

refuge in the west. We may, therefore, take for granted that some of the Kimmerians had fled in a westerly direction. What, then, became of those who had gone west? Unless they are the Kimbri of the Romans, we have no trace of them.

2. The names Kimmerians and Kimbrians sound very much alike. There can be no philological difficulty in regarding them as the same name. The two "m's" of Kimmerian might easily become the "mb" of Kimbrian.

3. It was the general, if not the universal, opinion of the Greeks that the Kimbri were the descendants of the Kimmerians. Strabo expressly states that "the Greeks call the Kimbri Kimmerians." (Book VII., 2, 2.) Again, Plutarch tells us that the Kimbri were anciently called Kimmerians.

Let us now look back, and consider the certainties or probabilities at which we have arrived. It is as well to admit at once that we have arrived at no absolute certainties. It seems highly probable, however—indeed, almost certain—that the Kimmerians are the same people with the Gomer of Genesis and Ezekiel, the Gimirrai of the Assyrian Inscriptions. It seems also probable, though not to an equal degree, that the Kimbri of the Romans are merely the Kimmerians of the Greeks.

Having glanced at the history of the Kimmerians and Kimbri, let us return to the question with which we started: Are the Kelts of Kimmerian origin?

In behalf of the Kimmerian origin of the Kelts, the following arguments may be advanced:—

1. If the Kimmerians were the same people with the Gomer of the Bible—and we have every reason to believe that they were—they belonged to the Japhetic family. But this is the family to which the Kelts belong.

2. Gomer is placed first among the sons of Japhet. We regard this fact as an indication that the people called Gomer was the oldest branch of the Japhetic or Indo-Keltic family. But that the Kelts were the first band of emigrants from the original home of the Kelts, Germans, Latins, Slaves, Greeks, Persians and Aryan Hindus is almost a matter of certainty.