PART ONE

CELTIC EXPANSION IN THE LA TÈNE PERIOD

CHAPTER I

THE CELTS IN ITALY

I

THE CIVILIZATION OF LA TÈNE. EXTENSION OF GALLIC SETTLEMENTS IN GAUL

THE new movements of expansion mentioned in the last chapters of the previous volume, The Rise of the Celts, are the effects in general history of something that had been going on inside Gaul and the Celtic regions of Germany since the time of the first Celtic settlements in Aquitaine and in Spain and first Celtic inroads into Italy, that is, since 550 B.C. These events are marked in archæology by the change from the civilization called after Hallstatt to that called after La Tène. [See Rise (i.e. Hubert, The Rise of the Celts, in this series), ch. iv, § i.] All over the region situated west of the Alps and the Central Plateau, the change took place in less than a hundred years. From Provence [Déchelette, CCCXVIII, ii, 3, p. 999; cf. p. 1055, fig. 435, 6 (Gard).] to Thuringia [Schumacher, CCCCIX, i, p. 120.] the civilization of the first La Tène period is represented. It begins about 500. The spread of the new styles strikes one less by its rapidity than by its universality. Everywhere the Celts fell into line with those who had started the fashion. This is interesting evidence of the unity and continuity of the Celtic world. But the fashion did not change merely in dress, arms, pottery, or art; funeral rites also changed, and equally universally. Moreover, the area covered by the La Tène civilization almost everywhere extends beyond that of the Hallstatt culture. Inhabited sites are found closer together; vacant spaces are filled up. The Celtic population is at once more numerous and, in general, denser. Certainly colonization went on inside the Celtic world, and there were shiftings of the

population, perhaps conflicts and disorders. But on the whole there was an increase of power which had for consequence the colonizing expeditions into Britain and Italy and, later, into the Danube valley and, lastly, into Spain.

In craftsmanship [For changes introduced in material civilization, see *Rise*, ch. v.] the civilization of La Tène is the direct continuation of that of the last period of Hallstatt. It develops the legacy of Hallstatt; at least, it implies it as an immediate predecessor. We have seen this already: the La Tène sword is a dagger with antennæ, elongated; the La Tène brooch is a Certosa brooch, with an upturned foot, the end of which curls back towards the bow; the bracelets and torques are very much alike; and the pottery carries on the Hallstatt types with provincial peculiarities. The chief difference comes from the imitation of Greek objects and decoration, due to relations established either on the Marseilles side or by way of the Danube valley. The problem raised by these changes is entirely one of the simple problems connected with the history of the progress of civilizations. It is not so, in my opinion, with the funeral rites. Here the changes come about in quite a peculiar way.

At the end of the Hallstatt period, the practice of cremation was almost universal among the Celts. Moreover, the ashes of the dead were laid in tumuli of the same type as those containing the previous burials. On the other hand, we may say that for a period of over two hundred years, beginning about 500 B.C., the practice of cremation was almost abandoned, and that fairly abruptly, as it would appear. The change was not absolutely instantaneous, nor quite universal. Cremation-tombs of La Tène I have been found in the Haute-Marne and Haute-Saône and, above all, in the valley of the Rhine. But they are exceptional, and we may take it that the exception confirms the rule. It shows that the disappearance of the earlier rite was due to its being dropped by the same people as had formerly practised it, and that, since the new rule did not prevail all at once, it was not adopted as a matter of course.

Furthermore, the use of tumuli was given up in the Celtic world as a whole. The typical tomb of the La Tène period is an oblong grave, in which the body is laid with or without a coffin. [Déchelette, ii, 3, pp. 1030 ff.] This change, too, was abrupt in certain parts, but it was not universal.

In the old Hallstatt settlements, the Celts continued to build tumuli in the La Tène period. In Germany [Ibid., pp. 1063 ff.] all the tombs which can be dated between 500 and 400 B.C. are tumuli, and so are some of those dating from 400 to 300. In Switzerland, [Ibid., pp. 1082 ff.; Gruaz and Viollier in XVII, 1914 pp. 257 ff.; 1915 pp. 1 ff. (Gallic cemetery

at St. Sulpice, Vaud).] this practice continued for about a hundred years, till about 100. In Alsace, [Déchelette, ii, 3, pp. 1069 - 1070.] Lorraine, [Ibid., p. 1042.] Haute-Marne, [Ibid., pp. 1041 - 2.] Burgundy, and Franche-Comté, [Ibid., pp. 1043 ff.] the vast majority of La Tène tombs were found under tumuli.

But we must make a distinction. For one thing, the Celts of the tumulus countries utilized the old tumuli and dug new tombs in them; for another, we know a certain number of tumuli which were deliberately erected to cover several burials. So each tumulus might become a little cemetery. But it is none the less true that tumuli were built in the La Tène period in these regions to cover at least one principal tomb. On the whole, tumulus-building lasted in certain parts of the Celtic area until the third period of La Tène, that is, till the first century B.C.

Where Hallstatt tumuli were rare, the La Tène tombs are always flat-graves. This is so in the Department of the Marne, where there are so many La Tène cemeteries. [For maps of cemeteries of the La Tène period in the Dept. of the Marne see ibid., p. 1018, fig. 423.]

But here again there is a point to consider. In the cemeteries of the Marne and Aisne, mounds have been noted, which are tumuli, apparently empty. The cemetery of Nanteuil, in the Aisne, consisted in part of a vast tumulus, like the Burgundian tumuli which contain many graves. Lastly, such place-names as Les Buttes, La Motte, La Motelle, La Tomelle, coinciding with Gallic cemeteries, suggest tumuli which have disappeared. What is more, single tombs (like the chariot-burial at Berru) [Ibid., p. 1026, fig. 426.] and groups of tombs are surrounded by a circular ditch. Circular enclosure and tumulus are found simultaneously in yet other regions, in England for example, and stand for the same culture. It should be noted that in two places the tumulus won the day - in England [Ibid., pp. 1102 ff.] and in the lower valley of the Rhone, [Ibid., p. 1056.] where there were new Celtic settlements dating from La Tène. In both cases, we may suppose that the settlement took place before the time when the flat-grave was beginning to gain the upper hand. In England, moreover, the La Tène tumuli are probably just continuations of the round barrows of the previous inhabitants. So there was, at least, a period of varying practice, which continued longer, or even indefinitely, where there were many tumuli.

We have already seen one group of Celts giving up its tumuli for cemeteries of flat-graves. This was the branch which occupied Aquitaine and Spain. [See *Rise*, pp. 283 ff.] This is a change similar to that which we have just noted all over the Celtic world, and it may have come about in the same way. I am inclined to think that the flat-graves are tombs reduced to their simplest expression by communities which were denser than those of the Hallstatt age, and, therefore, more anxious to save

space and not to spread out their cemeteries. These are considerations which matter in the history of funeral rites. [Déchelette (ii, 3, p. 1015) ascribes the abolition of the tumulus to a desire to hide the grave, for protection, from the eyes of the foreigners in the midst of whom the Celts were advancing. But it must not be forgotten that the La Tène flat-graves are grouped in cemeteries. If they had been completely hidden, these tombs would have been dug one above another or would have cut one into another. This does occur, but rarely. We must conclude that the graves had outward marks, a monument perhaps or a small mound, a wooden post, or something of the sort.]

But we are still left with some novelties - the oblong grave, the coffin, and, above all, the orientation. In the flat-grave cemeteries, the dead are laid east and west, with the head to the west, and the older the cemetery is the more regular is this rule.

New practices imply new ideas. There can be no question of a cataclysm, with new peoples taking the place of old peoples wholesale. The spread of the new ideas may have been due to propaganda. More than once, one has to resort to this hypothesis to explain some general phenomenon revealing the moral life of prehistoric peoples. But how did the propaganda take place and who conducted it? It seems to me that we must imagine imitation on the one side and authority or the preponderance of new elements on the other - in any case, new demographic and social conditions.

For every change in the appearance of the prehistoric civilizations there has been a movement of the population, greater or less. So it was at the beginning of the La Tène period. The arrival of new peoples can be seen clearly at certain points.

One of these is the Department of the Marne. [Ibid., p. 1020, and app. v.] If we go by archæological finds alone, we find it with very few inhabitants in the Bronze Age and almost completely depopulated in the Hallstatt period. In the La Tène period, on the other hand, it was covered with a very dense population. No less than 191 Gallic cemeteries have been found there. Within about twenty years, over a hundred tombs have been explored. In the cemetery of Les Croncs, at Bergères-les-Vertus, over a thousand have been opened. This large number of cemeteries represents a numerous and entirely new population. For one cannot suppose that all Hallstatt tumuli have succeeded in escaping the eye of the antiquary in this department, where tomb-hunting is almost a sport.

Another region, which was, indeed, inhabited in Hallstatt times, but sparsely, received in the La Tène period a fairly large population, quite differently grouped, and that was Switzerland. [Viollier, CCCCXCII, pp. 59 ff.] There the La Tène tombs are distributed in two groups. An eastern group extends from Basle to the lakes of Zurich and the Four Cantons. Near Basle there is a large cemetery, that of

Muttenz. The valleys of the Glatt, the Limmatt, and the Reuss contain Celtic cemeteries. A region in which the Aar still receives a few small tributaries divides this group from the western, which extends from the neighbourhood of Berne to the Lake of Geneva. The centre of the first group is Zurich and that of the second is Berne. In the district of Berne alone, in the immediate environs of the city, eighteen cemeteries of the La Tène period are known. The Hallstatt tumuli were in quite small groups, corresponding to a population which changed its abode easily. The cemeteries of La Tène are those of a fixed population. In some of them over two hundred tombs have been opened. Between these two settlements, the old groupings of the Hallstatt population do not seem to have been touched. We shall see later to what extent we must suppose them to have been penetrated by new elements.

We may picture bodies forcing their way across older settlements. In Haute-Saône [Déchelette, ii 3, p. 1046 (cemetery at Mercey).] a small Marne cemetery has been found, which probably represents the settlement of a small colony of new-comers. Further south, in Dauphiné and the Alps, [E. Chantre, in *Bull. Anthr. et biolog. de Lyon*, 1913 - 17, pp. 17 ff. (cemetery at Genas, Isère); H. Muller, in CXLVI, 1920, pp. 10 ff. (cemetery at Pariset, near La Tour-sans-Venin, Isère).] cemeteries or single tombs of the Marne type stand for recent settlements, the density of which we have no means of estimating. In Provence [Vasseur, in XI, xiii, 3, 1903 (Le Baou-Roux); cf. Déchelette, ii, 3, p. 1001. The fortified enclosures of Provence were occupied from 600 B.C. onwards and abandoned about 125 B.C. Cf. Justin, 4s, 4.] there are no burials of the new type, but objects of the first La Tène period found in the fortified enclosures, particularly brooches, announce the arrival of Celts in a new domain.

In the west, except in Normandy [Déchelette, ii, 3, p. 1060.] and certain places in Brittany [Ibid., pp. 945 - 6, 1060.] and Berry, [Ibid., pp. 1049 - 1050.] the chance which guides archæological discoveries has been very unfavourable to the Gauls. The archæological map of the cemeteries is almost blank. [Ibid., map iii (La Tène tombs and cemeteries in France).] The few swords found in the dragging of rivers would not fill it. And yet we must suppose that at this time there were Celts settled everywhere between the Seine and the Garonne. This blank space in the map leaves room for all kinds of conjecture. In any case, we may suppose that the settlements developed gradually and that those which reached furthest forward do not belong to the early phase of the La Tène civilization.No normal increase of the old Celtic occupants of Lorraine and Alsace, of Burgundy and Franche-Comté, would have sufficed for the foundation of the new settlements in Champagne, Switzerland, Dauphiné, and Provence, to say nothing of the others. We are therefore compelled to imagine something similar to what I have suggested as an explanation of the Hallstatt

occupation, a sort of drift of the Celtic tribes from the Rhine valley and beyond, or possibly definite invasions. It is, moreover, hard to believe that the evolution of the Hallstatt types of object from which the types characteristic of the La Tène culture sprang occurred anywhere but in the German domain of the Celts. Indeed, transitional forms abound in Germany whereas they are rare in France. It is in Germany that the civilization of La Tène makes its first appearance and first becomes really rich. I think, therefore, that on the whole it originated in Germany, and that it was from Germany that, between 500 and 400 B.C., the bodies set out which peopled Switzerland on the one side, Champagne on the other, and all the other districts which we can suppose to have been covered by this colonization. From where exactly did they start? Probably from more than one point in Celtic Germany. [Rademacher, in Ebert, CCCXXIV, s.v. "Kelten ", vi, pp. 285 - 6.] The question will arise later.

Lastly, although the funeral rites of the Gauls of this epoch are those of a military people which sends its men into the next world in fighting-gear, or at least in parade-dress, I cannot help noting the peaceful character of the new Celtic settlements.

We must picture the population of Champagne as dispersed in large open villages, which must necessarily have been agricultural villages. Champagne had not attracted the Hallstatt stock-breeders. I am inclined to think that, among the progress made by Celtic civilization in the La Tène period, there was some in agriculture, and that the men who stayed in Champagne knew how to make use of the dry slopes of its hills and, still more, of the richer uplands of the Aisne, with their heavy soil, where we also find them established. It is probable that the plough, [Déchelette, ii 3, pp. 1378 ff.; Dottin CCCXXII, pp. 192 ff.; Reinecke, in LXVII, 1919, pp. 17 ff.] a good plough, the Gallic name of which survived in Roman Gaul (carruca), with a coulter and probably wheels, was the invention which made it possible to till this ground. I imagine the landscape which they created in Champagne and the Aisne as something like that part of the country which has not been given over to vineyards, with ploughed fields running down the sides of the hills. [H. Muller-Brauel, in LXXXV, 1926, pp. 184 ff.] Their settlements in Switzerland were of the same character, and presented the same appearance. They still do; the contrast between the ploughed hillsides and the upland pasture-ground about Berne and the Lake of Thun is very remarkable and strange. It is a spectacle which implies peoples of different economic habits living side by side. But in my opinion it is a prehistoric spectacle.

I have called attention to the great number of Gallic names in -magus and in

-ialum in Gaul properly so called. They designate settlements in the plains, agricultural markets or centres of activity. [Jullian, CCCXLVII, i, pp. 238 ff.]

But there is something more. Except in Germany and Provence, where special circumstances and the presence of unruly neighbours compelled the Gauls to stand on their guard, there are no fortified places belonging to the earlier periods of La Tène. The Hallstatt forts had been abandoned and the Gallic *oppida* were not yet built. For instance, in Franche-Comté, the occupation of the camp of Château-sur-Salins, [Piroutet, in CXXXIX, 1928, 2, pp. 266 ff.] which was an admirable site for a fortress, seems to have been interrupted in La Tène I.

It is surprising to come upon a peaceful Gaul just before the invasions of Italy and Greece, but we have to accept it. That all went smoothly always, it would be rash to imagine. That there were no shiftings of population, no fluctuations of frontiers, is very unlikely; that there were no small wars is impossible; and we should find evidence of them if we examined these very cemeteries of the Marne. But the Gauls of France did not live in a world of constant violence and strife. Therefore their communities developed and multiplied in peace. Their nations and tribes generally lived on terms of international justice and policy which made it possible for social life to become organized. Indeed, that is why they had the surplus man-power and the inter-tribal concord which allowed them to make the great expeditions to which we now come.

ITALY II

THE GREAT GALLIC INVASION OF ITALY

The civilization of La Tène spread in France between 500 and 400 B.C. It is just about this latter date that we must place the Celtic invasion of Italy which was the first of the great historical-expeditions of the Celts.

All the ancient historians agree in describing the descent of the Celts into Italy as a mass invasion on the part of a people which was a huge army, speedily ending in the extermination of the former occupants of the country and the foundation of a very large colony. At the bottom of all their accounts there is

doubtless a version written for the occasion which probably comes from Timagenes. [Niese, in Pauly and Wissowa, CCCLXVIII, vii, col. 613; Hirschfeld, in CLXVIII, 1894, p. 331; d'Arbois, CCXLVIII, xii, p. 51; Müllenhoff, CCCLXII, ii, p. 613; Jullian, CCCXLVII, i, p. 281.] But, apart from the fact that Timagenes generally had fairly good information, in the account of the earliest Gallic wars there are probably good traditional elements, for which the Celts themselves were partly responsible. Gallic historians like Cornelius Nepos, who was an Insubrian, and Trogus Pompeius, who was a Vocontian, may have had a part in handing them on. This history, in which both sides have collaborated, is assuredly epic and heroic rather than purely historical.

But after all, the accuracy of the anecdotal details does not matter much. The history of the first Gallic wars appears to have been built up on a fairly sure chronological foundation with materials which are rather fabulous, but nevertheless of very great value, much like all that part of ancient history which has not been written by contemporaries. On the whole, it has survived criticism remarkably well. Archæology adds to it without correcting it.

It is of capital interest to us, in that it gives us the earliest information that we have of at all a detailed kind about the making of a Celtic settlement, and this information seems to be trustworthy. There is an artificial confederation of tribes from different districts, some newly formed, others old, among which foreign bodies may find a place. They go forward. Some settle down at once. Others hesitate and take longer to find their resting-place. They go about the country, fighting, treating, employing policy. Others follow them, summoned by them or tempted by their example. At last they are so many that they form a huge mass. Corners and outlines are rubbed away. The Gauls, with their curiosity about civilization, become assimilated to their new surroundings. They prosper in peace, but their political formations disintegrate and finally collapse.

All the historians except Livy [See *Rise* pp. 263 - 4.] run events together, placing them between 396 and 386 B.C. [Homo, CCCXLI, English, pp. 165 ff.; Grenier, DXXIX, pp 64 ff.; Meyer, CCCLIV, v, pp. 151 ff.] But Livy's account is not substantially different from the rest. Of the first invasion he only gives the date, and on the whole he passes it over. A certain number of chronological concordances have been established - the first year of the ninety-eighth Olympiad and the Archonship of Pyrgion in Athens (388 - 387 B.C.), [Dion., i 74; App., *Celtica*, 2, 1.] the Archonship of Theodotos, the Peace of Antalcidas, the siege of Rhegion, and the second year of the ninety-eighth Olympiad (387 - 386 B.C.). [Polyb., i, 6; Diod., xiv, 113, 1; Just., vi, 6, 5.] Cornelius Nepos [Pliny, *N.H.*, iii, 125; Unger, *Römisch-griechische Synchronismen vor Pyrrhos*, repr. from XXI, 1876, 1.] places the

entrance of the Gauls into Italy at the same time as the capture of Veii by Camillus, in 396. In Roman chronology, the uncertainty of the particular date is due to the way in which dictators may have upset the reckoning of Consulships. [O. Leuze, CCCLI, passim.] At all events, we may agree to place the capture of Rome in the year 387 - 386.

The most interesting thing which Livy adds to the accounts of his fellow-historians is the idea of a kind of political plan, which he supposes to have lain behind the expedition. The Celticum formed a confederation, at the head of which was the King of the Bituriges, whose name at that time was Ambicatus. [Livy, v, 34. The Gaul of Ambicatus, with its High King, provided by one of the confederate nations, is constituted like the Ireland of St. Patrick's day.] The population exceeded the normal size of agricultural tribes attached to the land. [The development of the Celtic family, as we know it in Ireland and Wales, results in the exclusion of a certain number of individuals from the original property of the family, and this necessitates periodical divisions of property between families or emigrations.] Ambicatus resolved to send out two colonies under the command of his nephews on the distaff side, [Livy, loc. cit.: sororis filios.] his heirs, Sigovesus and Bellovesus. He made them strong enough to break all resistance. [Ibid.: ne qua gens arcere advenientes posset.] Trogus Pompeius compares the Gallic expedition to a ver sacrum, [Just., XXIV, 4.] that is to one of the religious emigrations practised by the Italic peoples.

Apart from this difference, the facts are set forth by most historians in much the same fashion. [Plut., Cam., 15; Dion., xiii, 14 ff.; Polyb., ii, 17 ff.; Pliny, ii, 125; xii, 5; Cato, p. 36; Aul. Gell., xvii, 13, 4; App., Celtica, ii, 1; Historia Romana, iv, 2; Diod., xiv, 113, 1; Just., xx, 5.] The Insubres, Boii, and Senones destroy a large Etruscan town, Melpum, perhaps Melzo, west of Milan. They found Milan and a certain number of other towns. Following up their successes against the Etruscans, they attack Clusium (Chiusi). The Romans grow disturbed, negotiate, and send a relief army which is defeated on the Allia. Rome is taken, and then saved by the geese of the Capitol and Camillus.

According to some, the Gauls are wiped out. According to others, they retire fairly quietly to their settlements in Romagna, being recalled by an inroad of Veneti. [Polyb., ii, 18, 3.] The Gauls are said to have had guides. Some accounts speak of a noble of Clusium named Aruns, [Livy, v, 35; Plut., Dion., locc. citt.] seeking vengeance on his wife and his Lucumo ward; others, more significant, refer to Elico, a Helvetian smith working in Rome. [Pliny, xii, 5.]

In every case, it is the riches of Italy, the fruit, the figs, the wine, that draw the barbarians from their less kindly regions. The men who summon them bring them samples of these delights. What all historians have faithfully recorded, is the terror sown among the peoples of Italy by the approach of the Gauls. [Livy, v, 35, 4; 36,

2; 37, 2; 38, 6; 39. 1.] These queer-looking barbarians, coming from so far, were to the Italy of the fourth century before Christ what the Scourge of God was to the Gaul of the fifth century after Christ, an unavoidable, irresistible, God-sent calamity. The army which came down into Italy is rated at 300,000 men, that which triumphed at the Allia at about 30,000. These were terrifying hosts for Etruria and Latium, which were only accustomed to wars between one city and another. The battle of the Allia, Alliensis clades, was a rout, for which the Romans blushed until the end of the Empire. The war-cry of the Gauls, rising on all sides before the troops made contact, seems to have provoked a wild stampede. As for the evacuation of Rome, of which Livy gives us a remarkably objective picture, it was creditable to a few only. In any case, the Gauls were no gentle foes. They were in the first frenzy of their onrush. They came forward ravaging the country and burning the towns. [e.g. Mazarbotto (Montelius, DXXXIV, p. 410; Grenier, DXXIX, p. 99). Herr von Duhn (in Ebert, CCCXXIV, s.v. "Kelten ", vi, p. 207) seems to deny that the city was destroyed; but I think he is mistaken. Doubtless it was partially reoccupied by the Gauls.] No doubt, they had a law covering foreign relations and were accustomed to negotiating; indeed, we are told that they did negotiate. [Livy, v, 35.] But one can easily believe that these parleys gave rise to hopeless misunderstandings. The Gauls, being strong, and not properly understood, were touchy, and they seem to have been lacking in patience.

The deliverance of Rome did not put an end to their attacks. They returned into the valley of the Tiber and to Rome itself in 367, [Livy, iv, 42, 8; vii, 1, 3; Polyb., ii, 18, 6 -7.] in 361 - 360, [Livy, vii, 11, 1; 12, 8.] and in 350 - 349. [Ibid., vii, 26, 9; cf. Homo, CCCXLI, English, p, 175.] They descended into Campania in 360 and in 349. In 367 and in 349 they went as far as Apulia. [Livy, loc. cit.; Diod., xiv, 117, 7.] The dates of these expeditions are uncertain, and so is their relative size, but we have one piece of archæological evidence in the shape of a small cemetery at Canossa di Puglia. [Prähist. Blätt., 1898, pp. 49 - 56.] At the same time they went much further, into Greece, whither Dionysios I of Syracuse sent a body of them which he had taken into his service. [E. Cavaignac, in CXL, 1924, pp. 359 ff. The first relations of Dionysios with the Gauls seem to have been in 379, at the time of the siege of Croton.]

South of the Apennines, these Gallic expeditions were merely raids, which began to turn into expeditions of mercenaries. They had not the rapid successes of the campaigns in the plain of the Po. The fact is, that north of the Apennines the Gauls had had only Etruscans before them, who really formed nothing but a fairly recent colony there, and fortified places were rare. South of the Apennines, both in Etruria and in Latium and Umbria, the Gauls found themselves in the midst of a quantity of very ancient little cities, all fortified and perched in good situations. But the strength of their walls was only the instrument of their resistance. The cause of

that resistance and its success was that they were political bodies, which refused to yield in a war undertaken *pro aris et focis*, and would not die. The greatest disaster seems to have been that of Rome, and Rome had at once formed again with its army outside its ravaged soil.

Livy, in the chapters of Book V in which he describes the Gallic invasion, makes it plain, with the understanding, lucidity, and descriptive power of a great historian, that the Gauls were not then capable of subduing the determination to live and to conquer embodied in political units which were far superior to their own. Moreover, they did as all conquering armies do in warm and fertile countries. At first they let themselves go, taking what they pleased. Livy shows them to us, gorged with eating and drinking, even rasher and more careless than usual after their too easy victories, and falling into drunken slumber wherever the night happened to overtake them. Then comes the plague, which we may take to have been dysentery. They are encamped among the ruins of Rome, in the dust and ash of the burning city. It is summer, and the weather is hot for these men of the north. Disease spreads among them like cattle-plague, vulgatis velut in pecua morbis. Dead bodies accumulate, and have to be burned in heaps (usually they buried their dead). With the plague comes famine. The Gauls are no better organized for conducting large armies than the Italic peoples, but the latter at least know how to conduct small ones. They have no commissariat, and they have laid the country waste. Lastly, they know nothing about field fortification or intelligence, and they allow themselves to be surprised.

None the less, the effects of the terror died hard. Until 349 the Romans remained on the defensive. From that date onwards, it seems, they took courage, and turned upon their enemies. The Gauls were so surprised at the first encounter, Polybios tells us, that they stopped short and scattered. [Polyb., ii, 18, 7.] Indeed, peace seems to have been concluded about 335.[Ibid., xix, 1 (the Thirty Years' Peace).]

The general outcome was that, while Gallic inroads penetrated as far as the end of Italy, the Gallic conquest stopped at the Apennines. But in what manner did it take place? Is it true that the Gauls came in like a whirlwind, and where did they make their entry? That is the first question which we shall discuss. After that, we shall inquire how the Gauls conducted themselves in Italy, what were their general relations with their neighbours, and what became of their civilization in that country.