DOOHEE LEE

Luke-Acts and 'Tragic History'

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 346

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

346

DooHee Lee

Luke-Acts and 'Tragic History'

Communicating Gospel with the World

Mohr Siebeck

DooHee Lee, born 1969; is a visiting Professor at Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary in Seoul, Korea and an associate Pastor at Saemoonan Presbyterian Church in Seoul, Korea.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-152552-0
ISBN 978-3-16-152551-3
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

This book is a revision of my Graduate Theological Union doctoral dissertation (2009), and represents a synthesis of my faith life and academic pursuit in the area of New Testament and classics. My study of classics at Seoul National University in Korea led me to have an interest in the relation between the New Testament and the Greco-Roman world as a matrix in which the New Testament writings were shaped. In this book, I especially paid attention to how the author of Luke-Acts attempted to more effectively communicate his faith and concerns. One of Luke's choices is to employ a 'tragic-history' style which has been a quite popular means of historians to attract readers in the Greco-Roman historiographical tradition. In doing this, Luke was trying to bridge the gap between the world of faith and his Hellenistic audience. I hope that Luke's example will provide an insight for readers who want to communicate their faith with others. One thing I regret is that I did not have the time to follow up recent studies on Luke-Acts that have been published after 2009, except for occasional references.

I should express my heartfelt thanks to so many people who helped and encouraged me in the journey of my academic pursuit. I am most grateful to my dissertation advisor, David Balch, and the committee members, Judy Siker and Mark Griffith. When I had lost a way in my project after my comprehensive examination, I met David Balch who moved to Berkeley from Texas to teach at Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary. His expertise on my research topic broadened and enriched my study in many ways. Especially, my study on Dionysius of Halicarnassus would have been impossible without his suggestion and comments. Judy Siker, a professor of American Baptist Seminary of the West, was the person I have repeatedly relied on, whenever I have been drained emotionally and spiritually by the burdens of studying abroad. She would always cheer me up and gave me new strength to continue on with my journey, which so often was filled with many ups and downs. Mark Griffith, a professor of University of California at Berkeley, provided me with crucial help and insights to initially shape and to finally accomplish this book. In his seminar class on Greek tragedy, he guided me to think more specifically about the relation between Greco-Roman literature and New Testament writings. His suggestion to study *Exagoge*, a Hellenistic-Jewish tragedy, was a starting point to develop my academic interest in the relation between New Testament

and classics. I cannot forget the support of the members of Korean churches that made my study in USA possible. Without their generous support and prayers, this book would not have seen the light of day. Myung Sung Presbyterian Church (Rev. Dr. Sam Whan Kim), Bundang Central Presbyterian Church (Rev. Jong Chun Choi), and the Korea Institute for Advanced Theological Studies (Dr. Jaehyon Kim) supported me spiritually and financially throughout my academic journey in USA. Most of all, I would like to express my sincere thanks for Saemoonan Presbyterian Church and Rev. Dr. Sou-Young Lee. Dr. Lee, who was my professor at Presbyterian College & Theological Seminary in Korea, has been the most influential mentor in my life. His unchanging love and support has always been a source of new energy to reach this stage of my faith and academic journey. I also thank YunShin Choi for her gracious support and prayer that enabled me to concentrate only on my dissertation project at its last stage. I thank JungHyung Kim who kindly lent his hands in the preparation of this book's publication despite his own busy schedule, and ChanSeok Park, who helped me to locate an important article for the revision of my dissertation. I appreciate the editors of Mohr Siebeck who gave me suggestions to improve my dissertation. They showed kindness and endurance despite the long delay of my submission of the copy ready for publication. Lastly, I thank my family for their support and sacrifice. I cannot thank enough for my parents' love and my parents-in-law's sacrifice. My wonderful wife (Shin-sook Rho) and my precious son (Yeram) are the persons to whom I owe more than words can say; they truly have accomplished this together as my friends and partners on this journey. My last, but the most important acknowledgment goes to God: *Soli Deo Gloria!*

January 2013 DooHee Lee

Table of Contents

Introduction

1. The Genre Issue of Luke-Acts and Previous Scholarship about 'Tragic History'

1) The Genre of Luke-Acts: Biography, Novel, Epic or History?

One of the most debated issues concerning Luke-Acts is to what genre it belongs.[1] A related issue to this is the unity of Luke-Acts. While most contemporary New Testament scholars acknowledge the unity of Luke-Acts following the cue of H. J. Cadbury,[2] opinions of scholars on the genre of Luke-Acts are still divided. Disputing the traditional assumption that sees Luke-Acts as history, some others propose a different generic classification for Luke-Acts including biography,[3] novel[4] and epic.[5] Despite many interesting insights provided by these new proposals, many scholars continue to maintain that Luke-Acts is part of the Greco-Roman historiographical tradition.

Among those scholars who argue for historiography as the genre of Luke-Acts, there is, however, no consensus as to what kind of historiography Luke-Acts may be. In the past, the main issue was the reliability of Luke-Acts as a historical source for early Christianity. Since the

---

[1] Thomas E. Phillips, "The Genre of Acts: Moving toward a Consensus?," *Currents in Biblical Research* 4, no. 3 (2006): 365–396.

[2] Henry Joel Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: S.P.C.K., 1958), 1–11. There are of course, some others who argue for separate genres for Luke and Acts respectively. Cf. Mikeal Carl Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis [Minn.]: Fortress, 1993).

[3] Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* ([Cambridge (Mass.)] Missoula [Mont.]: Society of Biblical Literature; distributed by Scholars Press, 1975).

[4] Richard I. Pervo, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987).

[5] Marianne Palmer Bonz, *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic* (Minneapolis [Minn.]: Fortress, 2000); Dennis R. MacDonald, *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003); idem, "Paul's Farewell to the Ephesian Elders and Hector's Farewell to Andromache: A Strategic Imitation of Homer's *Iliad*," in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse* (ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).

Tendenz criticism of the Tübingen School, the veracity of Luke-Acts as a factual history has been challenged and can no longer be maintained. There was a time when the character of Luke as a theologian dominated the scholarly concern. But, as the conception of history has changed, a new approach to Luke as a historian was required. Nowadays most scholars agree that a history is more than the report of what actually happened. Historians' interpretation of the meaning of the events is accepted as a part of historiographical works. Taking this insight of a revised concept of historiography into account, some scholars attempted to define more precisely the character of Lukan historiography: David L. Balch (a political history),[6] Kota Yamada (a rhetorical history),[7] Gregory E. Sterling (an apologetic historiography),[8] David E. Aune (a general history),[9] Darryl W. Palmer (a historical monograph),[10] William S. Kurz (a continuation of biblical history),[11] Thomas L. Brodie (a Deuteronomistic history),[12] Craig A.

[6] David L. Balch, "Comments on the Genre and a Political Theme of Luke-Acts: A Preliminary Comparison of Two Hellenistic Historians," in *SBL 1989 Seminar Papers* (ed. David J. Lull; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989); idem, "The Genre of Luke-Acts: Individual Biography, Adventure Novel, or Political History?," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 33 (1990): 5–19. Balch recently modified his view on genre distinction, admitting the difficulty of drawing a sharp line between biography and historiography. Cf. David L. Balch, "ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ: Jesus as Founder of the Church in Luke-Acts: Form and Function," in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse* (ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 139–188.

[7] Kota Yamada, "A Rhetorical History: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles," in *Rhetoric, Scripture, and Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 230–250.

[8] Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 64; Leiden, New York: Brill, 1992).

[9] David Edward Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (1st ed.; Library of Early Christianity 8; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987), 77.

[10] Darryl W. Palmer, "Acts and the Ancient Historical Monograph," in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke; The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 1; Grand Rapids [Mich.], Carlisle: Eerdmans, The Paternoster Press, 1993), 1–29.

[11] William S. Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (1st ed.; Louisville [Ky.]: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993); Brian S. Rosner, "Acts and Biblical History," in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke; The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 1; Grand Rapids [Mich.], Carlisle: Eerdmans, The Paternoster Press, 1993), 65–82.

[12] Thomas L. Brodie, "Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative," in *New Views on Luke and Acts* (ed. Earl Richard; Collegeville [Minn.]: Liturgical Press, 1990), 78–85.

Evans (a hagiography)[13] and Hubert Cancik (an institutional history).[14] Without suggesting the generic classification of Luke-Acts as rhetorical historiography, Clare K. Rothschild attempted to demonstrate rhetorical techniques of Luke-Acts as a Hellenistic historiography competing with other historical narratives in an agonistic milieu.[15] Recently Todd Penner published a book in which he argues, focusing on Acts 6:1–8:3,[16] that Luke-Acts shows a feature of epideictic rhetoric. In a sense, all of these attempts are responding to W. C. van Unnik who called for detailed studies of Greco-Roman historiography to fully understand the character of Luke-Acts as historiography.[17]

In line with this effort, this study will focus on another aspect of Greco-Roman historiography, that is, so-called 'tragic history.' Van Unnik, Sterling, Rothschild, Yamada, Penner and some others noticed the presence of 'tragic history' in the Hellenistic period. However, no biblical scholar has taken 'tragic history' as an independent research topic. Van Unnik recognizes 'vividness' as a characteristic of ancient historiography but he denies that Luke wrote so-called 'pathetic history.'[18] Sterling simply dismisses 'tragic history' as a foil without any substance.[19] Yamada and Rothschild

---

[13] Craig A. Evans, "Luke and the Rewritten Bible: Aspects of Lukan Hagiography," in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (ed. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans; Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 170–201.

[14] Hubert Cancik, "The History of Culture, Religion, and Institutions in Ancient Historiography: Philological Observations Concerning Luke's History," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1997): 673–695. Refer to Mark Reasoner for an objection to Cancik's argument. Cf. Mark Reasoner, "The Theme of Acts: Institutional History of Divine Necessity in History?," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 635–659.

[15] Clare K. Rothschild, *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History: An Investigation of Early Christian Historiography* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

[16] Todd C. Penner, *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography* (Emory Studies in Early Christianity 10; New York: T. & T. Clark International, 2004).

[17] W. C. van Unnik, "Luke-Acts, a Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 27: "But a thorough study comparing him to well known historians of his own times is missing. It may be that such an investigation would reveal aspects that have been overlooked so far and which might be important for a proper understanding of his undertaking."

[18] W. C. van Unnik, "Luke's Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography," in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, Rédaction, Théologie* (ed. Jacob Kremer; Gembloux, Leuven: J. Duculot; Leuven University Press, 1979), 56–57. By 'pathetic history,' van Unnik seems to mean 'tragic history.' In my view, van Unnik's understanding of 'tragic history' is not wrong, but incomplete.

[19] Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 6–7.

subsume tragic history under the category of rhetorical history.[20] Penner seems to be in the same direction as Yamada and Rothschild, though not so explicitly. In my view, all these previous treatments of 'tragic history' are incomplete and somewhat misleading. Although I would not dare maintain that 'tragic history' was a distinctive sub-genre of Hellenistic historiography,[21] I would, however, argue that it is worth studying carefully this prevailing style of Hellenistic historiography as an independent subject for a fresh reading of Luke-Acts. In this work, I will explore this 'tragic history' at an in-depth level. This study will enable us to evaluate tragic history more adequately and open up new aspects of Luke-Acts that will be filtered through this lens.

2) Incomplete Understanding – or Misunderstanding of 'Tragic History'

There have been several biblical scholars who examined 'tragic history' with or without respect to Luke's historical narrative. However, their conception of 'tragic history' is often incomplete and sometimes even misleading, while partially revealing features of 'tragic-history' style. A common misconception on 'tragic history' is the understanding that 'tragic history' is an antonym to true report of what really happened. In an article on Josephus's *Bellum Judaicum*, Fausto Parente contrasts 'tragic history' with 'pragmatic' historiography as follows:[22]

> In other words, from a formal point of view, the *Bellum* displays an evident mix of different historiographical "genres": "pragmatic" historiography which seeks to present the reader with the facts as they actually happened and relies heavily on documents; and "dramatic" or "pathetic" historiography which seeks to present facts in tragic or dramatic terms, even to the detriment of their veracity, in order to impress the reader and to arouse particular psychological reactions.

With this distinction between pragmatic and tragic historiography, Parente seeks to show how fictitious Josephus's description of the events inside the city were, based on his observation that Josephus was not an eyewitness. Parente's final goal in his article was not to pejoratively criticize the falseness of Josephus's reports but to explain positively why Josephus employed such a fictitious mode of portrayal. However, Parente's distinction between pragmatic and tragic history on the basis of factuality of the report is unfair, because, as Thomas W. Africa argues, partisan historians

---

[20] Refer to Rothschild (*Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History*, chapter 3) and Penner (*In Praise of Christian Origins*, chapter 3).

[21] Frank W. Walbank, "History and Tragedy," *Historia* 9 (1960): 216–234; Robert B. Kebric, *In the Shadow of Macedon: Duris of Samos* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1977), 15.S

[22] Fausto Parente, "The Impotence of Titus, or Flavius Josephus's *Bellum Judaicum* as an Example of 'Pathetic' Historiography," in *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (ed. Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2005), 45.

were not better off than tragic historians in that regard.[23] Nowadays, it has become clear that they also rearrange or change facts to prove a political or moral point.[24]

As shall be discussed later, Parente's understanding of 'tragic history' as a genre is also problematic because stylistic characteristics of 'tragic history' are found among the so-called political historians as well. In this regard, Robert Doran's critique is legitimate that it is wrong to take 2 Maccabees as 'tragic history' in the sense of a historiographical subgenre.[25] Doran succinctly summarizes why 'tragic history' cannot be regarded as a subgenre of historical writing. According to Doran, it is partly because the term 'tragic history' comes from polemical context such as Polybius criticizing Phylarchus for his pro-Spartan inclination. Another reason for that is based on Doran's observation that the so-called 'tragic history' is not only characteristic of 'tragic historians' but also of most historians throughout the Greco-Roman historiographical tradition. From these observations, Doran disagrees with previous scholarship that explains the narrative incongruence in 2 Maccabees as a consequence of its belonging to 'tragic history.' To further his argument, Doran takes an example of incongruence of 2 Maccabees's report on a certain Timothy. In 2 Macc 10:17, Timothy is described to die, but he reappears in 2 Macc 12:2, 10–24, campaigning against the Jews. Most scholars settle for the explanation that the incongruence is due to the author being a tragic historian, who is not so much concerned about the factual report.[26] On the other hand, considering 2 Maccabees in itself without respect to its classification as tragic history, Doran suggests that this incongruence was caused by the author's intentional structuring to present the events in the order of 'minor campaign – major campaign – peace.' As to the question of the genre of 2 Maccabees, Doran suggests not to specify its historiographical subgenre but rather to examine what kind of historiography it may be, in consideration of its resorting to a literary *topos*, not genre, proposing 'the epiphanies of God' as an appropriate candidate for 2 Maccabees.[27] Doran's article is helpful in

[23] Thomas W. Africa, *Phylarchus and the Spartan Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961), 40.

[24] Cf. Kurt von Fritz, "The Historian Theopompus: His Political Convictions and His Conception of Historiography," *The American Historical Review* 46 (1941): 765: "Greek historiography in the fourth century B.C. has a special interest because it was then that historical interpretation for the first time became strongly influenced by, and in some cases almost completely subservient to, the political tendencies and convictions of the leading historians."

[25] Robert Doran, "2 Maccabees and 'Tragic History,'" *Hebrew Union College Annual* 50 (1979): 107–114.

[26] Ibid., 111.

[27] Ibid., 113–114.

raising an issue against the view that regards 'tragic history' as a subgenre of Greco-Roman historiography and relates automatically digression from the factual reports to an inherent feature of tragic history. While in his article Doran is concerned about making a case that 2 Maccabees does not belong to a subgenre of 'tragic history,' he is well aware of the 'tragic-history' style of 2 Maccabees. In his book on 2 Maccabees, Doran investigates the relation of 2 Maccabees with 'tragic history' and demonstrates characteristics of tragic style in 2 Maccabees, especially in comparison to Polybius's tragic narrative on Philip V of Macedon.[28] Doran's approach to 'tragic history' points to the right direction to follow.

It is Eckhard Plümacher who paid considerable attention to the tragic features of the Lukan narrative.[29] While Plümacher suggests historical monograph as the genre of Luke-Acts,[30] he recognizes the dramatic style in Lukan narrative, especially regarding Acts.[31] He calls this characteristic style of Luke "[den] dramatische[n] Episodenstil."[32] By 'dramatic,' Plümacher means a style that includes, as paraphernalia, 'reversal (*Peripetie*)' of the plot, providing surprise and suspense for the readers, and a direct dialogue. By 'Episode,' Plümacher means an inserted scene that is separate from the contexts both preceding and succeeding. More importantly, according to Plümacher, this style is a substitute for the "Stil einer erklärenden Argumentation oder eines heilsgeschichtlichen Traktates"[33] that aims to communicate through episodes that are vividly presented before the eyes of the readers. While Plümacher's study reveals a couple of important features of tragic history such as Luke's playing on emotion of suspense and an episodic vivid presentation of scenes, it does not cover the whole range of features of tragic history. This defect warrants our study about the tragic-history style at an in-depth level.

---

[28] Robert Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly. Monograph Series 12; Washington [D. C.]: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 89–95. Cf. David Arthur DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids [Mich.]: Baker Academic, 2002), 271.

[29] Lawrence M. Wills, "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 648.

[30] Eckhard Plümacher, "Die Apostelgeschichte als historische Monographie," in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, Rédaction, Théologie* (ed. Jacob Kremer; Gembloux, Leuven: J. Duculot, Leuven University Press, 1979), 457–466.

[31] Eckhard Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 80–136.

[32] Willi Braun, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 11–14. Braun notes that dramatic style proposed by Plümacher for Acts is also found in Luke 14:1–24.

[33] Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller*, 87.

At this point, a comment on the relation of 'tragic history' to rhetorical history is needed, since some scholars seem to subsume tragic history under the umbrella of rhetorical history as a type of it. In his book on Josephus's historiography, Louis Feldman classifies historiography into two kinds in large: rhetorical (Isocratean) and scientific (Aristotelian). Following this, he understands 'tragic history' as a feature of rhetorical historiography:

> [T]he first the rhetorical school associated with the name of Isocrates (436–338 B.C.E.), the second the scientific school founded by Aristotle (384–322 B.C.E.). The former emphasized the introduction of fictitious speeches into the narrative, the use of digressions often loosely connected with the main theme, *the introduction of a strong strain of tragedy*, and the stress on moralizing and on psychologizing. (Italics are mine.)[34]

On the other hand, Feldman himself is well aware that the distinction between subgenres is not so clear and meaningful, because they are so often mixed in reality. Rather, it is more important to note what features of historiographical style are employed in their works. Though conceptually Feldman understands that 'tragic history' belongs to rhetorical historiography, his awareness of fluidity between genres makes him pay due attention to the characteristics of 'tragic history.'[35] However, Feldman's general classification of 'tragic history' as part of rhetorical historiography may cause misunderstanding in terms of genre issue, even though he himself is very careful not to use the term 'genre' but rather 'two schools' of historiography.[36]

In her article, Kota Yamada explicitly classifies 'tragic history' as a type of rhetorical historiography that is a counterpart to political historiography:[37]

---

[34] Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 27; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 3.

[35] Cf. Martin Hose, "Exzentrische Formen der Historiographie im Hellenismus," in *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker und frühchristlicher Historiographie* (ed. Jörg Frey, Clare K. Rothschild and Jens Schröter; Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 182–183. In the beginning of his article on Hellenistic historiography, Hose comments on the fluidity of genre category that cannot be easily divided.

[36] In this work, I use the terms such as genre, school, and style with their different nuances in mind. The term 'genre' implies that more rigid rules and distinct lines between different genres may exist. The term 'school' may implicitly allow flexible room between different schools. For example, someone belonging to a school may be open to principles of different schools. A Peripatetic can embrace Isocratean skills in his writings. When we use the term 'style,' it assumes that the style is available to anyone without any generic limitation. For example, a novelist can employ a tragic-history style.

[37] Yamada, "A Rhetorical History," 241–242.

> There are two major trends of historiography in Graeco-Roman antiquity: one is political (e.g. Thucydides and Polybius), and the other is rhetorical, in which there are several types of schools – the Isocratean (e.g. Ephorus, Theopompus and Timaeus), the Peripatetic (e.g. Duris and Phylarchus) and the mixed type (e.g. Livy and Tacitus), while the rhetorical historiography of Dionysius of Halicarnassus is nearer to the political one in some way.

Rothschild's opinion is similar to Yamada's, though she is more careful and cautious. Like Feldman, Rothschild admits that the distinction between more scientific and more sensational approaches in historiography is not clear-cut. She is aware that characteristics of both styles are oftentimes found in a single work.[38] But she regards sensational and tragic effects as basically part of rhetoric:

> While sensational and tragic effects (rhetoric) of Hellenistic historians have been thoroughly examined, investigations of the scientific rhetorical strategies of these historians – those catering to more skeptical audiences, demanding positions, judgments, and proofs (also rhetoric) has attracted fewer commentators.[39]

Penner is distinctive in that he does not deal with Luke-Acts as a whole but focuses on a specific pericope, Acts 6:1–8:3. His discussion on ancient historiography in general is quite insightful, especially his observation that the line between different genres is not easy to be drawn. Penner is well aware that tragedy (especially, in regard to Aristotle's *Poetics*), oratory and historiography share several literary strategies like plot structuring (*mythos*), characterization (*ethos*) and communication of thought (*dianoia*).[40] Penner approaches those literary characteristics as a cultural matrix, in which ancient historians wrote their historiography, not as distinctive features of any one literary genre. In this regard, Penner did not specify 'tragic history' as a type of rhetorical history. However, I still suspect that he assumed features of tragic history as trappings of rhetorical history because he argued Stephen's speech as epideictic rhetoric despite his findings of tragic features in that speech, without giving due emphasis on tragic features. According to Penner, tragic features in Stephen's speech are only a means by which Luke blamed the Israelites, thereby praising Christian origin more effectively.

As Feldman, Yamada, Rothschild and Penner note, it is true that there is an overlap between rhetoric and tragedy. Conversely, it can also be true that rhetoric and tragedy can be distinguished from each other. Therefore, 'tragic history' cannot be subsumed under the roof of rhetorical historiography. As shall be seen below in the main part of this study, 'tragic history' has its own set of characteristics independent of rhetorical histori-

---

[38] Rothschild, *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History*, 76.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Penner, *In Praise of Christian Origins*, 104–222.

ography. It may also be doubted if we can regard rhetorical historiography itself as a subgenre. In my view, it is more appropriate to give due respect to both rhetorical and tragic historiography as distinct historiographical *styles*. In this regard, Feldman, Rothschild and Penner's studies are closer to the position I am proposing, but their classification of 'tragic history' as one of many features of rhetorical history seems to be somehow defective.

The previous studies I selectively commented on above points to the direction my study is to take below. Two things especially are once more to be emphasized. One thing is that tragic history is to be studied not as a subgenre of ancient historiography, but rather as a distinctive historiographical style. The other is that the concept of genre in the ancient period was not so clear and distinct. However, the tragic-history style has its own set of distinctive characteristics that are worth studying as an independent research topic. With these preliminary ideas on tragic history in mind, I will survey 'tragic history' as a historiographical style and then its relation to Luke-Acts. Before we investigate how the tragic-history style was employed in actual Greco-Roman historiography, we will start with a review on the issue of its origin and an attempt to create a working definition of tragic history by examining selective strictures on tragic history and ironic employment of tragic style by critics themselves of this style.

2. An Introduction to 'Tragic History'

1) What Is 'Tragic History' About?

It is well-known among scholars that one of the characteristic phenomena of Hellenistic historiography is the so-called 'tragic history.' Even though there has been much debate about its origin, there seems to be no disagreement that 'tragic history' was a quite popular style used by many Hellenistic historians. Nevertheless, it is unfortunate that we do not have any extant 'tragic history' writings *per se* except fragmentary citations in other historians' works and criticisms by others of tragic historians. However, the censures against the so-called 'tragic historians' by Polybius, Plutarch and several others prove the existence of this specific history-writing style in the Hellenistic period.[41] In addition, some important fragments still allow us to investigate some of the characteristics of tragic history. In this

[41] P. G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 18. It may be debated if 'tragic history' is a separate genre or simply a sort of history-writing style/tendency. As I indicated above, I would regard tragic history as rather a style in history writing, not an independent genre.

section, I will examine the characteristics of 'tragic history' and the issue of its origin.

Before jumping into these difficult issues such as the origin of 'tragic history,' we had better get some glimpse of what tragic history is about. However, there is no categorical statement by ancient historians and critics that defines 'tragic history.' It is our task therefore to find a way to define 'tragic history,' examining criticisms of tragic history and fragments that seem to be traced to so-called tragic historians.

The term 'tragic history' seems first to have been coined in the 1890's by Eduard Schwartz.[42] By this term, Schwartz denotes a certain Hellenistic history-writing style with a twofold inspiration: "tragic drama, for its scale, arrangement, and emotion, and literary criticism of the Peripatetic persuasion for certain theoretical assumptions."[43] On the other hand, the embryo of this term can be found long before Schwartz in the criticisms by Polybius of the so-called tragic historians. Polybius finds fault with some historians including Phylarchus that they are describing events in tragic color (τραγῳδοῦντες).[44] Polybius designates those historians as "ones like a tragic poet (καθάπερ οἱ τραγῳδιογράφοι)."[45] According to Polybius's attack against them, the tragic historians may be those who applied the poetic skills of tragedians to their history writing. This appears to indicate that tragic history is a history-writing style related to tragedy at least at a certain level, although we need to examine what Polybius exactly meant by the term 'tragic.' In fact, to be able to get a more complete concept of 'tragic history,' we need a thorough investigation of all the materials that can be regarded as tragic history and also criticisms directed against tragic historians. However, here in the beginning stage of our exploration of tragic history, I simply intend to attain some general idea of it. Later, looking at different historical writings by various historians since Herodotus of the 5th century, I will attempt an in-depth study of it.[46]

Polybius seems to be a good place to start our discussion of tragic historiography. This is because he himself gives some example of tragic-history writing, while severely blaming others for a 'tragic' tendency in their history writing. Thus, Polybius, who is regarded as following most

---

[42] C. O. Brink, "Tragic History and Aristotle's School," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 6 (1960): 14.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Kenneth Sacks, *Polybius on the Writing of History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 144–145. Cf. Polybius, *Hist.* 7.1–2.

[45] Polybius, *Hist.* 2.56–60.

[46] In chapters II and III of this book, I will examine the tragic style as exemplified by different historians including Herodotus, Thucydides, Duris, Phylarchus, Polybius, and Roman historians.

closely the scientific historiographical tradition of Thucydides,[47] ironically turns out to show how intense the influence of the tragic-history style was among the Hellenistic historians.[48]

We will first examine Polybius's strictures on the historians who employed the tragic style in their history writing. F. W. Walbank identifies Polybius's main criticisms in four places and summarizes them under three rubrics:[49]

Firstly, in Polybius's *Histories* (2.16.14), some predecessors of Polybius are criticized for including "the Greek myths concerning the river, the fall of Phaethon, the weeping poplars, the black clothing worn by the inhabitants of the district καὶ πᾶσαν δὴ τὴν τραγικὴν καὶ ταύτῃ προσεοικυῖαν ὕλην,"[50] thereby trying to conceal their ignorance of the geography they describe. Polybius seems to relate mythical elements in history writing to tragedy. It is understandable because tragedy, as a genre originating from the epic, actually includes many mythical stories, either filtered by historical standards or not.

Secondly, in 2.56–60, we see Polybius polemically criticizing Phylarchus, one of the famous tragic historians, in the context of explaining why he himself decided to follow the sources of Aratus instead of those of Phylarchus in his historiography of the Cleomenic war. One of the reasons for Polybius to disregard Phylarchus's description of the Cleomenic war is said to be Phylarchus's intention in his history writing "to arouse the pity and attention of his readers (εἰς ἔλεον ἐκκαλεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας καὶ συμπαθεῖς ποιεῖν τοῖς λεγομένοις)." (2.56.7) According to Polybius, this eagerness of historians "to thrill (ἐκπλήττειν) his readers" leads to the sensational exaggeration of the actual picture, preventing historians from reporting exactly what actually happened, which is to be the proper purpose of history writing. To buttress his polemic, Polybius gives us a vivid example of Phylarchus's tragic style that is found in Phylarchus's dramatic description of the sacking of the Mantineans by the Achaeans and Macedonians. Phylarchus presents "clinging women with their hair disheveled and their breasts bare, or again crowds of both sexes together with their children and aged parents weeping and lamenting as they are led away to slavery." (2.56.7) For Polybius, this kind of style belongs to the

[47] Walsh, *Livy*, 22–23.

[48] Regarding eccentric forms of Hellenistic historiography refer to Martin Hose's excellent article. Cf. Hose, "Exzentrische Formen der Historiographie im Hellenismus," 182–213.

[49] Frank W. Walbank, "ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ: A Polybian Experiment," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 58 (1938): 55–68. Cf. Polybius, *Hist.* 2.16.14; 2.56.1–2; 3.48.8; 7.7.2.

[50] Ibid., 56.

tragedians who intend to "thrill and charm his audiences for the moment (ἐκπλῆξαι καὶ ψυχαγωγῆσαι κατὰ τὸ παρὸν τοὺς ἀκούοντας)."

In Polybius's view, worse than this is that Phylarchus does not provide the causes of the catastrophes (τῶν περιπετειῶν) that he describes in an emotion-provoking way. Polybius argues that this kind of mere sensationalism misleads the readers to unjustly evaluate the events, because it does not give the proper criteria for evaluation. This is because, for Polybius, not every catastrophe deserves pity. For example, violence that happens to evil-doers will not evoke legitimate pity or proper anger.[51] Polybius goes on to say that the preoccupation of Phylarchus with mere sensationalism (αὐτῆς τῆς τερατείας χάριν) led him to compose the improbable falsehood.[52]

Thirdly, in 3.48, Polybius criticizes some historians who described Hannibal's passage through the Alps for their inaccurate and sensational exaggeration where they made Hannibal an incompetent military leader. Polybius argues that Hannibal was falsely presented by them as being saved from the predicaments caused by his ignorance of the Alps only through the intervention of gods and heroes. This kind of introduction of gods and heroes into the narrative is an apparatus of the tragedians (cf. *deus ex machina*) to bring the plot to a conclusion that they could not finish because "their plots are false and contrary to reason and probability" (3.48.8).

In 7.7.1–2, certain λογογράφοι are criticized because, in their description of the downfall of Hieronymus, they have written at great length and introduced much that is marvelous (πολλὴν τερατείαν),

> telling of the prodigies that occurred to them before his reign (τὰ πρὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῖς γενόμενα σημεῖα) and the misfortunes of the Syracusans, and describing in tragic color (τραγῳδοῦντες) the cruelty of his character and the impiety of his actions, and finally the strange and terrible (παράλογον καὶ δεινόν) nature of the circumstances attending his death, so that neither Phalaris nor Apollodorus nor any other tyrant would seem to have been more savage than he. (7.7.1–2)

Walbank summarizes the common features found in those four places under three headings: "1) inaccuracy: a basis of facts that were unreasonable and self-contradictory, 2) sensationalism: an *emotional* treatment of the subject-matter, with the introduction of rhetorical speeches and incidental embroidery for effect [emphasis added], and 3) neglect of underlying causes."[53] Walbank also suggests that the term 'tragic' used by Polybius for his criticism has not been employed in a strict manner. Rather, Walbank

[51] Polybius, *Hist.* 2.56.13. Cf. Aristotle, *Poetics* 1453a 1–11.
[52] Polybius, *Hist.* 2.58.12–13.
[53] Walbank, "ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ: A Polybian Experiment," 57.

argues, the historians criticized by Polybius may be better described to write in a 'sensational' or 'melodramatic' way.[54]

While Polybius's criticism certainly provides many important clues to the understanding of tragic history, given the polemical character of his criticism, at least in the case of Phylarchus, we need to be more cautious so as not to accept Polybius's criticism of tragic history at its face value.[55] In other words, we are not to rashly jump to the conclusion that Polybius had a staunch enmity against tragic history in general. On the contrary, as several scholars have noticed, Polybius himself seems to have employed the tragic mode of history writing in several cases.[56] Putting off the full investigation of Polybius's tragic history writing into its proper place, here I will examine a representative case of Polybius's tragic-history writing, which is Polybius's description of Philip V of Macedon.

Early on, P. V. M. Benecke had suspicion that behind Polybius's depiction of Philip V of Macedon there might be tragedies or historical novels as sources, noticing tragic aspects in the basic story-line.[57] While Walbank did not accept Benecke's suggestion of sources like tragedies or historical novels for the story of Philip V of Macedon in Polybius's *Histories*, he admits that Philip V's story by Polybius definitely reminds us of certain characteristics of tragedy in terms of its subject-matter.[58] Walbank demonstrates that Philip V of Macedon fits well with Aristotle's definition of the tragic hero.[59] Philip V was a highly renowned and prosperous man, whose

---

[54] Ibid., 58. As we shall see later, Walbank's suggestion may be correct in pointing out that tragic history has not been directly originated from the Peripatetic school but it will not be fair to completely disconnect the tragic history from tragedy. In another article, Walbank himself argues for the close relation between history and tragedy from the beginning, and seems to admit the influence of tragedy on historiography, and vice versa. Cf. Walbank, "History and Tragedy."

[55] Kebric, *In the Shadow of Macedon*, 12. Kebric suggests that Polybius's accusation of Phylarchus may be due to their different political stance, since Polybius was a staunch supporter of the Achaean League, whereas Phylarchus was a Spartan apologist. Cf. Max Ludwig Wolfram Laistner, *The Greater Roman Historians* (Sather Classical Lectures 21; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), 6.

[56] Walbank, "ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ: A Polybian Experiment"; Kebric, *In the Shadow of Macedon*, 12; B. L. Ullman, "History and Tragedy," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 73 (1942): 43.

[57] P. V. M. Benecke, "The Fall of the Macedonian Monarchy," in *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 8: *Rome and the Mediterranean, 218–133 BC* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930), 254.

[58] Walbank, "ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ: A Polybian Experiment," 55–56.

[59] "Such a person [the tragic hero] is someone not preeminent in virtue and justice, and one who falls into adversity not through evil and depravity, but through some kind of error; and one belonging to the class of those who enjoy great renown and prosperity, such as Oedipus, Thyestes, and eminent men from such lineages." (Aristotle, *Poetics* 1453a 7 ff., trans. Stephen Halliwell)

character changed from 'the darling of Hellas' to a cruel and ruthless tyrant, not because of any innate viciousness of his own but because of a weakness of character played upon by Demetrius of Pharus (5.102.1).[60]

At this point, for our better understanding of the discussion, it will be helpful to summarize the basic story line of Philip V of Macedon based upon Polybius's treatment of him and Livy's *History* that used Polybius as source.

'This year witnessed the outbreak of disaster for Philip and for Macedon, an event worthy of attention and careful record. Fortune, wishing to punish Philip for all his wicked acts, sent against him a host of furies, torments and avenging spirits of his victims; these tortured him up to the day of his death, never leaving him, so that all realised that, as the proverb goes, "Justice has an eye" and men must not scorn her.' (Next come the details of how these furies work – by inspiring infatuation, which leads their victim to commit acts leading to his own downfall.) 'First these furies inspired Philip to carry out exchanges of population between Thrace and the coast towns, in preparation for his war with Rome; and as a result *men's hatred grew greater than their fear and they cursed Philip openly. Eventually, his mind rendered fiercer by these curses, Philip came to feel himself in danger unless he imprisoned the children of those he had killed*. So he wrote to the officers in the various cities and had this done; he had in mind chiefly the children of Admetus, Pyrrhichus and Samus and the rest he had executed at the same time, but he included all who had been put to death by royal command, quoting the line,

νήπιος ὃς πατέρα κτείνας υἱοὺς καταλείπει.

The general effect of this was to awaken pity for the children of men of high station; *but a particular incident brought the corresponding loathing for Philip to a climax. This was the death of Theoxena and her sister's children*.' (Here occurred the account of this, as given in Livy.) 'This incident added new flame to the hatred of his people, and they now openly cursed Philip and his sons; and these curses, heard by all the gods, caused Philip to turn his anger against his own blood. For while his mind was almost maddened on this account (διὰ ταῦτα), the quarrel of his sons burst into flame simultaneously, Fortune as if of set purpose bringing their misfortunes on the stage at one and the same time. The quarrel was referred to Philip and he had to decide which of his two sons he should murder and which he should fear as his own possible murderer for the rest of his life. Who can help thinking that the wrath of heaven was descending on him for his past sins? The details that follow will make this clearer.'[61] (Then come the details of the quarrel between Demetrius and Perseus: Livy XL.5 – 24; Polyb. XXIII.10.17, 11.)[62]

---

[60] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1453a 7–11.

[61] The sentences in italics have only the authority of Livy; the rest is either Polybius or both. Emphasis by underlining is mine.

[62] Walbank, "ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ: A Polybian Experiment," 60–61. This summary of Philip's life is done by Walbank based on Polybius, *Hist.* 23.10–16 and Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 40.3–5.

When we see this last tragic event in Philip's life along with his earlier career, it becomes clear that Philip's story meets the requisites for the best plot for tragedy envisioned by Aristotle. In his *Poetics* (1451b 32–1452a 6) Aristotle explains,

> Of simple plots and actions, the episodic are worst. By "episodic" I mean a plot in which the episodes follow one another without probability or necessity. Such plays are composed by bad poets through their own fault, and by good poets for the sake of the actors: for in composing show pieces, and stretching the plot beyond its capacity, they are often forced to distort the continuity. *Given that the mimesis is not only of a complete action but also of fearful and pitiable matters, the latter arise above all when events occur contrary to the expectation yet on account of one another.* The awesome will be maintained in this way more than through show of chance and fortune, because even among chance events we find most awesome those which seem to have happened by design. (Italics are mine.)

As the above summary of Philip's last years show, Philip, who has lived a prosperous life in his earlier career, was struck by misfortunes in the unexpected times, that is, in his last years, because of his past sins.[63] Polybius describes that Tyche incited Philip to plan wars against Rome whose rise is inevitable, to punish Philip for the sins of his youth. It is noticeable that Polybius himself seems to introduce a host of tragic trappings such as furies, torments and avenging spirits of his victims as an embellishment for the steps leading to Philip's death. Walbank tries to exempt Polybius from the criticism he fired against Phylarchus, arguing that Polybius did not do this to engage the readers emotionally in the events, but rather to give a moral lesson. However, it is still true that Polybius structured his story of Philip as a kind of tragedy.

If so, we may ask an interesting question, whether it is possible for us to criticize Polybius for his inaccurate manipulation of the historical facts that was one of his attacks against the tragic historians. According to Polybius, Philip's opposition to Rome was initiated by his infatuation by Tyche. On the other hand, Walbank suggests that it is more likely that Philip's moves were a carefully calculated defensive measure in preparation for Rome's preemptive attack. Thus, while Walbank admits that Polybius's portrayal may not be factually accurate, he still suggests that this inaccuracy was not caused by Polybius's intentional desire to lie for other tragic effects but rather by an unconscious blindness influenced by his preoccupation with moral lessons.[64] As Walbank argues, even though Polybius should be

---

[63] Ibid., 63. Philip's past sins seem to refer to "his impiety at Thermum (Pol. V.9 f.; XI.7), his brutality at Messene (Pol. VII.11, 13; Plut. *Arat.* 49–51), his treachery at Rhodes (Pol. XIII.3), his cruelty at Cius (Pol. XV.22), his sacrilege at Pergamum (Pol. XVI.1), and, perhaps above all, the scandalous compact made in 203/2 with Antiochus against the infant Ptolemy Epiphanes (Pol. XV.20)."

[64] Ibid., 64–67.

differentiated from other tragic historians criticized by him, his story of Philip V can be said to be "a Polybian experiment in the tragic mode."

So far, we have been focusing on Polybius to get a glimpse of what 'tragic history' is about, because his criticism of the so-called tragic historians provides for us a starting point to see how tragic history was understood by one of their contemporary historians and at the same time his own ironic experiment in the tragic mode guides us to look beyond his criticisms with a broad spectrum of tragic history in mind.

Based on the above examination of Polybius's cases, we may tentatively summarize some of the characteristics of tragic history:

(1) It is concerned not so much about factual knowledge of what happened (ἐπιστήμη) as arousing of emotions (πάθος; e.g., pity and fear) from the readers just as tragedians did.

(2) To do that, the tragic historians employ both some of the apparatus of tragedians and also sensational/monstrous paraphernalia not directly related to tragedy. In this regard, key terms for the tragic history may be: δεινά, τερατεία, θαυμαστὸν ἢ παράδοξον, τύχης μεταβολαί, περιπέτεια, ἐκπλῆξαι/ἐκπλήττειν, ψυχαγωγῆσαι.

Depending on this basic observation, I would suggest a working definition of tragic history: tragic history is a style of history writing popular in the Hellenistic period that seems to involve an emotive style, calculated to present moving scenes in a vivid manner, and shows both qualities associated with tragedy and one not so closely related to tragedy.[65]

With this tentative working definition in mind, we will now turn to the complicated issue of its origin that will lead us to a better understanding of the characteristics of tragic history.

2) The Origin of Tragic History

The origin of 'tragic history' is an issue that has long been debated among scholars. The main candidates for its origin are three: (1) the Peripatetic school, (2) the Isocratean school and (3) Greek historiographical tradition since the 5th century B.C.E. We will examine the pros and cons for each of these three suggestions, because this discussion will help us define more

[65] It is important to remember that "tragedy" here is not limited to the Aristotelian understanding of it. In his article "Greek Middlebrow Drama," Mark Griffith suggests that "tragedy" by Polybius's date has a wide range of application, including the romantic novels. According to Griffith, the binary distinction between 'good, serious, high' tragedy and 'bad, shameful, low' comedy is problematic. Griffith's concept of 'middlebrow drama' leads us to an understanding of Greek tragedy that is broader and more inclusive, embracing comic, romantic, and tragic in a single drama. Refer to Mark Griffith, "Greek Middlebrow Drama (Something to Do with Aphrodite?)," in *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (ed. Martin Revermann and Peter Wilson; Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 59–87.

precisely the features of tragic history than we could in the previous section.

1) The Peripatetic Origin: Eduard Schwartz, Kurt von Fritz, and C. O. Brink

This hypothesis was first proposed by Schwartz and later developed by P. Scheller. At first, this hypothesis sounds strange because, in his *Poetics*, the teacher of the Peripatetics, Aristotle, as is well-known, clearly drew a distinct line between history and poetry:

> It is also evident from what has been said that it is not the poet's function to relate actual events, but the kinds of things that might occur and are possible in terms of probability or necessity. The difference between the historian and the poet is not that between using verse or prose; Herodotus's work could be versified and would be just as much a kind of history in verse as in prose. No, the difference is this: that the one relates actual events, the other the kinds of things that might occur. Consequently, poetry is more philosophical and more elevated than history, since poetry relates more of the universal, while history relates particulars. "Universal" means the kinds of things which it suits a certain kind of person to say or do, in terms of probability or necessity: poetry aims for this, even though attaching names to the agents. A "particular" means, say, what Alcibiades did or experienced. (Aristotle, *Poetics* 1451a 36–b 11)

However, Schwartz suggests that the situation changed among his pupils. He supposed that "someone within Aristotle's school blurred this distinction and diverted those features characteristic of poetry, and in particular of tragedy, to the field of history."[66] According to this line of argument, the transfer of tragic skills into historiography is supposed to have been perpetrated by persons related to the Peripatetic school such as Callisthenes, Duris and Theophrastus.

Schwartz suggests that we may see the reversal of Aristotle's own teaching in Callisthenes of Olynthus (ca. 370–328 B.C.E.), the great-nephew of Aristotle by his sister Arimneste. In his *Lives*, Plutarch presents Callisthenes as telling tall stories about Alexander the Great.

---

[66] Walbank, "History and Tragedy," 216; cf. Eduard Schwartz, *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman: Das Romanhafte in der erzählenden Literatur der Griechen*, (2nd ed.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1943), 124–125: "Aber schon bei seinen nächsten Schülern wurde das anders; leider wissen wir wenig mehr, als daß sie sich eifrig mit der historiographischen Kunst beschäftigt haben; ihre Lehren lassen sich nur mühsam erraten. Die Hauptsache war die, daß dem Historiker eine ähnliche Aufgabe zugewiesen wurde wie dem Tragiker, d. h. dem Tragiker nach der Theorie des Aristoteles; er soll rühren, Furcht und Mitleid erregen durch den künstlerischen Aufbau und die plastische Schilderung erschütternder Begebenheiten; an die Stelle der Götter und Orakel tritt, charakteristisch für die entgottete Zeit und die entgottete Philosophie, das blinde, grausame, menschenverfolgende Walten der Tyche."

At all events, during the journey which he made at this time, the assistance rendered him by Heaven in his perplexities met with more credence than the oracles which he afterwards received, nay, in a way, the oracles obtained credence in consequence of such assistance. For, to begin with, much rain from heaven and persistent showers removed all fear of thirst, quenched the dryness of the sand, so that it became moist and compact, and made the air purer and good to breathe. Again, when the marks for the guides became confused, and the travelers were separated and wandered about in ignorance of the route, ravens appeared and assumed direction of their march, flying swiftly on in front of them when they followed, and waiting for them when they marched slowly and lagged behind. Moreover, what was most astonishing of all, Callisthenes tells us that the birds by their cries called back those who straggled away in the night, and cawed until they had set them in the track of the march. (Plutarch, *Alexander* 27.1–3)

This contest at once made a great change in the situation to Alexander's advantage, so that he received the submission even of Sardis, the bulwark of the barbarian dominion on the sea-coast, and added the rest of the country to his conquests. Halicarnassus alone withstood him, and Miletus, which cities he took by storm and subdued all the territories about them. Then he was in doubt as to his future course. Many times he was eager to encounter Dareius and put the whole issue to hazard, and many times he would make up his mind to practice himself first, as it were, and strengthen himself by acquiring the regions along the sea with their resources, and then to go up against that monarch. Now, there is in Lycia, near the city of Xanthus, a spring, which at this time, as we are told, was of its own motion upheaved from its depths, and overflowed, and cast forth a bronze tablet bearing the prints of ancient letters, in which it was made known that the empire of the Persians would one day be destroyed by the Greeks and come to an end. Encouraged by this prophecy, Alexander hastened to clear up the sea-coast as far as Cilicia and Phoenicia. His rapid passage along the coasts of Pamphylia has afforded many historians material *for bombastic and terrifying description.* They imply that by some great and heaven-sent good fortune the sea retired to make way for Alexander, although at other times it always came rolling in with violence from the main, and scarcely ever revealed to sight the small rocks which lie close up under the precipitous and riven sides of the mountain.[2] (Plutarch, *Alexander* 17.1–3; italics are mine.)

In his *Geography* 1.43, Strabo designates Callisthenes as a historian using a tragic style in his description of Alexander the Great: προστραγῳδεῖ τούτοις ὁ Καλλισθένης.

Having before spoken at length of the temple of Ammon, we wish to add this only, that in ancient times divination in general and oracles were held in greater esteem than at present. Now they are greatly neglected; for the Romans are satisfied with the oracles of the Sibyl, and with Tyrrhenian divination by the entrails of animals, the flight of birds, and portentous appearances. Hence the oracle of Ammon, which was formerly held in great esteem, is now nearly deserted. This appears chiefly from the historians who have recorded the actions of Alexander, adding, indeed, much that has the appearance of flattery, but yet relating what is worthy of credit. Callisthenes, for instance, says that Alexander was ambitious of the glory of visiting the oracle, because he knew that Perseus and Hercules had before performed the journey thither. He set out from Paraetonium, although the south winds were blowing, and succeeded in his undertaking by vigor and perseverance. When out of his way on the road, he escaped being overwhelmed in a sand-storm by a fall of rain, and by the guidance of two crows, which directed his course.

These things are stated by way of flattery, as also what follows: that the priest permitted the king alone to pass into the temple in his usual dress, whereas the others changed theirs; that all heard the oracles on the outside of the temple, except Alexander, who was in the interior of the building; that the answers were not given, as at Delphi and at Branchidae, in words, but chiefly by nods and signs, as in Homer; "the son of Saturn nodded with his sable brows," the prophet imitating Jupiter. This, however, the man told the king, in express terms, that he was the son of Jupiter. *Callisthenes adds, (after the exaggerating style of tragedy)*, that when Apollo had deserted the oracle among the Branchidae, on the temple being plundered by the Branchidae (who espoused the party of the Persians in the time of Xerxes,) and the spring had failed, it then re-appeared (on the arrival of Alexander); that the ambassadors also of the Milesians carried back to Memphis numerous answers of the oracle respecting the descent of Alexander from Jupiter, and the future victory which he should obtain at Arbela, the death of Darius, and the political changes at Lacedaemon. He says also that the Erythraean Athenais, who resembled the ancient Erythraean Sibyl, had declared the high descent of Alexander. Such are the accounts of historians. (Strabo, *Geography* 1.43; emphasis is mine.)

The following Fragment 44, quoted by Athenaeus Mechanicus, is presented as another important literary evidence for the Peripatetic origin by Callisthenes.[67]

Ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἱστοριογράφος Καλλισθένης φησί· "δεῖ τὸν γράφειν τι πειρώμενον μὴ ἀστοχεῖν τοῦ προσώπου ἀλλ' οἰκείως αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι τοὺς λόγους θεῖναι." Ὁ δέ γε περὶ τοιαύτης τέχνης γινόμενος πᾶς λόγος συντομίας τε καὶ σαφηνείας ἐπιδεῖσθαί μοι δοκεῖ, τῶν δὲ ῥητορικῶν παραγγελμάτων οὐκ οἰκεῖος εἶναι.

Callisthenes' insistence that "anyone who is trying to write should not fail to hit off the character, but should match his speeches to the person and the situation" was thought by Schwartz to be an application of the Aristotelian concept of τὸ πρέπον to history. In his *Poetics*, Aristotle emphasizes the importance of the appropriateness of characterization.[68]

Περὶ δὲ τὰ ἤθη τέτταρά ἐστιν ὧν δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι … Δεύτερον δὲ τὸ ἁρμόττον ἔστι … Τρίτον δὲ τὸ ὅμοιον … Ἔστιν δὲ παράδειγμα … τοῦ ἀπρεποῦς καὶ μὴ ἁρμόττοντος … Χρὴ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἤθεσιν ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τῆι τῶν πραγμάτων συστάσει ἀεὶ ζητεῖν ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον ἢ τὸ εἰκός, ὥστε τὸν τοιοῦτον τὰ τοιαῦτα λέγειν ἢ πράττειν ἢ ἀναγκαῖον ἢ τὸ εἰκὸς καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τοῦτο γίνεσθαι ἢ ἀναγκαῖον ἢ εἰκός. (Aristotle, *Poetics* 1454a 16–36)

It seems that there is a clear connection between Callisthenes' insistence and Aristotle's emphasis on the appropriateness of characterization. Based on the above-mentioned materials, the hypothesis of the Peripatetic origin of 'tragic history' has been prevailing for a long time.

However, doubt about this hypothesis has been repeatedly raised by several scholars, beginning with Berthold Louis Ullman. Oppositions to this hypothesis were made from two directions. One is to deny that

[67] *FGrH* 124 F 44.

[68] Pertinent too is Aristotle's remark in *Rhetoric* 3.2.3 (1404b 16).