THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

NO. XCVI.—OCTOBER 1909 *

The Germans of Caesar

PART III.

IN my previous papers under this heading¹ I have tried to emphasise one or two facts not always remembered: first, that the name German is of Keltic origin and was originally applied by the western Gauls to those of their race who lived beyond the Rhine; secondly, that the Germans who in Caesar's time lived to the west of the Rhine and who gave their names to the Roman provinces of Germania Prima and Secunda had only recently traversed that river and settled in Gaul itself; thirdly, that the tribes who had thus emigrated from beyond the great river were of Gaulish and not of Teutonic blood and origin; fourthly, that those who settled on the upper Rhine, displacing the Sequani and Mediomatrici from part of their old country in Alsace and the Bavarian Palatinate, were Gauls who came from the neighbourhood of Pannonia, Noricum, and Vindelicia—old Gaulish districts—while those who settled in the north came at an earlier time, in all probability from the eastern parts of Holland, from Hanover, and from west Prussia. Lastly I tried to show that the moving impulse of these race changes, so far as the southern Rhine was concerned, is not to be sought, as that of the later race changes in that district must be, in Scandinavia, but in Hungary and the lower Danube, among the Getae and Daci and their allied tribes who at this time apparently broke up the old Gaulish communities of Noricum and its borders;

¹ *Ante*, vol. xxiii. 417 ff., 625 ff. There is a passage in Bede which confirms the view that the name German was one applied by the Gauls to their neighbours: *in Germania plurimas noverat esse nationes, a quibus Angli vel Saxones qui nunc Britanniam incolunt, genus et originem duxisse noscuntur; unde haecenus a vicina gente Breitonum corrupte Garmani nuncupantur*, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 9.

the result being that a large number of these eastern Gauls under a chief Ariovistus (very probably of Getic race) invaded Alsace and the Rhenish Palatinate.

According to the usual theory, which I followed,² the country between the Vosges and 'the Great River' had been divided in Caesar's time among three Celtic German tribes from the other side, the Triboci, Nemetes, and Vangiones, who occupied the whole stretch of Alsace from Switzerland to the Moselle. I am not now quite sure whether, in regard to two of the tribes in question, their occupation of this part of Gaul may not have been somewhat later than Caesar's Gaulish war. It is clear that all three tribes invaded Gaul with Ariovistus, but it may be that only one of them remained west of the Rhine on his discomfiture and that the other two, for a while at least, settled on the eastern side of the river between the Main and the Helvetii. It is at all events remarkable that Caesar, in book iv. 10 of his *Commentaries*, dealing with the state of things three years later than the campaign of Ariovistus and describing the course of the upper Rhine, says that it flowed for a long space through the country (*per fines*) of the Nantuates, Helvetii, Sequani, Mediomatrici, Triboci, and Treveri. This in fact enumerates the successive tribes on the western side of the Rhine, and it will be noted that neither the Vangiones nor the Nemetes are mentioned. Again in vi. 25 Caesar, speaking two years later of the Hercynian Forest, says that it stretched from the borders of the Helvetii, the Nemetes, and the Rauraci, and continued along the Danube to the country of the Daci and the Anartes, implying that the Nemetes were then living east of the Rhine. Strabo, who apparently had these passages of Caesar before him, entirely ignores the same two tribes in his account of Gaul and says definitely that after the Mediomatrici and the Triboci the Treveri inhabited along the Rhine, leaving thus no room for the two tribes in question.³ It would seem therefore that at this time the two tribes were still living to the east of the Rhine and not to the west of it.

The next notice we have of these tribes is a vague one. Lucan in his *Pharsalia*, i. 419, 420, describing the troops that gathered under the banner of Caesar in his war against Pompey, says in his rhetorical way:

. Tunc rura Nemausi
Qui tenet et ripas Aturi;

where Nemausi has been reasonably treated as a corruption of Nemetes. A few lines later he says:

Optima gens flexis in gyrum Sequana frenis
Et docilis rector rostrati Belga covini. . .
Et qui te laxis imitantur, Sarmata, braci
Vangiones.

² *Ante*, vol. xxiii. 628 ff.

³ *Geogr.* iv. 8. 4.

This would point either to the two tribes which supplied the recruits in question having by that time in a large measure transported themselves across the Rhine, or to the Romans having acquired authority east of the upper parts of the river as well as west of it. The same alternative is suggested by the statements in Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 70, about Tutor having raised contingents of troops in 70 A.D. among the Vangiones, Caracatians, and Triboci. It is consistent with either view. In regard to the Triboci it is noticeable that the diocese of Strassburg, which D'Anville identified very probably with their country, formerly included a part of the district east of the Rhine.⁴ An inscription found at Marbach on the Necker, in which *exploratores Triboci et Boi* are mentioned,⁵ probably only refers to a frontier guard. Walckenaer's statement that as late as 27 B.C. the Vangiones and Nemetes were still living east of the river is not supported by any one of the authorities he quotes.⁶ The safest conclusion in an uncertain matter perhaps is that the three tribes in question held both banks of the upper Rhine, their chief settlement being on the left bank.⁷

I now propose to complete my story by dealing with certain other tribes who were considered Germans by Caesar, and who still lived in his time not to the west but to the east of the lower Rhine, whence they made continual raids across that river. I propose to show that they were also Gauls and not of Teutonic origin, and to try to explain the reason for their restlessness. It is plain that when Caesar wrote there was a very aggressive race movement going on in north as well as south Germany, and a constant pressure from the north-east towards the lower Rhine, and that its impulse was not quite the same as that which led to Ariovistus' invasion of Gaul. It was initiated by pressure from the Elbe and its neighbourhood, and was dominated by a race about whose Teutonic origin and connexions there can be no reasonable doubt, namely the Suevi. This race in its various sections eventually,

See *Gallia Christiana*, v. 778, and Holmes, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, p. 493, note 1.

⁴ C.I.L. xiii. 242.

⁵ *Géographie des Gaules*, ii. 277, note 3.

⁷ In regard to the original homeland of the Triboci beyond the Rhine, I am now disposed to think that it may have been in Franconia in the midst of the Heroyrian Forest, north of the Main, where Mehlis, whose statements on the subject I had overlooked, places it. He associates the name with the mountain *Μηλ(β)οχος* of Ptolemy, doubtless as Zeuss suggested the Hartz, whose highest point is still called the Brocken. The same root is to be found in the *Mons Bacenis* of Caesar. Mehlis associates the name with Bockenfeld at the sources of the Tauber, Great and Little Bockenheim (anciently Buccenheim) in the North-East Palatinate, and more especially with the district reaching from Fulda to the Main, which in the eighth century retained its old name of Boconia, Buconia, Bochonia, and Buchonia. It is here that Mehlis puts the old land of the Triboci. He finds a trace of them again in the small town of Buchen in Baden, north-east of Mosbach, and in Triberg in the Black Forest, the *Deserta Helvetiorum* (*Studien zur ältesten Geschichte der Rheinlande*, pp. 72, 79).

and not very long after Caesar's time, succeeded in thrusting out the tribes which previously occupied the country east of the lower Rhine, and which I claim to have been Gauls in blood. The first of these tribes to attract our notice is that of the Ubii, the limits of whose country in Caesar's time it is not possible to fix accurately. Caesar describes them as bordering on the Rhine opposite to the Treveri. It is probable that they extended southwards as far as the Main. On the north we are expressly told that they bordered on the Sugambri, while it is pretty certain that they had the Suevi for their eastern neighbours. Caesar in defining the country of the Suevi in fact places them next to the Ubii: *ad alteram partem succedunt Ubii*.⁸

There has been much dispute about the extension of the Ubii northwards, where, as we know, they were bounded by the Sugambri. The only hint which has been supposed to point at their common frontier is to be found in what Caesar says about the position of the two bridges which he made across the Rhine. In regard to the second bridge he says, *paullum supra eum locum, quo ante exercitum transduxerat, facere pontem instituit*.⁹ This makes it plain that the two bridges were near each other. In regard to the first bridge he tells us that, when it was completed, having put a guard at either end he advanced (*contendit*) into the country of the Sugambri. It was after he had wasted the country of the Sugambri that he entered that of the Ubii, and the very strong inference is that this first bridge had its eastern end in the country of the Sugambri. The second bridge, on the other hand, which was planted 'a little higher up the river,' had one of its ends in the country of the Treveri (*in Treveris ad pontem praesidio relicto*). It would follow from the subsequent narrative that the other end of this bridge was in the country of the Ubii. This is Mr. Holmes' view. He says, 'It is clear then that, when he was about to set foot on the bridge, . . . he [*i.e.* Caesar] was standing upon Ubian territory.'¹⁰ Those who have wondered why he should have built two bridges near each other forget that the one had a hostile and the other a friendly people at its further end. In another passage Caesar tells us that when the Sugambri crossed the Rhine in 53 B.C. they did so thirty *milibus passuum infra eum locum, ubi pons erat perfectus*.¹¹ It is plain therefore that the frontier of the two tribes was not far from the two bridges.

The position of the bridges has been discussed by a German engineer officer, A. von Cohausen,¹² with considerable skill. He has shown that all the way from the Nahe to the Seven Mountains the Rhine valley is bounded by high, rugged banks, which in early times were hardly to be traversed by any but fisherfolk and hunters; and

⁸ iv. 3.¹¹ vi. 35.⁹ vi. 9.¹² *Caesar's Rheinbrücken*, pp. 7-11.¹⁰ *Op. cit.* p. 697.

he maintains that only at one place was the ground suitable for such structures as Caesar's bridges, as is further proved by the way in which the later roads were planned, and this was in the neighbourhood of Neuwied. Watterich accordingly places one of the bridges at Neuwied itself and the other at the so-called Neuwiedbecken,¹³ and he concludes that not far from these adjoining places was the northern frontier of the Ubii. The authors of the *Vie de César*, on the other hand, discuss the same question with considerable acumen, and conclude, I think reasonably, that the two bridges were planted near each other not far from Bona, the modern Bonn, where, according to Florus, Drusus crossed the Rhine fifty years later. This also fixes the northern frontier of the Ubii and the Sugambri. It long ago occurred to me, and I have since found that Usinger had made the same suggestion, that the Ubii were not very old possessors of the land they held in Caesar's time.¹⁴ This seems to follow from what we read of the Treveri who occupied the left bank of the Rhine opposite the Ubii. Of the state of the Treveri we are told by Hirtius, the author of the eighth book of the *Commentaries*,¹⁵ *cultu et feritate non multum a Germanis differebat*. In the *Germania*, ch. 28, we read: *Treveri et Nervii circa affectionem Germanicae originis ultro ambitiosi sunt*. It is therefore not improbable that the Treveri were not very distant immigrants from beyond the Rhine—that is, from the later country of the Ubii.

As for the Ubii, Zeuss¹⁶ considers the etymology of their name doubtful. Usinger, a great champion of the Teutonic side, admits:—

Der Name mag deutsch erklärt werden können: allein er kommt in der germanischen Ueberlieferung überhaupt nicht vor, und wenn wir ihn trotzdem aus einer deutschen Wurzel herleiten wollen, so muss unsere erheblich jüngere Kenntniss der Sprache den zweifelhaften Ausschlag geben. Ganz anders ist es, wenn wir annehmen, der Name sei keltischen Ursprungs. Er kommt selbst davon abgesehen, dass unsere Ueberlieferung keltisch-lateinisch ist, auch sonst zur Zeit seiner realen ethnographischen Existenz in der keltischen Welt vor.¹⁷

He then quotes the river name *Dan-Ubius* or *Dan-Uvius*, of which name Zeuss says that it is the Keltic equivalent of the Thracian name *Ister*, and remarks that each name was in use precisely in the district where the Kelts and the Thracians respectively prevailed. Jordanes¹⁸ states expressly that the Danube *lingua Bessorum Hister vocatur*. The Bessi were a Thracian race.¹⁹ Usinger points out that a tribe of Ὀβίοι are mentioned by Petrus Patricius as fighting on the

¹³ *Die Germanen des Rheins*, p. 7 &c.

¹⁴ *Es ist möglich, dass die Ubier von dessen rechtem Ufer Keltische Treverer verdrängten* (*Die Anfänge der Deutschen Geschichte*, pp. 227-228).

¹⁵ c. 25.

¹⁶ *Die Deutschen*, p. 87 note.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.* pp. 195, 196.

¹⁸ *Get.* c. 12. ¹⁹ Zeuss, p. 12, note.

Danube in the Marcomannic war in company with the Lombards. These he associates very probably in race with the Ubii of the Danube, while separating himself from Zeuss and Müllenhoff, who equated them with the Aviones of Holstein. It is not improbable that they migrated from the Danube country to the Rhine. Other names in which theirs occurs as a particle are the Esubii or Esuvii, mentioned by Caesar in northern Gaul.²⁰ Pliny also ²¹ mentions Esubiani among the Alpine tribes; Onubii are named by Caesar in southern Gaul; Oxubii by Pliny ²² among the Ligures. The same author puts the Uberi in the Alps,²³ while he gives, if the reading be right, the Bituriges in Aquitaine the cognomen of Ubisci: *Bituriges cognomine Ubisci*.²⁴ Other similar names are Vidubium, Ussubium, Virubium, which are doubtless all Keltic. Usinger therefore reasonably concludes: *Demnach liegt der Gedanke, auch der Name der deutschen Ubier sei Keltisch*. Thus while claiming the tribe as Teutonic he nevertheless concedes it a Keltic name.

After the Ubii had crossed the Rhine we are given the names of several towns in their country which were presumably of Ubian origin. The most northern of these towns according to Tacitus²⁵ was Gelduba. It is frequently named.²⁶ It was situated to the north of Neuss towards Ürdingen and was known as Geldapa in the middle ages, and still bears the name of Gellep or Gelf. The name is doubtless compounded with the same root as Ubii, and is associated by Müllenhoff with the Keltic root, *ab*, *ib*, *ob*, or *ub*.²⁷ He compares it with other similar names west of the Rhine, as Gennep on the Niers, known as Ganipa or Ganapia in the eleventh century; Genappe (the Latin Genapum) in the Walloon part of Brabant on the affluent of the upper Dyle of the same name; Gemapium or Gamapium in Normandy; Gempe between Louvain and Diest; Gulpen, known as Guloppe by the Walloons,²⁸ on the Gulpe, a branch of the Geule (called Gulia by Regino) between Aachen and Maastricht. A second town named among the later Ubians was Tolbiacum, *Tolbiacum in finibus Agrippinensium*.²⁹ Of this name I can suggest no reasonable etymology, certainly no Teutonic one. Within the new country of the Ubii were also Marcodurum (now Düren), an unmistakably Gaulish name, and Bona, which may be compared with the well-known Keltic name Bononia. What evidence there is, therefore, is strongly in favour of the Ubii having been of Gaulish rather than Teutonic race.

Caesar first mentions the Ubii in connexion with the war against Ariovistus. He tells us that the Suevi, who had advanced to the

²⁰ ii. 34; iii. 7, and v. 24.

²¹ iii. 20. 137.

²² iii. 4. 35.

²³ iii. 20. 135 and 137.

²⁴ iv. 19. 108.

²⁵ *Hist.* iv. 26.

²⁶ Pliny, xix. 5, 90; Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 32, 35, 36, 58; *Itin. Anton.* p. 255, 3.

²⁷ *Deutsche Alterthumskunde*, ii. 230.

²⁸ *Ibid.* and note ***.

²⁹ *Tac. Hist.* iv. 79.

borders of the Rhine, withdrew on hearing of his defeat. They were pursued by the Ubii who lived nearest to the Rhine (*proximi Rhenum incolunt*), and many of them were killed.³⁰ The Ubii, he says, formed a large and flourishing state according to German notions: *fuit civitas ampla atque florens, ut est captus Germanorum*. They were more cultured than others of their race, partly because they bordered on the Rhine and their country was therefore much frequented by merchants, while their proximity to Gaul had assimilated their manners to those of the Gauls. They had been frequently attacked by the Suevi, but on account of the size and strength of their community the Suevi had not been able to drive them out of their settlement. They had nevertheless made them tributary, and reduced them to a position of great weakness and inferiority.³¹ It is clear that in fact the Ubii had been in a perilous position, and were threatened with destruction by the Suevi, and it is not strange that they should have looked upon the advent of the Romans in eastern Gaul, and the destruction of Ariovistus, who was in alliance with their enemies, as affording them some hopes of surcease from their troubles. They had also incurred fresh penalties, for, although tributaries of the Suevi, they had not failed to attack and kill a number of them when they had recently retired from the Rhine country. It was very natural therefore that they should have made overtures to the Romans, and it is doubtless to them that Caesar refers when he tells us the Germans from beyond the Rhine had sent to offer their submission. This was in 57 B.C.³² Caesar's phrase must be read in connexion with his statement in book iv. 16, that the Ubii alone of the trans-Rhenane tribes had sent envoys to him, made peace with him, and given him hostages. Exaction of hostages was generally the first Roman step in the reduction of their neighbours to a dependent position, and we are not surprised that in this case the submission should have been highly valued by Caesar, since it gave him a great tactical advantage in his troubles with the wild tribes beyond the Rhine to have a friendly garrison there, and a convenient and safe landing-place and base when he needed to cross the river.

An opportunity for utilising the influence thus acquired soon came. In the year 55 B.C. the Tenchteri and Usipetes, who had been driven from their old country by the Suevi, begged Caesar to give them settlements in the Ardennes. This he could not see his way to doing, as he doubtless deprecated any policy by which the Germans should emigrate across the Rhine. He told their envoys that there were no vacant lands in Gaul where such a multitude could settle, but he added that at this very time other envoys had arrived in his camp from the Ubii, asking him

³⁰ i. 54.³¹ iv. 3, 4.³² ii. 35.

to assist them against their common enemy the Suevi, and he promised to try to induce the Ubii to find them quarters in their country. This proposal, as we shall see, did not then come about.³³ Presently we are told that the Ubii sent to Caesar and begged him to give them help, since they were being much harassed by the Suevi. If it was not possible, they said, in view of the policy of the Republic for him to go over and drive away the Suevi in person, they asked that he would at least send his army across. This would suffice to give them hope and to strengthen their hands, for such was the reputation of the Romans since the defeat of Ariovistus and the more recent one of the two other German tribes above named, even among the remotest Germans, that they would feel safe even with the mere reputation of sharing the patronage and friendship of the Roman people. They further promised a large contingent of boats to transport the army across.³⁴ Caesar professes that he deemed it unworthy of Roman dignity to accept such help, and he preferred to build a bridge over the river. Across this he marched his army into the country of the Sugambri and thence into that of the Ubii, to whom he promised help if they should be attacked by the Suevi, who had meanwhile retreated into their fastnesses on hearing of the Roman advance. Among the objects he claimed to have accomplished by his journey across the Rhine was the liberation of the Ubii from their vassalage to the Suevi.³⁵

Caesar again crossed the Rhine in 53 B.C., first to punish the Germans for having sent assistance to his enemies the Treveri, and secondly to prevent Ambiorix the chief of the Eburones from taking shelter there. He made a fresh bridge near the previous one, and planted a garrison at the western end, which was in the country of the Treveri. The Ubii again sent him envoys with their assurances that they had not given any help to the Treveri nor failed in their loyalty to himself; they begged that he would not visit them with any penalties incurred by the other Germans, *ne communi odio Germanorum innocentes pro nocentibus poenas pendant*, and promised that if he wished for more hostages he should have them. Having learnt that it was the Suevi who had sent the succour to his enemies, he accepted the explanation of the Ubii. Preparatory to attacking the Suevi he ordered the Ubii to remove their cattle and other provisions from their homes, so that the enemy should have no means of provisioning their forces. These precautions proved unnecessary, for the Suevi on hearing of the Roman advance hastily withdrew.³⁶ This is the last notice Caesar gives us about the Ubii.

The final withdrawal of Caesar from Gaul and the civil wars which followed, which would be closely watched by the various

³³ iv. 8.³⁴ c. 16.³⁵ c. 19.³⁶ vi. 9 and 10.

turbulent peoples beyond the Rhine, no doubt caused more than one unrecorded frontier trouble. The only notice of such troubles is contained in a short account of Cassius Dio under the year 38 B.C. He tells us³⁷ that Caesar (i.e. Augustus) in that year sent for Agrippa from Gaul to help him to build his fleet. Agrippa was then in charge of Gaul and had been fighting, he says, against the revolted Gauls, when he had been the second of the Romans to cross the Rhine for purposes of war. About the year 27 B.C., when Augustus held a meeting of the States of Gaul at Narbonne, he introduced a great administrative change in the empire, by which the government of the provinces was divided between the senate and himself. He himself took over the provinces which were under military government and where the governors were not annually changed. Gaul was at this time divided into four provinces, of which one, Gallia Narbonensis, remained subject to the senate, while the other three were reserved for the emperor. Of these we are here only interested in the eastern one, Gallia Belgica, which, like Lotharingia in later times, included most if not all the lands east of the Seine and Saône, comprising the country of the Sequani and Helvetii, and also the Rhine lands.³⁸ Augustus spent the greater part of the year 27 at Lyons superintending the organisation of these provinces.

In 19 B.C. Agrippa was again governor of Gaul. Cassius Dio tells us³⁹ that the inhabitants of Gaul had been at war among themselves and were being harshly treated by the Keltae, by whom he means the trans-Rhenan Germans. It was at this time doubtless, as Zeppel argues,⁴⁰ and not in 38 B.C. that he transferred the Ubii from the east to the west of the Rhine. Strabo is our earliest authority for the fact, and he says that the *Oὔβιοι* were so transported by Agrippa with their own consent.⁴¹ Tacitus makes the same statement. Speaking of Agrippina he says,⁴² *Ac forte acciderat, ut eam gentem Rheno transgressam avus Agrippa in fidem acciperet*, while in the *Germania* he tells us that they were so transported for their own protection and not that they might guard the frontier. What is plain is that the Ubii now became Roman subjects like the other tribes of Gaul. They were clearly not settled immediately opposite to their old country, since this was occupied by the Treveri, but in the lands then vacant which had formerly been occupied by the Eburones. Their southern neighbours in their new country were the Treveri, who were apparently partly pushed out of their old quarters, for Tacitus⁴³ makes the Moselle the frontier between the two tribes. Thence they extended northwards as far as a little north of Gelduba, which was not far from Roermond.

³⁷ xlviii. 49.³⁸ Strabo, iv. 1. 1.³⁹ liv. 11.⁴⁰ *Deutsche Völkerbewegungen*, p. 75.⁴¹ iv. 3. 4.⁴² *Ann.* xii. 27.⁴³ *Hist.* iv. 77.

In their new country the Ubii planted a fresh capital on the Rhine. It was known as Oppidum or Civitas Ubiorum. It is possible that their old capital before they crossed the river may have been at Deutz opposite this town. During the campaign of Germanicus the younger, A.D. 14-17, the Civitas Ubiorum had already acquired another name and was also known as Ara Ubiorum.⁴⁴ The name Ara thus given to it was doubtless derived from some famous altar erected there, like that erected at Lyons in honour of Rome and of Augustus. A more important change in the name took place in A.D. 50, when the empress Agrippina, who had been born there, created it a colony and gave it her own name. Tacitus says that, *quo vim suam sociis quoque nationibus ostentaret, in oppidum Ubiorum in quo genita erat veteranos coloniamque deduci impetrat, cui nomen inditum e vocabulo ipsius*.⁴⁵ As M. Reinier has shown, it was afterwards known as Colonia Claudia Ara and Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippensis. The full name of the place apparently was Colonia Claudia Ara Augusta Agrippinensium.⁴⁶ It became the capital of Lower Germany, as it is still the capital of the Rhine lands.⁴⁷

Tacitus mentions an inexplicable disaster which befel the Ubians in A.D. 58, caused, he says, by a sudden eruption of subterranean fire by which their farms, villages, and cities were involved in a general conflagration. The flames spread far and wide and reached the Roman colony, lately founded; neither the rain nor the river waters could extinguish the fire. Every remedy failed till the

⁴⁴ Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 39 and 57.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* xii. 27.

⁴⁶ Desjardins, *Géographie de la Gaule*, iii. 302-303.

⁴⁷ In defining the limits between Upper and Lower Germany in my former paper (*ante*, vol. xxiii. p. 636), I mentioned the current identification of 'the Obrincus' of Ptolemy, which he makes the boundary with the Moselle. This river name, by the way, is clearly Keltic, and may be compared with the Abrincatus of Pliny, *N.H.* iv. 18. 32. I now think it probable that Watterich was right in another conclusion. Ptolemy's statements about Germany and the Rhine lands are most unsatisfactory. He tells us *inter alia* that Mainz was in Lower Germany, which would mean that the boundary between the latter and the Upper Province was south of Mainz, and Mehlis accordingly tried to identify the Obrincus (Ὀβρίγγα) of Ptolemy and of the *Notitia imperii* (see Böcking, ii. 483-4) with the Eisbach, on which he found a small place still called Obrighheim, and urged that the Eisbach in early times had a common outlet with the Pfimm, and that the Rhine has since shifted its bed considerably to the east. Watterich, on the contrary, points out that there was found as early as 1810 an inscription (now preserved in the Museum of Antiquities at Brussels) which was published by Freudenberg in the *Jahrb. des Vereins für Alterthumsfr. in Rheinlande*, 1860, xxix. and xxx. 84-94, 23. This stone was found on the northern bank of the Vinxtbach, which falls into the Rhine at Rheineck, half a mile below Brohl, between the Moselle and the Ahr. This stone contains a dedication by two soldiers of the 30th Legion Ulpia Victrix to the gods of the frontier and the Genius loci (*Finibus et Genio loci*) and to Jupiter. See also Brambach, *Corp. Inscr. Rhén.*, Elberfeld, 1867, p. 649. Watterich concludes—I think, most reasonably—that the Obrincus of Ptolemy called Ὀβρίγγα in the Periplus of Marcianus Heracleensis was the Vinxtbach, and that Ptolemy's placing of Mainz in the lower province was a mistake.

peasants threw in heaps of stones and also threw wet clothes on the conflagration.⁴⁸ This reads like a somewhat fantastic account of a volcanic eruption, and is hardly explicable by the setting on fire of moorlands as some have suggested, for we are expressly told that the fires were subterranean.

In A.D. 69, when Mummius Lupercus led his forces against the famous Batavian rebel Civilis, Tacitus says that he took with him the Ubii and the cavalry of the Treveri, as being the nearest at hand. In the subsequent fight these auxiliaries fled and it is probable that their hearts were not in the business, for Civilis seems to have exercised a wonderful influence on all the tribes of the Rhine lands, even those who had accepted the Roman yoke most completely. At first however the Ubii did not join the league, and we read that Herennius Gallus and Vocula, the Roman commanders, pitched their camp at Gelduba, one of their towns.⁴⁹ In order to bring them to their senses, Civilis gave orders that the confederates who were nearest to the Ubii and Treveri should harass and devastate their borders. The Ubii were especially punished, for, as Tacitus says, although originally of German extraction (*gens Germanicae originis*), they had renounced their race and adopted the Roman name of Agrippinenses. Their cohorts, posted at a distance from the Rhine, thought themselves safe, but were attacked at Marco-durum (Düren near Aachen) and cut to pieces. The Ubii in their turn penetrated into Germany, i.e. beyond the Rhine, and at first committed depredations with impunity, but were eventually overpowered by superior numbers. According to Tacitus they were faithful to the Romans through the whole war, but a series of misfortunes was their only recompense.⁵⁰ Fortune continued in fact to shine on Civilis, and presently Gelduba, from which the Roman garrison had retired, fell into his hands.⁵¹

Meanwhile a conspiracy was formed in a private house at Cologne in favour of the cause of Civilis, at which some Ubii and Tungri were present—*attamen interfuere quidam Ubiorum Tungrorumque*⁵²—but it is clear that the people as a whole remained faithful to the Romans, and Civilis determined to destroy their now flourishing capital, although his son had been treated very kindly there when a prisoner. He had been captured in the earlier part of the war, but his father's hands were forced by the tribes beyond the Rhine who were in alliance with him and who insisted either that Cologne should be made a free town for all Germans or that the place and people should be destroyed.⁵³ A deputation from the Tenchteri, who lived beyond the Rhine, now arrived at the Agrippinian colony to plead that the Ubii should more openly join the confederates. An orator distinguished for his

⁴⁸ *Ann.* xiii. 57.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 36.

⁵⁰ *Hist.* iv. 26.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 55.

⁵² *Ibid.* 23.

⁵³ *Ibid.* 63.

ferocity addressed them. He first thanked his gods that they (the Ubii) had once again become Germans, and that thenceforth they would live a free people with their natural rights. The Romans, who had hitherto been masters of their lands and territories, had excluded free intercourse with them. If at any time they had been allowed to enter the city it was under the surveillance of a guard, and they were obliged before doing so to deposit their arms and to pay a tax. If they now wanted, he said, to be firm friends with them, they must demolish the walls of their city, the monuments of their former slavery. The fiercest animals grow soft and mild if long caged. He bade them rise and extirpate those of Roman race among them. When they were destroyed let their goods be brought into a common stock and not be appropriated by various individuals. He reminded them that their common ancestors enjoyed both banks of the Rhine: let the old rights and the primitive laws be restored, and let them rid themselves of Roman luxuries. The Agrippinians needed time for deliberation. Their position, it was clear, was a difficult one. In their reply they confessed that on seeing the dawn of coming liberty they had with more zeal than prudence joined in the common cause, but, they asked, was this a time to demolish fortifications when the Roman armies were threatening them on all sides? It was surely a time for strengthening and not destroying them. If there once had been emigrants from Rome and Italy in their midst, the fate of war had overwhelmed them or they had escaped homewards; as to those who had settled among them with their families, they had been long among them, had intermarried and mixed with them, and were now tied to them by bonds of blood. Their descendants were their own relations; this was their native country: how could they be asked to kill their fathers, brothers, and children? The free commerce they had asked for should be established, all duties which were a restraint of trade should be repealed. Their city should be open to them, but they must come unarmed and in open day. They wished that Civilis and Velede (i.e. the Bructerian prophetess so called) should arbitrate between them and a treaty be thus ratified. The Tenchteri were satisfied, and, as had been asked, Civilis and Velede arranged a treaty to the satisfaction of the Agrippinians.⁵⁴

In the great battle fought in A.D. 70 between Civilis and the Roman commander Cerealis, the Ubii, Lingones, and the Batavian cohorts were in the centre of the former's army. Cerealis managed to save the famous bridge over the Moselle uniting the Ubian territory, the Agrippenses, and the Treveri, and eventually by his extraordinary vigour utterly defeated the enemy.⁵⁵ Meanwhile the Ubians behaved treacherously to their allies. They

⁵⁴ *Hist.* iv. 64, 65.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 77.

killed all the Germans throughout their colony and declared themselves ready to deliver up the wife and sister of Civilis with the daughter of Classicus to the Romans. Civilis prepared to avenge himself. He planted a cohort of picked men from among the Chauci and Frisians at Tolbiacum, one of the Ubian towns, with which he intended to make a sudden attack on their capital; but the Ubii invited them to a sumptuous feast, and then at night, when they were overwhelmed with sleep and wine, they set fire to their houses and all of them were burnt to death.⁵⁶ It should be noticed—for it is the only personal name recorded of the race—that Claudia Sacrata, a Ubian woman (*mulieris Ubiae*), is mentioned by Tacitus in his account of the doings of Civilis in A.D. 70.⁵⁷ This is the last occasion in which we hear of the Agrippinians or Ubii taking part in the affairs of Rome as a separate body or as individuals, and they now seem to have become incorporated with the empire. Their country in fact probably became the most Romanised of any part of Gaul, the seat of its most successful arts and industries. As a proof of their conversion to entirely civil lives may be mentioned that neither Ubii nor Agrippinenses are mentioned in the *Notitia* as furnishing contingents of troops to the empire, nor are any such contingents mentioned in inscriptions. What took place in the old country of the Ubii beyond the Rhine immediately after their migration is unknown. Perhaps the whole race did not entirely abandon it, and certain parts of it may for a while have remained there. It is also pretty clear that a portion was now appropriated by the Chatti, a section of those Suevi who had made so many efforts to oust them from their homes. Their country lay behind that of the Ubii, and we are told by Dio that the Romans had given the Chatti lands to settle in. These were doubtless on the Rhine, and we are expressly told that about the year 11 B.C. Drusus built a stronghold 'among the Chatti.' This was apparently the first undoubted body of Teutonic race which settled on the Rhine. The year following (10 B.C.) the Chatti were partly weakened and partly subdued by Drusus, and abandoned the lands given them by the Romans, and went to settle among the Sugambri.⁵⁸

From the Ubii we now turn to their neighbours, the Sugambri or Sicambri. The name is written in various ways, and it is by no means so clear as some modern German writers have maintained that the usual form was Sugambri. The Roman poets who were contemporary with them generally wrote Sicambri, and this form is supported by a good many variants in the manuscripts of prose writers, although the majority of them have the form Sugambri. Müllenhoff very arbitrarily, as it seems to me, minimises the case

⁵⁶ *Hist.* iv. 79.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* v. 22.

⁵⁸ Cassius Dio, liv. 33–36.

for Sicambri, which has a strong probability. The Franks, who revived the name, certainly used this form. As however the form Sugambri has become so general, I shall continue to use it. The name is clearly compounded of two factors, *su* or *si* and *cambri* or *gambri*. In regard to *su*, it is a common prefix in Keltic names: e.g. Sucarius, Suagirus, Suanetes, Sucellas. *Cambri* or *gambri* seems to be unmistakably connected with the Celtic *Cambri* and *Cumbri*, and with what I also believe to have been a Keltic people, namely, the *Cimbri*. The only personal names we can directly connect with the Sugambri are Melo, their chief (who, according to Strabo and the Ancyran inscription, submitted to Augustus), and his brothers Deoderix and Baetorix. I can suggest no reasonable etymology for Melo or Melon. The other two names end in *-rix*, which is a common termination of Gaulish chiefs' names, and one of the two has an almost exact equivalent in Biturix, a recorded Gaulish chief's name, while the other seems connected with *teuto* as in Teutomagas, Teutobodiaci, Teutates, and especially Teutiorix, all Gaulish names. *Teuto* has its equivalent in *tuath*, Irish for 'people.' It would seem therefore that what philological evidence we possess goes to making the Sucambri or Sugambri Gauls. The principal reason for making them a Teutonic people has been the fact that in later times the Franks, who endeavoured to appropriate the glorious traditions of the race in its struggle against Rome, appropriated its name also; but the best authorities are now agreed that there was no direct connexion between the older Sugambri or Sucambri of Caesar and the Sicambri of the historians and poets of the Franks. As Latham long ago remarked, 'In all the cases where they so use the name the term is a titular archaism, no nation then being called Sicambrian.'⁵⁹ Müllenhoff holds that the view urged by Waitz that the Sicambri are to be equated with the Salian Franks *beruht schlechterdings auf einer mangelhaften und falschen Auffassung der Geschichte des Volkes und des Namens der Sugambern*.⁶⁰ So too, Bremer says, *Die alte sugambrische Civitas ist vernichtet, wenn auch die Franken noch nach Jahrhunderten in poetischer Sprache Sicambri genannt werden*.⁶¹

Caesar tells us of the Sugambri that they lived on the Rhine—*proximi Rheno*. Their southern neighbours were the Ubii and, as we shall see later, they extended northwards to the Lippe (doubtless a Keltic name connected with the Irish Liffey), while on the east they were bounded by the Cherusci.⁶² They are first mentioned by Caesar in the fourth book of the *Commentaries* (ch. 16), where

⁵⁹ Tacitus, *Germania*, Epilogomena, ii.

⁶⁰ *Deutsche Alterthumskunde*, iv. 603.

⁶¹ Cassius Dio, liv. 33.

⁶² *Op. cit.* p. 150.

he tells us that in the year 55 B.C. the cavalry of the Tenchteri and Usipetes, which, having been absent on a foraging expedition, had escaped the fate of their fellow-countrymen, recrossed the Rhine, after the defeat of the latter by Caesar, into the country of the Sugambri and united with them. This points to their probably having been of the same race. Caesar sent to demand that they would give up their fugitives who had been plundering Gaul. The Sugambri replied that the empire of the Roman people ended at the Rhine. If the Germans had crossed the Rhine without their consent it was no reason why Caesar should claim to dominate the country beyond the river. Caesar then proceeded to build his celebrated bridge in the neighbourhood of Bonn, and, having placed a strong guard at either end of it, he entered the country of the Sugambri. Thereupon several communities sent him envoys, whom he received affably and from whom he obtained hostages. Meanwhile the Sugambri withdrew from their country with their property and secluded themselves in the wastes and forests, being exhorted to do so by their guests the Tenchteri and Usipetes who had lately felt the severity of the Roman arms. Caesar tells us he spent a few days in their country burning their farms and villages and destroying their crops, and then moved on into the country of the Ubii.⁶³ The murderous campaigns of the Romans beyond the Rhine, in which for very slight offences and sometimes merely for the sake of fame so much cruel hardship was inflicted on races essentially poor, are commented on by Usinger :

Wenn Cäsar, wie kaum zweifelhaft sein mag, beabsichtigte, noch mehr Stämme am rechten Rheinufer in das Verhältniss zu bringen, in dem die Ubier zu Rom standen, so war dieser Plan vereitelt. Anstatt dessen hatte er die mächtige Völkerschaft der Sigambren, die anzugreifen nach seiner eignen Darlegung eigentlich gar kein Grund vorhanden war, zu Todfeinden Roms gemacht. In der Folge hat das die Beziehungen Roms zu den nicht-suebischen Völkerschaften bestimmt, und es ist so durch Cäsar die Politik begründet, die in dem Teutoburger Walde später ihr schmachvolles Ende fand.⁶⁴

During the war with the Eburones and their allies, when rumours reached the Germans beyond the Rhine that they had been invited to invade and plunder the country of the Eburones, the Sugambri assembled 2000 cavalry and crossed the river in boats and rafts 80 miles below the point where Caesar had planted his bridge. They overran the country of the Eburones, collected a large number of prisoners and cattle, and, having learnt that Caesar was absent and that in the course of three hours they could reach Aduatuca, the fortress where the Romans had collected their booty, they

⁶³ iv. 18.

⁶⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 50.

thought it possible to surprise it. Accordingly, having placed their own captures in a safe place, they crossed the Rhine and advanced on Aduatuca. But they found it impossible to take the place, and presently raised the siege and succeeded in recrossing the Rhine with their booty. This is the last notice of the tribe in Caesar.⁶⁵ They are next heard of in 16 B.C., when, according to Cassius Dio,⁶⁶ the greatest war which at that time the Romans had to wage was against 'the Keltae.' The Sugambri, Usipetes, and Tenchteri had first seized some of the Romans in their own territory, and then they crossed the Rhine and plundered Germania (i.e. the districts so called west of the Rhine) and Gaul. They took the Roman cavalry in ambush and defeated its commander Lollius. Augustus advanced against them, but they had meanwhile retired into their own territory. They afterwards made peace and gave hostages. The Romans clearly met with a heavy reverse on this occasion, and Velleius Paterculus⁶⁷ says very disagreeable things of the Roman commander:

Accepta in Germania clades sub legato M. Lollio (homine in omnia pecuniae quam recte faciendi cupidior et inter summam vitiorum dissimulationem vitiosissimo) amissaque legionis quintae aquila vocavit ab Urbe in Gallias Caesarem (Augustum);

and in a notable passage Tacitus⁶⁸ associates the *Lollianas Varianasque clades*; see also Suetonius (*Augustus*). It would seem from a passage in Julius Obsequens (*de insidiis*) that the Romans themselves had also exercised craft in this campaign: *Insidiis Romanorum Germaniae circumventi sub M. Lollio legato graviter vexati*. According to later writers the original cause of the troubles was that certain centurions had gone among these tribes to secure recruits for the army, and were thereupon surrounded and put to death.⁶⁹ Florus says twenty centurions then perished as a sort of sacrificial offering: *viginti centurionibus in crucem actis hoc velut sacramento sumpserant bellum*.

Augustus evidently deemed the difficulties beyond the frontier serious, for he spent the next two years on the Rhine trying to settle them. He plainly determined to make the frontier safe and to take efficacious measures for preventing such disasters as had recently taken place, and for this purpose he selected his best soldiers and his best general, who also had the prestige of high birth—namely, his stepson Drusus. The result was a general combination of the German tribes beyond the Rhine under the hegemony of the redoubtable Sugambri, who viewed what was coming as disastrous for their liberties. This was supplemented by outbreaks among the Belgae caused by the exactions of the Roman tax-gatherers.⁷⁰ It

⁶⁵ vi. 35.⁶⁶ liv. 20.⁶⁷ ii. 97.⁶⁸ *Ann.* i. 10.⁶⁹ Pseudo-Acro Scholiast. ad Hor. *Carm.* iv. 2, ed. Pauly, i. 372.⁷⁰ Livy, cxxxvii., epit.

was in the spring of 12 B.C., Dio tells us, that the Sugambri and their allies, owing to the absence of Augustus and to their knowledge that the Gauls had become restless under the Roman yoke, became hostile. Drusus drove back some bodies of marauders who had made raids across the river, and we are told that he occupied the district in front of them (*i.e.* the old land of the Ubii).⁷¹ In the summer of the same year he went to Lyons to take part in the festival at the inauguration of the great altar to the city of Rome and to Augustus by Gaius Julius Vercundaris Dubius, an Aeduan who was appointed high priest for the purpose. There the representatives of sixty Gaulish tribes were present; like the Ubian altar at Cologne, it was doubtless meant to symbolise their subjection. To this festival, it is recorded, the chief men of the Sugambri and their allies had been invited.⁷² In pursuance of his plan to pacify Germany and to punish the recent marauders, Drusus now crossed the Rhine to the land of the Usipetes, opposite the island of the Batavi, and thence marched along the river as far as the country of the Sugambri. He then seems to have taken ship and sailed down the Rhine to the country of the Frisians.⁷³ The following spring, 11 B.C., he again crossed the Rhine, no doubt at the same place, and having subjugated the Usipetes he bridged the Lupia (Lippe), and invaded the country of the Sugambri, which shows that that river was then the boundary between the two tribes. Dio tells us he was able to pass through the country of the Sugambri unmolested, because that people had engaged their allies to make a common attack on the Chatti, who alone among the trans-Rhenane tribes had refused to join their confederacy. This implies that the Chatti were then in alliance or on terms of friendship with the Romans, a suggestion which is confirmed by what we read presently, that they had in fact been permitted by the Romans to settle on certain lands under their control. It is not said whether these lands were on the east or west bank of the Rhine, but it was probably in the old country of the Ubii, which was now largely vacant.

According to Cassius Dio,⁷⁴ in the campaign which followed, Drusus advanced to the Visurgis or Weser, and to the country of the Cherusci, and would have advanced further but that his provisions ran short. Moreover, a swarm of bees was seen in his camp, which was apparently accepted as a bad omen. He now found himself in considerable difficulties, as other generals did who had made long marches into the wild German land. On his retreat he encountered great dangers all the way: the enemy harassed him with ambuscades, and once they closed round him in a narrow hollow and almost annihilated him. He would have been destroyed but that the enemy, fancying there was no escape for him, came up in disorderly

⁷¹ Dio, liv. 32.⁷² *Ibid.*; Livy, cxxxvii. epit., and various inscriptions.⁷³ Dio, liv. 32.⁷⁴ liv. 33.

fashion and suffered heavy loss, and afterwards kept up their pursuit at a distance. This story suggests that if we had more details the campaign would prove to have involved greater loss to the Romans than is actually related. The epitomator of Livy gives us no fresh details nor does he mention the Sugambri, who were the chief actors on the German side, at all. Florus,⁷⁶ who seems to have mixed up these misfortunes with those of Lollius, has a fantastic story which, whatever its basis, is clearly an echo of the campaign of Drusus just described. He says that the enemy were so sure of winning that they divided the booty by agreement before the battle: the Cherusci were to take the horses, the Suevi the gold and silver, and the Sugambri the captives; but matters having gone the other way, Drusus divided and sold the horses, cattle, torques, and prisoners.

Dio tells us how on his return Drusus planted a fortress at the junction of the Lupia or Lippe and the Aliso, apparently at Elsen-Neuhaus north-west of Paderborn at the outfall of the Aliso; and another in the country of the Chatti, which Watterich identifies with Castel opposite Mainz.⁷⁶ Florus says that to protect the Rhine Drusus built fifty fortresses. The next year, 10 B.C., the Chatti, weakened by the attacks of Drusus, who had also partially subdued them, abandoned the lands which the Romans had given them to settle in and joined the Sugambri. In the year 9 B.C. he had another campaign in Germany as far as the Elbe, but on his return towards the Rhine he fell from his horse, his leg was broken, and he died thirteen days after. He was given a stately funeral and buried in the tomb of Augustus. His place on the Rhine was taken by his brother Tiberius—like himself, a soldier of great gifts.

This famous war of Drusus against what was probably the most indomitable of all the German tribes gave ample scope to the poets. Thus in the so-called *Epiciedion Drusi*, whose claim to be a genuine ancient document seems to have been established by Hübner, we read, verse 17,

ille genus Suevos acre indomitosque Sicambros
contudit;

and again, verse 311,

Nec tibi [Livia] deletos poterit narrare Sicambros,
ensibus et Suevos terga dedisse suis.⁷⁷

So too Horace, *Od.* iv. 14,

Te caede gaudentis Sicambri
Compositis venerantur armis;

and Propertius, v. 6. 7,

Paludosos memoret servire Sicambros;

⁷⁶ ii. 30.

⁷⁷ Watterich, *op. cit.* pp. 57, 58, 151.

⁷⁷ *Poetae Latini Minores* (ed. Baehrens), i. 104, 115.

lastly Ovid, *Ars Am.* i. 14. 45,

Nunc tibi captivos mittet Germania crines :
cultæ triumphatæ munere gentis eris.

In the year 9 B.C. we are told by Cassius Dio⁷⁸ that Augustus, although inclined to lay down his imperial power, resumed it again, apparently in view of the threatening state of things beyond the Rhine. He did not cross the river himself but sent Tiberius there, and all the barbarians except the Sugambri made overtures for peace; but Augustus refused to entertain them unless the Sugambri would also negotiate in the same sense. Dio goes on to say that they did in fact send envoys but they failed to arrange matters; whereupon all of them, a numerous and distinguished body, met an untimely end, for Augustus arrested them and put them in various cities, where they slew themselves.⁷⁹ This reads like a truculent breach of faith on the part of the emperor who was generally reputable in his public conduct. Tacitus reports a much more drastic dealing with the Sugambri. In describing the policy of Ostorius Scapula towards the Silures in later times, he says: 'the Roman general had declared that they must be driven out like the Sugambri, who were exterminated or transplanted into Gaul' (*Sugambri excisi aut in Gallias traieci*).⁸⁰ Suetonius⁸¹ says in regard to the same event that Tiberius *Sugambros dedentes se traduxit in Galliam atque in proximis Rheno agris conlocavit*; and elsewhere,⁸² *Germanico quadraginta milia dediticiorum traiecit in Galliam iuxtaque ripam Rheni sedibus adsignatis conlocavit*. It was by the exercise of diplomacy rather than by fighting that he claimed thus to have subdued the Sugambri.⁸³

These statements about the submission and transportation of the Sugambri seem to have been a good deal misunderstood and exaggerated. That a large number of them were so transported, as the Ubii had been some years before, is plain. Suetonius, who is much the best authority, puts these emigrants at 40,000; Eutropius at 400,000; Usinger suggests that the former figure comprises the fighting men only. We are also told that they submitted to the Romans, and this is confirmed by the Ancyran inscription of Augustus where among the chiefs who submitted to him there is specially mentioned the Sugambrian Melo or Melon, who, according to Strabo,⁸⁴ was their leader in the war which they were the first to begin. It is nevertheless clear that a considerable body of the Sugambri still remained to the east of the Rhine. They apparently withdrew from the neighbourhood of the river and joined their neighbours, the Cherusci. It also appears

⁷⁸ lv. 6.

⁷⁹ lv. 6.

⁸⁰ Ann. xii. 39.

⁸¹ *Augustus*, 21.

⁸² *Tiberius*, 9.

⁸³ Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 26.

⁸⁴ vii. 1. 4.

that this section of the race had with it as a leader a relative of Melo who had submitted to Augustus,⁸⁵ and that he fought in the tragical battle of A.D. 10 in which Varus and his legions were destroyed. This we learn from Strabo, a contemporary, who tells us that all who had fought against Varus had received punishment, namely, in the war in which Germanicus the younger was most successful; and in the brilliant triumph which was accorded him there marched in the procession, among other distinguished personages, Deoderix the son of Baetorix, the brother of Melon, of the nation of the Sugambri, together with chiefs of the Cherusci and the Chatti. The wars of the younger Germanicus in Germany took place A.D. 14, 15, and 16. It is not improbable that the remnants of those Sugambri who lived beyond the river amalgamated with the Cherusci. Strabo, after mentioning that of the people of Germany some had been transported into Celtica, goes on to say that there were few remaining, some of whom were Sugambri.⁸⁶ This was written about A.D. 18.

In the *Annals* of Tacitus⁸⁷ there is a description of the campaign of Sabinus against the Thracians in A.D. 26. In a battle, in which the Roman ranks were somewhat broken by the enemy, we read that the position was restored by an auxiliary cohort consisting of Sugambri, a wild ferocious people who rushed to battle amid shouts and beating of arms: *Sugumbrica cohors prompta ad pericula, nec minus cantuum et armorum tumultu trux*. Though the Sugambri are not mentioned again by the historians till the name was revived by the Franks, more than one cohort of them is recorded in inscriptions as having been in the imperial service. These inscriptions all refer to the First and Fourth Sugambrian cohort, implying clearly the existence of a second and third one. The first is named in connexion with M. Valerius Lollianus in Mesopotamia and apparently in the time of Trajan.⁸⁸ In another inscription found at Giurgievo on the Danube,⁸⁹ granting privileges to veterans, there is mention of a 'Coh. 1 Claud. Sygambr.' This is dated 2 April 134, in the reign of Hadrian. This cohort had its quarters in Moesia, and Müllenhoff suggests with great probability that it was the same as that which fought under Sabinus in Thrace in the year 26. The tombstone of a prefect of this cohort was found at Rome,⁹⁰ and there is record of a tribune and a soldier of the fourth cohort.⁹¹ The use of the title 'Claudius' applied in one of these inscriptions to the first cohort has apparently been the reason why the Emperor Claudius

⁸⁵ It is by no means clear that even those of the Sugambri who crossed the Rhine did not recross it to join their countrymen as the allies of the Cherusci against Varus.

⁸⁶ *Geogr.* vii. 1. 4.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* iii. 2. p. 877.

⁸⁸ iv. 47.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* i. p. 543.

⁹⁰ *C.I.L.* iii. 1. p. 600.

⁹¹ *Ibid.* nos. 3580 and 3938

is said to have raised several cohorts of Sugambri. It was however doubtless an honorary title acquired for some act of bravery, and, as Müllenhoff says, it is clear that these cohorts continued to use their original name long after they had ceased to be recruited among the Sugambri. It is probable that they were originally raised by Tiberius at the time when he broke up their community and transported many of them across the Rhine.

As for the Sugambri who were settled west of the Rhine, the only vacant country available for them was to the north of the Ubii—that is to say, in the northern part of the district once occupied by the Eburones and then unoccupied. Here however we have no direct evidence of Sugambri *eo nomine*. On the other hand we find a tribe, the Cugerni, Guberni, or Gugerni, who are now mentioned for the first time, and who were long ago identified as those emigrants under another name by Cluver, an identification supported by Zeuss and other more recent writers. Pliny, who wrote about A.D. 60, is the first to name them, and he calls them Guberni: *Rhenum autem accolentes Germaniæ gentium . . . Ubii, Colonia Agrippinensis, Guberni, Batavi*. Tacitus, who is the next to mention them, calls them Gugerni and in some manuscripts Cugerni. He speaks of the town of Gelduba as being close to ‘the pagi’ of the Gugerni.⁹² In describing the army of Civilis he tells us the Batavi and Gugerni were in the right wing.⁹³ It is curious that, although thus mentioned in the *History* of Tacitus, the Gugerni are not noticed in the *Germania*, nor indeed are the Sugambri, nor are either of them named by Ptolemy. They supplied however some auxiliary troops to the Romans, which are mentioned as stationed in Britain, as we learn from inscriptions, one of them found at Procolitia on Hadrian’s wall,⁹⁴ another at Malpas in Cheshire, and a third in Dumbartonshire, in which the first cohort of the Cugerni is mentioned. The origin and meaning of their name have not been satisfactorily solved, nor is it quite clear why they should have changed it on crossing the Rhine. The Ubii did so no doubt, but they simply adopted the new name of their capital, and in calling themselves Agrippinenses merely emphasised their devotion to the cause of the Empire. We can hardly explain the similar change of Sugambri into Guberni or Gugerni in the same way. Walckenaer places the Gugerni in the district between Roermond and Cuyck.⁹⁵ He does this apparently because of the likeness between Gugerni and Cuyck, and it may be that they took their name from this town and district, and did not give it the name. The ‘land van Cuik’ is situated west of the Maas, separating it from Brabant and Toxandria. It seems pretty plain that the Cugerni, Gugerni, or Guberni were incorporated and

⁹² *In proximos Gugernorum pagos*: *Hist.* iv. 26. ⁹³ *Ibid.* v. 16.

⁹⁴ Hübner, 257 ff.

⁹⁵ *Géographie Ancienne des Gaules*, ii. 279.

lost among the Roman inhabitants of the country between the Maas and Rhine, for their name does not occur among those of the tribes who fought for or against Rome in later times in this district. When Tiberius removed the Sugambri from their old quarters east of the Rhine he seems to have caused the Usipi who had previously lived north of the Lippe to cross that river and to occupy the old Sugambrian country, and he then constituted the 'vacant lands,' where the legionaries had their horse and cattle pastures, lying between the Lippe and the Yssel.

Two other tribes also called German by Caesar, whose history it is difficult but important to unravel, are the Tenchteri and the Usipi or Usipetes. They are first mentioned in the fourth book of the *Commentaries*, ch. 1. Speaking of the winter of 56-55 B.C. he says: *Ea quae secuta est hieme, qui fuit annus Cn. Pompeio, M. Crasso coss., Usipetes Germani et item Tenchteri magna cum multitudine hominum flumen Rhenum transierunt non longe a mari quo Rhenus influit.* He then goes on to tell us that the reason for their invasion was that they had been harassed by war for many years by the Suevi, by whom they had been hard pressed and prevented from practising agriculture (which shows they had been a settled people and not nomads or huntsmen). Further on he repeats that the Usipetes and Tenchteri had sustained the attacks of the Suevi for many years. It seems pretty certain that the Tenchteri and Usipetes, who are so frequently associated together, were of the same race, and it is very probable that they were Gauls and not Teutons. The particle *et* in Usipetes is, as Zeuss long ago showed, like the similar *et* in Nemetae, the Gaulish plural, and the name is clearly therefore one given by Gauls, just as that of the Nemetae was. This is plain from the fact that while Caesar always calls the tribe Usipetes, Tacitus does so only on one occasion;⁹⁶ in all other places he calls them Usipi. Florus, doubtless following Livy, also calls them Usipi,⁹⁷ as does Martial.⁹⁸ Ptolemy calls them Οὔσιοι and Cassius Dio does the same, and Strabo, who makes many mistakes in the orthography of the proper names of the Rhine country, has Νοῦσιοι.⁹⁹ Müllenhoff¹⁰⁰ explains the name as Gaulish. He speaks of *der Volksname Usipii . . . mit entschieden keltischer Ableitung*, and he compares it with such names as *Ussubium*, Οὔσουβιον, and *Waisipius*, given by Zeuss in his *Grammatica Celtica*,¹⁰¹ and with such river names as Αὔσοβ and Τοῖσουβις, Τοῖροβις, found in Britain, derivatives of *ap, ip, up*. The Tenchteri also bear a name with a termination difficult if not impossible to explain by any Teutonic etymology. It resembles that of the Bructeri, who are made their neighbours by Tacitus,¹⁰² and this seems to point to the termination (however

⁹⁶ *Ann.* i. 51.⁹⁷ *iv.* 12.⁹⁸ *vi.* 6.⁹⁹ *vii.* 1. 4.¹⁰⁰ *ii.* 230.¹⁰¹ *Gramm. Celt.* pp. 789, 796.¹⁰² *Germania*, 33.

explained) being *teri* and not *eri*, a fact which becomes certain if, as I hope to show, the TENCHTERI of Caesar were the TUNGRI of later writers.

Having mentioned the way in which the Usipetes and TENCHTERI had been harassed by the Suevi, Caesar continues: *Ad extremum tamen agris expulsi et multis Germaniae locis vagati ad Rhenum pervenerunt*. These words imply that these tribes did not, as some have supposed, live on the Rhine or near it, but only reached the Rhine after wandering for some time in different parts of Germany. As Bremer says, *Die Usipetes und Tenchteri hatten vordem nicht am Rhein, sondern im inneren Deutschland gewohnt, aber i. J. 59 ihre Wohnsitze verlassen müssen*.¹⁰³ From what follows it seems clear that they came as strangers and not as old neighbours of the Menapii, upon whose lands they made their first recorded assault. Caesar goes on to say that the part of the Rhine where they made their inroad was inhabited on both sides by the Menapii, who had fields, houses, and villages or hamlets on both sides of the river; *ad utramque ripam fluminis agros, aedificia, vicosque habebant*. Terrified by the arrival of such a multitude, the Menapii migrated from their dwellings across the river and, having planted guards on this side of the Rhine, prevented the Germans from crossing: *cis Rhenum dispositis praesidiis, Germanos transire prohibebant*. The invaders, who were crafty in all things, finding that they were not in a position to force a passage across the river from a lack of boats, nor could they get over clandestinely, because of the Menapian guards, pretended to return home to their old country, *reverti se in suas sedes regionesque simulaverunt*; and having thus retired a three days' march, they returned and covered the same ground in one night on horseback—*tridui viam progressi rursus reverterunt, atque omni hoc itinere una nocte equitatu reverterunt*—and fell upon the Menapii, who were ignorant of their return, and who, having been informed by their spies of the retreat of the Germans, had recrossed the Rhine and reoccupied their old settlements.

This story, again, is only consistent with the supposition that the TENCHTERI and Usipetes were strangers to the Rhine lands and had come thither from Central Germany. The fact that they had no boats with which to cross the river shows that they were not a Ripuarian race, and their three days' journeyen route for home shows they lived at least a considerable distance to the east, while the statement in the previous clause that they had been wandering to and fro in various parts of Germany shows that they may have come from a long distance to the east. Whence then did they come? It does not seem possible to find a homeland for such a large crowd of people in the low country of Northern Germany between

¹⁰³ *Op. cit.* p. 63.

the lower Rhine and the Elbe. The valleys of the Ems and Weser were occupied by other tribes, and we have no evidence of any kind that would justify us in bringing them thence. Again, south of the Lippe and along the Rhine lived the Sugambri behind whom inland were the Cherusci, and not the Suevi; and we are expressly told by Caesar that it was the Suevi who drove the tribes we are discussing from their homes. The Suevi, so far as we have any evidence, then lived south of the Cherusci and east of the Ubii, and it would seem that the most likely homeland of the Tenchteri and Usipetes was in this very land whence the Suevi apparently had ejected them and which they had then appropriated. I would tentatively suggest therefore that the region whence the two tribes in question migrated was Thuringia and its borders, basing my opinion on the fact that the name Tenchteri should be equated with Turingi or Tungri, and that it was only when thus occupied by the Suevi that Thuringia became a Teutonic land. Indeed, that Thuringia and Franconia were old Keltic lands there can be little doubt. Bremer says that Eisenach is certainly a Keltic place-name, and the same must be said of the Leina near Gotha and of the Finne (Keltic *penna*, 'head') south of the lower Unstrut. He hence concludes *Hiernach wäre auch Thüringen westlich der Saale altkeltischer Boden . . . Ich halte es für wahrscheinlich dass in Thüringen ein anderer keltischer Stamm gewohnt hat*.¹⁰⁴

When the Menapii recrossed the Rhine, they were ignorant that their enemies had returned, and were attacked by the latter, who killed them and seized their boats; and before the remainder of their countrymen, who were living quietly at home west of the river were aware, they crossed the river and occupied all their houses, where they spent the rest of the winter. According to Caesar, the invaders numbered 430,000 souls, a statement about which I shall have more to say presently. What is more important to remember is that they did not consist of a predatory army engaged in making a plundering expedition, but as in the case of the Helvetians of a whole people who had abandoned their country under pressure from hostile tribes further east and were seeking new homes in which to settle: *Cum omnibus suis*, says Caesar, *domo excesserant Rhenumque transierant*.¹⁰⁵ It was in fact a case of the displacement of one race by another in Central Germany, and, as I hold, the substitution of a Teutonic race for a Keltic one in that district. Caesar tells us that the Tenchteri and Usipetes crossed the Rhine not far from the sea where the Rhine flows into it (*non*

¹⁰⁴ *Op. cit.* pp. 41, 44. In the succeeding note he finds a Keltic etymology for the name Thüringen, and associates it with the Keltic name Turones, which gave its name to Tours, the Teurisci of North Hungary, and the name of *Τευριοχαῖμαι* given by Ptolemy.

¹⁰⁵ iv. 14.

longe a mari, quo Rhenus influit). It seems pretty certain from what follows that Caesar meant that they crossed the river at or near the place where its western outlet the Waal united with the Maas.

Caesar, having heard of these things, hastened to cross the Alps earlier than usual, to rejoin his army between the Loire and Seine, where it had wintered. He then learnt that several of the Gaulish tribes had sent envoys to the invaders to invite them to leave the Rhine and advance further west, and had promised them settlements in their country if they did so. Thereupon the invaders put their forces in motion and entered the country of the Eburones and the Condrusi, who were clients of the Treveri. Caesar summoned the Gallic States, and, disguising the fact that he had heard of the invitation just mentioned, spoke some fair words to them and strengthened their resolve to resist, and, having given orders for the getting together some cavalry (no doubt Gaulish cavalry being meant), determined to attack the invaders. Having arranged his commissariat and his cavalry, he marched towards the district where he understood the enemy were encamped. When he had advanced a few days, envoys from them reached him declaring that the Germans had not begun the war, but that, in accordance with the counsels of their ancestors, they were wont when attacked to resist and not to parley. They however came to say that they had come unwillingly, having been driven from their homes; that they were in a position to be good friends to the Romans, from whom they asked either for a country to settle in or that they might retain that where they were then planted. They only allowed superiority to the Suevi, 'of whom not even the immortal gods were the equals,' and there was no one else on earth whom they could not defeat. Caesar's reply was unusually short. He said, it was impossible for him to speak of peace so long as they remained in Gaul, nor was it reasonable that those who could not defend their own country should claim to occupy the land of others, nor was it possible without doing grievous wrong to find vacant lands in Gaul for such a multitude; but he was willing, if they wished to negotiate with the Ubii, to permit them to settle in their country. The envoys of the Ubii were at that time in his camp seeking help against the Suevi, of whose attacks they complained, and he would ask this favour from them. The German envoys requested to be allowed to convey his message to their people, promising to return with their answer in the course of three days, but begged that meanwhile he would not move his camp nearer to them. This he would not promise, since he understood that a few days previously they had sent their cavalry across the Maas to plunder the Ambivariti.

When Caesar was within twelve miles of the enemy the envoys returned to him and implored him not to advance any further. If he would not concede this, they asked that he would send word

to his cavalry, who were in advance, not to attack until they had had an opportunity of consulting the Ubii as to whether they could accommodate them in their country, and if their senate and chief would guarantee the promise by their oaths, for which purpose they asked for a three days' respite. Caesar tells us he deemed this a ruse to secure time for the return of the cavalry from the Ambivariti; he nevertheless promised not to advance his men more than four miles that day—this being for the purpose of obtaining water. He bade them return the following day with a more promising answer, and meanwhile sent word to his cavalry not to provoke a fight, and if attacked themselves, to stand on the defensive until the legions arrived. Meanwhile, his cavalry, 5000 in number, was advancing leisurely when it was suddenly attacked by 800 of the enemy's horsemen, the rest not having yet returned from their foraging expedition. A panic ensued among the Roman cavalry—who were no doubt Gauls—whereupon the Germans dismounted, and after they had hamstringed a number of the horses and killed their riders, the rest fled and did not halt till in sight of the legions. The Romans lost 74 men in the struggle, including the Aquitanian Piso, a person of high family and courage, whose ancestor had exercised sovereign authority in his country and been styled 'friend' by the senate. His brother, who tried to save him, was also killed. Caesar deemed it unsafe to delay, knowing well how fickle the Gauls were and how easily they would desert him in a time of misfortune, nor did he wish the invaders to have time to recall their foraging cavalry. Accordingly the following day, when their chiefs came to his camp in larger numbers to excuse the attack, Caesar ordered their arrest. He then advanced; the enemy were only eight miles away. Taken by surprise and deprived of their principal chiefs, they made only a slight defence struggling among their carts and baggage. Meanwhile the women and children fled and were pursued by the cruel Gaulish cavalry in the Roman service. The defenders of the camp, hearing the cries of the fugitives behind them, threw down their arms and abandoning their military standards themselves fled from the camp. When they arrived at the confluence of the Maas and Waal, they were either massacred or drowned in the river as they tried to cross over. There was no battle, it was a mere slaughter; not a single Roman was killed and only a few were wounded. Caesar tells us that after the battle he offered to release the chiefs who had trusted themselves in his camp and whom he had arrested, but, fearing the vengeance of the Gauls, they preferred, he says, to remain with him. He gave them their liberty.

Much was said by Caesar's critics at Rome, and especially by Cato, and much has been since written about the moral side of Caesar's methods in his Gaulish wars, and it requires his well-known dexterity in presenting his case to justify it some-

times, and notably on this occasion. That 800 German cavalry should have wilfully risked a fight with 5000 well-trained German horsemen seems difficult to understand, and we probably do not know the whole story. That all the principal leaders of the enemy should have trusted themselves in his hands to explain and condone what had happened does not point to their complicity, nor was it according to approved Roman methods of war to arrest envoys in this fashion; while Caesar's offer of liberty to these chieftains at the end and the rhetorical use he makes of it was neither a very dangerous concession nor has it a very chivalrous look. As to the fight, it was clearly a mere massacre of a disorganised mob without officers or leaders. A great many more of the enemy must have escaped than Caesar's account would imply, as follows from what we know of the subsequent history of the Tenchteri and Usipetes, for their rôle was by no means at an end with their defeat by him. It is in fact incredible that the campaign should have followed the exact lines of Caesar's language. He tells us that the whole body of the enemy consisted of 430,000 head, including women and children. If this means there was the same proportion of fighting men as in the case of the Helvetii, it means that there were 100,000 warriors. That such a force should have been exterminated in a hand-to-hand struggle without the loss of a single Roman seems incredible. Nor is it likely that such a mass of people could have been transported across the Rhine where it was rapid and wide. Nor again can we quite conceive the enormous space that would be occupied by a camp which could contain such a multitude, for according to Caesar's account they were in their camp when he attacked them; nor how they could have been fed in the waste country of the Eburones, for they had confessedly been vagabonds for three years and could not have brought a great deal of food with them. Most probably 430,000 represents the whole census of the joint tribes, and that only a portion crossed over to the western bank of the Rhine, while the rest remained behind in the Menapian district east of the river, where they were presently joined by such fugitives as succeeded in escaping. Among those who certainly escaped was that portion of their cavalry which had crossed the Maas for the purpose of collecting supplies. They were not in the battle but managed to recross the Rhine and entered the country of the Sugambri, as Caesar tells us.¹⁰⁶ It seems plain in fact that, as might be supposed, the Tenchteri and Usipetes who had escaped the Roman arms returned to their old quarters whence they had driven away the Menapii and where they had probably been settled for two or three years.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ iv. 16.

¹⁰⁷ This view is also that of Usinger, who thus expresses it (p. 48): *Vereint mit den andern werden sie nun, und schwerlich ohne Erfolg, gestrebt haben, einen Theil der*

On learning that the Sugambri had offered shelter to the fugitives, Caesar sent to demand their surrender, and on receiving an unsatisfactory reply crossed the river, whereupon the Sugambri withdrew into the recesses of their country, counselled to do so by their guests: *hortantibus iis, quos ex Tencteris atque Usipetibus apud se habebant*.¹⁰⁸ What became of these fugitives is by no means clear and has not, I take it, been quite understood. Speaking of them, Caesar (and the sentence is important, for he generally uses very precise language) says: *se trans Rhenum in fines Sugambriorum receperat seque cum iis coniunxerat*. The phrase shows that, although they entered their country, they did not unite with the Sugambri but probably were settled by them in some vacant territory in close neighbourhood to themselves. Inasmuch as the Usipi are presently spoken of as being separated from the Sugambri by the river Lippe it seems plain that the district in question was that stretch of debateable land which the Romans presently insisted should be left an uninhabited waste stretching northwards from the Lippe. Bremer calls it West Münsterland. Now on turning to the famous speech of their chief, Boiocalus, to the Ansibarii reported by Tacitus,¹⁰⁹ where he claims that on grounds of right and justice his fugitive people should be permitted to settle in this vacant district, we find him saying that the Usipi who had occupied this district had been preceded there by the Tubantes. Bremer¹¹⁰ calls attention to the fact, which I had also noted, that it was from this very district that, according to Caesar, the Usipetes and Tenchteri had ejected the Menapii. I would infer—and the notion does not seem to have occurred to others—that the Tubantes were a section of the Menapii. The district to which the fugitives from Gaul repaired was in fact the very district whence they had set out on their raid and where, no doubt, a large number of their people still remained, the country between the Lippe and the Yssel. In the year 16 B.C. Cassius Dio tells us¹¹¹ that the Sugambri, Usipetes, and Tenchteri, who, as we have seen, were neighbours and friends and apparently close akin in race, seized and crucified some of the Romans in their territory, probably in return for some ruthless act committed by the Roman soldiers. They accordingly crossed the Rhine and plundered Germania, i.e. Lower Germany and Gaul. They planted an ambush into which the Roman cavalry fell, and their leader was also defeated. The statement is rather obscure, as is what follows, where we are told that Augustus advanced against them but found no one to fight with, for the barbarians had retired into their own territory and

allen Heimath von neuem in Besitz zu nehmen. Doch behielten sie, besonders Usipeten, auch einen, nämlich den östlichen Theil des rechtsrheinischen Menapiergebietes, westwärts von der Lippe.

¹⁰⁸ iv. 18.¹⁰⁹ Ann. xiii. 55.¹¹⁰ Op. cit. p. 155.¹¹¹ liv. 20.

made peace, giving hostages. This seems to point to the Romans having sustained a disaster which they were not able to punish. We seem indeed here to have an account of the invasion of the country of the Ardennes by a portion of the very people, the Tenchteri, whom Caesar claimed to have exterminated after they had made a similar raid there.

It is not improbable that one of the conditions of this peace-making and giving of hostages was that Augustus permitted one of these tribes (which had on two occasions sought to find a new home in the waste country of the Eburones, as the Ubii had been permitted) to settle in other parts of the Ardennes. At all events, we find a very notable change in the nomenclature of the Maas country and the sudden introduction there of what certainly must be deemed new comers, who, I take it, could only have been the Tenchteri or a section of them. These are called Tungri by Pliny, who was the first to mention them, and whose account must be dated about 66 A.D. Of these Tungri we read in the *Germania* ii., *Qui primi Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint, ac nunc Tungri tunc Germani vocati sint.* They were still known as Germans in the time of Vitellius, for they must have been the Germans who were summoned with their neighbours the Nervii, who supplied recruits to fill the places of the veterans taken away by Vitellius: *e proximis Nerviorum Germanorumque pagis segnem numerum armis oneraverat.*¹¹² The Tungri and the Nervii were in fact close neighbours. Aduatuca the chief town in the country of the Eburones is called *Aduatuca Tungrorum* in the *Itinerary*, while Ptolemy calls the capital of the *Τούγγροι Ἀτουάτουκον*. It is now known as Tongres. It is plain therefore that in some way or other, not long after Caesar's time, the wasted lands of the Eburones and their friends were occupied by a new people called Tungri. They must surely have come from beyond the Rhine, for no people with such a name were known to Caesar west of the river. Who then could they be but the Tenchteri, whose name (without its termination, the same termination as in Bructeri) resembles that of the Tungri; and they, it will be remembered, were the very people who asked from Caesar to be accommodated with seats in this very country, and who invaded it again in the time of Augustus, and whom we have for other reasons derived from Thuringia, with which the name Tungri has such a clear connexion. It is further to be noted that, after the time when the Tungri become known, the Tenchteri beyond the Rhine become a very insignificant element and are generally associated with the Bructeri, with whom they would seem to have become incorporated. They occur in no inscriptions, nor yet in the *Notitia* as furnishing auxiliary troops to the Romans, while the Tungri are frequently mentioned in inscrip-

¹¹² Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 15.

tions, notably in Britain: Agricola had at least two cohorts of them in his army.¹¹³ The change of name from Tenchteri to Tungri is paralleled by the greater change of Sugambri to Cugerni when the latter, as we have seen, also crossed the Rhine, and it may be that the form Tungri was the indigenous name of the people and Tenchteri their name as pronounced by the more western Gauls. It seems to me therefore that the Tungri of later writers were the descendants of the Tenchteri of Caesar, while a section of the latter remained in their old country beyond the Rhine.

We have seen that during the revolt of Civilis when the Tenchteri sent deputies to the Ubii or Agrippenses at Cologne some of the Tungri were holding a secret cabal inside the town with the same people; but the Treveri and Lingones were the life of the cause.¹¹⁴ Presently, when Claudius Labeo advanced at the head of a considerable number of Batavi, Tungri, and Nervii raised by sudden levies, Civilis in a battle with them, we are told, rushed among the Tungri and proclaimed aloud that the object of the war was not to procure dominion over the other nations for the Batavi and Treveri, but to secure their alliance in a common cause. This effective speech caused Labeo's men to put up their swords, and at the same time the leading chiefs of the Tungri who were called Campanus and Juvenalis—that is, bore Roman gentile names—submitted to Civilis with their men. The Batavi and Nervii followed their example, and they were all incorporated in his army.¹¹⁵ Presently Fabius Priscus marched with the fourteenth legion to invade the country of the Tungri and the Nervii, and the two tribes both submitted again to the Romans. As we shall see further on, in later times the Tenchteri and Bructeri were closely associated, and Sidonius Apollinaris similarly connects the Toringi—by whom he probably means the Tungri—with the same people:

. . . Toringus,
Bructerus, ulvosa quae vel Nicer alluit unda.
Prorumpit Francus.¹¹⁶

In 12 B.C. we are told by Cassius Dio that the Sugambri and their allies (by whom the Usipi were no doubt meant) had become hostile owing to the absence of Augustus and the restlessness of the Gauls. Drusus therefore occupied the subject territory before them (an ambiguous phrase) and sent for their foremost men on the pretext of taking part in the inauguration of the famous altar dedicated to Augustus at Lugdunum or Lyons. The next year again he crossed the Rhine into the land of the Usipi, which, he says, was opposite the island of the Batavi, and thence

¹¹³ Tac. *Agricola*, 86.

¹¹⁴ Tac. *Hist.* iv. 66.

¹¹⁵ Tac. *Hist.* iv. 55. See above, p. 635.

¹¹⁶ *Carm.* vii. 324.

marched along the river to the country of the Sugambri, which he laid waste mercilessly. The following year he again crossed the river and subjugated the Usipi.¹¹⁷ Florus, the epitomiser of Livy, says of these campaigns, which he abridged into one: *Drusus primo domuit Usipetes, inde Tencteros percurrit et Catthos*.¹¹⁸ The mention of Tenchteri here seems to be a mistake owing to the association of their name with that of the Usipetes in Caesar, for Dio does not mention them, while Florus ignores the Sugambri, who were no doubt the most important tribe at this time on the further bank of the Rhine.

It was after this campaign against the Sugambri that the latter vanquished tribe was transported across the Rhine and was thenceforth known as Gugerni, and it would appear that about the same time the Usipi crossed the Lippe and occupied a portion if not all of their old land, leaving vacant the country which they had previously occupied north of the Lippe. Both movements were doubtless due to the far-sighted policy of Tiberius, who not only wanted to break down the redoubtable power of the Sugambri but who also determined to have a vacant marchland between the Lippe and the Yssel, through which if necessary his armies could safely advance into Germany, and which Tacitus expressly tells us was kept vacant for military purposes. In A.D. 11 Germanicus, a ruthless commander, crossed the Rhine and attacked the Marsians who lived in the district of Münster. There he perpetrated a cruel slaughter, utterly laying waste the country for fifty miles, destroying the famous temple of Tanfan, and killing the people (whom he had surprised) regardless of age or sex. Thereupon we are told the Bructeri, Tubantes, and Usipi took up arms to avenge them. After varying fortune the Romans were completely victorious and punished the enemy without mercy.¹¹⁹

In 58 A.D. Tacitus reports how the Ansibarii (the dwellers on the Ems), who had been driven from their homes by the Chauci, and had been forced to wander about for a settlement, made an appeal to the Romans through their chief Boiocalus, who had been their faithful dependant and served in their armies and been put in chains by their enemy Arminius, the chief of the Cherusicans. He asked that he and his people might be allowed to settle in the wide territory above described, now unoccupied and waste, which lay between the Lippe and the Yssel. He suggested that the Romans should continue to pasture their cattle there and retain land for the purpose, but not maintain the whole district as a wide waste of barren land. These lands, he said, had been occupied by the Chamavi, then by the Tubantes, and finally by the Usipi. The plea was not admitted by the Roman commander, Avitus, who

¹¹⁷ *Op. cit.* liv. 32, 33.¹¹⁸ Ch. 30.¹¹⁹ Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 51.

claimed that the gods had ordained what had happened, nor would the Romans admit of any judges but themselves as to what should be done. He however offered Boiocalus an estate for himself (which he refused with disdain), and the Ansibarians prepared for war. We are told that they tried to rouse the Bructeri, the Tenchteri, and other more remote nations. Avitus sent word to Curtilius Mancina, the commander in chief on the Upper Rhine, to cross the river and make a diversion behind the enemy, while he himself at the head of the legions entered the country of the Tenchteri, and threatened to devastate it if they did not immediately abandon their allies. They at once submitted, as did the Bructeri. Thereupon the Ansibarians retired to the country of the Usipi and Tubantes, who also declined to help them. They then sought help from the Chatti and Cherusci, but in vain. At length, worn out with long marches, destitute and hapless, the whole nation perished: the young and those capable of bearing arms were put to the sword, and the rest were sold into slavery.¹²⁰

In the year 69 we are told that the Tenchteri and Bructeri, who were apparently now settled in the old lands of the Ubii to the south of the Usipi, joined the league of Civilis.¹²¹ Presently we read that a mixed corps of Chatti, Usipi, and Mattiaci, fighting on behalf of Civilis, laid siege to Magontiacum or Mayence, but on the approach of the Romans they fled with their booty.¹²² This puts the Usipi on the Middle Rhine, considerably south of their former quarters. It is probable that they were really a body of troops sent from the country further north, and that it is not implied that the community had left its old quarters. On the other hand, it is curious that they should be associated with the Mattiaci, who were so called from Mattium, which Tacitus calls the capital of the Chatti.¹²³ The warm baths which existed in their country and were known as *Aquae Mattiacae* have been identified with Wiesbaden, and the *Wies* in Wiesbaden has been associated rightly or wrongly with the name Usipi or Wispi. Bremer and others in fact make Nassau the later country of the Usipi, apparently on this very ground.

In A.D. 70 we again hear of the Tenchteri, who, we are told, were a people living on the opposite side of the Rhine and who sent an envoy to the Agrippenses or Ubii to explain to them the views of the various other German tribes and to invite them to join the league of Civilis.¹²⁴ It seems clear from several expressions in the speech of the Tenchterian spokesman that they were then living not far from Cologne. In the battle fought in this year between Cerealis and the confederates the Bructeri and Tenchteri were

¹²⁰ Tacitus, *Ann.* xiii. 55.¹²¹ Tac. *Hist.* iv. 21.¹²² *Ibid.* 37.¹²³ *Ann.* i. 56.¹²⁴ *Hist.* iv. 64.

in the left wing of the latter's army.¹²⁵ It is curious that the Usipi are not here mentioned. The next time we have a notice of them they had apparently become more or less subject to the Romans, who have left numerous remains of their former presence in Nassau. This was in A.D. 83, when we read in the *Life of Agricola* by Tacitus¹²⁶ that a cohort of the Usipi had been raised in Germany, and had thence been transported to serve in Britain. They murdered the centurion who was left in charge of them, as well as the soldiers who had been incorporated with these auxiliaries, in order to impose proper discipline in their several *manipuli* or sections, and then seized three light galleys and compelled their captains to sail away from the island. One of the pilots having escaped, they put the other two to death. They then set out without them, apparently from some place in Scotland. They were a good deal troubled by bad weather, and made several descents on the coast for purposes of foraging or plunder, in some of which they were successful and in others were beaten back. Pressed by famine, they eventually proceeded to consume each other, first choosing the weaker ones as victims and subsequently casting lots. Eventually, in their distress they sailed round the extremity of the island, possibly the Pentland Firth, and being unskilled in navigation they were wrecked on the continent, where they were treated as pirates first by the Suevians and afterwards by the Frisians. By them they were sold as slaves, and some of them reached the Roman settlements on the Rhine, and there became famous from the extraordinary adventures they had gone through. Cassius Dio, who refers shortly to this adventure, says the fugitives killed several centurions and a military tribune. It will be remembered that Tacitus describes how by Agricola's orders the Roman fleet circumnavigated the north of Scotland. Cassius Dio seems to suggest that it was the pirates who had really solved the question and that Agricola only followed in their wake.

In the *Germania* the notice of the Tenchteri and Usipetes is singularly jejune (ch. 33). It gives us no clue as to their situation and merely says they lived near the Chatti and that the Tenchteri were famous horsemen; while in another chapter (38) we are told that, unlike the Suevi, who were divided into various nations, the Chatti and Tenchteri each formed a single people. I do not propose to refer to the notice which Ptolemy gives of the country east of the Rhine under the heading of Great Germany, because I do not understand it. It seems to be a mere confused incoherent collection of names based upon some quite illusory authorities. Nor can his statements, it seems to me, be reconciled with the consistent testimony of other writers. We have now to pass on some time. The well-known Veronese tribal list, a docu-

¹²⁵ Tac. *Hist.* iv. 77.¹²⁶ Ch. 28.

ment containing an account of the Roman provinces,¹²⁷ was apparently compiled about A.D. 297 and copied by some Italian editor at the beginning of the fourth century. In describing the tribes of the Lower Rhine we read in the manuscript, which is very corrupt : *Usiphorum tuuainum victrensiū novarii casuariorum*. The first two names are those of the Usipi and the Tubantes, who were clearly in close neighbourhood. The district of Twente still recalls the name of the Tubantes, while, as was pointed out by Watterich, the name Wespe still survives on the right of the Yssel near Raalte, and Wesepe left of the Yssel near Zwolle.¹²⁸ *Victrensiū* has been accepted by Mommsen and Müllenhoff as a corruption of Tenchteri. Watterich asserts that the place-name Dingden, two miles north of Wesel, is the sole relic of their name there.¹²⁹

The history of the tribes mentioned by Caesar who occupied the larger part of the eastern bank of the Rhine from the Maas downwards in his time, and were all known as Germans, but were all, so far as we can see, of Gaulish race and speech, is complicated and much intertwined ; but it is important to disentangle it if we are to understand one of the greatest problems of ancient ethnography and history—namely the substitution of the Teutonic races for the Gauls in Central Europe. The Rhine itself has often been claimed as the great Teutonic river. When Caesar wrote, it was still bordered on either bank by Gauls ; and its name and the name, I believe, of almost every tributary from its source to its mouth still bears witness to the fact.

HENRY H. HOWORTH.

¹²⁷ Published by Mommsen in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy for 1862, pp. 492–493, 510–531.

¹²⁸ *Op. cit.* p. 144.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.* 145.