

MONIQUE CUANY

Proclaiming the Kerygma in Athens

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

596

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)
Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · Janet Spittler (Charlottesville, VA)
J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

596



Monique Cuany

Proclaiming the Kerygma in Athens

The Argument of Acts 17:16-34
in Light of the Epicurean and Stoic Debates
about Piety and Divine Images
in Early Post-Hellenistic Times

Mohr Siebeck

Monique Cuany, Born 1980; studied history and theology in Switzerland, China, the USA, and the United Kingdom; 2019 PhD in New Testament studies, University of Cambridge, UK; Professor of History of Christianity, Haute Ecole de Théologie, St-Légier, Switzerland.
orcid.org/0000-0001-7198-8907

ISBN 978-3-16-161427-9 / eISBN 978-3-16-161428-6
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-161428-6

ISSN 0340-9570 / eISSN 2568-7484
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <https://dnb.de>.

© 2023 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper and bound by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen.

Printed in Germany.

To my parents
Jacqueline and Dominique Cuany

Preface

This study is a slightly revised version of my PhD thesis, submitted at the University of Cambridge in 2018.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof Simon Gathercole, for reading my work with so much care, and providing me with helpful feedback and encouragement during those years, including on many pieces which never made it into this thesis. His expertise, attention to detail and precision in thinking has often challenged and inspired me, and made my thesis a much better work. Likewise, Prof Judith Lieu provided helpful criticism and advice at various stages of this project, especially during the first and second year of my research, challenging me to reflect on my methodology and the broader implications of my proposal. I also wish to thank the examiners of my thesis, Prof Sean Adams and Dr James Carleton Paget, for their helpful criticisms, remarks and suggestions.

My research has been made possible by a scholarship from the Faculty of Divinity, Cambridge, and by grants from my college, Corpus Christi. I am truly grateful for this institutional support. My appreciation also goes to the members of the Acts Seminar of the British New Testament Society and the European Association of Biblical Scholarship for giving me feedback on some of the ideas which helped to shape this thesis.

My time in Cambridge has been greatly enriched by the friendship and support of many friends. In particular I would like to thank Ruth Norris, Hannah Robinson, Nicki Wilkes, and Onesimus Ngundu for their friendship, as well as the Gurry Family for so generously opening their home to me on many occasions. The Cambridge Chinese Christian Church has been a very supportive and kind community of friends. In Switzerland, I would like to express a special thanks to Lucette et Danilo Hasler, Simone et Jean-Marc Tapernoux, Niki and Damaris Conzelmann, as well as to my siblings and their families: Thérèse and Philippe Cuany, Carmen and Joël Deriaz, and Francine and Mathieu Grandjean.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Jacqueline and Dominique Cuany, for their unwavering support in so many ways during those years of research. Words fail me to express my gratitude for their encouragements and kindness at every stage, and for the enthusiasm and patience with which they have shared the joys and doubts of this journey. I dedicate this work to them, in gratitude.

St-Légier, 21 August 2023

Monique Cuany

Table of Contents

Preface.....	VII
Table of Contents.....	IX
Abbreviations	XV
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 <i>The Areopagus Speech in Acts and Scholarship</i>	1
1.2 <i>Some Main Lines in Past Scholarship</i>	5
1.2.1 Jewish-Christian <i>Grundmotiv</i> and Stoic <i>Begleitmotiv</i> (Norden)	5
1.2.2 A Philosophical Sermon on the Knowledge of God (Dibelius, Pohlenz, Balch)	6
1.2.3 A Thoroughly Jewish Speech: Downplaying the Importance of Greek Material (Gärtner)	8
1.2.4 The Mixed Nature of the Speech and Hellenistic Jewish Preaching (Nauck).....	10
1.2.5 A Christian Speech: Reinterpreting Greek Philosophy Within a Christian Framework (Conzelmann)	12
1.2.6 <i>Anknüpfung und Widerspruch</i> : Philosophy as Criticism of Graeco-Roman Religion	14
1.2.7 The Search For ‘Common Ground’ and ‘Points of Contact’ in the Service of Apologetic	16
1.2.8 Christianity and Greek Philosophy as Rival Traditions (Rowe)	18
1.2.9 Conclusion: Making Sense of the Hellenization of the Speech and Its ‘Christian’ Conclusion	22
1.3 <i>A New Approach to the Areopagus Speech</i>	23
1.3.1 Recent Research on Hellenistic Judaism and Hellenization.....	23
1.3.2 Narrative and Verisimilitude in Acts.....	25
1.3.3 A Re-Examination of the Teachings of Stoicism and Epicureanism	29

1.4	<i>Outline and Structure of the Argument</i>	30
Chapter 2: Setting Up the Debate – The Immediate Context and Beginning of the Speech (Acts 17:16–23)		32
2.1	<i>The Occasion of the Speech: Collision and Newness in Athens</i>	32
2.1.1	Paul’s Reaction to Athenian Worship (vv. 16–17).....	33
2.1.2	The Athenians’ Perception of Paul and His Message (v.18).....	34
2.1.3	The Setting of the Speech (vv.19–21).....	38
2.2	<i>The Philosophical Context: Debating with Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers</i>	40
2.2.1	Debating With Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers.....	40
2.2.2	The Socratic Allusions	42
2.2.3	The <i>Deisidaimonia</i> of the Athenians and Their Ignorant Worship	44
2.3	<i>Conclusion</i>	45
Chapter 3: Neither ‘Piety,’ nor ‘Superstition’ – Redefining <i>Deisidaimonia</i> in the Context of Graeco-Roman Religious Grammar (c. 100 BCE–120 CE)		48
3.1	<i>Methodological Concerns in the Study of Deisidaimonia</i>	51
3.1.1	The Lack of Semantic Study of the Terminology of <i>Deisidaimonia</i>	51
3.1.2	The Assumption of Anachronistic Conceptual Frameworks in the Study of Ancient Religion and Philosophy	53
3.1.3	Ancient Definitions of <i>Deisidaimonia</i>	56
3.1.4	Methodology of this Chapter.....	58
3.2	<i>The Use of Deisidaimonia in Historians and Geographers</i>	60
3.2.1	Diodorus Siculus (90–30 BCE).....	60
3.2.2	Strabo (c. 64 BCE–c. 24 CE)	65
3.2.3	Josephus (37–100 CE).....	69
3.3	<i>The Use of Deisidaimonia in Plutarch of Chaeronea (c. 45 CE – Before 125)</i>	74

3.3.1	Plutarch's <i>De Superstitione</i> and His Religious Thought	74
3.3.2	Plutarch's Use of <i>Deisidaimonia</i> , <i>Eusebeia</i> and <i>Eulabeia</i>	76
3.3.3	Plutarch's Use of <i>Deisidaimonia</i> in <i>De superstitione</i> and His Religious Thought	78
3.4	<i>Conclusion</i>	80
3.4.1	The Use of <i>Deisidaimonia</i> Between the 1st c. BCE and the Early 2nd c. CE	80
3.4.2	<i>Deisidaimonia</i> and the Grammar of Graeco-Roman Religion	81
3.4.3	<i>Deisidaimonia</i> in Acts 17	83
Chapter 4: <i>Deisidaimonia</i> , Piety and the Gods in Debate – Polemics Between Epicurean and Stoic Philosophers Around the First Century CE		85
4.1	<i>Epicureans on Deisidaimonia, the Gods, and Piety</i>	87
4.1.1	<i>Deisidaimonia</i> and Piety in Epicurean Philosophy	87
4.1.2	Epicurean Theology in Debate: The 'Harms' of Gods Who Are Not Wrathful nor Favourable	96
4.1.3	Summary: The Epicureans on <i>Deisidaimonia</i> and Proper Piety ...	103
4.2	<i>The Stoics on Deisidaimonia, the Gods, and Piety</i>	104
4.2.1	<i>Deisidaimonia</i> and Piety in Stoic Philosophy	104
4.2.2	Stoic Theology in Debate: The Problems of Stoic Providence	116
4.2.3	Summary: The Stoics on <i>Deisidaimonia</i> and Proper Piety	120
4.3	<i>Conclusions</i>	120
4.3.1	The Philosophical Criticism of <i>Deisidaimonia</i> in Early Post-Hellenistic Times	121
4.3.2	Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers on Traditional Religion and Piety	126
Chapter 5: Something New in Athens – Godlikeness and Divine Justice in Light of the Resurrection (Acts 17:22–31)		130
5.1	<i>Introducing the Subject: Deisidaimonia and the Unknown God (17:22–23)</i>	130
5.1.1	The Altar to the Unknown God and the Concern About Hostile Gods	130

5.1.2	The Unknown God and the Subject of the Speech.....	132
5.1.3	Summary vv. 23–22	138
5.2	<i>The Creator God’s Relationship to Humanity (17:24–28)</i>	138
5.2.1	The Impossibility to Serve the Creator God Along Traditional Means (vv.24–25)	138
5.2.2	God’s Arrangement of Humanity’s Conditions to Seek Him (vv. 26–27).....	140
5.2.3	The Witness of Human Life (v. 28)	145
5.2.4	Summary vv. 24–28	152
5.3	<i>False Divine Representations (17:29)</i>	153
5.3.1.	Preliminary Remarks on the Logic of Verse 29	153
5.3.2	The Divine and Man-Made Images.....	157
5.4	<i>Divine Justice and Divine Representation (17:30–31)</i>	160
5.4.1	The Universal Call to Repentance.....	162
5.4.2	Divine Judgment in Righteousness and the Risen Man	163
5.4.3	The Resurrection and the Proclamation of True Divine Representation.....	168
5.5	<i>Conclusion</i>	171
Chapter 6: Conclusions – A New Interpretation of the Argument in Athens and Its Relation to Greek Philosophy		174
6.1	<i>A New Reading and Coherence for the Speech: Proclaiming the True Image of God</i>	175
6.1.1	The Argument of the Speech.....	176
6.1.2	The Immediate Narrative Context.....	178
6.1.3	The Philosophical Teaching in Early Post-Hellenistic Times	178
6.2	<i>The Speech and the Greeks: A Rapprochement with Greek Philosophers?</i>	179
6.2.1	No ‘Significant’ Rapprochement From a Philosophical Point of View	180
6.2.2	A Speech ‘at Home’ in – and Engaged With – the Debates About <i>Deisidaimonia</i> , Piety and Peace With the Gods Among Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers	182

6.2.3 A New Teaching in Athens: The Challenge of the Speech to Greek Philosophies.....	184
6.3 <i>Christology and the Proclamation of the Kerygma to the Gentiles in Acts</i>	187
6.4 <i>The Christian Movement, Graeco-Roman Culture and the Purpose of Acts</i>	191
Bibliography.....	195
Index of References.....	207
Index of Authors	216
Subject Index.....	218

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of biblical and other ancient writings generally follow the conventions in P. H. Alexander et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), and can be found in the index of references at the end of the present volume.

The additional abbreviations used are provided here for the reader's convenience.

EOD	“English Oxford Living Dictionaries.” Oxford University Press, https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/english .
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George/Scott, Robert/Stuart Jones, Henry. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9 th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon. 1996.
MC	Personal translation [Monique Cuany]
OCD	Hornblower, Simon/Spawforth, Antony, eds. <i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> . 3 rd rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2005.
PHI	“Searchable Greek Inscriptions: A Scholarly Tool in Progress.” The Packard Humanities Institute, https://epigraphy.packhum.org/ .
TLG	“Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature.” University of California, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/ .
TDNT	Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . 10 vols. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1964.
TLNT	Spicq, Ceslas. <i>Theological Lexicon of the New Testament</i> . 3 vols. Translated and edited by James D. Ernest. Peabody: Hendrickson. 1994.
SVF	Arnim, Hans Friedrich August von. <i>Stoicorum veterum fragmenta</i> . 4 vols. Leipzig: Teubner. 1903–24.
Usener	Usener, Hermann, ed. <i>Epicurea</i> . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2010 [1887].

Greek and Latin authors

Arius Didymus

Epit. Epitome of Stoic Ethics

Cicero

ND De natura deorum (On the Nature of the Gods)

Epicurus

*Ep. Hdt. Epistle to Herodotus**Ep. Men. Epistle to Menoeceus**Ep. Pyth. Epistle to Pythocles**KΔ Kuriai Doxai (Principal Doctrines)*

Lucretius

RN De rerum natura

Philodemus

P. Herc. 1251 [On Choices and Avoidances]

Seneca

[Superst.] [De superstitione]

1. Introduction

1.1 The Areopagus Speech in Acts and Scholarship

The passage in Acts (17:16–34) depicting the apostle Paul debating with Epicurean and Stoic philosophers and delivering a speech to the Areopagus in Athens constitutes the oldest account of a confrontation between Christianity and Graeco-Roman religion and philosophy.¹ Situated in the ancient cultural capital of Greece and penned with literary skills which have often drawn superlatives from exegetes,² this well-known scene has become a symbol of the encounter between Christianity and Graeco-Roman culture and its wisdom.³

In the book of Acts, this pericope is indeed one of the two *sole* descriptions of a Christian speech delivered to a broader Gentile audience.⁴ This quasi-unique status in a narrative which describes the spread of Christianity from Jerusalem (Acts 1) to Rome (Acts 28) led many past and current exegetes to the conclusion that the speech in Athens is ‘the’ or at least ‘a’ climax in the whole book. For example, in his landmark article published in 1939, Martin Dibelius wrote:

The scene in the book of Acts in which Paul preaches to the people of Athens (17.19-34) denotes, and is intended to denote, a climax in the book. The whole account of the scene testifies to that: the speech on the Areopagus is the only sermon reported by the author which is preached to the Gentiles by the apostle to the Gentiles.⁵

¹ Following the current convention in scholarship, the author of the gospel of Luke and the book of Acts will be referred to as ‘Luke’ in the present work. For the sake of convenience, the passage of Acts 17: 16–34 will sometimes be referred to simply as ‘Acts 17.’

² E.g., Harnack 1906: 321: ‘das wundervollste Stück der Apostelgeschichte.’ Cf. Mason 2012: 165–166: ‘an author of considerable worldly knowledge and literary ability.’

³ Conzelmann 1966: 217. Cf. Johnson 1992: 318: Luke made this account ‘the exemplary meeting between Jerusalem and Athens, and the anticipation of the Christianized Hellenistic culture for which it provided the symbol.’

⁴ Cf. the brief words addressed to the crowds in Lystra (Acts 14:15–17). As Soards (1994: 11) points out, the categorization of the speeches between mission- and trial- speeches in Acts is largely artificial, since the judicial speeches often contain the same elements as the *Missionsreden*. Hence the reference here to speeches to a ‘broader’ Gentile audience to distinguish them from speeches addressed to Gentile officials in trial narratives.

⁵ Dibelius 1956a: 260. The German scholar also emphasized the style and compactness of the speech which suggest its importance.

Along the same lines, but proceeding more from an analysis of the structure of Luke's complete narrative and his theological purposes, Paul Schubert argued that the speech in Athens is 'the final climactic part of his exposition' because it 'is not only a hellenized but also a universalized version of Luke's *βουλή*-theology.'⁶ Less categorical about the climactic status of the speech in the book of Acts, Jacques Dupont nonetheless concluded that Luke had sought to make this pericope the climax of Paul's *missionary* career. For the Belgian scholar, the fact that Luke chose to situate Paul's discourse to the Gentiles in Athens, a city in which his ministry was clearly not as important as in Corinth and Ephesus, and which was not at all an important political place, shows that he wants to sketch a symbolic scene of significance: 'la rencontre du message évangélique avec la sagesse des Grecs.'⁷

Of course, past scholars have also been impressed by the compactness, the rhetorical flourish, and the sophisticated interaction with Greek philosophy displayed in the pericope of Acts 17. Clearly Luke seemed to have crafted this passage with particular care and thus given it a special importance. But above all, it is Acts' apparent concern with the spread of the gospel to the Gentiles and Paul as a 'light to the nations' (Acts 13:47) which played a crucial role in their assessment of the centrality of this pericope in the account of the first Christian historian.⁸

Today, few exegetes would argue that Acts 17 is *the* climax of Luke's narrative.⁹ There is indeed little in the overall structure of Acts to suggest that this pericope is climactic or even central in Acts.¹⁰ But it has remained a crucial text to assess how Luke situates or describes Christianity's position towards the Gentile world, a problematic which lies at the heart of the Lukan project and has been central in scholarship on Luke-Acts for at least two centuries. As Daniel Marguerat summarizes:

How does he situate Christianity between Jerusalem and Rome – or, alternatively, between Israel and the Roman Empire? Without exaggeration, one could say that the whole history of the interpretation of Luke-Acts unfolds from this problematic. Anyone who wants to

⁶ Schubert 1968: 260–61.

⁷ Dupont 1984: 384–385. Cf. Also Vielhauer (1966: 34) and Schneider (1982: 231).

⁸ The importance of this point is underestimated by Rowe, who concludes that the assessment of those scholars is due to 'the academic inclination of the interpreters in questions that has led them to value the explicitly philosophical speech above other parts of the narrative' (Rowe 2009: 191, n.82). For Luke as the first Christian historian, cf. Marguerat 2004.

⁹ See, however, Fitzmyer (1998: 601) who calls it a 'major speech,' and Schnabel (2005: 176) who describes it as 'a key passage in the Book of Acts.' Rothschild (2014: 1) speaks of 'a literary crest of the overall narrative.'

¹⁰ As Johnson (1992: 319) rightly notes: 'It is not the end of the book, not its singular climax, but another in a series of symbolic encounters between the word of the gospel and the many aspects of the world it was destined to transform.'

establish the theological aim of Luke's writing must first determine how the author positions Christianity in relation to Judaism and in relation to the pagan world.¹¹

The pericope of Acts 17 has thus played an important role in scholarship's attempt to understand Acts' attitude towards the Gentiles, the Graeco-Roman world more generally, and thus Luke's overall purpose in writing the Acts of the Apostles.

For example, for Marguerat, Acts 17 is 'window on Luke's purpose to present 'a Christianity between Jerusalem and Rome' and illustrates his 'theological programme of integration.'¹² According to the Swiss scholar, the author of Acts has composed a speech which can be read from a Greek and a Jewish perspective until verse 31, thus underscoring that God is the God of the Greek and the Jew.¹³ Luke uses this device of semantic ambivalence several times in his work in the service of his theological project of presenting 'Christianity as both the fulfilment of the promises of Scriptures and as the answer to the religious quest of the Graeco-Roman world.'¹⁴

Very differently, Jacob Jervell sees the speech as wholly condemnatory of the Gentiles. Not only so, but the discourse – which is the only substantial speech delivered to a broader Gentile audience in Acts – is *not* a missionary speech, for it does *not* present the gospel. For Jervell this substantiates his thesis articulated since the 1970s over against the then general tendency among scholars to read Acts as an anti-Jewish and pro-Roman document. Indeed, according to him, the book of Acts is not concerned with the progress of the gospel among Gentiles outside of the synagogue, but only among Jews and God-fearers.¹⁵ According to this interpretation then, Graeco-Roman culture cannot in any way serve as a preparation for, or an ally in, the proclamation of the gospel. Only the Jewish context – i.e. the synagogue – and the Jewish Scriptures serve this function for Luke.

Another reading has been advanced recently by Kavin Rowe in an article published in *NTS* in 2011. Arguing against the interpretation of the Areopagus speech (Acts 17:16–34) as an attempt at theological rapprochement (*Anknüpfungspunkt*) between Christianity and Greek philosophy, Rowe proposes that it describes a fundamentally different grammar for the whole of life which conflicts with pagan tradition. The message presented by the speech in Athens is

¹¹ Marguerat 2004: 65.

¹² Marguerat 2004: 65–66. Marguerat develops this thesis in his essay 'A Christianity between Jerusalem and Rome' in Marguerat 2004, and in his commentary (2015).

¹³ Marguerat 2004: 71–72.

¹⁴ Marguerat 2004: 76.

¹⁵ Jervell 1998: 455: 'Dies liegt daran, dass die Heidenmission für Lukas nicht mit der Areopagrede und dem ausserjüdischen Heidentum zusammenhängt, sondern mit den Gottesfürchtigen in den Synagogen. Lukas hat also die knappen Nachrichten aus dem Bericht des Paulus in Athen VV 16f. und 34 zu einer Szene ausgestaltet, die das Nein der Kirche zum ausserjüdischen Heidentum darlegt.' Cf. Jervell 1972.

thus fundamentally in conflict with Greek philosophical teaching. Rowe's article was an extension of his treatment of the Areopagus speech in his book *World Upside Down* (2009), where he defends the thesis that the book of Acts depicts the early Christian movement as subversive of Graeco-Roman culture, but emphatically innocent of political sedition.

A final example is provided by Joshua Jipp's article published in *JBL* two years later, where he contends that Luke has composed a speech which resonates with *both* Jewish and Greek traditions, thereby appropriating elements of Greek culture both to criticize aspects of it, and to exalt 'the Christian movement as comprising the best features of Greco-Roman philosophical sensibilities.'¹⁶ Jipp points out that this reading corroborates other scholarly contributions on Acts which have highlighted the way Luke appropriates elements of Graeco-Roman script and culture, mimicking aspects of it in order to demonstrate that the Christian movement contains the best aspects of Graeco-Roman tradition and criticize competing movements.¹⁷

As those examples show, Acts 17 has become a window or a test case through which Luke's view of early Christianity's relation to the Gentiles and Graeco-Roman culture – including its politics, philosophy, and piety – is assessed; this perspective then is thought to shed important light on his literary purpose. At the same time, the strong differences and even incongruity between those interpretations of Acts 17 draws attention to the enduring conundrum which has marked the history of interpretation of this fascinating episode: the tension between the discourse's criticism of the Athenians' religion as 'ignorance' and idolatry, and yet the speech's apparent appeal to Greek philosophical religious common places to articulate the Christian message. As a result, the Areopagus speech's stance towards the Graeco-Roman world and pagan religiosity in particular has long been interpreted in very different and even radically opposite ways. At one end of the spectrum interpreters argue that the speech is to be understood along the lines of an anti-idol polemic denouncing the idolatry of the Athenians. The discourse is thus critical of Athenian religiosity through and through.¹⁸ At the other end, the speech is interpreted as a discourse on the true knowledge of God which, building upon the 'inkling' of the notion of the true God demonstrated by Athenian religiosity and/or philosophy, presents the true and only God to the Athenians and corrects their misunderstandings.¹⁹

To shed new light on this enduring debate, the present project suggests a fresh perspective on this pericope based on a different approach to the 'Greek' material included in the speech. Before describing the approach taken in the

¹⁶ Jipp 2012: 576 and 568 respectively.

¹⁷ Jipp 2012: 569.

¹⁸ E.g. Gärtner 1955; Dunn 1996; Jervell 1998.

¹⁹ E.g. Dibelius 1939; Haenchen 1971.

present work, however, it will be helpful to discuss some of the ways past scholarship has interpreted the speech's use and allusions to Greek philosophy, and to assess whether those approaches have led to a convincing interpretation of the discourse in Athens.

1.2 Some Main Lines in Past Scholarship

At least since the time of Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–c. 215 CE), exegetes have noticed the presence of Greek material and echoes to philosophy in the Areopagus speech.²⁰ Apart from the explicit quote from Aratus who is referred to as 'one of the poets' of the Athenians in v. 28, several motifs of the speech recall Greek philosophical formulations, such as the assertion that the divinity does not live in temples, that it has no need, or the reference to the divine appointment of seasons. While the great majority of exegetes in the 20th century has concurred that the speech in Athens is hellenized, there has been wide disagreement as to the extent or nature of this hellenization, and how it is to be interpreted in this pericope.²¹ This section discusses some of the main ways this phenomenon has been interpreted since the early 20th century, highlighting some of the problems and methodological concerns created by past approaches but also how some contributions point towards a new possibility to examine this question.²²

1.2.1 Jewish-Christian Grundmotiv and Stoic Begleitmotiv (Norden)

It is Eduard Norden who, with *Agnostos Theos* (1913), brought the question of the relationship between Jewish and Greek material in the speech to the fore of scholarly discussion. Norden saw the discourse in Athens as reflecting a tradition of mission speeches on the true knowledge of God. Highlighting the many parallels between the speech in Athens and the other speeches in Acts, he argued that the discourse is composed of a basic '*jüdisch-christliches*

²⁰ Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata* 1.19 is the earliest attestation to an identification of a quotation from Aratus' *Phaenomena* in Acts 17:28.

²¹ 'Hellenization' is used in a broad sense, and includes, for example, the adoption of Greek form, argumentation, terminology or authors.

²² The literature on this pericope is almost endless, but reviews of past scholarship remain almost non-existent, even in the two unique (!) monographs consecrated to this passage (Gärtner 1955; Rothschild 2014). To my knowledge, the most complete overview of scholarship is found in Zwick's unpublished dissertation, where he traces what scholars have said about natural revelation in Acts 17 (1985: 1–37). See also the overview in Dupont 1984: 396–403. Our analysis neither seeks comprehensiveness nor to differentiate between all nuances adopted by past exegetes. Rather it focuses on some of the major interpretations which have been or are still influential in scholarship, or contributions which are particularly helpful for our methodological reflection in the next section.

Grundmotiv’ into which has been inserted ‘*ein stoisches Begleitmotiv*’ which represents an adaptation of this basic motif to the Hellenistic audience at hand. This *Begleitmotiv*, expressed in verses 26–28, refers to the assertion that although the divine is invisible, its existence is revealed through the visible world, a common theme in Hellenistic philosophy and especially in Stoicism. According to Norden, the author of the speech inherited the practice of including Greek knowledge about the divine from Hellenistic Judaism, which often used support from Greek philosophers who had criticized popular conceptions of the gods in their anti-idol polemics. In particular, the Stoa and its pantheism provided an easy bridge to Jewish and Christian monotheism. For Norden, this arrangement between Jewish-Christian and philosophical motifs reflects an adaptation of the apostolic preaching to its Hellenistic audience, a practice which was anticipated in Hellenistic Judaism.²³

Although several of Norden’s other proposals in *Agnostos Theos* failed to convince exegetes,²⁴ his explanation of the speech in terms of a Jewish-Christian main motif into which are integrated Stoic motifs set the debate on the relationship between Jewish and Greek material in the speech on the agenda of scholarly discussion on the Areopagus for much of the 20th century, and many scholars were to view the relationship between Jewish and Greek motifs along similar lines.

1.2.2 *A Philosophical Sermon on the Knowledge of God (Dibelius, Pohlenz, Balch)*

While Norden had interpreted the philosophical material of the speech as a *Begleitmotiv* integrated in a typical missionary speech, Dibelius (1939) argued that the whole speech is a *philosophical sermon* on the true knowledge of God.²⁵ Departing from Norden’s form criticism and the question of the influence of tradition on the speech, Dibelius began his analysis with the discourse itself which he saw as a ‘*sinnvolles Ganzes*’ whose composition had been significantly shaped by the author. Starting with verses 26–27, he interpreted them as a reference to the manifestation of divine providence in the arrangement of the seasons and the habitable zones of the earth which, in philosophy, serve as proofs of divine existence and providence and ‘are intended to induce men to seek after God.’²⁶ He thus concluded that the rest of the speech must also be interpreted against this philosophical background to become intelligible.

²³ Norden 1913: 29.

²⁴ Norden’s thesis that Acts 17 was inserted in Acts by a second-century writer who composed it based on a speech from Apollonius of Tyana failed to convince exegetes. See especially Harnack’s refutation (1913).

²⁵ Dibelius 1956b: 26–77.

²⁶ Dibelius 1956a: 34.

Dibelius did not deny that some themes in the speech come originally from the Old Testament, such as the affirmation that God is the creator of the world or that he does not live in temples. But he argued that those themes have been hellenized. For example, the speech uses the terminology of *cosmos* rather than the terminology of ‘heaven and earth’ as does the Old Testament. Likewise, the *via negationis* way of talking about God, such as the assertion that he does not need anything, although it came to be used in Hellenistic Judaism and early Christianity, originates from Greek philosophy rather than from the Old Testament. Dibelius also saw verse v. 28 as affirming a pantheistic worldview and thus depicting humanity’s relationship with God in a way which totally departs from the Old Testament.²⁷

Importantly then, for Dibelius, it is ‘not only subsidiary motifs’ which are derived from Stoicism in the speech, but its main idea, which is that knowledge of God can be attained through nature and humanity’s inner knowledge of God. He thus concluded that ‘the Areopagus speech is a Hellenistic speech with a Christian ending.’²⁸ This led the German scholar to the strange and now famous conclusion that the speech is ‘a foreign body’ not only in Acts but in the whole New Testament. For stylistic reasons, however, Dibelius nonetheless believed that the speech is the composition of the author of Acts who thus pens a paradigmatic sermon on how one should preach to the Gentiles around 90 CE.

Following Dibelius, several scholars continued to interpret the speech in Acts 17 as essentially describing a philosophical argument about the knowledge of God, although they sometimes challenged his interpretation of parts of the speech.²⁹ Most influentially, Max Pohlenz, who argued that the speech has strong similarities with the teachings of the Stoic Posidonius (c. 135 BCE – c. 51 BCE), presented several modifications to Dibelius’ interpretation but concurred with him that the subject of the speech is ‘eine heidnische Theorie der natürlichen Gotteserkenntnis.’³⁰ For him, the Christian speech simply overtakes this Stoic doctrine as an attempt to seek common ground with his Gentile audience, as its mention of the verse from Aratus in v. 28 demonstrates.³¹

In the decades which followed, Dibelius and Pohlenz were regularly criticized for underestimating the importance of the Old Testament background of the speech.³² Furthermore, later scholars confirmed that the ‘Greek’ or ‘Stoic’ ideas identified in the speech were already present in Hellenistic Jewish

²⁷ Dibelius 1956a: 52. For Dibelius, what the speech affirms at this point has nothing to do with the OT idea that humanity is created in God’s image.

²⁸ Dibelius 1956a: 57–58.

²⁹ Pohlenz 1949, Vielhauer 1950–1951, Eltester 1957, Hommel 1955.

³⁰ Pohlenz 1949: 95.

³¹ Pohlenz 1949: 89–90. Note that Pohlenz points out that the speech uses Stoic teaching to teach the Christian God and not the Stoic one. The speech thus reinterprets Aratus theistically.

³² See 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 below.

sources and apologetic, thereby suggesting a different context than Stoicism for their origin and their interpretation. With the move of scholarship away from source to redaction and narrative criticism, several exegetes also criticized this interpretation for reading the speech's argument within a Stoic framework and not within the new framework suggested by the speech and its context.³³ In particular, this interpretation overlooks the new framework of the speech created by the anti-idol polemic and its Christological climax.

Despite this criticism, some commentators still claim that Paul's speech is 'a reflection on Stoic theology'³⁴ or that the general 'intellectual background of the speech' is Stoic.³⁵ Furthermore, in recent years, a similar reading which takes better into account the polemical context of the speech has been advanced by David Balch. Balch argues that the speech presents a Posidonian Stoic argument over against contemporary Stoicism – represented by Dio Chrysostom (c. 40 – c. 120 CE) – which was characterized by a rapprochement with popular religion. He concludes that 'Luke-Acts guards the legitimate philosophical tradition against the Athenians who delight in novelties.'³⁶ This thesis, however, does not avoid all the criticisms mentioned earlier. In addition to these, it can also be pointed out that this interpretation does not explain why the Athenians perceived Paul to be propagating a 'new teaching' (v.19) if he was simply propounding Stoic doctrine, nor how the resurrection of a man who would judge the world would fit well with the attempt to 'guard the legitimate philosophical tradition.'

1.2.3 *A Thoroughly Jewish Speech: Downplaying the Importance of Greek Material (Gärtner)*

At the opposite of Dibelius' thesis, some exegetes have downplayed the importance of Greek elements in the speech, and interpreted the discourse as making an essentially Jewish argument.³⁷

In 1955, Bertil Gärtner published a dissertation which, over against Dibelius and Pohlenz's interpretation, argued that the speech is to be interpreted against a Jewish and especially an Old Testament background. Gärtner contended that the adduced parallels with Stoic arguments and theology are deceiving because those arguments need to be examined in their contexts before they can be considered appropriate parallels. Methodologically then, Gärtner proceeded to

³³ E.g., Dupont 1984: 414.

³⁴ Walaskay 1998: 166.

³⁵ Pervo 2009: 430.

³⁶ Balch 1990: 79.

³⁷ In a different manner, in her recent book on *Paul in Athens* (2014), Clare K. Rothschild also downplays the importance of Greek philosophy but argues that the speech is rather to be interpreted in light of the traditions associated with Epimenides. Rothschild's thesis is idiosyncratic in scholarship and will not be discussed here. For a brief assessment, see Cuany 2016.

analyse different themes of the speech – such as the knowledge of God from nature, the conception of God or the polemic against idolatry – in the Old Testament, Hellenistic Jewish literature and Stoic writings, paying particular attention to their function and context in the theology represented in each literature. He concluded that while some of those themes and corresponding terminology can be found in both Jewish and Stoic literature, they do not function in the same way in both. Most importantly, the reference to the knowledge of God available from nature functions in Jewish literature to criticize false worship and idolatry (e.g. Wis 13–15) and not to build arguments about the existence of God as in Stoicism. Likewise, knowledge of God from nature in the Areopagus speech is not used to prove the existence of God like in Stoic arguments as claimed by Dibelius, but to build an anti-idol polemic.³⁸

For Gärtner then, the matrix out of which the speech comes is clearly the Old Testament and Judaism more generally. Without denying that the speech contains philosophical terminology, nor that it displays a rapprochement with philosophical ideas which is otherwise not found in the New Testament,³⁹ Gärtner emphasizes the necessity to distinguish between the ‘*assimilation* between Christian and Gentile-philosophical doctrines’ and ‘a clear-headed *adaptation* to the listeners’ phraseology that does not overshadow the specifically Jewish-Christian content.⁴⁰ For Gärtner the speech in Athens clearly falls in the second category, an interpretation which he saw as confirmed by the Athenians’ perception of Paul as a *spermologos*, which shows that they perceived him to be some kind of ‘eclectic.’⁴¹ The convergence of the argument with Greek philosophy is thus very limited and can be explained by the preaching style of diaspora Judaism.

Gärtner’s contribution, with the article of Wolfgang Nauck discussed in the next section, played an important role in highlighting the importance of the Old Testament and Jewish background of the speech, and in challenging Dibelius’ interpretation. He was, however, frequently criticized for underestimating the importance of the ‘Greek’ elements of the speech and his attempt to trace almost the entirety of the speech to a Jewish-biblical background failed to convince many exegetes.⁴²

More importantly for our purposes, and although this has not often been pointed out, Gärtner examines the way those motifs are used in two traditions – the Old Testament/Jewish and Stoic – and does not consider the possibility that the speech could be doing something totally different and new with them

³⁸ Gärtner 1955: 169.

³⁹ Gärtner 1955: 71.

⁴⁰ Gärtner 1955: 72 (my emphasis).

⁴¹ Gärtner 1955: 72.

⁴² See, however, Stenschke (1999: 203–224) who interprets the speech almost with no reference to the Greek material.

in a Christian speech. Methodologically, it is not so much the *origin* of the different motifs and ideas of the speech which is key here to interpret it, but how the discourse *as it stands in Acts 17* compares to the teachings of Hellenistic philosophy at this time.⁴³ In this light, and from a narrational perspective, Gärtner's interpretation of the Greek material as reflecting a purely 'formal' or terminological adaptation does not sufficiently take into account the fact that the final form of the speech does sound strangely similar to some of the things said by Hellenistic philosophers and that in the narrative it is addressed *to an audience at least partly made of Hellenistic philosophers*. Not only so, but the speech itself appeals to the poets of the audience, thereby seeking some kind of common ground at least explicitly at one point. Consequently, interpretations of the speech which – like Gärtner's – seek to explain its elements by appealing to a Jewish or Christian framework which would have been unknown to the audience of the speech depicted by the author all create tensions for the narrative realism of the pericope.

1.2.4 *The Mixed Nature of the Speech and Hellenistic Jewish Preaching (Nauck)*

In his long article published in 1956, Wolfgang Nauck moved back to tradition and form criticism, and argued that both the content and the structure of the speech can be explained against the tradition of Hellenistic Jewish preaching.⁴⁴ His publication defended three major points.

First, criticizing Dibelius for going too far in attempting to explain some motifs against the background of Greek philosophy, Nauck argued that the speech is mixed and shows a very close connection between Old Testament and Greek motifs. Furthermore, the speech hellenizes Old Testament teaching, sometimes to the point that this teaching has been reinterpreted within a Greek framework. Thus, in v. 28 the Old Testament motif of the creation of humanity in God's image has been reinterpreted along the lines of the Greek motif of the divine kinship of humanity. For Nauck, Luke is not the author of this convergence and hellenization of motifs, but he inherited it from Hellenistic Judaism.⁴⁵

Furthermore, Nauck argued that the Areopagus speech is structured along the schema of 'creation, conservation and salvation' (*Schöpfung – Erhaltung – Heil*), and claimed that this model can be found in the missionary practice of Hellenistic Judaism.⁴⁶ For him, the presence of this schema taken over from Hellenistic Judaism excludes the validity of Dibelius' proposal about the subject of the speech being Stoic theology, for it shows that the framework of the

⁴³ Pervo 2009: 430, n.51, mentions this problem.

⁴⁴ Nauck mentions that he finished his article before seeing Gärtner's publication.

⁴⁵ Nauck 1956: 122–23.

⁴⁶ Nauck 1956: 31. For a similar kind of argument, cf. Lebram 1964.

Index of References

Old and New Testament

<i>Genesis</i>		46:7	159
1:26–27	158	59:10	143
27:12	143		
27:21–22	143	<i>Daniel</i>	
		7:22	168
<i>Exodus</i>			
32–34	144	<i>Luke</i>	
		1:11	136
<i>Numbers</i>		11:51	136
23	135	20:35	168
3:10	135	20:38	145
		24:46–47	162
<i>Deuteronomy</i>			
28:29	143	<i>Acts</i>	
4:28	154	1	1
		2	169
<i>Joshua</i>		2:24	189
22	135	2:38	162
		3:26	162
<i>Judges</i>		4:1–2	189
16:26	143	13:47	2
		14:8–19	135
<i>1 Samuel</i>		14:11	170
12 :21	159	14:15–17	1
		14:17	141, 142, 152
<i>Job</i>		17:11	143
5:14	143	18:12–13	39
12:25	143	19:23–27	135
		19:26	154
<i>Psalms</i>		20:16	143
113:15	143, 145	23:6	188
115:4–8	155, 167	24:2–4	39
115:5–7	159	24:14	43
134:17	143, 145	24:15–16	162
		24:25	162
<i>Isaiah</i>		25:20	143
40:18–20	155	26:20	162
42:17	154	27:12	143
44:9–17	154	27:39	143

28	1, 37	<i>1 Corinthians</i>	
28:4	37	14:10	143
		15:37	143
<i>Romans</i>			
1	11, 148	<i>Titus</i>	
		1:12	146, 147, 149

Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha et Qumran Scrolls

<i>Wisdom</i>		17:3	158
3:7–8	168		
13–15	9	<i>2 Enoch</i>	
13:10	159	65:2	158
13:10–14:10	154		
14:29	164	<i>1QpHab</i>	
		5:4	168
<i>Sirach</i>			

Ancient Authors

Aeschylus		<i>De civitate Dei (Civ.)</i>	
<i>Eumenides (Eum.)</i>		6.10	108, 156
647–648	36, 161	6.10.1	108
		6.10.2	108, 112
Aratus		6.10.3	109
<i>Phaenomena (Phaen.)</i>		6.10.4	112
1–18	150–151	6.10.5	109
5	148	6.10.6	108
		6.10.6–7	108
Aristotle		Callimachus	
<i>Rhetorica (Rhet.)</i>		<i>Hymn to Zeus</i>	
3.14.12 (1415b 37–38)132		8	147
Arius Didymus		Cassius Dio	
<i>Epitome of Stoic Ethic</i>		52.36.1–2	38
10χ	57		
Athenaeus		Chrysippus	
<i>Deipnosophistae (Deipn.)</i>		<i>Fragmenta moralia</i>	
8	104	394.16	104
8.344C	34	408.4	104
		409.16	104
		411.8	104
Augustine			

Cicero		<i>Theologiae Graecae Compendium</i>	
		35	57
<i>De divinatione (Div.)</i>		Demosthenes	
1.87	94		
2.19	117	<i>Contra Boeotum I (1 Boeot.)</i>	
2.83	117	19.281	38
2.83–85	117		
<i>De natura deorum (ND)</i>		<i>De corona (Cor.)</i>	
1.41	112	18.127	34
1.45	88, 91, 94	Dio Chrysostom	
1.55–56	93, 117	<i>Orationes (Or.)</i>	
1.54	89	12.44	113
1.85	94	12.59	113
1.116	95	12.60	113
1.116–117	96	12.76–77	113
1.117	58, 88, 97, 104	12.60–61	144
1.121	97	12.80–81	156
1.122	98	12.48.5	81
2	110	13.35.5	81
2.10	89	31.146.7	81
2.12	111	32.5.2	81
2.19	117	32.9	34
2.58	110	54.3	42
2.62	37, 114	61.9	81
2.63–64	106	75.5.3	81
2.70–71	105, 112	77/78.30.1	81
2.71	111	fragment 6	81
2.71–153	110		
2.71–72	104	Diodorus Siculus, 61, 63	
2.83–85	117	1.2.2	64
2.140	110	1.65.2	64
2.147	110	1.70.8	60
2.154–167	110	1.79.2	60
2.163	111	1.83.8	60
3.52	118	1.92.5	64
3.78	118	1.93.3	64
3.82–83	118	1.96.5	64
3.90	118	3.6.3	60
3.93	118	4.8.5	64
Clement of Alexandria		4.18.22	64
<i>Stromata</i>		4.39.1	64
1.19	5, 132	4.46.4	64
1.59	146	4.51.1	60
5.12.76	113–114	4.51.3	62
Cornutus		4.52.2	64
		5.7.7	64
		5.27.4	60

- | | | | |
|---|---------|--|-----------------|
| 5.63.3 | 60 | 19.5 | 34 |
| 5.79.2 | 168 | | |
| 7.12.7 | 64 | <i>De Thucydide (Thuc.)</i> | |
| 8.12.8 | 65 | 42–46 | 28 |
| 8.15.2 | 64 | | |
| 8.15.5 | 64 | Epictetus | |
| 11.89.6 | 60 | <i>Dissertationes (Diss.)</i> | |
| 11.89.8 | 60 | 2.8.12–23 | 157 |
| 12.20.3 | 64 | 2.8.15–7 | 113 |
| 12.57.4 | 64–65 | 3.1.37 | 111 |
| 13.12.6 | 65 | 3.2.4 | 111 |
| 13.86.3 | 60 | 3.21.12–16 | 111 |
| 14.77.4 | 63 | 3.7.26 | 111 |
| 15.53.4 | 65 | | |
| 15.54.4 | 60 | <i>Enchiridion (Ench.)</i> | |
| 17.41.5–6 | 60–61 | 31.1–4 | 116 |
| 17.41.6 | 60 | 31.2 | 111 |
| 17.41.8 | 60 | 31.5 | 111 |
| 18.61.3 | 61–62 | | |
| 19.108.2 | 60 | <i>Fragments (frag.)</i> | |
| 20.14.5 | 60 | 32 | 111 |
| 20.43.1 | 60 | | |
| 21.17.4 | 64 | Epicurus | |
| 23.11.1 | 65 | <i>Epistle to Herodotus (Ep. Hdt.)</i> | |
| 27.4.5 | 60 | 81 | 88 |
| 27.4.8 | 60 | 76–78 | 92 |
| 32.12.1 | 60, 63 | | |
| 32.12.3 | 60 | <i>Epistle to Menoecus (Ep. Men.)</i> | |
| 33.5.2 | 65 | 123 | 90, 95, 100–101 |
| 34/5.10.1 | 60 | 123–124 | 94 |
| 34/5.2.47 | 60, 63 | 124 | 102 |
| 36.13.2 | 60 | | |
| | | <i>Kuriai Doxai (KA)</i> | |
| Diogenes Laertius | | 1 | 90–91 |
| 1.112 | 146–147 | | |
| 2.20 | 42 | Epiphanius | |
| 2.21 | 42 | <i>Adversus haereses</i> | |
| 2.40 | 42 | 3.2.9 | 224 |
| 2.45 | 42 | | |
| 2.122 | 42 | Herodotus | |
| 7.119 | 139 | 6.58 | 33 |
| 10.4–9 | 93 | Homer | |
| 10.10 | 94 | <i>Odyssea</i> | |
| 10.123 | 90 | 9.416 | 143 |
| 10.139 | 90 | | |
| | | Josephus | |
| Dionysius of Halicarnassus | | | |
| <i>Antiquitates romanae (Ant. rom.)</i> | | | |

<i>Against Apion (Ag. Ap.)</i>		2.119–166	43
1.208	69	2.174	70
1.212	70	2.230	70
1.224	73	4.393	73
2.130	49, 83	7.430	73
2.262–268	38		
2.263	42	Justin	
<i>Jewish Antiquities (Ant.)</i>		<i>Apologia i (1 Apol.)</i>	
1–5	33	5.4	42
4.31	72	<i>Apologia ii (2 Apol.)</i>	
5.116	72	10.5–6	42
5.327	72	Lactantius	
6.78	73	<i>Divinae Institutiones (Inst.)</i>	
6.90	73	3.17.7	92
6.127	72	<i>De ira Dei</i>	
6.265	72	13.19	92
7.269	73	Livy	
8.121	72	45.27.11	33
8.13	73	9.29.10	89
8.208	72	Lucian	
10.42	69	<i>De saltatione (Salt.)</i>	
11.239	73	45	36
12.255	73	<i>How to write history</i>	
12.259	73	58	28
12.278	73	Lucretius	
12.304	73	<i>De rerum natura</i>	
12.5	70	1.102–111	88
12.6	70	1.102–116	98
12.259	71	1.104–106	88
13.243	73	1.146–158	88
14.226	71	1.44–48	91
14.228	71	1.62–69	89
14.232	71	1.80–101	89
14.234	71	2.1090–92	89
14.237	71	2.646–651	91
14.240	71	5.1198–1203	95
14.72	73	5.195–324	92
15.277	70	5.8	96
16.172	73	5.82–90	92
18.11	43		
19.290	71, 80		
<i>Jewish War</i>			
1.108	69		
1.110	69		
1.113	69		
1.630	73		
1.633	73		

- 5.84–90 89
 6.68–78 102
 6.73–78 95
- Pausanias
 1.17.1 33, 35, 49, 83
- Philo
Decalogue (Dec.)
 7076 154
- Quod Deus sit immutabilis (Deus)*
 164.1 58
- Philodemus of Gadara
De musica
 Col. 4.6 94
- De pietate*
 Col. 3–36, 72–102 93–94
 Col. 20, 558–9 94
 Col. 25, 701–702 44
 Col. 27, 765–73 101
 Col. 28, 798 94
 Col. 28, 808–10 94
 Col. 31, 873–898 102
 Col. 31, 879–82 94
 Col. 32, 910–1 94
 Col. 36–59 100
 Col. 37, 1045–9 102
 Col. 39–40,
 1127–46 100
 Col. 39–40,
 1127–46 94, 96
 Col. 39–40,
 1127–55 100
 Col. 40, 1135–6 87
 Col. 46–47,
 1306–1344 98
 Col. 49, 1395–1402 96
 Col. 49–50,
 1412–1425 99
 Col. 53, 1505–32 93
 Col. 60–86 100
 Col. 64, 1850 94
 Col. 71, 2032–260 95
 Col. 76, 2203 95
- Col. 76–77 102
 Col. 77, 2233–41 102
 Col. 78, 2263–5 95, 102
 Col. 79, 2278 94
 Col. 80, 2313–20 103
- De pietate (ap. P. Herc. 1428)*
 Col. 4.16–26 112
 Col. 13–15 103
 Col. 14.32–15.8 97
- Dis* 88
- On Choices and Avoidances*
(P. Herc. 1251) 90
 Col. 10.12–15 87
- Plato
Apologia (Apol.)
 17c 42
 19d 42
 24bc 42
 28e–30e 42
 29d 42
 33a 42
 38a 42
- Euthyphro (Euthyphr.)*
 1c 42
 2c 42
 3b 42
- Leges*
 4.715 E–716A 98
- Phaedo*
 99b 143
- Respublica (Resp.)*
 454a 42
- Adversus Colotem (Adv. Col.)*
 1124E–1125A 98
- Aemilius Paullus (Aem.)*
 1.5 80
 3.2 139

		548CD	92
<i>Alcibiades (Alc.)</i>		549E	78
36	34	551D	163
		555A3	76, 80
<i>An vitiositas ad infelicitatem sufficiat (An vit.)</i>		<i>De Soicorum repugnantiis (Stoic. rep.)</i>	
500A	80	1034B–C	113
		1048	119
<i>Apophthegmata laconia (Apoph. lac.)</i>		1049A–D	119
238D1	77	1049D–E	119
		1049F–1050D	119
<i>Aratus (Arat.)</i>		1050D–1051A	119
53.2.3	76	1051DE	97, 110
		1051E	110
<i>Camillus (Cam.)</i>		1052B	97
19.8.4	76		
21.3.1	78	<i>De superstitione (Superst.)</i>	
6.6	78	165EF	77
		165B	107
<i>Cimon (Cim.)</i>		165BC	57, 76, 79
13.6	35	165D	57, 76
		166B7	77
<i>Comparatio Lyncurgi et Numae (Comp. Lyc. Num)</i>		167D–E	123, 127
1.1.5	77	168BC	76
		168C	76
<i>Conjugalium Precepta (Conj. praec.)</i>		168F6	80
140D8	80	169A	77
		169C	70, 72, 77
<i>Consolatio ad Apollonium</i>		169F–170A	107
120B4	77	170A	105
108F8	77	170B	76
		171F	58
<i>Crassus (Crass.)</i>		171F5	77
16.6.7	78	<i>Lysander (Lys.)</i>	
		25.2.4	77
<i>De Iside et Osiride (Is. Os.)</i>		<i>Marcus Coriolanus (Cor.)</i>	
11	75	25.2	78
354E	78	25.3	78
379C–D	127		
382AC	156	<i>Moralia (Mor.)</i>	
		1051E	75
<i>De latenter vivendo (Lat. viv.)</i>		<i>Nicias (Nic.)</i>	
1128D8	80	23.1.4	77
<i>De recta ratione audiendi (Rect. rat. aud.)</i>		<i>Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum (Suav. viv.)</i>	
43D11	77		
<i>De sera numinis vindicta (Sera)</i>			

1092B	88	12.24.5	81
1092AB	88	16.12.9	81
1100F	87–88, 99		
1101D9	57, 76		
1101DE	82, 122	Seneca	
1102B	94	<i>De beneficiis</i>	
1102BC	97	1.3.2–4.6	106
1105C	99	1.6.2	111
1105C–1106A	99	1.6.3	116
1091BC	96	4.28.1–4	116
<i>Numa (Num.)</i>		<i>De clementia</i>	
8.3.9	77	2.5.1	107
14.2.9	77		
22.7.10	77	<i>De providentia</i>	
<i>Pericles (Per.)</i>		1.4–6	116
6.1	77	<i>Epistulae morales (Ep.)</i>	
<i>Publicola (Publ.)</i>		22.15	107
21.2.1	77	31.11	156–157
		95.49	109–110
		95.49–50	114–115
<i>Quaestiones romanae et graecae (Quaest. rom.)</i>		121.4.2	107
277F4	76	123.16	107
272B9	78	<i>Naturales quaestiones (Nat.)</i>	
<i>Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat (Adol. poet. aud.)</i>		7.1.2.78	107
34E6	77	<i>Thyestes (Thy.)</i>	
<i>Romulus (Rom.)</i>		678	107
11.5.3	76	Sextus Empiricus	
22.1, 79		<i>Adversus physicos</i>	
24.2.1	77	1.123	139
		1.124	96
<i>Solon (Sol.)</i>		Sophocles	
12.6.1	77	<i>Oedipus coloneus</i>	
<i>Fragments (frag.)</i>		260	49, 83
67.2	77	Stobaeus	
Polybius		II, 147, 1–3	58
4.20.2	81	Strabo	
5.10.6	81	1.2.8	66, 67, 68
5.12.1	81	3.2.13	68
6.56.8	81		
9.19.1	81		
10.2.9	81		

4.1.13	66		
5.4.5	66		
6.2.3	68		
7.3.3	67–68		
7.3.4	67		
12.73	67		
13.1.26	68		
15.1.60	68		
16.2.36	68		
16.2.37	67		
Theophrastus			
<i>Characters</i>			
16	53–54		
16.1	57		
Thucydides			
<i>Peloponnesian War</i>			
		1.22.1	28
		2.60–4	28
		7.42	61
		8.66	61
Virgil			
<i>Aeneid (Aen.)</i>			
		8.364–365	156
Xenophon			
<i>Memorabilia (Mem.)</i>			
		1.1.1	42
		1.1.3	42
		1.1.10	42
<i>Apologia Socratis (Apol.)</i>			
		10–11	42

Index of Authors

- Aitken, J.K. 25, 192
Algra, Keimpe 112–116, 126, 132
Attridge, Harold W. 109, 111, 112
- Balch, David 6, **8**, 15
Barclay, John M.G. 24
Barnes, T. D. 40
Barrett, C. K. 14–17, 20, 35, 41, 85, 133, 134, 135, 137, 145, 154
Baur, F. C. 23, 35, 134
Baroja, Julio Caro 81–82
Bremmer, Jan 56
Brenk, Frederick 50, 75–6, 79
Bultmann, Rudolf 14, 133
- Conzelmann, Hans 1, 11, **12–14**, 20, 48, 134, 145, 154, 159, 182, 189
- Davies, Janson 81
Dibelius, Martin 1, 4, **6–8**, 9–11, 26, 28, 35, 41, 50, 83, 133–134, 142, 148, 158, 161, 163
Dunlop Gibson, Margaret, and Agnes Smith Lewis 147
Dunn, James D. G. 4, 16, 22–23, 35, 38, 42, 44, 161, 189
Dupont, Jacques 2, 8, 11, 12, 136
- Eltester W. 7, 142
Erbse, Hartmut 75
- Festugière, A.-J. 82, 101
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 2, 29, 146
- Gärtner, Bertil E. 5, **8–11**, 41, 130, 137, 145, 159
Gray, Patrick 49, 51, 54, 55, 58, 74, 75, 87, 123
Grodzynski, Denise 51, 82, 86–87
- Gruen, Erich 25
- Haenchen, Ernest 4, 12, 14–15, 20, 33, 49, 53, 55, 133, 134, 136, 146, 154
Harnack 1, 6
Harris, Rendel J. 146–148
Hengel, Martin 24, 25, 192
Hommel, Hildebrecht 7, 145, 146–148
- Jervell, Jacob, 3, 35, 38, 48, 49, 133, 145, 154, 158, **188**, **190**, **192**
Jipp, Joshua W. 4, **14–18**, 20–21, 123, 130, 145, 146, 158, 158, 192
Johnson, Luke Timothy 1, 2, 29, 38, 48, 146, 154
- Koet, Peter J. 48, 50, **51–55**, 63, 71, 75, 86
- Lake, Kirsopp 146, 147, 148, 149
- Marguerat, Daniel 2–3, 11, 17, 26, 28–29, 33, 41, 42, 145, 146
Martin, Dale B. 48, 50, 51, 53, 55, 58, 59, 61–63, 75, 79, 86, 117, 121, 123, 124, 126
Moellering, H. Armin 48, 49, 52, **53–55**, 75
- Nauck, Wolfgang 9, **10–12**, 13, 24, 158
Nongbri, Brent 56
Norden, Eduard **5–6**, 11, 143, 146, 148
- Opsomer, Jan 29, 75, 120
- Pervo, Richard I. 10, 23, 44, 133, 145, 154, 161, 184
Plümacher, Eckhard 28
Pohlenz, Max **6–8**, 145, 146, **148–149**

- Rothschild, Clare K. 2, 5, 8, 34, 146, 149, 150
- Rowe, Kavin 2, 3–4, 14, **19–22**, 23, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 49, 130, 133, 134, 136, 174, 175, 179, 182, 184
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. 2, 16–17, 20, 38, 188
- Schneider, Gerhard 2, 27
- Schubert, Paul, 2, 26
- Smith, Morton 74–75
- Smith Lewis, Agnes, and Margaret Dunlop Gibson 147
- Soards, Marion L. 1, 26, 28
- Stenschke, Christoph W. 9
- Sterling, Gregory E. 18
- Tannehill, Robert C. 26–27, 188
- Trapp, Michael 43
- Tier, Jost 52
- Vielhauer, Philipp 2, 7, 163
- Van Kooten, George 43
- Walaskay 8, 29
- Wycherley, R.E. 33
- Zahn, Theodor 35–36
- Zeller, Eduard 125
- Zweck, Dean 5

Subject Index

- Academics 41, 75, 97–98, 117–118, 125;
 see also Platonists
- Adam 19, 22
- Aeschylus 36, 161
- Agnostos Theos* (by Eduard Norden) 5–6
- Anknüpfungspunkt* 3, 19, 44, 133; *see also*
 Rapprochement, theological
- Antipater of Tarsus 104
- Anthropomorphic image/representation of
 the gods, *see* Image/representation of
 the gods, anthropomorphic
- Anti-idol polemic, *see* Polemic, anti-idol
- Apologetics 8, **16–18**, 20, 23, 31, 149, 180,
 189, **192–193**
- Appendix, Christian 130, 161, 175, 176
- Aratus 5, 7, 12, 22, 132, 148–151
- Aristobulus 11, 12, 151–152
- Asebeia*, *see* Impiety
- Atheism 17, 29, 52, 57–58, 75, 97, 100
- Augustine 108
- Begleitmotiv* 5–6, 11
- Callimachus 148, 150
- Captatio benevolentiae* 30, 48–49
- Celsus 86
- Characters* (by Theophrastus) 53–54, 56
- Chrysippus 104, 106, 110, 112
- Cicero 58, 87, 88, 96, 104–105
- Cleanthes 106
- Clement of Alexandria 5, 113–114, 132,
 146, 148
- Common ground 7, 10, 12, 14, 16–18, 21–
 23, 24, 25, 41, 46, 140, 201, 202, 214
- Common places, philosophical 18, 35, 41
- Conscience, bad (troubled) 76, 80, 104,
 122
- Contextualization, of the Christian
 message 174, *see also* Preaching, to the
 the Gentiles in Acts
- Cornutus 106
- Creation, doctrine of 16
- ~ of the Stoics 93
- Culture, Graeco-Roman (Gentile, Pagan)
 25, 174–175, 192–193
- Acts 17 as Christian encounter with ~
 1–2, 15, 184
- christianity as fulfillment of ~ 17
- Luke–Acts' attitude towards ~ 2–4, 18,
 31, 174–175, 189, 191–193
- philosophy and religion in ~ 43
- proclaiming foreign divinities in ~ 38
- the christian movement and ~ 191–193
- the christian movement as subversive
 of ~ 4, 19
- trials in ~ 40
- ~ as preparation for the gospel 3
- Curiosity, Athenian 39, 49, 123, 178
- Cynics 34, 126
- De Iside et Osiride* (by Plutarch) 75
- De pietate* (by Philodemus) 96, 100
- De superstitione* (by Plutarch) 50, 55, **74–
 79**, 107, 127
- De superstitione* (by Seneca) 104, 108–
 112
- Deisidaimonia*
- ancient definitions of 56–58
- ~ as criticism of Graeco-Roman
 religion 121, 126, 176
- ~ as criticism of idolatry 121, 130, 176
- ~ as superstition 31, 48–49, 53–56, 82
- contrasted with piety 57, 165, 185
- ~ criticized by Hellenistic philosophers
 85–87, **121–126**, 131, 182–183, 185

- in ancient historians and geographers 60–74
- in Graeco-Roman religion 63–64, 81–83, 121, 131
- in Epicurean philosophers 45, 85, 87–103, **121–126**, 175, 180–181, 185
- in Jewish religion 67, 69–72
- in Stoic philosophers 104–121, **122–126**, 167, 175, 180–181, 185
- in Plutarch 74–80, **121–126**
- modern studies of ~ 52–57
- ~ of the Athenians in Acts 17 30–31, 130, 160, 180
- Dio Chrysostom 8, 34, 42, 81, 113, 144, 156,
- Diodorus Siculus 30, 33, 50, 59, **60–65**
- Diogenes of Oenanda 125
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus 20, 28, 34
- Divine image, *see* Image, divine
- Divine-likeness ; *see* Godlikeness
- Divinization 37, 169, 170

- Eclecticism 9, 125, 180
- Empire, Roman 2, 29, *see also* Stoicism in Roman Empire, Epicureanism in Roman Empire
- Epictetus 31, 33, 44, 97, 104, 111, 113, 114, 116, 125, 126, 157
- Epicureanism
 - in Roman Empire 29–30
 - on fear of death 45, 88, 90
- Epicurus 87–102
- Epimenides 8, **146–149**, 151, 155, 159
- Epistle to Menoeceus* 88
- Eulabeia* 31, 52, 58, 82
 - in Diodorus Siculus 64–65
 - in Josephus 72–73
 - in Plutarch 76–78
- Eusebeia* 52, 58–59, 62, **80–82**, 128
 - in Diodorus Siculus 64–65
 - in Josephus 72–74
 - in Plutarch 77
 - in Strabo 65–68
- Euthyphro* (by Plato) 95

- Foreign body, *see* *Fremdkörper*
- Foreign gods/divinities, *see* Gods, foreign *Fremdkörper* (Acts 17 as) 7, 26, 175, 188, 190

- Gannat Busame* 146–150
- God, unknown 42, 44, 49, 130, 132, 133–138
 - altar to an ~ 45, 83–84, **130–138**, 149, 152, 162
- Gods/divinities
 - foreign (new) 16, 34–38, 132–133, 137–138, 139, 169, 171, 178, 180
 - anthropomorphic 92, 106; *see also* Images/Representation, divine
- Godlikeness (Divine-likeness) /Imitation of the gods
 - for Epicureans 31, 95–96, 101, 103, 128, 163, 179, 183, 185
 - for the Stoics 31, 110–111, 114–116, 120, 128, 144–145, 156–157, 163, 179, 183, 185
 - ~ in Acts 17 155, 173, 183–187, 189
 - the resurrection as demonstration of ~ 164, 168–170, 178, 189
 - piety as ~ 128, 163
- Graeco-Roman cult, *see* Religion, Graeco-Roman
- Graeco-Roman culture, *see* Culture, Graeco-Roman
- Graeco-Roman world, *see* Culture, Graeco-Roman
- Grammar of Graeco-Roman religion, *see* Religion, Graeco-Roman
- Grundmotiv* 5–6, 11

- Hades, *see* Underworld
- Hellenization 5, 7, 9, 10, 20, 21, 22–25, 179–182, 184, 192
- Heracles 37, 64, 78
- Historicity of Acts 17 23, 134, 161; *see also* Narrative realism
- Historiography 27–28
- History in Acts 13
- Homoiōsis theōi*, *see* Godlikeness
- Hostility, divine (of the gods), 31, 60–68, 70–73, 76, 78, 80–84, 89, 103, 121–122, 130, 131, 138, 149, 152, 160, 171, 176, 183, 184, 190
- Hymn to Zeus* (by Aratus) 150–151
- Hymn to Zeus* (by Callimachus) 148
- Hymn to Zeus* (by Cleanthes) 150

- Idols (statues of the gods)

- Athens as full of ~ 33, 46, 131, 135
- contrasting ~ with God 139–140, 152–153, 155–156, 170, 176, 178, 183
- contrasting ~ with human beings 158–159, 160, 164, 166, 169, 177
- humanity as ~ 166–167, 170, 178
- *see also* Image/representation, of the gods
- *see also* Image of God
- Idolatry
 - ~ of the Athenians 4, 35, 130, 176, 178
 - *see also* Polemic, anti-idol
- Ignorance
 - ~ of the Athenians 4, 17, 22, 44–45, 46, 49, 84, 131–138, 145, 152, 157, 158, 160, 162, 172, 176, 177
 - *deisidaimonia* and ~ 45–46, 90, 109, 122, 131
 - philosophical criticism of ~ 45, 49, 90, 122, 131, 136, 182
 - times of ~ 162, 165, 172, 177
- Image/representation, of the gods (statue of the gods)
 - anthropomorphic ~ 108–109, 112, 120, 126–127, 144, 167
 - Epicureans on ~ 30–31, 94, 103, 126, 174, 178–179, 183, 185, 189
 - philosophers on ~ 85, 121, 126, 131, 153, 156, 179, 183
 - role of ~ in Graeco-Roman religion 144, 152–153, 172
 - Stoics on ~ 29–31, 108, 111–114, 120, 126–127, 144–145, 174, 178–179
 - worship of ~ as superstition 54, 85
 - *see also* Idols
 - *see also* Image of God
- Image of God (*Imago dei*) 178
 - Jewish understanding of ~ 158
 - Moses as ~ 143–144
 - humanity as ~ 164, 166, 169–170, 172, 177
 - humanity as ~ among philosophers 156–157, 183
 - humanity created in the image of God 7, 10, 154, 158–159
 - the risen man as ~ 164–165, 166–167, 168–169, 171, 173, **175–179**, 183, 186–187, 184, 189
- Imitation of the gods, *see* Godlikeness
- Impiety 52, 102
 - as the other extreme of *deisidaimonia* 57–58
 - *deisidaimonia* as ~ 81, 108, 123–124, 185
 - Epicureans accused of ~ 93–94, 96–103, 125
 - trials for ~ 38–39, 44
- Isho‘dad 147–150
- Jerome 148–149
- John Chrysostom 35, 146
- Josephus 30, 33, 38, 43, 59, **69–74**, 83, 86, 121, 135
- Judaism 9, 14, 24, 137, 191
 - Christianity’s relation to ~ 3, 14, 189
 - Hellenistic ~ 6, 7, 10–12, 24–25, 181
 - Diaspora ~ 9, 24–25
- Judgment, divine 7, 22, 31, 122, 143, 161, 163, 164, 166, 167, 172, 174, 176, 182, 183, 184; *see also* Punishment, divine
 - post-mortem 79, 183
 - through the risen man 166, 168–169
- Justice, divine 102, 130, 160, 162–163, 165, 182–183, 190
 - post-mortem 163, 165
- Kerygma 161, 187, 192; *see also* Preaching
- Knowledge of God 4, 5, 6–8, 9, 11, 13, 171, 188
 - Acts 17 as discourse on ~ 4, 5
 - ~ among philosophers 116, 120, 131
 - *see also* Theology, natural
- Legitimization of Christianity 18, 191–192; *see also* apologetics
- Lives* (by Plutarch) 59, 75, 77
- Lucian 27–28, 36, 86
- Lucretius 31, 87–91, 93, 95, 96, 126,
- Minos 34, **146–149**, 168
- Missionary speech, *see* Speech in Acts
- Monotheism 6, 12–13, 16, 53, 81, 133, 134, 139, 161, 176, 178, 188–190
- Morality 63, 64, 82, 165
- Narrative criticism 25, 27, 30, 32

- Narrative realism (verissimilitude) 10, 16, 22, 23–24, **25–29**, 36, 49–50, 142, 161
- New gods, *see* Gods, foreign
- Nicias 65
- Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* (by Plutarch) 99
- Pantheism 7
- Pantheism 6, 12, 112, 145–148, 150–151
- Paulinism of Luke 175
- Pausanias 83
- Pax deorum* (peace with the gods) 30, 81–84, 121–122, 128, 130–131, 138, 169–171, 174, 176, 181–182, 184–187, 190–192
- Philo 81, 135
- Philodemus 31, 87, **93–103**, 124, 126,
- Philosophical common places, *see* common places, philosophical
- Philosophy, ancient
- ~ as art/way of life 19–20, 43, 179
 - grammar of ~ 19–21
 - nature of ~ 19–21, 23–24, 30, 43, 179
 - rapprochement with ~ 19
- Piety
- Athenian in the ancient word 38, 48–49, 83
 - *deisidaimonia* as perverted 45, 57–58, 109, 185
 - *deisidaimonia* as the opposite of ~ 81, 116, 123, 128
 - Epicureans on proper ~ 93–96, 100, 103–104, 126–129, 174, 180–181, 185–186
 - Stoics on proper ~ 111–116, 120–121, 126–129, 179, 180–181, 185–186
 - ~ as divinelikeness or imitation of the gods 156–157, 163, 169, 170, 179, 184–186, 189
 - ~ and righteousness 67
- Platonist 58, 79, 92, 99, 110, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 145, 163; *see also* Academics
- Platonism 43, 74
- Plutarch 139
- on *deisidaimonia* 30, 50, 55, 57–59, 70, 74–81, 82, 86, 87, 107–108, **122–126**, 127
 - on the Stoics 16, 113, 117, 119–121, 125
 - on the Epicureans 16, 92, 96, 98–100, 125
 - on traditional religion 126–127, 155–156
 - on divine representations 126–127, 154–156
- Poets, Greek
- the New Testament quoting ~ 5, 10, 23, 146–150, 152
 - Epicureans on ~ 99–100, 102–103
 - Stoics on ~ 106, 109, 156
- Polemic, anti-idol
- Acts 17 as ~ 4, 8, 49–50, 120, 127, 130, 134, 154, 161, 176, 191
 - Jewish ~ 6, 8, 11, 19, 33–34, 154, 160
 - in Acts 17 15, 33, 143, 145, 153–154, 160
 - in Acts 135
- Polybius 54, 81
- Points of contact, *see* Common ground
- Posidonius 7, 148
- Prayer of Manasseh*, 13
- Preaching
- Acts 17 as example of ~ in early Christianity 7, 188
 - Apostolic ~ 6, 9, 179
 - ~ in Acts 26, 28, 35, 36, 37, 179
 - ~ to the Gentiles in Acts 175, 178, 187–192
 - Jewish ~ in Hellenistic setting 6, 9, 10–12
 - *see also* Kerygma
 - *see also* Speeches, missionary
- Proof, of divine existence 6, 9
- Providence, divine 17, 155, 171–172, 186–187
- Epicurean criticism of ~ 92, 94, 98–100
 - Stoic belief in ~ 110, 116–119, 128
 - Criticism of Stoic vision of ~ 92–93, 117–119
 - Appointment of seasons as ~ 6, 140–142, 152
- Punishment/retribution, divine
- according to Epicureans 128
 - according to the Stoics 119–120
 - *deisidaimonia* as ~ 76

- fear of ~ 60, 63, 66–69, 73, 80–82, 88, 102, 104, 109, 176
- post-mortem ~ 64, 74–75, 79, 88–89, 99, 102, 109, 122, 128, 163, 183
- ~ of the wicked 64, 75, 92, 98–99, 100–103, 120, 163, 185
- *see also* Judgement, divine

- Rapprochement, theological
 - ~ with Greek philosophy 3, 9, **19–21**, 24, 85, 125–126, 127, 150, 175, **179–184**, 192–193
 - ~ with popular religion 8
- Religion
 - Athenian ~ 4, 15
 - *deisidaimonia* as meaning ~ 69, 71, 72, 73, 77, 82
 - distinction between ~ and philosophy in ancient world 43
 - *eusebeia* as meaning ~ 83
 - Jewish ~ 67, 178
 - of the philosophers 15, 75
 - *see also* Religion, Graeco-Roman
- Religion, Graeco-Roman/traditional 55, 62, 64, 139, 153, 175, 185, 190
 - attitude of the philosophers towards ~ 14–16, 29, 31, 85–86, 108, 192
 - *deisidaimonia* in ~ 82, 131
 - grammar of ~ 30, 51, 53, 55, 56, 59, 81–82
 - Epicureans on ~ 29, 93–96, 103, 126–127, 174–175, 183
 - philosophical criticism of ~ 14–18, 29, 85, 86, 121–122, 126–127
 - relationship of the speech in Acts 17 with ~ 174–175
 - the Stoics on ~ 29, 108, 111–116, 120, 126–127, 174–175, 183
- Repentance
 - call to ~ in Acts 17 11, 13, 14, 162, 172, 176
 - call to repentance in Acts 162–163, 187, 191
 - in Plutarch 162–163
- Resurrection
 - as center of apostolic preaching in Acts 179, 188–189
 - as proof 161, 164, 171–172, 177, 186–187
 - as subject of the speech in Acts 17 138, 179, 187, 189–190
 - in Greek culture 36, 161
 - of/from the dead 37, 168–169, 171, 178, 190
 - of Jesus 37, 171
- Retribution, divine, *see* Punishment, divine
- Rhadamanthus 34, 147, 168,

- Seasons, divine appointment of 5, 6, 140–143, 151–153, 171–172, 176–177, 186
- Self-contradiction
 - in the use of *deisidaimonia* 50
 - of philosophers 15–16, 99
 - of the Athenians 39
 - of the Epicureans 125
 - of the Stoics 113–119, 125
- Self-definition, of christianity 18
- Seneca 31, 87, 104, **107–111**, **112–116**, 126, 156–157
 - on *deisidaimonia* 104, **107–109**,
 - on divine representation 154–157
 - on traditional religion and piety 111–115, 126, 155, 156–157
 - on piety as divinelikeness 156–157
 - ~'s critic of allegorical interpretation 106
- Sibylline oracles* 11
- Socrates 38–39, 42–44, 46, 133, 180
- Speeches
 - in Acts 1, 5, 25–28, 184, 188, 190
 - in ancient historiography 27–28
 - missionary ~ in Acts 1, 5, 14, 23, 26, 148, 161, 188
- Spermologos* 9, 16, 34, 37, 39, 40–41, 137, 180
- Stoicism
 - in Roman Empire 29–30
- Strabo 30, 59, **65–69**, 72, 73, 121, 135, 217
- Superstition 82, 86–87, 108
 - Athenian piety as ~ 48, 84
 - Christianity as no ~ 17
 - *deisidaimonia* as meaning ~ 48–50, 52–56, 82
 - modern criticism of ~ 50, 53–55
 - modern definition of ~ 54
 - philosophical criticism of ~ 31, 49

- veneration of images as ~ 17, 54
- *see also deisidaimonia*
- Theodicy 102, 120, 123, 124, 164
- Theodore of Mopsuestia 146–147
- Theology, natural 7, 9, 11, 14, 141–143;
 - see also* Knowledge of God
- Theophrastus 51, 53–54, 56–57
- Theosebeia* 52, 64, 68, 72
- Thucydides 27–28, 61
- Trial
 - Paul on ~ in Acts 17 21, 38–40, 42–44
 - ~ narratives in Acts 1
 - ~ for impiety 38, 42, 44, 93
 - ~ of Socrates 42–44
- Tyndareus 36
- Underworld (Hades) 34, 66, 107, 168
- Varro 58, 87, 108
- World, Graeco-Roman, *see* Culture, Graeco-Roman
- Wrath, divine 30, 33, 36, 117, 122, 123, 130, 131, 138
 - traditional religion and ~ 81–82, 84
 - *deisidaimonia* as fear of ~ 63, 71, 76–77
 - Epicureans on ~ 90–93, 94, 96, 98, 100, 103
 - the Stoics on ~ 107–109
 - *see also* Hostility, divine
- Zeno 106, 113–115