The Art of Synchronization in Greek Historiography: The Case of Timaeus of Tauromenium

David Asheri

> τίς οὖν λόγος πρὸς ἱστορίας τέλος εἰδέναι καὶ γινώσκειν, ὅτι τήν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίαν ἐνίκων οἱ Ἕλληνες κυνὸς ἐπιτέλλοντος; τί δ' ὄφελος ... εἰ κατὰ ταύτην ἐτέχθη τὴν ἡμέραν ὁ δεῖνα καὶ μελοποιὸς ἀνέσχεν ἢ τραγωιδὸς ἄριστος;
>
> Eunapius of Sardis, *Historia* 1.6

I

Every chronological statement is, in a sense, a synchronism. When Herodotus states that the Persians entered Attica in the archonship of Calliades (8.51.1), he is in fact establishing a synchronicity between a historical and an astronomic event, the latter expressed in the approximate terms of a local and culturally conditioned parameter, known as the archontal or the eponymous year. A serious Athenian reader of Herodotus who wished to find out how many years elapsed since his city was burnt down by Xerxes had to go to the agora, where a marble stele bearing the names of the archons had been set up in about 425 B.C., and count backwards all the names on the list up to Calliades. For a Milesian or a Syracusan reader the same operation would have involved a journey by sea.

Scripta Classica Israelica vol. XI 1991/2 pp. 52-89

Understandably, the widespread use of a local list depended on its accessibility and its universal recognition as official and authoritative — a goal not easy to attain in a world of particularistic city-states. But at the same time diplomacy opened the door to double-dating, *i.e.*, double synchronisms, as a form of reciprocity between partner states, and historians soon followed suit. The treaties of 420 B.C. between Athens and Sparta were actually dated by both the Athenian archon and the Spartan ephor of the year. Thucydides not only had to record the documentary datings in spite of his notorious opposition to archontal chronology, but he even produced a multiple one of his own when he wanted to ensure that the majority of his readers would grasp the precise moment of the oubreak of the Peloponnesian War (2.2.1). Still, even a multiple eponymous synchronism did not satisfy everybody. It was the sophist Hippias of Elis, a contemporary of Thucydides, who hit upon the bright idea of publishing the list of Olympic victors (*FGrH* 6 F 2), which was presumably preserved at Olympia. As the Olympic games were the major panhellenic event of the time and their victors came from all quarters of the Greek world, this was not just another local list. However, we are not told what on Hippias' list was the starting-date of Olympiad One, nor can we be at all sure that its original purpose was chronographic. Therefore, it would be but a flimsy conjecture to infer from a much-quoted statement of Plutarch (*Numa* 1.4) — which in any case expresses scepticism about chronological certainty — that Hippias was the "first inventor" of Olympic chronography; but one may safely agree with the view that Hippias' list appeared just in time to serve as a basis of a chronicle of the Olympic games.[1] At any rate it took at least another century before an official panhellenic numbering of years created a basis for panhellenic and even universal historiography; but even then it never replaced the practice of eponymous synchronistic datings. In fact, Timaeus of Tauromenium, whom modern scholars generally credit with suc-

---

[1] *Cf.* A.A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg-London 1979), 92. I am not sure that Hippias' list "did make Olympic dates possible for the first time". The year 776 B.C. = Ol. 1.1 is not attested before Eratosthenes (*FGrH* 241 F 1), but it was almost cetainly known to Timaeus and presupposed in an Attic chronicle of the early third century B.C. (Ditt. *Syll.*^{3} 1056).

cessfully promoting Olympic chronography, was more famous in antiquity for the accuracy of his multiple eponymous synchronistic tables. This was the achievement that was recognized by Polybius: "[Timaeus] is the man who compares [the years of] the ephors with the kings of Sparta from the earliest times, and the archons of Athens with the priestesses of Hera at Argos and with the Olympic victors" (12.11.1 = *FGrH* 566 T 10).[2] This seems to be a description of a single or a double synchronistic table, possibly with vertical columns according to various local eponyms and with two panhellenic standards, the Olympiads and the Argive priestesses. By reading such a table horizontally from left to right, one could obtain a wide panhellenic synchronization at a glance. Timaeus, and not later chronographers, may securely be credited with the invention of the multiple synchronistic table and its graphic form,[3] a device still much in use nowadays. Polybius fitted the Roman consuls into the tables and added some chronological lists in an appendix to his History (see 39.8.8). A century later, Castor of Rhodes added oriental datings. Finally, *historia sacra* was enlisted to complete the tables, synchronizing the new canon *ab Abramo* (= 2016 B.C.) with regnal years from East and West, archonships, Olympionics, Roman years *ab urbe condita*, consulships and a choice of memorable historical and literary events. Thus the final achievement of Greek chronography from Hellanicus to Eusebius was a grand synchronistic framework for universal history in the widest sense conceivable at the time. It all started from the practical need to date documents in the Greek *polis* and from inter-city diplomatic relations,

---

2 See on this passage the commentary of Walbank and, by the same author, *Polybius* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1972), 101. For Hellanicus' *Priestesses of Hera* see *FGrH* 4 F 74-84 with the *Komm.*, and L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939), 225-231; D. Ambaglio, "L'opera storiografica di Ellanico di Lesbo", *Ricerche di storiografia antica* II (Pisa 1980), 147-151. A list of the "Prytaneis" (= Kings) of Sparta was published by Charon of Lampsacus in the late fifth century B.C. (*FGrH* 262 T 1).

3 *Cf. FGrH Komm.* III b (Suppl. 1), p. 382, and P. Pédech, *La méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris 1964), 433-4. C. Wachsmuth attributed the invention to Castor, *Einleitung in d. Stud. d. alt. Geschichte* (Leipzig 1895), 139f.; R. Helm, *Abhandl. Berl. Akad.* (1923, 4), 9-13 and Mosshammer (above, n. 1), 15, 34ff. argue for Eusebius.

and developed later in Hellenistic historiography out of the new political situation of close interconnection between all quarters of the *oikoumene*.

During Timaeus' lifetime, and in the very city where he spent many decades of his exile, a second important tool was being developed. Timaeus' contemporary Philochorus, an ἐξηγητής, a μάντις and an Atthidographer, was the right man in Athens to develop a keen interest, from both religious and historical points of view, in calendars and almanacs of all kinds. He was probably the first Greek author of a treatise *On Days* (Περὶ ἡμερῶν), an early forerunner of the *De diebus* by Varro and the Περὶ ἡμερῶν by Plutarch, and the first Greek counterpart of the later Roman *Fasti*. Philochorus' treatise was probably composed under the influence of Hesiod's *Days* (*cf. Op. et dies* 765-822) and possibly also of oriental hemeroscopes.[4] So far as we can judge from the few extant fragments, the second part of Philochorus' treatise was a systematic, annotated day-by-day enumeration of rites, festivals, birthdays of gods and heroes, and possibly also a number of mythical and historical events, thus combining in one almanac the functions of our common religious and historical calendars.[5] The usefulness of such almanacs, especially for professional ἐξηγηταί, priests and devout people in general, is self-evident. Whether such almanacs were arranged graphically, and if so, how, we cannot say, nor can we prove the existence of a direct link between Philochorus' work *On Days* and Timaeus' own elaboration of synchronistic tables. What can be safely argued is that these two important chronological tools definitely entered the historian's workshop around the year 300 B.C.

Both tools created an almost irresistible temptation to seek out coincidences of events, chronological parallelisms, significant time intervals and synchronisms: cities founded in the same year, battles fought on the same day in the same year or in different years or

---

4 Herodotus (2.82.1-2) knew of Egyptian hemeroscopes and of their influence in Greece.

5 See R. Reitzenstein, "Ein Bruchstück des Philochoros", *NAWG* (1906), 40-48; *FHG* I, 413-4 (frr. 176-183) Müller; L. Pearson, *The Local Historians of Attica* (Philadelphia 1942), 110; and esp. *FGrH* IIIb (Suppl. 2) *Komm.* on no. 328, Introduction and *Komm.* on F 85-88; 180-190.

fought simultaneously with an extraordinary natural event (an eclipse or an earthquake), birthdays of great men coinciding with birthdays of gods, *dies fasti* or *nefasti* for certain peoples or for certain types of activity, and so on. A new genre of erudite synchronization arose and had the prospect of becoming an amusing pastime even of serious historians. Contrary to the "technical" type of synchronism, the purpose of the new genre was not simply to help the reader to verify a chronological item, but rather to convey a metahistorical message — philosophical, moral or religious. This genre of didactic synchronism is the one that will mostly be discussed in this paper. It can be easily recognised in Greek historiography by the formal pattern in which it is presented, the primary historical event being synchronized not with a standard chronological parameter (e.g., an archon or an Olympic year), but with another historical event, with or without adding an absolute date in the conventional manner. This parameter is still in use today in elementary textbooks; we are told, for example, that the year 1848 is called the "Spring of Nations" because in that year national insurrections sprang up simultaneously in France, Germany, Austria, Lombardy and Hungary. It can also be found in certain pseudo-historical treatises written in a prophetic-journalistic vein, in which the author pretends to understand the "mystery of simultaneity" by discovering, or rather inventing, an "Axial Age" in a roughly synchronous line of great names that presumably represents a period of spiritual breakthrough. Didactic or symbolic synchronisms of this sort must of course be treated as a separate genre. Evidently such synchronisms are the result not of arbitrary coincidences but deliberate selection from a large number of known synchronic events, in order to serve a defined didactic purpose. As we shall see later, detecting the message encoded in didactic synchronisms is sometimes the main burden of a critical study.

It is my impression that Timaeus' synchronisms presuppose the use of both synchronistic tables and of daily almanacs. The practice of didactic synchronization, however, long predates the invention of these tools, and judging from the first synchronizations of this kind recorded by Greek historians, their origin seems to have been anything but an erudite pastime. Pindar, in the so-called First Pythian Ode (470 B.C.), extols to the skies Hieron's naval victory at Cumae against the Etruscans (474 B.C.), comparing it with the major cam-

paigns of the Persian Wars — Salamis (480 B.C.) and Plataea (479 B.C.) — and with the battle of Himera fought by Gelon against Carthaginians in 480 B.C. No strict synchronism is implied by this fourfold parallelism, although both its panhellenic spirit and its Sicilian patriotism are quite transparent.[6] Yet some forty years later Herodotus heard the Sicilians say that the victory at Himera took place on the very *day* of the victory of Salamis (7.166). This seems to be a popular version of what might have originally been a piece of Deinomenid propaganda. Herodotus, as often, does not take a stand, possibly because a synchronism of the "same day" seemed to him *a priori* suspicious (but see 8.15.1 and 9.90.1); nevertheless, the idea of an approximate simultaneity between the two battles was essentially accepted in antiquity and its significance much debated. Ephorus — a disciple of Isocrates, the great master of didactic historiography in the fourth century B.C. — having read his Herodotus and possibly his Pindar as well, accepted the synchronism and even tried to explain it rationally by suggesting a concerted military action on the part of Persia and Carthage. He thus created a basis for the much-disputed thesis of an anti-Hellenic alliance between the two greatest barbarian powers of that time.[7] This is a sophisticated way

---

6 *P.* 1.147-156. The epigram quoted by *Schol.Pyth.* 1. 152b (= 106a Diehl; *et vide* D.L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* [Cambridge 1981], 247-50) and ascribed by *AP* VI 214 to Simonides (= 106b Diehl) includes a distich praising the Deinomenids' victories over "barbarian peoples" (*viz.*, the Carthaginians and the Etruscans), which turned out to be a great help to the Greeks in their fight for freedom (*i.e.*, against the Persians). This epigram, if authentic (but see B. Gentili, *PdP* 8 [1953], 207f.), cannot be earlier than Pindar's First Pythian Ode. *Cf.* Ph. Gauthier, "Le parallèle Himère-Salamine au v^e^ siècle et au iv^e^ siècle av. J.C.", *REA* 68 (1966), 5-32; R. Bichler, "Der Synchronismus von Himera und Salamis. Eine quellenkritische Studie zu Herodot", in *Festschrift A. Betz*, edd. E. Weber and G. Dobesch (Vienna 1985), 59-74.

7 See Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 186; other sources and bibl.: *StV* II. no. 129, to which add T.J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks* (Oxford 1948), 422f. and, more recently, Ph. Gauthier (above, n. 6), 25ff. K. Meister, "Das persisch-karthagische Bündnis von 481 v.Chr. (Bengtson, *Staatsverträge* II, no. 129)", *Historia* 19 (1970), 607-612; V. Merante, ΚΩΚΑΛΟΣ 18-19 (1972-1973), 87f.; G. Maddoli, *La Sicilia antica* II.1, edd. E. Gabba and G. Vallet (Roma 1980), 43ff.; and G. Walser, *Hellas und Iran. Studien zu den*

of glorifying the great Sicilian victory without resorting to strict synchronism. Aristotle, on the other hand, though explicitly accepting the truth of the synchronism itself, dismissed it summarily as an example of purely fortuitous and meaningless coincidence: the two battles, he says, "did take place at the same time, but did not tend to any one achievement" (*Poet.* 1459a 25). This has often been understood as a criticism of Ephorus, but it may be no more than a general "positivistic" jeer at all those who seek hidden meanings in history. Three centuries later, Diodorus tried to summarize the dispute by arguing that because of Gelon's achievement at Himera "many historians compare this battle with the one fought by the Greeks at Plataea and the strategem of Gelon with the ingenious schemes of Themistocles" (11.23.1). These are very loose parallelisms; but the synchronism that struck Diodorus most was not that of Himera and Salamis (which he must have known), but another one, unknown from previous sources: "Now it so happened that Gelon won his victory on the same day that Leonidas and his soldiers were contesting against Xerxes at Thermopylae, as if intentionally (ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες) the deity so arranged that both the finest victory and the most honourable defeat should take place at the same time" (11.24.1).[8] Timaeus is probably the source of this passage;[9] at least, only a Sicilian historian could be interested in such a parallelism with the Persian Wars. As it was common knowledge that the battles of Thermopylae and Salamis, whatever the time interval separating them, were *not* fought on the same day, one of the two synchronizations with Himera must have been universally rejected as

---

griechisch-persischen Beziehungen vor Alexander (Darmstadt 1984), 43-45 (with bibliography).

8 ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες is a pregnant locution in this context; *cf.* the similar use by Polybius with a reference to the work of Tyche: see K. Ziegler, "Polybios", *RE* XXI 2 (1952), 1538ff., and F.W. Walbank 1972 (above, n. 2), 66.

9 See U. Mancuso, "Il sincronismo fra le battaglie d'Imera e delle Termopili secondo Timeo", *RFIC* 37 (1909), 548-554; L. Pareti, "La Battaglia di Imera", *Studi siciliani ed italioti* (Florence 1914), 158f.; K. Meister, *Historische Kritik bei Polybios* (*Palingenesia IX*, Wiesbaden 1975), 42. According to Meister, Diodorus' chapters on the battle of Himera (11.20-26) are "ein fortlaufendes Exzerpt aus Timaios" (*Die sizilische Geschichte bei Diodor*. Inaug. Diss. [Munich 1967], 42f.).

false. The choice of Thermopylae could have been made by a historian who somehow happened to know that Himera antedated Salamis;[10] however, what mattered to Diodorus (or to his source)

---

10 Theopompus (*FGrH* 115 F 193) and Phaenias (fr. 11 Wehrli), quoted by Athenaeus 6.231 ef, synchronized Gelon's offerings at Delphi καθ' οὓς χρόνους Ξέρξης ἐπεστράτευε τῆι Ἑλλάδι, both assuming that the battle of Himera had been fought months before the great battles against the Persians. See E. Lo Cascio, "Le trattative fra Gelone e i confederati e la data della battaglia d'Imera", *Helikon* 13-14 (1973-1974), 210-255, esp. 227ff. The precise dates of the battles in Greece in 480 B.C. are still debated. According to Herodotus, Thermopylae and Artemisium were fought simultaneously during, or immediately after, the end of the Olympic and Carnean festivals (8.15.1, 26.2), both culminating on a full moon of midsummer, which in 480 could be on 19 August. As Salamis was fought a few days earlier than the solar eclipse (9.10.3) of 3 October, the conclusion must be that the battle of Thermopylae was fought in late August and that of Salamis in late September. See F.J. Frost, *Plutarch's Themistocles. A Historical Commentary* (Princeton 1980), 123ff. The battle of Himera cannot be dated with any comparable degree of precision. A case for an early-spring date (see G. Vallet, *Rhégion et Zancle* [Paris 1958] 363ff.), can be made on the grounds that the Carthaginian army was brought into Sicily by Terillos "at the very time" when Gelon was receiving the Greek envoys (Hdt. 7.165), *i.e.*, during winter 481/0. According to a different Sicilian version, Himera was fought long enough before Salamis to allow Gelon to make all his after-battle arrangements, including the peace treaty with Carthage, before the news of Salamis reached him (Diod. 11.25-26). Besides, storms in the African Sea (*ibid.*, 20.2ff.), are more frequent in winter; and if the battle fell on a day sacred to "Poseidon" (*ibid.*, 21.4), or rather Melqart, it may have been the day of the god's ἔγερσις, which, according to Menander of Ephesus (*FGrH* 783 F 1), fell in the Macedonian month Peiritios; the equivalent Phoenician month would be supposedly the enigmatic *krr*, which has been tentatively equated to February/March (the problem is endlessly debated; see, *e.g.*, E. Lipiński, *Actes de la 17e rencontre assyriologique internationale* [Ham-sur-Heure 1969], 30-58; M. Delcor, *RSF* 2 [1974], 63-76). A case for a late-summer date (preferred by R. Hackforth, *CAH* IV, 378f. to save the synchronism with Salamis) would be much weaker. Plutarch knew that 22 Metageitnion (= August/September) was held by the Carthaginians to be an ἡμέρα ἀποφράς (*Cam.* 19.6), but one should not jump to the conclusion that Himera was fought on that day.

was not the accuracy of the dating but the metahistorical message of synchronicity.

Another famous synchronism of the "same day" engendered by the Persian Wars had similar consequences. Nobody in antiquity ever denied the "fact" that the battles of Plataea and Mycale were fought on the same day and that somehow the news of the first victory reached the Greeks in Ionia shortly before the second battle. Herodotus had some trouble explaining this extraordinary coincidence, although he accepted it without reservation. Typically, however, he made an effort to meet the expectations of both the credulous and the sceptical: "The rumour rightly (ὀρθῶς) did run — for the fight at Plataea fell early in the day, whereas that at Mycale was towards the evening. That the two battles were really fought on the same day of the same month became apparent when inquiries were made afterwards" (9.101.1).[11] Herodotus found nothing incredible in the story of the "rumour" crossing (on a swift ship) from Boeotia to Ionia in less than twelve hours; nevertheless, for him the coincidence was a sign of divine intervention. He also noticed that both battles were fought near a precinct of Demeter — another point of similarity. In sum, although the laws of nature were perhaps not transgressed on that eventful day, for Herodotus a coincidence, if proved, was always a divine act that conveyed a message (in this case, again, a message of panhellenic destiny and solidarity). Some sceptics, however, remained unconvinced. According to Diodorus (here probably following Ephorus), the report of the victory at Plataea was deliberately invented by Leotychidas' commanders to encourage their men, "for the great distance separating the places proved that the transmission of the news was impossible" within the space of one day (11.35.1-3).

These fifth-century examples may be taken as prototypes of early didactic synchronisms of which the factual basis clearly rested on

---

11 *Cf.* Hdt. 9.90.1 and 100.1-2; Iust. 2.14.7-9; Plut., *Aem.* 25.1. The day is 3 (or 4) Boedromion (= Sept./Oct.), according to Plutarch's Περὶ ἡμερῶν (*Cam.* 19.3; *Mor.* 349 F; *Aristid.* 19.7); it is 6 Thargelion (= May/June) according to a confused and unreliable list of memorable days in Ael., *VH* 2.25. C. Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece* (Oxford 1963), 456f. dates both battles in August 479 B.C. and believes that only a few days separated them.

oral tradition and on a popular or political interpretation, and not on the use of synchronistic tables, which did not as yet exist. The factual truth of these cases was never doubted; it was always the meaning, or want of meaning, of the synchronism which was disputed. In other words, what essentially mattered to both laymen and historians was not chronological accuracy, but the metahistorical message. However, the inclination to prefer didactic purposes to scientific accuracy persisted even in centuries of well-established chronographic erudition. For example, Plutarch (as many before him) clearly suspected on chronological grounds the historicity of the famous encounter between Solon and Croesus; nevertheless, he did not hesitate to declare shamelessly that "when a story is so famous and well-attested and, what is more to the point, when it comports so well with the character of Solon, and is so worthy of his magnanimity and wisdom, I do not propose to reject it out of deference to any (so-called) chronological canons, (χρονικοῖς τισι λεγομένοις κανόσιν), which thousands are to this day revising, without being able to bring their contradictions into any general agreement" (*Sol.* 27.1). This looks like a license for almost unrestrained inventiveness for didactic purposes.

It would be appropriate to conclude this introductory section with a reminder of the rule that all classifications require caution. It is sometimes dangerous to accept a given synchronism as factual truth because it is classified as "technical", or conversely to reject another as fanciful just because it is "didactic": each case deserves to be studied on its own merits. Nevertheless, the apparent presence, or absence, of a metahistorical message, quite independently of the problem of historical reliability, is always a useful criterion for a *prima facie* evaluation. It should be kept in mind that synchronization is not the sole chronological device suitable for didactic messages; another is periodization, a favourite pastime even today, especially among schoolteachers. Furthermore, chronological devices of all sorts are of course but a sub-species of a broader category, that of historical analogy and polarity — a truly enormous

field of methodological research, and as far as ancient historiography is concerned, still lacking a comprehensive study.[12]

II

Timaeus was the first Greek didactic synchronizer to benefit from the invention of synchronistic tables and daily almanacs. His fondness for striking coincidences equalled his chronological pedantry. Traces of such habits in the works of later historians (mainly Diodorus) are still profitably used by many scholars to unmask Timaeus' *longa manus* pulling the strings behind the scenes. Accordingly, Timaeus' synchronisms should be examined and evaluated in the light of two main problems: 1) which chronological canon he used to find out the synchronism in question, and 2) what metahistorical message it implies. With these questions in mind, we will examine the five synchronisms explicitly attributed to Timaeus in our sources.

1) The most famous of Timaeus' synchronisms is the one between the foundations of Rome and Carthage. Referring to the "historical" founding of Rome, Dionysius of Halicarnassus states that "Timaeus the Siciliote, using what canon I do not know, says that it was founded together with Carthage in the thirty-eighth year before the First Olympiad" (= 814/3 B.C.).[13] At first glance, this looks like one of the many traditional synchronisms of city-foundations (κτίσεις), all conventionally implying a vague message of some sort of shared or contrary destiny — a sub-species in its own right (see, for example, the well-known synchronism of the foundations of Croton and Syracuse, two cities emblematic of Health and Wealth, respectively[14]). It was Dionysius, however, who asked the

---

12 G.E.R. Lloyd, *Polarity and Analogy. Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought* (Cambridge 1966). On Herodotus see A. Corcella, *Erodoto e l'analogia* (Palermo 1984)..

13 1.74.1 = *FGrH* 566 F 60: Τίμαιος μὲν ὁ Σικελιώτης (οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτωι κανόνι χρησάμενος) ἅμα Καρχηδόνι κτιζομένηι γενέσθαι φησὶν ὀγδόωι καὶ τριακοστῶι πρότερον ἔτει τῆς πρώτης ὀλυμπιάδος. On Ol. 1.1 = 776 B.C. see above, n. 1. For κανών = "chronological system" *cf.* Plutarch's passage (*Sol.* 27.1) quoted above.

14 Str. 6.2.4 (Antiochus?) and Ael. fr. 316 Hercher; see H.W. Parke and E.W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* II (Oxford 1956), no. 229. Other famous

most relevant question: what was the canon in which Timaeus had found such a puzzling date for the foundation of Rome? Evidently, in the passage quoted by Dionysius, Timaeus did not specify his source of information, although he may have done so elsewhere, for instance in his account of the foundation of Carthage (*FGrH* 566 F 82), a chapter that may have escaped Dionysius' notice, since he was interested in the dating of Rome, not Carthage. Perhaps we moderns are able to provide an answer, at least partly, to Dionysius' question. We know, in fact, that the so-called "Tyrian archives" or "Phoenician chronicles" — documents highly praised by Josephus because of their antiquity and accuracy[15] — contained the date of Carthage's foundation. Greek translations of some of these texts circulated in Hellenistic and Roman times. The best-known was the translation included by Menander of Ephesus in his *Phoinikika* but probably made by a Hellenized Phoenician in the third or second century B.C.; another translation was made, or procured, by Philo of Byblos in the late first or early second century A.D.[16] Timaeus himself tells us that he spent a great deal of money and effort to collect "records" from the Tyrians (παρὰ Τυρίων ὑπομνήματα),[17] admittedly by purchasing scrolls and then having a bilingual Phoenician translate them for his personal use. There was no lack, after all, of Hellenized and educated Tyrians living in the thriving

---

synchronisms of this kind are those of Croton and Sybaris, Corcyra and Syracuse, Gela and Phaselis (sources in R. Van Compernolle, *Étude de chronologie et d'historigraphie siciliotes* [Brussels-Rome 1960], 18 n.5).

15 For a full collection and discussion of evidence on the "Tyrian Annals" see G. Garbini, *Oriental Studies presented to B.S.J. Isserlin* (Leiden 1980), 114-127 (Italian version in *I Fenici. Storia e religione* [Napoli 1980], c. 7).

16 According to Garbini (above, n. 15), Menander was not the original translator, although presented as such by Josephus (*FGrH* 783 T 3 a-c), but rather a bilingual Phoenician living in Hellenistic Tyre (perhaps Mochos: see *FGrH* 784). On Philo's translation see *FGrH* 790 T 3, and for a rich bibliography on Philo see now S. Ribichini, *Studia Phoenicia* IV, *Religio Phoenicia* (Namur 1987), 41-42 n.3.

17 *FGrH* 566 F 7 *ap.* Polyb. 12.28a.3, where the reading παρὰ Τυρίων in the Vaticanus 73 (M) is reported by Boissevain and accepted by Jacoby and others; Mai read παρὰ τινῶν and Heyse παρ' ἀστυρίων; παρ' 'Ασσυρίων Hultsch (*cf.* Paton's translation in the Loeb ed.); παρὰ Κυρνίων Büttner-Wobst (*coll. FGrH* 566 F 3 *ap.* Polyb. 12.3.7ff.). See Walbank *ad loc.*

community at Piraeus in the fourth century B.C. and later, and Timaeus could have easily obtained what he needed without leaving Athens. It is much more reasonable to assume that this is what he actually did than to suppose that he studied Punic, went personally to Carthage or to Panormus and read himself the so-called "Punic" or "Carthaginian Annals".[18] At any rate, there is no reason whatsoever to postulate that translations of Phoenician texts were unknown to the Greeks before the time of Menander of Ephesus.

The date of Carthage's foundation given in some Tyrian records is the seventh year of Pygmalion's reign; at least, in that year the king's sister was said to have taken flight from Tyre and built the city of Carthage (Menander of Ephesus, *FGrH* 783 F 1). The story was well-known to Timaeus, who possibly was the first to record it in a Greek book of history (*FGrH* 566 F 62). The Julian date corresponding to Pygmalion's seventh year cannot be determined with precision, although one or two Assyrian dates can now be used to pinpoint the absolute chronology of the entire extant series of Tyrian kings. There is little doubt, however, that the seventh year of Pygmalion should be located in the last quarter of the ninth century, into which Timaeus' year 814/3 falls.[19] Assuming, then, that

---

18 The old belief that Timaeus could read Punic and that he consulted the Tyrian or Carthaginian annals before they were translated, though recently revived by a scholar of Heurgon's stature (*Rome et la Méditerranée occidentale jusqu'aux guerres puniques*[2] [Paris 1980], 140f.), ought to have taken into account the Greek reluctance to learn foreign languages in general and Polybius' report that Timaeus did not leave Athens for fifty years (12.25d.1; 25h.1 = *FGrH* 566 F 34; 28.6). Albright's assumption that Timaeus "had spent part of his time under Carthaginian overlordship in the fourth century B.C." (*AIPHOS* 13 [1953] = *Mélanges Isidor Lévy*, 5 n. 3) is totally unwarranted. On the Carthaginian *libri Punici* see Sall., *BJ* 17.7 (with G.M. Paul's commentary [Liverpool 1984], 74). For a recent collection of references (mainly epigraphic) to the Phoenicians at Athens and Piraeus see M.-F Baslez, "Cultes et dévotions des Phéniciens en Grèce: les divinités marines", *Studia Phoenicia* IV (above, n. 16), 289-305.

19 The main chronological peg is supplied by the synchronism in 841 B.C. of Salmanassar III and Ba'almanzer (Balezoros in Josephus' text): see F. Safar, *Sumer* 7 (1951), 11-12 (text) and 19 (translation); J.M.ª Peñuela, *Sefarad* 13 (1953), 217-237 and 14 (1954), 3-43; J. Liver, *IEJ* 3 (1953), 113-120; E. Lipiński, *RSO* 45 (1970), 59-65; P. Cintas, *Manuel d'archéologie*

Timaeus' ultimate source for Carthage's foundation was a translated Tyrian record, one must conclude that the Carthaginian component of the synchronism is not an invention but rather a piece of chronological information discovered in the best document available at that time and a quite reliable one even by modern standards.[20] Thus we may be able partly to answer Dionysius' question: the canon Timaeus used for dating Carthage was apparently a Tyrian list of

---

punique I (Paris 1970), 198ff. (This volume is essentially a polemical and confused defense of Timaeus' dating against E.O. Forrer's criticism, "Karthago wurde erst 673-663 v.Chr. gegründet", in *Festschrift Franz Dornseiff*, ed. H. Kusch [Leipzig 1953], 85-93, reproduced in French translation, *ibid.*, 473-485); G. Bunnens, *L'expansion phénicienne en Méditerranée* (Brussels-Rome 1979), 322ff. Pygmalion's seventh year, now commonly equated to 825/820 B.C., has been taken by some ingenious scholars as the date of Elissa's flight from Tyre, and Timaeus' 814/3 as a reference to the "official era" of Carthage (hence drawn from Carthaginian, not Tyrian, annals): see F.C. Movers, *Die Phönizer* II.2 (Berlin 1850), 153ff., and more recently Cintas, *loc.cit.* above. The year 824 B.C. is Trogus' dating for the founding of Carthage (18.6.9) and possibly Josephus' as well. But see R. Van Compernolle, *AIPHOS* 20 (1968-1972, publ. 1973), 467-479, whose reckoning points to 806/5. Equating Pygmalion's seventh year to 814/3, as Ed. Meyer and others did on the assumption that the Tyrian king-list recorded precisely Timaeus' dating, amounts to a gross methodogical flaw; see rightly J. Liver, *op.cit.*, 323f.

20 I am less skeptical today about Timaeus' use of translated Phoenician sources than I was years ago (*Saggi di letteratura e storiografia antiche* [Como 1983], 57 n. 8), and more convinced than ever that Aly's view that 814/3 was reached by reckoning 7 generations of 40 years from the Ionian invasion (*RhM* 66 [1911], 601 and 603), or Bunnens' reckoning of 10 generations of 33 1/2 years from the alleged Persian-Carthaginian alliance of 480 ([n.19], 134 and 320), are mere arithmetical games; see W. Huss' reaction, *Geschichte der Karthager. Hndb. d. Altert.* III.8 (Munich 1985), 42f. Mommsen's theory that Timaeus' synchronism derives from his knowledge of the story of Dido and Aeneas (*Die römische Chronologie bis auf Caesar* [Berlin 1859] 135f.) is totally unwarranted; see L. Holzapfel, *Römische Chronologie* (Leipzig 1885), 229ff.; J. Geffken, *Timaios' Geographie des Westens* (Berlin 1892), 47ff.; W. Schur, *Klio* 17 (1921), 142; L. Moretti, *RFIC* 30 (1952), 295ff., etc. This hypothesis implies a double synchronism of a double foundation of both cities, i.e. a "mythical" one soon after Troy's fall and a "historical" one in 814/3. What Vergil allowed himself, Timaeus evidently could not.

kings or chronicle, translated into Greek and somehow squared with the Olympic chronology.

With his new dating of Carthage Timaeus made a break with the earlier chronological tradition. Sophocles placed Carthage in the age of Triptolemus (fr. 602 Radt), which is at any rate several generations earlier than the fall of Troy; Eudoxus of Cnidus placed it shortly before the Trojan War (fr. 360 Lasserre ap. *Schol. Eur. Troad.* 221 Schwartz); and even Timaeus' direct predecessor, Philistus, who ought to have been well-informed of his master's main enemy and ally, placed the founding about 1215 B.C., a date which in his own canon possibly belonged to a pre-Trojan age as well.[21] Timaeus, on the other hand, totally disregarded the Trojan connection, and by drastically lowering the date from the mythical to

---

21 In the *Triptolemus* (performed in 468 B.C., according to Pliny, *NH* 18.65) Sophocles mentioned Carthage as already existing (and the *Schol.Eur.Troad.* 221 Schwartz understood the passage as meaning that the city was "settled" (ᾠκίσθαι) in Triptolemus' time). In the same play he mentioned the first "sowing" of Oenotria by Triptolemus and Demeter (fr. 598 Radt): perhaps a vague notion of synchronous colonization of Carthage and Oenotria can be extrapolated from these fragments. The chronology of the Eleusinian hero Triptolemus depends upon that of Io, who is either a daughter of Inachus or of Piren or Iasus; in any case, her time goes back to at least 14 generations before Troy. For Philistus' dating of Carthage see *FGrH* 556 F 47 *ap.* Eus. *ab Abr.* 802. Philistus' Trojan dating is unknown. He possibly opened his historical work with a didactic (?) synchronism between the Sicel migration and the foundation of Carthage (Jacoby, *Komm. ad loc.*: "Wenn Ph(ilistus) Timaios gewesen wäre, hätte er die gründung von Syrakus und Karthago synchronisiert"). On Varro's dating of Carthage, possibly following Philistus or Eudoxus, see J. Poucet, *MEFRA* 101.1 (1989), 85-8. An oriental synchronism betwen the foundation of Carthage and the Exodus in the first year of the 7th Olympiad (= 752/1 B.C., which is also the year of Rome's foundation according to the Eratosthenic-Polybian canon) was made or accepted by Apion (*FGrH* 616 F 4 a = 165 Stern), thus creating a causal connection between the Israelite conquest of Canaan and the Phoenician migration to Northern Africa — a tradition well-attested by both Talmudic and Byzantine sources; see F.C. Movers (above, n. 19), 427-435; H. Lewy, *MGWJ* 77 (1933), 84-99, 172-180; A.H. Krappe, *AJSLL* 57 (1940), 229-243; on Apion's synchronism see A. Momigliano, *Athenaeum* 55 (1977), 187ff. = *Sesto contributo* (Rome 1980), 183f..

the historical past, he sharply departed from tradition, both in method (by using a Tyrian document instead of a conventional canon *a bello Troiano*) and in substance. His achievement did not go unnoticed: his new dating of Carthage was known to many later authors, from Cicero to Servius; others, probably for mnemonic reasons, preferred to round off Carthage's existence to 700 years, thus putting its foundation in 846 B.C.[22]

The Roman component of the synchronism raises the same question: what was the chronological canon on which Timaeus' dating depends? The possibility that he might have used no canon at all was clearly beyond Dionysius' grasp. As a matter of fact, the theory that Timaeus' Roman dating was arbitrarily invented for the sake of a didactic synchronism was first put forward in modern times. Mommsen declared starkly that Timaeus learned the date of Carthage from Punic sources and in order to put the two great rival powers at the same starting-point, he invented the date of Rome.[23] Nowadays, such hypercritical views often provoke extreme opposite reactions. In the last decades, several distinguished scholars went so far as to assert their belief that Timaeus had access to indigenous sources in Latium and that a ninth-century date might have been suggested to

---

22 See the systematic studies by R. Van Compernolle (above, n. 14) 139-235, and Cintas and Bunnens (above, n. 19); also, Th.B. De Graff, *Naevian Studies. A Dissertation* (Geneva-New York 1931), 28ff., and E. Frézouls, *BCH* 79 (1955), 159ff. Some ancient authors accepted Timaeus' dating of Carthage but not the synchronism with Rome (*e.g.*, Velleius Paterculus); others accepted the synchronism but not the date (*e.g.*, Apion). The number 700, no less than 666 (= 812-146), is a mystical one; see A. Dreizehnter, *Die rhetorische Zahl. Quellenkritische Untersuchungen anhand der Zahlen 70 und 700* (*Zetemata* 73, Munich 1978); N. Horsfall, *CQ* 24 (1974), 111, 114f.

23 See Th. Mommsen, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 20), followed by O. Leuze, *Die römische Jahrzählung* (Tübingen 1909), 289f., and many others. R. Van Compernolle posed the question in the best possible terms: "*Est-ce l'affirmation d'un synchronisme qui a amené l'historien à admettre, pour l'une des deux fondations, la date de l'autre cité ..., ou bien l'idée d'un synchronisme entre les deux fondations n'est-elle que le résultat de l'adoption d'une même date de fondation pour les deux villes*?" (above, n. 14), 133.

him by reliable informants during a visit to Lavinium.[24] Still, there is room for a middle way between the extreme theories of fanciful invention and archival documentation, namely, the possibility that Timaeus consulted some rare Greek canon — which is what Dionysius of Halicarnassus actually suspected. After all, Rome had nothing to offer comparable to the Tyrian archives before the middle of the second century B.C., and even then the local official date of Rome's foundation was never 814/3 but, as we all know, a considerably later date around the middle of the eighth century or even lower. Indeed, the first Roman annalists themselves had to consult Greek authors and canons, not local archives or Lavinian guides, in order to learn something about the origins of their own city. In fact, the first attempts to provide Rome with a conventional *ktisis*-story were made by Greeks, and they are well attested for the second half of the fifth century B.C. Starting with Antiochus of Syracuse, who believed that Rome existed prior to the Sicel migration (*FGrH* 555 F 6), the foundation of Rome — as that of Carthage — was usually chronologically related to the fall of Troy. Thus the dating of Rome's foundation depended on the different dates assumed by Greek historians for the fall of Troy. Hellanicus clearly synchronized within the same generation, and possibly even within the same decade, if not the same year, the fall of Troy and the founding of Rome, since in his version the founders of Rome were the two most famous wanderers of Greek mythology, Aeneas and Odysseus.[25] He was followed by Damastes of Sigeum (*FGrH* 5 F 3), writing in about 400 B.C.; but at some point in the fourth century the date of Rome's foundation began to be lowered by one to three generations, and as a result a chronological gap between Troy's fall and Rome's foundation was created, although apparently

---

24 See *e.g.* G.K. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome* (Princeton 1969), 142ff., 156f.; J. Heurgon (above, n. 18), 130ff.; T.J. Cornell, *PCPhS* 201 (1975), 23f.

25 *FGrH* 4 F 84: Αἰνείαν ... μετ' Ὀδυσσέως οἰκιστὴν γενέσθαι τῆς πόλεως: Ὀδυσσέα B; see recently A. Momigliano, *Settimo contributo* (Roma, 1984), 444, and F. Solmsen, *HSCP* 90 (1986), 93ff. "Mit Odysseus" Eus. *Arm.* p. 131, 33 Karst, σὺν Ὀδυσσεῖ Sync. p. 361, 16 Dindorf; *Schol. Lyc.Alex.* 1242: Ὀδυσσέα φασὶν ἐν Ἰταλίαι συντυχεῖν Αἰνείαι καὶ συνθήκας μετ' ἀλλήλων καὶ εἰρήνην ποιῆσαι. Obviously, "after Odysseus" does not make sense.

the older synchronism of the "same generation" was never abandoned.[26] What Timaeus could therefore find in earlier Greek authors were traditions variously connecting Rome with Troy; and if we reject the idea of his use of Latin sources as totally unattested and highly improbable, the only document he could have consulted was perforce one of the existing canons *a bello Troiano.*

As with Carthage, Timaeus' dating of Rome is a drastic down-dating from mythical to historical times.[27] The problem, then, may be more narrowly defined as the identification of the canon in which the year 814/3 would fit. Many tentative solutions have been suggested for this problem, but most of them are mere arithmetical games toying with hypothetical generation lengths and chronological starting-points.[28] The sole serious endeavour is based on the assumption that only in one known system does the year 814/3 make sense, namely, the most "modern" of all Trojan canons existing in Timaeus' time, which dated the fall of Troy a thousand years before Alexander's crossing into Asia (1334/3 B.C.). This famous mystical and didactic dating was proposed by Duris of Samos, a contemporary of Timaeus and a great admirer of Alexander.[29] The span of time separating 814/3 from 1334/3 is 520 years, a well-known archaic chronological unit already used by Herodotus (1.95.2) and later by Roman chronographers (Dion.Hal. 2.25.7), and equivalent to 13 generations of 40 years. The same span of 13 generations, albeit of 33 years each ("three generations in a century": Hdt. 2.142.2), *i.e.*, 433 years, separates the year 751/0 from 1184/3, the dates of Rome's foundation and Troy's fall, respectively, in the canon of Eratosthenes, which became truly canonic from the end of

---

26 See esp. C.J. Classen, "Zur Herkunft der Sage von Romulus und Remus", *Historia* 12 (1963), 447-457; G.K. Galinsky, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 24); N. Horsfall (above, n. 22), 112ff.

27 The thesis of a double foundation in Timaeus (one mythical and one historical) does not seem to be based on solid ground, and Dionysius' words in 1.74.1 should certainly not be interpreted as supporting this thesis. See L. Moretti, *RFIC* (1952), 296ff.; Jacoby's *Komm.* to *FGrH* 566 F 59-61; A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor 1963), 125, n. 4; N. Horsfall (above, n. 22), 112.

28 For an amusing collection of old conjectures of this kind see O. Leuze, (above, n. 23), 289 f., n. 359.

29 *FGrH* 76 F 41; see my essay (above, n. 20), 53-98.

the third century B.C. but was as yet unknown in Timaeus' time.[30] All later Greek and Roman authors who stated that Rome was founded 433 (or 432) years after the fall of Troy actually meant a span of 13 generations of 33 years each. There is no reason to doubt that the notion of 13 generations separating Rome from Troy — an interval which in due time was filled up by a list of Alban kings connecting Aeneas to Romulus — was the final result of the fourth-century process of widening the chronological gap between Troy and Rome, and that it goes back to Timaeus' time, while the length of time in number of years (520 or 433) depended on the unit of generation used in each canon by different chronographers.[31]

---

30 See *FGrH* 241 F 1 a-b, and 809 F 3 b. Doubt has been cast on 241 F 45 (Rome founded by Romulus, grandson of Aeneas): see E. Bickerman, *CPh* 42 (1952), 79, n. 223. The same interval of 13 generations x 33 years is found between the *Marmor Parium*'s date of Troy's fall (1209 B.C.: see *FGrH* 239 A 24) and the canonic date of the first Olympiad (776 B.C.). Vergil's 333 years between Aeneas and Romulus (*Aen.* 1.265ff.) reflect a different, obviously mystical span of time; see N.Horsfall (above, n. 22), 111ff., and G. d'Anna, "Cronologia storica", *Encicl. Virgiliana* I (Roma, 1984), 941-944 (with bibl.).

31 The names of the Alban kings are artificial and unknown before the second half of the first century B.C. (Diodorus, Dionysius, Virgil, Livy, Ovid); see R.A. Laroche, *Historia* 31 (1982), 112-120. In these lists, the number of kings from Ascanius to Numitor is 15, but since Ascanius and his successor Silvius are brothers, and Rome was founded in the second year of Numitor, the number of generations is in fact 13, although Romulus might correctly be described as the seventeenth king from Aeneas; see Dion. Hal. 1.9.4; 45.3; 71.5. The assumption that Timaeus, following Duris, dated Troy's fall in 1334/3 is confirmed by his statement that Corcyra was colonized by Chersicrates 600 years after the fall of Troy (*FGrH* 566 F 80). As Chersicrates was said to have sailed to the West together with Archias, the founder of Syracuse, Corcyra and Syracuse became synchronized (see above, n. 14); and since the year of Syracuse's foundation was held by Thucydides' source (probably Antiochus) to be 734/3 B.C., it follows that in the canon presumably used by Timaeus Troy was dated to 734/3 + 600 = 1334/3. Timaeus' report that the millennium of the famous Locrian maidens ended in 346 B.C. (*FGrH* 566 F 146 b) does not contradict Alexander's millennium, because Timaeus is here referring apparently to a local Locrian tradition, not his own reckoning; and Censorinus' statement that Timaeus dated Troy to 1194/3 (*FGrH* 566 F 126), which is Eratosthenes' dating of the

The conclusion is obvious: Timaeus' Roman dating, like that of Carthage, was not invented, because it could be easily discovered, or reckoned, by consulting the latest canon *a bello Troiano*. The fact that the existence of such a canon did not come to Dionysius' knowledge is another matter. This kind of canon may rightly seem to us less satisfactory than the one used by Timaeus for dating Carthage, but by ancient standards it was generally admissible and as weighty as any other. Many more and older Trojan canons were of course available in Timaeus' time: why, then, did he choose the patently mystical millennium of Duris? The answer again seems obvious: a historian fond of mysterious, didactic coincidences would instinctively adopt the first canon which might satisfy his penchant. Had Timaeus not been mentally prepared to draw a parallel between Rome and Carthage, Duris' canon might not have attracted his attention. All the same, Timaeus did not invent his Roman dating but rather laboriously sifted through his chronological tables until he found what he was looking for. As an historian, he needed evidence. In sum, both components of this famous synchronism could be found in documents fully reliable by contemporary standards.

As is apparent from Dionysius, Timaeus' synchronism was known and quoted in antiquity because of its eccentric dating and not for its implied message, which possibly nobody noticed. The presence of a message was first recognized in modern times and explained in various ways, mostly as a parallelism implying a common destiny, either a common past of enduring friendship or a common future of violent confrontation.[32] There has been much debate on the question of when and where Timaeus mentioned this synchronism. There are three possiblities. It could have been a part of Timaeus' antiquarian investigations in comparative chronology,

---

beginning of the Trojan War, is certainly wrong; for bibliography see my essay (above, n. 20), 60, n. 13, and the discussion, 56ff. Some scholars have suggested a double-dating of Troy's fall in Timaeus, *e.g.*, E. Manni, *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni* (Torino 1963), 168f. and n. 16; for other hypothetical double-datings in Timaeus see above nn. 20 and 27.

32 See in the last decades, *e.g.*, A. Momigliano (1959) = *Terzo contributo* (Rome 1966), 46f. (in English, see *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* [Oxford 1977] 54f.); A. Alföldi (above, n. 27), 125f.; J. Heurgon (above, n. 18), 226ff., 243f.; P. Cintas (above, n. 19), 107f.

genealogy and traditions of city-foundations (see *FGrH* 566 T 19); it is generally held that Timaeus devoted much attention to such studies in the early part of his long life and career.[33] It is also possible that the synchronism appeared in Timaeus' treatise on Pyrrhus, which was completed not earlier than 275 B.C. Finally, it may have been formulated at the very end of his life-work (which according to Polybius continued to the year 264/3 B.C.: 1.5.1, *FGrH* 566 T 6a), in direct connection with the premonitory signs of the First Punic War or with its actual outbreak. Choosing one of these three possiblities is bound to be arbitrary and of doubtful value in solving the problem of the message's precise meaning. One thing is certain: Timaeus need not have waited until 264/3 (when he might have been over ninety years of age) to realize the state of deep-rooted antagonism between Rome and Carthage, although both cities were formally allies from the end of the sixth century. As we all know, in 279 the Carthaginians concluded a new treaty with the Romans as part of their common struggle against Pyrrhus; but we also remember what Pyrrhus allegedly said when leaving the West in 275: "What a wrestling-ground for the Carthaginians and the Romans are we leaving!" (Plut., *Pyrrh.* 23.6). The apophthegm may be apocryphal, but in 275 no exceptional clairvoyance was needed to prophesy a clash between the two superpowers. In other words, Timaeus' synchronism could be seen as a way of expressing symbolically the anxieties of Sicilian Greeks after Pyrrhus' retreat. Yet this is not the entire story. Some time before Aristotle wrote his famous chapter on Carthage (*Pol.* 1272b 24 - 1273b 26), the political constitution of this city-state had been much praised by Greek political thinkers, and comparisons between the idealized constitutions of Carthage and Sparta were apparently fashionable in the fourth century. After Pyrrhus' retreat and the Roman conquest of Southern Italy, Rome entered the international stage as Carthage's partner, or potential rival, in western state- and warcraft. The discovery of Rome as the new political and military counterpart of Carthage, replacing the declining Graeculi of post-Agathoclean Sicily and of the semi-barbarized Magna Graecia, and inheriting their traditional position in the

---

33 See now L. Pearson, *The Greek Historians of the West. Timaeus and his Predecessors. Phil. Monogr. of the Am. Phil. Assoc.* 35 (1987), 37ff., and the bibl. 279ff..

network of political and commercial relations in the western Mediterranean, was the great contribution of Timaeus to early Hellenistic historiography. Aulus Gellius knew that *in litteris veteribus* (probably Greek) it was stated that Romans and Carthaginians were once equal in vigour, harshness and numbers, and that the contest between them was a deadly fight for the rule of the world (*NA* 10.27.1-2). This is a true antagonistic parallelism, emphasizing first and foremost the equality of martial virtues. It is not at all surprising that such a new vision of international politics could have been presented by Timaeus in the guise of a foundation-synchronism. One generation after Timaeus' death the parallelism was widely admitted and even became conventional. Eratosthenes, for example, took it for granted, incorrectly placing Rome and Carthage on the same meridian and featuring both peoples as models of "admirably governed barbarians".[34] Timaeus' synchronism may thus rightly be viewed as an ingenuous expression of third-century *Zeitgeist*.

2) In the Tenth book of his *Histories*, dealing with early fifth-century events, Timaeus apparently mentioned that the city of Camarina was destroyed or depopulated by Gelon and repeopled later by the Geloans, and added that a "capture" (ἅλωσις) of Camarina happened at the time of "Darius' crossing" (*FGrH* 566 F 19 a-b).[35] This piece of information appears in two versions of a scholium on Pindar's Fifth Olympic. The scholiast apparently could consult Timaeus' *Histories* whenever he wanted to verify the poet's

---

[34] *Ap.* Str. 2.1.40, and 1.4.9; *cf.* P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* I (Oxford 1972), 769. For Polybius' famous comparison see 6.51-52 and 56 (with Walbank's commentary).

[35] *FGrH* 566 F 19a = *Schol. Pind. O.* 5.19a: νέοικον ἕδραν εἶπε τὴν Καμάριναν ὁ Πίνδαρος. σαφηνίζει Τίμαιος ἐν τῇι δεκάτηι. εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι οἱ Καμαριναῖοι, <οἳ> ὑπὸ τοῦ Γέλωνος τυράννου ἀνηιρέθησαν, εἶτα ὑπὸ Γελώων συνωικίσθησαν ἐπὶ τῆς * ὀλυμπιάδος. ἡ δὲ ἅλωσις ἐγένετο κατὰ τὴν Δαρείου τοῦ Πέρσου διάβασιν. *Ibid.* 19b †Ἱπποκράτης ὑπὸ τοῦ τῶν Γελώων τυράννου ἀνηιρέθη, εἶτα ὑπὸ Γελώων συνωικίσθη ἡ Καμάρινα κατὰ τὴν† μβ ὀλυμπιάδα, ὡς φησι Τίμαιος· ... ἡ δὲ ἅλωσις αὐτῆς ἐγένετο κατὰ τὴν Δαρείου τοῦ Ὑστάσπου στρατείαν. *Cf.* Hdt. 7.156.2 on the memorable mass-deportation of the Camarinaeans to Syracuse by Gelon about 484/3 B.C.

allusions to Sicilian events. Here the event that prompted Pindar to call Camarina "a new-founded abode" (*O.* 5.19: νέοικον ἕδραν) was the repopulation of the city by the Geloans in 461 B.C. (Diodorus' date, 9.76.5). The text of both versions is irremediably corrupt, although it could be argued that these are fragments of an excerpt from a summary of the history of Camarina in the first half of the fifth century, apparently included by Timaeus in a chapter of his Tenth Book dedicated to Gelon's rise to power (cf. *FGrH* 566 F 18). However, the synchronistic formulas in the scholium are sufficiently clear: ἡ δὲ ἅλωσις ἐγένετο κατὰ Δαρείου τοῦ Πέρσου διάβασιν (*ibid.* F 19 a), and ἡ δὲ ἅλωσις αὐτῆς ἐγένετο κατὰ τὴν Δαρείου τοῦ Ὑστάσπου στρατείαν (*ibid.* F 19 b).[36] "Darius' crossing" has been understood by everybody as a reference to Datis' and Artaphernes' expedition to Greece in summer 490 B.C., although the term is not free of difficulties; Herodotus, for example, calls Δαρείου διάβασις the crossing of Darius into Thrace for the Scythian campaign (4.7.1). This campaign brings us back to a late sixth-century date and to a totally unknown "capture" of Camarina at that time (unless we are ready to lower considerably the date of a mid-sixth-century "destruction" of the city mentioned by Thucydides [6.5.3] and dated to 552/1 by Ps.Scymnus 294-296 and *Schol.Pind.O.* 5.16]).[37] If, on the other hand, we take "Darius' crossing" to mean Datis' expedition, no great difficulty would arise from a synchronism in the archon-year of Phaenippus (491/0 B.C.) between the διάβασις (in the precise sense of the sailing of the Persian fleet from Cilicia, or from Samos, to the Greek Aegean in the late spring or early summer 490)[38] and the ἅλωσις — or rather the acquisition as ransom — of Camarina by Hippocrates (through the agency of his hipparch Gelon). All we need to do is to allow enough time for the Corcyrean-Corinthian mediation between

---

36 On these texts see esp. Dunbabin (above, n. 7), 402 and 407-409; R. Van Compernolle (above, n. 14), 296ff., 307ff.; M. Miller, *The Sicilian Colony Dates* (Albany 1970), 99ff.; E. Manni, *ΚΩΚΑΛΟΣ* 33 (1987), 72 and n. 21.

37 There is no archaeological evidence to support this "destruction" of Camarina: see Dunbabin (above, n. 7), 106f.

38 See Beloch *GG* II.2^2, 55ff.; N.G.L Hammond, *CAH* IV^2 (1988), 494ff.; etc.

Syracuse and the tyrant of Gela, as agreed upon by both sides after the battle of Helorus (*ca.* 492/1 B.C.).[39]

The absolute dates of both events could have been easily found in many ancient chronological tables, but the synchronism may well have been the work of Timaeus himself, who apparently wanted to emphasize yet another example of parallelism in the history of East and West. He did it, in this case, in his known "parochial" way, provided that he actually meant to suggest a historical comparison between Darius and Gelon or between the Persian expedition and the capture of Camarina. This, however, is only one legitimate reading of the synchronism. Its original purpose may well have been merely to provide a chronological point of reference for an unknown event of Sicilian history.

3) Among the "chronological coincidences" (συντυχίαι, or τὰ εἰς ταὐτὸ καιροῦ συνδραμόντα) of birth- and death-days discussed by Diogenianus of Pergamum in Plutarch's *Quaestiones Convivales*, the most remarkable example is perhaps that of Euripides, "who was born on the day the Greeks fought at Salamis against the Mede and died on the day when Dionysius, the elder of the Sicilian tyrants, was born [ἐγεννήθη *codd.*]. At the same moment, as Timaeus said, Fortune led away the imitator of tragic experiences and brought in the actor himself" (*Mor.* 717 C and *FGrH* 566 F 105).[40] It is probable, but not absolutely certain, that Timaeus' dictum appeared somewhere in his excursus on Dionysius' rise to power included in the Sixteenth Book of the *Histories*. At most what can be inferred from the quoted passage is that Timaeus synchronized or accepted the synchronism of Euripides' death with Dionysius' birth "on the same day", and that

---

39 Main sources: *StV* II, n. 127; L. Piccirilli, *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci* (Pisa 1973), 58-60, n. 12, with full bibl.; see also Dunbabin (above, n. 7), 401f.; G. Vallet (above, n. 10), 348-353; and R. Van Compernolle (above, n. 14), 303ff., 307ff., 431. Most scholars rightly reject Pareti's low chronology of Hippocrates' tyranny (above, n. 9), 35ff.

40 τὸ περὶ Εὐριπίδου γενέσεως καὶ τελευτῆς, γενομένου μὲν ἡμέρᾳ καθ' ἣν οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐναυμάχουν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι πρὸς τὸν Μῆδον, ἀποθανόντος δὲ καθ' ἣν ἐγεννήθη Διονύσιος ὁ πρεσβύτερος τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ τυράννων· ἅμα τῆς τύχης, ὡς Τίμαιος ἔφη, τὸν μιμητὴν ἐξαγούσης τῶν τραγικῶν παθῶν καὶ τὸν ἀγωνιστὴν ἐπεισαγούσης. On the reading ἐγεννήθη see below.

he deduced from it a didactic lesson of his own. The synchronism of the poet's birth with the day of Salamis is *not* ascribed by Plutarch to Timaeus and there is no reason why we should make such an attribution; nor are we entitled to surmise that Timaeus reckoned, as other authors did, Euripides' age at his death (75). As a matter of fact, there is no mention of the day, the month or the year in the quoted passage. Theoretically, at least, it is possible that Timaeus meant the same day of different years[41] (as is the case in the next synchronism below). In want of an explanation, ἐγεννήθη in Plutarch's text implies the day on which Dionysius was born some 25 years before the day of Euripides' death; but even if we accept the correction ἐγενήθη = "became" tyrant (*cf.* Diod. 13.96.6), as most scholars do,[42] the passage still does not tell us that the *year* of Dionysius' rise to power was the *year* of Euripides' death. However, it seems that such an interpretation can be laid aside. The phrasing of the didactic message as we have it in Plutarch's version, coupling Euripides' exit with Dionysius' entrance upon the stage, evidently implies the same day of the same month and year.

Most scholars have always agreed, in fact, that what Timaeus had in mind was a full-fledged synchronism of the same day, month and year.[43] But which year? What can be gathered from other sources is, in the first place, that both Euripides' and Sophocles' death occurred before the production of Aristophanes' *Ranae* at the Lenaia of Callias' archonship (= late January/early February 405 B.C.); and if there is any historical value in a well-known anecdote which describes Sophocles mourning his colleague's death when the news

---

41 See L. Mendelssohn's discussion of Bernhardy's explanation in *Quod est de mortis anno Sophoclis et Euripidis, Quaestionum Eratosthenicarum* I. *Acta Societ. Philo. Lips.* I-II (1872), 183ff.; more recently, K.F. Stroheker, *Dionysios* I (Wiesbaden 1958), 198, n. 56.

42 See recently L. Pearson (above, n. 33), 157 n. 1, and L.J. Sanders, *Dionysius of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny* (London-New York-Sidney 1987), 105, n. 105, who reads καθ' ἣν τύραννος ἐγενήθη (ἐγεννήθη Διονύσιος mss.).

43 See Mendelssohn (above, n. 41), 183ff.; Chr. Clasen, *Untersuchungen über Timaios von Tauromenion. Inaug. Diss. Jena* (Kiel 1883), 28f.; E. Schwartz, *Hermes* 34 (1899), 486f., n. 2; F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* (Berlin 1902), 250-260; *Das Marmor Parium* (Berlin 1904), 183-185; *Komm. ad FGrH* 566 F 105; and Beloch, *GG* II.2^2, 258ff.; etc.

reached Athens (*Vita Eurip.*, p. 135 Westermann) a few days before the City Dionysia of Antigenes' archonship (= March/April 406 B.C.), then Euripides died in Macedon not long before that date. The *Marmor Parium* actually records the event under Antigenes' year (*FGrH* 239 A 63). Apollodorus dated the deaths of both Euripides and Sophocles in the same year, which may or may not be Callias' year, depending on what one is prepared to make of Diodorus' vague περὶ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον (13.103.4); but other chronographers, by placing Euripides' birth on the day of Salamis and by ascribing him 75 years of life (and an equal number of plays!), evidently lowered the year of death to Callias' archonship (480/79 - 406/5 B.C.).[44]

Which of these two years was the choice of Timaeus (or of his source) cannot be said with any degree of certainty; but before suspecting him (as Jacoby and others do) of arbitrarily manipulating chronology for didactic purposes, one should take into account that Timaeus did have access to Athenian documents and was in a position to corroborate dates by inquiring from learned people, such as his contemporary Philochorus, who wrote a book *On Euripides* (*FGrH* 328 T 1 and F 217-222) and stated the poet's age at his death as "over 70" (F 220). At any rate, the year and month of this famous event were not of such a kind that one could invent or blatantly distort at Athens without risking one's reputation.

The second component of the synchronism, Dionysius' rise to power, is dated by most sources in Callias' archonship (406/5 B.C). In Diodorus' account (13.92-96), Dionysius is said to have been elected *strategos autokrator* a few months after the fall of Acragas, shortly before the winter solstice (= mid-December 406 B.C.: 91.1), and his reign of 38 years is reckoned from this decisive point in his career (96.4). Callias' year is accepted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (7.1.5), by the Armenian Eusebius (*ab Abr.* 1610

---

44 See Jacoby, *Komm.* to Philochoros, *FGrH* 328 F 220, etc. On the conventional ages of the three tragedians at their first performance, acme and death, see A.A. Mosshammer (above, n. 1), 122ff., 305-319, and *TAPhA* 106 (1976), 291ff., 297ff. In Euripides' case, a mnemotechnic device has been suspected on account of three homonymous archons (Callias) in 480/79, 456/5 and 406/5, connected respectively with his presumed birth, his first presentation and his death.

= Ol. 93.3) and by most modern scholars.[45] Yet this is not the only ancient dating we have. Philistus, the earliest source and a contemporary one, ended his πρώτη σύνταξις with Dionysius' rise to tyranny (*FGrH* 556 T 11), but though he had many personal and factual recollections of this memorable event, we are not told the absolute date he gave it. At any rate, Philistus' dating need *not* necessarily have been the same archonship (Callias') under which Diodorus recorded the ending of the πρώτη σύνταξις (13.103, 4), for Diodorus notoriously often condenses in one year events actually belonging to a somewhat larger stretch of time. The *Marmor Parium* records the event under the archonship of Euctemon (*FGrH* 239 A 62), *i.e.*, 408/7 B.C., and its Olympic equivalent (Ol. 93.1) somehow found its way into one manuscript (Freherianus) of Eusebius' Latin version (Hieronymus).[46] Perhaps the *Marmor* dating derives from Ephorus, whom Timaeus sharply criticized on account of his mistaken chronology of Dionysius' reign.[47] The year 407/6 (Ol. 93.2) for Dionysius' rise to power is attested by most manuscripts of Eusebius (Hieronymus); besides, it was probably the year given by some *chronici* who used the Eratosthenic canon of Rome's foundation (= 751/0 B.C.).[48] Finally, an interpolated entry in Xenophon's *Hellenica* (2.2.24) dates the event "in the middle" of

---

45 For bibl. see K.F. Stroheker, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 41), and Walbank's commentary on Polybius, Vol. II, 325ff.

46 See E. Schwartz. *loc. cit.* (above, n. 43).

47 Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 218 *ap.* Plb. 12.4a.3 = Timaeus, *FGrH* 566 F 110. Timaeus' reckoning of the length of Dionysius' reign is unknown; see Chr. Clasen (above, n. 43), 27ff.; Jacoby, *Komm. ad locc.*; Walbank, *Commentary ad loc.*; K. Meister (above, n. 9), 11ff.

48 Aul. Gell., *NA* 17.21.19: *ad annum fere conditae urbis trecentesimum quadragesimum septimum triginta illi tyranni praepositi sunt a Lacedaemoniis Atheniensibus et in Sicilia Dionysius superior tyrannidem tenuit.* The two main Roman canons seem to have been contaminated in this passage: the year of the Thirty Tyrants is reckoned according to Varro's system (754/3-347 = 407/6 B.C.), while Dionysius' rise seems to be reckoned according to the Eratosthenic-Polybian canon (751/0 - 347 = 404/3 B.C.). A false synchronism between these events might have been suggested by some *chronici* (*ibid.* 21.1) for either mnemonic or rather didactic purposes (tyranny in Sicily and in Greece). At any rate, the year 404/3 for Dionysios' rise is unattested elsewhere.

Alexias' year (405/4 B.C.), *i.e.*, in January/February 404 (unless mid-summer is meant).[49] We have, in sum, four different datings of Dionysius' rise to power, fluctuating between 408/7 and 405/4; but a synchronism with Euripides' death restricts the choice to 407/6 or 406/5, the two common denominators of both events as attested in our sources. Timaeus probably derived his chronology of Dionysius' career — and possibly even the synchronism itself — from Philistus' πρώτη σύνταξις. He might well have found or reckoned Dionysius' election as *strategos autokrator* as having occurred on a certain day of the Syracusan calendar falling in late winter 406, and then have discovered that the news of Euripides' death reached Athens about the same time. The precise date of Dionysius' election was clearly not one a Sicilian historian could invent, nor could he change its year, without losing face. The "same day", however, might well have been Timaeus' own contribution to an already-established synchronism of the same month and year, as the exact day of Euripides' death in Macedon was probably never recorded.

The didactic message of the synchronism as related by Plutarch is no more than a kitschy metaphor devoid of any serious meaning. We should not expect from Timaeus deep thoughts on the end of tragedy and of political freedom, or on the relationship between poetry and tyranny in ancient Greece. The most we can deduce from Plutarch's passage is that Timaeus, like many of his contemporaries and successors, superstitiously believed in the effect of Tyche on human affairs and that he fully exploited the conventional rhetoric of this belief in order to "decode" a given chronological coincidence by interpreting it as a supernatural sign. This just confirms what was already well-known from Timaeus' own fragments and from Polybius' judgement of his predecessor. However, assuming that the "first inventor" of the synchronism in question was not Timaeus but Philistus, the original message might have been totally different. Dionysius, who himself wanted to be remembered as a tragic poet, greatly admired Euripides, and a story circulated that the tyrant even paid a huge sum to get some of the poet's *reliquiae* brought and

---

49 See U. Kahrstedt's ingenious interpretation of this passage in *Forschungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden fünften und des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 1910), 165ff.

stored in Syracuse.[50] Such anecdotes could have supplied enough material for a favourably biased didactic message; but what emerged from Timaeus' hands was no more than a bitterly resentful and defeatist truism.

4) Timaeus presents us with the following clear example of chronological coincidence of the "same day" type (and even of the "same hour"!) of presumably the same month but of different years:

> The Geloans had, outside the city, a bronze statue of Apollo of very great size. The Carthaginians seized it as spoil and sent it to Tyre. The Geloans had dedicated the statue in accordance with an oracular response of the god, but the Tyrians at a later time, when they were besieged by Alexander of Macedon, treated it spitefully on the ground that the god was fighting on the side of the enemy. But when Alexander took the city, as Timaeus says (*FGrH* 566 F 106) on the same day with the same name and at the same hour on which the Carthaginians seized the Apollo as spoil at Gela, it came to pass that he was honoured by the Greeks with the greatest sacrifices and processions as having been the cause of its capture. Although these events took place at different times, we have thought it not inappropriate to bring them side by side (παρ' ἄλληλα) because of their being contrary to all expectation. (Diod. 13.108.4-5)[51]

---

50 See Hermippus, *FHG* III 52 Müller *ap. Vita Eurip.* 138 Westermann. Another chronological parallelism might have derived from the tradition that both Sophocles (who died in the same year as Euripides) and Dionysius died of joy at the news of a dramatic victory (Diod. 15.74.1-4; Plin., *NH* 7.180); see Mendelssohn (above, n. 41), 189ff., and Jacoby's *Apollodors Chronik* (above, n. 43), 255f. Besides, for an admirer or flatterer of Dionysius' poetry a conventional synchronism between the Master's death and the disciple's birth (literally or metaphorically: see above p.76 and note 42) could easily have suggested itself. If tragedy as poetry ended virtually with Euripides' death, "the great tragedy of tyranny" ended with Dionysius' (see Plut., *Pel.* 34.1).

51 Timaeus, *FGrH* 566 F 106: Ἀλεξάνδρου δ' ἐλόντος τὴν πόλιν, ὡς Τίμαιός φησι, κατὰ τὴν ὁμώνυμον ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ὥραν ἐν ἧι Καρχηδόνιοι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα περὶ Γέλαν ἐσύλησαν, συνέβη τιμηθῆναι θυσίαις καὶ προσόδοις ταῖς μεγίσταις τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὡς αἴτιον γεγενημένον τῆς ἁλώσεως. On the chronology of Dionysius' rise to power see above, p. 77ff. [Xen.] *Hell.* 2.3.5 dates the fall of Gela in the archonship of Pythodorus (404/3 B.C.).

Diodorus might have found the story also in Philistus' *History of Dionysius* or in some *History of Alexander* in which the events of the siege of Tyre in 332 B.C. were narrated in detail (*e.g.*, in Clitarchus' history). The coincidence of the day and hour, however, was apparently to be found only in Timaeus, who may have mentioned it in his Sixteenth Book as a portent at the beginning of the narrative of the siege of Gela in 405 B.C. The two events would have normally appeared in synchronistic tables under different years, but might have been discovered as events of the "same day" in a daily almanac sufficiently supplied with both cultic and remembrance days. What we can gather from other sources on the chronology of these events is: a) that the Carthaginians pitched their camp along the river Gelas at the beginning of summer (Diod. 13.108.2); and if Alexias had already entered office as archon at Athens — as Diodorus' account implies (104.1) — the Athenian month must have been, at the earliest, Hekatombaion (= July/August); b) that the day and month of the capture of Tyre by Alexander were precisely recorded by contemporary historians: the month was Hekatombaion (= Loios in the Macedonian calendar of that year),[52] *i.e.*, the first month of the new archon, Niketes;[53] the day was the last one of a normally "hollow" month of 29 days, exceptionally prolonged by one day by order of Alexander to give a chance to the prophecy of his soothsayer Aristandros to come true on the morrow.[54] By combining these data one may assume that the

---

52 Correspondence between lunar calendars depends, of course, on concurrent intercalation, which was very rarely achieved at that time. A (forged) document inserted in Dem. 18.157 assumes that in 340/39 B.C. Loios corresponded to Boedromion (Sept./Oct.).

53 Νικέτου *Marm. Par. FGrH* 239 B 5, Dion. Hal., *Din.* 9; Νικεράτου Diod. 17.40, 1 (= Ol. 112.1); 'Ανικήτου Arr., *Anab.* 2.24.6. The siege lasted seven months (Diod. 17.46.5; Curt. 4.4.19; Jos., *AJ* 9.325; Plut., *Alex.* 24.3), and if it started in Peiritios (= Jan./Febr., a month sacred to Heracles/Melqart at Tyre and elsewhere: see note 10, above), the seventh month would be July/August (by inclusive reckoning). See Beloch, *GG* II.1^2, 411 and n. 1; II.2^2, 257f. and 314f.

54 Plut., *Alex.* 25.1-2. On Alexander's tampering with the calendar see L. Edmunds, *Historia* 28 (1979), 112-117.

date implied is an exceptional 30 Hekatombaion, a day approximately equivalent to 20 August 332 in Julian terms.[55]

We have no way of checking the day of the Geloan component of the coincidence. Late August is not what we would call the "beginning of summer"; but in 405 B.C. the Geloan month normally corresponding to Hekatombaion might have lagged behind as a result of a failed intercalation (as often happened to Greek lunar calendars). At any rate, if both events were recorded under the same month, there is no way of catching Timaeus red-handed in an act of forgery. If pressed, he might always have remonstrated that what he meant was the same day of different months.

What mattered to Timaeus most was, of course, the metahistorical message of the coincidence, a twofold one in this case: two sieges between the same enemies, with one sacrilege and one disaster; and a Greek god who became the "cause" of a barbarian catastrophe. We may see the entire passage as a scholastic exercise in conventional themes, such as the Variability of Fortune or Crime and Punishment. A Sicilian patriot, Timaeus would be delighted at the idea of a Geloan Apollo being outraged at Tyre as a traitor-*Alexandristes*, and soon after hailed as a Saviour-*Philalexandros*. For most of us such reasoning may have redeeming value only in the wider context of all comparative parallelisms between East and West; a hostile observer may well take it as another example of Timaeus' notorious parochialism.

5) Timaeus synchronized, or accepted the synchronization of, the night of Alexander's birth in 356 B.C. with the fire at Artemis' temple at Ephesus, and remarked that the coincidence "need cause no surprise, since Diana was away from home, wishing to be present at the childbirth of Olympias" (*FGrH* 566 F 150a *ap.* Cic., *ND* 2.69).[56] The narrative context of this synchronism in Timaeus'

---

55 The year 333/2 was intercalary both at Athens (see B.D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year* [Berkeley-Los Angeles 1961], 48-51, 83-85; E.J. Bickerman, *Chronology in the Ancient World* [London 1968], 75ff.) and in the Macedonian calendar by order of Alexander at the battle of Granicus (Plut., *Alex.* 16.2). Hence, Niketes probably entered office as archon at the new moon of 19 July (= 1 Hekatombaion, the first new moon after the summer solstice; but see Bickerman, *op. cit.*, 37).

56 *Concinneque, ut multa, Timaeus, qui cum in historia dixisset, qua nocte natus Alexander esset, eadem Dianae Ephesiae templum deflagravisse,*

Histories is unknown. It might have been the story of Alexander's birth or the story of the Artemisium's burning to which Timaeus added details about the means for the temple's restoration that offended the geographer Artemidorus' patriotic and religious feelings (*FGrH* 566 F 150b *ap.* Str. 14.1.22). Plutarch knew of the synchronism, but attributed it to Hegesias of Magnesia, a contemporary of Timaeus and the author of a *History of Alexander*: the explanation given by this Hegesias was to Plutarch "an utterance frigid enough to have extinguished that fire: he said that it was no wonder that the temple had burnt down, since Artemis was busy at Olympias' delivery of Alexander" (*FGrH* 142 F 3 *ap.* Plut., *Alex.* 3.3). Of course, Timaeus and Hegesias might have recorded the synchronism with the same explanation, both of them drawing from a common source or from different ones, or the one taking the entire story from the other. The identity of the "first inventor" of this bright idea is bound, therefore, to remain unknown for the time being.

According to Plutarch, Alexander was born on the sixth day of Hekatombaion, corresponding to the Macedonian month Loios that years (*loc. cit.*), *i.e.*, about 22 July 356 B.C. in Julian terms.[57] "To Philip", adds Plutarch, "who had just conquered Potidaea, there came three messages at the same time (κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον): the defeat of the Illyrians by Parmenio in a great battle, the victory by his courser at the Olympic games and the birth of Alexander. He was delighted by this news, of course, and the seers raised his spirits still higher by declaring that the son who was begotten together

---

adiunxit minime id esse mirandum, quod Diana, cum in partu Olympiadis adesse voluisset, afuisset domo. Cf. Cic., *de Div.* 1.47 (and n. 63, below); Nepos, fr. 6 Peter *ap.* Solin. 40.4 Mommsen (= Apollodorus *FGrH* 244 F 348 a); Plut., *Alex.* 3.3.

57 This dating cannot be reconciled with the tradition of Alexander's birth and death on the same day, 6 Thargelion (May/June): see Aristobulus' reckoning of Alexander's age at death (*FGrH* 139 F 61 *ap.* Arr., *Anab.* 7.28.1) and *cf.* Ael., *VH* 2.25. See Beloch *GG* III.2^2, 59. Since 6 Thargelion is also the birthday of Artemis (and the first day of the Thargelia), the connection between Alexander and the goddess of Ephesus in this tradition is no less evident, and it looks like another product of the same psychological circumstances prevailing in Ionia in 334 B.C. and after.

with three victories would be unconquerable" (*Alex.* 3.4-5).[58] Two out of the mentioned events can be dated approximately. If the Olympiad of 356 ended, as normally, on the second full moon after the summer solstice, the corresponding Julian date would be about 30 July. Parmenio's victory must have taken place later than 26 July, the day the Athenian assembly voted for an alliance with the Illyrian chief Grabus and with his Thracian and Paeonian associates (*Syll.*[3] 196).[59] If Philip was engaged at Potidaea in late July, Plutarch's statement that the three messages were delivered to him "at the same time" — *i.e.*, in early August — could make sense.

The other component of the synchronism, the night of the fire at the Artemisium, cannot be checked by any other source, either literary or archaeological. All we know about this famous event is that the perpetrator was a man called Herostratos.[60] After restoration, this great temple developed special relations with Philip, and later on with Alexander. A statue of Philip was set up in the temple after 336; Alexander did his best to show his favour to the temple through generous offerings and fiscal arrangements and had a picture of himself by Apelles put in the temple.[61] Several symbolic links connecting Philip, Alexander and the Artemisium must have been concocted and elaborated at Ephesus in 334 or later and then picked up by one of the adulatory historians of Alexander's entourage, who eventually became the direct source of information for Timaeus and/or Hegesias.

---

58 *Cf.* the version of Iust. 12.16.1. On the Olympic games of 356 see L. Moretti, "Olympionikai", *Mem. Lincei* VIII.8 (1957), no. 434.

59 *Cf.* Tod, *GHI* II 157 = *StV* II 309 = Hondius, *Novae inscriptiones Atticae*, no. 9. The alliance was voted on the 11th day of the First Prytany (Hippothontis) of the archon Elpines, who entered office about 15 July.

60 For a full list of sources see *Forschungen in Ephesus* (Wien 1906), 262ff. and G. Plaumann, "Herostratos (2)", *RE* VIII.1 (1912), 1145f. On the Artemisium and its fires see, most recently, W. Eckschmidt, *Die Sieben Weltwunder, ihre Erbauung, Zerstörung und Wiederentdeckung* (Mainz-am-Rhein 1984), 69-121, and B.L. Trell in *The Seven Wonders of the Ancient World*, edd. P.A. Clayton and M.J. Price (London-New York 1988), 79-99 (with bibl.).

61 Cf. E. Badian in *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies presented to Victor Ehrenberg on his 75th Birthday* (Oxford 1966), 40ff., 45.

We shall not waste time discussing the problem of whether Timaeus' and/or Hegesias' explanation of Artemis' absence was meant to be serious (as De Sanctis, to his dismay, came to believe),[62] or a joke. Cicero found it "fitly" (*concinne*) said from the theological point of view, Diana being represented by Timaeus, according to his reading of the text, in a non–superstitious way as the allegorical embodiment of a natural fact of life. On the other hand, Plutarch pronounced the message a "frigid utterance": tastes differ. A much more relevant problem is whether Plutarch's story of the Ephesian Magi, who, "deeming that the temple's misfortune was a sign of another misfortune, ran about beating their heads and crying that adversity and great calamity for Asia had that day begotten" (*Alex.* 3.4), is drawn from the same chapter (of Hegesias and/or Timaeus). A passage by Cicero might possibly be explained as pointing to a positive answer: in *Div.* 1.47, the same synchronism is mentioned as in *ND* 2.69, though in inverted order,[63] but instead of relating again the "apt" theological explanations of Timaeus, he adds that *ubi lucere coepisset* (*scil. templum*), *clamitasse magos pestem ac perniciem Asiae proxuma nocte natam* — a sentence virtually identical to Plutarch's and apparently derived by both authors from the same source. The prophecy of the Magi was certainly not meant to be a joke: it purports to be a serious, albeit banal message on the changing fate of Asian and European history as brought about by Alexander's invasion of the Persian empire. It, too, might have ultimately sprung *ex eventu* from the irrational atmosphere that prevailed at Ephesus in 334 or later. Timaeus would certainly have been pleased with any message comparing East and West, but whether he actually included this in his book cannot be substantiated.

In addition to the five synchronisms studied above, which are explicitly attributed by our sources to Timaeus, a few more adespota look very Timaic, and there is a strong case for attributing them, too, to our historian. One is the synchronism already mentioned, between the battles of Himera and Thermopylae fought on the same day in 480 B.C. (above, p. 56ff.). Two others are typical

---

62 *Ricerche sulla storiografia siceliota* (Palermo 1958), 46.

63 *Qua nocte templum Ephesiae Dianae deflagravit, eadem constat ex Olympiade natum esse Alexandrum* (*cf.* above, n. 56).

chronological parallelisms between historical events in East and West, sometimes provided with a characteristic message: the Gallic sack of Rome and the King's Peace in 387/6,[64] and the battle of Chaeronea and the fight in Lucania in which King Archidamus fell, both on the same day and hour in 338 B.C.[65] Finally, we have some characteristically Timaic coincidences such as the battles of Crimisus and Granicus on the same day (24 Thargelion) of different years;[66] the deaths on the same day of Alexander and Diogenes in 323 B.C.;[67] the murder of Agathocles' sons in 307 B.C. on the same day and month on which the tyrant, one or two years earlier, had caused Ophellas' death (Diod. 20.42.4; 70.3); and the occurrence "at the same time" as Agathocles' attack on Ophellas and Bomilcar's attempt at tyranny in Carthage (*ibid.* 43.3). Yet, in spite of the highly plausible Timaic origin of such anonymous synchronisms, it seems safer to base any conclusions about Timaeus' synchronizations chiefly on the ones explicitly attributed to him in our extant sources.

Contrary to the prevalent view, Timaeus' synchronizations do not seem at all arbitrary or fanciful inventions created purely for didactic

---

64 Plb. 1.6.2 (and Walbank's *Commentary* I, 46f., 185f., with bibl.); *cf.* Diod. 14.117.9 and Iust. 6.6.5 (here peace in Greece is contrasted to war and disaster in Italy; *cf.* Oros. 3.1.1). See now B. Amat Séguin, *MEFRA* 101.1 (1989), 147ff.

65 Diod. 16.88.3 (ἴδιον δέ τι συνέβη); Plut., *Cam.* 19.5 (the day is 7 Metageitnion — an unpropitious month for the Greeks — *i.e.*, about 1 September). See Beloch *GG* III.1^2, 595, n. 1.

66 See Plut., *Cam.* 19.5 and *Tim.* 27.1. Thargelion is an unlucky month for barbarians, and the 24th of it is also the day of the fall of Troy. For the month of the battle of Granicus see also Plut., *Alex.* 16.2. Ael., *VH* 2.25 dates to 6 Thargelion "Alexander's victory over Darius", which is a way of referring to Arbela rather than to Granicus (but see Beloch, *GG* III.2^2, 305 and 314, followed by many). The year of the battle of Crimisus is still disputed: 340/39 B.C. according to Diodorus (followed by M. Sordi, *Timoleonte* [Palermo 1961], 109-112), 341 B.C. according to R.J.A. Talbert, *Timoleon and the Revival of Greek Sicily 344-317 B.C.* (Cambridge 1974), 44ff., 49ff. (with a full discussion of sources and modern theories). For a collection of ancient sources on this battle see M. Sordi, *La Sicilia dal 368/7 al 337/6 a.C.* (Roma 1983), 166-173 (with bibl.).

67 See Demetrius of Magnesia (first century B.C.) *FHG* IV 382 Müller, quoted by Diog. Laert. 6.79. and Plut., *Mor.* 717 C.

purposes. As a matter of fact, some of them seem accurate, were probably well–documented or even were entered into synchronistic tables and almanacs by the end of the fourth century B.C. It can be safely argued that Timaeus did his homework diligently, treating his material in a way that was satisfactory to himself and to most of his contemporaries. Significantly, even his most censorious detractors did not find any flaw in his chronological reckonings: quite the contrary, his impeccable erudition and competence in the field were much admired. It is only a modern allegation, or at least suspicion, that Timaeus invented synchronisms in defiance of all evidence, although what he did in the case of Carthage's foundation–date is deemed by many modern scholars satisfactory from the point of view of method and of historical chronology. Timaeus, of course, should be judged not by our standards but by those of his own times and within the limits of early Hellenistic erudition.

Furthermore, for all his chronological pedantry, what Timaeus cared most about were, apparently, the didactic messages. For that purpose he certainly allowed himself some liberty, aware that a precise coincidence of the "same day", or even of the "same hour", is most striking and demands an explanation. Yet, he did it in such a way that nobody in his time would have been able to disprove it. For us, synchronisms of the same day are unfailingly suspect, although strange coincidences are in fact not rare at all even in modern times. We do not care for, nor do we believe any more in lucky and unlucky days, and we are convinced that most chronological coincidences are totally devoid of any serious meaning. The fact that many people die on their birthday is satisfactorily explained today by statistics of population. Yet synchronization has always been a popular pastime, either for mnemonic or didactic purposes, and there is no doubt that many synchronisms of the same day were created by consciously manipulating the truth or by semi–innocent faults of memory. Professional historians did not invent the genre: as we said above, fifth–century Sicilians were well-trained in the game before Herodotus interviewed them. Timaeus adapted an already-existing mental inclination to the requirements of the new erudite chronography.[68]

---

[68] On faulty memory and psychological fallacy as sources of "absolute" synchronizatios in ancient, medieval and modern historiography, see the ex-

It ought to be stressed that, contrary to a widespread opinion, Timaeus' critical faculties did not become deeply impaired by contemporary beliefs in supernatural forces like Fortune or Divine Providence. Some of his didactic messages sound like *façon de parler*, even if he took them seriously. They are not, of course, all on the same level. The synchronism of Rome and Carthage implies a grand new vision of the world, while the scene of Artemis assisting Olympias at childbirth seemed puerile even to some ancient readers. Still, we should remember that didactic synchronisms of all kinds obviously assume that historical events are not unique or disconnected from each other and from the world at large, that they become meaningful only by supposing the existence of ties between them, and that the search for a meaning is always a worthwhile labour, even at the risk of discovering sometimes imaginary ties or false explanations. We must realise that such an assumption is tantamount to a decisive step towards a higher conception of universal history. During his exceptionally long life, Timaeus witnessed the most spectacular restructuring of the world since the end of the Bronze Age: the waning of the city–state, Alexander's conquest of the Persian empire, the rise of the Hellenistic monarchies in the East and of Rome and Carthage in the West. It was too much for a parochial Tauromenite to digest without seeing supernatural forces at work behind the scenes. A Sicilian exile who spent half a century quarrying in Athenian libraries, Timaeus became naturally inclined to make serious comparisons and trivial parallelisms between facts and personalities of East and West. Some are stimulating even today, others definitely not. Timaeus raised his western mother–country up to the level of mainland Greece or the East, a parochial pose paradoxically bound to become an original contribution to the development of universal historiography.

Polybius followed his predecessor not only by taking up the pen and continuing from the point where Timaeus had laid it down, but in other ways as well. Admittedly, many of Polybius' synchronisms are of a different kind. Synchronization was to Polybius as basic an instrument as his Olympiad chronology. The purpose of the known

---

tremely stimulating paper by R. Hennig, "Die Gleichzeitigkeits-Fabel. Eine wichtige psychologische Fehlerquelle in der Geschichtsschreibung", *Zeitschrift für Psychologie* 151 (1941/42), 289-302.

group of eight synchronisms within Ol. 140 (= 220-217 B.C.) was to present simultaneous events in a synoptic effort to overcome the technical difficulties of juxtaposing diachronic history in different theatres. Yet in Polybius' mind, synchronism as an external sign of international interweaving (συμπλοκή) was so fundamental to his system that he could be found guilty of creating a false synchronism for the sake of his metahistorical argument.[69] He followed Duris in choosing as a narrative starting-point the synchronous change of rulers, viewed as a symbolic moment of historical "renewal".[70] Besides, some of his synchronisms are not clearly explicable in terms of universal history, and some of his Tyche–pronouncements testify to the vitality of Timaic thinking; nor does he entirely shun coincidences of the same day or of puerile moralistic crime–and-punishment messages.[71] One last thought comes immediately to mind: if Polybius could be described as an historian with two souls in his breast, one scientific and one superstitious, then much the same thing may surely be said about his great predecessor, and with better reason.[72]

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

---

69 See P. Pédech (above, n. 3), 432-495 (esp. 467-473); F.W. Walbank, "Synchronisms in Polybius, Books 4 and 5", in *Polis and Imperium. Studies in Honour of E.T. Salmon*, ed. J.A.S. Evans (Toronto 1974), 59-80.

70 See 4.28.1-6, with Walbank's commentary *ad loc.* and *ad* 3.17.

71 Duris *FGrH* 76 T 5 *ap.* Diod. 15.60.3-6; Plb. 4.2.4-11, and *cf.* 2.41.1-2, 71.3-4.

72 *E.g.*, 2.70.7; 3.118.6; 26.13.2; see also the "comparison" between Hannibal and Spendios in 1.86.7.