The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Agnostos Theos *Agnostos Theos*, Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede. E. Norden. Demy 8vo. I vol. Pp. ix + 410. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. M. 12 ; bound, M. 13.

W. K. Lowther Clarke

The Classical Review / Volume 27 / Issue 06 / September 1913, pp 199 - 200

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00005564, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00005564

How to cite this article:

W. K. Lowther Clarke (1913). The Classical Review, 27, pp 199-200 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00005564

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

AGNOSTOS THEOS.

Agnostos Theos, Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede. E. NORDEN. Demy 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. ix+410. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. M. 12; bound, M. 13.

MUCH of the progress in New Testament criticism during recent years has been due to scholars who have made their reputation in other fields of learning. In the present volume Norden, the learned author of *Die antike Kunstprosa*, following in Blass' footsteps, has studied the Acts of the Apostles from the standpoint of a classical philologist and produced a work of remarkable interest and originality.

As the title indicates, the investigation starts from St. Paul's speech at Athens and the altar-inscription *ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ*. Norden tries to show that the speech conforms to a fixed type of Jewish-Christian missionary preaching, which can be traced back to old Greek prophetic addresses, but owed its special characteristics to later Hellenism as modified by Oriental and Jewish influences. By the side of this *Grundmotiv* of the speech there is a Stoic *Begleitmotiv*, which appears in such expressions as *οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θεραπεύεται προσδεόμενός τινος, ζητεῖν τὸν θεὸν εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὗροιεν*, and others. In the famous sentence *ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν* each of the verbs can be paralleled from Stoic sources, though the author of Acts was the first to combine them into a solemn formula. For *κινεῖσθαι* in the sense of movements of the soul the words that Lucan puts into Cato's mouth are quoted: *Iuppiter est quodcunque vides, quodcunque moveris* (IX. 580). But in the parallels adduced God is represented as *ἀόρατος, ἀθεώρητος, ἀφανής, ἀκατάληπτος*; why did the author substitute *ἀγνώστος θεός* for these expressions?

This brings Norden to the most controversial stage of his argument. Not only the speech, but also the whole situation out of which it arises is said to be composed from traditional material. To praise Athens for piety was a *locus communis* (cf. Apuleius, *flor.* 1). But the

actual source of the section in Acts was the story of the visit of Apollonius of Tyana to Athens. Apollonius visited Athens, noted the piety of the inhabitants and wrote a little book on the subject, in which he criticised the Eleusinian hierophant who had refused to initiate him into the mysteries (Philostratus, IV. 18, 19). A quotation from this *διάλεξις περὶ θυσιῶν* is preserved in Eusebius, *praef. ev.* IV. 13, which contains a polemic against idolatry agreeing with that which Philostratus puts into Apollonius' mouth during his visit to Egypt (VI. 19, cf. VI. 3, where Apollonius refers to *βωμοὶ ἀγνώστων δαιμόνων* at Athens). Norden concludes that the author of Acts used a report of Apollonius' visit to Athens as a model for his own narrative, and changed the plural of the inscription *ἀγνώστων θεῶν* into the singular, which suited his purpose better (Jerome had already given this explanation).

So bold a theory demands searching criticism, which indeed Harnack has already given in his *Ist die Rede des Paulus in Athen ein ursprünglicher Bestandteil der Apostelgeschichte?* (*Texte und Untersuchungen* XXXIX. 1.) The reader has only to look up the passages of Philostratus for himself to see how slight is the resemblance to Acts xvii.; and, even were the resemblance much closer, 'Damis' is a very shadowy person and the possibility of a hypothetical source of Philostratus having been used by the final editor of the Acts is a weak foundation for so radical a reconstruction.

Norden's theory of the composition of Acts must now be considered. He supposes the existence of a Redactor, who used a source written in both first and third persons, and whose own activity was evinced chiefly in the composition of speeches (p. 315). The Areopagus-speech will then have been composed by this Redactor about 100 A.D. In thus distinguishing between the Redactor and the author of the bulk of the narrative Norden takes the work of earlier scholars as an assured result and only mentions Harnack's studies in order to disagree with them. But the lin-

guistic arguments in favour of the unity of Acts are very strong; the speeches are probably Luke's own free compositions; even the Areopagus speech contains nothing that would have been beyond the reach of an educated Gentile Christian in the third quarter of the first century. The only thing that would have commended Norden's theory is absent, namely, an investigation showing a difference between the speeches and narrative of Acts in respect of language.

We believe then that on these two points, Apollonius and the composition of Acts, Norden's conclusions are erroneous. With all his wealth of illustrative material he has neglected the careful linguistic study of the text of Acts on which so much depends.

It is a pleasure to point to the brilliant investigations in the second half of the book, dealing with the forms of prayer used in Greek, Jewish and Christian religious circles, and showing the exist-

ence of fixed types of religious utterance. More ingenious than convincing is a dissertation on St. Matthew xi. 25-30, which reaches the result that the author of Q (the Gospel-source formerly called 'Logia') used a 'mystic-theosophic tractate, which had already had a long past and, at least in Oriental languages, received a fixed literary expression' (p. 307).

The above account is fragmentary, but corresponds with the book itself, which is a series of separate treatises and appendices loosely strung together. Its value consists in its astonishing learning, exact scholarship and wealth of illustrative material rather than in any assured results. But even where the conclusions seem erroneous, the theologian will find that Professor Norden throws a flood of welcome light on the New Testament.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Cavendish Rectory, Suffolk.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

The Loeb Classical Library. Edited by T. E. PAGE, M.A. and W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt. D. *The Apostolic Fathers*, Kirsopp Lake. 2 vols. viii + 409, 396. London: Heinemann, 1912, 1913.

TRANSLATIONS of the *Apostolic Fathers* already exist in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library (1867) and in the admirable edition of Lightfoot and Harmer (1891 and subsequent reprints). In some respects therefore the way has been made smooth for the translator, but the task of producing an independent work has been correspondingly difficult. Professor Lake has given us an admirable rendering in terse, modern English of these important writings, and his edition is by far the best for the non-specialist reader that has yet appeared. In some cases his method entails sacrifices, as when he translates the second person singular and plural alike by 'you,' and thereby blurs some important distinctions of the original; but the gain is more than the loss. Professor Lake's

repute as a textual critic guarantees the excellence of the Greek text, and the few notes that are allowed by the plan of the series make the reader desire further guidance from so competent a scholar.

There are a few slips in the translation. On pp. 149, 203 of the first volume *διὰ παντός* is rendered 'every way,' 'in everything,' instead of 'continually.' In the second volume *ἐλκομένους* is rendered 'which had been dragged' (p. 31), *τοῦ κυρίου* 'God' (p. 49), *ἁμαρτίαν* 'shame' (p. 119), *ἡ πύλη ἔστειλεν ὑπὲρ τὸν ἥλιον* 'glistened in the sun' (p. 221). On p. 89 *εἰς κεράμιον μέλιτος ἐπιχέης* hardly means 'pour into it a jar of honey'; on p. 99 'covetousness' demands *πλεονεξία* in the text in place of *πλεονεξιῶν*; on p. 129 *ἀλήθειαν* is left untranslated. No doubt there is a good reason for rendering *ἀπόκενος* 'half-empty,' but the meaning usually given is 'quite empty,' which suits the context better (p. 135). After Dean Robinson's discussions in his commentary on Ephesians it seems better not to trans-