MUSEUM HELVETICUM
Vol. 31 1974 Fasc. 4

Notes on the Sources for Campanian History in the Fifth Century B. C.

By Timothy J. Cornell, Cambridge

The aim of this paper is to consider the surviving accounts of the upheavals which overtook the cities of Campania in the second half of the fifth century B.C. We possess no contemporary reports of these events – Thucydides, for example, ignores them – and the archaeological picture is still unclear. Our knowledge is based almost exclusively on a handful of scattered notices in comparatively late sources – Livy, Diodorus, Strabo, Dionysius of Halicarnassus. These extant versions have often been studied[1], but in my view no satisfactory attempt has been made to analyse the historical tradition on which they are based. In the following pages I hope to show that fresh light can be thrown on the subject by a detailed reappraisal of the surviving sources.

It will be well to begin with a brief summary of the relevant historical facts, so far as they can be ascertained.

In the second half of the fifth century B.C., the fertile plain of Campania was overrun by Oscan-speaking highlanders from the Samnite hinterland. The details of this process are lost to us, but the main sequence of events seems clear enough. The movement seems to have begun as a gradual infiltration of Samnite immigrants rather than any kind of organised invasion. We know at any rate that at Capua the Etruscan inhabitants were at first able to resist the pressure of the newcomers; but after a period of unrest the latter were admitted into the community. Some time after this a revolution occurred in which the Etruscan governing class was overthrown by the Samnites, who now took complete control of the city. Shortly afterwards the Greek city of Cumae suffered the same fate, and fell into the hands of the Campani, as the Samnite intruders were now called. The other Greek and Etruscan cities of Campania, such as Dicaearchia, Nola and Pompeii, probably did not hold out for long. Meanwhile the Greek cities on the Tyrrhene coast to the South of Campania came under pressure from the Lucanians, an Oscan-speaking people related to the Samnites. Poseidonia, Pyxus and Laos were in their hands by 400 B.C. By this time Neapolis and Elea were probably the only surviving centres of Hellenic culture along the whole length of the Tyrrhene coast[2].

[1] Most recently in a clear and instructive paper by N. K. Rutter, *Campanian Chronology in the fifth century B.C.*, Class. Quart. N.S. 21 (1971) 55–61. It will become evident, however, that I cannot accept all of Rutter's conclusions.

[2] On the Oscan expansion in Southern Italy see e.g. Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* V (Stuttgart 1902) 122ff.; L. Homo, *Primitive Italy* (trans. V. Gordon Childe [London 1927]) 136ff.; E. Ciaceri, *Storia della Magna Grecia* II (Milan 1927) 388ff.; J. Heurgon, *Recherches sur ... Capoue préromaine* (Paris 1942) 82ff.; M. Pallottino, *Le origini storiche dei popoli italici*

But even at Neapolis the Greeks were eventually compelled to make concessions to Oscan pressure, and to admit some of the Campani into the citizen body. Thus, as Strabo tells us, "they were obliged to treat their worst enemies as their best friends" (5, 4, 7, p. 246C). Already in 356 B.C. we hear of a Neapolitan with an Oscan name – a certain Nypsius – serving as general under Dionysius II of Syracuse[3]. Strabo refers to the list of magistrates (demarchoi) at Neapolis, and points out that whereas the earliest names were exclusively Greek, the later entries were a mixture of Greek and Campanian (ibid.). Both the coinage and the pottery of Neapolis provide evidence of barbarian influence in the early part of the fourth century[4]. But the city was nonetheless able to retain its essentially Hellenic character. Greek continued to be spoken there, and Roman sources consistently describe it as a Greek city[5]. Strabo writes: "Many vestiges of the Greek way of life survive there – gymnasia, ephebeia, and phratries, as well as Greek names, although the inhabitants are now Romans"[6]. The survival of Greek culture at Neapolis was no doubt due in large part to the fact that at the end of the fifth century its Greek population was greatly increased by the arrival of refugees from Cumae (Dion. Hal. 15, 6, 4).

There is evidently a sharp contrast between 'Greek' Neapolis and the other Campanian cities, which the sources regard as firmly under Oscan control by the end of the fifth century[7]. Some traces of the old Greek and Etruscan civilisations were precariously maintained[8], but in general there can be no doubt that the

in *Relazioni del X Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche* (Rome 1955) II 24ff.; A. J. Toynbee, *Hannibal's Legacy* I (London 1965) 21f. 93f.; E. Lepore in *Storia di Napoli* I (Naples 1967) 193ff.; and above all G. Devoto, *Gli antichi Italici*[3] (Florence 1968) 123ff.

[3] Diod. 16, 18, 1; cf. K. J. Beloch, *Campanien*[2] (Breslau 1890) 31; id., *Griech. Gesch.*[2] III 1, 260 n. 1; on the name W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte der lateinischen Eigennamen* (Göttingen 1904) 164. 198; further examples and general discussion in E. Wikén, *Die Kunde der Hellenen von dem Lande und den Völkern der Apenninenhalbinsel* (Lund 1937) 165ff.

[4] See E. Lepore, Parola del Passato 7 (1952) 306ff.; A. Sambon, *Les monnaies antiques de l'Italie* I (1903) 177 n. 3.

[5] E.g. Varro, *L.L.* 6, 15; Sil. Ital. *Pun.* 12, 18; Tac. *Ann.* 15, 13, etc. Cf. Beloch, *Campanien* 28ff.; H. Philipp, RE s.v. *Neapolis* 2119f.; G. Pugliese Caratelli, Parola del Passato 7 (1952) 243ff., esp. 254f.

[6] Strabo, loc. cit.; for confirmatory evidence see F. de Martino, Parola del Passato 7 (1952) 333ff., esp. 335f.

[7] E.g. Livy 4, 52, 6 (411 B.C.): *superbe ab Samnitibus qui Capuam habebant Cumasque legati prohibiti commercio sunt.*

[8] Cf. Strabo 5, 4, 3 p. 243 C: *ὅμως δ'οὖν ἔτι σώζεται πολλὰ ἴχνη τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν νομίμων* (at Cumae). Coins of Cumae continued to bear Greek legends after the Campanian occupation (Sambon, *Monnaies antiques* I 146ff.). The red-figured pottery produced in the fourth century at Cumae and other centres in Campania provides additional evidence; although the pottery is 'provincial', nonetheless its style is Greek and according to Beazley it is undoubtedly the work of Greek craftsmen (JHS 63 [1943] 69, citing F. Weege, Jahrb. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. 24 [1909] 132. Cf. M. W. Frederiksen, Dialoghi di Archeologia 2 [1968] 4. The Campanian red-figured pottery is now collected in A. D. Trendall, *The Red-figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily* [Oxford 1967] I 189–572; II, plates 78–224). But the scenes depicted on the pots tend rather to reflect the ideals of the Oscan warrior-aristocracy for whom they were produced. (For some examples of these warrior scenes see Weege, art. cit. 141ff., and Trendall,

Oscan invasion had a drastic effect on the cultural life of most of Campania. From Magna Graecia the new situation was viewed with alarm. The mood of despondency is captured in a fragment of a fourth century writer, Aristoxenus of Tarentum. Speaking of the inhabitants of Poseidonia, who had become "completely barbarised" (*ἐκβεβαρβαρῶσθαι*), Aristoxenus writes "but they still celebrate one festival that is Greek to this day, at which they gather together and recall those ancient words and institutions, and after bewailing them and weeping over them in one another's presence they depart home"[9].

From this brief survey of the reasonably certain facts we may turn to a more detailed examination of the sources.

The revolutions at Capua and Cumae are recorded by both Livy and Diodorus. Under the year 423 B.C. Livy writes: *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, 37, 1).

This passage evidently coincides with a report in Diodorus under the year 437 B.C. (=Vulg. 445/309): *Κατὰ μὲν τὴν Ἰταλίαν τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Καμπανῶν συνέστη καὶ ταύτης ἔτυχε τῆς προσηγορίας ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς τοῦ πλησίον κειμένου πεδίου* (12, 31, 1).

The capture of Cumae is briefly noted by Livy under the year 420 B.C.: *Eodem anno a Campanis Cumae, quam Graeci tum urbem tenebant, capiuntur* (4, 44, 12).

Diodorus gives more details in his account, included among the events of 421 B.C. (=Vulg. 428/326): *Περὶ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν Καμπανοὶ μεγάλῃ δυνάμει στρατεύσαντες ἐπὶ Κύμην ἐνίκησαν μάχῃ τοὺς Κυμαίους καὶ ⟨τοὺς⟩ πλείους τῶν ἀντιταχθέντων κατέκοψαν. προσκαθιζόμενοι δὲ τῇ πολιορκίᾳ καὶ πλείους προσβολὰς ποιησάμενοι κατὰ κράτος εἷλον τὴν πόλιν. διαρπάσαντες δ' αὐτὴν καὶ τοὺς καταληφθέντας ἐξανδραποδισάμενοι τοὺς ἱκανοὺς οἰκήτορας ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπέδειξαν* (12, 76, 4).

The first point that calls for comment is the unusual character of the Livian notices. The events at Capua and Cumae had no direct connection with the history of Rome, and it is remarkable that Livy's annalistic sources should have mentioned them at all. The normal practice of the annalists was to concentrate exclusively

---

op. cit. II, plates 98, 1; 126, 1 and 4; I, pp. 192. 307. 358. 399. Notice in particular the work of the Libation Painter, Trendall I 405ff., and the CA painter, I 450ff., and Bull. Inst. Class. Studies Suppl. 26 [1970] 81ff. Plates in *Red-figured Vases* II, plate 175ff.). At Capua the old population was not entirely wiped out by the Oscan invaders; the evidence of inscriptions indicates that Etruscan continued to be spoken there well beyond the end of the fifth century. The latest texts can be dated to c. 300 B.C. (J. Heurgon, *Capoue préromaine* 98).

[9] Aristoxenus frg. 124 Wehrli (= Athenaeus 14, 232A). The earlier part of the text reads *οἷς συνέβη τὰ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ἕλλησιν οὖσιν ἐκβεβαρβαρῶσθαι Τυρρηνοῖς ἢ Ῥωμαίοις γεγονόσι* – where the words *Τυρρηνοῖς ἢ Ῥωμαίοις γεγονόσι* are clearly a later gloss.

on the *res Romana* in its narrowest possible sense[10]. Contemporary occurrences elsewhere in Italy were brought in only when they were felt to have some immediate bearing on the activities of the Romans. Livy's Campanian notices are a conspicuous exception to this well established rule. It is noticeable that Livy himself was embarrassed by their presence[11], and felt it necessary to offer some apology for introducing extraneous items – *peregrina res*, he writes, *sed memoria digna traditur eo anno facta* ... The only comparable instance in Livy is a report, under the year 431 B.C., of a Carthaginian crossing into Sicily; and here again he tries to justify the intrusion, this time by the transparent device of referring forward to the future rivalry between Rome and Carthage: *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* (4, 29, 8). R. M. Ogilvie has observed that these three passages (4, 29, 8; 4, 37, 1–2; 4, 44, 12) are "the only notes of their kind in the first five books"[12].

The second point to be noted is that the reports of the Samnite occupation of Capua and Cumae are also isolated in Diodorus; they are his only references to independent Campanian events. (Hieron's victory at Cumae in 474 B.C. [11, 51, 1–2] was directly connected with the central events of Western Greek history.) This can scarcely be a coincidence, and must suggest a close relationship between his account and that of Livy. We may add that the derivation of the name *Campani* from the nature of the surrounding country is common to both (*a campestri agro*; *ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς τοῦ πλησίον κειμένου πεδίου*). It seems highly improbable that the same two isolated pieces of information should have found their way independently into Livy and Diodorus, and the most obvious inference is that both authors drew on the same body of tradition; which is another way of saying that Diodorus must have taken his information about the Oscan invasion from his annalistic sources[13].

The chronological discrepancy between Livy and Diodorus does not stand in the way of this interpretation, since it is clear that they used different annalists and followed different chronologies. Livy at this point may have been using

---

[10] This point is emphasised e.g. by F. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart 1920) 46; cf. A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor 1965) 122; A. J. Toynbee, *Hannibal's Legacy* I 285–286; E. T. Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* (Cambridge 1967) 2ff.

[11] Noted by Toynbee, loc. cit. (n. 10).

[12] R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books I–V* (Oxford 1965) 580.

[13] A. B. Drachmann included the Campanian notices in his edition of *Diodors römische Annalen* (Bonn 1912), but he hedged his bet by stating in a footnote "Die Notiz stammt schwerlich aus der römischen Quelle D.s» (pp. 25. 28). The view expressed in the text was put forward long ago by Mommsen (*Röm. Forschungen* II [Berlin 1879] 281), but has since been largely ignored by scholars, who have assumed that Diodorus took his information from a Greek source (However NB A. Klotz, *Livius und seine Vorgänger* [1940] 278). Rutter, art. cit. (n. 1), suggested Ephorus; others have argued for Timaeus, or Hyperochus, the "chronicler of Cumae". On these sources see below p. 206 ff.

Licinius Macer[14], while Diodorus – or his source[15] – probably drew on a writer of the second century B.C. G. Perl has collected a list of parallel passages of Livy and Diodorus in which identical notices are placed in different years[16]. For example, the war against the Aequi and the capture of Tusculum, events which Diodorus (11, 40, 5) places in the consulship of Caeso Fabius and L. Aemilius Mamercus (i.e. Vulg. 484 B.C.), are recorded by Livy (3, 23) under the year 459 Vulg. (Coss. Q. Fabius Vibulanus III, L. Cornelius Maluginensis). We find a similar divergence if we compare their accounts of the story of Timasitheus, the Liparaean pirate who escorted the Roman thank-offering to Delphi after the successful conclusion of the war against Veii. Diodorus (14, 93, 2) ascribes the incident to the year 396 B.C. (Tr. mil. L. Titinius, P. Licinius, P. Maelius, Q. Manlius, Cn. Genucius, L. Atilius), while Livy (5, 28, 1–5) places it two years later, in 394 (Tr. mil. M. Furius Camillus, L. Furius Medullinus VI, C. Aemilius, L. Valerius Publicola, Sp. Postumius, P. Cornelius II). Precisely how these discrepancies arose is a complex matter which need not detain us. The important thing is that they occurred.

To return to the Campanian notices, it is sometimes argued that Diodorus and Livy were not talking about precisely the same events, and that when Diodorus wrote *τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Καμπανῶν συνέστη* he was not referring to the final seizure of Capua, but only to an initial stage in the infiltration of the city (a stage corresponding to Livy's phrase *in societatem urbis agrorumque accepti*)[17]; it is true that Livy's version does develop in stages, but the vague wording of Diodorus does not in itself warrant such a distinction. The words *τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Καμπανῶν συνέστη* are surely meant to describe, in a very abbreviated form, the whole process outlined in Livy 4, 37, 1–2[18]. In any case this interpretation does not account for the

[14] This is the view of Ogilvie, *Commentary* 580.

[15] A problem in any discussion of the Roman material in Diodorus is the uncertain role of the so-called 'chronographic source'. This is the name given to the source on which Diodorus is thought to have based his chronology, and which presumably contained synchronised lists of Attic archons, Olympiads, and various king-lists. But it is a matter of dispute whether the chronographic source also included the list of Roman consuls (thus e.g. Beloch, *Römische Geschichte* [Berlin 1926] 107ff.), or whether Diodorus himself undertook the task of synchronising the Roman list with the dates entered in his chronographic source (thus e.g. Schwartz, RE s.v. *Diodoros* 665). It is also unclear whether, and to what extent, the chronographic source included notices of historical events as well as eponyms. Since the content of the supposed chronographic source is frankly a matter of conjecture, no clear answer can be given to this question; but the possibility undoubtedly exists that Diodorus has transmitted information drawn from more than one annalist. Beloch (op. cit. 110f.) points to various internal chronological discrepancies in Diodorus' Roman narrative, and concludes: "natürlich ist der Chronograph seinerseits einem Annalisten gefolgt, aber einem anderen als dem, den Diodor benutzt hat". For a full discussion of the problem see G. Perl, *Kritische Untersuchungen zu Diodors römischer Jahrzählung* (Berlin 1957) 123ff.

[16] G. Perl, op. cit. (n. 15) 124ff.

[17] Thus J. Heurgon, *Capoue préromaine* 87f.; F. Altheim, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Geschichte* I (Frankfurt a. M. 1961) 204f.; E. T. Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* 38f.; M. W. Frederiksen, Dial. Arch. 2 (1968) 4f.; N. K. Rutter, art. cit. (n. 1) 58f.

[18] The origin of the Campanian nation should not be distinguished from the capture of Capua.

discrepancy over the date of the fall of Cumae. It must be recognised that our two writers are also in conflict over this latter date; the near agreement between Livy and Diodorus' Greek chronology[19] is fortuitous[20]. If it is agreed that Diodorus' Campanian notices depend on his annalistic sources, then they must be considered only in relation to his *Roman* chronology, which places the fall of Cumae in 428, as opposed to Livy's 420. It is possible that the variance between Livy and Diodorus has a purely mechanical explanation; and almost certainly it has something to do with the fact that five consecutive sets of Roman eponymous colleges, for the years 423–419 Vulg. (i.e. including precisely those years under which Livy inserts his Campanian notices), have dropped out of Diodorus' list[21]. But the crucial factor was surely that extraneous items of information like the Campanian notices must have been derived ultimately from a tradition which was independent of the *fasti*. It must have been very difficult for the annalists to assign such items to their appropriate consul-years (or military tribune-years); and it is really not at all surprising that there were discrepancies.

The annalists' difficulty was increased when the original source of information was not arranged in an annalistic framework. This could sometimes lead to what may be called 'annalistic compression'. That is to say, the events of several years would sometimes be grouped together and presented in an annalistic notice as if they had all taken place within a single year. Now there are clear signs of this

It is true that Diodorus' text does not mention Capua, but closer examination reveals that some reference to the city is implied, since the name Campani is said to derive from the plain "nearby" (*πλησίον*); as Rutter has shown (art. cit. 59), this can only be understood by reference to a specific place, which must be Capua. We may note also that Livy described the Oscan intruders as Samnites right up to the moment of the seizure of the city, and it was surely that event which gave them a separate identity as Campani. In exactly the same way the Campanian ex-mercenaries of Agathocles in a famous incident in the 280's B.C. acquired an independent political identity as Mamertini following their coup d'état at Messana (Polyb. 1, 7, 3, and esp. 1, 8, 1; Diod. 21, 18, 2, etc.).

[19] Diodorus places the capture of Cumae in the archonship of Aristion (Olympic year 89.4), i.e. July 421 to July 420. The later part of this Athenian year coincides with the beginning of the Varronian year 334 (= 420 B.C.). Livy records the fall of Cumae under the consular tribunes who took office in March of this year – L. Quinctius Cincinnatus, L. Furius Medullinus, M. Manlius, A. Sempronius Atratinus. In this way the Roman dating of Livy and the Greek dating of Diodorus can be made to coincide. Cf. O. Leuze, *Die römische Jahrzählung* (Tübingen 1909) 245; J. Heurgon, *Capoue préromaine* 86f.; N. K. Rutter, art. cit. (n. 1) 60.

[20] Rutter, while arguing that Diodorus used a Greek source for his report on Cumae, nonetheless admits (art. cit. 61) that "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."

[21] A. B. Drachmann, *Diodors römische Annalen* p. 30, l. 7; cf. E. Schwartz, RE s.v. *Diodoros* 700; for some suggestions for a possible mechanical solution, see Ogilvie, *Commentary* 581. To these one might add the observation of Beloch (*Röm. Gesch.* 113) that L. Quinctius and A. Sempronius, two of the consular tribunes of 420 (Livy's date for the seizure of Cumae), appear in Diodorus (12, 77, 1) as consuls, and are synchronised with the Athenian archon of 420/19 B.C. There is no equivalent consul pair in the vulgate tradition, and in Diodorus they are sandwiched between the consuls of 428 vulg. (= Attic 421/20) and 427 (Attic 419/18). The first of these two years is precisely that in which Diodorus records the fall of Cumae. Coincidence?

phenomenon of annalistic compression in the Campanian reports of both Livy and Diodorus. Incidentally this must provide additional confirmation of the view that both depend on a common tradition. At Capua Livy speaks of an exhausting war (*bello fatigatis Etruscis*), and then tells us that first (*prius*) the Etruscans admitted the Samnites *in societatem urbis agrorumque*, and that subsequently (*deinde*) these new settlers occupied the city by rising up against the old inhabitants. The situation thus developed in several distinct stages, and it is obvious that a considerable time, probably a matter of several years, elapsed between them. Similarly at Cumae the final capture of the city was preceded by a fierce battle and a siege which from the language of Diodorus seems to have been prolonged[22]. Diodorus goes on to mention the subsequent *ἐξανδραποδισμός* and the Oscan resettlement of the city. Here too one receives the definite impression that the events of several years have been concentrated into a single annalistic entry[23].

The evidence of Livy and Diodorus thus tells us something about the original source from which the annalists first extracted their information. It is clear that we are dealing with a coherent and self-contained narrative of the history of Campania, which was not arranged in the form of an annalistic chronicle, and which was independent of the Roman chronology. Moreover the much abbreviated notices in Livy and Diodorus suggest that it must originally have dealt with the Samnite invasion in considerable detail.

Evidence in support of this view, that the annalists drew on a detailed account of the events in question, comes from another passage of Livy in which reference is made to the Oscan seizure of Capua. This second reference occurs in Livy's account of Samnite military preparations at Aquilonia in 293 B.C. – at first sight perhaps a rather surprising context. This difficult passage (10, 38, 2–12) requires careful consideration.

The Samnites, Livy tells us, had decided at the start of 293 to prepare for a final major campaign against Rome. All their available men were mobilised, and when they had assembled at Aquilonia on an appointed day they set about selecting an elite force of soldiers by a curious and novel procedure. An enclosed area was formed in the middle of the camp, fenced around with wicker hurdles and completely roofed over with linen. Within this enclosure a special sacrifice was performed, a ceremony which according to the officiating priest had formerly been employed by their ancestors when they had taken Capua from the Etruscans. After this the Samnite general called forth all the warriors who were most distinguished by birth or reputation. Each of these men in turn was introduced into the enclosure, where he was greeted by a gruesome sight ... *in loco circa omni contecto arae in medio victimaeque circa caesae et circumstantes centuriones strictis gladiis*. He was led up to the altars *magis ut victima quam ut sacri particeps*, and was obliged to swear not to tell anyone what he should there see or hear. He was then com-

[22] 12, 76, 4: *προσκαθιζόμενοι δὲ τῇ πολιορκίᾳ καὶ πλείους προσβολὰς ποιησάμενοι ...*
[23] Cf. Rutter, art. cit. (n. 1) 57.

pelled to swear a second oath, whereby he invoked a curse on himself and his family if he should disobey his commander or fail to kill anyone who was seen to flee. Those who refused to take this oath were instantly beheaded, and their bodies left to lie among those of the sacrificial victims. When all the noble Samnites had undergone this ordeal the general chose ten of them, and told each of these to choose another man, "and so to proceed until their numbers had reached 16,000" (*ut vir virum legerent, donec sedecim milium numerum confecissent*). These 16,000 men were named the 'Linen Legion' (*legio linteata*), because of the linen roof of the enclosure where the aristocrats had taken their oath. They were distinguished from the rest of the army by splendid arms and crested helmets.

The chief difficulty in this account is that although it is perfectly comprehensible in its basic outlines many of its details are either redundant or completely incongruous.

It is clear that the procedure being described by Livy is essentially a *lex sacrata*[24]. Livy does not actually use that phrase here, but its application is perfectly legitimate in this context since the process contains all the characteristic features of a *lex sacrata*. The *lex sacrata* was an old Italic practice (it was probably Sabellian in origin[25]) which was adopted in times of crisis as a method of raising an army. The point of the *lex* was that it made enlistment compulsory, and its sanction was that anyone who refused to obey became *sacer*. Hence the wording of the oath in Livy's account: *Dein iurare cogebant diro quodam carmine, in exsecrationem capitis familiaeque et stirpis composito, nisi isset in proelium quo imperatores duxissent et si aut ipse ex acie fugisset aut si quem fugientem vidisset non extemplo occidisset*[26]. Moreover the method by which the elite linen legion was chosen (*vir virum legere*) is a feature of a *lex sacrata*[27].

The linen legion itself was an authentic Samnite institution and took its name from the fact that the soldiers wore linen tunics. This can be inferred from another passage of Livy in which he mentions a force of Samnites wearing *tunicae linteae candidae* (9, 40, 3), and describes them as *sacratos more Samnitium milites, eoque candida veste et paribus candore armis insignes* (9, 40, 9). The detail of the linen tunics is confirmed by the evidence of Oscan tomb paintings in which items of Samnite equipment are shown as spoils hanging from the lances of victorious Campanian warriors[28].

---

[24] For further examples of *leges sacratae* see Livy 4, 26, 3; 7, 41, 4; 9, 39, 5; 36, 38, 1; and see F. Altheim, *Lex Sacrata: die Anfänge der plebeischen Organisation*, Albae Vigiliae I (Amsterdam 1940) (cited hereafter as "Altheim, *Lex sacrata*").

[25] Thus Altheim, *Lex sacrata* 11f.

[26] Cf. Festus p. 422 L.: *Sacratae leges sunt, quibus sanctum est, qui[c]quid adversus eas fecerit, sacer alicui deorum †sicut† familia pecuniaque.*

[27] Cf. Livy 9, 39, 5: *Interea Etrusci lege sacrata coacto exercitu, cum vir virum legisset, quantis nunquam alias ante simul copiis simul animis dimicarunt.*

[28] See F. Weege, Jahrb. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. 24 (1909) 136ff.; C. Nicolet, Mél. Arch. et Hist. 74 (1962) 505; E. T. Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* 105; M. W. Frederiksen, Dial. Arch. 2 (1968) 3ff.

But the difficulties begin when it is observed that many elements in Livy's account of the selection of the linen legion are totally inappropriate to such a procedure. The most striking anomaly is the double oath. The Samnite aristocrats are forced to swear two oaths, one binding them to secrecy, the other compelling obedience. The second of these oaths makes sense in the context of a *lex sacrata*, but the first clearly does not. Its precise function in the narrative is obscure, because Livy does not tell us exactly what was supposed to be concealed; the phrase *quae visa auditaque in eo loco essent* is vague and in any case fails to explain why an oath of secrecy was necessary at all[29]. Indeed it is difficult to imagine why any part of the ceremony should have been carried out in a secret enclosure. It is hardly likely that the idea of a tent was dreamed up by some annalist in order to explain the name 'linen legion'; the derivation *ab integumento consaepti* is not only absurd but superfluous, since the real reason for the name was perfectly obvious and well known to the annalists (as Livy shows in 9, 40, 9). Other puzzling elements include the killing of the recusants, a feature which has no place in the formation of a *legio linteata*, and the uncertain relationship between the grim ceremony in the enclosure and the selection of an elite legion. The oath of allegiance is taken only by the aristocrats, and not by the 16,000 men of the linen legion, who were selected later and by a different method (*vir virum legere*). One would have expected the oath to be administered to all the 16,000, and to have formed an essential part of the process of selection.

An explanation of these anomalies has been given in two important papers by F. Altheim, whose argument is that Livy's source took the historical fact of a *lex sacrata* and combined it with extraneous elements derived from an independent account of a totally different set of events[30]. The true context for most of the details of the secret ritual is suggested by Livy himself. The original sacrifice in the tent was derived, he tells us, *ex vetusta Samnitium religione, qua quondam usi maiores eorum fuissent, cum adimendae Etruscis Capuae clandestinum cepissent consilium* (10, 38, 6). According to Altheim, here taking up a suggestion of K. Latte[31], details of the conspiracy which led to the coup d'état at Capua at the end of the fifth century have been arbitrarily incorporated into the narrative of the Samnites' military preparations in 293 B.C. The story of the priest at Aquilonia who claimed to be reviving an old Samnite tradition is patently a fiction designed to justify the insertion into the narrative of material which does not really belong there.

The hypothesis is convincing. It is clear that all the details that are inconsistent with the selection of a *legio linteata* – the concealed rituals, the oath of secrecy, the killing of the recusants, in fact all the 'conspiratorial' elements – would be appropriate in the context of a *clandestinum consilium*, and would certainly fit

---

[29] Cf. F. Altheim, *Historiae Cumanae Compositor*, in *Untersuchungen zur römischen Geschichte* I (Frankfurt a. M. 1961) (hereafter referred to as "Altheim, *Untersuchungen*") 201.

[30] Altheim, *Lex sacrata* 12–18; id., *Untersuchungen* 200–207.

[31] K. Latte, Gött. Nachr., Phil.-Hist. Kl., N.F. 1 (1934–36) 69f. (= *Kleine Schriften* 350f.).

into an account of the conspiracy which led to the overthrow of the Etruscans at Capua. Proof of Altheim's theory is furnished by the Campanian notices of Livy and Diodorus which we discussed earlier; these show that a version of the revolution at Capua *was* known to the Roman annalistic tradition.

If we accept Altheim's basic argument (as I believe we should), then it must necessarily follow that the borrowed elements in Livy 10, 38 go back to the same source as the Campanian notices in book 4[32]. There is an underlying tone of hostility to the Oscans in all the passages under discussion; and Livy's statement in 4, 37, 1 *festo die gravis somno epulisque incolas veteres novi coloni nocturna caede adorti,* with its emphasis on the unexpected and treacherous nature of the attack, together with the fact that it occurred at night after a festival, suggests a secret *coniuratio* and is in every way compatible with the description of the gruesome ritual and the oath which we find transposed into the context of the battle of Aquilonia.

We may conclude that detailed information about the Samnite occupation of Capua and Cumae in the fifth century was available to the Roman annalists; the events themselves were noted in passing in their appropriate place, but the picturesque details associated with them were utilised elsewhere in the elaboration of events which had a more direct connection with the history of Rome. As Latte pointed out, "es ist nur natürlich, dass die Annalisten aus solchen Quellen die Farben entlehnten, mit denen sie die alte knappe Stadtchronik ausschmückten"[33].

It is now time to ask ourselves how the Roman annalists came to be influenced by an independent account of events in Campania in the fifth century. Let us repeat that this Campanian material must ultimately go back to a tradition that was not Roman, since it relates to events that occurred outside the Roman sphere of interest in the fifth century. This means that the details of the Samnite invasion of Campania cannot have been preserved either in the native pontifical records or in the popular oral tradition of the Romans; the final source must have been an independent local tradition of Campania, elements of which were somehow incorporated into the national story of Rome's past at a time when the literary historical tradition was being established. But the parochial outlook of the annalists, whose practice of concentrating exclusively on the history of the city of Rome has already been noticed, makes it unlikely that their references to Campanian events were based on a direct consultation of Campanian sources. It is far more probable that the annalists drew on an intermediary account in which local Italian traditions were assembled and presented to the Roman public in a more accessible form.

It is not difficult to conjecture the identity of this hypothetical intermediary source. By far the most likely explanation of the Campanian notices of Livy and

---

[32] Thus Altheim, *Lex sacrata* 13ff.; id., *Untersuchungen* 202f.
[33] Latte, art. cit. (n. 31) 69 n. (= *Kleine Schriften* 350 n. 12).

Diodorus is that they are based on material taken from the 'Origines' of Cato the Censor[34].

There are strong arguments in favour of this attribution. As its title suggests, a substantial portion of Cato's work was devoted to the subject of origins. But in contrast to the narrow approach of other Roman historians Cato concerned himself not only with Rome but with the origins and early history of all the tribes and cities of peninsular Italy. Thus, as Cornelius Nepos informs us, *primus* (sc. *liber Originum*) *continet res gestas regum populi Romani, secundus et tertius unde quaeque civitas orta sit Italica, ob quam rem omnes Origines videtur appellasse*[35]. As far as we can see this attention bestowed on the communities of non-Roman Italy was unique in Roman historiography.

It is clear from the relatively numerous fragments that survive from books II and III that Cato considered the Italic communities to be worth studying for their own sake; we can see that he examined local traditions at first hand, and that his researches were based largely on the primary material that was available in the communities themselves[36]. Thus it is likely on general grounds that the local Campanian material we find in Livy and Diodorus should have been introduced into the Roman tradition by way of Cato's 'Origines'.

But there are also specific reasons for attributing the Campanian notices to Cato. First we may remind ourselves that in both Livy and Diodorus the name Campani is said to derive from the surrounding plain – *a campestri agro*. This etymology would seem to indicate a source written in Latin[37]. Moreover the fragments of the second and third books of the 'Origines' make it clear that Cato had a predilection for etymological speculations[38].

Secondly, Campania was an area which Cato knew very well. It is probable that he served there in the Second Punic War[39], and his personal knowledge of

---

[34] This possibility is recognised by Ogilvie, *Commentary* 581, and Rutter, art. cit. (n. 1) 58.

[35] Cornelius Nepos, *Cato* 3, 3. There is no adequate modern discussion of Cato's *Origines*. The standard edition of the fragments is in volume I of H. Peter's *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*[3] (Leipzig 1914). The fragments of book I have been re-edited, with exhaustive commentary, by W. A. Schröder, *M. Porcius Cato. Das erste Buch der Origines*, Beiträge z. klass. Phil. 41 (Meisenheim 1971). The fullest recent discussion is that of D. Timpe, *Le Origini di Catone e la storiografia latina*, in Atti e Mem. Accad. Patavina Sc. Lett. 83 (1970–71) 5–33.

[36] Local legends appear in e.g. frgs. 36. 45. 50. 59. 71 (Peter). Frg. 58 P. appears to be a direct quotation from an inscription at Aricia. On Cato's sources for books II–III see e.g. A. Schwegler, *Römische Geschichte* I[2] (Tübingen 1867) 310; A. v. Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* V (Leipzig 1894) 522; L. Pareti, *Storia di Roma* I (Turin 1952) 30, and in *Studi minori di storia antica* I (Rome 1958) 293f.

[37] Of course it is not impossible that this Latin etymology was first suggested by a Greek writer (cf. Rutter, art. cit. 59). We may note that Strabo (5, 4, 3 p. 242 C; 5, 4, 10 p. 249 C) derives the name Capua from *caput*. I owe this point to Prof. E. Lepore, who kindly read a copy of this paper and offered many helpful suggestions.

[38] E.g. frgs. 9. 50. 53. 54. 57. 59, etc. Notice especially the 'local' etymologies, e.g. frg. 46: *Graviscae ... quod gravem aerem sustinent*, and frg. 60: *Praeneste ... quia is locus montibus praestet.*

[39] Cato first saw military service after the battle of Cannae, probably under Marcellus, who operated in Campania before crossing to Sicily, with Cato as military tribune, in 214. For this

the district is confirmed by the list he gives in the 'De Agricultura' of utensils produced in various Campanian towns[40]. Of Cato's treatment of Campania in the 'Origines' we know only what we are told in a controversial passage of Velleius Paterculus. Here Cato is alleged to have written that Capua and Nola were founded by the Etruscans 260 years before the capture of Capua by the Romans in the Hannibalic War[41]. The statement is controversial because most scholars are unable to accept such a late date (471 B.C.) for the Etruscan foundation of Capua[42]. In the opinion of Beloch Cato's reported statement is an "absurdity"[43] and as Cato did not normally write absurdities it is often assumed that Velleius must have misquoted him. But Velleius himself was surprised at the lateness of Cato's date, and this awareness of the point at issue makes it unlikely that he misquoted or misunderstood his source[44]. A date of 471 B.C. may perhaps be a few decades too low, but Pallottino has argued strongly in its favour[45] and in general there seems no reason to question either the reliability of Velleius or the sanity of Cato. The true dating of the Etruscan colonisation of Campania is a complex question which we need not go into[46]; the important point as far as we are concerned is that Cato knew about the Etruscan presence at Capua in the fifth century and recorded it as a fundamental stage in the development of the city.

It is important to realise that Cato's account of Italian origins was not simply

---

reconstruction see P. Fraccaro, *Opuscula* I (Pavia 1956) 150; H. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics 220–150 B.C.* (Oxford 1951) 111; D. Kienast, *Cato der Zensor* (Heidelberg 1954) 142 n. 32.

[40] Cato, *Agr.* 135. On this passage notice the remarks of M. W. Frederiksen in Papers Brit. Sch. Rome 27 (1959) 109f.

[41] Vell. 1, 7, 2 = Cato, *Origines* frg. 69 P.: *Quidam huius [sc. Hesiodi] temporibus tractu aiunt a Tuscis Capuam Nolamque conditam ante annos fere octingentos et triginta, quibus equidem adsenserim. sed M. Cato quantum differt! qui dicat Capuam ab eisdem Tuscis conditam ac subinde Nolam; stetisse autem Capuam, antequam a Romanis caperetur, annis circiter ducentis et sexaginta.*

[42] The bibliography is given by Alföldi, *Early Rome* 183f., to which add H. H. Scullard, *The Etruscan Cities and Rome* (London 1967) 191. One scholar who did not share the general scepticism was Grote, *History of Greece*[2] III (London 1869) 356; more recently only Pallottino has upheld the later date (see below n. 45).

[43] K. J. Beloch, *Campanien* 8f.; cf. L. Pareti, *La Tomba Regolini-Galassi* (Rome 1947) 498; A. Alföldi, *Early Rome* 184.

[44] The chronological calculation *stetisse autem Capuam, antequam a Romanis caperetur, annis circiter ducentis et sexaginta* clearly goes back to Cato himself, because Velleius had to make further calculations in order to translate his information into terms which meant something to himself and his readers: *quod si ita est, cum sint a Capua capta anni ducenti et quadraginta, ut condita est, anni sunt fere quingenti.* [45] M. Pallottino, Parola del Passato 11 (1956) 81–88.

[46] It is to be hoped that some aid will come from archaeological findings. Recent excavations at Capua have provided evidence of continuous habitation of the site from a very remote period – at least as far back as the middle of the eigth century B.C. (W. Johannowsky, Klearchos 5 [1963] 62ff.; id., Studi Etruschi 33 [1965] 685; A. Alföldi, *Early Rome* 185ff., and Johannowsky's appendix, ibid. 420ff.; H. H. Scullard, *The Etruscan Cities and Rome* 191f.). But the mid-eighth century is on anybody's view too early for the Etruscan colonisation of Campania, and it follows that a town must already have existed on the site when the Etruscans arrived. The gradual etruscanising of the city, beginning with the importation of Etruscan bucchero pottery, goes back to the seventh century B.C. (In addition to the works cited above cf. W. Johannowsky's remarks in *Greci e Italici in Magna Grecia*, Atti d. pr. convegno d. studi

a catalogue of mythical foundation-stories, as is sometimes supposed[47]. The fragments show that the 'Origines' contained an ethnographical and geographical survey of Italy as it was in Cato's own day, and that the account of 'origins' was designed to trace the historical antecedents of the contemporary situation he was attempting to describe[48].

In the case of Campania it is evident that Cato did not confine his attention to the remote and mythical past; the fragment dealing with the Etruscan occupation is itself proof of that. We may assume that his account must have gone on to mention the overthrow of the Etruscan and Greek dominions by Samnite invaders at the end of the fifth century, since this was the definitive stage in the *origo* of the Campani. We have seen that the Oscan revolution at Capua was precisely the event which was held to mark the emergence of the Campani as a separate and clearly defined national group[49]. In short there is nothing unlikely in the suggestion that Cato's 'Origines' contained an account of the Samnite occupation of Capua and Cumae, including details of the *coniuratio* at Capua which are reflected in Livy's narrative of the battle of Aquilonia.

Obviously Cato himself was not responsible for the transposition of these details into the context of the Third Samnite War; for him the independent history of Campania was worth recording for its own sake. But the later Roman annalists ignored Cato's message and confined themselves exclusively to the history of Rome in its narrowest sense, and it is they who were responsible for filling out the meagre data provided by native records with originally unrelated elements drawn from independent traditions[50].

---

sulla Magna Grecia [1962] 248, and D. Mustilli, ibid. 183). But while the discovery of Etruscan artefacts can indicate the effects of Etruscan cultural influence and trade, it is notoriously difficult to deduce political facts from this kind of evidence.

[47] The supposition is based on the idea that Cato modelled his account of Italy on a special category of Hellenistic literature that dealt with foundations, and even that the title, *Origines*, was meant to be a translation of the Greek *Κτίσεις*. See for example B. Schmid, *Studien zu griechischen Ktisissagen* (Diss. Freiburg/Schweiz 1947) 189 n. 1; M. Gelzer, *Kleine Schriften* III (1966) 107; D. Timpe, Atti Accad. Patavina 83 (1970–71) 15ff., etc. It would be pointless to give the whole literature; *Κτίσεις* make their appearance in almost every discussion of Cato's work. But there is in fact no justification whatever for the notion that the *Origines* were connected with the Hellenistic *Κτίσεις*. The latter were not historiographical works; if anything they belong to antiquarian scholarship.

[48] Descriptive fragments, no doubt mostly drawn from personal observation, include nos. 32. 33. 34. 35. 37. 38. 39. 41. 43. 44. 46. 52. 57. 60. 61. 73. 74. 75. 76. For the dynamic concept of *origo* as outlined in the text the best evidence is the account of early Rome in book I of the *Origines*. This book dealt not only with the founding of the city but with the whole of the regal age and perhaps also the first few decades of the new Republic. The explanation for this is that for Cato the *origo populi Romani* was not an event but a process, in which the characteristic institutions of the *res publica* reached their fully developed form. Thus, at the start of Cicero's *De Rep.* II, Scipio is made to say: *Quam ob rem, ut ille [Cato] solebat, ita nunc mea repetet oratio populi Romani originem; facilius autem, quod est propositum, consequar, si nostram rem publicam vobis et nascentem et crescentem et adultam et iam firmam atque robustam ostendero* (Cic. *Rep.* 2, 1, 3).

[49] See above n. 18.

[50] There are many other examples in Livy of the effects of this practice. The most striking is

The character of the original Campanian sources from which Cato drew his information cannot be ascertained with any certainty. Many have thought that the Campanian notices of Livy go back in the last analysis to a Greek account; Altheim, for example, suggested a local chronicle of Cumae, and connected the Campanian notices with reports about the life of the Cumaean tyrant Aristodemus Malacus[51]. The suggestion deserves attention.

A full and detailed biography of Aristodemus of Cumae is preserved in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (7, 3–11) – an account which must go back to an independent Greek source[52]. It is to be noted also that information about Aristodemus has somehow intruded into the traditional Roman account of events following the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus, who is said to have taken refuge with Aristodemus[53]. Eduard Meyer and others believed that the source of all these accounts was the *Κυμαϊκά* attributed to one Hyperochus (FGrHist 576), of which a few fragments survive[54]. But F. Jacoby pointed out that the *Κυμαϊκά* could not be the source of the annalistic notices – at least, not in the first instance – because the fragments show that Hyperochus was himself influenced by the annalists, and that the work ascribed to him was a late compilation[55].

In a recent discussion of this material A. Alföldi distinguished two stages in the development of the tradition about Aristodemus of Cumae[56]. The various annalistic references in Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (see note 53), together with the three fragments of Hyperochus, represent a late and contaminated

---

the account in book 5 of the great war between Rome and Veii. The story of this war, which made a deep impression on the popular memory of the Romans, attracted to itself a number of traditions which originally had no connection with it, such as the folk-tale of the old man of Veii who revealed to his captors the fate of the city (5, 15, 1), and the item about the impious king who disrupted the Etruscan national games (5, 1, 3). These elements, together with numerous references to half-understood ideas and practices of Etruscan religion, do not reflect the use of an independent Etruscan account of the war, as some suppose (e.g. Ogilvie, *Commentary* 628); rather they were arbitrarily brought into the Roman historical tradition at a late stage in its development.

[51] Altheim, *Lex sacrata* 14f.; id., *Untersuchungen* 206f.; id., *Welt als Geschichte* 2 (1936) 76.

[52] Thus e.g. B. G. Niebuhr, *History of Rome* (trans. C. Thirlwall, London 1853) I 553 and n. 1224; A. Schwegler, *Römische Geschichte* II 193; K. O. Müller/W. Deecke, *Die Etrusker* I (Stuttgart 1877) 147; Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* II² (Stuttgart 1893) 809f.; W. von Christ, Sb. Bayr. Akad. 1905, 62ff.; Ernst Meyer, Mus. Helv. 9 (1952) 180; B. Combet-Farnoux, Mél. Arch. et Hist. 69 (1957) 29f.; A. Alföldi, Gymnasium 67 (1960) 194; R. Werner, *Der Beginn der römischen Republik* (Munich 1963) 386; A. Alföldi, *Early Rome* 63ff.

[53] Livy 2, 14, 5–9; 2, 29, 5; 2, 34, 3–5; Dion. Hal. 5, 36, 1–4; 6, 21, 3; 7, 1, 3; 7, 12, 1–3. Quoted in full by Alföldi, *Early Rome* 59ff.

[54] Ed. Meyer, loc. cit. (n. 52); cf. E. Ciaceri, *Storia della Magna Grecia* II 272; Altheim, works cited in n. 51, and *Epochen der römischen Geschichte* I (Frankfurt 1934) 102 and n.

[55] FGrHist III B, Kommentar pp. 606–608; Noten pp. 352–353; cf. Alföldi, *Early Rome* 57ff.; G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* I² (Florence 1956) 438 n. 79.

[56] Alföldi, *Early Rome* 56–72; cf, E. Gabba in *Les Origines de la République Romaine*, Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt XIII (Vandœuvres-Geneva 1966) 144–147; E. Gjerstad, Opuscula Romana 7 (1967–69) 159f.; E. Lepore in: *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classique*, ed. C. Nicolet (Paris 1970) 46 n. 2.

version of an original Cumaean account. The story of Aristodemus' mistress Xenocrite, related in Plutarch (Mul. Virt. 26 p. 261 E–262 D), must also derive from this secondary level of tradition, because in this romance Aristodemus' relief expedition to Aricia (cf. Dion. Hal. 7, 5) has been transformed into an attempt to aid the Romans against Lars Porsenna[57]. But Alföldi argues that the detailed biography of the tyrant in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (7, 3–11) is independent of the annalistic notices which immediately precede and follow it[58]; it is a digression which Dionysius has interpolated into his main narrative[59], and as such it is based *directly* on an original Greek source.

The source of Dionysius' life of Aristodemus is now widely believed to have been Timaeus[60]. This possibility was seen long ago by Niebuhr, and argued at length by F. Reuss[61], on the crude but plausible grounds that a polemical and highly-coloured presentation of "the despot's progress" is indicative of Timaeus. Alföldi himself favoured this conjecture, although he seems to have been misunderstood here[62]; his suggestion of a local Cumaean chronicle was an attempt to identify not the immediate source of Dionysius, but the source of the Hellenistic author (probably Timaeus) followed by Dionysius. The character of the source on which the Hellenistic version was based is, however, entirely a matter for speculation. Alföldi's theory of an old local chronicle of Cumae is no more than a theoretical possibility. The important point is that the substance of Dionysius' narrative must derive ultimately from indigenous Cumaean sources of some kind.

Elements of the same Cumaean tradition will have found their way into the Roman annals either through Cato or some other early Roman writer. Alföldi proposes Fabius Pictor[63]. In this case it is not quite so surprising that Cumaean material should have been exploited by the Roman annalists, in view of the obvious relevance of the Aristodemus story to the history of the early Roman Republic. The traditions about Aristodemus' reign provided an independent account of events in Latium at the end of the sixth century B.C., and confirmed the

---

[57] Alföldi, *Early Rome* 58f.

[58] Alföldi, *Early Rome* 62f., following W. v. Christ, art. cit. (n. 52) 62f.

[59] This is confirmed by the apology with which Dionysius introduces his account of Aristodemus (7, 2, 5): *ἀφορμαῖς δὲ τῆς τυραννίδος ὁποίαις ἐχρήσατο καὶ τίνας ἦλθεν ἐπ' αὐτὴν ὁδοὺς καὶ πῶς διῴκησε τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν καταστροφῆς τε ὁποίας ἔτυχεν οὐκ ἄκαιρον εἶναι δοκῶ μικρὸν ἐπιστήσας τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν διήγησιν κεφαλαιωδῶς διεξελθεῖν.* Cf. W. v. Christ, art. cit. (n. 52) 63; G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* I² 438 n. 79.

[60] U. Cozzoli in *Miscellanea greca e romana* (Rome 1965) 5–29; M. W. Frederiksen, Dial. Arch. 2 (1968) 29 n. 59; cf. Ed. Meyer, loc. cit. (n. 52); J. Heurgon, *Capoue préromaine* 64; contra, W. v. Christ, art. cit. (n. 52) 70f.

[61] Philologus 45 (1886) 245ff., esp. 271–277.

[62] Alföldi, *Early Rome* 68: "... possibly extracted by Dionysius from Timaeus." Frederiksen, loc. cit. (n. 60) wrongly attributed to Alföldi the view that Dionysius himself used a local chronicle of Cumae.

[63] Alföldi, *Early Rome* 71: "... it is obvious that the Greek helpers of Pictor put at his disposal the unique data of the Cymaean chronicle – in the adaptation we have just quoted or another ..."

dating of the expulsion of Tarquin, whose flight to Cumae was probably based on an old Roman tradition[64].

It cannot be certain whether the other Campanian notices (about the Samnite capture of Capua, etc.) were also transmitted by way of a Greek literary tradition, as Altheim suggested[65]. In any case this question does not affect the contention that these fragments of Campanian history first entered the Roman tradition through the 'Origines' of Cato; the question is whether Cato's work had been done for him by some Greek writer such as Timaeus, or whether his account of the early history of Capua and other Campanian cities was based on independent research.

No definite answer to this question is possible. That Cato had read Timaeus is extremely probable on general grounds. Timaeus prefaced his main historical account with five books on the geography and ethnology of the Western Mediterranean[66]. In this respect his work provided the formal model for Cato's 'Origines', which contained three books on the origins of Rome and Italy, followed by four books of historical narrative covering the period from the Punic Wars down to his own day[67]. Moreover we know that Timaeus was interested not only in the early history of Magna Graecia but also in the barbarian peoples of Italy; and there is evidence that he had access to valuable indigenous material[68]. Cato must have found useful material in Timaeus; unfortunately the surviving fragments of both writers are too inadequate to allow us to prove a direct relationship in any particular case[69].

---

[64] Livy 2, 21, 5; Cicero, *Tusc.* 3, 12, 27; Dion. Hal. 6, 21, 3; [Victor] *De Vir. Ill.* 8, 6. The authenticity of this tradition is upheld by W. v. Christ, art. cit. (n. 52) 61–62; but note the contrary view of G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* I² 438 n. 78; F. Schachermeyr, RE s.v. *Tarquinius* (no. 7) 2389.

[65] See above n. 51. E. Gabba is sceptical about this conclusion – art. cit. (n. 56) 145, and *Miscellanea Rostagni* (Turin 1963) 192 and n. 24.

[66] See J. Geffcken, *Timaios' Geographie des Westens*, Philologische Untersuchungen 13 (Berlin 1892); cf. F. Jacoby, FGrHist. IIIB Kommentar p. 542ff.

[67] I do not accept the view that the *Origines* was in fact a posthumous compilation of two separate works (3 books of origins, 4 of contemporary history) which Cato himself had intended to publish separately. For this hypothesis see A. Rosenberg, *Einleitung und Quellenkunde zur römischen Geschichte* (Berlin 1921) 163–169; R. Helm, RE s.v. *Porcius* (no. 9) 160–161; R. Meister, Anz. Österr. Akad. Wiss. Phil.-Hist. Kl. 101 (1964) 1–8.

[68] Notice in particular his information on the Penates of Lavinium; FGrHist 566 F 59; cf. F 36. 51, etc.

[69] Polybius remarked that some writers had been deceived by Timaeus' account of foundations of cities (12, 26d, 2). R. Laqueur (RE s.v. *Timaios* 1203) suggested that he was making a veiled reference to Cato, whom he could not, of course, criticise directly (cf. G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* IV 2, 1, 62); but this is hardly demonstrable, as Walbank rightly points out (F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* II [Oxford 1966] 407 ad loc.). L. Moretti enlisted the aid of Justin and Lycophron in an attempt to show that Cato depended directly on Timaeus (Riv. Fil. 80 [1952] 289–302); but his argument fails to convince.