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The only indication which we have of the origin and nationality of the poet Naevius appears in a chapter of the *Attic Nights* in which Aulus Gellius records the epitaphs of Naevius, Plautus, and Pacuvius. In introducing the epitaph of Naevius, Gellius makes the following comment: *Epigramma Naevii plenum superbiae Campanae quod testimonium esse iustum potuisset nisi ab ipso dictum esset*. Here the word *Campanae* is our indication. But the information which it contains remains, unfortunately, rather uncertain for so important a fact until we establish the precise sense in which Gellius used it and the source of information which permitted him its use. Although this subject has often been touched upon, I believe that there is still much to be learned from a methodical investigation of all its aspects and it is such an investigation which I propose to carry out in these pages. Apart from any conclusions regarding Naevius' origin, it will also have the value, I hope, of being the first complete study of our sources of information for Naevius' life.

Now it has long been recognized that the epitaph proper which Gellius cites directly after the comment given above was taken from the first book of Varro's *De Poetis*. Gellius mentions this book expressly as his source for the epitaph of Plautus which follows that of Naevius and no reasonable doubt can be raised that all three epitaphs, coming together in the same small chapter in which only a single source appropriate to all of them is mentioned, go back to the same Varronian treatise.

For the moment, however, we cannot extend our certainty regarding the source of the epitaph to the comment upon it. Marx and Marmorale apparently consider the latter's Varronian origin to be self-evident; Fränkel holds it probable; others accept the crucial word *Campanae* more or less at face value and ignore its source. But on the whole these various views are casual opinions rather than results of methodical investigation. The basic problem still remains unsolved: what is the source of the information which permitted Gellius to speak of *superbia Campana* and exactly what did he mean by it?
In attempting a solution of this problem, let us first see what Gellius believed about the source of the epitaph. As he tells us in the opening words of his chapter, he believed that it had been composed by Naevius himself: *Trium poetarum illustrium epigrammata, Cn. Naevius, Plauti, M. Pacuvii quae ipsi fecerunt et incidenda sepulcro suo reliquerunt.* This belief appears again in the statement that the epitaph could have been a *iustum testimonium*, if it had not been composed by Naevius himself.

Here we learn where the *superbia* of the epitaph lay in the eyes of Gellius. The lines

> *itaque postquam est Orchi traditus thesauro*
> *obliti sunt Romae loquier lingua Latina*

are in themselves open to the charge of arrogance. But Gellius concedes that they, together with the two preceding lines concerning the sorrow of the Muses at Naevius' death, could have been a fair attestation (of Naevius' poetic genius) had he not written them himself. To Gellius, then, the arrogance did not lie so much in the contents of the epitaph as in the fact that Naevius had composed it about himself. In other words, the epitaph is full of arrogance in relation to its author and the "Campanian" quality of its arrogance must hence be connected with the "Campanian" quality of its author.

Now it has long been established that it is impossible to understand *superbia Campana* as a proverbial phrase denoting an arrogance of a particularly offensive or excessive kind, regardless of its "provenance." Whenever these words or their equivalent are used by Cicero in his first two orations, *De Lege Agraria* (I, 18-22; II, 76-98) or by Livy (IX, 6, 5; XXIII, 5, 1) they always refer to the city of Capua (I include the *ager* in this designation) and its citizens and to the kind of arrogance which was found there and among them. But Cicero and Livy have more to teach us than this. They tell us something indirectly about the mental environment of the concept which is worth knowing.

To Livy the arrogance of the Capuans culminated in their defection from Rome during the Second Punic War. After Cannae they began to scorn the Roman *imperium* and the defeated consul whom their envoys approached at Venusia is *quam poterat maxime miserabilem bonis sociis, superbis atque infidelibus, ut erant Campani, spennendum* (XXIII, 4, 6; 5, 1). This trait was, of course, nothing new in them, for it is mentioned by Livy in an earlier connection. As the Romans approached
Capua after passing under the Samnite yoke, pity for their plight overcame the *superbiam ingenitam Campanis* (IX, 6, 5). But we must note the use of the past tense (*erant*) in Livy, XXIII, 5, 1. The historian knew of the punishment which awaited the Capuans for their defection, a punishment which would take the arrogance out of them (see the description of Capua in XXXI, 29, 11). After this punishment, there is no further mention of Capuan arrogance in Livy.

Coming now to Cicero, there is no mention of this trait in all his works except in the first two orations of the *De Lege Agraria*. In them Cicero was attempting to deter the senate and the people from supporting the bill of Rullus by painting a terrifying picture of its consequences. Part of the bill provided for the planting of a colony at Capua. Cicero proclaims this provision to be most dangerous. He speaks of *illam Campanam adrogantiam atque intolerandam ferociam* (*Leg. Agr.*, II, 91) which the maiores reduced to impotence by the measures which they imposed upon Capua after its surrender. *Campani semper superbi bonitate agrorum et fructuum magnitudine, urbis salubritate, descriptione, pulchritudine* (95). Hence the arrogance which made the Capuans demand that one consul should come from Capua; hence the luxury which enervated Hannibal. What, then, would be the effect of these natural riches, of this splendid city, on the new colonists? Obviously to make them arrogant in turn and a danger to Rome.

It is quite clear what Cicero was doing. He was resurrecting a well remembered chapter from Capua's past and turning it to the immediate purpose of frightening his audience. There can be little doubt that sending a colony to Capua in 63 B.C. would have been no more dangerous to Rome than sending it to any other part of Italy. In fact, a colony was sent out to Capua in 59 B.C. and again in 43 B.C. with no dire results. But Cicero was attempting to present all of Rullus' bill in the darkest light possible and a colony at Capua was one of its provisions. It was not the only time that he argued a weak point skillfully.

We need not therefore be surprised that we do not hear of Capuan arrogance after Livy except in Gellius. This Roman estimate of the Capuan character was connected primarily with the events of the Second Punic War and with Capua before its fall except in so far as Cicero brought it down to his own time for the purpose which we have noted above. If we find it, then, in Gellius, a writer of the second century A.D., it appears likely that it there represents a reflection of an earlier period.

In this connection, I would here submit the hypothesis that
Gellius was influenced by Cicero. We know that he was familiar with the first two orations De Lege Agraria. He cites a fragment from that part of the first oration which is now lost (Gellius, XIII, 25, 6 = Cicero, frag. 4, Oxford edition) and two fragments of the second (XIII, 25, 6 = II, 59; VII, 16, 7 = II, 100). The fact that he makes Favorinus the speaker in XIII, 25 will not deceive anyone who is familiar with Gellius' methods of presentation regarding Gellius' firsthand knowledge of the Ciceronian text. And in VII, 16, he cites Cicero directly.

I would, therefore, reconstruct as follows. Gellius found the epitaph of Naevius at the end of Varro's biography of Naevius in the De Poetis. It was accompanied by the statement that it was composed by Naevius himself. He copied it down as something which pricked his curiosity and added to it the epitaphs of Plautus and Pacuvius which he also found at the ends of their respective biographies in the same book.

When he came to write the chapter in which he presents the three epitaphs, that of Naevius seemed to him to deserve a word of comment. As an admirer of Naevius' dramatic works, he was forced to concede the justice of the contents, but the fact that Naevius had written thus about himself struck him as a piece of arrogance. He knew that Naevius had been a Capuan. In the back of his mind were Cicero's words about the city and its citizens: 

**superbia nata inibi (Leg. Agr., I, 20), quantam locus ipse adferat superbiam (II, 92), 'Campani semper superbi (II, 95) in domicilio superbiae (II, 97).** Here was the mot juste sanctioned by the use of the master. It would recall to the reader its Ciceronian associations. Furthermore, it was completely appropriate since Naevius was born a Capuan in the proud days before the city's fall. What neater way could there be to characterize Naevius' arrogance than with the words **superbia Campana?**

I claim for this hypothesis a fair degree of probability. But it is also quite possible that Gellius found the comment on the epitaph in Varro. Of one thing, however, we can be certain. If the comment was original with Gellius, he knew that Naevius was a *Campanus* in the sense in which the word was used by Cicero; that is, a native of Capua. For otherwise his **superbia Campana** would have no reminiscence or point. On the other hand, if the comment came from Varro, the word *Campanus*, as we shall see below, gives us again a clear indication of Naevius' Capuan origin. In view of what I have said above, I am inclined to think that the comment is original with Gellius and that he found the statement that Naevius was a *Campanus* at the begin-
ning of Varro's biography of the poet. For where, if not in Varro, could Gellius have learned that Naevius was a Capuan?

In the well-known passage in which Gellius recapitulates the chronology established by Varro for the beginnings of Latin literature, we are informed that Naevius began to produce plays in 235 B.C. and that Varro stated in the first book of the *De Poetis* that Naevius had campaigned in the First Punic War and had stated this fact himself in the poem which he composed about it (*the Bellum Punicum*). Here again, we find Varro furnishing Gellius with an important biographical fact. But we may not assume that Gellius was not familiar with the *Bellum Punicum* at first hand because he cites a piece of information which it contained from Varro. A few lines above, in the same discussion, Gellius cites the same book of Varro in a very similar manner, but this time in connection with Ennius. "Varro writes," he says, "that Ennius was in his sixty-seventh year when he was writing the twelfth book of the *Annals* and that Ennius himself so stated in that very same book." There can be no doubt, however, that Gellius had not only read the *Annals* but knew them extremely well. He was simply working from Varro at the moment and was honest enough to say so.

On the other hand, Gellius mentions the *Bellum Punicum* only once again. This he does in connection with an explanation of the word *Diovis*: *Idcircoque simili nomine Iovis 'Diovis' dictus est et 'Lucetius,' quod nos die et luce quasi vita ipsa afficeret et iuvaret. 'Lucetium' autem Iovem Cn. Naevius in libris belli Poenici appellat*. Gellius does not mention his source. But in view of his dependence on Varro in the discussion of such matters, and the fact noted above that Varro was familiar with the *Bellum Punicum*, I am inclined to agree with Hosius that we have here an excerpt from the *Res Divinae*. Be that as it may, it is a fact of greater importance that Gellius does not cite a single verse from the *Bellum Punicum*. When we compare this silence with his frequent citations from the *Annals*, it is reasonable to believe that Gellius had not read the *Bellum Punicum* and hence could not draw on it for biographical data.

Gellius has two more notices regarding Naevius' life. One tells us of his incarceration and forms the counterpart to a notice about Plautus' literary activity while working in a mill. Gellius states expressly that he has been using Varro's *De Comoediiis Plautinis* in writing this chapter and it is generally assumed—and rightly, I believe—that the information concerning Naevius comes from the same source.

The second contains the famous verses of Naevius which,
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according to Gellius, were almost certainly directed against Scipio (et propemodum constitisse, hosce versus a Cn. Naevio poeta in eum scriptos esse). Again the source is not mentioned but we have some indication of its nature. Gellius states that what he is telling us is historical (ex historia); secondly, the story revolves around Scipio’s continentia and the verses of Naevius are introduced merely as proof that Scipio’s reputation in his youth was far from stainless. We are therefore led to think of some source which dealt with Scipio’s life. Leo (Geschichte, p. 78, n. 2) thinks it probable that Gellius found the verses in Valerius Antias, who is mentioned in the same chapter as a writer who was hostile to Scipio’s reputation. Valerius is certainly a more likely source than Oppius, Hyginus, or the unnamed others mentioned by Gellius (VII, 1), who appear to have stressed Scipio’s admiranda. But whoever furnished the notice, he was clearly more occupied with Scipio than with Naevius.

To summarize the first step in our investigation, it has been demonstrated that where the source can be ascertained with reasonable accuracy, Gellius was indebted to Varro for everything which he knew about Naevius’ life with the exception of the attack upon Scipio. It would therefore be logical to assume that the knowledge that Naevius was a Campanus came also to Gellius from the same author. This assumption will be strengthened if we examine the biographical information concerning Naevius which is not contained in the Attic Nights.

Under the year 01. 144, 3 = 202 B.C. in his revision of the Chronicle of Eusebius, St. Jerome places the following notice: Naevius comicus Uticae moritur pulsus Roma factione nobilium ac praecipue Metelli. We need not dwell on St. Jerome’s immediate source here, for it has already been demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that he was indebted to the De Viris Illustribus of Suetonius for this and similar information regarding Latin writers. We must rather go back beyond Suetonius and attempt to establish his source.

Fortunately, the desired information can be attained through a passage of Cicero. In the Brutus (60) he writes: His consulibus (Cethegus and Tuditanus, 204 B.C.) ut in veteribus commentariis scriptum est, Naevius est mortuus; quamquam Varro noster diligentissimus investigator antiquitatis putat in hoc erratum vitamque Naevi producit longius.

In commenting on this passage, Leo expresses the opinion that the veteres commentarii were probably the records of the magistrates who were in charge of the public games and that the last production of a play of Naevius was there entered under the
year 204. From this others concluded that Naevius died in that year, but Varro knew of reasons other than death why his plays then ceased to be produced at Rome. Consequently he gave him a longer span of life.

Helm has carried the investigation further with good results. Varro must have perceived, he points out, that if Naevius had died in Utica in 204, he would have died in a city which was in the possession of the Carthaginian enemy. But as indicated by Cicero’s vague phrase *producit longius*, he could not have known the exact date of death. Hence in discussing Naevius, Varro would have shown the impossibility of placing his death in Utica in 204, stating that it could not have occurred in that city until the end of the Second Punic War. Inasmuch as Helm equates 01.144, 3, the date given by Jerome, with 201 B.C., he further suggests that Varro may have chosen the year 201 because it was the date when the peace was ratified and Naevius could have visited Utica. St. Jerome, finding in Suetonius’ version of Varro no exact date for the death, would have taken the latest one mentioned therein. The same assumption, of course, could be maintained in regard to the more correct equation 01.144, 3 = 202 B.C., since it was in 202 that Zama was fought and the war ended to all intents and purposes.

In recapitulating Helm’s arguments, the question of Suetonius’ relation to Varro in regard to the notice in question has been somewhat anticipated. Let me return to it here. First of all, Suetonius’ dependence on Varro for certain biographical information has been proved. In the second place, St. Jerome, repeating Suetonius, shows that the latter did not accept the traditional date of 204 B.C. for Naevius’ death but like Varro extended his life beyond it. Finally, the fact that St. Jerome gives the year of death, which was apparently unknown to Varro, does not mean that Suetonius obtained it from some other source. Helm’s fine study has taught us how St. Jerome used his source material and what little faith we can place in the exactitude of his chronological data. We are now justified in believing that the exact year of death was not given by Suetonius who was following Varro and that St. Jerome devised it quite possibly in the manner suggested by Helm above.

To return now to the passage in the Brutus which enabled us to trace St. Jerome’s notice back to Varro, Cicero speaks in it as if he had consulted Varro at first hand. Yet we are now well aware of Cicero’s dependence in the Brutus on the Liber Annalis of Atticus which was dedicated to Cicero in 47 B.C. and furnished him with a convenient chronological table of important events,
both historical and literary. Comparison, however, of the chronology of early Latin literature as established by Varro (preserved in Gellius) and Atticus (preserved in Cicero) has demonstrated that Atticus chose to adopt Varro's dates in preference to those which had earlier been established by Accius. It is therefore possible that in speaking of Varro in the passage in the Brutus which now holds our attention, Cicero was speaking of him as Atticus' source and actually had the Liber Annalis before his eyes. I cannot believe, however, that Cicero did not often turn from the summary notices of Atticus to the more detailed accounts which lay behind them. But be that as it may, Varro in this instance was the ultimate source of Cicero's knowledge.

In the Cato Maior (14, 50) Cicero tells us that Naevius wrote his Bellum Punicum as a senex. Since the same chapter contains a similar notice on Plautus and the Varronian date for the first production of a play by Livius Andronicus, he may again have been following Varro through Atticus. On the other hand, Cicero speaks in the Brutus (19, 75) as if he were familiar at first hand with the Bellum Punicum of Naevius. This is curious in view of the fact that he does not cite a single verse from it. Possibly he did not find this work which pleased him quasi Myronis opus, suitable for citation. At any rate, when he says in the Brutus (60) that Latin as spoken in the time of Cethegus could be found in the works of Naevius, he was probably thinking of the plays which he had read. We must therefore confess that we do not know whether Cicero had ever read the Bellum Punicum. But if he had, he might have found within it the information that Naevius had written it as a senex. For as we have seen above on the authority of Varro, the epic contained biographical data.

Mention of Cicero's familiarity with some of Naevius' plays brings us to the latter's famous quarrel with the Metelli. We know of it chiefly by virtue of the commentary of Pseudo-Asconius on Cicero's first Verrine oration. In attacking Metellus Creticus (Cos. 69) for the support which he received from Verres at the time of his election, Cicero states: Nam hoc Verrem dicere aiebant, te non fato, ut ceteros ex vestra familia sed opera sua consulem factum. On which the commentator writes: Dictum facete et contumeliose in Metellos antiquum Naevii est:

Fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules.

Cui tunc Metellus consul iratus versu responderet senario hypercatalecto, qui et Saturnius dicitur

Dabunt malum Metelli Naevio poetae.
NAEVIUS’ "CAMPANIAN" ORIGIN

De qua parodia subtiliter Cicero dixit: Te non fato, ut ceteros ex vestra familia.

Since Jachmann and Frank have presented valid reasons for believing in the authenticity of the quarrel, I shall not discuss here the earlier doubts of Wissowa and Leo. But inasmuch as the proponents of authenticity have concentrated their attention on the historical circumstances which could have given rise to the verses and the interpretation of the verses themselves, a few words regarding the way by which Pseudo-Asconius obtained his information remain to be said. They will, I believe, not only strengthen the thesis of authenticity, but also serve the purpose of ascertaining the ancient sources of Naevius’ biography.

To begin with Cicero, who furnished the occasion for the comment, it is quite clear that he had the verse *Fato Metelli Romae iunt consules* in mind when making the remark directed against Metellus Creticus in the first Verrine oration. A reflection of the same verse, as Frank has pointed out, occurs in a letter written by Cicero to another Metellus (Metellus Celer) in 62 B.C.

The verse is clearly a senarius and hence comes from some play of Naevius. Cicero may have read the play himself for, as we have seen, he was familiar with some of Naevius’ dramatic works. On the other hand, it is equally possible that it was circulating in Rome as part of the anecdote which was later repeated in full by Pseudo-Asconius and that Cicero lifted it from its context as a verse which could be easily paraphrased for use against the Metelli of his own time and would be readily recognized together with its political implications.

Turning now to the anecdote as it appears in Pseudo-Asconius, let us first note that the verse *dabunt malum Metelli Naevio Poetae* was known to Caesius Bassus, who lived under Nero. Bassus characterizes the verse as follows: *optimus (saturnius) est quem Metelli proposuerunt de Naevio aliquotiens ab eo versu lacesiti:*

Malum dabunt Metelli Naevio Poetae.

*Hic enim saturnius constat ex hipponactei quadrati iambici posteriore commate et phallico metro.*

If we now compare the notices of Bassus and Pseudo-Asconius regarding this verse, we find substantial agreement in the matter of context. That the verse begins with *malum dabunt* in one and with *dabunt malum* in the other, a reverse in order of the same words which affects neither sense nor meter, can hardly be considered more than a copyist’s error which need not concern us here. Rather, the important thing is that both authors knew
that the verse was composed by a Metellus in answer to an attack on him or his family by the poet Naevius. From the verse itself Bassus could have inferred that the Metelli had written it about Naevius and indeed his use of the plural Metelli in his comment quem (versum) Metelli proposuerunt de Naevio indicates that this comment had been influenced by the contents of the verse. Pseudo-Asconius is more exact in speaking of a Metellus Consul. But it would have been impossible for Bassus to infer from the verse alone that it was a reply to an attack by Naevius and, what is more, an attack in verse (Metelli aliquotiens ab eo [Naevio] versu lacessit). This is one of several cogent reasons why Wissowa's hypothesis that this Saturnian was invented by Bassus must be abandoned.

On the other hand, the word aliquotiens is significant. Pseudo-Asconius states expressly that the Saturnian dabunt malum was a reply to the insulting verse fato Metelli. Bassus' aliquotiens ("on several occasions") thus indicates a vaguer knowledge of the background. Bassus knew that Naevius had attacked the Metelli in verse and that the Metelli had answered in a Saturnian. He doesn't appear to have known just how Naevius took the first provocative steps, but it seemed reasonable to him to assume that there had been a number of attacks.

All this is consistent with the purpose and plan of his work. Bassus was not writing a commentary on Cicero but a work on meters. He was interested in Naevius only in so far as Naevius could furnish him with examples of Saturnians for his chapter on the Saturnian verse. In citing two of Naevius' Saturnians (1 and 7 Morel), he states simply apud Naevium poetam hos repperi idoneos, or when speaking of the difficulty of finding correct Saturnians, ut vix invenerim apud Naevium quos pro exemplo ponerem. On the other hand, the Saturnian of the Metelli needed fuller identification than apud Naevium poetam. It was not evidently contained in any work which could be briefly indicated by the name of the author as the Bellum Punicum was indicated by the name of Naevius; nor could the document in which it stood be cited as in the case of the two Saturnians quoted ex Regilli tabula and in Acilii Glabrionis tabula. To indicate the origin of the Saturnian of the Metelli, to identify it for the reader, a few words regarding its background were necessary. They or something very much like them must have been in Bassus source. They represent part of the anecdote told in full by Pseudo-Asconius, but they were made to serve another purpose.

What, then, was Bassus' source? Surely a work on metrics.
But whose? Let us see what we can now learn from an analysis of his entire chapter.

In demonstrating that the Saturnian *Malum dabunt* was composed *ex hipponactei quadrati iambici posteriore commate et phallico metro*, Bassus cites as an example of a *hipponacteus quadratus* the following verse without indication of author: *quid immerentibus noces quid invides amicis*. The *quid invides amicis* is made the equivalent of *malum dabunt Metelli*, while with the removal of the first syllable (*detracta syllaba prima*) it becomes *invides amicis* or the equivalent of *Naevio Poetae*.

In spite of Bassus’ silence, the origin of the verse *quid immerentibus* has been ascertained. In an important article on ancient metrical systems, Leo called attention to the fact that the same verse is cited by Diomedes from Varro: *septenarium versum Varro fieri dicit hoc modo cum ad iambicum trisyllabus pes additur et fit tale: quid immerentibus, etc.*

Wissowa was inclined to believe that this verse is a post-Varronian invention reflecting Horace, *Epod. 6, 1*: *quid immerentis hospites vexas canis*. In view of Diomedes’ express testimony, such a view can hardly be accepted. Thus we have learned that Bassus was indebted to Varro for one example, at least, in his discussion of the Latin Saturnian. Is there other Varronian material to be found therein?

Bassus begins his chapter by saying that *nostri* (Latin writers on metrics) considered the Saturnian peculiar to Italy, but that they were in error since it had been used by the Greeks. The *nostri* are not difficult to identify since Varro indicates clearly in the *De Lingua Latina* (VII, 36) that he considers the Saturnian a native Italic verse form. Bassus then proceeds to give three examples in Latin of some Greek Saturnians. As Leo observed, we have in these Greek Saturnians no more than Latin verses which are the metrical equivalents of three Greek verse forms: the Euripedeum, Archilocheum and Eupolideum. To explain the fact that Bassus presented these forms as Greek Saturnians, Leo assumed—and rightly, I believe—that Bassus knew of genuine Latin Saturnians which had these same forms. He then found their Greek metrical equivalents in a manual of Greek meters and thus classified these metrics as Greek Saturnians. The final step was to compose verses in Latin which would illustrate them. Since Varro did not believe in a Greek Saturnian, it follows that this part of Bassus’ chapter could not have come from Varro.

On the other hand, Bassus might well have found in Varro the genuine Latin Saturnians, the metrical forms of which allowed...
him to find exact Greek equivalents (his Greek Saturnians). He naturally had to give new Latin versions of these Greek forms since otherwise he would have been presenting genuine Latin Saturnians which would have been recognized as such. But had he presented his examples in Greek, they would have been quickly recognized as the Greek verse forms which they were: not Saturnians, but a Euripedeum, etc. Bassus was striving to prove the existence of a Greek Saturnian at any cost.

But when we come to the Latin Saturnians which follow in Bassus’ discussion, we come to actual verses, not verses manufactured to serve as metrical illustrations. Two of them, as we have noted above, are taken from tabulae triunphales and two from Naevius’ Bellum Punicum. Bassus cites them as if at first hand. But the fact is that he otherwise cites no author older than Terence and it is not likely that he consulted the tabulae or the epic directly. Leo and Wissowa both believe that he found these verses reproduced in Varro and I agree. But if this is so, why should he not have found there also the Saturnian malum dabunt, which is an integral part of the same section?

The apparent reason is this: his metrical analysis of malum dabunt is not the analysis which we should expect of Varro. As we know from its vestiges preserved in the grammarians, Varro propounded a metrical system based on the theory that all meters were derived from two original forms, the dactylic hexameter or the iambic trimeter, by means of adiectio, detractio, concinnatio or permutatio. To Varro, for example, an octonarius is formed cum duo iambi pedes iambico metro praeponuntur, a septenarius cum ad iambicum trisyllabus pes additur (both examples of adiectio). We would therefore expect a less complex analysis of the Saturnian than that given by Bassus and, in fact, this is what we have.

In his brief definition of the Saturnian verse, Diomedes writes as follows: Saturnium in honorem dei Naevius invenit addita una syllaba ad iambicum versum sic: summas opes qui regum regias refregit. Huic si demas ultimam syllabam, erit iambicus de quo saepe memoratum est.

Although Diomedes does not cite his source, his analysis obviously rests on the principle of adiectio and must go back ultimately to Varro. Bassus, however, as we have noted above, gave a far different analysis, although there seems to be a trace there of general Varronian theory (cui detracta syllaba prima facit phallicon metrum; clearly detractio). Yet in doing so, he used a verse of Varro as the basis of his analysis (the quid immernentibus noces) which Varro defined as a septenarius formed
by the addition of a three-syllable foot to an iambicus while Bassus defined it as an *hipponacteus quadra\-tus*.

With this evidence before us, we can see how Bassus worked in composing his chapter *De Saturnio Versu*. In the belief that Greek Saturnians existed, he discovered Greek verses which were the metrical equivalents of some Saturnians and composed Latin counterparts to illustrate their metrical structure. Coming to the Latin Saturnian, he cited genuine examples including that of the Metelli from Varro. When he came, however, to the analysis of the Saturnian verse form, he had a theory which differed from that of Varro. This was natural since he did not agree with Varro also on the origin of the verse. But he found in Varro a *septenarius* which would serve to illustrate his theory and he used it. It was one thing to draw his genuine Saturnians from Varro; another to explain their composition.

The thesis which has just been presented on the evidence of Bassus alone that he took the verse *malum dabunt* and what he knew of its historical background from a metrical work of Varro receives welcome support from Pseudo-Asconius. As a commentator, Pseudo-Asconius was primarily concerned with explaining a remark of Cicero. But curiously enough he adds to the factual material which serves his immediate purpose, a metrical comment: *cui tunc Metellus Consul responderat senario hypercatale\-cto qui et Saturnius dicitur*. This must have stood almost certainly in his source and gives us a slight indication of its nature. It was not the kind of glossary or grammatical work from which he seems to have drawn most of his quotations from the older poets, for such works, as we know from Festus-Paulus, were rarely concerned with metrical problems. The author of this source was primarily interested in an event in Naevius' life; but he was also interested enough in metrical matters to offer an analysis of a Saturnian in passing. To him a Saturnian was a *senarius hypercatale\-ctus*.

I hardly need to point out that this is merely a more succinct way of saying that a Saturnian was a verse formed *addita una syllaba ad iambicum versum* or Varro's definition of a Saturnian. Howsoever the collection of scholia which passes under the name of Pseudo-Asconius may have grown up, we have a part of it at least which indicates Varro as the ultimate source. We cannot tell, of course, through how many hands it passed before reaching the Verrine scholia but of one thing we can be certain: it did not pass through Bassus. On the other hand, the similarity of the accounts of Bassus (as far as he goes) and Pseudo-Asconius in everything but metrical analysis (and we have seen why and...
how the difference arose in Bassus) points to common Varronian origin for the material held in common but does not point to the same work. The source of Bassus was a discussion of the Saturnian meter, that of Pseudo-Asconius a biographical notice.

Where was this notice contained? Varro knew of Naevius' imprisonment ob assiduam maledicentiam et probra in principes de Graecorum poetarum more dicta (Gellius, III, 3). The words de Graecorum poetarum more refer to the ὄνομαστὶ κομῳδεῖν or the τροφανῶς σκόπτειν of old Greek comedy and indicate that Varro was thinking of attacks by Naevius from the stage on the chief men of the state. We have one such attack preserved in the verse fato Metelli. Moreover, it is rightly believed by almost all scholars that part, at least, of the malum which the Metelli promised to inflict on Naevius took the form of the imprisonment to which Plautus refers.51

Gellius took the notice of this imprisonment, as we have seen above, from the De Comoediis Plautinis. But we can hardly believe that such an important event in Naevius' life, together with its attendant circumstances, was not recounted in some detail in the biography of Naevius contained in the De Poetis. That Varro indulged in such natural repetition is proved by the notice of Plautus' labor in a mill. It appeared both in the De Comoediis Plautinis, as attested by Gellius (III, 3) and in the De Poetis as attested by St. Jerome (01.145, 1, p. 24 Reiffersheid).

As for the metrical definition of the verse dabunt malum which Pseudo-Asconius reproduces, it seems most likely that Varro, whose interest in the Saturnian we have observed, took the occurrence of this verse in his biographical anecdote as an occasion to express his opinion in passing regarding its formation. His contemporaries needed no explanation of the preceding senarius and did not receive one; a Saturnian in the time of Varro was something that merited particular comment.

Our study, therefore, of the sources of information regarding Naevius' life in authors other than Gellius has led us time and again back to the works of Varro, in general, and to his De Poetis in particular.52 If we add the sum total of this evidence to what we earlier ascertained about Gellius' dependence on Varro for his knowledge of other aspects of Naevius' life, we shall have to conclude that Gellius learned also from Varro that Naevius was a Capuan. Whether he found it in some such form as Cnaeus Naevius Capuae natus est (cf. the Suetonian life of Terence, 1. 1) or Naevius Campanus (cf. Jerome's Pacuvius Brundisinus) makes little difference. As we have seen above, if Gellius wrote the comment on the superbia Campana of Naevius' epitaph, he
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understood the word Campanus in the sense of Capuan. If, on the other hand, the comment is repeated from Varro, we arrive at the same result, for we know that to Varro Campanus also meant Capuan and would have been used in this sense anywhere in his biography of Naevius.

The instances of the word Campanus in Latin literature have been collected in the Thesaurus. There it can be seen that it was used in literature, until Livy, solely in reference to the city of Capua and its ager. In Livy, it usually retains its old, circumscribed meaning, but in one passage this meaning has been extended to cover the natives or inhabitants of other cities situated in Campania. Because the term had thus begun to lose its precise meaning, it was evidently felt that a new term should be used to designate the "Capuan" in contradistinction to the "Campanian." Although Capuanus is not attested in literature until Symmachus, its popular use was as old as Varro. In the De Lingua Latina he writes (X, 16): quare proinde ac simile conferri non oportet ac dicere, ut sit ab Roma Romanus, sic ex Capua dici oportere Capuanus quod in consuetudine vehementer natat.

Varro, then, stood against the use of Capuanus for Capuan. Clearly, then, he must have used the traditional Campanus. Both in R. R., I, 2, 10 and in the fragment of the Res Humanae cited by Macrobius (III, 16, 12) where he uses Campanus, he is obviously thinking of Capua. His use of Campanus in R. R., I, 2, 6 is classed as dubiae interpretationis in the Thesaurus but a comparison of the context with the fragment cited by Macrobius makes it clear that we again have the meaning Capuan. (The reference in the Thesaurus to Varro, rust., 2, 3, 14 is a mistake for Horace, Sat. II, 3, 143-144). In view of this evidence, especially the express statement in the De Lingua Latina, I cannot attribute much importance to the statement of Servius Danielis on Aen. X, 145 (p. 404 Thilo-Hagen) that Varro dicit—campum eundem Capuanum cratera dictum. Here Varro may have reproduced a popular designation of his time (Capuanus crater) which contained a form of the adjective of which he disapproved or the author of the scholium may have slipped unwittingly into the terminology of his own time while transcribing.

We may have seemed to have taken a long path to arrive at the conclusion that Naevius was a Capuan and that Varro said so. But for our understanding of much in Naevius' life it was essential that his origin be placed on the firmest possible basis. I plan elsewhere to use this Capuan origin of Naevius to restudy parts of his life about which too much has already been written.
without due reference to his civil status. It was worth while too, I believe, to learn how deeply indebted we are to the great Roman polymath for our knowledge of the life of the first Latin poet. With Varro as our authority, we may be certain that what we know about Naevius is true in so far as Varro could attain the facts. And we know that Varro worked well and wisely to attain them.

NOTES

1 I, 24.
3 *Sitzb. Sächs. Akad.*, LXIII (1911), 49 f.
7 The epitaphs of Naevius and Plautus were probably not true epitaphs but epideictic epigrams, while that of Pacuvius was a true epitaph; cf. Buechler, *Rh. Mus.*, XXXVII (1882), 521, n. 1 = *Kleine Schriften*, II, 466, n. 1, and Leo, op. cit., 438, n. 1. But this doubtful authenticity does not affect our immediate problem.
9 In this connection, I did not find O. Froehde's "Römische Dichtercitate bei Gellius" (*Festschrift Johannes Vahlen*, pp. 525 ff.) very helpful. Consequently, I examined all of Gellius' citations from the *Annals* and assured myself that in at least seven passages Gellius states or indicates that he is citing the *Annals* either by memory or from the text (I, 22, 16; X, 29, 2; XII, 4, 5; XIII, 21, 13; XVI, 10, 1; XVIII, 2, 16; XX, 10, 4).
10 He does this again in X, 1, 6.
11 V, 12.
12 On this dependence, see J. Kretzschmer, *De Auctoribus A. Gellii Grammaticis* (Berlin, 1866), pp. 44 ff.
13 In the preface to his Teubner edition of Gellius, pp. xxxiv f.
14 III, 3.
16 VII, 8.
17 First perceived by Joseph Justus Scaliger. The most complete discussion of the problem is still that of Reifferscheid, *Suetoni Reliquiae*, pp. 363 ff. The notice on Naevius appears there on p. 23. For a recent estimate of the nature and extent of the section of the *De Viris Illustribus* which dealt with the Latin poets, the section from which St. Jerome took his information on Naevius, see Rostagni, *Suetonio de poetis e biografi minori* (Torino, 1944), pp. v-xxiv.
18 *Plautinische Forschungen*, p. 69.
19 *Philologus*, Suppl. XXI (1929), Heft II, 13 ff.
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22 The most satisfactory discussion of the Liber Annalis and its relation to Cicero's later works is that of Münzer, Hermes, XL (1905), 50 ff. For the date of composition and dedication, see idem, pp. 50 f.


24 Münzer has also shown that many other parts of the chronology of the Cato Maior were taken from the Liber Annalis; op. cit., pp. 61 ff.

25 The passages in which Cicero discusses or cites Naevius have been collected by W. Zillinger, Cicero und die altromischen Dichter (Erlangen Diss., 1911), pp. 91 ff.


27 ANTIAΔΩPON (Festschrift Jacob Wackernagel), pp. 181 ff.

28 AJP, XLVIII (1927), 105 ff.

29 Genethliacon für Carl Robert, pp. 51 ff.

30 Gzech. d. röm. Lit., p. 78, n. 5.


32 Ad Fam., V, 2, 8: Huius (Metelli) ego temeritati si virtute atque animo non restitissem, quis esset qui me in consulatu non casu potius existimaret quam consilio fortanmuisse?

33 Marmorale (op. cit., pp. 57 ff.) not only considers this verse a Saturnian and assigns it therefore to the Bellum Punicum but holds also that it was written to honor L. Caecilius Metellus (Cos. 251).

34 GL, VI, 266, 5 Keil.

35 Wissowa, op. cit., p. 61.

36 GL, VI, 263, 30; 14.


38 Idem, p. 266, 10.

39 Hermes, XXIV (1889), 280 ff., especially n. 2, p. 281. The parts dealing with Bassus and the Saturnian have been expanded in the same author's Der Saturnische Vers, Abh. Gött., VIII (1905), 7 ff.

40 GL, I, 515, 5.


42 GL, VI, 265, 8.

43 Sat. Vers, p. 10.

44 Wissowa, op. cit., p. 59.

45 Cf. Rufinus, GL, VI, 555, 22.


47 Cf. Bassus, GL, VI, 271, 5; Leo, Hermes, p. 289, especially n. 5.

48 Cf. Diomedes, who cites Varro expressly as his source for both definitions; GL, I, 515, 8; 3.

49 Idem, p. 512, 18.

50 In his first article (Hermes, p. 281, n. 1), Leo was certain of this. Later (Sat. Vers, p. 9, n. 2; cf. p. 7, n. 2) he still admitted the possibility of Varronian origin but considered Diomedes' example summas opes qui regum regias refregit very doubtful as a genuine Saturnian. In view of Varro's metrical system as illustrated above and what I shall later say about the source of Pseudo-Asconius, I believe that all the evidence still points to Varro.

51 Miles, 211 f.; cf. Festus-Paulus, s.v. Barbari, p. 23, Lindsay. The exact interpretation of Plautus' allusion has caused much discussion (cf. Marmorale, op. cit., pp. 107 ff., who deals with earlier theories). But Leo (Geschichte, p. 78, n. 5), Fränkel (op. cit.) and others are undoubtedly correct in referring it to Naevius' imprisonment.

52 The only piece of information the source of which I have not discussed is
the one of Plautus and Festus-Paulus mentioned in the preceding note. As a
ccontemporary of Naevius, Plautus, to say nothing of his audience, had heard
of Naevius' imprisonment at first hand. There is no question here of a literary
source. As for the notice in Paulus (Festus is lost here) which identifies the
 poeta barbarus of Plautus as Naevius, it probably goes back to a glossary of
Plautus, for it appears within a list of Plautine glosses (cf. Reitzenstein, Ver-
rianische Forschungen, pp. 58-67). There is no way, however, of identifying
its author.

58 TLL, Onomasticon II, cols. 129 ff.

54 An exception to this statement may be contained in Horace's morbus Cam-
panus (Sat., I, 5, 62) if this meant the Campanian rather than the Capuan
disease.

55 This can be seen in XXVI, 34. In section 6, we find Campani used to
designate "Capuans" in contradistinction to Atellani, Calatini and Sabatini (cf.
33, 12); in 8, we find qui nec Capuae nec in urbe Campana quae a populo
Romano defecisset. Here the urbs Campana would be Atella or Cales.
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Errata.

In the title of Mr. Rowell’s article under Contents and on pp. 15 and 17 C. Naevius should read CN. Naevius.