

IOANNIS G. TAIFACOS

CICERO AND THE SICILIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY:
TIMAEUS

o. Introduction

o.1. Philistus and Timaeus, the two writers who belong to the circle of the Sicilian historiography, are the only ones who have attained an outstanding position in the surviving works of Cicero. The purpose of this paper is the examination of Cicero's point of view with regards the historical work of Timaeus and of the historical and geographical information one can draw from the works of the latter. In the future a similar presentation will be made concerning Philistus' place in the works of Cicero (1).

o.2. The lack of any reference by Cicero — at least in his surviving works — to other eminent representatives of the Sicilian historiography (2) leads one to believe that he had no knowledge of its overall production, of its specific characteristics and style, and, moreover, it is impossible to draw any pertinent conclusions from his works. That being the case, out of necessity, one must turn and examine the two writers, Timaeus and Philistus by Cicero, individually.

(1) Cicero cites Philistus in *div.* 1, 20, 39 (= *FGrHist* 556 T 24, F 57), 1, 33, 73 (= F 58), *Brut.* 17, 66 (= T 21), *de orat.* 2, 13, 57 (= T 17b), and *ad Q. fr.* 2, 11, 4 (= T 17a).

(2) The other eminent writers are: Alcimus, mentioned also by later Latin authors (*FGrHist* 560 F 4, 8, 9-10); Athanas (*ibid.* 562); Callias, to whom Macrobius makes reference (564 F 1); Antandros (565); Nymphodorus, to whom Pliny and Natalius refer quite often along with Aulus Gellius and Tertullian (572 T 3a-c, F 13, 14, 17-21). For a historical outline of that historiography see B. Pace, *Arte e civiltà della Sicilia antica III: Cultura e vita religiosa*, Città di Castello 1945, 139-172; E. Manni, *Da Ippi a Diodoro*, « *Κώκκαλος* » 3, 1957, 136-155. Recent scholarship (1964-1968) on the subject is discussed in F.W. Walbank, *The Historians of Greek Sicily*, « *Κώκκαλος* » 14-15, 1968-1969, 476-497.

o.3. A swift review of those excerpts of Timaeus to be found in Cicero's work is rather disappointing; every one of them being an extract whose origin, book and number is unknown, giving one the immediate impression that Cicero is dealing with reports which were received extempore, or second hand, in order to cover information for instance. The fragment referring to the simultaneous burning of the temple of Artemis in Ephesos and the birth of Alexander the Great is characteristic, because with its witticism is attributed by Plutarch to Hegesias the Magnesian (3). This very same fragment has been referred to by Jacoby as unclassified (4), while, with regards Timaeus, the remaining passages belong to three categories. The only fragment which is considered as having a historical basis is the one from Lucceius' letter where information is given to the effect that Timoleon was praised by Timaeus (5). Two other fragments, that which refers to Timaeus' refutation of the historical existence of Zaleucus, the lawgiver of the Locrians — two passages — (6), and of Timaeus' exile (7) belong to cultural history, while that referring to *De re publica* concerns a description of land, that is, of the beautiful and renowned city of Syracuse (8).

I. *Timaeus as a historiographer according to Cicero*

I.1. One group of Cicero's reference to Timaeus is derived from a presupposed knowledge of the Timaeian text and of its position within the sphere of Hellenistic historiography as a whole. I shall proceed immediately to the texts.

I.1.1. In his second book of *De oratore* Cicero refers to Timaeus as being one among other Greek historians who did not use his rhetoric ability in court, but in the writing of history. Tauromenian is referred to specifically: *minimus natu horum omnium* (sc. Herodotus, Thucydides, Philistus, and others) *Timaeus, quantum autem iudicare possum, longe eruditissimus et rerum*

(3) Cic. *nat. deor.* 2, 27, 69 = Timaeus, *FGrHist* 566 F 150a.

(4) An index of Timaeus' fragments and their location in Jacoby's edition is given in T.S. Brown, *Timaeus of Tauromenium*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1958 (= University of California Publications in History 55), 21-22.

(5) Cic. *epist.* 5, 12, 7 = Tim. F 119c.

(6) *Leg.* 2, 6, 15 = Tim. F 130a; *Att.* 6, 1, 18 = Tim. F 130b.

(7) *Brut.* 16, 63 = Tim. F 138.

(8) *Rep.* 3, 31, 43 = Tim. F 40.

copia et sententiarum varietate abundantissimus et ipsa compositione verborum non impolitus magnam eloquentiam ad scribendum attulit, sed nullum usum forensem (9). In spite of the fact that Cicero praises the eloquence of Timaeus, remaining faithful to his belief that historiography belongs to the general area of the eloquence, but that the eloquence of a historian is quite different from that of an orator (10), which must be just *ad forensem usum et publicum* (11), he condemns from an orator's point of view this eloquence as having *nullum usum forensem* (12). He cannot however disregard the great wealth of knowledge and information that this historian has to offer, that is, that part of his historiography connected purely with a specific acquaintance with antiquarian research. The combination of the above, along with his eloquence present us with the twin capacities of an integral, comprehensive, and successful historian, as he is viewed by Cicero; a historian who must have been an « artist and scholar » (13).

1.1.2. A second testimony reaches us through *Brutus*. In this case, Timaeus is placed among the historians of the Asian style (Ἀσιανὸς ζῆλος), as a representative of its first kind, the sententious and studied, and is related to such representative orators such as the brothers Hierocles and Meneclides from Alabanda (14). Timaeus' style has been characterized *sententiosum et argutum, sententiis non tam gravibus et severis quam concinnis et venustis* (15). It has already been observed that Cicero's judge-

(9) *De orat.* 2, 14, 58 = Tim. T 20; cf. H. Henze, *Quomodo Cicero de historia eiusque auctoribus iudicaverit quaeritur*, Diss. Ienae 1899, 53.

(10) Cf. P. Boyancé, *Sur Cicéron et l'histoire*, « REA » 42, 1940, 389.

(11) *Orat.* 9, 30: *Thucydides autem res gestas et bella narrat et proelia, graviter sane et probe, sed nihil ab eo transferri potest ad forensem usum et publicum*. See L. Ferrero, *Osservazioni sugli interessi storici ciceroniani*, « GIF » 3, 1950, 234.

(12) See also K.A. Sinkovich, *Cicero historicus*, « RSC » 22, 1974, 166.

(13) E. Rawson, *Cicero the historian and Cicero the antiquarian*, « JRS » 62, 1972, 44-45.

(14) Examples of this kind of Asian style from literature and inscriptions are given in C. Wooten, *Le développement du style asiatique pendant l'époque Hellénistique*, « REG » 88, 1975, 100-102.

(15) *Brut.* 95, 325 = Tim. T 21. On this passage, see U. von Wilamowitz - Möllendorff, *Asianismus und Atticismus*, « Hermes » 35, 1900, 1-2; J.F. D'Alton, *Roman literary theory and criticism. A study in tendencies*, New York 1962, 501; A.D. Leeman, *Orationis ratio. The stylistic theories and practice of the Roman orators, historians, and philosophers I*, Amsterdam 1963, 94-95.

ment of Timaeus, who was a Sicilian, presents him as a characteristic representative of a significant tendency in historiography, that of the Asian style which, at this point, ceases to be confined within strict geographical boundaries (16). Cicero does not proceed any deeper in characterizing Timaeus' style, does not offer further examples or excerpts from his writings, something that was done, for instance, by Caecilius or by the author of the essay *Περὶ ὕψους*. The latter, in fact, presents *verbatim* only three samples of the cold style of Timaeus *ἐπειδὴ τὰ πλείω προέλαβεν ὁ Καικίλιος* (17).

1.2. The two testimonies that have been referred to above in Cicero's works present a clear picture of that which Timaeus represented: that is the rhetorical historiography for whose sake the Tauromenian historian sacrificed many of the virtues of his art (18). We have, however, two additional significant testimonies, pertaining to the historiographical method of Timaeus, in the famous letter of Cicero to Lucceius. In spite of the fact that these reports are not unique because they can be checked against other texts in classical literature (19), they assume an entirely special significance since they concern Hellenistic historiography as this is interpreted by Cicero.

1.2.1. Approximately seven years after his turbulent consulship, the orator wrote to Lucceius asking the following: he begs him, in the stories that he was writing at the time to separate Catilina's conspiracy from the external wars of that era by presenting a separate monograph, such as that which had been written by three Hellenistic historians, whom he mentions and whose names he associates with the wars that were described by them: *ut multi Graeci fecerunt, Callisthenes Phocicum bellum, Timaeus Pyrrhi, Polybius Numantinum, qui omnes a perpetuis suis historiis ea, quae*

(16) D'Alton, 209.

(17) [Longin.] 4. 1 ff. = Caecil. fr. 85 Ofenloch. Timaeus' fragments are: 102a, 122, and 139.

(18) Cf. D'Alton, 500-501.

(19) See D.H. 1, 6, 1 = Tim. T 9b: *ἐπειτα Τιμαίου τοῦ Σικελιώτου τὰ μὲν ἀρχαῖα τῶν ἱστοριῶν ἐν ταῖς κοιναῖς ἱστορίαις ἀφηγησαμένου, τοὺς δὲ πρὸς Πύρρον τὸν Ἑπειρώτην πολέμους εἰς ἰδίαν καταχωρίσαντος πραγματείαν.* The only certain fragment is Plb. 12, 4b 1 = Tim. F 39. For the others see P. Lévêque, *Pyrrhos*, Paris 1957 (= Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 182), 32-33. In Gell. 11, 1, 1 = Tim. T 9c we see an allusion to this monograph (cf. below).

dixi, bella separaverunt, tu quoque item civilem coniurationem ab hostilibus externisque bellis seiungeres (20). It is indisputable that Timaeus served as a significant source pertaining to the wars of Pyrrhus against Rome (21). To Rome and its annalists these wars were highly significant events which found their eulogizer and poet in Q. Ennius whom Cicero held in high esteem and used as a source (22). As it is being presented from a Roman point of view and particularly in his philosophical works (23), even Cicero's information about the wars of Pyrrhus shows clearly that it had originated in Roman sources, most certainly in Ennius and annalists (24). It is quite probable that the attractive light under which Pyrrhus has been viewed has its origin in these writers (25). The knowledge of a monograph by Timaeus was left as an argument for the literary critic, in order to convince Luceius.

1.2.2. In a second mention of Timaeus in the same letter, Cicero's emphasis is transferred from Timaeus to Timoleon who is praised by him (26). It is well known the excessive praise of the Corinthian general by the Sicilian historiographer who, according to Plutarch, said that ἐπιφωνεῖν ἔπρεπεν

ὦ θεοί, τίς ἄρα Κύπρις ἢ τίς Ἴμερος
τοῦδε ξυνήψατο; (27)

(20) *Epist.* 5, 12, 2 = *Tim.* T 9a; cf. Brown, 112 n. 55. Callisthenes: *FGrHist* 124 T 25; Polybius: 173 T 2.

(21) See Lévêque, 32-37.

(22) *Ibid.* 45-46 (Ennius), 47-51 (annalists).

(23) R. Schütz, *Ciceros historische Kenntnisse*, Diss. Berlin 1913, 70-72 with refs.; the only passage from Greek point of view is *off.* 2, 7, 26 (cf. Schütz, 49).

(24) See *Enn. ann.* 179-181, 194-203 V³, all from Cicero's philosophical works; Cicero knew also the speech of App. Claudius Caecus *De Pyrrho rege*: *ORF*⁴ 1 F 4-6.

(25) T. Frank, *Two historical themes in Latin literature*, «CPh» 21, 1926, 314: «... Pyrrhus is the only enemy of Rome who is consistently treated with sympathy by the Roman annalists». Compare *Cic. Lael.* 8, 28: *cum duobus ducibus de imperio in Italia est decertatum, Pyrrho et Hannibale; ab altero propter probitatem eius non nimis alienos animos habemus, alterum propter crudelitatem semper haec civitas oderit.*

(26) This is an observation of R.J.A. Talbert, *Timoleon and the revival of Greek Sicily 344-317 B.C.*, Cambridge 1974 (= Cambridge Classical Studies), 40 n. 1.

(27) *Plu. Tim.* 36, 2, 253c = *Tim.* F 119b. It is doubtful if Plutarch quotes Sophocles (*TrGF* IV fr. 874) or Timocles (*ibid.* 86 F 1); cf. Radt *ad TrGF* IV p. 567.

Polybius' violent reaction against this praise of the man is also well known; as being a man whom Τίμαιος... μείζω ποιεῖ... τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων θεῶν (28), but Westlake condemned as an opportunist (29). During the last decades, archaeological evidence from research, conducted on Sicilian ground, have proven the man as one of eminence, a man about whom we are in a position to speak of as a 'renaissance' of the island (30). Cicero makes an allusion to a praise when he asks of his friend to have in his stories the same place that Timoleon has in Timaeus and Themistocles in Herodotus: *atque hoc praestantius mihi fuerit et ad laetitiam animi et ad memoriae dignitatem, si in tua scripta pervenero quam si in ceterorum, quod non ingenium mihi solum suppeditatum fuerit tuum, sicut Timoleonti a Timaeo aut ab Herodoto Themistocli* (31). In other words, in combination with the testimony about the central hero of the Pyrrhian wars and Timoleon, which has already been analyzed above, Cicero is demanding a laudatory historical monograph to be written by a recognised historian, *a laudato viro* (32). All this is perfectly clarified in Timaeus' two testimonies which also help in interpreting both writers.

(28) Plb. 12, 23, 4 = Tim. F 119a with a comparison (of Polybius) of Timoleon and Alexander the Great (§§ 5-6); Brown 83, 103; F.W. Walbank, *Polemic in Polybius*, « JRS » 52, 1962, 9. But at the same time Polybius makes a comparison between Scipio and the Spartan lawgiver, Lycurgus (10, 2, 8-13): ἐμοί (δὲ) δοκεῖ Πόπλιος Λυκούργῳ τῷ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων νομοθέτῃ παραπλησίαν ἐσχηκέναι φύσιν καὶ προχίρῃσιν; cf. F. Focke, *Synkrisis*, « Hermes » 58, 1923, 349.

(29) H.D. Westlake, *Timoleon and his relations with tyrants*, Manchester 1952 (= Publications of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Manchester 5); cf. in a review by J.H. Kent, « CPh » 48, 1953, 279: « Professor Westlake demolishes once and for all the Timoleon legend ».

(30) See the articles presented by various scholars in « Κώκυλος » 4, 1958. Cf. also P. Lévêque, *De Timoleon à Pyrrhos*, *ibid.* 14-15, 1968-1969, 138-139. For a systematic presentation of the material: Talbert, 116-191.

(31) *Epist.* 5, 12, 7 = Tim. F. 119c; cf. Jacoby's commentary IIIb I p. 586 and Brown, 83.

(32) V. Paladini, *Sul pensiero storiografico di Cicerone*, « RAL⁸ » 2, 1947, 518 ff., 520 = « Latomus » 6, 1947, 339 ff., 341-342. B. Shimron, *Ciceronian historiography*, « Latomus » 33, 1974, 232-244, suggests that *encomium* refers to the style and not to the content of the monograph. That the historian, according to Cicero, must be an important one is clear from the quotation of the Naevian verse:

laetus sum laudari me abs te pater a laudato viro

from *Hector proficiscens* (SRF I 35 fr. I v. 17 Kl.). In fact, Lucceius was a friend of Theophanes (FGrHist 188 T 8ab) who wrote Τὰ περὶ Πομπηίου (? F 1-7), a monograph on Pompeius' war against Mithridates. Cf. Paladini, 520-521 = 340-342.

2. *Timaeus' fragments in Cicero's works*

2.1. According to the evidence found in his rhetorical works and his letter to Lucceius, we have seen what Cicero knew about the style of Timaeus' historical work and his opinion of this work. Material derived from these works, whose quality has already been sketchily presented above, is also to be found in Cicero's. Let us analyze these fragments in greater detail.

2.1.1. In the surviving portion of Scipio's speech, which refers to a just governing as being the foundation of a state, in *De legibus*' third book, Syracuse, a famous, spacious and most beautiful city, which was being tyrannized, is presented as a major example. Of its lovely edifices, its avenues, its stoas, its shrines, its fortification walls, none belonged to its people, while these very people were the property of one, its tyrant. As to the size and the beauty of the city, Cicero without question invokes Timaeus' testimony: *atque hoc idem Syracusis, urbs illa praeclara, quam ait Timaeus Graecarum maximam, omnium autem esse pulcherrimam, arx visenda, portus usque in sinus oppidi et ad urbis crepidines infusi, viae latae, porticus, templa muri nihilo magis efficiebant, Dionysio tenente ut esset illa res publica; nihil enim populi, et unius erat populus ipse* (33). Being aware, however, of Timaeus' revulsion towards the tyrants of Syracuse (34), since he had been exiled by one of them, Agathocles (35), a fact that was already known to Cicero (36),

(33) *Rep.* 3, 31, 43 = *Tim.* F 40; cf. Jacoby's commentary IIIb I p. 559. See also H. Kothe, *Zu den Fragmenten des Historikers Timaios*, « *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* » 137, 1888, 825 and *Timaios und Ciceros Tusculanen*, *ibid.* 139, 1889, 637 n. 1.

(34) See *Plb.* 8, 12, 12 = *Tim.* T 124a: τὴν ... Τιμαίου τοῦ συγγραφέως πικρίαν, ἣ κέρηται κατ' Ἀγαθοκλέους τοῦ Σικελίας δυνάστου, ... ὁμως λόγον ἔχειν - ὡς γὰρ κατ' ἐχθροῦ καὶ πονηροῦ καὶ τυράννου διατίθεται τὴν κατηγορίαν. Compare *Diod.* 21, 17, 1 = *Tim.* T 12: ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀγαθοκλέους πράξεσι τὰ πολλὰ κατάψευσται τοῦ δυνάστου διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐχθρὰν; *ibid.* = *Tim.* T 124d: ζῶντα μὲν ἀμύνασθαι τὸν δυνάστην οὐκ ἴσχυσε, τελευτήσαντα δὲ διὰ τῆς ἱστορίας ἐβλασφήμησεν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. On the contrary, Brown 6 suggests that Timaeus « had .. written about him (*sc.* Agathocles) from a distance, his diatribe would probably have been less hysterical, more professional ».

(35) *Diod.* 21, 17, 1 = *Tim.* T 4a. Cf. H.J.W. Tillyard, *Agathocles*, Cambridge 1908 (= *Cambridge Historical Essays* 15), esp. 12-18; H. Berve, *Die Herrschaft des Agathokles*, München 1953 (= *SBAW* 1952.5), esp. 4-21, and *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, München 1967, 441-457, 728-731.

(36) *Brut.* 16, 63 = *Tim.* F 138: (Lysias) *est enim Atticus, quoniam certe Athenis est et natus et mortuus et functus omni civium munere, quamquam Timaeus eum quasi Licinia et Mucia lege repetit Syracusas.* For the

one may go a step further and suppose that Timaeus provided Cicero with more than a mere geographical information.

It is true that it has already been noted above that Cicero had remarked on Timaeus' inexperience of speaking in public, and it is also true that Polybius accused him of lack of political expertise (37). All this, however, can be justified if one keeps in mind the structure of the Greek city-state. During his entire life, as far as the Athenians were concerned, Timaeus was a foreigner with no civil rights (38). Of course, he was not obligated to get involved in politics (and at this point I tend to accept Cicero's testimony rather than Polybius' criticism), but it was not possible for a historian with the broad education, all-encompassing knowledge of Timaeus, and the background of his family in politics, to cease being a politically minded person as well. His father, Andromachus, has been presented under a most favourable light by ancient sources: πλούτῳ δὲ καὶ ψυχῆς λαμπρότητι διαφέρων says Diodorus (39), πολὺ κράτιστος τῶν τότε δυναστευόντων ἐν Σικελίᾳ γενόμενος, τῶν θ' ἑαυτοῦ πολιτῶν ἠγεῖτο νομίμως καὶ δικαίως, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς τυράννους φανερὸς ἦν ἀεὶ διακείμενος ἀπεχθῶς καὶ ἀλλοτρίως says Plutarch in his *Life of Timoleon* (40). Professor Manni has presented an exceptional sample of the political thinking of Timaeus, having drawn his conclusions from the topics of his stories: « non ci allontaniamo troppo dalla verità se attribuiamo allo storico tauromenita un pensiero non del tutto strano per un nemico di Agatocle: Roma e Cartagine ... potevano, appunto come nemiche di Agatocle, essere considerate con spirito amichevole, quasi vindici di un libero mondo siceliota conculcato dall'odiato tiranno » (41). It is also true that other scholars have interpreted Timaeus directing his interests and eyes towards Rome as being a motivation related to political ideology; in the

lex referred to, see E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae* (264-70 B.C.), Oxford 1958, 213-214, 297; A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman citizenship*, Oxford² 1973, 140. R.W. Husband, *On the expulsion of foreigners from Rome*, « CPh » 11, 1916, 323 says that the Ciceronian passage « is inconclusive », while E. Gabba, *Politica e cultura in Roma agli inizi del I sec. a.C.*, « Athenaeum » 31, 1953, 261 n. 4 suggests that « l'inciso del *Brutus* è su un tono scherzoso e non pretende ad un valore storico preciso ».

(37) Cf. Brown, 6.

(38) Plb. 12, 25h 1 = Tim. T 4b; 12, 28, 6 = T 4d: ξενιτεύων.

(39) 16, 7, 1 = Tim. T 3a.

(40) 10, 7, 24od = Tim. T 3b.

(41) « Κώκαλος » 3, 1957, 146-147.

midst of the Hellenistic world, which was being governed by various monarchs and tyrants, the Roman Republic shone in the eyes of the democrats in Italy as a perfect model (42). This is the reasoning behind my view that Scipio's image of a beautiful Syracuse, which suffered under the yoke of tyrants, is a distant echo of Timaeus' rendition.

2.1.2. Another fragment which has been attributed to Timaeus (followed by the observation that it had been said neatly: *concinneque, ut multa, Timaeus*) comes from *De natura deorum* — this has already been mentioned (above, 0.3.): it refers to the simultaneous burning of the temple of Artemis in Ephesos and the birth of Alexander the Great. These two events occurred during the same night; a witticism has, in fact, been added, to the effect that it was only natural that such a disaster would happen to the temple since the goddess was absent, being in attendance at the birth of the great man: *adiunxit (sc. Timaeus) minime id esse mirandum, quod Diana, cum in partu Olympiadis adesse voluisset, afuisset domo* (43). There is no difficulty up to this point; but in his *Life of Alexander*, Plutarch attributes the above to Hegesias the Magnesian: Ἡγησίας ὁ Μάγνης ... εἰκότως γὰρ ἔφη καταφλεχθῆναι τὸν νεῶν, τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἀσχολουμένης περὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου μαίωσιν (44). In spite of the belief, according to which Cicero confused Hegesias with Timaeus (45), it is extremely difficult to accept this here, both due to the lack of further evidence, as well as the fact that Timaeus is known to have had a liking for such synchronisms (46).

2.1.3. On the other hand, another item by Timaeus is extremely well-founded and is presented in the *De legibus* and a letter sent to Atticus: this pertains to Timaeus' known view that Zaleucus, the lawgiver of the Locrians, never existed as a historical personage (47). Of all three passages in Cicero, which refer

(42) A.D. Momigliano, *Atene nel III secolo a.C. e la scoperta di Roma nelle Storie di Timeo di Tauromenio*, in: *Terzo Contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* I, Roma 1966 (= *Storia e Letteratura* 108), 44.

(43) 2, 27, 69 = Tim. F 150a. The same synchronism without Timaeus' name: *div. 1, 23, 47: qua nocte templum Ephesiae Dianae deflagavit, eadem constat ex Olympiade natum esse Alexandrum*. Cf. Schütz, 42.

(44) 3, 6, 665e.

(45) Plaumann, *RE* VIII (1913), 1146.

(46) Cf. J.R. Hamilton, *Plutarch Alexander. A commentary*, Oxford 1969, 8.

(47) *Leg. 2, 6, 15* = Tim. F 130a (the passage is quoted in the text); *Att. 6, 1, 18* = Tim. F 130b: *quis Zaleucum leges Locris scripsisse non dixit?*

to Zaleucus, Timaeus is mentioned in two along with the name of Theophrastus, the philosopher who, following the Peripatetic tradition, believed in the historical reality of the Locrian lawgiver (48). In the most significant of Cicero's three passages a comparison of the two writers is made, and — according to Cicero's view — Theophrastus is being presented as not being a scholar inferior to Timaeus, and, in fact, according to the opinion of many others, as being superior to him: *at ait Theophrastus, auctor haud deterior mea quidem sententia (meliorem multi nominant)*. Live tradition and the legend of the people of Locri, concerning their lawgiver, is also mentioned in the same passage; at the end, however, Cicero takes a neutral stand on this issue: *commemorant vero ipsius cives, nostri clientes, Locri. sed sive fuit sive non fuit, nihil ad rem; loquimur quod traditum est* (49).

3. Cicero's use of Timaeus

3.1. Following this brief review, one faces the question as to the way Cicero had come by this information. Was it indirect information or a direct use of Timaeus? He tries to emphasize the latter impression in *De oratore*. Before his favourable criticism of the historical value and the importance of Timaeus as a writer, he states: *Timaeus, quantum autem iudicare possum, longe eruditissimus* etc. (50). He had already used pretty much the same expression in a somewhat enriched form, however, when he attempted to formulate a favourable opinion of Herodotus' eloquence; he has this to say about him: *atqui tanta est eloquentia, ut me quidem, quantum ego Graece scripta intellegere possum, magno opere delectet* (51). His observations concerning Timaeus' style are such that they could be drawn by Cicero from the various handbooks on rhetoric that he had at his disposal.

num igitur iacet Theophrastus si id a Timaeo tuo familiari reprehensum est? See Jacoby's commentary IIIb I p. 589. Cf. Schütz, 18; M. Mühl, *Die Gesetze des Zaleukos und Charondas*, «Klio» 22, 1928, 459. The third passage of Cicero is again from the *De legibus* (1, 22, 57), but contains a mere reference to *leges ... Zaleuci*.

(48) See Brown, 126 n. 19 and the authors cited there.

(49) *Leg.* 2, 6, 15. Compare Mühl, 459 n. 1: «was Cicero selbst angeht, so verhält sich dieser, wie aus seinen Bemerkungen zu erschliessen ist, in der ganzen Frage neutral».

(50) 2, 14, 58.

(51) *Ibid.* 2, 13, 55.

3.2. What about the information on historical events, however? Did Cicero find it indirectly or did he have access of the Timaean texts on history and his monograph on Pyrrhus?

3.2.1. From the moment that Timaeus' historical data reached Rome — and it would only be logical that this was done following the conquest of Sicily (52) — they were read extensively by the educated Romans who enjoyed and liked reading about their victories and especially about those concerning the era of Pyrrhus (53). Timaeus also played another more significant role, when he was read in Rome; his influence in the formation of its historiography was great. In all probability Fabius Pictor, the first Roman historian who wrote history of Rome in Greek language, used him as a model. The reason for this was that Timaeus actually was the first historian concerned with Rome and the most significant one during the pre-Polybian era (54).

3.2.2. Timaeus' significance and priority in the field of Roman history is the main cause of Polybius' strong criticism (55). Of course, it is also true that Timaeus had already been criticized a great deal before Polybius: Istrus and Polemon had written Ἀντιγραφὰς πρὸς Τιμαίων. In fact, the former called him Ἐπιτιμαίων (56). But Polybius' criticism, which covers practically all the areas of the personality and of the historiographic output of Timaeus, originated from his personal hatred against him whom he had to eliminate before he could take his place (57).

(52) Momigliano, 50.

(53) *Ibid.* Cf. also his article *Linee per una valutazione di Fabio Pittore*, in *vol. cit.*, 61: «nessun altro storico ellenistico ha avuto risonanza a Roma come Timeo».

(54) See Momigliano, 50, 62; Walbank, «JRS» 52, 1962, 10 and «Κώκκαλος» 14-15, 1968-1969, 484; L. Pearson, *Myth and archaeologia in Italy and Sicily — Timaeus and his predecessors*, «YCIS» 24, 1975, 175. Note that Fabius Pictor corrected Timaeus' interpretations: A. Momigliano, *Timeo, Fabio Pittore e il primo censimento di Servio Tullio*, *Miscellanea di studi Alessandrini in memoria di A. Rostagni*, Torino 1963, 180-187.

(55) Tillyard 13-14; Walbank, «JRS» 52, 1962, 9-11.

(56) Istrus: *FGrHist* 334 F 59. Polemon: *FHG* III 126-129 fr. 39-46. Cf. Brown, 91-93.

(57) For a recent complete discussion of this criticism, see K. Meister, *Historische Kritik bei Polybios*, Wiesbaden 1975 (= *Palingenesia* 9), 3-55. An attempt to date this hatred: F.W. Walbank, *Three notes on Polybius*, *Miscellanea A. Rostagni*, 207.

3.2.3. Was he successful? The loss of a great number of ancient writings in which Timaeus might have been used, is a serious impediment in arriving at an answer. For example, we have two Timaeian fragments from Varro, both concerning the same thing, which is the Greek origin of the name of Italy: a direct one from *Res rusticae* and another, indirect one, Aulus Gellius' reference from the lost *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* (58). It seems that the inveterate antiquarian, Varro, had made great use of Timaeus; Geffcken's research of the Timaeian material, which reached Latin writers as well as Vergil, Ovid, and others through Varro, is well known (59). Certain authors that were contemporaries of Cicero and even some later ones have included excerpts from Timaeus (60). Among those in Cicero's milieu, Atticus was φιλοτίμῃαιος; in one of his letters to him Cicero states: *a Timaeo tuo familiari* (61).

3.2.4. Timaeus' absence from Livy is worth noting (62). It is also noteworthy that here is a lack of Roman topics among those Timaeian fragments that are found in Cicero's works and letters. A typical example has been noted in which, while he mentions and knows of Timaeus' monograph on the war of Pyrrhus, his entire knowledge on this subject has been derived from Roman sources, from Ennius and the annalists (above 1.2.1.). Cicero makes use of Timaeus only on topics concerning Greek history and civilization. Why?

4. Conclusion

4.1. An answer to this question constitutes the final conclusion of this paper. Polybius' criticism as such does not seem to have influenced Cicero (63), who appreciated Timaeus' rhetori-

(58) Varro, *rust.* 2, 5, 3 = Tim. F 42b; fr. 1 Mirsch (Gell. 11, 1, 1) = Tim. F 42a. For Gellius' passage as a probable reference to Timaeus' monograph on Pyrrhus: Momigliano, 45; Walbank, «JRS» 52, 1962, 10.

(59) J. Geffcken, *Timaios' Geographie des Westens*, Berlin 1892 (= Philologische Untersuchungen 13), 74-82. Cf. Pace, 158; Pearson, 175-177.

(60) Nep. *Alc.* 11, 1-6 = Tim. F 99; Vit. 8, 3, 27 = T 30. For Trogus, see Geffcken, 71-74. In Pliny we have an indirect use of Timaeus, perhaps through Philemon (*FHG* IV 474); cf. Brown, 26.

(61) *Att.* 6, 1, 18 = Tim. T 29. Cf. D'Alton, 499 n. 9; Pearson, 172 n. 6.

(62) Brown, 22.

(63) See M.A. Levi, *La critica di Polibio a Timeo*, Miscellanea Rostagni, 200-201; Pearson, 175. Cf. Wilamowitz, 18 n. 1.

cal historiography had the desire to see this method applied in the writing of monographs concerning him, and to be praised, as well, by a famous historian, like Timoleon by Timaeus: it was this that had caused Polybius' fury. But I believe (and this is Livy's case as well) that Timaeus had already been substituted by Polybius as well as by Roman sources. His information about Rome was already dated, and in this case one cannot find Polybius at fault. Antiquarians such as Varro, could do research concerning Timaeus. Cicero, however, did not have the time to conduct research of such a nature: Atticus invokes this very same reason as being an obstacle in his writing a history of Rome (64). But he needed and wanted material for his examples. That is the reason behind his indirect use (65) of the above mentioned fragments which can be called « Timaeian material » in this presentation (66).

(64) *Leg. 1, 2, 6: quam ob rem adgrederere, quaesumus, et sume ad hanc rem (sc. to write history) tempus.*

(65) Momigliano has a different opinion (61-62): « ancora Varrone e Cicerone lo ammiravano (sc. Timaeus) e lo leggevano ». Cf. *ibid.* 50 n. 77: « Cicerone stesso citava Timeo con facilità ».

(66) Timaeian material must have been used in Cicero's anecdotes about the tyrant Dionysius, *Tusc. 5, 20, 57-5, 22, 63*; cf. Kothe 637-640 and K.F. Stroheker, *Timaios und Philistos*, Satura. Früchte aus der antiken Welt, O. Weinreich zum 13. März 1951 dargebracht, Baden-Baden 1952, 156-158, esp. 157. Such a thing is evident also in Cicero's chronology of Lycurgus; his source was Cornelius Nepos' *Chronica* (*HRR II 25-26*). See F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente*, Berlin 1902 (= *Philologische Untersuchungen 16*), 34, 125-126.

o.3. A swift review of those excerpts of Timaeus to be found in Cicero's work is rather disappointing; every one of them being an extract whose origin, book and number is unknown, giving one the immediate impression that Cicero is dealing with reports which were received extempore, or second hand, in order to cover information for instance. The fragment referring to the simultaneous burning of the temple of Artemis in Ephesos and the birth of Alexander the Great is characteristic, because with its witticism is attributed by Plutarch to Hegesias the Magnesian (3). This very same fragment has been referred to by Jacoby as unclassified (4), while, with regards Timaeus, the remaining passages belong to three categories. The only fragment which is considered as having a historical basis is the one from Lucceius' letter where information is given to the effect that Timoleon was praised by Timaeus (5). Two other fragments, that which refers to Timaeus' refutation of the historical existence of Zaleucus, the lawgiver of the Locrians — two passages — (6), and of Timaeus' exile (7) belong to cultural history, while that referring to *De re publica* concerns a description of land, that is, of the beautiful and renowned city of Syracuse (8).

I. *Timaeus as a historiographer according to Cicero*

I.I. One group of Cicero's reference to Timaeus is derived from a presupposed knowledge of the Timaeian text and of its position within the sphere of Hellenistic historiography as a whole. I shall proceed immediately to the texts.

I.I.I. In his second book of *De oratore* Cicero refers to Timaeus as being one among other Greek historians who did not use his rhetoric ability in court, but in the writing of history. Tauromenian is referred to specifically: *minimus natu horum omnium* (sc. Herodotus, Thucydides, Philistus, and others) *Timaeus, quantum autem iudicare possum, longe eruditissimus et rerum*

(3) Cic. *nat. deor.* 2, 27, 69 = Timaeus, *FGrHist* 566 F 150a.

(4) An index of Timaeus' fragments and their location in Jacoby's edition is given in T.S. Brown, *Timaeus of Tauromenium*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1958 (= University of California Publications in History 55), 21-22.

(5) Cic. *epist.* 5, 12, 7 = Tim. F 119c.

(6) *Leg.* 2, 6, 15 = Tim. F 130a; *Att.* 6, 1, 18 = Tim. F 130b.

(7) *Brut.* 16, 63 = Tim. F 138.

(8) *Rep.* 3, 31, 43 = Tim. F 40.

copia et sententiarum varietate abundantissimus et ipsa compositione verborum non impolitus magnam eloquentiam ad scribendum attulit, sed nullum usum forensem (9). In spite of the fact that Cicero praises the eloquence of Timaeus, remaining faithful to his belief that historiography belongs to the general area of the eloquence, but that the eloquence of a historian is quite different from that of an orator (10), which must be just *ad forensem usum et publicum* (11), he condemns from an orator's point of view this eloquence as having *nullum usum forensem* (12). He cannot however disregard the great wealth of knowledge and information that this historian has to offer, that is, that part of his historiography connected purely with a specific acquaintance with antiquarian research. The combination of the above, along with his eloquence present us with the twin capacities of an integral, comprehensive, and successful historian, as he is viewed by Cicero; a historian who must have been an « artist and scholar » (13).

1.1.2. A second testimony reaches us through *Brutus*. In this case, Timaeus is placed among the historians of the Asian style (Ἀσιανὸς ζῆλος), as a representative of its first kind, the sententious and studied, and is related to such representative orators such as the brothers Hierocles and Meneclides from Alabanda (14). Timaeus' style has been characterized *sententiosum et argutum, sententiis non tam gravibus et severis quam concinnis et venustis* (15). It has already been observed that Cicero's judge-

(9) *De orat.* 2, 14, 58 = Tim. T 20; cf. H. Henze, *Quomodo Cicero de historia eiusque auctoribus iudicaverit quaeritur*, Diss. Ienae 1899, 53.

(10) Cf. P. Boyancé, *Sur Cicéron et l'histoire*, « REA » 42, 1940, 389.

(11) *Orat.* 9, 30: *Thucydides autem res gestas et bella narrat et proelia, graviter sane et probe, sed nihil ab eo transferri potest ad forensem usum et publicum*. See L. Ferrero, *Osservazioni sugli interessi storici ciceroniani*, « GIF » 3, 1950, 234.

(12) See also K.A. Sinkovich, *Cicero historicus*, « RSC » 22, 1974, 166.

(13) E. Rawson, *Cicero the historian and Cicero the antiquarian*, « JRS » 62, 1972, 44-45.

(14) Examples of this kind of Asian style from literature and inscriptions are given in C. Wooten, *Le développement du style asiatique pendant l'époque Hellénistique*, « REG » 88, 1975, 100-102.

(15) *Brut.* 95, 325 = Tim. T 21. On this passage, see U. von Wilamowitz - Möllendorff, *Asianismus und Atticismus*, « Hermes » 35, 1900, 1-2; J.F. D'Alton, *Roman literary theory and criticism. A study in tendencies*, New York 1962, 501; A.D. Leeman, *Orationis ratio. The stylistic theories and practice of the Roman orators, historians, and philosophers I*, Amsterdam 1963, 94-95.

ment of Timaeus, who was a Sicilian, presents him as a characteristic representative of a significant tendency in historiography, that of the Asian style which, at this point, ceases to be confined within strict geographical boundaries (16). Cicero does not proceed any deeper in characterizing Timaeus' style, does not offer further examples or excerpts from his writings, something that was done, for instance, by Caecilius or by the author of the essay *Περὶ ὕψους*. The latter, in fact, presents *verbatim* only three samples of the cold style of Timaeus *ἐπειδὴ τὰ πλείω προέλαβεν ὁ Καικίλιος* (17).

1.2. The two testimonies that have been referred to above in Cicero's works present a clear picture of that which Timaeus represented: that is the rhetorical historiography for whose sake the Tauromenian historian sacrificed many of the virtues of his art (18). We have, however, two additional significant testimonies, pertaining to the historiographical method of Timaeus, in the famous letter of Cicero to Lucceius. In spite of the fact that these reports are not unique because they can be checked against other texts in classical literature (19), they assume an entirely special significance since they concern Hellenistic historiography as this is interpreted by Cicero.

1.2.1. Approximately seven years after his turbulent consulship, the orator wrote to Lucceius asking the following: he begs him, in the stories that he was writing at the time to separate Catilina's conspiracy from the external wars of that era by presenting a separate monograph, such as that which had been written by three Hellenistic historians, whom he mentions and whose names he associates with the wars that were described by them: *ut multi Graeci fecerunt, Callisthenes Phocicum bellum, Timaeus Pyrrhi, Polybius Numantinum, qui omnes a perpetuis suis historiis ea, quae*

(16) D'Alton, 209.

(17) [Longin.] 4. 1 ff. = Caecil. fr. 85 Ofenloch. Timaeus' fragments are: 102a, 122, and 139.

(18) Cf. D'Alton, 500-501.

(19) See D.H. 1, 6, 1 = Tim. T 9b: *ἐπειτα Τιμαίου τοῦ Σικελιώτου τὰ μὲν ἀρχαῖα τῶν ἱστοριῶν ἐν ταῖς κοιναῖς ἱστορίαις ἀφηγησαμένου, τοὺς δὲ πρὸς Πύρρον τὸν Ἑπειρώτην πολέμους εἰς ἰδίαν καταχωρίσαντος πραγματείαν.* The only certain fragment is Plb. 12, 4b 1 = Tim. F 39. For the others see P. Lévêque, *Pyrrhos*, Paris 1957 (= Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 182), 32-33. In Gell. 11, 1, 1 = Tim. T 9c we see an allusion to this monograph (cf. below).

dixi, bella separaverunt, tu quoque item civilem coniurationem ab hostilibus externisque bellis seiungeres (20). It is indisputable that Timaeus served as a significant source pertaining to the wars of Pyrrhus against Rome (21). To Rome and its annalists these wars were highly significant events which found their eulogizer and poet in Q. Ennius whom Cicero held in high esteem and used as a source (22). As it is being presented from a Roman point of view and particularly in his philosophical works (23), even Cicero's information about the wars of Pyrrhus shows clearly that it had originated in Roman sources, most certainly in Ennius and annalists (24). It is quite probable that the attractive light under which Pyrrhus has been viewed has its origin in these writers (25). The knowledge of a monograph by Timaeus was left as an argument for the literary critic, in order to convince Luceius.

1.2.2. In a second mention of Timaeus in the same letter, Cicero's emphasis is transferred from Timaeus to Timoleon who is praised by him (26). It is well known the excessive praise of the Corinthian general by the Sicilian historiographer who, according to Plutarch, said that ἐπιφωνεῖν ἔπρεπεν

ὦ θεοί, τίς ἄρα Κύπρις ἢ τίς Ἴμερος
τοῦδε ξυνήψατο; (27)

(20) *Epist.* 5, 12, 2 = *Tim.* T 9a; cf. Brown, 112 n. 55. Callisthenes: *FGrHist* 124 T 25; Polybius: 173 T 2.

(21) See Lévêque, 32-37.

(22) *Ibid.* 45-46 (Ennius), 47-51 (annalists).

(23) R. Schütz, *Ciceros historische Kenntnisse*, Diss. Berlin 1913, 70-72 with refs.; the only passage from Greek point of view is *off.* 2, 7, 26 (cf. Schütz, 49).

(24) See *Enn. ann.* 179-181, 194-203 V³, all from Cicero's philosophical works; Cicero knew also the speech of App. Claudius Caecus *De Pyrrho rege*: *ORF*⁴ 1 F 4-6.

(25) T. Frank, *Two historical themes in Latin literature*, «CPh» 21, 1926, 314: «... Pyrrhus is the only enemy of Rome who is consistently treated with sympathy by the Roman annalists». Compare *Cic. Lael.* 8, 28: *cum duobus ducibus de imperio in Italia est decertatum, Pyrrho et Hannibale; ab altero propter probitatem eius non nimis alienos animos habemus, alterum propter crudelitatem semper haec civitas oderit.*

(26) This is an observation of R.J.A. Talbert, *Timoleon and the revival of Greek Sicily 344-317 B.C.*, Cambridge 1974 (= Cambridge Classical Studies), 40 n. 1.

(27) *Plu. Tim.* 36, 2, 253c = *Tim.* F 119b. It is doubtful if Plutarch quotes Sophocles (*TrGF* IV fr. 874) or Timocles (*ibid.* 86 F 1); cf. Radt *ad TrGF* IV p. 567.

Polybius' violent reaction against this praise of the man is also well known; as being a man whom Τίμαιος... μείζω ποιεῖ... τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων θεῶν (28), but Westlake condemned as an opportunist (29). During the last decades, archaeological evidence from research, conducted on Sicilian ground, have proven the man as one of eminence, a man about whom we are in a position to speak of as a 'renaissance' of the island (30). Cicero makes an allusion to a praise when he asks of his friend to have in his stories the same place that Timoleon has in Timaeus and Themistocles in Herodotus: *atque hoc praestantius mihi fuerit et ad laetitiam animi et ad memoriae dignitatem, si in tua scripta pervenero quam si in ceterorum, quod non ingenium mihi solum suppeditatum fuerit tuum, sicut Timoleonti a Timaeo aut ab Herodoto Themistocli* (31). In other words, in combination with the testimony about the central hero of the Pyrrhian wars and Timoleon, which has already been analyzed above, Cicero is demanding a laudatory historical monograph to be written by a recognised historian, *a laudato viro* (32). All this is perfectly clarified in Timaeus' two testimonies which also help in interpreting both writers.

(28) Plb. 12, 23, 4 = Tim. F 119a with a comparison (of Polybius) of Timoleon and Alexander the Great (§§ 5-6); Brown 83, 103; F.W. Walbank, *Polemic in Polybius*, « JRS » 52, 1962, 9. But at the same time Polybius makes a comparison between Scipio and the Spartan lawgiver, Lycurgus (10, 2, 8-13): ἐμοί (δὲ) δοκεῖ Πόπλιος Λυκούργῳ τῷ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων νομοθέτῃ παραπλησίαν ἐσχηκέναι φύσιν καὶ προχίρῃσιν; cf. F. Focke, *Synkrisis*, « Hermes » 58, 1923, 349.

(29) H.D. Westlake, *Timoleon and his relations with tyrants*, Manchester 1952 (= Publications of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Manchester 5); cf. in a review by J.H. Kent, « CPh » 48, 1953, 279: « Professor Westlake demolishes once and for all the Timoleon legend ».

(30) See the articles presented by various scholars in « Κώκκαλος » 4, 1958. Cf. also P. Lévêque, *De Timoleon à Pyrrhos*, *ibid.* 14-15, 1968-1969, 138-139. For a systematic presentation of the material: Talbert, 116-191.

(31) *Epist.* 5, 12, 7 = Tim. F. 119c; cf. Jacoby's commentary IIIb I p. 586 and Brown, 83.

(32) V. Paladini, *Sul pensiero storiografico di Cicerone*, « RAL⁸ » 2, 1947, 518 ff., 520 = « Latomus » 6, 1947, 339 ff., 341-342. B. Shimron, *Ciceronian historiography*, « Latomus » 33, 1974, 232-244, suggests that *encomium* refers to the style and not to the content of the monograph. That the historian, according to Cicero, must be an important one is clear from the quotation of the Naevian verse:

laetus sum laudari me abs te pater a laudato viro

from *Hector proficiscens* (SRF I 35 fr. I v. 17 Kl.). In fact, Lucceius was a friend of Theophanes (FGrHist 188 T 8ab) who wrote Τὰ περὶ Πομπηίου (? F 1-7), a monograph on Pompeius' war against Mithridates. Cf. Paladini, 520-521 = 340-342.

2. *Timaeus' fragments in Cicero's works*

2.1. According to the evidence found in his rhetorical works and his letter to Lucceius, we have seen what Cicero knew about the style of Timaeus' historical work and his opinion of this work. Material derived from these works, whose quality has already been sketchily presented above, is also to be found in Cicero's. Let us analyze these fragments in greater detail.

2.1.1. In the surviving portion of Scipio's speech, which refers to a just governing as being the foundation of a state, in *De legibus*' third book, Syracuse, a famous, spacious and most beautiful city, which was being tyrannized, is presented as a major example. Of its lovely edifices, its avenues, its stoas, its shrines, its fortification walls, none belonged to its people, while these very people were the property of one, its tyrant. As to the size and the beauty of the city, Cicero without question invokes Timaeus' testimony: *atque hoc idem Syracusis, urbs illa praeclara, quam ait Timaeus Graecarum maximam, omnium autem esse pulcherrimam, arx visenda, portus usque in sinus oppidi et ad urbis crepidines infusi, viae latae, porticus, templa muri nihilo magis efficiebant, Dionysio tenente ut esset illa res publica; nihil enim populi, et unius erat populus ipse* (33). Being aware, however, of Timaeus' revulsion towards the tyrants of Syracuse (34), since he had been exiled by one of them, Agathocles (35), a fact that was already known to Cicero (36),

(33) *Rep.* 3, 31, 43 = *Tim. F* 40; cf. Jacoby's commentary IIIb I p. 559. See also H. Kothe, *Zu den Fragmenten des Historikers Timaios*, « *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* » 137, 1888, 825 and *Timaios und Ciceros Tusculanen*, *ibid.* 139, 1889, 637 n. 1.

(34) See *Plb.* 8, 12, 12 = *Tim. T* 124a: τὴν ... Τιμαίου τοῦ συγγραφέως πικρίαν, ἣ κέρηται κατ' Ἀγαθοκλέους τοῦ Σικελίας δυνάστου, ... ὁμως λόγον ἔχειν - ὡς γὰρ κατ' ἐχθροῦ καὶ πονηροῦ καὶ τυράννου διατίθεται τὴν κατηγορίαν. Compare *Diod.* 21, 17, 1 = *Tim. T* 12: ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀγαθοκλέους πράξεσι τὰ πολλὰ κατάφραστοι τοῦ δυνάστου διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐχθρὰν; *ibid.* = *Tim. T* 124d: ζῶντα μὲν ἀμύνασθαι τὸν δυνάστην οὐκ ἴσχυσε, τελευτήσαντα δὲ διὰ τῆς ἱστορίας ἐβλασφήμησεν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. On the contrary, Brown 6 suggests that Timaeus « had .. written about him (*sc.* Agathocles) from a distance, his diatribe would probably have been less hysterical, more professional ».

(35) *Diod.* 21, 17, 1 = *Tim. T* 4a. Cf. H.J.W. Tillyard, *Agathocles*, Cambridge 1908 (= *Cambridge Historical Essays* 15), esp. 12-18; H. Berve, *Die Herrschaft des Agathokles*, München 1953 (= *SBAW* 1952.5), esp. 4-21, and *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, München 1967, 441-457, 728-731.

(36) *Brut.* 16, 63 = *Tim. F* 138: (Lysias) *est enim Atticus, quoniam certe Athenis est et natus et mortuus et functus omni civium munere, quamquam Timaeus eum quasi Licinia et Mucia lege repetit Syracusas.* For the

one may go a step further and suppose that Timaeus provided Cicero with more than a mere geographical information.

It is true that it has already been noted above that Cicero had remarked on Timaeus' inexperience of speaking in public, and it is also true that Polybius accused him of lack of political expertise (37). All this, however, can be justified if one keeps in mind the structure of the Greek city-state. During his entire life, as far as the Athenians were concerned, Timaeus was a foreigner with no civil rights (38). Of course, he was not obligated to get involved in politics (and at this point I tend to accept Cicero's testimony rather than Polybius' criticism), but it was not possible for a historian with the broad education, all-encompassing knowledge of Timaeus, and the background of his family in politics, to cease being a politically minded person as well. His father, Andromachus, has been presented under a most favourable light by ancient sources: πλούτῳ δὲ καὶ ψυχῆς λαμπρότητι διαφέρων says Diodorus (39), πολὺ κράτιστος τῶν τότε δυναστευόντων ἐν Σικελίᾳ γενόμενος, τῶν θ' ἑαυτοῦ πολιτῶν ἠγεῖτο νομίμως καὶ δικαίως, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς τυράννους φανερὸς ἦν ἀεὶ διακείμενος ἀπεχθῶς καὶ ἀλλοτρίως says Plutarch in his *Life of Timoleon* (40). Professor Manni has presented an exceptional sample of the political thinking of Timaeus, having drawn his conclusions from the topics of his stories: « non ci allontaniamo troppo dalla verità se attribuiamo allo storico tauromenita un pensiero non del tutto strano per un nemico di Agatocle: Roma e Cartagine ... potevano, appunto come nemiche di Agatocle, essere considerate con spirito amichevole, quasi vindici di un libero mondo siceliota conculcato dall'odiato tiranno » (41). It is also true that other scholars have interpreted Timaeus directing his interests and eyes towards Rome as being a motivation related to political ideology; in the

lex referred to, see E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae* (264-70 B.C.), Oxford 1958, 213-214, 297; A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman citizenship*, Oxford² 1973, 140. R.W. Husband, *On the expulsion of foreigners from Rome*, « CPh » 11, 1916, 323 says that the Ciceronian passage « is inconclusive », while E. Gabba, *Politica e cultura in Roma agli inizi del I sec. a.C.*, « Athenaeum » 31, 1953, 261 n. 4 suggests that « l'inciso del *Brutus* è su un tono scherzoso e non pretende ad un valore storico preciso ».

(37) Cf. Brown, 6.

(38) Plb. 12, 25h 1 = Tim. T 4b; 12, 28, 6 = T 4d: ξενιτεύων.

(39) 16, 7, 1 = Tim. T 3a.

(40) 10, 7, 24od = Tim. T 3b.

(41) « Κώκαλος » 3, 1957, 146-147.

midst of the Hellenistic world, which was being governed by various monarchs and tyrants, the Roman Republic shone in the eyes of the democrats in Italy as a perfect model (42). This is the reasoning behind my view that Scipio's image of a beautiful Syracuse, which suffered under the yoke of tyrants, is a distant echo of Timaeian rendition.

2.1.2. Another fragment which has been attributed to Timaeus (followed by the observation that it had been said neatly: *concinneque, ut multa, Timaeus*) comes from *De natura deorum* — this has already been mentioned (above, 0.3.): it refers to the simultaneous burning of the temple of Artemis in Ephesos and the birth of Alexander the Great. These two events occurred during the same night; a witticism has, in fact, been added, to the effect that it was only natural that such a disaster would happen to the temple since the goddess was absent, being in attendance at the birth of the great man: *adiunxit (sc. Timaeus) minime id esse mirandum, quod Diana, cum in partu Olympiadis adesse voluisset, afuisset domo* (43). There is no difficulty up to this point; but in his *Life of Alexander*, Plutarch attributes the above to Hegesias the Magnesian: Ἡγησίας ὁ Μάγνης ... εἰκότως γὰρ ἔφη καταφλεχθῆναι τὸν νεῶν, τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἀσχολουμένης περὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου μαίωσιν (44). In spite of the belief, according to which Cicero confused Hegesias with Timaeus (45), it is extremely difficult to accept this here, both due to the lack of further evidence, as well as the fact that Timaeus is known to have had a liking for such synchronisms (46).

2.1.3. On the other hand, another item by Timaeus is extremely well-founded and is presented in the *De legibus* and a letter sent to Atticus: this pertains to Timaeus' known view that Zaleucus, the lawgiver of the Locrians, never existed as a historical personage (47). Of all three passages in Cicero, which refer

(42) A.D. Momigliano, *Atene nel III secolo a.C. e la scoperta di Roma nelle Storie di Timeo di Tauromenio*, in: *Terzo Contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* I, Roma 1966 (= *Storia e Letteratura* 108), 44.

(43) 2, 27, 69 = Tim. F 150a. The same synchronism without Timaeus' name: *div.* 1, 23, 47: *qua nocte templum Ephesiae Dianae deflagavit, eadem constat ex Olympiade natum esse Alexandrum*. Cf. Schütz, 42.

(44) 3, 6, 665e.

(45) Plaumann, *RE* VIII (1913), 1146.

(46) Cf. J.R. Hamilton, *Plutarch Alexander. A commentary*, Oxford 1969, 8.

(47) *Leg.* 2, 6, 15 = Tim. F 130a (the passage is quoted in the text); *Att.* 6, 1, 18 = Tim. F 130b: *quis Zaleucum leges Locris scripsisse non dixit?*

to Zaleucus, Timaeus is mentioned in two along with the name of Theophrastus, the philosopher who, following the Peripatetic tradition, believed in the historical reality of the Locrian lawgiver (48). In the most significant of Cicero's three passages a comparison of the two writers is made, and — according to Cicero's view — Theophrastus is being presented as not being a scholar inferior to Timaeus, and, in fact, according to the opinion of many others, as being superior to him: *at ait Theophrastus, auctor haud deterior mea quidem sententia (meliorem multi nominant)*. Live tradition and the legend of the people of Locri, concerning their lawgiver, is also mentioned in the same passage; at the end, however, Cicero takes a neutral stand on this issue: *commemorant vero ipsius cives, nostri clientes, Locri. sed sive fuit sive non fuit, nihil ad rem; loquimur quod traditum est* (49).

3. Cicero's use of Timaeus

3.1. Following this brief review, one faces the question as to the way Cicero had come by this information. Was it indirect information or a direct use of Timaeus? He tries to emphasize the latter impression in *De oratore*. Before his favourable criticism of the historical value and the importance of Timaeus as a writer, he states: *Timaeus, quantum autem iudicare possum, longe eruditissimus* etc. (50). He had already used pretty much the same expression in a somewhat enriched form, however, when he attempted to formulate a favourable opinion of Herodotus' eloquence; he has this to say about him: *atqui tanta est eloquentia, ut me quidem, quantum ego Graece scripta intellegere possum, magno opere delectet* (51). His observations concerning Timaeus' style are such that they could be drawn by Cicero from the various handbooks on rhetoric that he had at his disposal.

num igitur iacet Theophrastus si id a Timaeo tuo familiari reprehensum est? See Jacoby's commentary IIIb I p. 589. Cf. Schütz, 18; M. Mühl, *Die Gesetze des Zaleukos und Charondas*, «Klio» 22, 1928, 459. The third passage of Cicero is again from the *De legibus* (1, 22, 57), but contains a mere reference to *leges ... Zaleuci*.

(48) See Brown, 126 n. 19 and the authors cited there.

(49) *Leg.* 2, 6, 15. Compare Mühl, 459 n. 1: «was Cicero selbst angeht, so verhält sich dieser, wie aus seinen Bemerkungen zu erschliessen ist, in der ganzen Frage neutral».

(50) 2, 14, 58.

(51) *Ibid.* 2, 13, 55.

3.2. What about the information on historical events, however? Did Cicero find it indirectly or did he have access of the Timaeian texts on history and his monograph on Pyrrhus?

3.2.1. From the moment that Timaeus' historical data reached Rome — and it would only be logical that this was done following the conquest of Sicily (52) — they were read extensively by the educated Romans who enjoyed and liked reading about their victories and especially about those concerning the era of Pyrrhus (53). Timaeus also played another more significant role, when he was read in Rome; his influence in the formation of its historiography was great. In all probability Fabius Pictor, the first Roman historian who wrote history of Rome in Greek language, used him as a model. The reason for this was that Timaeus actually was the first historian concerned with Rome and the most significant one during the pre-Polybian era (54).

3.2.2. Timaeus' significance and priority in the field of Roman history is the main cause of Polybius' strong criticism (55). Of course, it is also true that Timaeus had already been criticized a great deal before Polybius: Istrus and Polemon had written Ἀντιγραφὰς πρὸς Τιμαίων. In fact, the former called him Ἐπιτιμαίων (56). But Polybius' criticism, which covers practically all the areas of the personality and of the historiographic output of Timaeus, originated from his personal hatred against him whom he had to eliminate before he could take his place (57).

(52) Momigliano, 50.

(53) *Ibid.* Cf. also his article *Linee per una valutazione di Fabio Pittore*, in *vol. cit.*, 61: «nessun altro storico ellenistico ha avuto risonanza a Roma come Timeo».

(54) See Momigliano, 50, 62; Walbank, «JRS» 52, 1962, 10 and «Κώκκαλος» 14-15, 1968-1969, 484; L. Pearson, *Myth and archaeologia in Italy and Sicily — Timaeus and his predecessors*, «YCIS» 24, 1975, 175. Note that Fabius Pictor corrected Timaeus' interpretations: A. Momigliano, *Timeo, Fabio Pittore e il primo censimento di Servio Tullio*, *Miscellanea di studi Alessandrini in memoria di A. Rostagni*, Torino 1963, 180-187.

(55) Tillyard 13-14; Walbank, «JRS» 52, 1962, 9-11.

(56) Istrus: *FGrHist* 334 F 59. Polemon: *FHG* III 126-129 fr. 39-46. Cf. Brown, 91-93.

(57) For a recent complete discussion of this criticism, see K. Meister, *Historische Kritik bei Polybios*, Wiesbaden 1975 (= *Palingenesia* 9), 3-55. An attempt to date this hatred: F.W. Walbank, *Three notes on Polybius*, *Miscellanea A. Rostagni*, 207.

3.2.3. Was he successful? The loss of a great number of ancient writings in which Timaeus might have been used, is a serious impediment in arriving at an answer. For example, we have two Timaeian fragments from Varro, both concerning the same thing, which is the Greek origin of the name of Italy: a direct one from *Res rusticae* and another, indirect one, Aulus Gellius' reference from the lost *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* (58). It seems that the inveterate antiquarian, Varro, had made great use of Timaeus; Geffcken's research of the Timaeian material, which reached Latin writers as well as Vergil, Ovid, and others through Varro, is well known (59). Certain authors that were contemporaries of Cicero and even some later ones have included excerpts from Timaeus (60). Among those in Cicero's milieu, Atticus was φιλοτίμῃαιος; in one of his letters to him Cicero states: *a Timaeo tuo familiari* (61).

3.2.4. Timaeus' absence from Livy is worth noting (62). It is also noteworthy that here is a lack of Roman topics among those Timaeian fragments that are found in Cicero's works and letters. A typical example has been noted in which, while he mentions and knows of Timaeus' monograph on the war of Pyrrhus, his entire knowledge on this subject has been derived from Roman sources, from Ennius and the annalists (above 1.2.1.). Cicero makes use of Timaeus only on topics concerning Greek history and civilization. Why?

4. Conclusion

4.1. An answer to this question constitutes the final conclusion of this paper. Polybius' criticism as such does not seem to have influenced Cicero (63), who appreciated Timaeus' rhetori-

(58) Varro, *rust.* 2, 5, 3 = Tim. F 42b; fr. 1 Mirsch (Gell. 11, 1, 1) = Tim. F 42a. For Gellius' passage as a probable reference to Timaeus' monograph on Pyrrhus: Momigliano, 45; Walbank, «JRS» 52, 1962, 10.

(59) J. Geffcken, *Timaios' Geographie des Westens*, Berlin 1892 (= Philologische Untersuchungen 13), 74-82. Cf. Pace, 158; Pearson, 175-177.

(60) Nep. *Alc.* 11, 1-6 = Tim. F 99; Vitruv. 8, 3, 27 = T 30. For Trogus, see Geffcken, 71-74. In Pliny we have an indirect use of Timaeus, perhaps through Philemon (*FHG* IV 474); cf. Brown, 26.

(61) *Att.* 6, 1, 18 = Tim. T 29. Cf. D'Alton, 499 n. 9; Pearson, 172 n. 6.

(62) Brown, 22.

(63) See M.A. Levi, *La critica di Polibio a Timeo*, *Miscellanea Rostagni*, 200-201; Pearson, 175. Cf. Wilamowitz, 18 n. 1.

cal historiography had the desire to see this method applied in the writing of monographs concerning him, and to be praised, as well, by a famous historian, like Timoleon by Timaeus: it was this that had caused Polybius' fury. But I believe (and this is Livy's case as well) that Timaeus had already been substituted by Polybius as well as by Roman sources. His information about Rome was already dated, and in this case one cannot find Polybius at fault. Antiquarians such as Varro, could do research concerning Timaeus. Cicero, however, did not have the time to conduct research of such a nature: Atticus invokes this very same reason as being an obstacle in his writing a history of Rome (64). But he needed and wanted material for his examples. That is the reason behind his indirect use (65) of the above mentioned fragments which can be called « Timaeian material » in this presentation (66).

(64) *Leg. 1, 2, 6: quam ob rem adgrederere, quaesumus, et sume ad hanc rem (sc. to write history) tempus.*

(65) Momigliano has a different opinion (61-62): « ancora Varrone e Cicerone lo ammiravano (sc. Timaeus) e lo leggevano ». Cf. *ibid.* 50 n. 77: « Cicerone stesso citava Timeo con facilità ».

(66) Timaeian material must have been used in Cicero's anecdotes about the tyrant Dionysius, *Tusc. 5, 20, 57-5, 22, 63*; cf. Kothe 637-640 and K.F. Stroheker, *Timaios und Philistos*, Satura. Früchte aus der antiken Welt, O. Weinreich zum 13. März 1951 dargebracht, Baden-Baden 1952, 156-158, esp. 157. Such a thing is evident also in Cicero's chronology of Lycurgus; his source was Cornelius Nepos' *Chronica* (*HRR* II 25-26). See F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente*, Berlin 1902 (= *Philologische Untersuchungen* 16), 34, 125-126.