

were Thracians, and the latter were certainly not Germans. The other is that of Latham, who supposes, with much ingenuity, that the name of Get, or Goth, was the general name given by the Slavonic nations to the Lithuanians. According to this theory, the Goth-ones, or Guth-ones, at the mouth of the Vistula, mentioned by Tacitus and Ptolemy, are Lithuanians, and the Get-æ, on the Danube, belong to the same nation. Latham also believes that the Goths of a later period were Germans who migrated to the Danube, but that they did not bear the name of Goths till they settled in the country of the Getæ. See Latham, *The Germania of Tacitus*, Epil., p. xxxviii., seq.—W. Smith, *Note to Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 10.—“The first clear utterance of tradition among the Goths points to Sweden as their home. It is true that this theory of the Swedish origin of the Goths has of late been strenuously combatted, but until it is actually disproved (if that be possible) it seems better to accept it as a ‘working hypothesis,’ and, at the very least, a legend which influenced the thoughts and feelings of the nation itself. Condensing the narrative of Jornandes . . . we get some such results as these: ‘The island of Scanzia [peninsula of Norway and Sweden] lies in the Northern Ocean, opposite the mouths of the Vistula, in shape like a cedar-leaf. In this island, a warehouse of nations (‘*officina gentium*’), dwelt the Goths, with many other tribes,’ whose uncouth names are for the most part forgotten, though the Swedes, the Fins, the Heruli, are familiar to us. ‘From this island the Goths, under their king Berig, set forth in search of new homes. They had but three ships, and as one of these during their passage always lagged behind, they called her “Gepauta,” “the torpid one,” and her crew, who ever after showed themselves more sluggish and clumsy than their companions when they became a nation, bore a name derived from this circumstance, Gepidae, the Loiterers.’” Settling, first, near the mouth of the Vistula, these Gothic wanderers increased in numbers until they were forced once more to migrate southward and eastward, seeking a larger and more satisfactory home. In time, they reached the shores of the Euxine. “The date of this migration of the Goths is uncertain; but, as far as we can judge from the indications afforded by contemporary Roman events, it was somewhere between 100 and 200 A. D. At any rate, by the middle of the third century, we find them firmly planted in the South of Russia. They are now divided into three nations, the Ostrogoths on the East, the Visigoths on the West, the lazy Gepidae a little to the rear—that is, to the North of both. . . . It is important for us to remember that these men are Teutons of the Teutons. . . . Moreover, the evidence of language shows that among the Teutonic races they belonged to the Low German family of peoples: more nearly allied, that is to say, to the Dutch, the Frieslanders, and to our own Saxon forefathers, all of whom dwelt by the flat shores of the German Ocean or the Baltic Sea, than to the Sualiaus and other High German tribes who dwelt among the hills.”—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, introd., ch. 3 (r. 1).

ALSO IN: T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 6.—T. Smith, *Arminius*, pt. 2, ch. 2.—See, also, VANDALS.

Acquisition of Bosphorus.—“The little kingdom of Bosphorus, whose capital was situated on

the straits through which the Mæotis communicates itself to the Euxine, was composed of degenerate Greeks and half-civilized barbarians. It subsisted as an independent state from the time of the Peloponnesian war, was at last swallowed up by the ambition of Mithridates, and, with the rest of his dominions, sunk under the weight of the Roman arms. From the reign of Augustus the kings of Bosphorus were the humble but not useless allies of the empire. By presents, by arms, and by a slight fortification drawn across the Isthmus, they effectually guarded, against the roving plunderers of Sarmatia, the access of a country which, from its peculiar situation and convenient harbours, commanded the Euxine Sea and Asia Minor. As long as the sceptre was possessed by a lineal succession of kings, they acquitted themselves of their important charge with vigilance and success. Domestic factions, and the fears or private interest of obscure usurpers who seized on the vacant throne, admitted the Goths [already, in the third century, in possession of the neighboring region about the mouth of the Dnieper] into the heart of Bosphorus. With the acquisition of a superfluous waste of fertile soil, the conquerors obtained the command of a naval force sufficient to transport their armies to the coast of Asia.”—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 10.

A. D. 244-251.—First invasions of the Roman Empire.—As early as the reign of Alexander Severus A. D. (232-235) the Goths, then inhabiting the Ukraine, had troubled Dacia with incursions; but it was not until the time of the Emperor Philip, called the Arabian (244-249), that they invaded the Empire in force, passing through Dacia and crossing the Danube into Mæsia (Bulgaria). They had been bribed by a subsidy to refrain from pillaging Roman territory, but complained that their “stipendia” had not been paid. They made their way without opposition to the city of Marcianopolis, which Trajan had founded in honor of his sister, and which was the capital of one of the two provinces into which Mæsia had been divided. The inhabitants ransomed themselves by the payment of a large sum of money, and the barbarians retired. But their expedition had been successful enough to tempt a speedy repetition of it, and the year 250 found them, again, in Mæsia, ravaging the country with little hindrance. The following year they crossed the Hæmus or Balkan mountains and laid siege to the important city of Philippopolis—capital of Thrace, founded by Philip of Macedon. Now, however, a capable and vigorous emperor, Decius, was briefly wearing the Roman purple. He met the Goths and fought them so valiantly that 30,000 are said to have been slain; yet the victory remained with the barbarians, and Philippopolis was not saved. They took it by storm, put 100,000 of its inhabitants to the sword and left nothing in the ruins of the city worth carrying away. Meantime the enterprising Roman emperor had reanimated and recruited his troops and had secured positions which cut off the retreat of the Gothic host. The peril of the barbarians seemed so great, in fact, that they offered to surrender their whole booty and their captives, if they might, on so doing, march out of the country undisturbed. Decius sternly rejected the proposition, and so provoked his dangerous enemies to a despair which was fatal to him. In a terrible battle that was fought before