

# CAMPANIAN CHRONOLOGY IN THE FIFTH CENTURY B.C.<sup>1</sup>

## *Testimonia*

1. The establishment of the Campanian nation (Diod. 12. 31. 1).

*Ἐπ' ἄρχοντας δ' Ἀθήνησι Θεοδώρου (438/7) Ῥωμαῖοι μὲν κατέστησαν ὑπάτους Μάρκον Γενύκιον καὶ Ἀγρίππαν Κούρτιον Χίλωνα (445/4). ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων κατὰ μὲν τὴν Ἰταλίαν τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Καμπανῶν συνέστη, καὶ ταύτης ἔτυχε τῆς προσηγορίας ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς τοῦ πλησίον κειμένου πεδίου.*

2. Carthaginian expedition to Sicily (Livy 4. 29. 8).

(Coss. T. Quinctius L. f. Poenus Cincinnatus, Cn. Julius Mento : 431/30 B.C.).

Insigni magnis rebus anno additur nihil tum ad rem Romanam pertinere visum, quod Carthaginienses, tanti hostes futuri, tum primum per seditiones Siculorum ad partis alterius auxilium in Siciliam exercitum traiecere.

3. The Samnite 'capture' of Capua (Livy 4. 37. 1-2).

(Coss. C. Sempronius Atratinus, Q. Fabius Vibulanus : 423/22 B.C.).

Peregrina res, sed memoria digna traditur eo anno facta, Volturnum, Etruscorum urbem, quae nunc Capua est, ab Samnitibus captam Capuamque ab duce eorum Capye, vel, quod propius vero est, a campestri agro appellatam. Cepere autem prius bello fatigatis Etruscis in societatem urbis agrorumque accepti, deinde festo die graves somno epulisque incolas veteres novi coloni nocturna caede adorti.

4. The Samnite capture of Cumae.

- a. Livy 4. 44. 12 (Cons. tribunes L. Quinctius Cincinnatus, L. Furius Medullinus, M. Manlius, A. Sempronius Atratinus : 420/19).

Eodem anno a Campanis Cumae, quam Graeci tum urbem tenebant, capiuntur.

- b. Diod. 12. 76. 4 (Archonship of Aristion : 421/0; coss. T. Quinctius Poenus Cincinnatus II, A. Cornelius Cossus : 428/7).

*περὶ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν Καμπανοὶ μεγάλην δυνάμει στρατεύσαντες ἐπὶ Κύμην ἐνίκησαν μάχῃ τοὺς Κυμαίους καὶ τοὺς πλείους τῶν ἀντιταχθέντων κατέκοψαν. προσκατιζόμενοι δὲ τῇ πολιορκίᾳ καὶ πλείους προσβολὰς ποιησάμενοι κατὰ κράτος εἶλον τὴν πόλιν. διαρπάσαντες δ' αὐτὴν καὶ τοὺς καταληφθέντας ἑξαδραποδισάμενοι τοὺς ἱκανοὺς οἰκήτορας ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπέδειξαν.*

THE archaeological details of the Samnite entry into Campania in the fifth century are still largely unknown, but the literary authorities give a few indications of the chronology. According to them, the story runs roughly as follows. By about 438/7 some of the newcomers were sufficiently numerous and well

<sup>1</sup> I should like to thank Professor N. G. L. Hammond for his criticisms of an earlier draft of this paper.

organized to assume the name 'Campani',<sup>1</sup> and for a period of several years they seem to have been assimilated into the existing social order, but finally Capua was taken over by them in 423 *vulg.*,<sup>2</sup> and Cumae a year or two later.<sup>3</sup> Many of the Cumaeans who survived the Samnite attack fled to Neapolis, where they were hospitably received.<sup>4</sup> What then happened at Neapolis itself is not entirely clear. Presumably the Cumaeans fled to a city that was still free from Samnite control. But according to Strabo<sup>5</sup> the Neapolitans 'later' had to accept Samnites into their citizen-body. Strabo does not specify when this took place, but after the fall of both Capua and Cumae, Neapolis can hardly have held out for long against Samnite pressure, even with a stiffening of refugees from Cumae. The effects of the fall of Cumae on the population of Neapolis were therefore twofold: first, an influx of Cumaean refugees, followed probably at no great interval by the admission of Samnites. Recent work on the fifth-century coinage of Neapolis has shown that both these substantial changes in the composition of the citizen-body were reflected in the coins issued by the city; the date of the fall of Cumae into Samnite hands is therefore crucial for the chronology of the earliest Neapolitan issues and calls for detailed discussion. The problem should not be treated in isolation, but in relation to other dated events in fifth-century Campanian history.

The point of departure is Diodorus' account of the capture of Cumae. First of all, who is the source for Diodorus' narrative at this point? In his discussion of the sources of Book 16 of Diodorus' history, Hammond concluded<sup>6</sup> that 'Diodorus employed a simple method of composition: he chose the author whom he considered to be the best standard author of convenient scale and derived his own narrative from that one source'. Ephorus was initially his source for Greek and Persian affairs, and Theopompus for Sicilian affairs; then, since each of these two authorities failed him in the middle of the book, he turned to Diyllus and Timaeus respectively. In Book 16 the Sicilian narratives are long and consecutive, and occupy a major portion of the book. In Book 12 on the other hand references to western affairs are comparatively brief, especially after the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. Events from 431 to 421 inclusive are narrated in chapters 38–76. The only references to events in the west are chapters 53–4 (the embassy from Leontini to Athens and the Athenian intervention in Sicily), chapter 64 (an episode from Rome's wars against the Aequi), and chapter 76. 4 (the Samnites at Cumae). Clearly Diodorus was not, in chapters 38–76, treating western affairs with any fullness, and it is most unlikely that he was using a separate Greek source for them. There can be little doubt that he was using one standard author for these years, with the exception of chapter 64, which is possibly derived from a Latin source. Moral tales of the kind there related were a commonplace in the Roman tradition,<sup>7</sup> and in Diodorus' narrative it is the only event recorded for 425/4. The introduction to the chapter is apparently taken from the chronological source, but this latter could not be the source of the chapter as a whole. If one author was the source for the remaining events from 431 to 421, who was he? There are good grounds for identifying him as Ephorus.

At 12. 41. 1 Diodorus cites Ephorus by name as the source for his account of the causes of the Peloponnesian War, and his known methods of work

<sup>1</sup> Diod. 12. 31. 1.    <sup>2</sup> Livy 4. 37. 1–2.

<sup>3</sup> Diod. 12. 76. 4; Livy 4. 44. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Dion. Halic. 15. 6. 4.

<sup>5</sup> 5. 4. 7 (246).

<sup>6</sup> *CQ* xxxii (1938), 149.

<sup>7</sup> Sallust, *Cat.* 9. 4.

combine with the internal evidence of the text to prove that he continued to use Ephorus for the subsequent narrative. An Ephoran bias in favour of Athens is several times apparent in Diodorus' account of the Archidamian War.<sup>1</sup> In chapters 53 and 54, the prelude to Athenian intervention in Sicily and the progress of the expedition itself are described all under one year, an arrangement that may reflect the grouping of material *κατὰ γένος* which Diodorus describes as characteristic of Ephorus.<sup>2</sup> Finally, the most likely explanation of the sudden appearance of Cumae at 12. 76. 4 is that the passage is derived from Ephorus. The latter had a partiality for digressions<sup>3</sup> and his enthusiasm for his native city of Cyme in Asia Minor was so well known that it was the object of some ridicule;<sup>4</sup> he was no doubt interested in the fortunes of Cyme's sister, or cousin, in the west, and was prepared to give prominence to it. The Diodoran notice about Cumae is a chronologically compressed account of what happened. The advance of the Campanians and their victory in battle precede a fairly lengthy siege and the capture of the city; the aftermath includes not only the customary plunder and selling-off of captives, but also the settlement of Campanian colonists. This again seems to reflect an Ephoran method of composition. If the source for the whole of chapter 76 was Ephorus, then the Cumaean events were mentioned by him as being contemporary with events which we know belong to the Attic year 421/0, immediately after the Archidamian War ended.<sup>5</sup> The actual capture should therefore be put in the earlier of those two years, that is, in 421.

Diodorus is not alone in referring to the capture of Cumae: Livy mentions it very briefly under the year 420 *vulg.*<sup>6</sup> It was argued by Heurgon<sup>7</sup> that since Livy and Diodorus give almost identical dates for the capture of Cumae, their chronological calculations were based on a common source which must have been Greek, perhaps even Timaeus. In a recent article<sup>8</sup> M. W. Frederiksen provisionally followed Heurgon: '... the near agreement between Livy and Diodorus' chronographic source tends to show that Livy's dates are trustworthy'; Cumae passed into the power of Oscan-speaking tribes in 421. I agree with this dating of the event, but in my view it depends on a recognition of the relation of Diod. 12. 76. 4 to the narrative of Ephorus, and not on any reference either to Diodorus' chronographic source or to the Livian dating. Diod. 12. 76. 4 cannot come from the chronographic source. The latter regularly gives archons, consuls, and Olympiads, and occasionally authors,<sup>9</sup> and kings,<sup>10</sup> but very little more; certainly never an account, however abbreviated, of a military campaign.

The Livian chronology needs more discussion. A recent study of the text of the early books of Livy isolated and identified some of the underlying sources<sup>11</sup> and showed in particular that the notices of the capture of Cumae in 420 *vulg.*, of a Carthaginian expedition to Sicily in 431 *vulg.* (4. 29. 8; testimonia, 2), and of the Samnite *coup d'état* at Capua in 423 *vulg.* (4. 37. 1-2; testimonia, 3), are the only notes of their kind in Books 1-5, and that they all derive from

<sup>1</sup> G. L. Barber, *The Historian Ephorus*, 90 ff. and Appendix IX.

<sup>2</sup> 5. 1. 4.

<sup>3</sup> G. L. Barber, *op. cit.* 132 and 152.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo 13. 3. 6 (623).

<sup>5</sup> Compare Diodorus' use of the formula *περὶ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους* here and at 12. 82. 3.

<sup>6</sup> 4. 44. 12 (testimonia, 4).

<sup>7</sup> *Capoue préromaine*, 85 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *Dialoghi di Archeologia*, ii (1968), 4 and note 3.

<sup>9</sup> e.g. Antiochus, 12. 71. 2.

<sup>10</sup> e.g. Artaxerxes and Xerxes, 12. 64. 1; Xerxes, Sogdianus, and Darius, 12. 71. 1.

<sup>11</sup> R. M. Ogilvie (*JRS* xlviii [1958], 40-6); cf. also *id.*, *Livy, Books 1-5*, 580-1.

Licinius Macer, who in his turn used the *libri lintei* as the source for his eponymous magistrates. Ultimately the three notices may go back to a western Greek source, and possibly entered the Roman tradition through a work such as Cato's *Origines*. Cato was certainly interested in Campanian chronology.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand it can be shown that the *libri lintei* used by Licinius and quoted from him by Livy omitted names, muddled *cognomina*, and failed to distinguish censors from consular tribunes.<sup>2</sup> This would present an additional hazard to a Roman author writing in an annalistic framework, and already faced with the problem of placing correctly the isolated details of South Italian and Sicilian history. What, for example, are we to make of Livy's report of the Carthaginian expedition to Sicily in 431 *vulg.*? The wording of the text is inaccurate since Carthaginians did not 'then for the first time' send an army across to Sicily. After 480 the first major Carthaginian intervention in Sicilian affairs took place in 409, and neither Diodorus nor Thucydides gives any hint of either a Carthaginian expedition to Sicily or a threat of one between those dates. Recent historians of Carthage and Sicily are agreed that in the middle of the fifth century, and for many years after, Carthaginian energies were absorbed in consolidating a land empire in North Africa and in coping with important internal political changes.<sup>3</sup> Almost certainly, Licinius and Livy were mistaken in putting a Carthaginian expedition to Sicily in 431 *vulg.* Is there a purely mechanical explanation of their error? One of the consuls of 409, L. Furius, was the son of the consul of 432, who bore the same name. But the correspondence of the dates is not quite exact enough to carry conviction as a possible explanation of Licinius' mistake.

Livy's account of events at Capua in 423 *vulg.* contains an intriguing variety of information (*testimonia*, 3). The city, then called Volturnus and held by Etruscans, was captured by the Samnites and renamed Capua. Two derivations of the new name are suggested, one of which does not fit. The word *captam* is then defined and turns out to be in some sense a rebellion of people who some years previously had entered into a kind of treaty relationship with the Etruscan rulers. Interpretation of this passage has to take account of a sentence of Diodorus, who nowhere mentions a capture of Capua, but refers<sup>4</sup> to the establishment of the Campanian nation, under the year 438/7. The reference to the event is brief, but is accompanied by a note on the derivation of the name 'Campani'. It has long been recognized that there is a connection between the above texts. Beloch<sup>5</sup> assumed that both authorities were describing the same event, the capture of Capua by the Samnites, and rejected Livy's date on the ground that it put the capture of Capua too close to that of Cumae. Heurgon pointed out<sup>6</sup> that Diodorus does not speak of a capture and, by supposing that Livy and Diodorus were not talking about the same event, he accepted the chronological testimony of both: Diodorus speaks of the establishment of the Campanian nation, Livy apparently of the capture of Capua. The Samnite occupation of Campania was a gradual process of infiltration rather than a once-for-all conquest, and the texts are to be interpreted as records of two stages in that occupation: the newcomers acquired an identity as settlers of the countryside before they gained control of the cities.

<sup>1</sup> Vell. Pat. 1. 7. 2-4.

<sup>2</sup> R. M. Ogilvie (*JRS* xlviii [1958], 45).

<sup>3</sup> B. H. Warmington, *Carthage* (1960 ed.),

51 ff.; M. I. Finley, *Ancient Sicily*, 64.

<sup>4</sup> 12. 31. 1 (*testimonia*, 1).

<sup>5</sup> *Campanien*<sup>2</sup>, 299.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.* 88.

Diodorus' sentence about the Campani is preceded by a citation from the chronographic source (see testimonia, 1) and followed by a citation from the same source concerning the regnal years of the Bosporan kings. It is clear that the information concerning the Campani is drawn also from this source. Although his suggested derivation of the name Campania depends on a Latin translation of his words, there is no reason why a Greek source should not have known the word *campus*, whether it was Latin, or Oscan, or both. To whom exactly does the phrase τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Καμπανῶν refer? Surely to the inhabitants of Capua and its immediate neighbourhood. The name 'Campania' first occurs in Greek and Latin authors of the second century B.C., by which time coastal as well as inland cities were included in the area.<sup>1</sup> Livy 26. 34. 8 may preserve an example of third-century usage if he is quoting at that point from the text of a *Senatus Consultum* the words *nec Capuae nec in urbe Campana*. The two elements in this phrase have been taken as tautologous, but it is more likely that *Campanus* was used here in the sense of 'Campanian'. On the other hand, the statement of Aulus Gellius<sup>2</sup> that an epigram Naevius wrote for himself was full of *superbia Campana* has usually been taken as evidence that Naevius was born at Capua.<sup>3</sup> In the fifth century itself, the hinterland of Cumae was known not as Campania but as Opicia to Thucydides,<sup>4</sup> that is, probably, to Antiochus of Syracuse, who may form the basis of Thucydides' narrative at this point.<sup>5</sup> The wording of the phrase τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Καμπανῶν is itself helpful. Polybius uses a similar expression in his own account of Campania.<sup>6</sup> After enumerating the coastal cities from north to south, Sinuessa, Cumae, Dicaearchia, and Neapolis, he concludes with τὸ τῶν Νουκερίνων ἔθνος. Nuceria was a city, and not simply a district, but Polybius' phrase embraces both, to cover places such as Pompeii which he does not mention separately by name. The Polybian use of the word ἔθνος suggests that the phrase τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Καμπανῶν in Diodorus means 'Capuans and their neighbours'. Also, Diodorus' Campanians derived their name from the plain 'near'. Near what? The word *πλησίον* cannot be understood except by reference to a specific place, and that place is most likely to be Capua. Compare Polybius' description of Capua and its environs:<sup>7</sup> τὰ πεδία τὰ κατὰ Καπύην.

Towards the end of the fifth century didrachms were issued in the name of the Campani.<sup>8</sup> The types were copied from contemporary Neapolitan issues, and one obverse die is common to both series. A close study of die-transferences has shown that at the beginning of the fourth century coins were minted at Neapolis in the name of the Nolans, and if that is right, then it is a possibility that the coins bearing the name of the Campani were also minted at Neapolis on behalf of the Capuans. Some of the legends bridge the difference between the name of the city and that of the people by spelling the ethnic with a double pi: ΚΑΠΠΑΝΟΣ.<sup>9</sup> This difference is overlooked by Livy, who includes Diodorus' derivation of the word *Campanus* even though it is not relevant to his discussion of the name 'Capua'. His derivation from *campus*, or rather *campestris*, may come from the same source as Diodorus' notice, but there are several additional

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Polybius 3. 118. 3; Varro *de R. R.* 1. 10. 1, 20. 4; 2. 6. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Noctes Atticae* 1. 24. 2.

<sup>3</sup> For further discussion and additional references, see O. Skutsch, *CR* N.S. i (1951), 174.

<sup>4</sup> 6. 4. 5.

<sup>5</sup> A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, i. 124 and 142; K. J. Dover (*Maia*, vi [1953], 9).

<sup>6</sup> 3. 91. 4.

<sup>7</sup> 3. 91. 2.

<sup>8</sup> A. Sambon, *Monnaies antiques de l'Italie*, 283-91.

<sup>9</sup> Op. cit. 291, no. 771.

elements in his narrative: references to Capys, to Capua as an Etruscan city, and to the details of the *coup d'état*. The conflation and compression of two different accounts are a possible explanation of Livy's alternative derivations of the name Capua, and of his uncertainty about both the sequence of events there and the precise nature of what took place. For example, the description of Capua as *Etruscorum urbem* in 423 is puzzling. There are admittedly very few literary references to the Etruscan penetration of Campania, and the archaeological evidence for it is still meagre. But after events in Latium at the end of the sixth century had cut the land route between the Etruscan heart-land and Campania, and after the defeat of the Etruscan naval forces off Cumae in 474, it is difficult to imagine that Etruscans were still in control at Capua in 423. Perhaps Livy is to be understood as describing Volturnus as a city of Etruscan origin.

I agree with Heurgon that the Samnite conquest of Campania took time, but I have tried to show that both Diodorus (testimonia, 1) and Livy (testimonia, 3) are talking about Capua itself. I agree that the two texts, and Livy especially, provide evidence of at least two stages in the Samnite occupation of Campania, but I do not think that Heurgon's distinction between the *populus Campanus* of the countryside and the people of the *urbs Capua* is a valid one.<sup>1</sup> It is not the case that Diodorus is referring to the acquisition of a political identity by the people of the countryside only, and Livy to their later control over the city of Capua. How could country-dwellers have controlled the countryside properly without possession of the towns? Such control was possible later for Hannibal only because he possessed in his army a strong base of operations.<sup>2</sup> Further, Livy states that before the *coup d'état* the Samnites had been *in societatem urbis agrorumque accepti*, (note in particular the word *urbis*). The phrase implies that the privileges of partnership were won by a people conscious of their political identity. Perhaps that identity was established by the granting of such privileges both inside the city and outside it, a significant political event that inspired the entry in Diodorus' chronographic source. The conclusion, therefore, is that the establishment of the Campanian nation in Diodorus is to be equated with the *societas* of Livy's narrative, which is to be dated to 438/7. The Campanian *coup d'état* followed fifteen years later, if Livy's date can be trusted at all.<sup>3</sup>

Discussion of Livy's dating of a Carthaginian expedition to Sicily and of his handling of the Samnite occupation of Capua have not encouraged confidence in his ability to place these asides correctly in his main narrative. Did he fare any better with his dating of the capture of Cumae? Diodorus' account is included under events of the archonship of Aristion and of the fourth year of the 89th Olympiad, that is, approximately July 421 to July 420.<sup>4</sup> Livy put the capture in the year when L. Quinctius Cincinnatus, L. Furius Medullinus, M. Manlius, and A. Sempronius Atratinus were consular tribunes, that is, from March 420 to March 419. The names come from the *libri lintei* through Licinius, but comparison with the Capitoline *fasti* shows that in fact Titus,

<sup>1</sup> *Capoue préromaine*, 88.

<sup>2</sup> Polybius 3. 91. 10.

<sup>3</sup> For a resolution of the apparently divergent accounts of Livy and Diodorus along similar lines, see R. M. Ogilvie, *CR* n.s. xviii (1968), 332.

<sup>4</sup> The eponymous archons entered office at Athens on Hecatombeion 1st, and the Olympic festivals were celebrated at the height of the summer: E. J. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World*, 64 and 76.

and not Lucius, Quinctius was in office in 420/19.<sup>1</sup> The closeness of the Livian date to that of Diodorus comes more and more to look fortuitous, and their near-agreement cannot be used as evidence that the two authors used the same source to calculate their chronology. The testimony of Diodorus-Ephorus stands by itself, and if, therefore, the dating of the fall of Cumae rests on Greek and not Roman chronological calculation, it is much more firmly established than has hitherto been supposed.

*University of Bristol*

N. K. RUTTER

<sup>1</sup> R. M. Ogilvie, *Livy, Books 1-5*, 600 (note on 4. 44. 1).