on this side." Carnuntum was on the Danube, a little above the modern Presburg; which makes it clear that our Bohemia was the Bohemia of Velleius. Dr. Latham makes it an objection, that none of the ancients describe the mountains of Bohemia. How *could* they describe a locality into which Maroboduus betook himself to avoid their sight? Velleius speaks of it as girt with the Hercynian forest; surely that is enough. Tacitus says that a continuous chain of mountains cleaves Suevia apart (by which he must mean the chain which forms the northern side of Bohemia); but he clearly did not know enough of the geography to specify it more distinctly.

As to the Cimbri, Dr. Latham has indeed brought out a most impotent result. After reprinting an essay, in which he maintains that every thing hitherto believed about the Cimbri is uncertain, and that the ancients knew nothing about them, and pushed them always to the utmost bounds of known geography,—the Cimbri being among races what Thule was among islands, a name for the distant unknown,—he adds the following post-script:

"Some change in my opinion concerning the populations in question, since the publication of the preceding paper, has taken place. The conflicting difficulties have increased with the increase of the attention that has been bestowed on the subject. Hence I modify the last proposition, and hesitate to commit myself to the doctrine that the Cimbro-Teutons were Gauls at all; *what they were being a greater mystery than ever.*"

This oracle is delivered without assigning any reasons for his change of mind, and without indicating *which* of his former arguments now appear to him unsatisfactory. Nor is this the worst. So very hasty is he, as to fall into blundering self-contradiction, which is made the less excusable by his tone of confidence. In p. 134 (of his later and *improved* view!) he writes concerning the "Cimbri, Tigurini, Ambrones, Teutones":

"What did Cæsar consider their ethnological affinities to be? Gallic. Sallust? Gallic. Velleius Paterculus? Gallic. It is only the later writers that carry their origin north of Gaul."

Velleius considers them to be *Gallic*, says Latham! Yet, in p. clvii. he himself writes :

“Velleius Paterculus places them [the Cimbri] beyond the Rhine, and deals with them as *Germans* : ‘Tum Cimbri et Teutoni transcendere Rhenum . . .’ (ii. 8). ‘Effusa immanis vis Germanarum gentium, quibus nomen Cimbris ac Teutonis erat’ (ii. 12).”

So much for Velleius. As for Cæsar, Dr. Latham is consistent with himself, but consistent in error. In p. clvi. (his old essay) he had written :

“Cæsar, whose evidence ought to be conclusive—inasmuch as he knew of Germany as well as Gaul—fixes them [the Cimbri] to the south of the Marne and Seine. This we learn, not from the direct text, but from inference. ‘Gallos a Belgis Matrona et Sequana dividit. . . . Belgas solos esse, qui patrum nostrum memoria, omni Gallia vexata, Teutones Cimbrosque intra fines suos ingredi prohibuerint.’ Now if the Teutones and Cimbri had moved from north to south, they would have clashed with the Belgæ *first*, and with the other Gauls *afterwards*. The converse, however, was the fact.”

We will not discuss whether this overstrains the necessary force of the past participle “vexata;” we do believe that Cæsar intended to represent the Cimbri as attacking the Belgians *from the south*. Niebuhr, who follows Plutarch and Appian in bringing the Cimbri through Thrace and along the Danube into Noricum, whence they cross the Rhine far south of the Belgians, no doubt agreed with Latham in so interpreting this passage. But how does this “fix” the earlier home of the Cimbri to Gaul and its south? How does this indicate that “Cæsar considers their ethnological affinities to be Gallic”? On the contrary, in the *Gallic War* (i. 40), Cæsar tells his centurions, when about to engage the German Ariovistus, that “this enemy” (the German) was already tried by the Romans in the defeat of the Cimbri and Teutones, and of the army of Spartacus. Similarly, in i. 33, he compares the invasion of Gaul by Ariovistus from Germany to that of the Cimbri and Teutones. Dr. Latham overlooks these notices, and distorts a third.

Yet we do not account these definite errors so hurtful as the general confusion which he has thrown over the subject. Two points concerning these invaders we hold to be clear; a third and fourth far more doubtful; but he has treated them all together, and has unjustifiably tampered with ancient testimony, equalising the best with the worst. It seems to us not useless to mark these things more distinctly.

First, then, it ought not for a moment to be questioned that there was a tribe called Cimbri living in Jutland. The armies of Augustus, accompanied by a fleet, traversed Germany from

the Rhine to the Elbe; so, indeed, did Germanicus, in the beginning of Tiberius's reign. Strabo (vii. 1, p. 70, Tauchnitz) says: "The northern Germans reach along the ocean; and *they are known* from the mouths of the Rhine as far as the Elbe. *And of these the best known are the Sugambrians and the Cimbrians.** But what is beyond the Elbe, along the coast of the ocean, *is utterly unknown* to us." Here we find limited and cautious assertion, his means of knowledge being exactly defined by the progress of the Roman armies. His absolute disclaimer of knowledge beyond the Elbe gives weight to his assertions as to this side; and his positive statement concerning the Cimbrians is confirmed by Tacitus. This passage is quoted from Strabo by Latham, and set aside. Why? Simply because Ptolemy, writing one hundred and twenty years later, puts the Cimbri in the *northern* part of Denmark!—as if the tribe (already exceedingly weakened, as Tacitus states) could not have been driven northward, or its southern part have been swallowed up, by more powerful neighbours. As if to show how defiant of reason he can be, he further quotes from the *Monumentum Ancyranum* the reference of the Emperor Augustus to the Cimbri. The whole passage stands thus: "The Roman fleet sailed from the mouth of the Rhine toward the east, so far as no Roman previously had ever gone by land or sea. And the *Cimbri*, the Charudes, and the Semnones, *other German tribes of the same region*, sought my friendship." Nor do we find any thing, with Dr. Latham, absurd or confused in Pliny's testimony, who says that Mount Sevo, or the great Norway range, "makes a vast bend to the Cimbric promontory,"—the entrance of the Baltic being so narrow, that the opposite lands seem to point at one another. The phrase "quorum pars Cimbri" seems, indeed, to be wrongly repeated in Pliny's text; but if otherwise, it will only imply that in his belief the Cimbri were partly in one, partly in another district of Germany. This has nothing in it confused nor absurd; but it certainly is not in agreement with other authorities.

Secondly; whatever the race or home of the Cimbri and Teutones, we first learn of them as marauding in Illyria and Noricum, and next in southern Gaul. Hence, *whatever their race*, and *whatever their recent home*, it is to be received, until disproved, that they crossed the Rhine (if at all) very high up, and appeared among the Sequani first of Gaul. This also agrees with the mention of the Tigurini as their allies, since the Tigurini are identified with Zurich.

Thirdly; to what race the Cimbri belonged, and to what the

* Latham, commenting on this very passage, is pleased to say (p. clxii.), that the Sicambri and the Cimbri are *confounded* by Strabo! If this is confusion, what would distinction be?

Teutones,* is a very vexed question, supported ably and reasonably from opposite sides. Ancient writers, who call them Germans, may have only intended to say that they came from Germany. On the other hand, Cicero and Sallust, who call them Gauls, may have done so because the name of German was hardly yet known, and *all* northern people were regarded as Gauls, as in Greece they were vaguely named Scythians. We perceive that the learned Dr. Leonhard Schmitz, in his article on the Cimbri in Smith's *Geographical Dictionary*, accedes decidedly to what we have been accustomed to regard as the English view,—that is, the old-fashioned belief that they were Celtic. He also identifies the word with the Welsh national name *Kymry*, which we familiarly know in Cambria and Cumberland. This, we suppose, is inevitable with those who regard them as Celts; yet, as we shall presently say, it might lead them to take one step further. But we must first give prominence to an argument concerning the language of the Cimbri, in which Dr. Latham shows how very ingenious and how very bold he can be. Pliny, in discussing the geography of the Baltic coast and Jutland, tells us that Hecatæus calls the Baltic *Amalchius*, a name which, in the Scythian tongue, signifies Frozen; but that according to Philemon, the Cimbrians call it *Morimarusa*, that is, Dead Sea. On this Prichard has made a remark, which, superadded to all the rest, appeared to settle the fact of the *Cimbri* talking the language of the *Kymri*, or modern Welsh—namely, that *Môr-marw* in Welsh means Dead Sea;—"a meaning," says Dr. P., "which does not belong, I believe, to similar vocables in any German dialect." To this Latham replies, that Pliny has probably mistaken Cimmerians for Cimbrians, since the Greek Philemon is not likely to have written about the Baltic; that the Baltic could not be called a dead sea [though liable to be frozen], but the Sea of Azof and Putrid Sea notoriously can; that if *Morimarusa* is good Welsh, it is also good Slavonic in the very same sense, and perhaps is found again in the Sea of *Marmora*. In short, therefore, it was not the name given by Welsh Cimbri to the Baltic, but the name given by Slavonic Cimmerii to the Palus Mæotis.

Fourthly; it is not to be thrown out of sight that Appian and Diodorus distinctly entitle the Gauls who invaded Greece "Cimbrians;" and with Plutarch, Justin, and Strabo, they represent the Cimbrian invasion of Gaul to have come *up* the Drave.

* The modern use of "Teutonic" for Theodisc or Deutsch, as a collective name for all the Germans, is rightly esteemed delusive by Latham. *Teutones* with the Romans was the name of one sharply-defined tribe, whose relation to other tribes of Germany, Switzerland, Gaul, or Illyria, is left obscure. It is difficult to believe that the other Germans would call *one* small tribe of themselves emphatically *Teut*, "The People."

In narrating, indeed, the earlier course of the movement, it is evident that mere theory guided them: the name of the Cimmerii deluding some, and the known seat of the Cimbri in Jutland biasing others. But that Illyricum and Mœsia were the scene of their marauding expeditions before they met the Roman arms in Noricum, is stated with too many circumstances to be wholly rejected. Hence those who believe that the name Cimbri was spread over all Britain as well as Jutland, cannot justly be incredulous as to the name belonging equally to the powerful Gaulish tribes on the north of Greece and Illyria; and if so, it appears an open question whether the Marian Cimbri did not come from Upper Mœsia, or Pannonia. The feeble tribe of Cimbrians in Denmark, surrounded by Germans, may have learnt the German tongue, and have thus been accounted German by the Romans, and yet be pleased to boast of the great deeds of the Cimbrian invasion as its own.

It is time to endeavour to sum up. What, on the whole, do we seem to learn as to the tribes of ancient Germany?

We find a people,—then, as now,—on the whole homogeneous and conscious of unity, yet having no fixed political centres, and no uniformity of political system. The more eastern was the tribe, the more decidedly was it monarchical. The Goths, on Scythian soil, had defined dynastic races, like Scythians and Persians. The Gothones in Prussia (whatever their race) had also a constitutional royalty; so had the Getæ and Dacians. Less methodised and fixed was the royalty of the Quadi in the south-east of Germany, and of the Suevi, the greatest of the confederations, which stretched from the south-west diagonally over half of Germany. Descending from the highlands to the banks of the Rhine or shores of the German ocean, we pass from royalty into republicanism—with a strong inclination indeed to revere the offspring of great men, but not so as to hinder the rise of plebeian merit. Already there must have been not only the great distinction of German and Dane, but also deeply marked dialects, such as come to their extreme in the Frisian and Dutch at one end, in the Swiss and Austrian at the other. In the republican part of the country, the confederacies themselves, and not only their centres, were constantly shifting. At one time Ariovistus the Suevian is the formidable power, chief of a very motley host, not the proper Suevian league; afterwards the Sugambri; then the Cheruskans; then the Chatti; later, again, the Alemanni and the Franks. No one of these confederacies at all spreads over the same tribes as another, but varies, just as in Greece an Athenian, a Theban, a Thessalian, an Achaian league. On the other hand, the Suevian confederacy had far greater permanence, and is in some respects comparable

to the middle-age German empire. It is generally governed by a king; and between the era of Augustus and Trajan, the race of Maroboduus was signal in it; yet, as an elective monarchy, it was often shifting. Maroboduus himself was a "marcomann," or *borderer* of the Danube; but we find also Vannius the *Quade*, and Catualda the *Gothon*, in the chief authority. Thus the Suevian system was a sort of mean between that of Goths or Dacians, and that of Low Germany; which is in harmony with what we might expect from other considerations. The Suevian power often included the Lygians within it, although the Lygians had an internal confederacy of their own; a phenomenon so common in ancient Greece, that we must not rest on it too exclusively as any proof that the Lygians were of foreign race. Among the Suevians *proper*, Strabo expressly includes the *Semnonnes*; but excludes the Lygians. He says that the Suevi reach from the Rhine to the Elbe, and in part extend beyond the Elbe;—are partly within the forest [the Bohemian north-east limit?], and partly beyond it, on the frontier of the *Getæ*. Tacitus regards the Suevi as "holding the greater part of Germany," and says that they are even externally distinguished from all the other Germans by the treatment of their hair. "Among the Suevi," says he, "the *Semnonnes* regard themselves as the most ancient and most noble;"—"fortune adds authority to them, since they live in a hundred pagi; and their great mass enables them to believe themselves the head of the Suevi." The Suevi proper were, in Tacitus's view, genuine Germans; and that their nearer confederates also were German in tongue may be reasonably inferred from his remark that the *Marsigni* and *Burii* (eastern races) have the same language as the Suevi. If the *Semnonnes* (who were less distant) had been un-German in tongue, he must have known it, and would have been sure to tell us: yet Dr. Latham would persuade us that the *Semnonnes* were Slavonic, in order that he may make out that Slavonism has no where, in later ages, encroached on Germany.

He certainly has gratuitously invented difficulties. When the Germans flocked into the Roman empire in numbers so vast as at length to reconstruct society from its very basis, and inundate Gaul and Italy with German words, surely they must have left behind them in their own land an immense vacuum. It is well known, that while the native institutions ascribed by Tacitus to the Germans are found in the common-law and municipalities of Anglo-Saxon England, they vanished out of Germany itself, who owes her local and municipal law to Rome. This is a strong testimony to the emptiness which the German invaders of the Roman empire left behind them. Suppose that the women did *not* always accompany them, and that it was not (in this

sense) a national migration; still, if the flower of the youth departed, the old country was left very defenceless: and at what time Slavonians entered Bohemia and other parts there was no historian to record. To argue from the silence of history against such a change of population, of which no Italian could easily be informed,—and in an age when Italian literature itself was all but vanishing,—is not the smallest of Dr. Latham's weaknesses.

Germany emptied itself southward, and thereby opened itself to Slavonian, to Hunnite, to Magyar invasions. That land of many centres has never yet been duly poised into one stable confederation. When this end is achieved, Europe may at length attain a permanent equilibrium.

ART. VI.—THE LITERATURE OF SPIRIT-RAPPING.

The Spiritual Herald. London, 1856.

The Yorkshire Spiritual Telegraph. 1855-6.

Apparitions: a New Theory. By Newton Crosland. London, 1856.

Epic of the Starry Heaven. By Thomas L. Harris. New York, 1856.

Lyric of the Golden Age. By Thomas L. Harris. New York, 1856.

WHATEVER we may think of what is called, however improperly, Spiritualism, we cannot deny that it possesses a literature. We may be unscientific, and inclined to think the whole subject a grotesque absurdity; or we may be scientific, and disposed to account for the phenomena by some theory of mental delusion or physical force: but whatever we think of it, the fact remains, that a considerable number of persons not only believe in table-rapping, table-tipping, spectral hands, flying musical instruments, conversations held with, and revelations given by, spirits; but they solemnly record their belief, collect and print remarkable instances of such manifestations, and have reduced "spiritualism" into a certain curious order and system. In England, this literature cannot be said to flourish; it exists, but in a very poor and precarious way, the number of believers being too small to defray the expense of elaborate or frequent publications. But in America the Spiritualists boast that they number nearly three millions. They have a voluminous current literature of Spiritualism. They there, too, possess what we should call a minor