

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

NOVA SERIES

VOL. VII

HELSINKI 1972 HELSINGFORS

## INDEX

Anders Ahlqvist	Notes on the Silesian Lugi . . . . .	5
Iiro Kajanto	Women's praenomina reconsidered . . . . .	13
Saara Lilja	Odour sensations in the Roman novel . . . . .	31
Bengt Löfstedt	Zu Tatwines Grammatik . . . . .	47
Martti Nyman	Ma(vo)lo — a generative approach. . . . .	67
Teivas Oksala	»Polymythia» in Pindars Aigineten-Oden . . . . .	93
Tuomo Pekkanen	Tac.Germ. 2,3 and the name Germani . . . . .	107
Eeva Ruoff-Väänänen	The Roman public prodigia and the ager Ro- manus . . . . .	139
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica . . . . .	163
Jaakko Suolahti	Princeps Senatus . . . . .	207
Holger Thesleff	Colloquial style and its use in Plato's later works	219

# TAC. GERM. 2,3 AND THE NAME GERMANI

Tuomo Pekkanen

Chapters 2—4 of Tacitus' *Germania*, which deal with the archaeology of the Germans (ἀρχαιολογία Γερμανική, *origo Germanorum*), are compared by Norden to a vast tripartite period. *Germ.* 2,3 can only be understood as a part of this monumental construction, and anyone who detaches it from its context is in advance prevented from interpreting it correctly. This principle, established by Norden, cannot be too strongly emphasized. It seems to me, however, that in all attempts to interpret *Germ.* 2,3, that of Norden included, its Tacitean context has not been given adequate consideration. In order to illustrate the position of *Germ.* 2,3 in the Germanic archaeology as a whole, it is necessary to set forth the passages concerned and subdivide them following Norden's scheme.<sup>1</sup>

A (2,1) *Ipsos Germanos indigenas crediderim minimeque aliarum gentium adventibus et hospitibus mixtos, quia nec terra olim, sed classibus advehebantur qui mutare sedes quaerebant, et immensus ultra utque sic dixerim adversus Oceanus raris ab orbe nostro navibus aditur. quis porro, praeter periculum horridi et ignoti maris, Asia aut Africa aut Italia relicta Germaniam peteret, informem terris, asperam caelo, tristem cultu aspectuque, nisi si patria sit?*

B<sup>1</sup> (2,2) *Celebrant carminibus antiquis, quod unum apud illos memoriae et annalium genus est, Tuistonem deum terra editum. ei filium Mannum, originem gentis conditoremque, Manno tris filios assignant, e quorum nominibus proximi Oceano Ingaevones, medii Herminones, ceteri Istaevones vocentur. quidam, ut in licentia vetustatis, pluris deo ortos plurisque gentis appellationes, Marsos Gambrivos Suebos Vandilios affirmant, eaque vera et antiqua nomina. (2,3) ceterum Germaniae vocabulum recens et nuper additum, quoniam qui primi Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint ac nunc Tungri, tunc Germani vocati sint: ita nationis nomen, non gentis evaluisse paulatim, ut omnes primum a victore ob metum, mox etiam a se ipsis invento nomine Germani vocarentur.*

B<sup>2</sup> (3,1) *Fuisse apud eos et Herculem memorant, primumque omnium virorum fortium ituri in proelia canunt. sunt illis haec quoque carmina, quorum relatu, quem barditum vocant, accendunt animos, futuraeque pugnae fortunam ipso cantu augurantur; terrent enim trepidantve, prout sonuit acies, nec tam voces illae quam virtutis concentus videntur. affectatur praecipue asperitas soni et fractum murmur, obiectis ad os scutis, quo plenior et gravior vox repercussu intumescat. (3,2) ceterum et Ulixen quidam opinantur longo illo et fabuloso errore in hunc Oceanum delatum adisse Germaniae terras, Asciburgiumque, quod in ripa Rheni situm hodieque incolitur, ab illo constitutum nominatumque; aram quin etiam Ulixi consecratam adiecto Laertae patris nomine eodem loco olim repertam, monumentaque et tumulos quosdam Graecis litteris inscriptos in confinio Germaniae Raetiaeque adhuc extare. (3,3) quae neque confirmare argumentis neque refellere in animo est: ex ingenio suo quisque demat vel addat fidem.*

<sup>1</sup> *Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus Germania*, Darmstadt 41959, 42 ff.

C (4) *Ipse eorum opinionibus accedo, qui Germaniae populos nullis aliis aliarum nationum conubiis infectos propriam et sinceram et tantum sui similem gentem extitisse arbitrantur. unde habitus quoque corporum, tamquam in tanto hominum numero, idem omnibus: truces et caerulei oculi, rutilae comae, magna corpora et tantum ad impetum valida. laboris atque operum non eadem patientia, minimeque sitim aestumque tolerare, frigora atque inediam caelo solove assueverunt.*

Norden's analysis of the passages quoted is as follows: The bipartite middle part B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>, the components of which are of an approximately similar length, is framed by an introductory and a concluding part A and C, which are equal in length to each other. This correspondence is also expressed in the same or similar words or motifs: A and C begin with *ipsos* — *ipse*; further *crediderim* in A corresponds to *eorum opinionibus* in C, *aliarum gentium . . . hospitibus mixtos* in A to *aliarum nationum conubiis infectos* in C; both conclude with an allusion to the harsh climate. B<sup>1</sup> and B<sup>2</sup> each begin with a reference to songs, for a god and for a hero respectively, and at exactly the same distance from the beginning they introduce a sentence beginning with *ceterum*. In both there may be distinguished from the main narrative an inset, introduced by *quidam . . . affirmant* — *quidam opinantur*. The main narrative in B<sup>1</sup> consists of one short and one long sentence (*celebrant* — *vocentur*): the songs in honour of Tuisto, the division of the race into three parts each named after one of the three sons of Mannus; the inset, presented entirely in indirect speech, takes up the rest of B<sup>1</sup>: the multitude of groups and designations, the name *Germani*; it concludes with *vocarentur*, which corresponds to *vocentur* in the main narrative. In B<sup>2</sup> too, the main narrative consists of one short and one long sentence (*fuisse* — *intumescat*): the songs in honour of Hercules, barditus; the inset, again entirely in indirect speech, continues as far as *extare*: Ulixes in Germany, Greek inscriptions on the border of Germany and Raetia. The short sentence *quae neque confirmare* — *fidem* forms the transition to C, the concluding passage. In this way the whole is like a period, the conclusion of which reverts to its beginning. The contents parallel the form. A and C witness the author's belief in the autochthony and racial purity of the people, the former in a discussion which excludes the contrary opinion, the latter by means of anthropological conclusions. In B<sup>1</sup> and B<sup>2</sup> the problem is discussed by the citation of abundant evidence: B<sup>1</sup> adduces proofs for the autochthony of the people by references to original songs in honour of an autochthonous god and to epichoric names; B<sup>2</sup> admits the possibility of immigrations by reference to the alleged presence of Hellenic heroes in Germany and to Greek inscriptions. In the short transitional sentence it is left to the reader to judge the validity

of the claims stated in B<sup>2</sup>. The introductory part A and the conclusion C, however, leave no doubt about the opinion of the author. Thus far Norden.<sup>1</sup>

With regard to the interpretation of *Germ.* 2,3, the most important result of Norden's analysis is the fact that the contents of B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup> are closely connected with those of AC: the author's belief in the autochthony and racial purity of the Germans is stated in AC, the arguments for (B<sup>1</sup>), as well as against (B<sup>2</sup>) this opinion in B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>. It is of the utmost importance to recognize that *Germ.* 2,3 thus forms a part of the total argument in favour of the opinion defended by Tacitus in AC. This fact, however, has not so far been taken into consideration. Since all the other names presented in B<sup>1</sup> (*Tuisto, Mannus, Ingaevones, Herminones, Istaevones, Marsi, Gambriui, Suebi, Vandilii*) are to be considered as arguments in favour of autochthony, it is not likely that the name *Germani* alone has no bearing on the contents of AC. It is true that a clear distinction is made between *vera et antiqua nomina* and *Germaniae vocabulum recens et nuper additum*, but this distinction does not justify us in disconnecting the explanation of the generic use of *Germani* from the rest of the arguments in B<sup>1</sup>.

An archaeology or *origo*, like that of the Germans, is found in Tacitus on two other occasions, viz. in *Agr.* 11 for the Britons and in *hist.* 5,2ff. for the Jews. The discussion of the origin of the Germans and Britons is preceded by a topographical description of their country. In that of the Jews, the order is reversed: the account of the origin of the people is given in *hist.* 5,2ff., that of their land in 5,6ff.<sup>2</sup>

Norden has established that in the three Tacitean archaeologies the argumentation is presented in an analogous manner: »Allen drei Taciteischen Urgeschichten gemeinsam ist die reichliche Auseinandersetzung mit mehreren, untereinander abweichenden Quellenberichten über die Art der Besiedelung. Überall ist es dieselbe Frage: sind die Bewohner Eingeborene (*αὐτόχθονες, indigenae*), Zuwanderer (*ἐπήλιδες, advecti*) oder Mischlinge (*μυγάδες, mixti*), denn wir müssen hier gleich die griechischen Worte mit einsetzen, da die in griechischer Sprache verfassten jüngeren Ethnographien die Erörterung in analoger Weise bieten: das Quellenmaterial wird in der Form einer Diskussion der abweichenden Ansichten vorgelegt, zu denen der

<sup>1</sup> *Urg.* 45 f.

<sup>2</sup> According to Norden, there is a particular reason for this reversed order: *Urg.* 47 »der Schriftsteller hat weiterhin von Jerusalem's Schicksal zu erzählen und strebt daher über das Volks- und Besiedelungsgeschichtliche hinweg zu der Topographie von Land und Stadt.«

Autor Stellung nimmt.»<sup>1</sup> The identity of the argumentation, according to Norden, is also evidenced by corresponding expressions<sup>2</sup> and by the fact that most of *hist.* 5,2—3 is presented in indirect speech like *Germ.* 2—3.

Let us examine in greater detail the similarities of argumentation in *Germ.* 2—4, *Agr.* 11, and *hist.* 5,2ff.

In his discussion of the Germans Tacitus himself decides in favour of their autochthony (2,1 *Ipsos Germanos indigenas esse crediderim*) and excludes the other possibilities (*ib. minimeque . . . mixtos, quia nec terra olim sed classibus advehantur qui mutare sedes quaerebant*). In the case of the inhabitants of Britain, he poses the question as to whether they are *indigenae* or *advecti*: *Agr.* 11,1 *Ceterum Britanniam qui mortales initio coluerint, indigenae an advecti, ut inter barbaros, parum compertum*. Having presented arguments for immigration from Germany and from Spain, he decides that a Gallic origin is the most reasonable: *ib.* 3 *in universum tamen aestimanti Gallos vicinam insulam occupasse credibile est*. On the origin of the Jews Tacitus sets out divergent views, in all of which, however, they are looked upon as immigrants: as exiles from the island of Crete (*Creta insula profugos*), as the superfluous population of Egypt (*exundantem per Aegyptum multitudinem*), as Ethiopian stock (*Aethiopum prolem*), Assyrian refugees (*Assyrios convenas*), or »Solymi, a people celebrated in Homer's poems» (*Solymos, carminibus Homeri celebratam gentem*).

One similarity which has escaped Norden, lies in the use of names both in *Germ.* 2 and *hist.* 5,2 as arguments for the origin of the people concerned. In the latter case this principle is presented in plain words: *Iudaeos Creta insula profugos novissima Libyae insedissememorant, qua tempestate Saturnus vi Iovis pulsus cesserit regnis. argumentum e nomine petitur: inclutum in Creta Idam montem, accolas Idaeos (Indeos M) aucto in barbarum cognomento Iudaeos vocitari.* »It is said that the Jews were originally exiles from the island of Crete who settled in the farthest parts of Libya at the time when Saturn had been deposed and expelled by Jove. An argument in favour of this is derived from the name: there is a famous mountain in Crete called Ida, and hence the inhabitants were called the Idaei, which was later lengthened into the barbarous form Iudaei.» The name *Iudaei* is thus given as a main argument in favour of the theory that the people were not indigenous but had arrived from Crete. On the other hand, in *Germ.* 2 it is the case

<sup>1</sup> *Urg.* 47.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *hist.* 5,2 *memorant . . . , quidam . . . , sunt qui tradant . . . , 3 plurimi auctores consentiunt . . . ; Germ.* 2,2 *quidam . . . affirmant, 3,1 memorant . . . , 2 quidam opinantur.*

for autochthony that is argued on onomastic evidence: the name of the earth-born autochthonous god Tuisto and those of the groups (*Ingaevones, Hermiones, Istaevones, Marsi, Gambrivii, Suebi, Vandilii*), descended from his son Mannus or other possibly existing sons (*pluris deo ortos*), are adduced as arguments in favour of Tacitus' opinion that the Germans originated in Germany and were its indigenous inhabitants. Just as Tacitus in *hist.* 5,2 uses the expression *argumentum e nomine petitur*, so *Germ.* 2,2 as a whole could be called an *argumentum e nominibus petitum*. That the sentence is of this character is clearly noticeable from the abundance of proper names and the use of the appellatives *nominibus, appellationes, nomina: Celebrant carminibus antiquis, quod unum apud illos memoriae et annalium genus est, Tuistonem deum terra editum. ei filium Mannum, originem gentis conditoremque, Mannotris filios assignant, e quorum nominibus proximi Oceano Ingaevones, medii Hermiones, ceteri Istaevones vocentur. quidam, ut in licentia vetustatis, pluris deo ortos plurisque gentis appellationes, Marsos Gambrivios Suebos Vandilios affirmant, eaque vera et antiqua nomina.*

As was said above, *Germ.* 2,3 is to be regarded as a part the argumentation presented in B<sup>1</sup> (= 2,2—3) in favour of the views stated in AC. Since the first half of B<sup>1</sup> (2,2) consists of an *argumentum e nominibus*, it is natural to conclude that the latter half (2,3) may also be seen as an argument of the same kind, i.e. an *argumentum e Germaniae vocabulo*.

A further point that has not been given adequate consideration in the discussion of *Germ.* 2, 3 is the fact that in *Agr.* 11 the argumentation of Tacitus on the origin of the Britons is substantially based on their outward appearance: *Ceterum Britanniam qui mortales initio coluerint, indigenae an advecti, ut inter barbaros, parum compertum. habitus corporum varii, atque ex eo argumenta. namque rutilae Caledoniam habitantium comae, magni artus Germanicam originem asseverant; Silurum colorati vultus, torti plerumque crines et posita contra Hispania Hiberos veteres traiecisse easque sedes occupasse fidem faciunt; proximi Gallis et similes sunt, seu durante originis vi, seu procurrentibus in diversa terris positio caeli corporibus habitum dedit. in universum tamen aestimanti Gallos vicinam insulam occupasse credibile est.* »On the other hand, the question who the first inhabitants of Britain were and whether they were indigenous or immigrant is one which, as one would expect among barbarous people, has received little attention. The outward appearance of the people presents many varieties, and arguments are derived from it: the red hair and the large limbs of the inhabitants of Caledonia proclaim

their German origin; the swarthy faces of the Silures, the curly quality, in general, of their hair, and the position of Spain opposite their shores, attest the passage of Iberians in old days and the occupation by them of these districts; those peoples, again, who adjoin Gaul are also like Gauls, whether because the influence of heredity persists, or because when two lands face each other the climatic condition stamps a certain physique on the human body; but, taking a general view of the case, we can readily believe that Gauls took possession of the adjacent island.» As outward appearance is for Tacitus the most important argument which influences him in favour of the opinion that the Britons are immigrants (*advecti*), not indigenous people (*indigenae*), there is good reason for examining the relationship between the *habitus corporum* of the Germans, described in *Germ.* 4, and the question of their origin.

The opinion of Tacitus, as expressed in A (= 2,1), consists of two claims, one for autochthony and the other for racial purity: *Ipsos Germanos indigenas crediderim minimeque aliarum gentium adventibus et hospitibus mixtos.* In C (= 4) the claim for racial purity is once more emphasized: *Ipse eorum opinionibus accedo, qui Germaniae populos nullis aliis aliarum nationum conubiis infectos propriam et sinceram et tantum sui similem gentem extitisse arbitrantur.* The uniform outward appearance of the Germans is seen as a result of their racial purity: *unde habitus quoque corporum, tamquam in tanto hominum numero, idem omnibus: truces et caerulei oculi, rutilae comae, magna corpora et tantum ad impetum valida.* Outward appearance and racial purity are in this way closely connected and together they form a part of the thesis AC which is to be proved with the material presented in B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>. In the *Agricola*, *habitus corporum* is used as an argument (cf. *habitus corporum varii, atque ex eo argumenta*), in the *Germania* it belongs to the thesis that is to be proved with other arguments. One of these is, as was concluded above, the *argumentum e Germaniae vocabulo*.

Let us now examine how the above conclusion fits the interpretation of *Germ.* 2,3: *ceterum Germaniae vocabulum recens et nuper additum, quoniam qui primi Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint ac nunc Tungri, tunc Germani vocati sint: ita nationis nomen, non gentis evaluisse paulatim, ut omnes primum a victore ob metum, mox etiam a se ipsis invento nomine Germani vocarentur.* Norden<sup>1</sup> divides the passage colometrically (κατὰ κῶλα) in the following manner:

<sup>1</sup> *Urg.* 313.



*ceterum Germaniae vocabulum recens et nuper additum,  
 quoniam qui primi Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint  
 ac nunc Tungri tunc Germani vocati sint:  
 ita nationis nomen, non gentis evaluisse paulatim,  
 ut omnes primum a victore ob metum,  
 mox etiam a se ipsis invento nomine Germani vocarentur.*

The period thus consists of two parts, which are almost equal in length, equally constructed of three colons, and bound together with *ita*; *Germaniae vocabulum* at the beginning of the sentence corresponds to *Germani vocarentur* at its end. The conclusion thus reverts to the beginning just as was the case with the Germanic archaeology as a whole. The translation of the first part and the beginning of the second presents no difficulties: »On the other hand, Germania is a modern name which has been recently given to the country, since those who first crossed the Rhine and drove out the Gauls, and are now called Tungri, were then called Germani; thus what had been the name of a nation, not of a race,<sup>1</sup> gradually prevailed . . .» The rest is divided by Norden<sup>2</sup> κατὰ κόμματα as follows:

*ut omnes  
 primum a victore ob metum,  
 mox etiam a se ipsis invento nomine  
 Germani vocarentur.*

The studied parallelism between *primum a victore ob metum* and *mox etiam a se ipsis invento nomine* is of the greatest importance for the interpretation: *primum* corresponds to *mox*, *a victore* to *etiam a se ipsis*, *ob metum* to *invento nomine*.<sup>3</sup> There has been much controversy about the meaning of the preposition *a*, which in itself means both 'by' (ὕπό) and 'after' (ἀπό). It has also been discussed whether *ob metum* should be interpreted as 'to inspire fear' (*ob metum iniciendum*) or 'for fear'.<sup>4</sup> Norden has already established in a most convincing

<sup>1</sup> For the translation of *nationis nomen, non gentis*, cf. p. 121 below.

<sup>2</sup> *Urg.* 335.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. B. Melin, Zum Namensatz der Germania, *Eranos* 61 (1963) 149.

<sup>4</sup> For the different opinions, see: K. Kraft, *Zur Entstehung des Namens 'Germania'*. Sitzungsber. d. wiss. Gesell. an der Goethe-Univers. Frankfurt/Main 9 (1970) Nr. 2, p. 48 ff.; J. Delz, 'Namensatz' und weitere korrupte Stellen bei Tacitus, *Mus. Helv.* 27 (1970) 227 f.; W. Theiler, Drei Vorschläge zum Namensatz der taciteischen Germania, *Mus. Helv.* 28 (1971) 118 f.

manner that *a victore ob metum* must be translated 'after the conqueror for fear'.<sup>1</sup> The parallelism between *primum a victore* and *mox etiam a se ipsis*, the use of *etiam*, and the fact that the predicate *vocarentur* is common, make it necessary to conclude that the second *a* has the same significance as the first.<sup>2</sup> If we translate *a victore* 'after the conqueror', we must understand *a se ipsis* as 'after themselves'. This was realized by Norden, but he found the translation »all were called after themselves» incomprehensible.<sup>3</sup> Consequently, he tried to prove that, in spite of the fact that *a victore* means 'after the victor', *a se ipsis* meant 'by themselves'. He therefore suggested that *a se ipsis* might correspond to the logical subject of *ob metum*, which he thought to be *a victo*, ὑπὸ τοῦ νικηθέντος.<sup>4</sup> Norden also tried to provide examples of an analogous change of meaning of the preposition *a*, but, as pointed out by Melin,<sup>5</sup> they all are of a different nature from that of the Tacitean sentence.

The arguments put forward by Melin, when he rejects Norden's interpretation of *a se ipsis* as 'by themselves' and defends 'after themselves', are sound enough. Nevertheless, I think that his explanation of *a se ipsis* is not to the point,<sup>6</sup> for he has not refuted the objection made by Norden against this solution. It still remains to be explained, how a whole, that was at first called after one of its parts, was later called after itself.

In my opinion *a se ipsis*, 'after themselves', must be understood in the light of the explanation that Tacitus himself gives to the words *ipsi Germani*: 2,1

<sup>1</sup> *Urg.* 323—335. The objections raised against this interpretation have been refuted by Melin, *art.cit.* 149—154. The latest contributions on the problem have only brought into the discussion unnecessary emendations: Kraft (*op.cit.* 56 ff.) suggests *a pictore* for *a victore*; Delz (*art.cit.* 229) assumes a lacuna in the text and reads *a <victis e> victore ob metum*; Theiler (*art.cit.* 121) changes the order of the words *omnes primum a victore ob metum* to *omnes a victore primum ob metum*. — These suggestions need scarcely be taken seriously, for the word *victor* is necessitated by the preceding *Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint*, and the emendations of Delz and Theiler are rendered impossible by the mere fact that they spoil the Tacitean architecture of the sentence.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Kraft, *op.cit.* 55 »Eine im Sinngehalt plausible Lösung, welche den gleichartigen Gebrauch der Präposition bei *a victore* und *a se ipsis* wahrt, muss den Vorzug gegenüber einer anderen im Sinngehalt gleichfalls plausiblen Lösung haben, bei der aber an den beiden Stellen ein unterschiedlicher Gebrauch der Präposition *a* unterstellt werden muss.»

<sup>3</sup> *Urg.* 339 f. »Wenn nun *a victore* und *a se ipsis* gleichmässig zu verstehen wäre, so würde der an sich schon unverständliche Gedanke, eine Gesamtheit sei nach sich selbst benannt, dadurch nur um so widersinniger, dass gesagt wäre, sie sei zuerst nach einem ihrer Teile, dann nach sich selbst so benannt worden.» Cf. R. Much, *Die Germania des Tacitus*, Heidelberg <sup>3</sup>1967, 66 »Bei dem das Gegenstück (zu *a victore*) darstellenden *a se ipsis* ist jedoch eine Bedeutung 'nach sich selbst' als sinnlos auszuschliessen.»

<sup>4</sup> *Urg.* 345.

<sup>5</sup> *Art.cit.* 157.

<sup>6</sup> *Art.cit.* 158 »nach sich selbst, d.h. mit dem nunmehr existierenden und immer weitere und weitere Geltung gewinnenden Gesamtnamen».

*Ipsos Germanos indigenas crediderim minimeque aliarum gentium adventibus et hospitibus mixtos; 4 Ipse eorum opinionibus accedo, qui Germaniae populos nullis aliis aliarum nationum conubiis infectos propriam et sinceram et tantum sui similem gentem extitisse arbitrantur.* The 'Germans themselves' thus are to him *minime . . . mixti, nullis aliis aliarum nationum conubiis infecti, propria et sincera et tantum sui similis gens*. When he says that the Germans were called *a se ipsis*, 'after themselves', it must be understood as *ex ea re, quod minime mixti, proprii et sinceri et tantum sui similes essent*, i.e. after the fact that they were considered to be unmixed, peculiar and pure, a race resembling no one but themselves.

The above interpretation that the Germans were called after their alleged physical characteristics makes *Germ. 2,3* an *argumentum e Germaniae vocabulo*: the author's opinion of the racial purity of the Germans is argued on the evidence that they were called *Germani* 'after themselves'. This implies that the name *Germani* was understood to denote something that is to be connected with physical characteristics and purity of race. The Latin *germanus* has the meaning 'unmixed' and it is also used as a synonym of *proprius* and *sincerus*, the words by which Tacitus characterizes the physical type of the Germans.<sup>1</sup> If we assume that *Germani* was understood to be a Latin word,<sup>2</sup> the most enigmatic words of the whole sentence find a natural explanation: the whole people (*omnes*) were called *Germani* after themselves (*a se ipsis*), i.e.

<sup>1</sup> Forcellini, *Totius Latinitatis lexicon* s.v. *germanus* 10: *verus, proprius, sincerus, non fucatus, merus*; s.v. *sincerus*: *purus, integer, nulla alia re admixtus, incorruptus, verus*; s.v. *proprius* 6: *legitimus, germanus*.

Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 40,3 *Magni praeterea existimas sincerum atque ab omni colluvione peregrini ac servilis sanguinis incorruptum servare populum, et civitates Romanas parcissime dedit et manumittendi modum terminavit*; Hier. *epist. Tit.* 1,2 p. 560<sup>c</sup> *γνήσιους . . . hoc potius sonat cum quis fidelis et proprius et . . . legitimus sive . . . germanus appellatur*; Boeth. *in Porph. comm. pr.* 1,1 p. 5,1 *si . . . eius . . . germanus propriusque liber est, quod γνήσιον interpretari solet*; *ib.* 1,6 p. 15,6 *proprium germanumque opus*; Aug. *serm.* 7,7 *esse verum, esse sincerum, esse germanum non habet nisi qui non mutatur*. — It may be added that in *hist.* 4,64 Tacitus explains the expression *corpus nomenque Germaniae* in a way that reminds one of the definition given in *Germ.* 4: *redisse vos in corpus nomenque Germaniae communibus deis . . . gratulamur . . . sincerus et integer et servitutis oblitus populus aut ex aequo agetis aut aliis imperitabitis*.

It seems to me that F. Hartmann (*Germanus, Glotta* 9, 1918, 6) is right when he thinks that in the words of Tacitus *propriam et sinceram et tantum sui similem gentem* should be seen »die Absicht des Vfs. . . durch Umschreibung eine genaue Begriffsbestimmung des lateinischen Wortes *germanus* zu geben.« The views of Hartmann are shared by Th. Birt, *Die Germanen*, München 1917, 104.

<sup>2</sup> That Tacitus understood the name in this way, has previously been suggested by several scholars: Below, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Germanen*. Programm des Berlin. Gymnasiums zum grauen Kloster 1850, 19; O. Hirschfeld, *Der Name Germani bei Tacitus und sein Aufkommen bei den Römern, Festschrift für H. Kiepert*, Berlin 1898, 265 f.; A. Gudeman, *Zur Germania des Tacitus, Philologus* 58 (1899) 27 f.; Hartmann, *loc.cit.*; Birt, *loc.cit.*

after their physical characteristics, defined by Tacitus in the words *minime mixtus*, *proprius* and *sincerus*, the synonyms of *germanus*.

In this way the objection raised by Norden against the translation 'after themselves' is refuted on the evidence given by Tacitus himself in *Germ.* 2,1 and 4. The idea that a whole is first called after one of its parts and later after itself is absurd only if we take 'after itself' in the sense of 'after the name it had'. But if we interpret 'after itself' as 'after its own characteristics', there remains no obscurity and the result is in harmony with the traditions of ancient ethnographical literature.<sup>1</sup>

It seems to me that the conclusion that *Germ.* 2,3 is an *argumentum e Germaniae vocabulo* fits quite well the interpretation of the whole passage. Norden's analysis of the Tacitean archaeology of the Germans, explained above, must consequently be made more complete. According to Norden, the thesis presented in AC is argued on the proofs presented in B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>; those in B<sup>1</sup> are for, those in B<sup>2</sup> against it. The thesis consists of two claims, autochthony and racial purity, which are clearly separated from one another with *-que: Ipsos Germanos indigenas crediderim minime quae aliarum gentium adventibus et hospitibus mixtos*. Norden, however, found in B<sup>1</sup> arguments only in favour of autochthony, not in favour of racial purity. As I am going to correct his analysis, I must quote him verbatim: »A und C bezeugen den Glauben des Schriftstellers an die A u t o c h t h o n i e und R a s s e n r e i n h e i t des Volkes, jenes in einer die gegenteilige Ansicht ausschliessenden Diskussion, dieses durch anthropologische Folgerungen. In B<sup>1</sup> und B<sup>2</sup> wird das Problem durch Vorlegung reichhaltigen Überlieferungsmaterials erörtert: B<sup>1</sup> bringt durch die Erwähnung originaler Gesänge auf eine Landesgottheit und epichorischer Stammesnamen Gründe für die U r e i n g e s e s s e n h e i t, B<sup>2</sup> lässt durch Hinweise auf die angebliche Anwesenheit hellenischer Heroen und auf griechische Inschriften die Möglichkeit von Zuwanderungen offen. . . .» (The typographical spacing is mine).<sup>2</sup> In Norden's analysis the correspondence between AC and B<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup> remains incomplete, as he finds in B<sup>1</sup> arguments only for autochthony (»Ureingesessenheit»), not for racial purity (»Rassenreinheit»). According to my interpretation, the latter part of B<sup>1</sup> (2,3) is to be taken as an *argumentum*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the following examples, in which proper names are likewise explained as derived from the characteristics or the qualities of the object in question: Plin. *nat.* 5,35 *mons . . . Ater nostris dictus a natura, adusto similis aut solis repercussu accenso*. Isid. *orig.* 9,2,1 *Franci a quodam proprio duce vocari putantur. Alii eos a feritate morum nuncupatos existimant*. *Ib.* 104 *Galli a c a n d o r e corporis nuncupati sunt. Γάλα enim Graece lac dicitur*. *Ib.* 110 *Galleci a c a n d o r e dicti, unde et Galli*.

<sup>2</sup> *Urg.* 45.

*e Germaniae vocabulo* in favour of racial purity, and thus the correspondence becomes complete. Both claims, presented in AC, are argued in B<sup>1</sup>, which is to be regarded as a whole as an *argumentum e nominibus*: the first part (2,2) argues autochthony, the latter (2,3) racial purity; the former is an *argumentum e nominibus veris et antiquis*, the latter an *argumentum e Germaniae vocabulo, recenti et nuper addito*. To sum up, the analysis of the whole archaeology gives the following picture:

- A Autochthony and purity of race (2,1)
- B<sup>1</sup> Arguments in favour of autochthony (2,2)  
Arguments in favour of purity of race (2,3)
- B<sup>2</sup> Possibility of immigrations (3,1—2)  
Transition to C (3,3)
- C Purity of race and anthropological conclusions (4).

The generalization of the name *Germani*, according to the opinion quoted by Tacitus in *Germ.* 2,3, took place in two phases (*primum — mox*). In the first phase *omnes* were called *Germani* 'after the conqueror' (*a victore*), in the second 'after themselves' (*a se ipsis*). This interpretation involves no difficulties when we assume that the name *Germani* was understood to be identical with the Latin word *germani*. It remains to be discussed how the fear, given as the motive of the generalization in its first phase, is understandable in the light of this conclusion. Our first concern is to examine, who was thought to have been afraid of the invaders, i.e. to be the logical subject of *ob metum*.

Norden is no doubt right when he concludes that the logical subject of *ob metum*, ὁ φοβούμενος (δεδιώς) αὐτούς, also is the ὀνομοθέτης, who first gave the name *Germani* its extensive generic meaning. He is, however, too rash when, without taking into consideration any other possibility, he identifies the ὀνομοθέτης with the conquered Gauls.<sup>1</sup> When somebody is called so and so after the conqueror for fear (*a victore ob metum*), our first thought no doubt is that he who gives the name is one of the conquered. But it need not always be so. We can just as well assume that there is a third party interested

<sup>1</sup> *Urg.* 345 »Wer ist nun dieser, der aus Furcht den Namen einer siegreichen Völkerschaft auf das Gesamtvolk übertrug? Der Besiegte, in diesem Falle also der von dem eindringenden Germanenstamme vertriebene Gallier.« This is also what Melin thinks (*art. cit.* 154): »Die besiegten und erschrockenen Gallier übertrieben die Zahl des siegenden Stammes. Diese waren ja auch die ersten, die den Rhein überschritten hatten, die einzigen, mit denen die Gallier in Berührung getreten waren. 'Jenseits des Stromes wohnen die Germanen' — dies war ihre Auffassung, und die Besiegten fürchteten neue Überfälle des mächtigen Feindes.«

in the result of the battle, an observer, who is worried about the successes of the conquerors because of their possible effect on his own interests and who in his fear exaggerates their number and so gives their name a more extensive application than it previously had. In our case this means that the logical subject of *ob metum*, ὁ φοβούμενος and ὁ ὀνομαθέτης, can just as well be a Roman as a Gaul.

Norden explains that in the ethnographical literature fear is never mentioned as a motive for the generalization of a name in such a straightforward manner as in the Tacitean account.<sup>1</sup> He therefore presumes that in this case the fear-motive must be explained by the particular conditions that prevailed only here. These conditions are known through the *Commentaries* of Caesar,<sup>2</sup> in which the fear inspired by the Germans is often mentioned. Norden, who identifies the logical subject of *ob metum* with the conquered tribes, regards as most important for his argumentation those passages of Caesar in which the fear entertained by the Gauls is described. He draws particular attention to the speech which Diviciacus the Aeduan delivers on behalf of the other Gallic leaders when applying to Caesar for help against Ariovistus, king of the Germans (*Gall.* 1,31,3 f.). The Arverni and the Sequani had summoned the Germans to their aid; about 15.000 of them had crossed the Rhine in the first instance, then more had been brought over, and at that time there were about 120.000 of them in Gaul. Ariovistus had settled within the borders of the Sequani and seized a third part of their territory: »and now he orders them to evacuate another third, because a few months since 24.000 of the Harudes joined him, for whom he had to provide a settlement and a home. In a few years all the natives will have been driven forth from the borders of Gaul, and all the Germans will have crossed the Rhine.» — *et nunc de altera parte tertia Sequanos decedere iuberet, propterea quod paucis mensibus ante Harudum milia hominum xxiiii ad eum venissent, quibus locus ac sedes pararentur. futurum esse paucis annis, uti omnes ex Galliae finibus pellerentur atque omnes Germani Rhenum transirent.* The conclusion Norden draws from this passage is the following: »Also aus der Invasion der Suebi

<sup>1</sup> *Urg.* 416.

<sup>2</sup> Norden (*Urg.* 414) has emphasized the importance of Caesar's *Commentaries* for an understanding of the Tacitean account: It was natural that every author who intended to write about the relations between the Gauls and the Germans sought out the primary evidence of Caesar. Caesar, as far as his knowledge of Gaul is concerned, is also to Tacitus 'the highest authority', *summus auctorum* (*Germ.* 28,1), and the influence of Caesar's *Commentaries* must be reckoned with wherever he is dealing with the earliest period in general and the relations between the Gauls and Germans in particular.

und der wenige Monate vorher in der Zahl von 24.000 Mann zu ihnen gestossenen Harudes schliessen die Haedui in ihrer Angst auf eine bevorstehende Invasion der rechtsrheinischen Germanen in ihrer Gesamtheit. Eine schönere Bestätigung des Gesamtinhaltes des Taciteischen Satzes, insbesondere auch der Begriffsbestimmung *omnes* lässt sich nicht denken: hinter dem Einzels Stamm, mit dem man es gegenwärtig zu tun hat, steht eine siegreich vordringende Gesamtnation von furchterregender Volkszahl.»<sup>1</sup>

I think we shall find a much stronger confirmation of the Tacitean sentence if we also examine Caesar's own attitude to the situation described by Diviciacus: *Gall.* 1, 33,2 f. »And straightway many considerations induced him (sc. Caesar) to suppose that he must take thought and action in that matter . . . Next, he could see that the Germans were becoming gradually accustomed to crossing the Rhine, and that the arrival of a great host of them in Gaul was dangerous for the Roman people. Nor did he suppose that barbarians so fierce would call a halt after seizing the whole of Gaul; but rather, like the Cimbri and Teutoni before them, they would break out into the Province, and push on thence to Italy, especially as there was only the Rhone to separate the Sequani from the Roman Province. All this, he felt, must be faced without a moment's delay.» — *et secundum ea multae res eum (sc. Caesarem) hortabantur, quare sibi eam rem cogitandam et suscipiendam putaret . . . paulatim autem Germanos consuescere Rhenum transire et in Galliam magnam eorum multitudinem venire populo Romano periculosum videbat, neque sibi homines feroces ac barbaros temperaturos existimabat, quin cum omnem Galliam occupavissent, ut ante Cimbri Teutonique fecissent, in provinciam exirent atque inde in Italiam contenderent, praesertim cum Sequanos a provincia nostra Rhodanus divideret; quibus rebus quam maturime occurrendum putabat.* Caesar is ready to accept the arguments of Diviciacus, but it is noticeable that his attitude differs from that of the Aeduan leader: Diviciacus fears that all the Gauls will be driven out of their territories and all the Germans will cross the Rhine; Caesar considers the situation from the standpoint of the Romans and realizes that the gradual arrival of the Germans in Gaul is also dangerous for Italy and for the Roman people. But when we examine the Germanic invasion in the light of the words of both Diviciacus and Caesar, we find in it all the elements that are necessary for the understanding of the fear-motive as it is expressed by Tacitus:

<sup>1</sup> *Urg.* 418 f.

*Gall.* 1,31,11 *futurum esse paucis annis, uti omnes ex Galliae finibus pellerentur atque omnes Germani Rhenum transirent* — 1,33,3 *paulatim autem Germanos consuescere Rhenum transire et in Galliam magnam eorum multitudinem venire populo Romano periculosum videbat.* — *ceterum Germaniae vocabulum recens et nuper additum, quoniam qui primi Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint ac nunc Tungri, tunc Germani vacati sint: ita nationis nomen, non gentis evaluisse paulatim, ut omnes primum a victore ob metum, mox etiam a se ipsis invento nomine Germani vocarentur.* In the words of Diviciacus we find the item *omnes Germani*; in those of Caesar himself *paulatim* and *periculosum*; in Tacitus these items are united to *paulatim, ut omnes . . . ob metum . . . Germani vocarentur*. It was the fear common to both Gauls and Romans that is reflected by the Tacitean expression *ob metum*.

The conclusion, based on the facts known from the *Commentaries* of Caesar, is that the logical subject of *ob metum* can quite well be thought of as a Latin speaking Roman.

Another question which may be raised is whether the name *Germani*, when understood to be Latin, might also have a connotation that was of a nature to inspire fear.<sup>1</sup>

First of all, it must be emphasized that there is no evidence whatever in favour of the hypothesis that *Germani* was ever the name of one single tribe. On the contrary, from the very beginning of our literary tradition it appears as a collective name. When Athenaeus 4,153 e, quoting Posidonius, describes the food and drink of the *Γεγραυοί*,<sup>2</sup> the quotation is preceded by another about the Indians (from Megasthenes), to which the *Γεγραυοί* stand in contrast. In the same chapter Athenaeus discusses the Parthians, Etruscans, and Romans, in the following the Celts, and it is perfectly clear that in all these

<sup>1</sup> Norden (*Urg.* 388 f.) is of the opinion that the problem of the etymology of the name *Germani* has nothing whatsoever to do with the Tacitean account. This is also what Much (*Die Germania* 70) thinks when he writes: »Was der Name *Germani* bedeutet, ist für den Vorgang seiner Übertragung auf die Gesamtheit, ebenso aber auch für das Verständnis der von ihm handelnden Stelle der *Germania* völlig belanglos.« It is true that Tacitus does not say from where the first Transrhenean invaders had got the name *Germani*, but this fact does not justify the assumption that he did not give the name any significance.

<sup>2</sup> To the question of whether Posidonius already used the name *Γεγραυοί* or whether it was inserted in the quotation by Athenaeus, see: K. Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* 2, Berlin 1887, 188; G. F. Unger, *Umfang und Anordnung der Geschichte des Posidonius*, *Philologus* 55 (1896) 112; Hirschfeld, *Festschrift für H. Kiepert* 268; Norden, *Urg.* 70 ff.; F. Jacoby, *F. Gr. Hist.* 87 F 22 Comm.; J. J. Tierney, *The Celtic Ethnography of Posidonius*, *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 60 C (1960) 198 ff.



cases he refers to the groups mentioned collectively. In Caesar's day the name *Germani* had already become firmly established among the Romans. The land of the Germans is called *Germania* (*Gall.* 4,4,1; 5,13,6; 6,11,1 etc.) and Caesar also forms the adjective *Germanicus* (4,16,1 *Germanicum bellum*). When he says in the beginning of his first book that the Belgae are *proximi Germanis* and that the Helvetii also excel the rest of the Gauls in valour because they fight almost daily with the Germans, he takes it for granted that the name *Germani* was as well known in Rome as that of the Helvetii and Belgae.<sup>1</sup> As for Tacitus, who in *Germ.* 2,3 expressly says that *Germani* first was *nationis nomen* and referred to the Tungri, it has been definitely established by Norden that this was due to the important position that the Tungri had gained in regard to the other Cisrhenane Germans: the tribes that in Caesar's times were known as *Cisrhenani Germani* (*Gall.* 2,3,4; 2,4,10; 6,2,3; 6,32,1) were in the source of Tacitus represented by the Tungri alone.<sup>2</sup> In *Germ.* 2,3 *nationis nomen, non gentis* means that *Germani* was not thought to be derived from the name of an eponymous hero like the preceding names *Ingaevones, Istaevones*, etc., which are defined as *gentis appellationes*.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the question

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Birt, *Die Germanen* 8 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Urg.* 396—405.

<sup>3</sup> In his interpretation of *nationis nomen, non gentis* Norden (*Urg.* 314 ff.) repeated the error of his predecessors as he did not realize the correspondence between *gentis appellationes* and *nomen, non gentis* in *Germ.* 2,2—3: *quidam, ut in licentia vetustatis, pluris deo ortos plurisque gentis appellationes, Marsos Gambrivios Suebos Vandilios affirmant, eaque vera et antiqua nomina. ceterum Germaniae vocabulum recens et nuper additum, quoniam qui primi Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint ac nunc Tungri, tunc Germani vocati sint: ita nationis nomen, non gentis evaluisse paulatim, ut omnes primum a victore ob metum, mox etiam a se ipsis invento nomine Germani vocarentur*. This made him contradict himself in that, when referring to the same thing, he sometimes uses the term »Germanengruppenname» sometimes »Stammesname»; cf. *Urg.* 387 »Von der alten germanischen Stammesgruppe auf dem linken Rheinufer ist nun nach der Annahme des Livius-Tacitus die Propaganda des Germanengruppennamens zum Volksnamen ausgegangen»; *ib.* 389 »Die Frage, die die Gewährsmänner des Tacitus und diesen selbst beschäftigte, war nur diese: wie ist der Stammesname zum Volksnamen geworden» (The typographical spacing is mine). The correct approach has only quite recently (1970) been found by Kraft (*op.cit.* 36), who interprets *gentis appellationes* as »Benennungen nach der blutmässigen Abstammung» and *nationis nomen* as »Benennung nach einem von der blutmässigen Abstammung zu unterscheidenden Gesichtspunkt». Additionally, referring to Charisius (*Ars gramm.* V, 397,26 b *natio solum patrium quaerit, gens seriem maiorum explicat*) Kraft concludes quite correctly that *natio* in *Germ.* 2,3 cannot be understood as 'tribe' but rather as a denomination for the inhabitants of the same country or the members of the same political unity (»die geographisch, allenfalls politisch bestimmte Herkunft»). The objections of Theiler (*Mus. Helv.* 28,1971,119 f.) against this interpretation of Kraft's appear to me incomprehensible, for although in *originem gentis* (*Germ.* 2,2) the meaning 'Gesamtvolk' is defensible, in *gentis appellationes*, by which are meant not only the names *Ingaevones, Herminones, Istaevones*, but also *Marsi, Gambrivii, Suebi, Vandilii*, this sense is absurd. Furthermore, it is in *gentis appellationes* and *nomen, non gentis* that, because of the antithesis *vera et antiqua nomina — vocabulum recens et nuper additum* and the common source defined with *quidam . . . affirmant*, we must give the word *gens* the same meaning.

of the generalization of *Germani* is not how a tribal name was extended to a group of many tribes but how a name that already was a generic one was generalized to cover all the tribes that inhabited the lands beyond the Rhine.

As the name *Germani* from the very beginning refers to several tribes collectively, it is reasonable to assume that its origin may lie in the mutual relationship of the tribes concerned. Our first concern shall be to examine the words used to denote this kind of relationship.

The Aedui, who were the first Gaulish allies of the Romans, were hailed by the Roman Senate as *fratres consanguineique*.<sup>1</sup> This appellation has been explained by Hirschfeld<sup>2</sup> with Gaulish analogies: *Caes. Gall.* 1,11,4 the Ambarri are called *necessarii et consanguinei Haeduum* and *ib.* 2,3,5 the envoys of the Remi use the expression *fratres consanguineique* for the Suessiones. According to Hirschfeld, the Romans, having become neighbours of the Aedui, made an alliance with them in accordance with Gaulish forms and translated as *fratres et consanguinei* the corresponding Celtic term. I quote the words of Hirschfeld in full: »An eine Blutsverwandtschaft im eigentlichen Sinne ist hier keineswegs zu denken, wohl aber an ein der Blutsverwandtschaft in den Wirkungen gleichgesetztes Bundesverhältniss, d.h. es ist nichts Anderes als die in Germanien wohlbekannte, dort freilich nur für Individuen, nicht für ganze Stämme bezeugte Blutsbrüderschaft, die, wie Hr. Brunner es kurz formuliert, 'zwischen zwei oder mehreren nicht verwandten Personen männlichen Geschlechts begründet werden kann; die Eingehung erfolgt durch einen Formalact, bei welchem die Vermischung des beiderseitig geweckten Blutes und der Eid, dass sie Einer des Anderen Tod wie Brüder rächen wollen, die Hauptrolle spielen. Zwischen den Blutsbrüdern besteht Rachepflicht und Unterstützungspflicht.' Die Analogie dieser Blutsbrüderschaft mit den

<sup>1</sup> *Caes. Gall.* 1,33,2 *Haeduos fratres consanguineosque saepe numero a senatu appellatos in servitute atque ditione videbat Germanorum teneri*; cf. *ib.* 1,43,6 f. *docebat etiam quam veteres quamque iustae causae necessitudinis ipsis cum Haeduis intercederent, quae senatus consulta, quotiens quamque honorifica in eos facta essent*; *Cic. fam.* 7,10,4 *fratres nostri Haedui*; *ad Att.* 1,19,2 *Haedui fratres nostri*; *Plin. nat.* 4,107 *Aedui foederati*; *Tac. ann.* 11,25 *solii Gallorum (Aedui) fraternitatis nomen cum populo Romano usurpant*; *Paneg.* 8,2 *(Aedui) solii etiam consanguinitatis nomine gloriati sunt*; *ib.* 3 *solii Aedui . . . fratres populi Romani crediti sunt appellarique meruerunt*; *Str.* 4,3,2 *οἱ δὲ Αἰδοῦοι καὶ συγγενεῖς Ῥωμαίων ὀνομάζοντο καὶ πρῶτοι τῶν ταύτη προσήλθον πρὸς τὴν φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν*. *Diod.* 5,25,1 *ἢ τοίνυν Γαλατία κατοικεῖται μὲν ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἔθνων . . . ὧν ἓν ἐστὶ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἔχον συγγένειαν παλαιὰν καὶ φιλίαν τὴν μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων διαμένουσαν*. Cf. Norden, *Germani. Ein grammatisch-ethnologisches Problem. Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Ak.* 1918, 112.

<sup>2</sup> Die Haeduer und Arverner unter römischer Herrschaft, *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Ak.* 1897, 1099—1119.

gallischen Verbänden springt in den Augen, sei es nun, was mir am wahrscheinlichsten dünkt, dass hier eine kelto-germanische Sitte vorliegt, sei es, dass die Sitte der Blutsbrüderschaft von Germanien nach Gallien übertragen und hier zu einer staatsrechtlichen Institution geworden ist, bei deren Eingehung ohne Zweifel ein ähnliches Ceremoniell als bei Eingehung der Blutsbrüderschaft zwischen einzelnen Individuen beobachtet sein wird. So erklärt es sich, dass, als die Römer durch Einverleibung des Allobrogen-Gebietes zu Nachbarn der Haeduer geworden waren, das Bündniss, das sie mit diesen abschlossen, in dieser für die Gallier engsten und feierlichsten Form eingegangen und dass der Titel *fratres et consanguinei* den Haeduern und zwar ihnen allein verliehen worden ist, nicht der Fiction einer gemeinsamen Abstammung von Troja zu Liebe, sondern als lateinische Wiedergabe der keltischen Bezeichnung für Blutsbrüder.»<sup>1</sup>

Hirschfeld thinks that 'kinship by blood' in Germany is attested only between individuals, not tribes, but holds it most probable that the institution in question is Celto-Germanic. It seems to me, however, that he has overlooked some sources which attest 'kinship by blood' even among the Transrhenane tribes.

In the speeches of the Batavian leader Civilis and the Agrippinenses (= Ubii) the Transrhenane Germans are called *consanguinei* of the Cisrhenane ones: Tac. hist. 4,14,4 *at sibi (Civilis) robur peditum equitumque, consanguineos Germanos, Gallias idem cupientes; ib. 4,65,1 quae prima libertatis facultas data est, avidius quam cautius (nos Agrippinenses) sumpsimus, ut vobis (Tencteris) ceterisque Germanis, consanguineis nostris, iungeremur.* The federation between the Gepidae and the Goths is called by Jordanes *consanguinitatis foedus*: Get. 97 *ergo, ut dicebamus, Gepidarum rex Fastida quietam gentem excitans patrios fines per arma dilatavit. nam Burgundzones pene usque ad internicionem delevit aliasque nonnullas gentes perdomuit. Gothos quoque male provocans consanguinitatis foedus prius inportuna concertatione violavit superba admodum elatione iactatus, crescenti populo dum terras coepit addere, incolas patrios reddidit variores.* It may be added that in Germ. 28,4 Tacitus explains *Germanica origo* with *gloria sanguinis* <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.* IIIIO f.

<sup>2</sup> *Treveri et Nervii circa affectationem Germanicae originis ultro ambitiosi sunt, tamquam per hanc gloriam sanguinis a similitudine et inertia Gallorum separentur.* In our sources the Treveri appear as ambitious to form an alliance with the Transrhenane tribes: Caes. Gall. 5,2,4 *in fines Treverorum proficiscitur, quod hi neque ad concilia veniebant neque imperio parebant Germanosque Transrhenanos sollicitare dicebantur; 5,55,1 Treveri vero atque Indutiomarus totius hiemis nullum tempus intermiserunt, quin trans Rhenum legatos mitterent, civitates sollicitarent, pecunias pollicerentur; 6,2,1 Interfecto Indutiomaro . . . ad eius propinquos a Treveris imperium defertur. Illi finitimos*

and that *ib.* 39,1 the Suebic tribes which through their delegations took part in the religious ceremonies of the Semnones are called by him *eiusdem sanguinis populi*.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, in a passage that is derived from Posidonius,<sup>2</sup> Plutarch says of the Cimbri that they had sent to Marius a delegation to demand land for themselves and their 'brethren', by which they meant the Teutoni: *Mar.* 24,3 f. »For they (the Cimbri) terribly maltreated those who brought tidings of the destruction of the Teutoni, and sent to Marius ambassadors demanding territory for themselves and their brethren (ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς) and enough cities for them to dwell in. When Marius asked the ambassadors whom they meant by their brethren (περὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν), they said they meant the Teutoni. At this, all the other Romans who heard them burst out laughing, and Marius scoffingly said: 'Then don't trouble yourselves about your brethren (ἀδελφούς), for they have land, and they will have it forever — land which we have given them.' The ambassadors understood his sarcasm and fell to abusing him, declaring that he should be punished for it, by the Cimbri at once, and by the Teutoni when they came. 'Verily', said Marius,

---

*Germanos sollicitare et pecuniam polliceri non desistunt; 6,2,3 a Treveris Germanos crebris legationibus sollicitari; 6,9,1 (Germani) auxilia contra se (Caesarem) Treveris miserant.* The Nervii appear together with the Eburones — who belonged to the Cisrhenane Germans (cf. *Gall.* 2,4,10) — as enemies of the Romans: *Gall.* 5,38.2 *in Nervios pervenit (sc. Ambiorix rex Eburonum) hortaturque, ne sui in perpetuum liberandi atque ulciscendi Romanos pro iis quas acceperint iniuriis occasionem dimittant. . . . 4 facile hac oratione Nervii persuadet; 5,39,3 His circumventis magna manu Eburones, Nervii, Aduatuci atque horum omnium socii et clientes legionem oppugnare incipiunt; 5,58,7 hac re cognita omnes Eburonum et Nerviorum quae convenerant copiae discedunt.* Later on we find them among the enemies of Caesar together with all the Cisrhenane Germans and the Treveri: *Gall.* 6,2,3 *Caesar cum undique bellum parari videret, Nervios, Aduatucos, Menapios adiunctis Cisrhenanis omnibus Germanis esse in armis . . . a Treveris Germanos crebris legationibus sollicitari, maturius sibi de bello cogitandum putavit.* — I think the truth which lies behind Tacitus' statement about the ambition of the Treveri and Nervii to claim a German origin may be that these tribes, as is expressly stated about the Treveri, were ambitious to have the Transrhenane Germans as their allies, i.e. 'kinsmen by blood', *consanguinei*, in the iuridical sense of the word. This kind of ambition can easily be misunderstood as a claim to be in actual fact 'of the same blood' as those with whom the alliance based on 'kinship by blood' is going to be established. According to Tacitus, glorious consanguinity (*gloria sanguinis*) and German origin (*Germanica origo*) are the same thing and he seems to connect the latter with inherited qualities to which the *inertia* of the Gauls stands in sharp contrast. This statement, as pointed out by Much (*Die Germania* 361), cannot be taken as evidence for the assumption that German blood would have been more highly valued among the Gauls than Gaulish, but is probably to be attributed to Tacitus himself. If we assume, as suggested above, that the statement is due to a misunderstanding, the expression *gloria sanguinis* may be understood in the sense that in reality it was not the 'German blood' but the glory that followed from being a member of the *foedus consanguinitatis* with the Transrhenane Germans that was highly esteemed among the Treveri and Nervii.

<sup>1</sup> For this expression, see p. 132 f. below.

<sup>2</sup> Norden, *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Ak.* 1918, 114; Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* 2, 190 n. 1.

'they are here, and it will not be right for you to go away before you have embraced your brethren (*ἀδελφούς*).' Saying this, he ordered the kings of the Teutoni to be produced in fetters; for they had been captured among the Alps, where they were fugitives, by the Sequani.» The word *ἀδελφοί*, used four times in the passage quoted, shows that the mutual relation of the Cimbri and Teutoni was based on the principle of brotherhood. In his discussion with the Cimbrian ambassadors Marius must have availed himself of interpreters who translated their words into Latin. Plutarch's account must be based on a Latin description of the event derived from the report of Marius and his soldiers. The Greek *ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς* is in Latin *sibi et fratribus suis* and in this expression *fratres* cannot mean a real brotherhood based on common parents but it denotes a similar relationship to that implied in the words *fratres et consanguinei* used by the Remi about the Suessiones and about the federation between the Aedui and the Romans or the Ambarri and the Aedui, for which the word *fratres* alone can be used.<sup>1</sup> In reality the Cimbri demanded land for themselves and their allies, the Teutoni, but as the alliance in question was based on 'kinship by blood', the Cimbrian ambassadors could use about the Teutoni a barbaric word equivalent to *ἀδελφοί* — *fratres (consanguinei)*.

The above examples show that *consanguinei* is the Latin word that was used to denote a close mutual relationship between tribes of both Celtic and Teutonic origin. Considering in addition the fact that throughout the whole of Latinity *germani* is used as a synonym of *consanguinei*,<sup>2</sup> it is difficult to assume that the name *Germani*, which likewise referred to a tribal confederacy, might have been semantically separated by the Romans from this concept (i.e. *germani/consanguinei*). There is evidence that the Romans understood the word *consanguinei* in the sense of 'federated', for Plin. *nat.* 4,107 the Aedui have the epithet *foederati*, whereas in the other sources quoted above they appear as *consanguinei* of the Romans. If its synonym *germani* had a similar connota-

<sup>1</sup> This was even noticed by Hirschfeld in *Festschrift für H. Kiepert* (1898), in which he points out (p. 267 n. 3): »Wenn bei Plutarch: Marius c. 24 die Cimbern von den Teutonen als *ἀδελφοί* sprechen, so wird hier ebenfalls ein solches Verbrüderungsverhältniss zwischen den zwei benachbarten und verbündeten Stämmen anzunehmen sein.»

<sup>2</sup> Norden, *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Ak.* 1918, 111. Cf. Acc. *praetext.* 21 f. *duos consanguineos arietes inde eligi | praeclarioremque alterum immolare me. | deinde eius germanum cornibus conitit.* *Carm. epigr.* 1403,5 (= Diehl, *Inscr. Christ.* 727) *Iustus et Theodosia sanguine germani, sed plus germana voluntas.* *Vigil. Trid. ad Simplic.* 3 *consanguinitate germanus.* *Aug. civ.* 15,16 p. 93 *ipsi (sc. consobrini) inter se propter tam propinquam consanguinitatem fratres vocantur et paene germani sunt.*

tion, the fear mentioned by Tacitus *Germ.* 2,3 as a motive for the extensive use of *Germani* becomes quite understandable: the tribes called *Germani* were so named because they formed an alliance, based on the same principle of kinship by blood as that of the Aedui — Ambarri, Remi — Suessiones, Tenceri — Agrippinenses, Gothi — Gepidae, and Cimbri — Teutoni. The extent of this alliance was not known and it was feared that all the tribes beyond the Rhine might belong to the same confederacy.

The result of the above considerations is that the Germanic archaeology of Tacitus, when analysed as a whole, justifies the conclusion that *Germ.* 2,3 was used by the author as an *argumentum e Germaniae vocabulo* in favour of his thesis of the racial purity of the Germans. It becomes such an argument when *a se ipsis* is taken in the sense of 'after themselves' and *Germani* is taken as a Latin word. If the name is looked upon as a Latin one, the fear-motive is also comprehensible by virtue of the synonymy of *germani/consanguinei* and the use of the latter in the sense of *consanguinitate foederati*. The course of the events that led to the generalization of *Germani* was thought to have been as follows: the tribes that first crossed the Rhine and drove out the Gauls were known as *Germani*; the fear that all the other tribes which inhabited the lands beyond the Rhine, from which the conquerors had come, might be their allies, was expressed in that the name (meaning 'of the same blood', 'kinsmen by blood' = *consanguinei*) began to be used for all the other tribes as well; when the generalization had taken root in this way, it subsequently gained more ground because the name (in its sense 'of the same blood' = *proprii/sinceri/non mixti*) also expressed qualities that were considered to be characteristic of the peoples beyond the Rhine.

It must be emphasized that this was the development as it was conceived by the author whom Tacitus quotes in *Germ.* 2,2—3. We do not know his name; Müllenhoff thinks that he might have been Pliny,<sup>1</sup> Norden's suggestion is Livy.<sup>2</sup> In any case, the originator of the hypothesis seems to have been acquainted with the account given to Caesar by the envoys of the Remi about the Germanic invasion of Gaul.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Deutsche Altertumskunde* 2, 192 »wir machen hier nur darauf aufmerksam, dass . . . die hypothese nach der verbindung, in der sie bei Tacitus mit der vierteilung steht, gewiss erst nach den kriegern in Deutschland, vielleicht von Plinius selbst, ausgebildet ist, da die Marsen, die ersten in der einteilung, erst nach der aufhebung der Sugambern im j. 8 vor Chr. auftauchen und nebst den mit ihnen gepaarten Gambriviern seit den zügen des Germanicus a. 14—16 aus der geschichte verschwinden.«

<sup>2</sup> *Urg.* 351, 378, 383.

<sup>3</sup> *Caes. Gall.* 2,4,2 *plerosque Belgas esse ortos a Germanis Rhenumque antiquitus tra-*

A mistake made by many commentators on *Germ.* 2,3 is that of attempting to interpret the passage in such a way that its contents may be accepted as a truthful and reliable account of the facts which gave rise to the extensive generic use of the name *Germani*. It has often been overlooked that Tacitus only reports a theory, the originator of which scarcely had any more accurate information about the Germanic invasion of Gaul than did Caesar, in whose works *Germani* already appears with its fully developed, generalized meaning.<sup>1</sup> A theory which is principally based on Caesar, is therefore of no great value unless it can be proved that it contains items of truth that are in harmony with the facts that can be ascertained independently of this theory. Therefore, we shall try to establish how far the contents of *Germ.* 2,3, as interpreted in the above manner, may correspond to reality.

Independently of Tacitus, it is possible to establish that federations based on 'kinship by blood' were common between tribes of both Celtic and Teutonic origin. But is it possible that the origin of the name *Germani* is really to be connected with this fact? In fact, Norden did take this possibility into consideration, although the Teutonic examples quoted above escaped his notice. His argumentation is worthy of being quoted in full: »Wie nun also, wenn wir dieses beides, die gallische Titulatur von engverbündeten Nachbarvölkern als *fratres et consanguinei* und die Synonymität dieser Wortverbindung mit dem lat. *germani*, kombinierend annähmen, dass die Kelten dasjenige Nachbarvolk, mit dem sie in vorgeschichtlicher Zeit in Teilen Mittel- und Süddeutschlands jahrhundertlang zusammensassen, das sich mit ihnen dann auf gallischem Boden zur Abwehr des römischen Erobers aufs engste verbündete, als seine 'Brüder' tituliert hätte?»<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, he draws a negative conclusion and justifies his standpoint as follows: »Die Bezeichnung *fratres et consanguinei* war ein Ehrentitel, kein Name: die Völkerschaften, die ihn trugen, hiessen *Haedui*, *Ambarri*, *Suessiones*, und gewiss hat es noch andere als diese von Cäsar nur beiläufig genannten gallischen Stämme gegeben, die von ihren Nachbarn dieser Ehrung für würdig gefunden worden waren. . . . Wieder liegt es mithin in diesen Fällen so, dass die Völker ihre echten

*ductos propter loci fertilitatem ibi consedissee Gallosque qui ea loca incolerent expulisse;* cf. Tac. *Germ.* 2,3 *quoniam qui primi Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint ac nunc Tungri, tunc Germani vocati sint.* In the Tacitean account that of Caesar has so far been modified that instead of the *plerique Belgae orti a Germanis* are mentioned the Tungri, who in the Imperial age were the most important group of the Cisrhenane Germans of Gallia Belgica. Cf. Norden, *Urg.* 377 f.; Melin, *art. cit.* 145 f.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* 2, 200.

<sup>2</sup> *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Ak.* 1918, III.

ethnischen Namen tragen und von ihren Stammesverwandten 'Brüder' bloss appellativisch benannt werden. In der ethnographischen Literatur . . . gibt es auch nicht einen einzigen Fall, wo ein Volk 'die Brüder' geheissen hätte.»<sup>1</sup>

I think the objections raised by Norden may easily be refuted. First of all, it is by no means necessary to assume that there ought to have existed a tribe called 'the Brothers', for *Germani* was never the name of one tribe alone, but is used in a collective sense from the very beginning of our literary tradition.<sup>2</sup> When a name refers to a group of several tribes, it is quite natural that the individual tribal names appear alongside the generic name for the whole group. This is confirmed by Caesar, when he states *Gall.* 2,4,10 *Condrusos Eburones Caerosos Paemanos qui uno nomine Germani appellantur*.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, it is true that the designation *fratres et consanguinei* when used by the Romans about the Aedui, may be considered as a title of honour (»Ehrentitel«), as it had officially been given to them by the Roman senate (Caes. *Gall.* 1,43,6 f.) and an alliance *ex aequo* between small and great peoples may always be considered as glorious from the standpoint of the former. But when the Cimbri (Plu. *Mar.* 24,3 f.) in their colloquium with Marius use the word translated as ἀδελφοί about the Teutoni, there is no reason to assume that the word expressed anything more than the fact that the two tribes were federated and considered each other as their 'kinsmen by blood'. Nor is it permissible to draw from the *foedus consanguinitatis* between the Gepidae and the Goths, attested by Jordanes (*Get.* 97), any other conclusion than that their federation was based on the same principle; and when Tacitus (*hist.* 4,14,4 and 4,65,1) makes Civilis and the Ubii call the Transrhenane Germans *consanguinei*, this word is in no way used as a title of honour, but only as an expression of the mutual relationship of these groups.

Hirschfeld thought that *fratres et consanguinei*, when used by the Romans about the Aedui, should be taken as a Latin translation of the Celtic desig-

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.* 113 f.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 120 ff. above.

<sup>3</sup> The indicative *appellantur*, as emphasized by Birt (*Die Germanen* 46), is worthy of notice, for the relative clause quoted belongs to the account given to Caesar by the Remian envoys (*Gall.* 2,4,2 ff.), which is in indirect speech. Elsewhere in the same account the predicates of the subordinate clauses are in subjunctive as demanded by the rules of *oratio obliqua*. When Caesar puts the verb *appellare* in the indicative, he makes it clear that the fact that *Germani* was the collective name of the four tribes was not declared to him by the Remian envoys but was an addition of his own. This means that the Condrusi, Eburones, Caerosi and Paemani were called *Germani* not among the Remi but among the Romans.



nation for 'kinsmen by blood' (»lateinische Wiedergabe der keltischen Bezeichnung für Blutsbrüder«). This was accepted by Norden,<sup>1</sup> but although he held the name *Germani* to be of Celtic origin,<sup>2</sup> he rejected the hypothesis that the designation for 'kinsmen by blood' might have any connection with it.

My interpretation of *Germ. 2,3* implies that *Germani* is Latin.<sup>3</sup> Norden, who definitely rejects the theories of the Latin origin of *Germani*, has established the following principle concerning congruences of ethnic names between themselves or with appellatives: »Wortkongruenzen, scheinbar so sichere Wegzeichen, erweisen sich nur zu oft als Irrlichter, die in einem Sumpf locken. . . . Im Gegensatz zu solchen Verkehrtheiten werden wir es als Grundsatz jeder wissenschaftlichen Forschung auf diesem Gebiete betrachten: lautliche Übereinstimmungen von Völkernamen unter sich oder mit Appellativen sind — sofern sie über die Suffixe auf die Wortstämme hinübergreifen — nur da bedeutsam, wo sie anderweitig überlieferte oder sicher erschlossene ethnische Zusammenhänge bestätigen; ihre Bedeutung ist mithin bloss sekundär, die Etymologie hat sich der Ethnologie unter-

<sup>1</sup> *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Ak.* 1918, 110 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* 102 and *Urg.* (1920) 388. Later on, however, Norden twice changed his opinion: in the additions to the second edition of *Urg.* (1922, 11) he considered the name to be Germanic and in *Altgermanien* (Leipzig u. Berlin 1934, 261—302), Illyric. For the other theories about the etymology of the name, see the literature mentioned by Kraft, *op.cit.* 27; Much, *Die Germania* 70 ff.; H. Birkhan, *SAWW* 272 (1970) 203 n. 356.

<sup>3</sup> The last scholar to have defended the Latin origin of *Germani* is B. Collinder, *The Name Germani*, *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 59 (1944) 19—39, who regarded the name as a Latin translation of *Suebi*. Before that, various suggestions of a similar kind had been put forward. In 1850 it was already suggested by Below (*op. cit.*, see p. 115 n. 2 above) that *Germani* was a Latin translation of a name used by the Celts to indicate their eastern neighbours. Below was not sure which was the Celtic name in question, but he thought it might at a later date be possible to find an etymology for the name *Tungri* which would correspond to the Latin *germani*. L. Laistner (*Germanische Völkernamen. Württembergische Vierteljahreshefte für Landesgeschichte*, N.F. 1, 1892) considered *Germani* as a Latin translation of *Istvaeones* (or *Istaevoines*), which he connected with Old Bulgarian *istŭ*, 'true, real, genuine', and the Greek word ἀπείστυς, 'absence'. Gudeman (*Philologus* 58, 1899, 28) was also convinced of the Latin origin of the name, but regretted the fact that he could not indicate which barbarian word had been translated as *Germani*. Subsequently, the Latin hypothesis was defended by Birt (*Die Germanen* 1917) and Hartmann (*Glotta* 9, 1918, 1—32), who, however, thought that the name had been invented by the Romans to characterize the peoples of Central Europe, considered by them to be of a pure and unmixed race. — The theory of Below of a semantic connection between *Tungri-Germani* is based on a misinterpretation of Tacitus' words *qui . . . nunc Tungri, tunc Germani vocati sint*, for which see p. 121 and p. 126 n. 3 above. As for the suggestion of Laistner, it seems to me that Collinder (*art.cit.* 27) with reason points out that »the Slavic adjective (sc. *istŭ*) is too remote to allow us to interpret *Istvaeones* as 'die Echten, Leiblichen, Vollbürtigen, Blutsverwandten'.« The hypotheses of Birt and Hartmann, it seems to me, are incomplete and erroneous in so far as the reason for the denomination is sought only among the Romans not in the ethnic connections of the Teutonic tribes themselves. For a discussion of Collinder's thesis, see p. 133 ff. below.

zuordnen. In solcher Weise vorsichtig betrachtet, kann das Wortbild für die Ergänzung der ethnographischen Überlieferung nützlich sein.»<sup>1</sup> According to this principle, the congruence between the name *Germani* and the Latin appellative has no significance unless it can be proved that it confirms ethnic connections known or certainly established from other sources.

The interpretation of *Germani* as Latin *germani/consanguinei* may at least be said to confirm otherwise established ethnic connections in as far as the existence of the *foedus consanguinitatis* is known among the tribes called *Germani* independently of *Germ.* 2,3. There are, however, still further ethnic connections that are in conformity with this solution.

In a paper to be published in the *Indogermanische Forschungen* and, in a more extensive form, in the *Quaderni Urbinati* for 1972 I presented the theory that the name *Germani* might be considered as a Latin translation of the Teutonic name *Sciri*, which means 'the Pure', 'the Unmixed' as the opposite of *Bastarnae* 'the Bastards'.<sup>2</sup> My argumentation is principally based on the fact that in several passages in Strabo<sup>3</sup> and in Pliny<sup>4</sup> the name *Germani* seems to be

<sup>1</sup> *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Ak.* 1918, 98.

<sup>2</sup> The name *Sciri* (Σκίροι) is derived from German \**skīra-*, 'clear, pure, sheer, unblemished'; cf. Gothic *skeirs*, Old Nordic *skirr*, Old English *scīr*, English *sheer*, Old Saxon *skīri*, High German *schier*, and Old Nordic *skirborinn*, *skirgetinn*, 'of genuine birth'. *Bastarnae* has been compared by Much with the Gothic *widuwairna*, 'son of a widow, orphan', \**piwairnō*, 'daughter of a menial, harlot'. He considers the name as a compound, the latter part of which has a common origin with the Greek ἔρνος, 'shoot, sprout, offspring'; the first part of it he connects with Old French *bast*, 'unlawful intercourse', which he considers to be of German origin. The meaning of the compound is thus 'the offspring of unlawful intercourse', 'the Bastards'. For the references, see *Arctos*, *Suppl.* I, 109. The *Sciri* appear for the first time in the so-called Protogenes-inscription of Olbia: *Inscr. ant. or. sept. Pont. Eux.* I, 32 (dated 290—200 B.C.) Γαλάτας καὶ Σκίροϋς πεποιῆσθαι συμμαχίαν κτλ. Their companions, the *Γαλάται*, are generally identified with the *Bastarnae*; cf. *Plu. Aem.* 9,6 ὑπεκίνει δὲ (Περσεύς) καὶ Γαλάτας τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἰστρὸν ᾠκημένους, Βαστέρωνα καλοῦνται, στρατὸν ἰππότην καὶ μάχιμον. See Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* 2, 104 ff.

<sup>3</sup> 7,1,1 τὰ Γερμανικὰ (sc. ἔθνη) μέχρι Βασταρῶν. 7,2,4 τί δ' ἐστὶ πέραν τῆς Γερμανίας . . . εἴτε Βαστάρων ἢ γρη λέγειν, ὡς οἱ πλείους ὑπονοοῦσιν κτλ. 7,3,17 ἐν δὲ τῇ μεσογαίᾳ Βαστάρων μὲν τοῖς Τυρρεταῖς ὁμοροὶ καὶ Γερμανοῖς. The *Bastarnae*, who in the Protogenes-inscription appear together with the *Sciri*, are here expressly mentioned as neighbours of the *Γερμανοί*. As the Latin *germani* is the exact equivalent of the Teutonic *Sciri*, it seems that the companions of the *Bastarnae* in both cases are the same and that the name *Sciri* in Strabo has been replaced by its Latin equivalent. Although Strabo's explanation (7,1,2) that the Germans were γνήσιοι *Γαλάται* is wrong, it remains a fact that the word γνήσιοι, with which he translates *Γερμανοί*, is in Greek the opposite of νόθοι, 'bastards'.

<sup>4</sup> *nat.* 4,13 *adversa tenent Bastarnae aliique inde Germani*. Cf. A. Stender-Petersen, *Slavisch-germanische Lehnwortkunde*, Göteborg 1927, 100 »Unter den *alii Germani*, die nach Plinius Worten *inde*, d.h. nördlich der galizischen Bastarnen, sassen, werden nur die mit den letzteren verbündeten . . . germanischen Skiren zu verstehen sein.»

substituted for *Sciri*, and if it is taken to be Latin it may be concluded that the same relation that exists between the opposite concepts *Sciri* — *Bastarnae* is continued between *Bastarnae* — *Germani*.

It may seem that the interpretation of *Germani* as a translation of *Sciri* contradicts the assumption that it means 'of the same blood', 'kinsmen by blood' = *consanguinei*. The difficulty, however, is merely apparent, as becomes evident when we recall that *Germani*, according to the interpretation of *Germ.* 2,3, also means 'of the same blood' = *proprii/sinceri/non mixti*, which in fact is fully equivalent to *Sciri*. In the light of these considerations it seems to me that both of the meanings, which are given to *Germani* in *Germ.* 2,3, are supported by independently established facts. Above all, it appears that the idea of the Germans being called *a se ipsis*, 'after their own racial characteristics', was not only due to the meaning of the Latin word *germani* but also to its Teutonic equivalent.

If *Germani* is the Latin translation of *Sciri* 'the Pure', 'the Unmixed', but is also used in the sense of 'kinsmen by blood' = *consanguinei*, the name *Sciri* should have the latter meaning too, i.e. it ought to be a word by which the Teutonic members of a federation, based on the principle of kinship by blood, referred to one another. Although the sources on the *Sciri* are very scanty,<sup>1</sup> there are in them certain facts which give support to this hypothesis. The most important are the ones that suggest a connection between the *Sciri* and the *Suebi*.

Pliny, in his classification of the Germans, refers the *Suebi* to the group of the *Hermiones*: *nat.* 4,100 *mediterranei Hermiones, quorum Suebi, Hermunduri, Chatti, Cherusci*. Thereupon he continues: *quinta pars Peucini Basternae supra dictis contermini Dacis*. Of the four peoples of the Plinian *Hermiones* the *Suebi* are the most eastern, from which it seems that Pliny considers the *Suebi* as neighbours of the *Peucini Basternae*. This conclusion also fits in with the fact that Tacitus mentions the *Suebiae finis* immediately before the *Peucini*: *Germ.* 46,1 *Hic Suebiae finis. Peucinorum Venethorumque et Fennorum nationes, etc.*

Mela 3,32 calls the *Hermiones ultimi Germaniae*. Since he continues his narrative with the description of *Sarmatia*, the word *ultimi* must be taken in the sense of 'easternmost': *ultra ultimi Germaniae Hermiones*. (33) *Sarmatia*

<sup>1</sup> See M. Schönfeld, *Wörterbuch der altgermanischen Personen- und Völkernamen*, Heidelberg 1965, 200.

*intus quam ad mare latior, ab his quae secuntur Vistula amne discreta, qua retro abit usque ad Histrum flumen inmittitur.* The wording of Mela is not quite clear, but it is most probably to be understood as *Sarmatia intus quam ad mare latior — ab his (Hermionibus) (ea,) quae secuntur, Vistula amne discreta (sunt) — qua retro abit usque ad Histrum flumen inmittitur*, i.e. the Vistula was to Mela the boundary between the Hermiones and Sarmatia.<sup>1</sup>

In Plin. *nat.* 4,97 the Sciri appear as inhabitants of the region near the Vistula to the west of the Sarmatae and Venedi: *Quidam haec habitari ad Vistulam usque fluvium a Sarmatis, Venedis, Sciris . . . tradunt.* The Venedi of Pliny are identical with the Venethi of Tacitus, placed in *Germ.* 46,1–2 after the *Suebiae finis* between the Peucini-Bastarnae in the south and the Fenni in the north. The Sciri must therefore represent the easternmost Suebi, as is also suggested by their name which is definitely Teutonic.

It may be noted that the Suebic origin of the Sciri has been suggested by E. Petersen, who, however, based his opinion on archaeological evidence. Petersen even thought it possible that the Sciri might have been among the participants of the religious ceremonies of the Semnones: »Da sie (sc. die Skiren) offenbar aus den westgermanischen Schweben herausgewachsen sind, dürfen wir annehmen, dass deren Geisteswelt und Religion auch im Volke der Skiren mächtig war. Vielleicht haben auch skirische Männer zu Festeszeiten schon jenen berühmten 'Fesselhein' der Semnonen aufgesucht, den wir in Brandenburg annehmen müssen und der sicher das höchste Heiligtum der Schweben gewesen ist.»<sup>2</sup>

The presumed Suebic origin of the Sciri opens new perspectives on our problem. The name *Sciri/Germani* can be explained as the opposite of *Bastarnae*, but if the Sciri also represent the Suebi, the question arises, as to whether the relation that prevails between the Sciri and the Bastarnae might also be established between the latter and the Suebic group as a whole. I think this is possible, for the Suebic tribes which according to Tac. *Germ.* 39,1 through their delegates assembled in the sacred grove of the Semnones, were *eiusdem*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* 4, Berlin 1900, 39 f. The evidence of Mela has been misunderstood by Haug, when he says of the Hermiones (*RE* s.v.): »Ihre Wohnsitze lagen . . . nach Mela im äussersten Norden.« According to Tacitus (*Germ.* 2,2) the Herminones (*hermiones* Bb<sup>1</sup> CE) were *medii*, which corresponds to the Plinian *mediterranei Hermiones*. The Hermiones thus were *ultimi mediterranei* in eastern Germany and as Mela does not mention any other group between them and the Vistula, the conclusion to be drawn is that he considered their abodes to extend as far as that river.

<sup>2</sup> *Vorgeschichte der deutschen Stämme*, herausgegeben von H. Reinerth, Leipzig 1940, III, 936.

*sanguinis populi*,<sup>1</sup> which is equivalent to *populi consanguinei*. It seems that the self-denomination of the Sciri, 'the Pure', 'the Unmixed', is to be derived from the Suebic habit of distinguishing themselves from others as 'peoples of the same blood'. Therefore, the fact that Tacitus makes Suebia end where the territory of the Peucini-Bastarnae begins cannot be due to an arbitrary generalization of the name *Suebi*, but must be based on the conditions then existing.<sup>2</sup>

The Suebic tribes which assembled in the grove of the Semnones did so to perform religious ceremonies, but it has been assumed that their confederacy was not only a religious amphictyony but also a political unity.<sup>3</sup> Much thinks that the words *eiusdem sanguinis populi* refer to a common origin of the tribes concerned, but as he does not believe that this was possible for all the Suebi he assumes that the participation in the ceremonies was limited to a restricted number of »real Suebi» (»wirkliche Sueben»)<sup>4</sup>. To me it would seem a more plausible hypothesis that the bond of union between the *eiusdem sanguinis populi* of Germ. 39 was rather the *consanguinitas*, 'kinship by blood', in the sense explained by Hirschfeld, although this assumption need not exclude the possibility that there also existed between the tribes concerned ties of kinship based on a common ancestry. Anyway, the Celto-Teutonic institution of 'kinship by blood' can scarcely be disconnected from the Suebic usage attested by Tacitus.

My hypothesis that the name *Sciri*/*Germani* is to be derived from the Suebic habit of distinguishing themselves from others as *eiusdem sanguinis populi* gains further support from several facts presented by B. Collinder in favour of his own theory that *Germani* might be considered as the Latin translation of *Suebi*.<sup>5</sup> A brief discussion of these facts is therefore worth while.

In several sources the names *Suebi* and *Germani* seem to be used without

<sup>1</sup> *Vetustissimos se nobilissimosque Sueborum Semnones memorant; fides antiquitatis religione firmatur. stato tempore in silvam auguriis patrum et prisca formidine sacram omnes eiusdem sanguinis populi legationibus coeunt caesoque publice homine celebrant barbari ritus horrenda primordia.*

<sup>2</sup> Just as the Suebi appear in Germ. 39 as *eiusdem sanguinis populi*, so the Peucini-Bastarnae, the first group mentioned by Tacitus after the *Suebiae finis*, are defined in 46, 1 as *conubiis mixtis foedati: Peucini, quos quidam Bastarnas vocant . . . conubiis mixtis nonnihil in Sarmatarum habitum foedantur.*

<sup>3</sup> Much, *Die Germania* 437 »Diese religiöse Feier im Semnonenhain, bei der Vertreter aller swebischen Stämme sich einfanden, war sicherlich nicht ein blosser Kultakt, hatte vielmehr auch eine politische Seite.»

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* 434.

<sup>5</sup> *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 59 (1944) 19 ff.

much differentiation. Ariovistus is called in *Caes. Gall.* 1,31,10 *rex Germanorum*, but his first wife, whom he had brought with him from his home, was *Sueba natione* (*Gall.* 1,53,4), from which it has been inferred that he himself also was a Suebian. The resemblance between Caesar's account of the Suebi in *Gall.* 4,1—3 and his description of the Germans in 6,21—23 is so striking that Collinder sees only two possible explanations: »either Caesar deliberately identified the Suebi with the Germani (which is rather difficult to believe), or he must have heard the two names used indiscriminately, without having a clear notion of this synonymy.»<sup>1</sup> I shall repeat here the table of the parallels in the two accounts, given by Collinder.

*Suebi.*

4,1,4 f. Quotannis singula milia armatorum bellandi causa suis ex finibus educunt. Reliqui, qui domi manserunt, se atque illos alunt. Hi rursus invicem *anno post* in armis sunt, illi domi remanent. Sic neque *agri cultura* nec ratio atque usus belli intermittitur. Sed privati ac separati *agri* apud eos nihil est, neque longius anno remanere uno in loco colendi causa licet.

Neque multum frumento, sed maximam *partem lacte* atque pecore vivunt multumque sunt *in venationibus*.

4,1,10 Atque in eam se consuetudinem adduxerunt, ut locis frigidissimis neque vestitus praeter *pellis* habeant quicquam, quarum propter exiguitatem magna est *corporis pars* aperta, et laventur *in fluminibus*.

4,3,1 Publice *maximam* putant esse *laudem* quam *latissime a suis finibus* vacare *agros*: hanc re significari magnum numerum civitatum suam vim sustinere non potuisse.

*Germani.*

6,22,2 f. Neque quisquam *agri* modum certum aut *finis* habet proprios, sed magistratus ac principes in annos singulos gentibus cognationibusque hominum quique una coierunt quantum et quo loco visum est *agri* adtribuunt atque *anno post* alio transire cogunt. Eius rei multas adferunt causas: ne adsidua consuetudine capti *studium belli* gerendi *agri cultura* commutent — —.

6,21,3 Vita omnis *in venationibus* atque in studiis rei militaris consistit — —.

6,22,1 *Agri culturae* non student, maiorque *pars* eorum victus *in lacte*, caseo, carne consistit.

6,21,5 — — et — — *in fluminibus* perluuntur et *pellibus* aut parvis renonum tegimentis utuntur, *magna corporis parte* nuda.

6,23,1 f. Civitatibus *maxima laus* est quam *latissime* circum se vastatis *finibus* solitudines habere. Hoc proprium virtutis existimant, expulsos *agris* finitimos cedere neque quemquam prope se audere consistere; simul hoc se fore tutiores arbitrantur, repentinae incursionis timore sublato.

The conclusion of Collinder is that »Caesar's procedure remains unintelligible unless we assume that to him *Suebi* and *Germani* might have meant approximately the same thing.»<sup>2</sup> This conclusion also finds support from

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.* 29.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* 30.

Tacitus, who like Caesar sometimes seems to use *Germani* and *Suebi* as synonyms: *Germ.* 43,1 *Retro Marsigni, Cotini, Osi, Buri terga Marcomanorum Quadorumque claudunt. e quibus Marsigni et Buri sermone cultuque Suebos referunt; Cotinos Gallica, Osos Pannonica lingua coarguit non esse Germanos;* 45,2 *ergo iam dextro Suebici maris litore Aestiorum gentes adluuntur, quibus ritus habitusque Sueborum, lingua Britannicae propior. . . . 3 frumenta ceterosque fructus patientius quam pro solita Germanorum inertia laborant;* 46,1 *Hic Suebiae finis. Peucinorum Venethorumque et Fennorum nationes Germanis an Sarmatis ascribam dubito. quamquam Peucini, quos quidam Bastarnas vocant, sermone cultu, sede ac domiciliis ut Germani agunt.* Furthermore, the statement of Cassius Dio that there were many tribes who claimed for themselves the name Σουήβοι (51,22 πολλοὶ γὰρ καὶ ἄλλοι τούτων τοῦ τῶν Σουήβων ὀνόματος ἀντιποιοῦνται) reminds us of Tac. *Germ.* 28,4 *Treveri et Nervii circa affectationem Germanicae originis ultro ambitiosi sunt.*<sup>1</sup>

The fact is that *Suebi*, like *Germani*, was the designation of a group of tribes, each of which had its own individual name.<sup>2</sup> As the Suebi in Tac. *Germ.* 39,1 are described as *eiusdem sanguinis populi* and Latin *germanus* is the synonym of *consanguineus*,<sup>3</sup> Collinder assumes that *Suebi* also has the same meaning and the name *Germani* is its Latin translation.<sup>4</sup>

The weak point in Collinder's hypothesis is that the etymology of *Suebi* is not quite clear. Much explains it from ur-Germanic \**Swēbōz*, which he derives from the pronominal stem \**svē*, \**svō* and translates as 'Leute vom eigenen Volk' or 'homines sui iuris' (cf. Gothic *swes*, adj., 'own, related', 'eigen, angehörig'; *swes*, noun, 'property', 'Eigentum') as the opposite of slaves or foreigners.<sup>5</sup> In *PBB* 20,3 he translates it as 'die dem eigenen Verbande Gehörigen', 'die freien Männer', and thinks that the name »zur Römerzeit auch noch als Appellativum in Geltung war und in seinem Sinne wohl verstanden wurde. So erklärt sich am einfachsten die Tatsache, dass — im Gegensatz zum gewöhnlichen Umfange des Begriffes Suebi — bei Tacitus alle die Germanen diesen Namen führen, die den Römern nie unterworfen, also frei und selbständig geblieben waren.«<sup>6</sup> Schönfeld also com-

<sup>1</sup> See p. 123 n. 2 above.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Tac. *Germ.* 38,1 *Nunc de Suebis dicendum est, quorum non una, ut Chattorum Tencterorumve gens; maiorem enim Germaniae partem obtinent, propriis adhuc nationibus nominibusque discreti, quamquam in commune Suebi vocentur.*

<sup>3</sup> See p. 125 n. 2 above.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* 32 f.

<sup>5</sup> *Die Germania* 58.

<sup>6</sup> Quoted from Collinder 31.

pares *Suebi* with Gothic *swes* and explains that »der Name gehört in die Kategorie derjenigen, welche auf Zusammengehörigkeit deuten (vgl. *Alamanni*, wahrscheinlich auch *Semnonēs*) und wäre vielleicht zu übersetzen mit 'Wir selbst'.«<sup>2</sup> Collinder prefers to assume that »*Suebi* is a compound word, the second part of which contains the Indo-European verbal stem *bhu-*, to *be*. *Suebus* may be an *o*-stem, as for instance Latin *super-bus* or *pro-bus* (I.E. — \**bhwo-*, which is supposed to occur also in Old Bulgarian *svoboda*, liberty), but it may also reflect a *u*-stem, cf. Sanskrit *svayambhū-*, durch sich selbst seiend, *pratibhū-*, Bürge, die Stelle vertretend von. If this be so, the name may be rendered 'sui generis, nostras, ἀὐτοφονής'. The Suebi called themselves so in their capacity of *eiusdem sanguinis populi*.»

Considering the synonymy of *germani/consanguinei*, I think that the Suebi, in their capacity of *eiusdem sanguinis populi*, could be called by the Romans *Germani* even though their own name had neither been translated to them in this way nor was connected with the Latin word semantically. Therefore, the fact that the two names *Suebi* and *Germani* are used indiscriminately need not imply that the latter was a translation of the former.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, the theory of Collinder is a noteworthy contribution, although his solution as such cannot be accepted.

The interpretation of *Germ.* 2,3 involves no problem when we take the name *Germani* as a Latin word and give it the two meanings 'of the same blood', 'kinsmen by blood' = *consanguinei* and 'of the same blood' = *proprii/sinceri/non mixti*. Both these meanings may also be attributed to the Teutonic name *Sciri*, 'the Pure', 'the Unmixed', because the origin of this self-denomination may be derived from the Suebic habit of distinguishing themselves as *eiusdem sanguinis populi* or *populi consanguinei*. Therefore, the name *Sciri* may be

<sup>2</sup> *RE* s.v. *Suebi* 579.

<sup>3</sup> In the third century the name of the Suebic *Semnonēs* is replaced by *Alamanni*, and the meaning of both names, according to Schönfeld, is the same (*RE* s.v. *Semnonēs* »... da *Semnonēs*, ablautend zu got. *samana* 'zusammen', wohl dasselbe bedeutet wie der später an seine Stelle getretene Name *Ala-manni* 'Allmänner'»). Nevertheless, *Alamanni* is also used indiscriminately with *Suebi* (*RE* s.v. *Suebi* 570), although in this case no semantic connection between the two names can be established. Cf. Walafr. Strab. *praef.* (*MG. SS. II*, 2–3, from the 9<sup>th</sup> century) *Nam cum duo sint vocabula (sc. Alamanni vel Suevi) unam gentem significantia, priori nomine nos appellant circum positae gentes quae latinum habent sermonem, sequenti usus nos nuncupat Barbarorum*. The name of one Suebic group (*Semnonēs*) is thus replaced by its synonym (*Alamanni*), which afterwards can be used to denote the whole group (*Alamanni vel Suevi*). A parallel to this development is that the name of the Suebic *Sciri* is replaced by its translation *Germani*, which then can be used in the sense of the generic *Suebi*.



considered as a word by which the Teutonic members of a federation, based on the principle of kinship by blood, referred to one another. If we assume that *Sciri* is the Teutonic equivalent of the Latin *Germani*, the Tacitean theory of the generalization of the name in two phases (*primum — mox*) needs some comments.

We cannot make a chronological distinction between the two meanings of *Germani*, as its Teutonic equivalent could already be understood in both ways. It is therefore not necessary to think that the generalization in the second phase only was due to the characteristics of the *Germani*, but it is more probable that this motive contributed to the development from the very beginning, for a name that can be connected with the physical type of a people easily becomes extended to all the peoples that correspond to the type in question.

As to the geographical area within which the name *Germani* was first used for tribes of Teutonic origin, the semantic connection between *Sciri/Germani* and *Bastarnae* suggests that it was in the east and not in the west that the Teutonic equivalent to 'kinsmen by blood' was first translated into Latin as *Germani*. But although the origin of the name leads us to the neighbourhood of the *Bastarnae*, its extensive generic use to cover all the tribes in the area called after them *Germania* may quite well be due to the Teutonic invasions of Gaul attested by Caesar.

I would sum up my analysis of *Germ. 2,3* with the following translation: »On the other hand, *Germania* is a modern name which has been recently given to the country, since those who first crossed the Rhine and drove out the Gauls, and are now called *Tungri*, were then called *Germani*; thus what had been the name of a nation, not of a race, gradually prevailed, so that all were called *Germani*, first after the conqueror from fear (i.e. because it was feared that they were *consanguinei/germani/foederati* of the conqueror) and subsequently, when they had got that name, after themselves (i.e. after their physical characteristics which made them appear to be 'of the same blood') as well.»<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The following details, not discussed in this treatise, may be added: With Anderson (*Germania*, Oxford <sup>2</sup>1958, 43) and Much (*Die Germania* 61) I take *additum* in the meaning of *inditum*, 'given', not in the sense of 'added' ('hinzugefügt'), as Melin (*art.cit.* 148 n. 4) thinks, basing his opinion on the traditional misinterpretation of *gentis appellationes* as 'Benennungen des Volkes'. *invento nomine* corresponds to *additum* as *Germani vocarentur* does to *Germaniae vocabulum* (Anderson 46). From this correspondence it follows that when *additum* is understood as 'given', *nomen invenire* must have the sense of 'to come by, get a name' (Norden, *Urg.* 337 'einen Namen bekommen'), not that of 'to invent a name' (Much 67, Anderson 46, Melin 58); *invento nomine* is to be considered with Melin (150) as an *ablativus absolutus*. The anti-

thesis *nunc . . . tunc* establishes for *vocati sint* the meaning 'were called', 'hiessen' (Anderson 44, Melin 148 n. 3) or 'were known as' and excludes the translation 'got the name', 'bekamen den Namen'. The point of time at which *Germani* began to be used as a designation of the invaders is left quite open, only the priority of *Germani* to *Germania* is clear (Kraft, *op.cit.* 43). The fact that the first invaders of Gaul at the time of their invasion are told to have been known as *Germani* in no way excludes an earlier use of the same word among the Romans to denote other groups from the Celto-Teutonic area, in which the institution of 'kinship by blood' is historically attested.