

ERIC C. MOORE

Claiming Places

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*
525

Mohr Siebeck

Copyright 2020. Mohr Siebeck GmbH & Co. KG. All rights reserved. May not be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher, except fair uses permitted under U.S. or applicable copyright law.

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)

525



Eric C. Moore

Claiming Places

Reading Acts through the Lens
of Ancient Colonization

Mohr Siebeck

Eric C. Moore, born 1976; MDiv from Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary (Biblical Studies); ThM from Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary (Biblical Studies); PhD in New Testament from Emory University; currently Adjunct Professor of New Testament at Candler School of Theology, Emory University, and Interdenominational Theological Center.
orcid.org/0000-0001-7595-9687

ISBN 978-3-16-156985-2/eISBN 978-3-16-156986-9

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-156986-9

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 <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2020 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 by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

It is appropriate, in a book about foundations, that I express gratitude to the individuals who made this enterprise possible. *Claiming Places* is a revised form of my doctoral dissertation completed at Emory University in 2017. Members of the Graduate Division of Religion, particularly the New Testament faculty, merit my sincerest appreciation. The way they both embody and nurture careful, creative scholarship has been a continuing source of inspiration.

Heartfelt thanks are due above all to my advisor, Carl Holladay. Every step of the way, he challenged me to strengthen my argument while providing ample encouragement to see this project through to completion. A seasoned mentor, Carl always struck the right balance between offering sage guidance and fostering scholarly independence.

I am also profoundly grateful to my committee members. Sandra Blakely has been a consistent source of support. It was in a readings course with her that I first became fascinated with the practices – and accounts – of colonization in the ancient Mediterranean world, giving birth to the idea for this book. Luke Timothy Johnson showed early enthusiasm for this project and challenged me to make the strongest argument possible. His careful reading of my dissertation yielded many constructive recommendations. Walter Wilson, likewise, was an enthusiastic supporter of this project and offered numerous helpful suggestions. Finally, Vernon Robbins lent his expansive creativity, and sharp insight, to his reading of the dissertation.

Likewise, I am thankful for the excellent editors and staff at Mohr Siebeck. These include series editor Jörg Frey and dedicated professionals who have offered critical feedback while shepherding my manuscript through the publication process: Katharina Gutekunst, Elena Müller, Dominika Zgolik, Tobias Stähler, and Federica Viviani. Here I would like to offer special thanks to Tobias Nicklas for reading my manuscript and recommending it to Mohr Siebeck in the first place.

This project would not have been possible without the support of family. Rich and Linda Moore, my parents, nurtured the intellectual endeavors that eventually produced this book. My father also read final dissertation drafts with his keen grammatical eye. I dedicate *Claiming Places* to my wife, Ping. Her

patience and persistent encouragement are the ultimate foundation upon which this book was formed.

Eric C. Moore
Atlanta, April 2020

Table of Contents

Preface	V
List of Abbreviations	XI
Introduction:	
Colonization as a Framework for Reading Acts	1
Chapter 1: Locating This Book's Approach to (Luke-) Acts.....	6
<i>1.1 Two Common Approaches</i>	6
1.1.1 Studies of (Luke-) Acts' Genre.....	6
1.1.2 Studies of (Luke-) Acts' Geography	12
<i>1.2 An Alternative Approach: (Luke-) Acts and Cult/Community Foundations</i>	16
1.2.1 Studies of Colonization and Related Accounts	16
1.2.2 Studies of Paul	20
1.2.3 Studies of Luke-Acts.....	21
<i>1.3 This Book's Approach: Reading Acts via a Colonizing Framework</i>	26
Chapter 2: Colonization – An Analytic Framework.....	27
<i>2.1 Introduction</i>	27
<i>2.2 Colonization in the Ancient Mediterranean World</i>	27
2.2.1 A Variegated Phenomenon	27
2.2.2 Colonization Motifs.....	28
2.2.2.1 Origins	28

2.2.2.2 Divine Sanction	32
2.2.2.3 Founder(s)	36
2.3 <i>Colonization Accounts: Case Studies</i>	37
2.3.1 Colonization in the Archaic Period.....	38
2.3.1.1 The Foundation of Gela	39
2.3.1.2 The Foundation of Rhegion.....	42
2.3.1.3 The Foundation of Croton	48
2.3.1.4 The Foundation of Syracuse.....	52
2.3.1.5 The Foundation of Cyrene.....	55
2.3.2 Colonization in the Classical Period.....	63
2.3.2.1 <i>Metropolis</i> and Colony	64
2.3.2.2 Religious Sanction	68
2.3.3 Colonization in the Hellenistic Period	73
2.3.3.1 Alexander the Founder according to Arrian, Plutarch, and Ps.-Callisthenes	73
2.3.3.2 The Foundations of Seleucus Nicator according to John Malalas	76
2.3.4 Colonization of Rome	77
2.3.4.1 Introduction.....	77
2.3.4.2 The Foundation of Rome according to Livy, Plutarch, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus.....	78
2.4 <i>Conclusions</i>	87
Chapter 3: The Origins of the Cult Community in Jerusalem (Acts 1–5).....	88
3.1 <i>The Community's Founder(s), Origins, and Divine Mandate</i> (Acts 1–2).....	88
3.1.1 Founding Figure(s)	88
3.1.2 Jerusalem Origins	92
3.1.3 Divine Sanction	93
3.1.3.1 Oracle of Colonization	93
3.1.3.2 Precipitation of Colonization.....	95
3.1.4 Summation	106
3.2 <i>The Colonizing Mission in Jerusalem (Acts 3–5)</i>	106
3.2.1 Comparative Introduction	107
3.2.2 The Founding Acts of the Apostles	112

3.2.2.1 The Pattern of Founding Acts.....	112
3.2.2.2 Divine Sanction of the Apostles' Founding Acts.....	115
3.2.3 The "Institutions" of the Jerusalem Community.....	116
3.3 <i>Conclusions</i>	122
Chapter 4: Antioch of Syria: Colony and Mother Community	124
4.1 <i>Introduction: The Pivotal Role of Antioch in Acts</i>	124
4.2 <i>Socio-Historical Sketch of Antioch</i>	125
4.3 <i>Antioch, Colony of the Jerusalem Community</i>	131
4.3.1 Crisis Origins.....	131
4.3.2 Foundation through Cult Transfer	134
4.3.3 Constitution as a "Mixed" Community	138
4.3.3.1 Precursor: Acts 8 (Philip's Ministry).....	142
4.3.3.2 Precursor: Acts 9:1–31 (Paul's Commission)	144
4.3.3.3 Precursor: Acts 10:9–11:18 (Peter in Caesarea).....	144
4.3.4 Jerusalem Oversight.....	147
4.4 <i>Antioch, Mother City of "Second-Generation" Colonies</i>	150
4.4.1 Divine Sanction of Colonizing Ventures	151
4.4.2 Community "Institutions"	153
4.4.2.1 Leadership Institutions	154
4.4.2.2 Religious Institutions	157
4.4.3 Conclusion: The Antiochene Community's Colonies.....	167
Chapter 5: Pisidian Antioch and the Rhetoric of "Second-Generation" Colonization	168
5.1 <i>Introduction: The Significance of Acts 13</i>	168
5.2 <i>Socio-Historical and Architectural Sketch of Antioch</i>	170
5.3 <i>Paul's Speech: The Rhetoric of "Second-Generation" Colonization</i>	178
5.3.1 Introduction	178
5.3.2 The Ancestral Prehistory (13:17–22)	181

5.3.2.1 Introduction	181
5.3.2.2 Prehistory as Preparation.....	183
5.3.3 The Colonizing Message for Antioch (13:23–41)	192
5.3.3.1 Introduction	192
5.3.3.2 Announcing the Colonizing Message (13:23–31).....	192
5.3.3.3 Explaining the Colonizing Message (13:32–37).....	196
5.3.3.4 Pressing Home the Colonizing Message (13:38–41)	202
5.3.4 Summation: The Rhetoric of “Second-Generation” Colonization	209
 5.4 <i>The Outcome of Second-Generation Colonization at Antioch</i>	210
5.4.1 The Foundation of a “Mixed” Community	211
5.4.2 The Colonization of Pisidian Antioch – A Success?.....	215
 Chapter 6: Conclusion	217
 Appendix: Abridged Chart of Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman Colonies.....	221
 Bibliography.....	229
Index of Ancient Sources	239
Index of Modern Authors	262
Index of Subjects.....	265

List of Abbreviations

Primary Sources

Abbreviations of biblical, apocryphal, and pseudepigraphical texts follow *The SBL Handbook of Style*. 2nd ed. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.

1QM	Milḥamah (War Scroll)
1QpHab	Habbakuk Peshier
1QS	Serek Hayahad (Community Rule)
<i>ad Ol.</i>	scholium on <i>Olympionikai</i> (Pindar)
<i>Adv. Jud.</i>	<i>Adversus Judaeos</i>
<i>Aen.</i>	<i>Aeneid</i>
<i>Agr.</i>	<i>De Lege agraria</i>
<i>A.J.</i>	<i>Antiquitates judaicae</i>
<i>Alex.</i>	<i>Alexander</i>
<i>Anab.</i>	<i>Anabasis</i> (Arrian and Xenophon)
<i>Ant. rom.</i>	<i>Antiquitates romanae</i>
<i>Argon.</i>	<i>Argonautica</i>
<i>Ascon. Pis.</i>	Asconius's commentary on <i>in Pisonem</i>
<i>Att.</i>	<i>Epistulae ad Atticum</i>
<i>Aug.</i>	<i>Divus Augustus</i>
<i>B.J.</i>	<i>Bellum judaicum</i>
bMeg.	Megillah (Babylonian Talmud)
bSabb.	Shabbat (Babylonian Talmud)
<i>C. Ap.</i>	<i>Contra Apionem</i>
<i>Congr.</i>	<i>De congressu eruditionis gratia</i>
<i>Contempl.</i>	<i>De vita contemplativa</i>
<i>Curt.</i>	<i>Curtius Rufus</i>
<i>De Vit. Pythag.</i>	<i>De vita pythagorica</i>
<i>Decal.</i>	<i>De decalogo</i>
<i>Def. orac.</i>	<i>De defectu oraculorum</i>
<i>Div.</i>	<i>De divinatione</i>
<i>E Delph</i>	<i>De E apud Delphos</i>
<i>Flacc.</i>	<i>In Flaccum</i>
<i>Hymn. Apoll.</i>	<i>Hymnus in Apollinem</i> (Callimachus)
<i>Iph. taur.</i>	<i>Iphigenia taurica</i>
<i>Legat.</i>	<i>Legatio ad Gaium</i>
<i>Men. Rhet. Gr.</i>	<i>Menander Rhetor</i> (Greek)
<i>Metam.</i>	<i>Metamorphoses</i>

<i>Mil.</i>	<i>Miltiades</i>
<i>Mor.</i>	<i>Moralia</i>
<i>Mos.</i>	<i>De vita Mosis</i>
<i>Nat.</i>	<i>Naturalis historia</i>
<i>Ol.</i>	<i>Olympionikai</i>
<i>Or.</i>	<i>Orationes</i>
<i>Phil.</i>	<i>Orationes philippicae</i>
<i>Pol.</i>	<i>Politica</i>
<i>Pyth.</i>	<i>Pythionikai</i>
<i>Pyth. orac.</i>	<i>De Pythiae oraculis</i>
<i>QG</i>	<i>Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesis</i>
<i>Quest. graec.</i>	<i>Quaestiones graecae</i>
<i>Quest. rom.</i>	<i>Quaestiones romanae</i>
<i>Res Gest. Divi Aug.</i>	<i>Res gestae divi Augusti</i>
<i>Rom.</i>	<i>Romulus</i>
<i>Spec.</i>	<i>De specialibus legibus</i>
<i>Thes.</i>	<i>Theseus</i>

Secondary Sources

<i>ABD</i>	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
<i>Ann. Sc. Norm.</i>	<i>Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa</i>
<i>Super. Pisa</i>	
<i>BDF</i>	Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Revised and edited by Robert W. Funk. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
<i>BTR</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Conservative Judaism</i>
<i>CIAnt</i>	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
<i>FGrHist</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> . Edited by Felix Jacoby. Leiden: Brill, 1954–1964
<i>FHG</i>	<i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> . Paris, 1841–1870
<i>HSCP</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JRASS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement Series</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JSAH</i>	<i>Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series</i>

<i>LSJ</i>	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTL</i>	New Testament Library
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>PEGLMBS</i>	Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> . Edited by Theodor Klauser et al. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1950–.
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RE</i>	<i>Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche</i>
<i>R&T</i>	<i>Religion and Theology</i>
<i>SBLSP</i>	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
<i>SEG</i>	Supplementum epigraphicum graecum
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>

Introduction

Colonization as a Framework for Reading Acts

Casual readers and scholars alike recognize Acts of the Apostles as a story about the beginnings of early Christianity. Its appeal stems largely from how it fills a gap in the historical imagination – providing a memorable account of “Christianity’s transformation from a small band of Galileans following Jesus into a vast, multicultural network of urban churches.”¹ However, the story’s utility in explaining this transformation does not, by itself, render Acts more culturally intelligible. Scholars thus employ various approaches to locate Acts in its first – or second² – century Mediterranean setting. I review several such attempts at contextualization in the following chapter.³ There, I distinguish approaches that focus on the genre or geographical horizons of Luke’s narrative from the one adopted in this study. My guiding question is what it means to label Acts an origins story or story of beginnings given its broader cultural milieu. To explore this dimension of the narrative, I employ ancient colonization as an analytic lens.

At its most basic, Acts is a story about community replication. From a precise point of origin, Jerusalem (Acts 1–7), the Jesus movement expands to cities such as Caesarea (10:1–11:18), Antioch of Syria (13:13–52), Philippi (16:11–40), Thessalonica (17:1–9), Athens (17:16–34), Corinth (18:1–17), Ephesus (18:19–21; 19:1–41), and eventually Rome (28:11–16). Luke thematizes this process of replication in distinct ways. Persecution often serves as the impetus for expansion (8:1–4; 11:19; 13:50; 14:5–7, 19; 17:5–7). Divine manifestations (oracles, visions, the Holy Spirit, angels) combine to authorize, guide, propel, and consolidate expansion (1:8–9; 2:1–4; 8:17, 39–40; 10:3–6; 10–17, 19; 11:4–10, 12; 13:2–4, 9; 16:6–10; 18:9–11; 19:6–7). Just as notable, charismatic figures such as Peter and Paul play a pronounced role in forming new communities of Jesus followers (e.g., Acts 3:1–26; 10:1–11:18; 13:16–43; 14:1–7; 16:1–40; 18:1–11; 19:1–20). Their activity often engenders opposition (4:1–7, 13–22; 5:17–18, 22–42; 6:8–15; 7:54–8:3; 13:6–12, 45, 50; 16:16–24; 17:5–9, 13; 18:6, 12–17; 19:9, 23–41; 21:27–30; 22:22–40; 23:12–22; 24:1–9; 25:1–12; 28:24–27). Many of the communities established feature a mixture of

¹ Walter Wilson, “Urban Legends: Acts 10:11–11:18 and the Strategies of Greco-Roman Foundation Narratives,” *JBL* 120 (2001): 78.

² See Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2006).

³ See chapter 1.

Jewish and gentile members (8:40/10:1–11:18; 13:43, 48–50; 17:4, 12; 19:10; 28:24/28–31). Though “new,” these communities are linked to a more distant past through the narrative’s references to Jewish ancestors and ancient prophecies (2:17–35; 3:22–25; 7:2–50; 8:32–33; 13:16–41; 15:15–18; 28:25–27).

My argument in this book is that our understanding of Luke’s narrative is enhanced when reading it in light of a specific *topos* in Mediterranean antiquity: civic or community origins. To be clear, I am not making an argument about the genre of Acts, for instance, that it *formally* constitutes a “foundation narrative.” Rather, what this study does is offer an assessment of the narrative informed both by the phenomenon of ancient colonization *and* representations of it in literary and material forms. My approach is heuristic. I develop a colonization model to identify prominent concerns which Acts shares with other accounts of community/civic beginnings.

Let me explain what I mean by “colonization” in this study. Most basically, I adopt it as a convenient term to express the idea of replication or expansion. In this basic sense, colonization is an umbrella term flexible enough to encompass a great many different types and instances of community foundation. But I also employ the term colonization since it is what is conventionally used in scholarship to describe the establishment of new cities in the ancient Mediterranean world, including during the Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. Since foundations took many forms, as did later reports about them, colonization functions as a baseline term. Here a further clarification is in order. Some will immediately think of post-colonial criticism when encountering the term colonization. This is not the nuance intended here, though insights gleaned from this study can be deployed in service of this interpretative strategy. In sum, the use of “colonization” to describe my analytic framework is intended, first, to signal community replication and, second, to evoke the varied expressions of civic/community foundations in the ancient Mediterranean world.

This book therefore contributes to Acts scholarship at both the conceptual and analytic levels. First, conceptually, colonization offers a culturally intelligible framework for reading Luke’s narrative. To begin with, themes in Acts like dislocation/relocation were associated with different forms of colonization in the ancient Mediterranean world. There is also the resonance of the narrative’s subject matter – community origins. Stories about how communities (especially cities) came to be were immensely popular, remaining so from the Classical period of Greece down through late antiquity.⁴

Appreciation for this context can illuminate Acts. The narrative’s episodes are typically set in cities with rich foundation traditions and/or that are distinguishable as Roman colonies (e.g., Antioch of Pisidia, Philippi, Corinth). This setting evokes a world of competing origin stories against which Luke’s is set.

⁴ See chapter 2.

Comparing Luke's tale about the beginnings of a minority community to the foundation of cities is not as odd as it appears at first glance. As we will see, Philo adopts colonization language/themes to glorify Jewish communities planted in cities throughout the Roman Empire, and he and Josephus alike utilize colonization terms/concepts in their reworking of exodus traditions.⁵ An argument of this book, therefore, is that the conceptual world of community foundations is a productive one for assessing the subject matter and goals of Acts.

Second, colonization offers an effective framework for analyzing the form and features of Acts. As observed above, at the macro-level Acts is about a process of replication beginning in Jerusalem and expanding outward to "Judea, and Samaria, and to the end of the earth" (Acts 1:8). It is only natural that this replication should involve the spread of the Christian cult and not merely the formation of communities. After all, ancient colonization frequently entailed the transfer of cult.⁶

My analytic framework likewise helps account for the shape of Acts at the micro- or episodic level, that is, when it comes to *how* the story of replication is told. I identify three prominent concerns which encompass a "general fund of narrative and tropological strategies" deployed in foundation accounts⁷: community origins, divine sanction, and founders.⁸ These preoccupations correlate with the features of Acts detailed above. Luke traces the origins of the Christian cult back to Jerusalem and a memorable crisis – persecution – which precipitated its spread throughout the Mediterranean world. His characters' references to the ancestors and prophecies push those origins back further still, connecting new communities to an ancient salvation-history and its proto-founders.

The risen Jesus's oracle (1:8), dream-visions, and the Holy Spirit provide divine sanction for the replicating Christian community. Acts' non-divine protagonists, Peter and Paul, operate as founders. Their primary activities are preaching and miracle working. The founders typically provoke opposition but manage to establish new communities, most of which are ethnically mixed – comprised of Jews and gentiles. In the study which follows, I will show the profitability of using ancient colonization as an analytic resource to fill out this sketch of Christian foundations in Acts.

The study proceeds in the following fashion: Chapter 1 contextualizes this project. I trace how my approach offers an insightful alternative to other readings of Acts while building on studies of ancient colonization and foundation

⁵ See chapter 3.

⁶ See chapters 2 and 4.

⁷ Wilson, "Urban Legends," 79; see chapter 1.

⁸ This tripartite scheme serves two purposes. First, it allows me to identify overarching concerns in colonization accounts. Second, it facilitates comparison between Acts and other accounts, even when the use of individual motifs (e.g., "surprised *oikist*," "crisis") differs.

narratives. Chapter 2 elucidates the colonization framework used throughout this book. To begin with, I illustrate key concerns in colonization accounts. Then, I analyze individual narratives that depict colonization in the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods and finally accounts about the origins of Rome. Proceeding thusly, I provide a textured portrayal of how colonizing motifs function in specific accounts of community origins. This discussion sets the table for my analysis of Acts in the succeeding chapters.

In chapter 3, I argue that Acts 1–5 functions like a colonizing account in its own right as well as the “origins” portion of a longer such narrative. I show how these chapters introduce founding figures and their pattern of “founding acts”; underscore the importance of Jerusalem as the origin of the colonizing movement; reveal the movement’s divine mandate; and depict the way of life, or “institutions,” that characterize the community of Jesus followers in Jerusalem.

Subsequent to this, chapter 4 tracks the major development in the colonizing narrative that occurs at Antioch of Syria (Acts 11:19–30; 13:1–3; 15:1–35). I demonstrate how the replication of the community here serves a pivotal role in Acts. On the one hand, the community represents a “colony” of the Jerusalem community, one which is generated by a “crisis” in the mother community, formed via cult transfer, and characterized by its mixed composition. On the other hand, the community at Antioch operates as a “mother city” akin to Jerusalem but of “second-generation” colonization outside the land of Israel. The community’s leadership and religious institutions – the latter dictated in Jerusalem (Acts 15) – reflect its outward orientation. Yet ultimately it is the community’s mandate, given by the Holy Spirit and recognized by its leadership, which formalizes its role as mother city of other Jewish-gentile communities. The narrative span 13:4–14:28 represents the first wave of such replication.

Chapter 5 focuses on the replication of the community in Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13:13–52), foremost of the sites Paul visits during the colonizing venture sanctioned by the mother community at Antioch of Syria. I contend that the site, as a colony of Rome, was highly symbolic for Luke. Paul’s activities here anticipate the spread of the movement to the empire’s capital. His synagogue speech is characterized by the rhetoric of “second-generation colonization”; it legitimates replication of the Jesus movement outside the land of Israel – and with it, the establishment of mixed (Jewish-gentile) communities. Indeed, this is precisely the profile of the community produced by Paul and Barnabas’s proclamation in “little Rome.” The successful outcome is precipitated in no small measure by opposition, a common feature in Acts as well as colonization accounts more broadly.

This represents an apt end to my study. The colonizing movement which begins in Jerusalem has spread to Antioch of Syria and from there to another Antioch, near Pisidia. At the end of the latter colonizing venture, the founding figures report back to the mother city “all that God had done with them”

(14:27). In a brief conclusion (chapter 6), I summarize my findings and their implications for the study of Acts.

Above, I asked: What does it mean to call Acts an origins story in light of its cultural context? My book proposes that colonization offers a compelling framework for addressing this question. The following chapter distinguishes this mode of analyzing Acts from other approaches.

Chapter 1

Locating This Book's Approach to (Luke-) Acts

1.1 Two Common Approaches to (Luke-) Acts

To my knowledge, no one has fully exploited the lens of ancient colonization to read Acts. While scholars are not blind to the narrative's territorial pretensions, they have tended to adopt other frameworks for analyzing its subject matter. Two approaches relevant to this study consider, respectively, the work's genre and its geographical features. Limitations in these approaches, I argue, highlight this book's analytic value.

1.1.1 Studies of (Luke-) Acts' Genre

A particularly prominent approach to (Luke-) Acts considers the work's genre. Many scholars preoccupied with this question have concluded that Luke's narrative represents an example of ancient historiography. Eckhard Plümacher, for instance, has made this identification on the basis of similar literary techniques deployed in Acts, on the one hand, and the works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Livy, on the other.¹ He specifically points to each author's use of archaizing speeches, adaptation of literary models, and construction of dramatic episodes as historiographical building-blocks. Helpful to a point, the overly broad classification of Acts as "historiography" fails to fully illuminate the work's preoccupations and their function. Though aiming at greater precision, David Aune's proposal that Luke-Acts is an example of general history warrants critique on the same grounds.²

Still more precise is Gregory Sterling's classification.³ He maintains that Luke-Acts should be considered an example of apologetic historiography, a subgenre flourishing during the Roman period but having roots in the ethnographic tradition of Herodotus. Explicating this classification, Sterling analyzes the content, form, and function of selected works from the fifth century

¹ Eckhard Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).

² David Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1987), 88–89.

³ Gregory Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).

BCE to the second century CE.⁴ What distinguishes examples of apologetic historiography such as these is the privileging and hellenization of native sources in order to legitimize subject peoples. This characteristic defines Luke-Acts just as it does the works of Josephus and other Hellenistic Jewish authors. Though designed for “insiders,” the two-part narrative would have given its intended audience confidence in their “interplay” with “the larger outside world.”⁵

Sterling has introduced greater precision to the classification of Luke-Acts as a form of historiography, but his work raises further questions. In particular, how might broader cultural traditions have influenced the way Acts (the focus of my investigation) was conceived and constructed? Sterling has adduced convincing formal and functional parallels between Luke-Acts and other “native” works. But for Luke’s narrative to give “insiders” confidence in their

⁴ Ibid. Herodotus’s works attempt to situate peoples within the hegemonic framework of the Persian Empire. Paralleling Herodotus’s endeavor were the attempts of those writing during the Roman period who sought to valorize the histories of their respective (minority) communities. Works by Hellenistic Jewish authors, the *Antiquities of the Jews* by Josephus, and Luke-Acts itself do this by appropriating native sources and transforming them according to Hellenistic norms.

⁵ Ibid., 629. While specific literary features vary as a function of the groups and interests represented, the general rules of the game are strikingly similar whatever the chronological and geographical context. Thus, for example, the appeal to antique origins typifies many works. Stories of Israel’s patriarchs and kings provide Jews access to venerable histories on par – from their perspective – with the legendary and mythical narratives of their neighbors. Yet for these traditions to function effectively, they must conform to general Hellenistic conventions. Sterling argues that this is what one witnesses in the works of those such as Artapanus, Pseudo-Eupolemus, and Josephus, who recast HB and LXX traditions in order to eulogize the origins, histories, and practices of their communities (ibid., 355–60; 490–94).

Sterling’s argument elsewhere that Stephen’s speech in Acts 7 represents a programmatic justification for Jewish life outside Israel – and thereby legitimation for the early Christian mission in different centers of the Roman Empire – is thus quite plausible. See Gregory Sterling, “‘Opening the Scriptures’: The Legitimation of the Jewish Diaspora and the Early Christian Mission,” in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke’s Narrative Claim upon Israel’s Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner (Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999), 199–217. Sterling buttresses this claim with illustrations of similar legitimation strategies in comparanda drawn from the Jewish diaspora (especially the Hellenistic Jewish fragments). Jewish luminaries such as Moses and Abraham are associated with particular “places” outside the land of Israel in many of these examples. Descriptions of a respective figure’s characteristics (e.g., “great learning”) and activities in these distant lands effectively co-opt such space for Jewish community living there. In this manner, figures such as Moses and Abraham operate akin to cult heroes or colony founders around whom local mythical traditions develop in order to justify minority identities. Sterling brings this assessment to bear on his analysis of Stephen’s speech. He argues that Luke’s variation from the LXX at key junctures reflects a similar desire to broaden the scope of life and mission beyond the narrow borders of Jerusalem and Judea. Despite his stoning, Stephen’s legitimation for God’s work outside Israel, according to Sterling, threads its way through the subsequent spaces of Luke’s narrative.

interactions with “outsiders,”⁶ it must resonate with customary ways of depicting community origins.

Daniel Marguerat deserves mention in this connection.⁷ He observes historiography’s ability to “construct ... self-understanding”⁸ but steers the classification of Acts in a different direction than Sterling.⁹ In his second volume, Marguerat argues, Luke fashions identity via a “narrative of beginning” – a common function of remembering the past.¹⁰ Following Pierre Gibert, he delineates six “parameters” said to define such narratives:¹¹

(1) the presence of a break which functions as an [sic] founding rupture; (2) the intervention of a supernatural dimension implying transcendence; (3) a mysterious aspect reinforced by the absence of any other witnesses (vision, divine call); (4) the event is understood by reference to an ultimate origin, to an absolute beginning; (5) the situation which is created presents something new; (6) the event inaugurates a history or a posterity. (Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian*, 32)

Marguerat demonstrates fairly convincingly that these elements can be located in Acts.¹² His study is thus welcome not only because it pushes for greater precision in the classification of Acts – as a form of historiography concerned with beginnings – but also due to its elucidation of prominent features in the narrative. These features are largely subsumable to the analytic motifs employed in my study. However, I suggest that the classification of Acts as a “narrative of beginnings” is most profitably explored in relation to cultural *topoi* rather than as a function of genre.

This is precisely what the present volume attempts. I articulate how the features in Acts together with their associated concerns relate to the larger phenomena of colonization and civic/community origin accounts. This framework allows me to compare the perspectives of “native” works (e.g., by Luke, Philo, and Josephus) with those of more “mainstream” voices in the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. Moreover, it enables me to demonstrate how colonization perspectives – while featuring “history” in some sense – are embedded in a host of different genres, subgenres, and even material forms.

⁶ Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 629.

⁷ Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the “Acts of the Apostles,”* trans. Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery, and Richard Bauckham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

⁸ *Ibid.*, 8. Working from Ricoeur’s framework, Marguerat identifies this “strong” type of historiography as “poetic” history. The “truth” of such history “lies in the interpretation it gives to the past and the possibility it offers to a community to understand itself in the present” (*ibid.*).

⁹ Marguerat considers the literary parallels adduced by Sterling to be “a bit forced” (*ibid.*, 30).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 32.

¹¹ Pierre Gibert, *Bible, mythes et récits de commencement* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil: 1986).

¹² Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian*, 32–34.

Charles Talbert dissents from the view that Luke-Acts is historiography.¹³ He poses an alternative: Luke's two-volume work constitutes a biographical sketch of a founder and his followers, comparable to Diogenes Laertius's *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*.¹⁴ Talbert produces a list of parallels between Luke's portraits of Jesus in the gospel and his disciples in Acts in support of his position.¹⁵ Parallels notwithstanding, his thesis has won few adherents. Critics note that Acts in particular contains few of the features constitutive of more well-established examples of ancient biography.¹⁶ Others complain, furthermore, that Talbert's take neglects the historical and theological dimensions of Luke's work.¹⁷

To these critiques, I add an additional: Talbert's characterization of Luke-Acts as biography is too individualistic, obscuring the communal significance of the work at the level of both the narrative and its (envisioned) reception. In the first respect, while Talbert commendably highlights the links between Jesus and his disciples in Luke's narrative(s), he neglects to reflect adequately on the role played by both in planting communities via their actions. In the second respect, he does not consider how – as a consequence – the founding activities of both parties might have functioned as charter accounts for Luke's communities. My analysis of Acts takes up both issues. I focus on how the apostles' appointment and actions qualify them as community founders as well as on how Luke's narrative about their deeds might have operated as a foundation account – or series of foundation accounts – for Christians of the author's generation.

Richard Pervo offers an even more adventurous take on the genre of Acts. He proposes that it ought to be read as a Greek novel, a somewhat amorphous category of ancient fiction.¹⁸ Pervo's chief justification for this classification is the entertaining character of Acts. Its author relates imprisonment, shipwreck, escapes, trials, persecution, martyrdom, mobs, assemblies, humor/wit,

¹³ Charles Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 125–34.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 15–65.

¹⁶ Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1987), 36.

¹⁷ Cf. Francois Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950–2005)*, 2nd ed. (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 72–77.

¹⁸ Pervo, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987). Pervo realizes the challenges of defining what constitutes a Greek novel. However, he embraces the definition of Arthur Heiserman, *The Novel before the Novel* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 114, because it provides cohesion to the classification while allowing for diversity: novel = material + manner + style + structure. Later, Pervo moderates his argument about the genre of Acts. See *idem*, *Acts: A Commentary*. Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009).

irony, pathos, exotica, speeches, and snippets of high society.¹⁹ In Pervo's estimation, even the scenes of "local color" identified by Conzelmann (see below) reflect a proclivity of ancient novelist writings.²⁰ To the extent that Luke has utilized material from other sources, he has creatively shaped it for the twin purposes of edification and entertainment.

Pervo's proposal is to be commended for its originality, not least how it challenges unexamined assumptions about the genre of Acts, particularly its frequent classification as historiography.²¹ Moreover, his study sheds light on those features Acts shares in common with ancient Greek novels (as he defines them), illuminating a wider body of literature with which Luke's work can be profitably compared. Yet Pervo's work suffers from a significant flaw: In seeking to undermine the classification of Acts as historiography, he too downplays its communal dimensions. He goes so far as to suggest that Acts lacks a concern for institutional matters and therefore does not "intend to describe the history of the Christian mission."²² This conclusion, however, drives a false wedge between founding figures and movements and/or communities for which they possess a defining significance.²³ The narrative about the founders of the Christian movement, in other words, implies the existence of Christian communities and therefore possesses an implicitly institutional concern. To this indirect critique, I add one that is more direct: Acts actually demonstrates an *explicit* concern for institutional matters. Thus, in this book I not only characterize the apostles as community founders but also analyze the institutional features of communities established through their activities, including their leadership structures (Acts 13:1; cf. 20:17), mixed composition (11:19–20), and "customs" (15:19–20, 29; cf. 21:25).

¹⁹ Pervo, *Profit with Delight*, 12–85.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 70–72.

²¹ Leaving aside the merits of his genre argument, Pervo deserves commendation for his incisive diagnosis of the motive behind many previous attempts to classify Luke-Acts as historiography. He argues that the debate over the essential truth-worthiness/historicity/factuality of the narrative has unduly influenced discussions of its genre. Owing to this subtext, even those not predisposed to read Acts as factual narrative – for example, Ernst Haenchen (*The Acts of the Apostles*, trans. and ed. Bernard Nobel et al. [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971]) – evaluate its content by the (supposed) canons of historiography. This orientation inevitably lends itself to a negative evaluation of passages striking the reader as having little or no basis in historical fact. Pervo reveals how this overall framework for reading (Luke-) Acts precludes appreciation for how such passages contribute to the entertaining character of the narrative. *Ibid.*, 1–11.

²² *Ibid.*, 131.

²³ Compare Pervo's distinction between national histories and national novels, as well as his related claim that "Luke did for Paul what Artapanus did for Moses," which leads him to conclude that Luke is a "writer of historical fiction" (*ibid.*, 135).

A further, and ambitious, proposal about the genre of Luke-Acts comes from Marianne Palmer Bonz.²⁴ She maintains that Luke-Acts emulates the epic tradition and thus rejects its classification as either historiography or Greek novel.²⁵ Bonz supports this proposal by appealing to the narrative's wide-open scope, interconnected storyline, and thematic development.²⁶ To lay the groundwork for this argument, she outlines several characteristic themes in epic while formulating their social and historical importance. Common plot devices include reversal, prophecy, allusions/ambiguity, journey, divine mission, et cetera.²⁷ The devices are fairly stock in character; their shape in any given epic is influenced by prevailing political and social conditions. In the *Aeneid*, for example, Virgil adopts thematic elements from Homeric epic but reshapes them in order to glorify Rome's beginning – from a markedly Augustan perspective.²⁸ Later epics contest or nuance this Augustan-centric view of the empire while deploying these same themes.²⁹ The presence of such thematic consistency in Luke-Acts leads Bonz to conclude that it too qualifies as an epic – imagined and fashioned to glorify the beginnings of Christianity.³⁰

Bonz's proposal furnishes a fresh opportunity to examine the shape and defining characteristics of Luke's work. In my estimation, she has not proved her case that Luke-Acts emulates epic. Aside from the fact that the narrative is set in prose, quite a few of the themes/plot devices she wishes to assign to epic – divine mission, prophecy, allusion – characterize other genres as well.³¹ Nevertheless, Bonz does a service in highlighting these features and demonstrating how they are molded to serve a specific function: exalting civic/community beginnings. Accounts concerning such beginnings are not limited to a particular genre, whether historiography or epic. In the present book, I illustrate how Luke's story about the replication of the Christian movement can be likened to colonization accounts that are embedded in various ancient genres.

Though each of the above proposals has its merits, the exclusive concern for the genre of Acts (or Luke-Acts) comes with pitfalls, as my review has suggested. Chiefly, these include: (1) labeling features/themes as constitutive of a genre, when in fact they characterize other genres as well; (2) misconstruing

²⁴ Marianne Palmer Bonz, *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).

²⁵ Bonz rejects the reading of Acts as Greek novel as “trivializing” (ibid., vii, 14); moreover, she dismisses the classification of Luke-Acts as historiography on the basis that the narrative betrays a lack of fastidiousness for historical accuracy (ibid., 184–89).

²⁶ Ibid., 87–193.

²⁷ Ibid., 36–56.

²⁸ Ibid., 31–36.

²⁹ Ibid., 61–86.

³⁰ Ibid., 25–29.

³¹ Bonz does admirably illustrate how the recasting of themes and traditions tacks closely to the historical/social context(s) of the authors of such works.

the function of features/themes; (3) and failing to focus on the subject matter of Luke's narrative.

My approach seeks to avoid these pitfalls: (1) I note that key elements of Acts resonant with cultural motifs represented in various genres as well as non-literary media; (2) I maintain that these features/themes together ultimately function to glorify community origins; (3) and, correspondingly, I argue that the subject matter of Acts is the foundation and replication of the Christian community.

1.1.2 Studies of (Luke-) Acts' Geography

An alternate approach considers Luke's use of geography. Pioneering this approach was Hans Conzelmann. Though not the first to observe the prominent function of geography in Luke-Acts, Conzelmann applied more rigor than most in working out its role in advancing the author's literary and theological aims; he accomplished this in his studies on Luke's redaction.³² These studies shed light on the author's depiction of villages, cities, and regions as well as natural, political, and sacred landscapes.³³ Conzelmann above all relates his geographical treatment to Luke's schematization of (salvation-) history, which derives its impetus from the parousia's delay.³⁴ This schematization identifies three separate periods – that of Israel, Jesus, and the church.³⁵ Thus, Conzelmann's lens for examining the geography of Luke-Acts is manifestly theological.

More recently, Matthew Sleeman has picked up on Conzelmann's geographical and theological interests but worked them out along theoretical lines.³⁶ Using a model proposed by human geographer Edward Soja, Sleeman considers how Jesus's ascension reconfigures space in Acts 1–11:18. That is to say, he appropriates Soja's first space, second space, and third space schema as a way of analyzing the different dimensions of spatiality in this section of Acts. First space denotes spatiality as depicted by maps; second space, imagined space as in a blueprint; and third space, the merging of the two spaces. Sleeman argues that Christ's ascension and related heavenly status constitute a third space condition, which in turn structures the first and second spaces observed in the first part of Acts – and by extension, in the remainder of the narrative.³⁷

Sleeman's theoretical and Conzelmann's redaction-centric approaches offer many helpful insights concerning the theological implications of geography in

³² Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. G. Buswell (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1961); idem, *Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963).

³³ Idem, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 18–94.

³⁴ Ibid., 17.

³⁵ Ibid., 137–234.

³⁶ Matthew Sleeman, *Geography and the Ascension Narrative in Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

³⁷ Ibid., 42–56.

Luke-Acts. However, neither adequately considers how the geographical pretensions of Luke's narrative would have resonated in its wider Mediterranean context, where tales of relocation and new beginnings were commonplace.³⁸ In the present study, I demonstrate how the cultural phenomena of colonization and foundation narratives illuminate the account of community replication found in Acts. As in many foundation narratives, geographical expansion – or relocation – in Luke's work receives its impetus from both divine (= oracle) and human (= *stasis*) causes.

Someone who has given much thought to the relevant background(s) of Luke's geography is James M. Scott.³⁹ He argues that Luke-Acts is governed by separate geographical horizons headlined by Rome and Jerusalem, respectively. The former is evoked, for example, by the census in Luke 2:1–2 and the later by the Acts 1:8 oracle's forecast of mission reaching from Jerusalem outward unto the "end of the earth" (Acts 1:8).⁴⁰ Scott surveys various ways of conceptualizing geography in ancient writings, including *periplus*-oriented descriptions and more theoretical-based approaches. He then turns to geographical views coincident with Rome's emergence as Mediterranean superpower, showcased in projects such as Julius Caesar's survey of the world, Agrippa's world map, and Augustus's *Res Gestae*.⁴¹

The epitome of Scott's position is that Luke accommodates to this Roman geographical vision in a manner commensurate with other Jewish writers of the

³⁸ Conzelmann is not oblivious to the wider context, of course. He notes that for Luke, places not only delineate salvation-history trajectories, but also assume a stereotyped quality – for example, mountains are a place of prayer, and Jerusalem is one of prophecy (*The Theology of St. Luke*, 28–29). Moreover, he identifies how Luke (especially in Acts) frequently "furnishes scenes with local color (Lystra, Philippi, Ephesus)" (*Acts*, xli). But Conzelmann's focus on Luke's activity as redactor leaves the impression that Acts is a theological piece of literature largely distinctive in its ancient context.

Sleeman simply does not take up the topic. His study certainly takes for granted that Christianity's movement throughout the broader Mediterranean context contributes to the motivation for a work such as Acts (see Vernon Robbins, "Luke-Acts: A Mixed Population Seeks a Home in the Roman Empire," in *Images of Empire*, ed. Loveday Alexander, JSOTSup 122 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991]). Consequently, he demonstrates rather effectively, in his own way, how Acts constitutes an imaginative construal of spatiality. Yet since Sleeman hews so close to the theoretical model, he neglects comparative material that might further illuminate Luke's claiming and (re)configuring of spaces for the Christian movement.

³⁹ James M. Scott, "Luke's Geographical Horizon," in *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting*, ed. David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf, vol. 2 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*, ed. Bruce W. Winter (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 483–544; idem, "Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations," in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles*, ed. Jostein Adna and Hans Kvalbein (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 87–123.

⁴⁰ Scott, "Luke's Geographical Horizon," 543–44.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 484–92.

time. Thus, “Jews had by the first century A.D. assimilated the Graeco-Roman world of their Roman overlords” while mapping onto it their traditional way of constructing the world.⁴² Among these traditions, the so-called Table of Nations in Genesis 10 allowed Jews inside and outside the geographical region of Israel to conceptualize the boundary regions of the inhabited world, with “the nations of *Japheth* in the northern and western lands, including Asia Minor and Europe (Gen 10:2–5); the nations of *Ham* in Egypt and North Africa (vv. 6–20); and the nations of *Shem* in Mesopotamia and Arabia (vv. 21–31).”⁴³ In similar fashion, Scott suggests, the Table of Nations furnished Luke with a ready-made geographical model for plotting the expansion of early Christianity. Not only does the catalogue of diaspora Jews in Acts 2:5–11 itself share commonalities with other Table of Nations traditions,⁴⁴ but also the broader structure of Acts reflects the Table of Nations framework established via missions to Shem (2:1–8:25), Ham (8:26–40), and Japheth (9:1–28:31).⁴⁵

Loveday Alexander’s work on the geography of Acts also considers the narrative in its ancient literary context.⁴⁶ She acknowledges (like Conzelmann) that geography is critical for the progression of Acts but desires to capitalize on this insight through discussion of the differences (as well as similarities) between travel and geography in Acts and that of other broadly contemporaneous writings. She notes, for instance, that Acts’ place descriptions typically focus on cities and thus are at variance with Paul’s own scattered accounts of his trips, which tend to reference regions. Further, she observes very different attitudes toward sea voyage: Acts effectively glorifies it as the means of transporting Paul (and hence early Christianity) across the Mediterranean all the way to Rome; by contrast, Paul accepts it with a measure of distaste.

Indeed, comparison offers Alexander a fruitful way of considering Acts’ geography more broadly. Employing “voyage” as the middle term, Alexander reads Acts alongside Greek novels. She readily concedes that Acts displays a certain affinity with *periplus* literature and thus that it occasionally strikes a dissonant chord with the world of the novels on account of its “topographical

⁴² Scott, “Luke’s Geographical Horizon,” 492.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 501. Scott maintains that later Jewish texts such as 1 Chr 1:1–2:2; Dan 11; Isa 66:18–20; Jub. 8–9; 1QM 2.10–14; Josephus, *A.J.* 1.120–147; Philo, *Legat.* 279–329 all assume the Table of Nations partitioning.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 529–30. These include considerations of form (“part for whole,” “apparent lack of structure and uniformity”), content (e.g., names of nations), and context.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 540–41. Scott also argues for allusions to the Table of Nations in Paul’s speech in 17:22–31.

⁴⁶ Loveday Alexander, “‘In Journeying Often’: Voyaging in the Acts of the Apostles and in Greek Romance,” in *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 69–96; *idem*, “Narrative Maps: Reflections on the Toponymy of Acts,” in *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context*, 97–132.

factuality.”⁴⁷ At the same time, she argues that periodic returns to Jerusalem “gives the narrative in Acts a distinctive shape which is much closer to the shape of voyaging in the novels than in the epistles.”⁴⁸

Alexander’s discussion of “mental mapping” adds a further level of sophistication to her study of geography in Acts, facilitating consideration of how humans structure their world. A concept borrowed from cognitive geography, mental mapping posits that human beings organize their world in different ways (not least, according to center and periphery). Alexander appropriates the concept in order to imagine and compare the respective mental maps of Acts, Paul, and the Greek novels; toponyms furnish the raw data. Beyond noting the propensity of such maps to suggest geographical horizons and invisible landscapes, Alexander argues that they reveal “political” and “emotional” landscapes, which “may provide a window into worldviews less frankly displayed in other ancient texts.”⁴⁹ Geographical description, in other words, possibly reflects biases in how the world is perceived.

Alexander and Scott’s fundamental contribution is just this: showing how geographical descriptions in Acts reflect a particular way of organizing the world. Here they echo Conzelmann’s basic insight but extend its implications in a more contextualized direction than either Conzelmann’s theologically-oriented work or Sleeman’s theory-driven construal. Scott’s studies foster greater appreciation for how Jews and Christians might formulate views of the inhabited (i.e., Roman) world using native traditions and in so doing, stake out their identity in it. Alexander widens the analysis by showing how the geography of Acts compares with that of contemporary non-Jewish or Christian works, notably the Greek novels.

However, neither scholar fully explores how Luke’s geographical horizons relate to his depiction of Christian beginnings in specific locales, including how his protagonists (Peter/Paul, the Holy Spirit) reconfigure space via their actions. Foundation narratives offer a useful comparison for exploring this issue. In the present book, for example, I trace how founders – capitalizing on divine guidance – define the spaces of their new communities.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 116.

⁴⁸ *Idem.*, “In Journeying Often,” 74.

⁴⁹ *Idem.*, “Narrative Maps,” 113.

1.2 An Alternative Approach: (Luke-) Acts and Cult/Community Foundations

1.2.1 Studies of Colonization and Related Accounts

Before looking at approaches which compare Acts to foundation narratives, I will introduce a few works by scholars who examine *ktisis* accounts and/or the broader context of colonization.⁵⁰ These studies illustrate how the subject matter can be explored from numerous intriguing perspectives. Irad Malkin's *Religion and Colonization* represents a historical-critical investigation.⁵¹ Using literary, epigraphic, and archaeological sources, the author seeks to reconstruct the constituent elements of Greek colonization, especially in the Archaic period. As the title suggests, Malkin is keen to delineate how Greek religion shaped colonization, beginning with oracular authorization at Delphi but including practices such as divination, transfer of sacred fire, siting of sacred

⁵⁰ In addition to the works mentioned below, the following treatments of colonization are of interest: John Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas: Their Colonies and Trade* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1980), gives an archaeologist's perspective on Greek colonization. The studies in Vanessa B. Gorman and Eric W. Robinson, eds., *Oikistes: Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), place colonization in a wider profile. Henry R. Hurst and Sara Owen, eds., *Ancient Colonizations: Analogy, Similarity and Difference* (London: Duckworth, 2005), demonstrate how colonization was a varied phenomenon. The numerous case studies in Gocha R. Tsetskhladze, ed., *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2006–2008), bear this out. Guy Bradley and John-Paul Wilson, *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions* (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2006), explore colonization at the point of contact between settlers and natives. Ted Kaizer et al., eds., *Cities and Gods: Religious Space in Transition* (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), consider spatial repercussions of colonization. Getzel M. Cohen, *The Seleucid Colonies: Studies in Founding, Administration and Organization* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1978), and idem, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), examines colonization in Hellenistic times.

A number of important works focus on Roman colonization. Edward T. Salmon, *Roman Colonization under the Republic* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970), still offers valuable information. More recent overviews include those by Rebecca Sweetman, ed., *Roman Colonies in the First Century of Their Foundation* (Oxford: Oxbow, 2011) and Ségolène Demougine and John Scheid, eds., *Colons et colonies dans le monde romain* (Rome: École française de Rome, 2012). Other works focus on specific territories or regions. The study by Barbara Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), is an early analysis of this type, as is the more recent volume by Ioana Oltean, *Dacia: Landscape, Colonization and Romanization* (New York: Routledge, 2007). Finally, the study by P. Van Dommelen and Nicola Terrenato, *Articulating Local Cultures: Power and Identity under the Expanding Roman Republic*, JRASS 63 (Portsmouth: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2007), considers the social and ideological implications of Roman expansion.

⁵¹ Irad Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden: Brill, 1987).

precincts, and establishment of the *oikist* cult.⁵² Not all foundation accounts feature every element of this process, nor does every reported account factually recreate the original venture. Malkin's task here involves sifting reliable reportage from legendary accretions. His investigation yields a culturally patterned way of thinking about colonization in ancient Greece. While positivistic in places, the work remains illuminating. Malkin's critical insight – rigorously demonstrated – concerns the intricate connection between religion and colonization in the ancient Greek experience. The framework employed in my book utilizes such experiences as comparanda for analysis, offering a wider-than-usual ancient cultural lens for reading Acts. Implicitly, therefore, the book argues a case for how Luke's narrative of divinely driven replication would have resonated with his audience given its ancient Mediterranean setting.

Malkin's subsequent works, while still diachronic and rigorous in their use of literary and material evidence, express an interest in the social and political relevance of foundation narratives.⁵³ Two studies focus on the function of myth in such accounts.⁵⁴ In *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, Malkin explores how mythical narratives were used to articulate Sparta's territorial ambitions and, correspondingly, shape the identity of both the mother city (Sparta) and those within its colonizing network.⁵⁵

In *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity*, Malkin further expands his exploration of how myth functions within history.⁵⁶ Here he focuses on the “‘active’ role of myth in filtering, shaping, and mediating cultural and

⁵² The seminal work on the oracle of Delphi is Herbert W. Parke and Donald E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956). See also Joseph Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).

⁵³ One of his most recent works appropriates network theory to explain the varied sets of relationships existing between *metropoleis* and colonies in the Greek world. See Irad Malkin, *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). Underpinning this study is the observation that Greek identity began to take shape during the high tide of colonization – that is, when Greeks were moving outward from “the mainland.” Though Malkin shows how no two versions of *metropolis*-colony relations looked the same, he points to the enduring connections forged via trade, cultic practices, benefactions, et cetera as a compelling reason for common identity at a time of dispersion.

⁵⁴ Cf. Martin P. Nilsson, *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1951), on the function of myth in Greek society more generally, and Claude Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece: The Symbolic Creation of a Colony*, trans. D. W. Berman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), on the operation of myth in different retellings of the foundation of Cyrene.

⁵⁵ Irad Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

⁵⁶ Idem, *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

ethnic encounters.”⁵⁷ As might be expected, therefore, Malkin is not interested in reconstructing factual events behind mythical retellings; rather he concentrates on the “dynamism between that which ‘happens’ ... and that which is continuously influenced by observation.”⁵⁸ Malkin chooses the returns of Odysseus as a conceptual center for his study, since the mythical hero’s adventures were used to frame later Greek experiences of trade, exploration, and colonization.

Another work which explores how foundation accounts function is Carol Dougherty’s *The Poetics of Colonization*.⁵⁹ Dougherty isolates key narrative features that represent both exigencies in the Greek experience and attempts to resolve them. Hence, the phenomenon of murderous founders correlates with societal concerns about purification; the riddling oracle – with its identification of seemingly impossible sites to colonize – reflects the unknowns of colonization; and the *oikist* cult symbolically resolves the crisis that prompted resettlement in the first place.⁶⁰ Since Dougherty’s investigation is not diachronic, she is able to compare early and late elements alongside each other as variations of a colonization pattern comprising crisis, consultation, foundation, and resolution.

Two insights of Dougherty’s work deserve special mention. First, she recognizes the “present” uses of foundation narratives in Greek colonial experiences.⁶¹ The enduring utility of such narratives is evident from their survival and use down to and through the Roman period. But Dougherty suggests, moreover, that they served a vital purpose even in early colonial contexts – for example, to obscure violent conquests, justify local traditions, et cetera. Second, Dougherty’s study underscores the malleability of colonization as a metaphor. Due to such flexibility, the metaphor was deployed in many different literary and social contexts. Dougherty illustrates this superbly in her analysis of Pindar’s poetry, which compares athletic victories to successful colonization endeavors.⁶²

Malkin and Dougherty’s studies about how foundation accounts about the past function in the present inform my own analysis. Two insights are especially relevant. First, mythical/legendary narratives often serve to advance hegemonic or territorial claims. In my analysis of Acts, I demonstrate how in relating the distant origins of the Christian movement, Luke appeals to Jewish

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 5. The essays in Jean-Paul Descoeudres, ed., *Greek Colonists and Native Populations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), examine such encounters along historical lines.

⁵⁸ Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus*, 7.

⁵⁹ Carol Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 13–80.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 103–56. Cf. Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece*.

ancestors both to anchor the beginnings of the new cult community in a more ancient sacred history and to legitimate its connections to lands outside Judea. Second, colonization accounts are malleable in form, featuring various motif configurations; as such, they are serviceable in different contexts. In this book, for example, I illustrate how Luke employs a range of colonization motifs to glorify the beginnings of a minority religious community embedded in cities throughout the Mediterranean world.

Elizabeth Gebhard's article, "The Gods in Transit," provides further warrant for the connection between community foundations and cult expansion suggested in my analysis of Acts.⁶³ Gebhard focuses on cult transfer narratives. The form of such stories, she postulates, derives from the earlier colony and/or cult foundation narrative type, which itself grew out of epic and elegiac poetry. Gebhard attaches little historical value to cult transfer accounts, averring that the creative deployment of *topoi* is responsible for both the shape and contents of such narratives.⁶⁴ She details these *topoi* and analyzes their variations in specific narratives of cult transfer – for example, that of Artemis's cult to Mas-salia, Serapis's to Delos (etc.), Asclepius's to Corinth (etc.), and Magna Mater's to Rome. She isolates recurring thematic elements in these narratives: (1) initial crisis; (2) oracular appeal; (3) oracular response; (4) impediments to transfer; (5) god/goddess's arrival; (6) and establishment of sanctuary/erection of image.⁶⁵

Gebhard's study represents a commendable piece of scholarship. She rightly notes the key similarities shared by stories of cult transfer, on the one hand, and those of cult and colony foundations, on the other. Indeed, my analysis of Acts in subsequent chapters as a story about community foundations *and* cult transfer will capitalize on this recognition. Further, Gebhard is incisive in her identification of *topoi* which occur in both types of accounts. The *topoi* overlap significantly with the thematic elements of colonization narratives identified by Dougherty.⁶⁶

⁶³ Elizabeth R. Gebhard, "The Gods in Transit: Narratives of Cult Transfer," in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Religion and Philosophy*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 451–76. Robert Garland, *Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion* (London: Duckworth, 1992), explores a similar subject matter in relation to ancient Athens. Alain Blomart, "Transferring the Cults of Heroes in Ancient Greece: A Political and Religious Act," in *Philostratus's Heroikos: Religion and Cultural Identity in the Third Century C.E.*, ed. Ellen Bradshaw Aitken and Jennifer K. Berenson Maclean (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 85–98, attempts to show how cult transfers/introductions had a protective function in the ancient *polis*.

⁶⁴ Gebhard, "The Gods in Transit," 453–54.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 455.

⁶⁶ Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization*, 13–80; Cf. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*.

However, Gebhard's exclusive focus on the literary form of transfer accounts gives short shrift to their functional significance, an issue quite separate from that of historicity. Might not the form of transfer and foundation narratives reflect a way of envisioning beginnings, one which owes as much to cultural expectations as literary form? Dougherty and Malkin's (later) works⁶⁷ maintain that this was true for an earlier period in Mediterranean history, demonstrating the stakes both for a community's internal identity (Dougherty) and for its geo-political clout (Malkin). In the present volume, I illustrate how Acts embodies this "poetics of colonization" (to borrow Dougherty's phrase) as a way of defining and legitimizing Christian origins.

1.2.2 Studies of Paul

Prior to examining studies of (Luke-) Acts, I wish to note several studies devoted to Paul's activities and their potential reception in light of the ancient Mediterranean context. In his study of Romans 6, Hans Dieter Betz likens Paul to a founding figure, who transfers the ritual of baptism to the nascent Christian community situated in the empire's capital.⁶⁸ Betz's student, James Constantine Hanges, fills out this characterization in a full-length monograph exploring the "founding-figure" in the Hellenistic-Roman world, the final chapter of which considers Paul's relationship to the founder paradigm.⁶⁹ Cavan Concannon's study "*When You Were Gentiles*" is also worthy of note.⁷⁰ Primarily interested in ethnicity, including ethnic reconfiguration, Concannon is nevertheless alert to how local colonization traditions might shape corporate identity – in this case, both that of Corinth in relation to Rome⁷¹ and the Christians dwelling in the city as a distinct community.⁷²

These studies are suggestive for their characterization of Paul (as founder – Betz, Hanges) and his communities ("colonies" – Concannon). None of them, however, explores in detail how these conceptualizations relate to the colonization *topos* (despite brief allusions by Concannon). Moreover, Hanges alone

⁶⁷ See above.

⁶⁸ Hans Dieter Betz, "Transferring a Ritual: Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Romans 6," in *Paulinische Studien: Gesammelte Aufsätze III von Hans Dieter Betz* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 240–71.

⁶⁹ James Constantine Hanges, *Paul, Founder of Churches: A Study in Light of the Evidence for the Role of "Founder-Figures" in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. WUNT 292 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012). On the subject of foundation narratives more broadly, see idem, "The Greek Foundation-Legend: Its Form and Relation to History," SBLSP 34 (1995): 494–520.

⁷⁰ Cavan Concannon, "*When You Were Gentiles*": *Specters of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul's Corinthian Correspondence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014).

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 48.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 80.

considers Luke's portrayal of Paul as founder in Acts – and then, only in a brief section.⁷³

1.2.3 Studies of Luke-Acts

Paralleling this research on Paul are a batch of studies that relate Luke's works to the theme of foundations. Laura Nasrallah's article, "The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Cities, and Hadrian's Panhellenion," merits attention here. Nasrallah's chief concern is giving the geographical ambitions of Acts a plausible historical context.⁷⁴ She argues that the Second Sophistic – following Hadrian's rule (second century CE) – provides the most intelligible background for the work. Peculiar features of Luke's work such as its harmonizing, borderline status between history and novel, and preoccupation with *paideia* fit this historical and literary setting. Acts' geographical horizon, moreover, corresponds nicely with Hadrian's imperial policies. This emperor, Nasrallah notes, actively promoted interregional cooperation via city-leagues such as the Panhellenion. It is no wonder then that Acts imagines a Christianity rooted in civic ties forged through Paul's travels. The work is interested "not necessarily in establishing links between cities.... Rather, it is interested in the larger geographical imagining of Christian etiological myths for various cities."⁷⁵

Leaving aside her argument about the date of Acts, there is much to take away from Nasrallah's work. Critically, she recognizes the civic (political and social) dimensions of Acts by comparing the establishment of Christian centers in Acts to those of Greek cities. Nasrallah's argument further suggests that Acts' depiction of Christian beginnings in particular cities resembles how foundation myths articulated the origin of *poleis*. Unfortunately, however, her concern with establishing a second-century dating of Acts largely dictates the course of her discussion; the result is that when she explores how Luke formulates *paideia* in Acts 2, 14, 16, and 17, she fails to capitalize on her own comparison of Acts with foundation accounts. My study works out this comparison in more detail.

Marla Selvidge explicitly analyzes Acts as a kind of foundation myth, a violent one at that.⁷⁶ Selvidge isolates key features of Luke's etiological account. She notes, for example, the development of the *dynamis* of God theme and how

⁷³ Hanges, *Paul, Founder of Churches*, 442–46.

⁷⁴ Laura Nasrallah, "The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Cities, and Hadrian's Panhellenion," *JBL* 27 (2008): 533–66. See also, idem, *Christian Responses to Roman Art and Architecture: The Second-Century Church amid the Spaces of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

⁷⁵ Idem, "The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Cities, and Hadrian's Panhellenion," 550.

⁷⁶ Marla Selvidge, "The Acts of the Apostles: A Violent Aetiological Legend," *SBLSP* 25 (1986): 330–40.

it sanctions the expansion of the Christian movement in the narrative.⁷⁷ She especially focuses on the frequency of conflict in Acts. Accordingly, Selvidge concludes that the substantial attention devoted to instances of Christian and Jewish as well as Christian and Roman discord normalizes such conflict along with the violent character of Acts as a whole.

Selvidge's study certainly offers an insightful take on Luke's second volume. Her classification of Acts as an etiological account highlights the ways its features (specifically, divine power and violence) legitimate early Christian expansion. However, Selvidge insufficiently contextualizes her analysis. First, she offers minimal comparison to illustrate how these features operate in other etiological or foundation accounts from the ancient Mediterranean world. Second, and correspondingly, she does not articulate how the power of God and violence themes relate to additional motifs in such accounts. My utilization of colonization as an analytic framework contextualize Acts in both respects. Above all, I am thereby able to compare motifs in Acts with those in other community origin narratives, helping to clarify their variations and function.

"Urban Legends," the title of Walter Wilson's study, reveals the author's conceptual reference point: Greek and Roman *ktisis* ("foundation") narratives.⁷⁸ Wilson contends that the ubiquity of these stories in the ancient Mediterranean world offers a significant clue about the type of expectations a reader would brought to a broadly historical writing like Acts. He argues that the work would have been received as a story about institutional beginnings, akin to the countless other contemporary accounts glorifying civic and cultic beginnings.⁷⁹ In the case of Acts, what Luke relates is "Christianity's transformation from a small band of Galileans following Jesus into a vast, multicultural network of urban churches."⁸⁰

Wilson is careful to point out, however, that such "portrayals of urban origins (*ktiseis*) do not constitute a fixed or autonomous subgenre, but function in various settings, exhibiting diverse styles, perspectives, and forms."⁸¹ Wilson delineates some of the common features of foundation narratives, which he characterizes as "strategies of colonial storytelling."⁸² While he does not argue that Luke consciously "drew on such foundational tales in framing history [in Acts], or that he wanted this audience to construe the church as a *polis*," Wilson effectively utilizes the conceptual paradigm of foundations to illuminate "the general fund of narrative and tropological strategies that Luke shared with

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 331–34.

⁷⁸ Wilson, "Urban Legends," 77–99.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 77–78.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 78.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 80.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 81.

other Greco-Roman writers who were also telling stories about the origins of their communities.”⁸³

Wilson’s analysis of Acts 10:1–11:18, the account of Peter’s meeting with Cornelius and the beginning of the gentile Christian community, reveals the fruitfulness of the approach. He identifies several features that correlate with elements typical of foundation tales, including (1) the unexpected nature of the foundation enterprise; (2) the divine initiative undergirding it; (3) the conflict associated with its impetus; (4) the new – oftentimes multiethnic – social character engendered by its realization; (5) and the ambiguous nature of the colony’s relationship with the mother city. These similarities, he suggests “point to a shared context of cultural phenomena and the literary representation of those phenomena that could be pressed into the service of communal self-definition and apologetic.”⁸⁴

Wilson’s cogent and methodologically sound study demonstrates the value of examining Acts alongside foundation narratives in Greek and Roman literature. More work remains to be done, however. My study builds on his in at least two ways. Most basically, in a full-length book I am able to explore how Luke exploits the “strategies of colonial story telling” in a significant chunk of his narrative. But further, the colonization lens allows me to evaluate more fully *at the cultural level* what it means to characterize motifs in this way. For example, I am able to illustrate how foundation motifs are reflected in Roman practices of colonization roughly contemporary with Acts – and in material not just literary evidence.

Two other studies of (Luke-) Acts are worthy of note. In *Plots of Epiphany*, John Weaver examines the prison escapes in Acts in light of relevant *topoi* in Greek and Roman literature.⁸⁵ Weaver, like Wilson, avoids claiming that Luke directly relied on a specific subgenre of literature in crafting these episodes. Rather, he identifies recurrent patterns in comparanda as a means of illuminating how the prison escapes in Acts function in their narrative context. For this analysis, Weaver adopts an approach in harmony with Wendy Doniger’s concept of “micromyth” – a “reduction of different mythic stories to a shared progression of events.”⁸⁶ The progression he identifies in the prison escapes – plots of epiphany – involves (1) the arrival of a new god/cult; (2) conflict with impious ruler(s); (3) imprisonment; (4) epiphanic deliverance from prison; (5) death or repentance of oppressor; (6) and establishment of cult.⁸⁷ Weaver examines this pattern of denouement in Greek and Roman accounts and then in

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 79.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 98.

⁸⁵ John Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004).

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 23

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 22.

Acts 1–7, 12, and 16. He observes how like mythical accounts in general, plots of epiphany serve a legitimizing function – both in the narrative and the (implied) social context.

Weaver's study is helpful in two specific regards. First, his construal of myth encourages fruitful comparison since it identifies similarities spanning different kinds of literary accounts. Second, it is flexible in its application – that is, sensitive to a given work's narrative arc.⁸⁸ Thus, for example, Weaver applies his conceptual framework to Acts 1–7 in order to ascertain how prison escape elevates Christian origins; Acts 12, how it serves the cause of group validation; Acts 16, how it legitimates cult foundations in a civic context (Philippi). The last of these subjects naturally dovetails with my own study. However, though Weaver explores how cult and civic foundation narratives intersect and relate to accounts of prison escape, he does not investigate how foundation themes proliferate in other episodes of Acts. Moreover, Weaver's focus on prison escapes precludes an analysis of how colonization as a broader cultural phenomenon informs motifs in foundation accounts. My project engages both questions.

David Balch is another scholar who links Luke-Acts to *ktisis* narratives.⁸⁹ This comparison, he argues, is not due to the work's genre but rather its aim: to establish the origins of Christianity as a social and religious movement.⁹⁰ On this reckoning, Jesus functions as the movement's founder (= *oikist*) in the gospel of Luke, while figures such as Peter and Paul fulfill a similar role in Acts.⁹¹ Balch evinces further overlap between Acts (in particular) and foundation narratives, including emphases on divine initiative, community growth, mixed ethnicity, and conflict (or *stasis*) – often initiated by the founder.⁹² He devotes the bulk of his attention, however, to a feature in Acts especially relevant to institutional identity: constitutional change.

Balch frames his analysis of Acts with a comparison of how two other authors treat the issue of constitutional change, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Plutarch. He observes that each author's overall aims predetermine how constitutions are presented, whether as static or changing. Thus, Dionysius –

⁸⁸ The present book's analytic mode shares these same advantages. The colonization framework embraces comparison between a wide range of accounts, textual and material, while recognizing variations in the expression of cultural motifs.

⁸⁹ David 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), 139–88.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 154.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 174.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 154–74.

whose goal was legitimation – presents Rome’s constitution as static, while Plutarch – whose interest was comparison – relates the changes it underwent.⁹³

Balch harnesses the comparative perspectives on the Roman constitution to re-characterize the controversies in Acts over purification and table fellowship. What was at stake for Luke, roughly speaking, was the institutional identity of early Christianity. Conflicting perspectives stemming from priestly and prophetic traditions, respectively, explain the specific controversies in Acts; yet the controversies also approximate debates about constitutions in Luke’s broader Mediterranean environment.⁹⁴ As for the comparison between Christian communities and *poleis*: Balch contends it is justified based on the translocal character of Hellenistic Judaism from which early Christianity arose.⁹⁵

Balch’s study offers valuable insights. Most helpful, of course, is his analogy between the communities founded in Acts and cities in the wider ancient Mediterranean milieu. His defense of the comparison on the basis of both the translocal character of Hellenistic Judaism and early Christianity is apposite: It accounts for the unique preoccupations of these minority communities (e.g., table fellowship) while underscoring their wider intelligibility as markers of institutional identity. Balch’s comparison thus illuminates how Acts might have been received by its ancient audience.

The present book extends Balch’s study in several ways. First, I consider a wide swath of comparative evidence, culled from Jewish, Greek, and Roman sources – both literary and material. Second, I provide a more robust comparison of Luke’s narrative and civic foundations; using a colonization framework, I analyze the profile of communities (e.g., ethnic composition, institutions) as well as the cultural motifs leveraged to validate them (e.g., origins, divine sanction, founding figures).⁹⁶ Third, I offer a fuller sketch of community foundation(s) in Luke’s narrative through an examination of several lengthy passages: Acts 1–5; 11:19–30/13:1–3/15:1–35; and 13:13–52.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 174–80.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 180–88.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 184–86. This construal undercuts the objection that Jesus and his apostles did not found cities. Furthermore, it invites exploration of how the ambivalent relationship between mother city and colony is approximated in the relationship between the Jerusalem community and its various offshoots in Acts.

⁹⁶ I thus capitalize on the same comparison made by Balch, arguing that Jewish and/or Christian minority communities – embedded within cities – might themselves be likened to colonies.

1.3 This Book's Approach: Reading Acts via a Colonization Framework

The works surveyed in this chapter exemplify different approaches to (Luke-) Acts. While each makes a valuable contribution to the study of Luke's narrative(s), I have throughout distinguished these approaches from my own. In the present book, my concern is neither the genre nor the geography of Acts. Rather, I am interested in how the cultural lens of colonization informs the reading of Acts as a story of Christian origins. My book thus shares the greatest affinity with the last set of studies surveyed.

However, in what follows I move beyond such studies. Using the colonization framework, I analyze several significant movements in Luke's narrative of Christian beginnings/replication, each of which displays common colonizing concerns. But first, I articulate this analytic framework, drawing on accounts of colonization in different historical periods.

Chapter 2

Colonization – An Analytic Framework

2.1 Introduction

This book illustrates the benefit of using colonization as a lens for reading Acts of the Apostles, Luke’s narrative about the origin and replication of the Christian community. The present chapter articulates the analytic framework used throughout the study; it draws on accounts of colonization from Greek and Roman antiquity. In comparing these accounts and Acts, I am not suggesting that Luke’s narrative is, formally speaking, about colonization. What I do argue, however, is that conceiving Acts as a narrative of community replication is illuminating. Above all, this reading framework sheds light on critical features of the work – especially its attention to Jerusalem; prominent figures such as Peter and Paul; and divine guidance in the form of Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and dream-visions. Each legitimates the Christian community’s expansion. I begin by introducing Greek and Roman colonization as well as motifs frequently employed in depicting the foundation of new communities. Then, I analyze narratives and reports about colonization in several historical periods.

2.2 Colonization in the Ancient Mediterranean World

2.2.1 *A Variegated Phenomenon*

Colonization in the ancient Mediterranean world was a variegated phenomenon. Nevertheless, some generalizations are possible. In the Archaic period, private settlement ventures featured more prominently than was the case during later eras.¹ By contrast, in the Classical period, powerful *poleis* such as Athens and Sparta oversaw the establishment of colonies (in Athens’ case, cleruchies as well) which furthered their strategic ambitions.² Alexander and his Hellenistic successors planted many colonies as founder-kings; particularly in the

¹ See, e.g., Robin Osborne, “Early Greek Colonization? The Nature of Greek Settlement in the West,” in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, ed. Nick Fisher and Hans Van Wees (London: Duckworth, 1998), 255, 268.

² See Thomas Figueira, “Colonisation in the Classical Period,” in *Greek Colonisation*, 2:427–523.

later instances, these foundations tended to involve rather disruptive processes of depopulation and resettlement.³

Roman colonization was also quite varied.⁴ Throughout most of the Republican period, colonization fell within the purview of the senate,⁵ which appointed commissioners (decemvirs or triumvirs) to supervise the establishment of each colony.⁶ With their mandate, the commissioners supervised the ritual foundation of the colony.⁷ Toward the end of the Republic, powerful individuals such as Sulla, Marius, and then Caesar embraced colonization as means for resettling key members of their powerbase, whether in the military (e.g., Sulla) or among the urban poor (Marius and Caesar).⁸ In the Imperial period, colonization furthered the geo-political aims of the empire, namely, expansion and consolidation of territory. While many of the formal procedures of colonization remained unchanged, the emperor assumed a symbolic role as colony founder, much like that of the founder-kings in the Hellenistic period.⁹ As will be seen in chapter 5, Roman colonies such as Antioch of Pisidia foregrounded – through their architecture and ritual practices – the emperor’s role in shaping civic identity. This brief overview reveals that Greek and Roman colonization was a diverse phenomenon. Nevertheless, recurrent motifs in colonization accounts suggest that there were some common ways of thinking about the phenomenon in antiquity.

2.2.2 Colonization Motifs

2.2.2.1 Origins

One of the most fundamental colonization motifs is that of “origins.” The concern for colonial origins manifests itself in various and sometimes overlapping ways, though almost always with the aim of legitimating the colony.¹⁰ A vivid way of achieving this purpose was to attribute a colony’s beginnings to a noteworthy event of some sort, especially a crisis. Examples of crisis include

³ On Hellenistic colonization, see especially Cohen, *The Seleucid Colonies*; idem, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*.

⁴ See Susan E. Alcock, “Roman Colonies in the Eastern Empire: A Tale of Four Cities,” in *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters*, ed. Gil J. Stein (Sante Fe: School of American Research Press, 2005), 297–329, who notes the diversity of practices relating to Roman colonization during the late Republican and early Imperial periods.

⁵ See, e.g., Cicero, *Phil.* 13.31; Livy 8.16.14; 39.55.5.

⁶ Cicero, *Agr.* 1.5.16; 2.4.10; 2.12.31; Livy 4.10–11; 9.28.8; 10.21.9; 35.53.2.

⁷ See, e.g., Varro 5.143; Cicero, *Phil.* 2.102; Cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 7.

⁸ Salmon, *Roman Colonization under the Republic*, 130–32, 136–44; Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 3–4.

⁹ This was especially the case in the Greek East. See Timothy J. Cornell, “Gründer,” *RAC* 12.

¹⁰ There are exceptions. Note, for example, the accounts of Jerusalem’s foundation given by Manetho (per Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.225–250) and Diodorus (34/35.1). See chapter 3.

overpopulation,¹¹ drought,¹² plague,¹³ Persian aggression,¹⁴ and *stasis*.¹⁵ Later, I will argue Acts proffers “crisis” – namely, *stasis* – as an explanation for the replication of the Christian community outside Judea.¹⁶ And indeed, as an explanation crisis does possess a certain verisimilitude, when one takes into consideration the hazardous conditions of ancient Mediterranean life. However, as a means of legitimation, it is just as key that such crises furnished *memorable* origin accounts.¹⁷

The most obvious way for a colony, or a colonization account, to emphasize origins is by underscoring the identity of the *metropolis*,¹⁸ whether a Greek *polis* or Rome. Though by nature ambivalent, the colony-*metropolis* relationship possessed both practical and symbolic import,¹⁹ signaled by the

¹¹ See Plato: “As a final step, – in case we are ... faced with a superabundance of citizens ..., – there still remains that ancient device which we have often mentioned, namely, the sending forth, in friendly wise from a friendly nation, of colonies of such people as are deemed suitable” (*Laws*, 740e [Bury, LCL]; cf. 708b; Xenophon, *Anab.* 5.6.15–17; 6.4.3–5).

¹² See, e.g., the foundation of Cyrene (Herodotus 4.151).

¹³ See, e.g., the foundations of Tripodisci (Pausanias 1.43) and Heraclea Pontica (Justin 16.3.4–7).

¹⁴ See, e.g., the foundations of Abdera (Herodotus 1.168) and Hyele (Herodotus 1.165–167).

¹⁵ See, e.g., the foundations of Petelia (Strabo 6.1.3), Taras (Diodorus 8.21.2–3; Strabo 6.3.2–3), and Syracuse (Plutarch, *Mor.* 772d–777b).

¹⁶ See chapter 5.

¹⁷ In many narratives, this depiction contributes to a crisis – Delphic consultation – resolution pattern. See Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization*. This same pattern is reproduced in stories of cult transfer. See Gebhard, “The Gods in Transit,” 451–76. As a corollary of their focus on crisis, such accounts tend to downplay any economic and strategic motive for colonization. Seen in this light, the element of “crisis” functions similarly to the “surprised *oikist*” motif, which highlights the selection of an unwitting founder. On the surprised *oikist* generally, see Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization*, 18. On the inadequacies of the *oikist* specifically, see Hanges, *Paul, Founder of Churches*, 71, 79.

¹⁸ Even depictions of *stasis* such as we find in Strabo’s foundation account(s) of Taras (see chapter 4) were likely meant to strengthen, rather than sunder, the connection between the colony and her *metropolis* (in this case, Sparta). See Jonathan Hall, “Foundation Stories,” in *Greek Colonisation*, 2:383–426.

¹⁹ See A. J. Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Ares, 1983). The relationship between Abdera and Teos reveals the symbolic potency of the *metropolis*-colony bond. According to Herodotus, Teians fled to Thrace after Persians besieged their homeland. Successfully driving out the natives, the settlers founded the colony of Abdera. Some evidence suggests, though, that Abdera later refounded Teos, her erstwhile mother-city! Indeed, a Teian inscription (SEG 31.985) published by Peter Herrmann, “Teos and Abdera im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Ein neues Fragment der Teiorum Dirae,” *Chiron* 11 (1981): 1–30, reads “I gave birth to my mother’s mother.” On the probability of this refoundation, and the close ties between Abdera and Teos, see Ian Rutherford, *Pindar’s*

obligations laid on both parties.²⁰ A colony also might link her origins to a particular *metropolis*/region by adopting laws and institutions associated with the latter. We see this, for example, in Acragas' implementation of Geloan institutions (*nomima*),²¹ Massalia's appropriation of Ionian laws (*nomoi*),²² and Antioch of Pisidia's organization into Roman *vici* along with her adoption of the Roman *ordo*.²³ I will demonstrate in the course of this study how Luke also prioritizes the *metropolis* (first Jerusalem, then Antioch) when narrating the formation of new Christian communities.²⁴ In doing so, Acts displays the “origins” *topos* prominent in colonization accounts.

Of course, the formation of mixed colonies – comprising settlers from two or more origins – problematizes a straightforward relationship between colony and *metropolis*. Jointly-founded colonies were often necessary given limitations on manpower. Strabo reports, for instance, how Milesians, Erythraeans, and Parians banded together to found Parium on the Hellespont, and how farther southeast along the Gulf of Saros, Mytilenians and Cumaeans joined forces to plant Enos.²⁵ Elsewhere and much later, Corinth and Corcyra each contributed settlers to the Illyrian colony that was later christened Apollonia.²⁶ Despite its necessity, the foundation of a mixed colony posed challenges for colonial identity. This particularly held true for the colony's relationship with its *metropolis*,²⁷ as my discussion below of Athens' foundation of Amphipolis and Thuri demonstrates.²⁸

Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 268; cf. A. J. Graham, “Abdera and Teos,” *JHS* 112 (1992): 44–73.

²⁰ See the introduction to colonization in the Classical period below.

²¹ See below.

²² See chapter 4.

²³ See chapter 5.

²⁴ See chapters 3, 4, and 5.

²⁵ 7 fr. 51 (52).

²⁶ Strabo 7.5.8. There are countless other examples. Acragas was founded by Aristonous and Pystilus (Thucydides 6.4.4); Ascras was founded by Ephialtes and Otus (Pausanias 9.29.1); Brea was founded by Democlidides and ten *oikistae* (IG 1³46); Camarina was founded by Dascon and Menecolus (Thucydides 6.5.2–3); Cumae was founded by Megasthenes of Chalcis and Hippocles of Cumae (Strabo 5.4.4); Gela was founded by Antiphemus of Rhodes and Entimus of Crete (Thucydides 6.4.3; Diodorus 8.23.1); Heraclea Trachis was founded by Leon, Alcidas, and Damagon (Thucydides 3.92.5); Himera was founded by Euclides, Simus, and Sacon (Thucydides 6.5.1); Messene was refounded by Epaminondas of Thebes and Epiteles of Argos (Pausanias 4.26–27); Thuri was founded by Lampon and Xenocritus of Athens (Diodorus 12.9f); Zancle was founded by Gorgus and Manticlus (Pausanias 4.23.5–7) or Perieres and Krataimenes (Callimachus 2 fr. 6[22]).

²⁷ Aristotle identified mixed populations as the chief cause of *stasis* within a new *polis* (*Pol.* 1303 a25).

²⁸ Stories of mixed settlements such Rhegion (discussed below) also, implicitly, provide a rationale for the position of each *ethnos* within the colony.

But different participants in the settlement venture could forge compromise in the interest of unity and signaling a common identity. Such compromise might focus narrowly on deciding a colony's *metropolis* and name.²⁹ It might also, though, concentrate more broadly on determining a colony's *nomima*. According to Malkin, *nomima* were the “diacritical markers’ of a community and involved social divisions such as the name and number of ‘tribes,’ sacred calendars, and types and terminologies of institutions and magistracies.”³⁰ In other words, *nomima* provided a tangible expression of a community’s self-understanding. For mixed colonies such as Gela (see below) and Himera,³¹ these identity markers – “Dorian” and “Chalcidian,” respectively – served as mechanisms for unifying each community’s disparate constituents and evoking dominant origins. Something similar, I will argue, occurs in the establishment of what I call “second-generation” Christian colonies in Acts, those formed outside Judea and whose members contained both Jews and gentiles.³² In this particular case, nomenclature, leadership offices, and ethical norms contribute to a common identity, one which still acknowledges the Jewish roots of the new Christian communities. From what has been said, therefore, the issues of community identity and origins are closely intertwined.

²⁹ See, for example, the colonization of Cumae in southern Italy. Euboeans from Chalcis and Cumae joined together in the endeavor. Purportedly, the settlers agreed that the colony would borrow its name from Cumae, while acknowledging Chalcis as its *metropolis* (Strabo 5.4.4). Strabo (relying on Antiochus) similarly claims that Thuri and Tarantini resolved a conflict over who would colonize Siris by agreeing to settle the territory together provided that it be “adjudged the colony of the Tarantini” (6.1.14 [Smith]). But see Plutarch’s account of the founding of Acanthus (*Quest. rom.* 30), coveted by Chalcidians and Andrians alike. He reports that the first to reach the land could win the right of *metropolis* for his homeland. Ultimately, an Andrian scout launched his spear into the land ahead of his Chalcidian counterpart, winning it for Andros. In this particular case, the dispute which arose afterward underscores the failure of the solution to decide the *metropolis* of the joint settlement.

³⁰ Malkin, *A Small Greek World*, 55.

³¹ See Thucydides 6.5.1; cf. Malkin, *A Small Greek World*, 192.

³² See chapters 4 and 5.

Appealing to legendary/mythical figures³³ and traditions represents a further way colonization accounts legitimate colonies when delineating their origins. Traditions relating to the *nostoi*, the wandering of Heracles, and the Dorian and Ionian migrations³⁴ function in this way.³⁵ In what follows below, we will see mythology appropriated to adorn, for example, the origins of Croton in southern Italy. Later still in this book, I will show how some Jewish authors appealed to legendary traditions about the patriarchs in order to validate their diaspora communities. I will argue, moreover, that Luke does something very similar on behalf of Christian communities in Acts, particular the one founded in Antioch of Pisidia.³⁶ Here, my purpose has been to underscore how origins assume critical importance in colonization accounts. Their legitimating work took different forms, whether a focus on a precipitating crisis, a powerful or symbolic *metropolis*, legendary/mythical figures or events – or a combination of these.

2.2.2.2 Divine Sanction

Colonization accounts (and often practices) prioritize the role divine authorization plays in settlement ventures. Divine sanction takes many forms. The oracle of Delphi acted as the most common form of sanction in connection with colonization; this was in part because Apollo himself was associated with foundations. Thucydides suggests that Apollo of Delphi was critical to colonization already in the eighth century BCE, when Chalcidians – with Thoucles as their leader – founded Naxos in Sicily and built an altar to Apollo *Archegetes* outside the city.³⁷

³³ Compare the analysis of “historical” founders by Wolfgang Leschhorn, *Gründer der Stadt: Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1984), with that of divine and semi-divine figures by Friedrich Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* (Munich: C. H. Beck’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1979).

³⁴ On the Ionian migration, see Solon fr. 4a; Pherecydes fr. 155; Thucydides 1.12. Cf. Herodotus 1.145–148. On the Dorian migration, see Jonathan M. Hall, *A History of the Archaic Greek World, Ca. 1200-479 BCE*, 2nd ed. (Malden: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 44; Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, 43–45.

³⁵ Even the sober-minded Thucydides relates how Sicily was populated by Cyclopes and Laestrygonians prior to its colonization by the Greeks (6.2.1–2).

³⁶ See chapter 5.

³⁷ 6.3.1–2. *Theoroi* were to have sacrificed here before departing Sicily. On the cult of Apollo *Archegetes* centered at Naxos, see Parke and Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, 1:66–67; Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 27. Irad Malkin, “Apollo Archegetes and Sicily,” *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa* 16 (1986): 959–72; idem, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*; idem, *A Small Greek World*; Lieve Donnellan, “Oikist and Archegetes in Context: Representing the Foundation of Sicilian Naxos,” in *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses*, ed. Naoise Mac Sweeney (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 41–67.

Plato credits Apollo as the source of the “greatest, finest, and foremost of laws” (*Republic* 4.427b [Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL]), laws which concern the “foundation [ἰδρύσεις] of sanctuaries, sacrifices and other services paid to gods, spirits and heroes” (4.427c [Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL]). He declares that Apollo is the interpreter [ἑξήγητῆρ] for all mankind in such matters ...” (4.427b–c [Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL]).

Callimachus traces the god’s expertise to his own experience as founder of the island *polis* Delos,³⁸ which instilled in him a fondness for planting cities more generally.³⁹ The ubiquity of *poleis* named Apollonia, after the god, reveals that Thucydides, Plato, and Callimachus’s view was hardly a novel one in ancient Greece.⁴⁰ Pindar’s fourth, fifth, and ninth *Pythian Odes*, discussed below, demonstrate the ease with which the god’s activity could be woven into accounts of “historical” foundations.

Most often, Apollo planted cities by proxy through his oracle at Delphi.⁴¹

³⁸ Among other accomplishments, Apollo constructed an altar and walls from horns (*Hymn. Apoll.* 60–65). Indeed, divine figures were commonly credited with founding cities in antiquity. See Prehn, s.v. “Ktistes,” *RE*, 1922; Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie*; Cornell, “Gründer”; Leschhorn, *Gründer der Stadt*; Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece*; Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*; idem, *The Returns of Odysseus*.

³⁹ According to Callimachus, Apollo’s experience as founder also guaranteed the sagacity of his guidance to mortal founding figures such as Battos of Cyrene (*Hymn. Apoll.* 86).

⁴⁰ Examples include Apollonia in Akte, Libya, Macedonia, Mygdonia, and Thasos, as well as Apollonia Pontica on the Black Sea coast. See the list of ancient Greek colonies identified by Gocha R. Tsetsckhadze, “Introduction: Revisiting Ancient Greek Colonisation,” in *Greek Colonisation*, 1: xxiii – lxxxiii. According to Diodorus, Thuri also claimed the god as its founder (12.35.3), the selection probably calculated to reduce tensions between the colony’s “mixed” settlers. Pausanias also identifies Apollonia in Illyria (5.22.3). Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 87–88, conjectures that this city so named itself in order to assert independence from Corinth. Indeed, Thucydides identifies Corinth as Apollonia’s *metropolis* (1.26.2). (Pausanias reports yet another tradition that Corcyra was Apollonia’s *metropolis* [5.22.4]. Strabo maintains that Corinth and Corcyra founded Apollonia together [7.5.8].)

⁴¹ Most of the oracles gleaned from literary sources have little claim to authenticity. See Parke and Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*; Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle*. (Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, is a bit more credulous.) Parke and Wormell assign the oracular responses to nine periods, beginning with those rendered up to the end of the First Sacred War (early sixth c. BCE), and concluding with those extending from 30 BCE onward – to the end of the oracle’s influence during the period of the Roman Empire. They categorize oracles according to subject matter (e.g., “Oracles referring to six-century tyrants” [12]), style (e.g., “Another oracle of a similarly proverbial style” [125]), and probability (e.g., “Fictitious oracles of the sixth period” [117]). Fontenrose proposes a more systematic classification and comparison of the oracular responses based on their historical, legendary, and quasi-historical character. In categorizing the oracles, Fontenrose focuses on – *inter alia* –

While the oracle's definitive origin eludes us,⁴² sources such as Plutarch demonstrate the endurance of its cultural significance into the Roman period,⁴³ long after Delphi ceased to be a center of political importance. Literary accounts variously depict the oracle's place of authority in sanctioning colonization. Many times, for example, the oracle gives geographical directions to help the founder locate the proper site for the colony.⁴⁴ Such guidance might also take the form of a corrective⁴⁵ or be embedded in a riddle.⁴⁶ Those who pursued

the “question formula” (52), “occasion of consultation” (54), “modes of response” (45), and “topics of response” (48).

Questions of authenticity aside, the oracles shed light on ancient convictions about religion's place in colonization. Cf. Richard Stoneman, *The Ancient Oracles: Making the Gods Speak* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 2, 11, 26, who reproduces ancient testimony concerning oracular reports more generally. Apollo's oracle at Didyma (*Men. Rhet. Gr.* 3.442.44) is also credited with sanctioning colonies, as too is Zeus's oracle at Dodona (Dionysius 1.18, 51, 55) and Ammon's in Libya (Ps.-Callisthenes 1.30).

⁴² Ancient sources are divided on this question as well, particularly whether the oracle was installed at Delphi by force. See *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*; Aeschylus, *Eumenides*; Euripides, *Iph. taur.* For a thorough discussion of these accounts, see Parke and Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, 1:3–5.

⁴³ See, e.g., Plutarch, *Pyth. orac.*; *Def. orac.*; *E Delph.*

⁴⁴ Pausanias, for example, relates how the oracle given to Archias, founder of Syracuse, identified relevant land masses and water bodies: “An isle, Ortygia, lies on the misty ocean, over against Trinacria, where the mouth of Alpheius bubbles, mingling with the springs of broad Arethusia” (5.7.3 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]). Parke and Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, 1:50, suppose that Delphi acted as a repository of geographical knowledge. Cf. Thomas J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks: The History of Sicily and South Italy from the Foundation of the Greek Colonies to 480 B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), 38–39. This claim is hard to sustain. Geographical signposts in oracular reports likely originated locally and were designed for local consumption. See Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 46.

⁴⁵ See the discussion below of oracular reports in Herodotus's account(s) of Cyrene's founding (1.50–61) and in Strabo (6.1.12) and Diodorus's (8.17) accounts of Croton's founding.

⁴⁶ See the discussion below of the oracular reports in Diodorus (8.23.1) and Dionysius's (19.2) accounts of the foundation of Rhegion. Also illustrative are Diodorus's account of the colonization of Thurii (12.9) and Pausanias's account of the foundation of Taras (10.10.6). In the case of Thurii, the oracle purportedly informed a mixed party of settlers that they should “found a city ... where there would be water to drink in due measure (μέτρον), but bread to eat without measure (ἄμετρον)” (Diodorus 12.8.5 [Oldfather, LCL]). The settlers located the spring Thuria, discovering nearby a bronze pipe known as a μέδιμνος, which corresponds to the Athenian word for “corn measure” (cf. *LSJ*, s.v. μέδιμνος). There they founded Thurii. In the case of Taras, the riddle does not provide geographical clues; rather, it predicts the conquest of this territory in southern Italy. (In chapter 4, I will discuss the very different accounts of Taras's foundation transmitted by Dionysius [19.2], Diodorus [8.21.2–3], and Strabo [6.3.2–3].) According to Pausanias, when Phalanthus set out to found a colony, he received an oracle “that when he should feel rain under a cloudless sky (*aethra*) he would then win both a territory and a city” (10.10.6–7 [Jones, LCL]). The enigmatic

colonization on their own initiative were likely to meet with failure, as did Sparta when first seeking to colonize Tegea.⁴⁷ Mistaking the oracle's riddling response for authorization, the Spartan forces "danced" to their demise.⁴⁸ Indeed, the riddling nature of Delphi's oracles predisposed them to misinterpretation, with such misinterpretation supplying a rationale for failed outcomes. In other words, the fault lay with the interpreter *not* the god.⁴⁹ Whichever form the oracle took, the effect was the same, the effect was the same: to emphasize Apollo's supremacy in colonization.

Though the Delphic oracle is the most prominent form of divine sanction in colonization accounts, it is by no means the only one, as demonstrated below and throughout this study. Visions play a significant role in narratives such as Ovid's concerning the foundation of Croton,⁵⁰ Strabo's about the foundation of Massalia,⁵¹ and Pausanias's relating to the refoundation of Messene.⁵² So, too, do divine signs – like those in accounts about the foundation of Alexandria⁵³ and Rome⁵⁴ – and the interpretation of *manteis* – such as found in reports on Seleucus Nicator's foundations⁵⁵ and Xenophon's would-be settlement near the Black Sea.⁵⁶ In connection with colonization, cult transfers constitute

aspect of the riddle is at the forefront of the account: The *oikist* initially failed in his quest since "he neither examined the oracle himself nor informed one of his interpreters" (10.10.7 [Jones, LCL]). Only by happenstance – when Phalanthus's wife *Aethra* spilt her tears upon the ground in commiseration with his grief – did the founder perceive the oracle's meaning. Upon this recognition, Phalanthus seized the territory that would become Taras (10.10.7–8).

⁴⁷ Herodotus 1.66.

⁴⁸ The oracle pronounced: "Lands Tegeaeae I'll give thee, to smite with feet in the dancing, also the fertile plain with line I'll give thee to measure" (Herodotus 1.66 [Godly]). The oracle was fulfilled when the Tegeans made their Spartan captives "till the Tegean plain, wearing the fetter which they themselves had brought [for the Tegeans] and measuring the land with a line" (*ibid.*).

⁴⁹ See Herodotus's account of the foundation of Elea (1.165–167). Besieged by Harpagus the Median general, Phocaeans deserted their homeland and set out for Cymnos, "where at the command of an oracle they had twenty years before built a city called Alalia" (1.165 [Godley, LCL]). After five years, however, the settlers met stiff resistance from neighboring Tyrrhenians and Carchedonians and were forced to abandon their plan, at first sailing to Rhegion and then founding Hyele (Elea) in southern Italy. To rationalize what was a reversal for the Phocaeans – especially considering their prior connection to Cymnos – the narrative reports how "a man of Poseidonia [clarified] that when the Pythian priestess spoke of founding a settlement and of Cymnos, it was the hero that she signified and not the island" (1.167 [Godley, LCL]).

⁵⁰ Ovid, *Metam.* 15.1–60. See below.

⁵¹ Strabo 4.1.4–5. See chapter 4.

⁵² Pausanias 4.26–27. See below.

⁵³ Ps.-Callisthenes 1.30–31; Plutarch, *Alex.* 26. See below.

⁵⁴ Livy 1.1–17; Plutarch, *Rom.*; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1–2. See below.

⁵⁵ Malalas 199–201. See below.

⁵⁶ Xenophon, *Anab.* 6.4. See below.

particularly powerful forms of divine sanction, since they entail the corresponding spread of patron gods/goddesses – for example, the expansion of Apollo Karneios’s cult from Thera to Cyrene⁵⁷ and of Artemis Ephesia’s from Ionia to Massalia.⁵⁸ These examples⁵⁹ underscore how various forms of divine sanction play a critical role in colonization accounts. In the following chapters, I argue that Acts’ depictions of Jesus’s “commission” (1:8) and the Holy Spirit’s various manifestations (e.g., 2:1–4; 13:2–4) likewise operate as divine sanction, and do so in service of a similar aim – legitimating the replication of the Christian community.

2.2.2.3 Founder(s)

The prominent role of the founder in colonization is the third major motif in our analytic framework. There was, of course, variety in the nature of the founder(s)’s appointment. I have detailed some of this variety above. There are precedents for the appointment of both single and multiple founders.⁶⁰ The founder sometimes acted as a representative of the *metropolis*⁶¹ and at other times as more of an individual leader. Rather than diminish the value of founder as an analytic category, this diversity – when properly acknowledged – supports a typological flexibility. This becomes evident when I discuss the role of the apostles and Paul as founding figures who act as representatives of *the* founder, Jesus, and on behalf of the Jerusalem mother community.⁶²

⁵⁷ Pindar, *Pyth. 5*; Callimachus, *Hymn. Apoll. 72–73*. Cf. Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, 147. See chapter 4.

⁵⁸ Strabo 4.1.4–5.

⁵⁹ The Roman foundation ritual, in its own way, constitutes a form of divine sanction. See Plutarch, *Rom.* 1–4; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.88–89.

⁶⁰ We see this in some instances of colonization during the Classical period: E.g., Sparta appointed Leon, Alcidas, and Damagon as founders of Heraclea in Trachis (Thucydides 3.92.5; Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 38–39), and Athens appointed Lampon and Xenocritus as founders of Thurii (Diodorus 12.9). Cf. the purported foundation decree of Athens’ colony Brea (IG 1³ 46), which specifies that “Democles shall establish the colony with full powers to the best of his ability” (IG 1³ 46 [Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 228]) but also provides for the appointment of ten *oikistae* to serve alongside him, each of whom represents a tribe of Athens and is charged with parceling out land to the colony’s settlers. Perhaps the reasoning ran that the *metropolis*’ ability to exercise colonial oversight was best served by such distributed powers. As noted above, a similar arrangement applied during the Roman Republic: The senate appointed a committee of founders to plant the colony. Later, during the Imperial period, there is a return to the idea of a single founder, with emperors casting themselves in this role.

⁶¹ Indeed, Thucydides details a custom whereby the city wishing to plant a colony summoned a founder from its own *metropolis* (1.24.2). Though this practice was surely not as widespread as Thucydides imagines, it nevertheless illustrates how the founder might embody the link between colony and *metropolis*.

⁶² See chapter 3.

Such variation aside, there was common assent about one thing: the founder's divine charter. That the founder(s) acted with a divine calling – not just on the basis of his own initiative or that of the *metropolis* – typifies ancient perspectives on colonization, especially in the Archaic period. This viewpoint emerges in reports of Delphic consultations generally, as for example in the foundation accounts of Gela, Rhegion, and Croton discussed below. It is also apparent, more specifically, in the “surprised *oikist*” motif in accounts such as those of Herodotus and Diodorus about the foundation of Cyrene and Croton, respectively.⁶³ In these narratives the founder consults Delphi about an unremarkable concern and is told, unexpectedly, to found a city. The function of the motif is unambiguous: to stress the divine origin of the founder's charter. Even if to a lesser degree, accounts of colonization in the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods continue to underscore the divine sanction of founder(s), whether expressed through oracles, visions, portents, cult transfers, or founding rituals. This divine backing imbued the founder's actions with a sacred legitimacy.⁶⁴

If there was an essence to the founder's responsibility, it was community formation. He not only spearheaded the establishment of the community but also helped shape its identity. In practice, the details of this process varied. They would have often entailed the subjugation and subsequent fortification of the desired territory, as for example in Miltiades the Elder's colonization of Thracian Chersonese.⁶⁵ Other responsibilities would have included marking out boundaries, as Alexander does when founding his eponymous city in Egypt;⁶⁶ identifying sacred sites; and establishing institutions. Whatever the case may be, the founder's leadership in community formation is fundamental to this study, as will be seen below and in subsequent chapters. In analyzing Acts, I will highlight how the apostles (e.g., Peter and Paul) play a critical role in the establishment and identity formation of communities. Like colony founders, moreover, they perform these functions in compliance with a divine charter.

2.3 Colonization Accounts: Case Studies

My objective in what follows is to analyze accounts of colonization in different historical periods: Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman. Each introduction is designed to give a snapshot of some of the characteristics of colonization

⁶³ See below.

⁶⁴ Hence the development of the founder's cult. See, e.g., Pindar, *Paeon 2*; Herodotus 6.35–37; Thucydides 5.11; Libanius, *Or.* 11.52.

⁶⁵ Herodotus 6.35–37.

⁶⁶ Arrian 3.1.5–2.1; Plutarch, *Alex.*; Ps.-Callisthenes 1.30–31. See below.

in that period. The accounts which follow, however, should not be taken as accurate representations of colonization. Indeed, most are centuries removed from the events they describe. Rather, my treatment of these case studies is designed, in the first place, to show the prevalence of the “origins,” “divine sanction,” and “founder” motifs, and in the second, to provide a textured analysis of their different expressions. This discussion will fill out my colonization framework in preparation for the analysis of Acts in the succeeding chapters.

2.3.1 Colonization in the Archaic Period

The Archaic period was a time of abundant colonization in the Mediterranean world. Most settlement enterprises probably grew out of experiences of trade and exploration, and many were likely precipitated by hardships of various kinds in the *metropolis*. It follows that we should not imagine that in each case a city undertook colonization in order to advance some larger strategic agenda, whether economic or geo-political.⁶⁷ Most settlement parties originated as private enterprises, led by charismatic individuals and accompanied by elite aristocrats seeking opportunities for betterment abroad.⁶⁸ Such was probably the norm for Greek colonization in southern Italy and Sicily.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, colonies often adopted practices to highlight a relationship with their respective *metropoleis*,⁷⁰ particularly religious practices.⁷¹ At any rate, most of the narratives which survive are concerned with identifying the founder(s) and his divine mandate; these tend to focus on the *metropolis* as the origin rather than orchestrator of the colonizing endeavor.⁷² This is true particularly of the

⁶⁷ Corinthian colonization during this period represents a partial exception. See below.

⁶⁸ Figueira, “Colonisation in the Classical Period,” 2:427–28. Cf. Osborne, “Early Greek Colonization?,” 255, 268.

⁶⁹ Other areas colonized during this period include the Black Sea region, southern Europe (coastal regions of modern-day France and Spain), and North Africa (notably, Libya).

⁷⁰ Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 22: “The relationship between colonies and mother cities were considered important from the beginning of the great colonizing movement.”

⁷¹ In Naucratis (Egypt), various Greek *ethne* erected altars to their respective gods on land allotted by Pharaoh Amasis (Herodotus 2.178). In Apollonia Pontica (Thrace), Milesian settlers paid homage to their patron god, Apollo (Ps.-Skymnos 726–733; Pliny, *Nat.* 4.45; Strabo 7.6.1).

⁷² Herodotus’s account of the colonization of Thracian Chersonese by the Athenian Miltiades the Elder is instructive. Miltiades went to the oracle of Delphi with the question, should I colonize Thracian Chersonese? He had been invited to be *oikist* (founder) of the territory by members of the Dolonci tribe (6.35–37). By seeking out the oracle, Miltiades showed proper deference to the will of Apollo and thus received the latter’s sanction. Employing various martial maneuvers, he went on to carve out some Thracian territory for his own personal rule. He “built a wall across the neck of the Chersonese, and thus thrust the Apsinthians back ... [and then] made war upon the Lampsacenes first of all the rest” (6.37

accounts surveyed below, with the slight exception of Herodotus's narrative about the foundation of Cyrene.

2.3.1.1 *The Foundation of Gela*

The foundation of Gela, located on the southern coast of Sicily, is traditionally dated to the early seventh century BCE.⁷³ Thucydides (6.4.3) and Diodorus (8.23.1) attribute the city's name to the nearby river.⁷⁴ An alternate tradition suggests the city's name derives from the *oikist* Antiphemus's laughter upon hearing the oracular response (see below).⁷⁵ Gela founded her own colony Acragas (modern-day Agrigento) in the sixth century BCE,⁷⁶ which would achieve even greater prominence in the Classical period.⁷⁷ The accounts of Thucydides and Diodorus discussed below mention Gela as an example of a joint settlement, with the former commenting on how integration of the different parties was achieved in the new colony, and the latter elaborating on the colony's founding oracle. The accounts of Pausanias and Herodotus, in turn, report cult-related transfers that occurred at Gela – one presumably at its founding (Pausanias) and the other at a subsequent period in its history (Herodotus).

Gela's Joint Settlement and Dorian Institutions according to Thucydides

Our sources do not agree about whether Rhodes founded Gela alone or was joined in the effort by Crete. Herodotus maintains: κτιζομένης Γέλῃς ὑπὸ Λινδίων τε τῶν ἐκ Ἰρόδου καὶ Ἀντιφήμου.⁷⁸ Pausanias's reference – Ἀντίφημος ὁ Γέλας οἰκιστῆς – also assumes Rhodian initiative, which he relates to the broader migration of Dorians to Sicily.⁷⁹ However, Thucydides and Diodorus⁸⁰ portray the settlement as a joint initiative of Rhodians and Cretans led by Antiphemus and Entimus, respectively.⁸¹ Possibly, conflict at home

[Godley, LCL]). At one point, Miltiades was captured by the Lampsacenes, barely winning back his freedom due to the intervention of Croesus (6.37).

⁷³ Jean Bérard, *La colonisation grecque de l'Italie Méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'Antiquité: l'histoire et la légende*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Universitaires de France, 1957), 225–35.

⁷⁴ Thucydides (6.4.3) offers the same explanation for the name of Gela's colony, Acragas.

⁷⁵ Aristaenetos *FGrHist* 771 F1; Theopompus *FGrHist* 115 F358.

⁷⁶ Thucydides 6.4.4.

⁷⁷ See Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, 177.

⁷⁸ 7.153.

⁷⁹ 8.46.2. Archaeological evidence is consistent with Rhodian presence in the region even prior to the foundation of Gela. Adolfo J. Dominguez, "Greeks in Sicily," in *Greek Colonisation*, 1:279.

⁸⁰ Diodorus may have relied on Thucydides or a common tradition.

⁸¹ Pottery is consistent with Cretan participation in an early settlement. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, 178; Dominguez, "Greeks in Sicily," 1:281.

stimulated the participation of the Rhodians,⁸² who were then joined by compatriots from Lindus already possessing a foothold in Sicily.⁸³ Herodotus and Pausanias's concentration on the Rhodian element suggests that the eventual domination of this contingent influenced traditions about Gela's origins.⁸⁴

Thucydides's account, though brief, offers an illuminating glimpse at how identity was negotiated in the mixed colony.⁸⁵ He notes that the preeminent civic landmark was associated with Rhodes (τὸ δὲ χωρίον οὗ νῦν ἡ πόλις ἐστὶ ... Λίνδιοι καλεῖται).⁸⁶ However, his remarks about the colony's *nomima* hints at compromise between the settlers from Rhodes and Crete. Recall that *nomima* ("institutions") were tangible expressions of a community's self-understanding.⁸⁷ Often they signaled a connection between a colony and its *metropolis*; for instance, Gela was said to have given Geloan *nomima* to its colony, Acragas.⁸⁸ However, at her own foundation Gela adopted Dorian *nomima*. These "sub-ethnic" *nomima* appear to represent a compromise designed to assimilate the respective groups of settlers that was predicated on the legend of common Dorian descent.⁸⁹ This is not the only time we encounter something like the use of sub-ethnic *nomima*. Strabo tells us that the Phocaeans who founded Massalia adopted "Ionic" laws.⁹⁰ This case is clearly different since Massalia is not identified as a joint settlement. But Strabo does note how the colony spread its influence over the surrounding territory, particularly via the cult of Ephesian Artemis.⁹¹ One can infer that in conjunction with the Ionic complexion of this cult, the Ionic laws helped negotiate a common identity between the settler and native populations in the area – akin to what the Dorian *nomima* of Gela did for its two sets of settlers. And to reiterate, since Gela was a joint settlement, its decision in favor of such institutions constituted a form of compromise.

Gela's Founding Oracle according to Diodorus

Religion played a critical role in shaping ancient perceptions about colonization, and this is no less true regarding Gela. Further below I illustrate one way

⁸² A *scholium* to Pindar (*ad Ol.* 2.15) reports that Rhodians forced out a portion of its population. Cf. *ibid.*, 1:280.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 1:279–83.

⁸⁴ Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 53.

⁸⁵ 6.4.3.

⁸⁶ The reference here is to Lindos in Rhodes.

⁸⁷ Malkin, *A Small Greek World*, 189–204.

⁸⁸ Thucydides 6.4.4–5.

⁸⁹ Malkin, *A Small Greek World*, 74–75, interprets the adoption of Dorian *nomima* as a concession from the Rhodian settlers who had earlier attempted to establish a Lindian community in Sicily. The term "sub-ethnic" is his.

⁹⁰ 4.1.5. Here *nomoi* approximates *nomima*.

⁹¹ For a discussion of Massalia's founding, see chapter 4.

this concern was manifested, namely, in cultic transfers. Here I discuss the founding oracle of Gela. Apollo's jurisdiction over colonization meant that his sanction was critical to the legitimation of new foundations. Sometimes, as here in Diodorus's account, his oracles weave geographical directions into the broader mandate.

Diodorus foregrounds the exchange between the *oikists* and oracle. He begins by noting how the founders of Gela, Antiphemus and Entimus, "consulted the Pythia" (ἠρώτησαν τὴν Πυθίαν). The Pythia responded thus:

Entimus and thou, illustrious Craton's son
Sagacious [δαίφρον], fare ye two forth to Sicile,
On her fair soil to dwell, where ye shall build
A city [δευμάμενοι πολίθρον], home for men of Crete and Rhodes,⁹²
E'en Gela, at the sacred [ἄγνοῦ] river's mouth
Whose name it too shall bear. (Diodorus 8.23.1 [Oldfather, LCL])

The first thing to be noted is that the Pythia supplies clues to guide the founders, comprising a combination of general directions (Σικελίην) and specific geographical markers (πὰρ προχοᾶς ποταμοῦ Γέλα ... ἄγνοῦ). It is equally clear that this guidance embraces a particular objective: founding a new city for Cretan and Rhodian settlers. In Diodorus's report the clues and articulation of purpose together function as the colonization mandate. This becomes apparent when we compare the accounts of Diodorus and Thucydides. Both offer roughly the same assemblage of details: founders, geographical landmarks, the founding of a colony. Yet Diodorus embeds these particulars within the oracle, making Apollo responsible for siting the colony and ensuring its successful foundation. Therefore, the oracular framework reinforces Apollo's superintendence, while the god's geographical clues demonstrate how he offers his guidance.

Cult Transfers at Gela according to Pausanias and Herodotus

Pausanias mentions the transfer of a cultic object in his account of Gela. Significantly, Gela's founder was the one who accomplished this transfer. He

⁹² Diodorus's oracular report is consistent with the characterization of Gela as a joint settlement (see above). Cf. Thucydides 6.4.3. The Pythia names one *oikist* while alluding to the other by his father's name. It is not clear whether the oracle betrays a preference for Entimus and the Cretan settlers. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 53–54, suggests that the priority position of Entimus and the Cretan settlers in the oracle's response projects a pro-Cretan perspective. He characterizes the oracle as a "Delphic sanction of the social order" meant to redress the rising dominance of Rhodian elements in Gela. Yet countering this position is the fact that the oracle also embellishes the stature of Antiphemus through an allusion to his "illustrious" parentage (Κράτωνος ἀγακλέος) and sagacity (δαίφρον).

relates that Antiphemus installed in the colony an *agalma*⁹³ fashioned by the legendary Daedalus.⁹⁴ The *oikist* supposedly seized the image as spoils following the sack of Omphace, a city not far inland from coastal Gela.⁹⁵ The transfer was significant. It symbolized not only the defeat of a rival but also the empowerment of Gela. It is only fitting that Pausanias mentions Antiphemus's transfer as a precedent for the Emperor Augustus's later seizure of the "agalma of Athena Alea, and with it the tusks of the Calydonian boar," following his victory over Antonius (8.46.1–2 [Jones, LCL]).

Herodotus relates another transfer which took place at Gela, this time of items sacred to the cult of Demeter and Persephone (ἱρὰ ... τῶν θεῶν).⁹⁶ The transfer was designed to reintegrate a portion of Gela's population which, as a result of *stasis*, had been exiled to nearby Mactorium. A certain Telines acquired the sacred items, parlaying their symbolism to win the promise of a safe return for the Geloan exiles. Herodotus's account is illuminating. To begin with, it reveals the potency of sacred objects; their transfer could achieve resettlement and reconciliation. But further, it underscores the prestige reserved for the one accomplishing these objectives by means of the transfer. Herodotus reports that Telines secured a guarantee "that his posterity should be ministering priests of the goddesses [ἱεροφάνται τῶν θεῶν]" (7.153 [Godley, LCL]).⁹⁷

2.3.1.2 The Foundation of Rhegion

Rhegion (Reggio Calabria) lies at the extreme southwestern tip of Italy, nearly opposite of Zancle⁹⁸ to the north across the straits of Messina in Sicily. Greeks likely founded this colony sometime in the early part of the eighth century BCE.⁹⁹ Here I focus on accounts of the city's foundation narrated by Strabo,

⁹³ "A statue in honour of a god" – *LSJ*, s.v. ἄγαλμα.

⁹⁴ The attribution of the image to Daedalus may imply a more specific validation of Cretan settlers. See Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, 112.

⁹⁵ 8.46.2–3.

⁹⁶ 7.153.

⁹⁷ Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, 178, 188, cites the evidence for sanctuaries of Demeter (seventh c. BCE) and Persephone at Gela and Acragas, respectively. The tradition about the hereditary priesthoods ultimately benefited Gelon the despot of Syracuse and Gela, "descendent of the ministering priest Telines" (Herodotus 7.154–157 [Godley, LCL]). Cf. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, 65.

⁹⁸ On the foundation of Zancle, see Callimachus 2 fr. 6 (22); Thucydides 6.4.4–6; Pausanias 4.23.5–7; Georges Vallet, *Rhegion et Zancle: Histoire, commerce et civilisation de cités chalcidiennes du détroit de Messine* (Paris: de Boccard, 1958); Leschhorn, *Grunder der Stadt*, 11, 16–22; Dominguez, "Greeks in Sicily," 263–68, 294.

⁹⁹ Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 31, dates the foundation to ca. 730 BCE. See Vallet, *Rhegion et Zancle*, for a full discussion of the colony. For the strategic importance of the straits separating Rhegion and southern Italy from Sicily, see Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, 206–7.

Diodorus, and Dionysius, highlighting its identification as a joint settlement and reports of its founding oracles.

Mixed Traditions and Mixed Foundation: Strabo and the Joint Settlement of Rhegion

Our sources differ over whether Rhegion was a single or joint foundation. The latter is the interpretation of Strabo, who draws on various material¹⁰⁰ to spin his account.¹⁰¹ By contrast, several other authors – both contemporary and later – identify a single *ethnos* responsible for settling the colony. For instance, Diodorus¹⁰² and Dionysius¹⁰³ give credit to Chalcidians for planting Rhegion,¹⁰⁴ while Pausanias acknowledges Alcidas and the Messenians.¹⁰⁵ Strabo (6.1.6) and Diodorus (8.23.2) report that the individuals comprising the settlement were drawn from ten percent of Chalchis' population, which had been dedicated to Apollo¹⁰⁶ – an expedient due to crop failure per Strabo.¹⁰⁷ To this

¹⁰⁰ 6.1.6. Strabo relies on Antiochus (*FGrHist* 555 F9), Heraclides Lembos (*FGrHist* 25 F219), and probably Timaeus (*FGrHist* 566 F43). Yet it is not always clear where Strabo is mining his information – for example, when he mentions οἱ Μεσσηνίων φυγάδες supplementing the first wave of colonists (6.1.6).

¹⁰¹ The city's once-eminent stature (ἐπιφανῆ ... πόλιν οὖσαν) piques Strabo's interest: It "founded many cities [πολλὰς ... πόλεις οἰκίσασαν] and produced many notable men" (6.1.6 [Jones, LCL]).

¹⁰² 8.23.2. Diodorus offers a description of the Chalcidian settlers – similar to Strabo's initial report (see below) – before delineating the oracular sanction and its fulfillment.

¹⁰³ *Ant. rom.* 19.2. After recounting the fulfilment of the oracle delivered to the founder Artimedes, Dionysius reflects on the reason for the city's name: It was so named "either because there was an abrupt headland or because in this place the earth split and set off from Italy Sicily which lies opposite, or else it is named after some ruler who bore this name" (19.2.2). Cf. Strabo 6.1.6. According to Heraclides Lembos, it was called "Rhegion after some local hero" (25 FHG 219).

¹⁰⁴ See Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, 171–72, for material culture evidence supporting early Euboean exploration and settlement in Magna Graecia. Commercial and agricultural opportunities probably enticed Greek settlers. See Emanuele Greco, "Greek Colonisation in Southern Italy," in *Greek Colonisation*, 1:169–200; Bruno D'Agostino, "The First Greeks in Italy," in *Greek Colonisation*, 1:201–37. Cf. Thucydides 3.86.2; 6.44.3; Aristotle, *Pol.* 1274b on Rhegion's connection to Chalcis. Rhegion's early laws and coinage are similar to those of other Chalcidian colonies in Sicily. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, 75. Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 18.

¹⁰⁵ 4.23.6.

¹⁰⁶ Ἀνατεθέντες (Diodorus 8.23.2) or δεκατευθέντες (Strabo 6.1.6). Strabo casts this earlier dedication as a response to an oracle – κατὰ χρῆσμον (6.1.6). Parke and Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, 1:55, trace the Near Eastern roots of the human tithe. However, the evidence is insufficient to base Delphi's original role in colonization upon such a practice. Cf. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 37–41.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Heraclides Lembos 25: διὰ λιμῶν. See the introduction on the different reasons given for colonization.

contingent, Strabo continues, were joined “others from their homeland” (6.1.6 [Jones]).¹⁰⁸ While precedent exists for the human tithe, particularly in legendary accounts,¹⁰⁹ the significance of the practice in the present instance is that it underscores Delphi’s role in colonization.¹¹⁰ Strabo’s alternative version, taken from Antiochus, credits Zancle with initiating the settlement of Rhegion.¹¹¹ The “Zancleans,” he relates, “sent for the Chalcidians and appointed Antimnestus their founder (οἰκιστήν)” (6.1.6 [Jones, LCL]).¹¹² Zancle’s initiative is quite comprehensible since it stood opposite the straits of Messina in Sicily and had itself been planted by Chalcidians.¹¹³

Dionysius likewise connects Rhegion to Chalcis yet in a different fashion – through an *oikist* named Artimedes.¹¹⁴ The relation of Dionysius’s account to Strabo’s¹¹⁵ is unclear: It may represent an essentially different account, conceiving Rhegion as a settlement planted independent of Zancle; or it may represent a compatible version, focusing on Chalcis and the separate *oikist* whom it supplied. This latter interpretation would be consistent with Thucydides’s claim that it was customary for a colony planting a second-generation colony to adopt a founder from its *metropolis*.¹¹⁶ At any rate, Dionysius like Strabo (= Antiochus) highlights the colony’s (Chalcidian) identity via the founding figure. In Dionysius’s case, concern for the identity of the settlers extends to their arrival in southern Italy. Rather than assimilate, Artimedes and the Chalcidians expelled the native inhabitants of the territory.¹¹⁷ In this manner Dionysius portrays Rhegion as a Chalcidian establishment from beginning to end.

Strabo goes on to note the participation of Messenians in the founding of Rhegion, perhaps relying here on Timaeus and Heraclides Lembos.¹¹⁸ According to the latter source, the Chalcidians and Messenians made a joint settlement at the grave site of Iokastos, a local hero,¹¹⁹ before receiving an oracle to found

¹⁰⁸ Neither Diodorus nor Strabo’s first version identifies an *oikist*.

¹⁰⁹ Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 37–38.

¹¹⁰ Diodorus recounts an oracle delivered to the Chalcidians, who “came to the god to inquire about sending forth a colony (περὶ ἀποικίας)” (8.23.1 [Oldfather, LCL]).

¹¹¹ See Vallet, *Rhegion et Zancle*, on subsequent relations between the two cities. Rhegion seems to have cooperated with Zancle in the foundation of Mylae, possibly for agricultural reasons. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, 211–12. Cf. Diodorus 1.87.1–3.

¹¹² Antiochus 555 fr. 9.

¹¹³ Thucydides attributes the feat to “pirates” from the Chalcidian city of Cumae (6.4.4–6). D’Agostino, “The First Greeks in Italy,” 221, argues that Chalcidians from Pithekoussai founded Zancle.

¹¹⁴ “Artimedes of Chalcis had an oracle [λόγιον εἶχεν]” (*Ant. rom.* 19.2.1 [Cary, LCL]).

¹¹⁵ That is, Antiochus’s account.

¹¹⁶ 1.24.2; cf. 6.4.2, 5. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*, 32.

¹¹⁷ *Ant. rom.* 19.2.1.

¹¹⁸ Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*, 32.

¹¹⁹ Honoring local heroes is a practice commonly noted in foundation accounts. See *ibid.*, 35.

a city elsewhere. Strabo, however, has the Messenians approach Delphi separately after they are vanquished by Sparta in the First Messenian War. Like his source, Strabo does not mention a Messenian *oikist*. Pausanias, on the other hand, singles out Alcidas, who “left Messene for Rhegion after the death of King Aristodemus and the capture of Ithome” (4.23.5–7 [Smith, LCL]). Pausanias’s erroneous dating – ὁ δὲ Ἀναξίλας ... τέταρτος δὲ ἦν Ἀλκιδαμίδου – casts doubt on the veracity of his account. Yet this is an ancillary point. More relevant is the manner in which the reference to Alcidas serves “to legitimate the pedigree of Anaxilas [tyrant of Rhegion] ... whose great-grandfather was said to have originated in the Peloponnesian Messenia.”¹²⁰ This tradition, likely transmitted by Pausanias’s source, reflects a desire on the part of Anaxilas and the Messenian population of Rhegion to embellish their bonds with Messene.¹²¹ The same motive probably undergirds Strabo’s second account, which does not identify a Messenian *oikist*. Its emphasis on the participation of settlers from Messene sufficiently conveys Messenian influence in Rhegion.¹²² Ultimately, what seals this perception of Messenian participation – making Rhegion a joint settlement – is Delphi’s role in authorizing it.

Indeed, Strabo (= Antiochus) like Diodorus and Dionysius carves out a preeminent space for the oracle.¹²³ The Pythia delivers her response to a group of Messenians who consult the oracle (πέμπουσιν εἰς θεοῦ) not only as defeated warriors but also as religious transgressors. Strabo reports the tradition that holds the Messenians responsible for defiling maidens sent to perform religious rights at Limnae.¹²⁴ Messenian representatives solicit Delphi’s advice on how they “might be saved [σωθεῖεν],”¹²⁵ and receive the response that they are to “go forth with the Chalcidians to Rhegion” (6.1.6 [Smith, LCL]). Therefore, like other “crisis” accounts, Strabo’s narrative depicts colonization as a solution to a plight, in this case that of the beleaguered “fugitives” (φυγάδες).¹²⁶ Beyond land, the oracle’s response promises cleansing from the impurity clinging to the Messenians. Most important, the oracle empowers the Messenians who settled in Rhegion; indeed, Strabo hints that Delphi’s

¹²⁰ Hall, “Foundation Stories,” 2:392. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*, 33, accepts Messenian incorporation under Alcidas.

¹²¹ In fact, Thucydides credits Anaxilas with renaming Zancle “Messene” (6.4.6).

¹²² Messenians need not actually have participated in founding Rhegion. Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 19. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*, 33, however, appeals to epigraphy and cult to substantiate Messenian influence dating to the colony’s foundation.

¹²³ I discuss both oracles below.

¹²⁴ Cf. Pausanias 4.4.1.

¹²⁵ 6.1.6. Apollo’s response parallels the inquiry: οὐ ... ἀπολωλέναι αὐτούς, ἀλλὰ σεῶσθαι.

¹²⁶ The Messenian homeland was soon “to be captured ... by the Spartans” (6.1.6) [Smith, LCL]).

authorization enhanced their position. Though the Messenians joined Chalcidians already intent on settling Rhegion, the sanction they enjoyed from the oracle helps explain why, in the mixed colony, “the rulers of the Rhegini down to Anaxilas were always appointed from the stock of the Messenians” (6.1.6 [Smith, LCL]).

In conclusion, our sources differ in their characterization of Rhegion’s original settlers.¹²⁷ There is a strong insistence in several of the treatments about the Chalcidian character of its new inhabitants. Diodorus¹²⁸ and Strabo¹²⁹ contribute to this impression by incorporating the tradition about a prior title of Chalcidian settlers to Delphi. Strabo’s first account reinforces the Chalcidian character of the enterprise by noting the additional participation of settlers from the homeland. Strabo’s alternative account (= Antiochus) further embellishes the Chalcidian character of Rhegion by noting how Zancle, another Chalcidian colony, initiated its establishment and provided the *oikist*. Dionysius’s identification of a Chalcidian *oikist* (Artemedes) aligns his account in emphasis with those of Diodorus and Strabo, even if it differs in particulars.¹³⁰ Other accounts foreground Messenian participation in the new settlement. Pausanias suggests that the colony’s *oikist* came from Messene.¹³¹ The tradition seems to have legitimized rulers such as Anaxilas via a link to Messene. And the tradition about Messenian participation alongside the Chalcidian settlers, relayed by Strabo, seems tailored with a similar end in view.¹³²

Taken as a whole, Strabo’s account depicts Rhegion as a joint foundation. Strabo does not reflect on the difficulties inherent in this arrangement. Rather, he focuses on the character of the settlers and the conditions leading them to southern Italy. Concerning this, two points deserve mention. First, both groups constitute populations ousted from their native lands. Chalcidians had been dedicated to Delphi because of famine in the homeland, while Messenians stood in violation of sacred norms and thus were driven out by Sparta.¹³³ Second, Apollo is responsible for bringing the two groups together to form a new community.¹³⁴ Put another way, Strabo’s combined account implies that alienation and divine direction provide the basis for common identity among Chalcidians and Messenians in the joint settlement of Rhegion.

¹²⁷ Recall that founders link Rhegion to one or the other *metropolis* in several of the accounts. Thus, Alcidas evokes Rhegion’s Messenian influence (Pausanias 4.23.6), Artemedes its Chalcidian identity (Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 19.2.1), and Antimnestus its combined Zanclean/Chalcidian roots (Strabo 6.1.6).

¹²⁸ 8.23.2.

¹²⁹ 6.1.6.

¹³⁰ *Ant. rom.* 19.2.1.

¹³¹ 4.23.6.

¹³² 6.1.6.

¹³³ Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 33–34.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*

Guiding Riddle: The Foundation Oracle of Rhegion according to Diodorus and Dionysius

Also instructive are the oracles reported in Diodorus¹³⁵ and Dionysius's¹³⁶ accounts of the foundation of Rhegion.¹³⁷ Of the two oracles, Dionysius's – purportedly received¹³⁸ by Artimedes of Chalcis – is the briefer. The oracle instructs the *oikist* to establish a settlement¹³⁹ where “he should find the male covered by the female” (τὸν ἄρρενα ὑπὸ τῆς θηλείας ὀπυόμενον) (19.2.1 [Cary, LCL]). Diodorus transmits an expanded form of the oracle, allegedly directed to the consecrated Chalcidians¹⁴⁰:

Where Apsia, most sacred river, falls

Into the sea, and as one enters it

The female weds/covers the male (τὸν ἄρρενα θῆλυς ὀπυίει), a city found [πόλιν οἴκιζη],
Thou there, the land of Auson is thy gift [ἰδοῖ δέ σοι Αὔσονα χώραν].

(8.23.3 [Oldfather, LCL])

Diodorus's oracle is explicit about the goal of the quest – to found a city – and introduces signposts to guide the way.¹⁴¹ The geographical markers introduce the riddle while also offering a key to its solution. The settlers encountered “on the banks of the river Apsia a grape-vine entwined about a wild fig-tree,”¹⁴² there they “founded a city” (ἔκτισαν πόλιν; 8.23.2 [Oldfather, LCL]). In both Dionysius and Diodorus the riddle – the female marrying/covering the male – thus offers guidance to those able to decipher its meaning,¹⁴³ here as is often the case using local geography. Indeed, while highlighting the knowledge differential between Apollo and mortal inquirers, the riddle certifies the reputation of the founder, who is able to tap into the god's omniscience.

¹³⁵ 8.23.2.

¹³⁶ 19.2.1–2.

¹³⁷ Cf. Strabo 6.1.6.

¹³⁸ Λόγιον εἶχεν (19.2.1).

¹³⁹ Ἄυτόθι μένειν καὶ μηκέτι προσωτέρω πλεῖν (19.2.1).

¹⁴⁰ See the discussion of Rhegion's founding above.

¹⁴¹ Dionysius reports that Artimedes located the site of the future city πλεύσας δὲ περὶ τὸ Παλλάντιον τῆς Ἰταλίας (*Ant. rom.* 19.2.1).

¹⁴² Cf. Dionysius: The “the fig-tree [was] masculine, and the clinging was the sexual ‘covering’” (*Ant. rom.* 19.2.1). Compare the similar fulfillment of Taras' foundation oracle in Dionysius (19.1). Hall, “Foundation Stories,” 2:401.

¹⁴³ On the riddles ascribed to the Delphic oracle, see Stoneman, *The Ancient Oracles*, 40–54.

2.3.1.3 The Foundation of Croton

Croton was another one of the colonies planted by Greeks during the great age of colonization.¹⁴⁴ Strabo, Diodorus, and Ovid’s accounts of the foundation illustrate a preoccupation with familiar concerns: the origin, founder, and divine sanction of the colony.

Legendary Precursors in Strabo’s Account of the Founding of Croton

In colonization accounts, a concern with “origins” sometimes extends to the mythical prehistory of the colony. This prehistory legitimates the “historical” act of colonization. Such is the case in Strabo’s account of the foundation of Croton. The heart of Strabo’s narrative concerns Myscellus the founder’s consultation of the oracle at Delphi and his eventual settlement of Croton. However, Strabo introduces this report with a rehearsal of the founder’s legendary precursors.

These, the geographer informs us, were a group of Achaeans (τινας τῶν ... Ἀχαιῶν) who strayed from the larger fleet returning home from the Trojan War; they “put in there [near Croton] and disembarked for an inspection of the region” (6.1.12 [Smith, LCL]). However, seizing the moment, the captive Trojan women burned the Achaean ships, stranding their occupants in southern Italy. Strabo offers this narrative as an etiology for the river Neaethus, “to burn ships” (νέας ἀέθειν). Though the legend casts the foundation as a product of necessity, it nevertheless portrays it as a fortuitous event given the land’s fertility, which is capable of sustaining civilization. Moreover, other groups happened to observe the Achaean’s successful exploitation of the land and “on the strength of their racial kinship [κατὰ τὸ ὁμόφυλον], came and imitated them, and thus arose many settlements [κατοικίας]” (6.1.12 [Smith, LCL]).¹⁴⁵ Within Strabo’s account, therefore, the mythical Achaean settlement at Croton provides a precedent for later settlements; together, they help legitimate Myscellus’s foundation, which is subsequently narrated.¹⁴⁶

The Oracle and the “Surprised” Founder in Diodorus’s Account of the Founding of Croton

Diodorus gives a particularly colorful account of Myscellus’s divine authorization to found Croton. He is not alone in stressing the point: Strabo, too, suggests that the founder did not act on his own initiative. However, the latter’s

¹⁴⁴ The city later became a Roman colony named Cortona/Corthonia (see Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.26.1–2).

¹⁴⁵ About these settlements, Strabo further adds ὧν αἱ πλείους ἐόνυμοι τῶν Τρώων ἐγένοντο (6.1.12).

¹⁴⁶ On the use of legendary or mythical traditions to validate colonization, see Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*; idem, *The Returns of Odysseus*.

opening statement to this effect is rather succinct – τοῦ θεοῦ φήσαντος Ἀχαιοῖς Κρότωνα κτίζειν.¹⁴⁷ Later he reproduces a second oracle delivered to Myscellus (see below). Diodorus’s account even more than Strabo’s, though, highlights the posture of the founder.

Diodorus presents Myscellus as fundamentally unprepared for the oracle he receives.¹⁴⁸ The element of surprise hinges on the actual expectation of the founder, who had approached the oracle due to his difficulty begetting children (περὶ τέκνων γενέσεως). Myscellus, however, receives a startling response: “Myscellus, too short of back,¹⁴⁹ beloved art thou of him, even Apollo, who works afar, and he will give thee children; yet this first is his command, Kroton the great to found [οἰκῆσαι σε Κρότωνα μέγαν]¹⁵⁰ amidst fair fields” (8.17.1 [Oldfather, LCL]). Note that the Pythia acknowledges the query – “Apollo, who works afar ... will give thee children” – but prioritizes a different objective: founding “Kroton the great ... amidst fair fields” (8.17.1 [Oldfather, LCL]). This shift in focus is even more startling than the subject of Myscellus’s inquiry – infertility not deformity.¹⁵¹ Indeed, the element of surprise has a calculated effect: to depict the founder as an (initially) unwitting participant in the colonization enterprise.

This surprise does not diminish the founder’s stature; the reference to Apollo’s affection makes this plain.¹⁵² What it does accomplish is to underscore the initiative of Apollo at the expense of the mortal founder. Two additional oracles bolster this impression. The first seeks to remedy the founder’s confusion¹⁵³ at “the reference to Croton” (8.17.1 [Oldfather, LCL]), with the Pythia identifying geographical signposts to guide him:

To thee the Far-darter in person now doth speak
And give thou heed. Here lieth the Taphian land,
Untouched by plow, and Chalcis there, and there
The home of the Curetes, sacred soil [ἢ ἱερὰ χθών],
And there the isles of the Echinades:
And on the islands’ left a mighty sea.
This way thou cans’t not miss the Lacinian Head,

¹⁴⁷ 6.1.12.

¹⁴⁸ We encounter this “surprised *oikist*” motif again in Herodotus’s account of the foundation of Cyrene (4.150–161). See below.

¹⁴⁹ Compare Myscellus’s physical deformity with the stuttering of Battos, Cyrene’s founder (Herodotus 4.155). See below.

¹⁵⁰ The reference to the city’s greatness is striking given the third oracle delivered to Myscellus (Diodorus 8.17; cf. Strabo 6.1.12). See below.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 44.

¹⁵² “Beloved art though” (8.17.1 [Oldfather, LCL]). Compare how the oracle in Herodotus’s account of the foundation of Cyrene greets the surprised Battos as the future king (4.155). See below.

¹⁵³ Τοῦ δὲ Κρότωνα ἀγνοοῦντος εἰπεῖν πάλιν τὴν Πυθίαν (Diodorus 8.17).

Nor sacred Crimisê, nor Aesarus' stream. (Diodorus 8.17 [Oldfather, LCL])

The clues presented in the oracle create the impression of Apollo as a divine tour guide; his utterance aids the founder in locating the proper site for the colony. As such, it reinforces Myscellus's dependence on Apollo.¹⁵⁴

The second follow-up oracle is offered as a corrective. For, despite having received clarification about Croton, Myscellus set his affections on Sybaris to the north,¹⁵⁵ desiring to plant (κτίσαι) a colony there, instead.¹⁵⁶ (With only minor differences,¹⁵⁷ this oracle corresponds to the second oracle reported by Strabo.¹⁵⁸)

Myscellus, too short of back,¹⁵⁹ in searching things
Other than god commands [παρέκ θεοῦ], thou seekest naught
But tears. Approve the gift [δῶρον] the god doth give.
(Diodorus 8.17 [Oldfather, LCL])

Most basically, the oracle serves as a rebuke to Myscellus.¹⁶⁰ It warns of the consequences should the founder act on his desire to colonize Sybaris, with the “tears” symbolizing those hardships sure to follow any siege on the well-defended community. Yet the oracle provides a carrot to accompany the stick. In following the oracle's guidance, Myscellus would be securing a “gift” (δῶρον) from the god.¹⁶¹ Here the force of the oracle's corrective applies not just to the location of the territory but also its evaluation. Myscellus's view of the future Croton is myopic; in reality, there is more there is more to the site than meets his eye. Diodorus's subsequent demeaning judgment of the Sybarites – “slaves to their belly and lovers of luxury” (8.18.1 [Oldfather, LCL])¹⁶² confirms the

¹⁵⁴ The “list of place names implies that the *oikist* does not know the route, that he is divinely guided” (Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*, 45).

¹⁵⁵ Τὴν περὶ Σύβαριν χώραν θαυμάσας (Diodorus 8.17).

¹⁵⁶ According to Strabo, Myscellus had inspected (κατασκεψόμενον) Croton but found it lacking in comparison with Sybaris. Thus, he inquired whether “it would be better to found this [Sybaris] instead of Kroton” (εἰ λῶε εἴη ταύτην ἄντ' ἐκείνης κτίζειν) (6.1.12 [Oldfather, LCL]).

¹⁵⁷ Most notably, Strabo displays “outside you” (παρέκ σέθεν) in place of Diodorus's “outside god” (παρέκ θεοῦ) and (likely) “morsels” (κλάσματα) instead of Diodorus's “tears” (κλάματα).

¹⁵⁸ Strabo does not mention any oracle corresponding to Diodorus's second oracle.

¹⁵⁹ Βραχύνωτε. Strabo mentions the founder's deformity as an aside: “Myscellus was a hunchback as it happened” (6.1.12 [Jones, LCL]).

¹⁶⁰ Strabo's alternative wording, παρέκ σέθεν, implies the same idea – “away from the path designated for you.”

¹⁶¹ Compare the reference to Κρότωνα μέγαν in the first oracle (Diodorus 8.17).

¹⁶² For the origins of this stereotype, see Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, 80–82. Croton sacked Sybaris in 510/11 BCE (Herodotus 5.44–45). This triumph was reflected on subsequent coinage from Sybaris displaying a tripod of Croton on one side and the bull of Sybaris on the other. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, 198.

superiority of Croton and thus the oracle's wisdom.¹⁶³ The corrective oracle serves up a lesson: The colony founder is best served by heeding Apollo's instruction in place of his own judgments.

Legend, Myth, and Divine Sanction in Ovid's Account of the Founding of Croton

Like Strabo's, Ovid's account of the foundation of Croton also embellishes its subject with legendary and mythical traditions. Yet Ovid brings Croton into the orbit of Rome by setting his narrative of the city's beginning within the larger framework of traditions about Numa, who is portrayed wandering about seeking "nature's general law" (*Metam.* 15.17.6 [Miller, LCL]). Indeed, Ovid casts the story of Croton's founding as an etiological report offered to Numa in response to his inquiry about the "founder of this Grecian city on Italian soil" (*Metam.* 15.9–10 [Miller, LCL]).

Like Strabo's account above, the story Numa receives also invokes divine sanction for the foundation of Croton, yet in this case that of Hercules. Moreover, here also prior events set the stage for the establishment of the city. Long before the time of Myscelus,¹⁶⁴ Hercules in his wanderings had received hospitality from a certain Croton, in gratification for which the hero promised his host that "in future times here in this place will stand a city of your descendants" (aevo ... nepotum hic locus urbis erit; *Metam.* 15.17–18 [Miller, LCL]).¹⁶⁵ Myscelus fulfilled this prophecy when he founded Croton – so named after this man who had shown Hercules hospitality. By thus invoking the wandering Hercules's prophecy, Ovid's prehistory furnishes Croton with an ancient and illustrious legacy.

But Hercules is not finished. He actively ensures that his prophecy is brought to fulfillment. Here Ovid appeals to another form of divine sanction encountered in colonization accounts, the vision.¹⁶⁶ Appearing to Myscelus in just such vision (*visum*), the "club-bearer ... addressed him: 'Up and away from your native land; go seek out the rocky channel of the distant Aesar'" (15.17 [Miller, LCL]).¹⁶⁷ Here the vision not only commissions the (implied) founding of a city, but also, like the oracle recounted by Diodorus, dangles a

¹⁶³ Strabo, meanwhile, praises Croton's fame in athletics, philosophy, and medicine (6.1.12).

¹⁶⁴ On Myscellus (so spelled in the Greek accounts), see Strabo 6.1.12; Diodorus 8.17. Cf. Diodorus 4.24; Iamblichus, *De Vit. Pythag.* 50.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Heraclides Lembos 68.

¹⁶⁶ Details and functions of visions vary across foundation accounts. They can introduce the topic of colonization and/or provide directions or clarification about matters related to its execution. See, further, the discussion of Alexander and Seleucus's visions below and that of Aristarcha in chapter 4.

¹⁶⁷ The passage continues: "and he threatened him with many fearful things should he not obey" (*Metam.* 15.17 [Miller, LCL]).

geographical clue – the river “Aesar”¹⁶⁸ – to help guide its eventual founder. Also like Diodorus’s oracle, the vision meets resistance from the founder, who hesitates since “his country’s laws prohibited his departure. The punishment of death was appointed to the man who should desire to change his fatherland [patriam mutare volenti]” (*Metam.* 15.29 [Miller, LCL]). In the end, Myscelus resolves to obey Hercules.¹⁶⁹ Yet while the compliance renders a further vision unnecessary,¹⁷⁰ it does not terminate the hero’s assistance. Hercules intervenes again to overturn a guilty verdict against Myscelus,¹⁷¹ facilitating the founder’s safe departure. Once free, Myscelus successfully locates the river Aesar and finds Croton as instructed.¹⁷²

Myscelus’s vision therefore functions much like the oracle in Diodorus’s account. It mandates colonization while providing guidance to ensure its fulfillment. In doing so, moreover, it has to overcome the hesitancy of the appointed founder. Here the backstory of Croton’s hospitality is important: It offers an etiology for Hercules’s commitment to founding the city.

2.3.1.4 The Foundation of Syracuse

The Corinthians founded Syracuse sometime around 734 BCE. Quite possibly the Corinthians established the colony as a hedge against other settlements on Sicily, undertaken by those such as the Euboeans, who had begun to exploit the commercial potential of the island’s coastal regions.¹⁷³ The Bacchiads ruled Corinth at the time Syracuse was founded. Their successors in the seventh century BCE were assertive in utilizing colonization to consolidate the influence of Corinth, thus anticipating a feature of foreign policy that characterized Classical-period Greek powers such as Athens and Sparta.¹⁷⁴ Thus Cypselus and Periander each appointed sons as “founders” of colonies: The former’s son was tapped to rule Ambracia, Leucas, and Anactorium; the latter’s was chosen to govern Potidae.¹⁷⁵ In this way the tyrants of Corinth established a leadership pyramid with themselves at the top, while aligning the colonies’ foreign and commercial policies with those of the *metropolis*. However, Syracuse and

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Diodorus 8.23.1.

¹⁶⁹ Myscelus relinquishes responsibility to Hercules himself: “O thou to whom thy twelve great labours gave thee a claim to heaven, help me, I pray! for thou art responsible for my sin” (*Metam.* 15.39–40 [Miller, LCL]).

¹⁷⁰ Compare the follow-up oracles in Strabo (6.1.12) and Diodorus (8.17).

¹⁷¹ “By the will of Hercules” the color of the pebbles indicating the verdict on Myscelus was altered so that “the vote was made favourable” (15.46–47 [Miller, LCL]).

¹⁷² 15.56–57.

¹⁷³ Dominguez, “Greeks in Sicily,” 253–357; cf. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*. Corinth planted Corcyra not long after (ca. 730 BCE).

¹⁷⁴ Though see Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 115–50, who qualifies this assessment.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 30–31.

Corcyra – which was founded not long after (ca. 730 BCE) – enjoyed greater independence than the other colonies, thriving to the point that they came to rival Corinth itself.¹⁷⁶

Crisis and Solution: The Foundation of Syracuse according to Plutarch and Diodorus

Most of our sources identify Archias as the founder of Syracuse,¹⁷⁷ with Thucydides relating how he accomplished this feat once he had “first expelled the [native] Sicels from the island” (6.3.2 [Smith, LCL]). Thucydides’s account probably came from Antiochus of Syracuse, which partially explains his valorizing identification of Archias as “one of the Heracleidae.”¹⁷⁸ However, I focus here on the accounts of Plutarch and Diodorus, which relate the foundation of Syracuse to a crisis in the *metropolis* Corinth that involved bloodshed and a divine curse. These narratives are particularly interesting since they focus on the flaws of a founder and represent colonization as a means of purification for founder and *metropolis* alike.

According to Plutarch, it was the murder of Actaeon which, setting into motion a series of events, led to the foundation of Syracuse. Archias brought about Actaeon’s death by accident. He had determined that force was required since the boy he loved had spurned his affections, so he assembled a group of accomplices to accompany him to the home of Melissus, Actaeon’s father.¹⁷⁹ But tragedy struck: Actaeon “was pulled to pieces and killed” (*Mor.* 772 [Fowler, LCL]) in the struggle that ensued between Archias and his supporters, on the one hand, and those attempting to save the youth – such as Melissus, friends, and other residents of the house (Diodorus) or neighbors (Plutarch) –, on the other hand.¹⁸⁰

At first, Melissus’s demand for justice went unfulfilled. Thus, in desperation, “calling upon the gods to avenge him, he threw himself down from the rocks” outside the temple of Poseidon at Isthmia, an act of suicidal supplication which brought “affliction and pestilence” (ἀνχμὸς καὶ λοιμὸς) upon the city complicit in Actaeon’s death due its inaction. Given the origin of the crisis, its solution needed to involve appeasement of the god responsible, Poseidon. According to Plutarch, the Corinthians consulted an oracle “concerning relief”

¹⁷⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 150–51.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Pindar (*Ol.* 6.6–8), who celebrates the (elite) Hagesias as “fellow-founder” (συννοικιστήρ) of Syracuse.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Plutarch: “Archias, of the family of the Heracleidae, [was] in wealth and general influence the most outstanding man in Corinth” (*Mor.* 772E-F [Fowler]).

¹⁷⁹ Either drunk (Diodorus 8.10) or “as in a drunken folic” (Plutarch, *Mor.* 772 [Fowler, LCL]).

¹⁸⁰ Diodorus’s concern at this point is not with the founding of Syracuse but rather how Actaeon’s death resembled that of his namesake, the mythical hunter killed by his dogs.

(περὶ ἀπαλλαγῆς) and learned that they could satisfy Poseidon’s wrath by punishing those responsible for Actaeon’s death. Archias, among those consulting the oracle, surmised that returning to Corinth was not a viable option; consequently, he chose to sail to Sicily and there planted the colony Syracuse.¹⁸¹ Archias’s self-exile satisfied (at least in part) the justice sought by Melissus while also bringing an end to Corinth’s hardships.

These accounts are revealing. In the first place, they demonstrate how a colony founder might be perceived as a flawed individual. In this instance, Archias committed a terrible act that brought pain and suffering to his homeland, Corinth. But in the second place, such accounts reveal how colonization can represent a solution to a collective crisis. Or put another way, depictions of the foundation of Syracuse, as well as other colonies,¹⁸² demonstrate how crisis can function as an explanation for colonization. In this particular instance, the etiology substitutes a memorable tale of pollution and divine expiation for an account of geo-political ambition.

One last feature in these accounts of Syracuse’s foundation deserves mention: the role of the oracle. It is true that in the narratives discussed above the oracle does not explicitly authorize Archias’s enterprise. The founder deduced that his self-exile would satisfy the demands of the oracle; this by turn led to the colony’s establishment. Nevertheless, this association of Archias with the oracle – which indeed came about because he was part of the consulting party – signals an indirect form of divine sanction for the colony’s establishment.¹⁸³ At any rate, accounts such as Pausanias’s are more explicit about Archias’s divine mandate.¹⁸⁴

Geography and the Mandate of Apollo: The Founding Oracle of Syracuse according to Pausanias

The second century CE author delivers his report while relating the legend about Alpheius and Arethusa, who turned into river and spring, respectively, bequeathing their names to eponymous bodies of water in Ortygia.¹⁸⁵ For

¹⁸¹ Or: πλεύσας δ’ εἰς τὴν Σικελίαν Συρακούσας ἔκτισας (*Mor.* 772).

¹⁸² For example, Taras. See chapter 4.

¹⁸³ Strabo’s account of nearby Tenea is also of interest (8.6.22). The city formed part of the territory of Corinthia. Its good fortunes down to Strabo’s time is in large part attributable to its alignment with Mummius and the Romans. But Strabo offers another anecdote: Tenea “prospered more than the other settlements” (τὴν κατοικίαν) because “most of the colonists [of Syracuse] who accompanied Archias ... set out” (8.6.22 [Jones, LCL]) from the temple to Apollo in Tenea. By linking its settlers (and not only its founder) to Apollo, this tradition further legitimates the colony Syracuse.

¹⁸⁴ Pausanias gives a terse introduction to the oracle received by Archias: Ἀρχίαν τὸν Κορίνθιον ἐς τὸν Συρακουσῶν ἀποστέλλων οἰκισμὸν (5.7.3).

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Plutarch’s assertion that at Syracuse Archias “became the father of two daughters, Ortygia and Syracuse” (773 [Fowler, LCL]).

Pausanias, Delphi's oracle offered corroboration for the mingling of river and spring, which in turn gave rise to the legend. Its ostensible purpose was to guide Archias to his future colony:

An Isle, Ortygia, lies on the misty ocean
Over against Trinacria, where the mouth of
Alpheius bubbles

Mingling with the springs of broad Arethusa. (5.7.3 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL])

As with oracles in other foundation accounts,¹⁸⁶ the identification of local geographical features meant to guide the *oikist* additionally glorified the colony, linking it both to Apollo's knowledge of the land and his colonizing plans. Pausanias's account therefore contributes another level of legitimation to Syracuse beyond what is encountered in the narratives of Diodorus and Plutarch. These other accounts depict the foundation of Syracuse as a solution to crisis, while Pausanias's stresses a deeper impetus: Apollo's will.

2.3.1.5 The Foundation of Cyrene

The Greeks colonists in the Archaic period did not only settle in Southern Italy and Sicily; they also planted colonies further west in the Mediterranean coastal region of modern-day Spain and France as well as eastward along the Adriatic, Aegean, and Black Sea coasts. Moreover, sometime in the late seventh century BCE, the island of Thera sent settlers south to the coastal area of North Africa, where they founded the city of Cyrene in what is modern-day Libya.

Counter Narratives and the Role of a Metropolis: The Foundation of Cyrene according to Herodotus

Herodotus offers alternative accounts of Cyrene's founding – a Theraean (4.150–153) and Cyrenean (4.154–156) version. These demonstrate how a city's origins, including its *metropolis*, were often contested. (These accounts follow Herodotus's report on the founding of Thera.¹⁸⁷) In both accounts the oracle of Delphi introduces colonization during a consultation by representatives from Thera, though momentum builds toward this goal only after initial neglect causes the *metropolis* to experience hardships.¹⁸⁸ The common version into which both accounts merge¹⁸⁹ reports that the Greeks first settled on the

¹⁸⁶ See, e.g., Diodorus's accounts of the foundation of Croton (8.17) and Gela (8.23.1).

¹⁸⁷ According to Herodotus, the Spartan Theras presided over the founding of the eponymous city, which boasted Minyae – descendants of the Argonauts – among its settlers (4.148–149).

¹⁸⁸ Drought (4.151) and unspecified difficulties (4.156), respectively.

¹⁸⁹ 4.156–158. A. J. Graham, "The Ὀρκειον Τῶν Οἰκιστῆρων of Cyrene," in *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 87. Contra Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 60.

offshore island of Platea; two years after they moved inland to Aziris on the insistence of a subsequent oracle.¹⁹⁰ Seven years later the settlement party moved to a place called κρήνην ... Ἀπόλλωνος, which became the eventual site of Cyrene.¹⁹¹ Subsequently – “in the time of the third ruler” – an additional wave of Greeks reinforced the settlement, acting on the basis of an oracle which promised abundant land.¹⁹² Having established the framework of Herodotus’s narrative, I wish to concentrate on the relative initiative of Thera, the putative *metropolis*, in the dueling versions of Cyrene’s foundation.

Rather expectedly, the Theraean version assigns the island *metropolis* a significant role in the establishment of the Libyan colony. The attention given to Grinnus, King of Thera, offers the first indication of Thera’s comparatively prominent position vis-à-vis Cyrene. Herodotus’s depiction of the king is significant: He is a descendent of Theras, eponymous founder of the *metropolis*. This detail, introduced in the context of Grinnus’s trip to Delphi, simultaneously invites a comparison between the king’s role and that of his *oikist* ancestor,¹⁹³ on the one hand, and between Cyrene and her *metropolis* Thera, on the other. Indeed, from the outset King Grinnus assumes the role of *oikist*; he is credited with consulting Delphi “concerning other matters” (περὶ ἄλλων χρᾶ) – after offering a hecatomb on behalf of Thera – and receiving the unexpected command “to found a city in Libya” (κτίζειν ἐν Λιβύῃ πόλιν).¹⁹⁴ To be sure, Grinnus is accompanied by a delegation that includes Battos the eventual founder of Cyrene.¹⁹⁵ Yet the introduction of Battos into the Theraean account reinforces, rather than diminishes, the position of Grinnus since both figures are cast in relation to their ancestors. The result is that Grinnus resembles the *oikist* Theras while Battos recalls the Minyans, who participated in a subordinate role in the founding of Thera.¹⁹⁶

The delegated nature of Battos’s duties witnesses to his subordinate role. Protesting that he is too old to act as *oikist*, King Grinnus requests that the responsibility instead be shifted “‘to some of these younger men,’ pointing as he spoke to Battos” (4.150 [Godley, LCL]). Critically, therefore, Battos receives his charge from the king rather than the oracle; he is, in effect, a

¹⁹⁰ 4.157.

¹⁹¹ 4.158.

¹⁹² “Whoso delayeth to go till the fields be fully divided unto the Libyan land, that man shall surely repent it” (Herodotus 4.159 [Godley, LCL]).

¹⁹³ Further, the genealogy cements Thera’s association with Sparta. Cf. 4.147–149.

¹⁹⁴ 4.150.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. 4.159. Herodotus identifies Battos as “son of Polmnestus, a descendant of Euphemus of the Minyan clan” (4.150 [Godley, LCL]). Bloodlines such as these, flowing from the Argonauts, burnished the credentials of the eventual king of Cyrene. (Yet the Minyae are not unambiguously positive figures in Herodotus – see 4.146).

¹⁹⁶ 4.148. Pindar links Euphemus more directly to the Cyrenean foundation via Medea’s foundation (Pindar, *Pyth.* 4.9–58).

representative. Later in the narrative Battos is sent out with two penteconters to settle the island of Platea of the coast of Libya, being appointed “leader and king” (ἡγεγμόνα καὶ Βασιλέα) over the settlers – “one of every pair of brothers” – who accompany him (4.153 [Godley, LCL]). It is plain, though, that Battos acts not on his own but rather on behalf of the Theraeans,¹⁹⁷ “who resolved to send out men from their seven regions” to colonize Platea (4.153 [Godley, LCL]).

Indeed, even from the outset the focus of Herodotus’s first version falls on Thera. The *metropolis* suffered the consequences of the initial disobedience; suffering seven years’ worth of drought, representatives were compelled to consult Delphi again. The response which Herodotus reports – προέφερε ... τὴν ἐς Λιβύην ἀποικίην¹⁹⁸ – assumes the initiative of the Theraeans rather than the appointed Battos. The narrative represents this reply as a galvanizing event: The people of Thera finally mobilized to plant a colony in Libya. To compensate for their unfamiliarity with the territory, they commandeered the services of a Cretan guide, Corobius. The advance party made its way to Platea, left Corobius behind as a security on the land, and sailed back to the *metropolis* to report on its discovery of a site appropriate for settlement.¹⁹⁹ As with Herodotus’s subsequent remarks about Samians that sail by and restock the Cretan’s provisions, initiating friendship (φιλίαι) between themselves and the people of Thera and (eventually) Cyrene,²⁰⁰ Corobius’s insertion into the narrative provides an etiology for the amicable affiliation between Crete and the other two cities.²⁰¹ Instructively, however, Thera’s initiative led to both encounters since the *metropolis* had gone to the effort of employing the Cretan guide, and Corobius maintained the claim on Platea on behalf of the *metropolis*. Finally, Thera’s orchestration of the settlement venture reaches its high point with the commissioning of Battos discussed above; though empowered with the eminent of “leader and king,” Battos acts as a representative of Thera.

As opposed to its Theraean counterpart, Herodotus’s Cyrenean version foregrounds the role of Battos. Herodotus telegraphs this focus with his extended delineation of the origins of the *oikist* at the outset. We eventually learn that Battos’s father was “Polymnestus, a noble Theraean” (4.155 [Godley, LCL]), but only after discovering that his mother Phronime was a Cretan by birth, the daughter of Etearchus, ruler of Oaxus. Due to the baseless accusations of the stepmother, Etearchus had attempted to kill Phronime, binding a Theraean trader (Themison) with an oath to dump his daughter into the sea. But the trader exploited a loophole to preserve Phronime’s life and transported her to Thera,

¹⁹⁷ Presumably King Grinnus was dead by this point.

¹⁹⁸ 4.151.

¹⁹⁹ 4.151.

²⁰⁰ 4.152.

²⁰¹ Notably, the Cyrenean version provides a different explanation for Crete’s link with Cyrene. See below.

where she became the concubine of Polymnestus.²⁰² The Cyrenean account of Battos’s parentage, of course, has no more claim to originality than does its Theraean counterpart²⁰³; yet its focus on the mother Phronime achieves two effects. First, it introduces a Cretan connection. As will be recalled, in Herodotus’s former account, the Theraeans orchestrated the relationship by employing the guide Corobius when they set out to found Platea.²⁰⁴ By contrast, the competing Cyrenean version suggests this connection ran deeper – through the lineage of the founder Battos. Second and related, the attention to the mother in the latter account complicates the founder’s relation to the *metropolis*. This result stems in large part from Phronime’s reduced status as a concubine. When paired with the founder’s genealogical connection to Crete, this detail weakens Battos’s ties to the *metropolis*.

The prioritization of Battos is especially transparent in the Cyrenean version of the Delphic consultation. The surest sign of this slant is the depiction of Battos – rather than Grinnus – as the primary petitioner. Herodotus segues to the oracular event by reflecting on the name of the *oikist*, specifically its meaning and whether it was bequeathed after or prior to the oracle’s command. Purportedly, the Theraeans and Cyreneans believed that Polymnestus coined the name based on his son’s stammering speech, while for his part Herodotus maintains that Battos adopted it only after assuming his position in Libya – that is, in fulfillment of the oracle’s prophecy. In other words, this latter understanding construes the oracle’s direct address (“Battos”) as a proleptic acknowledgment of the ruling dynasty established by the *oikist*.²⁰⁵ However, the narrative is quite explicit that Battos came to Delphi soliciting a response *περὶ τῆς φωνῆς*,²⁰⁶ which implies some connection between the founder’s name and condition. Irrespective of the “true etymology,” the oracle cited by Herodotus plays on both possibilities:

Battos, you have come about a voice [ἐπὶ φωνήν], but the king [ἄναξ]
Phoebus Apollo,
Sends you to Libya [σε ... ἐς Λιβύην πέμπει], dwelling place of sheepfolds.
(4.155 [Godley, LCL])

While acknowledging Battos’s vexation concerning his voice, the Pythia redirects his attention to a different subject, the founding of a colony in Libya. This

²⁰² 4.154–155.

²⁰³ Osborne, “Early Greek Colonization?,” 255, points out the credulity required to accept that “Battos’s mother was called ‘Sensible woman’ (Phronime) daughter of ‘True Ruler’ (Etearkhos), was rescued by ‘the man who does right’ (Themison) or was married off to ‘The man who woos too much’ (Polymnestor).”

²⁰⁴ 4.151–152.

²⁰⁵ “For the Libyan word for king is ‘battus,’ and this ... is why the Pythian priestess called him so in her prophecy, using a Libyan name because she knew he was to be king in Libya” (Herodotus 4.155 [Godley, LCL]; cf. 4.153).

²⁰⁶ 4.155.

constitutes another example of the “surprised *oikist*” motif, which endeavors to show the unsuspecting nature of the founder’s mandate and therefore its divine basis.²⁰⁷ Indeed, the Pythia’s reference to Apollo’s kingship may, granting for a moment Herodotus’s interpretation of the name “Battos,” imply the delegation of the god’s authority to Cyrene’s *oikist*. Furthermore, on this reading the oracle pairs Greek (*anax*) and Libyan (*battos*) words for king in a manner which parallels Battos’s own transition from Thera to Libya.

Even the subsequent course of Herodotus’s Cyrenean version privileges Battos’s actions. In doing so, the narrative attributes to the founder a higher level of agency than all other characters (except Apollo), implying his fundamental importance for the new colony. Though paradoxical at first glance, this attention includes Battos’s negative reaction to the oracle’s pronouncement. Whereas Grinnus and his delegation (in the Theraean version) had simply neglected the divine instructions, Battos reveals a shocking level of insolence (in the Cyrenean version), protesting, “I came to you inquiring about my speech [περὶ τῆς φωνῆς], but you reply to me about other, impossible [ἀδύνατα] things, urging me to plant a colony [ἀποικίσειν] in Libya, but where shall I acquire the power [δυνάμει] or strength” for such an endeavor (4.155 [Godley, LCL])? Battos then confirmed his irreverence by walking away before the Pythia’s response was complete. Admittedly, this part of the narrative does not cast Battos in the best light. However, it confirms Battos’s centrality in the narrative and underscores the divine basis of the founder’s subsequent actions.

Correspondingly, Battos’s insolent response appears responsible for the ills that befall Thera and thus serves as the proximate cause of the settlement venture. This inference is inescapable despite the brevity of Herodotus’s report – “afterwards matters went untowardly with Battos and the Theraeans” (4.156 [Godley, LCL]) – since the narrative immediately prior to this holds Battos liable for repudiating the oracle. However, concentration on the founder’s culpability is not designed to blemish his standing,²⁰⁸ as suggested by other foundation accounts which foreground the flaws of founders.²⁰⁹ Like stories that

²⁰⁷ The “surprised *oikist*” is a feature of Herodotus’s first version as well. But there King Grinnus is the one who inquired about “other matters” (Herodotus 4.150). There are other examples of this motif. See the discussion of Diodorus’s account of the foundation of Croton above. Also, some Boeotians were said to have consulted Delphi about a remedy for the plague before being instructed to found Heracleia Pontica (Justin 16.3.4–7).

²⁰⁸ Recall that Grinnus had neglected the oracle’s instruction in the Theraean version (4.150–151).

²⁰⁹ See, e.g., above on Archias’s accidental murder of Actaeon that led to the foundation of Syracuse (Plutarch, *Mor.* 772d–773b. Diodorus 8.10.1–3. Cf. Thucydides 6.3.2–3; Strabo 8.6.22; Pausanias 5.7.3; Stephanus Byzantinus, s.v. Syracuse).

concentrate on societal discord more broadly,²¹⁰ narratives focusing on the founder's missteps offer a compressed explanation for complex processes of colonization. The person or event embellished in the foundation account, therefore, comes to symbolically embody the foundation.

Portraying a galvanizing determination to plant the colony, the remainder of the Cyrenean version continues to differentiate Battos from his Theraean *metropolis*. The first indication of this juxtaposition emerges in the characterization of Thera's involvement in the settlement. Just like in the Theraean version, suffering (of some sort) prompts a consultation of the oracle. Yet whereas in the earlier account Battos is formally appointed by citizens of the *metropolis*—and only after the advance party had scouted out Platea²¹¹—, in the Cyrenean narrative he is identified by the Pythia's reply. Indeed, the oracle advises that the Theraeans “ought to join together with Battos to found a colony [συγκτίζουσι Βάττω] at Cyrene in Libya” (4.156 [Godley, LCL]). The phrasing “join together ... to found” underscores the primacy of Battos in this endeavor. When Herodotus reports, therefore, that “the Theraeans sent Battos with two penteconters” (4.156 [Godley, LCL]), it is best to interpret the action as assistance rendered to the *oikist* rather than simply a means of delegating responsibility. Thus, even though the Cyrenean version fails to identify Battos as “leader and king,”²¹² its depiction of the oracle nonetheless signals the founder's future greatness.

Yet a final episode in the Cyrenean narrative implies that the success of Battos and his settlement party – and hence Cyrene – was ultimately achieved apart from the assistance of the *metropolis* Thera. Herodotus reports that this event occurred after the founder had set out with his assembled crew on the two ships allotted them. Though they had sailed to Libya, they were lost as to what to do next (οὐ γὰρ εἶχον ὅ τι ποιέωσι ἄλλο) and therefore returned to Thera. The response of their fellow citizens was not reassuring: Rather than welcome back the failed settlers, the Theraeans shot at them. Fear that Thera would continue to endure hardship should the colony remain unplanted, in violation of the oracle's instruction, apparently stimulated this response. The reaction worked: Compelled to sail back (ὀπίσω πλώειν), the founder and his settlement party initially planted a colony (ἐκτίσαν) at Platea.²¹³ When this colony failed, they consulted Delphi yet again and received a third oracle that referenced “Libya's pastures,” thus correcting the settlement “off the Libyan coast” (4.156 [Godley, LCL]). They went on to found Cyrene in Libya proper.

²¹⁰ See, for example, accounts of the founding of Rhegion (Diodorus 8.23.1; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 19.2; Pausanias 4.23.6; Strabo 6.257.6), Taras (Strabo 6.3.2; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 19.2; Diodorus 8.21.2–3), and Massalia (Strabo 4.1.4–5).

²¹¹ 4.151.

²¹² Cf. 4.156.

²¹³ 4.156.

But it is important to see that they did so under duress from their *metropolis*.²¹⁴ In short, the Theraean rejection at this critical juncture in the narrative contributes to the independence of Battos and his party's subsequent efforts in founding a colony, first at Platea and then Cyrene.

To summarize, the Theraean and Cyrenean accounts reported by Herodotus offer two different perspectives on the role of the *metropolis*, Thera.²¹⁵ As expected the Theraean version prioritizes the initiative of Thera. It conveys this view from the outset through the depiction of Grinnus's oracular consultation, which portrays the king – rather than Battos (as in the Cyrenean version) – as *oikist*. The attention to Grinnus's eminent genealogy is of the same piece: He is descended from the Spartan Theras, who was the eponymous island city's own *oikist*. However, the Cyrenean version problematizes this neat lineage together with its implications for the colonization of Cyrene. It emphasizes the agency of Battos – not Grinnus – via Delphi's identification of him as *oikist*. Battos's mixed parentage does not entirely negate Cyrene's link to Thera but it does introduce complicating considerations. His mother Phronime possessed a reduced role in Thera due to her position as concubine; at any rate, she hailed from Crete. Further, the predominant focus on Battos in the narrative contributes to the impression of his importance in contrast with Thera. His impudent response to the oracle brought about Thera's misfortunes. He was tapped by the oracle (a second time) to plant the colony in Libya. Finally, Thera's response to Battos and the settlers seals the latter's (relative) independence from Thera. The citizens of the *metropolis* repel the settlers when the latter attempt to return.

Two different portraits of Thera thus emerge from the Theraean and Cyrenean versions in Herodotus. In the former, we see a *metropolis* formally responsible for the planning – via a scouting party – and establishment of the colony in Libya. In the latter, we encounter a *metropolis* which produces the *oikist*, settlement party, and supplies but otherwise occupies a secondary role in comparison with the one played by Battos. This latter account, in other words, presents us with an ambivalent relationship between *metropolis* and *apoikia*.

Convergence of Myth and History in Pindar's Poems about the Foundation of Cyrene

Pindar's reflections on the founding of Cyrene incorporate numerous legendary and mythical traditions.²¹⁶ (Indeed, for this reason Calame draws on these odes

²¹⁴ Thera still occupies the role of *metropolis* in the Cyrenean version.

²¹⁵ Beginning at 4.156, Herodotus relates a common Theraean and Cyrenean tradition about how the colonists came to Cyrene from Platea.

²¹⁶ *Pyth.* 4, 5, and 9.

to deconstruct the categories “myth” and “history.”²¹⁷) The celebration of a victory by King Arkesilas’s athlete in the chariot race at the Pythian Games of 462 BCE is the occasion for *Pythia* 4. The poem, crafted as an appeal on behalf of the exiled Damophilos,²¹⁸ borrows heavily from the Argonaut cycle while framing Cyrene’s founding with reinforcing prophecies: the Pythia’s prophecy to Battos that he “would be the colonizer of fruit-bearing Libya, and that he should ... leave [Thera]” to found Cyrene (4.3–8 [Sandys, LCL]), as well as a prior one uttered by Medea, which likewise concerns “a root of famous cities” planted within Libya (4.13–16 [Sandys, LCL]). Thus, similar to Ovid’s Croton account, the prophecy and events concerning the “historical” founder Battos fulfill an earlier, prehistorical forecast – in this case spoken “to the demigods who sailed with spear-bearing Jason” (4.11–12 [Sandys, LCL]). In this mode, Pindar celebrates further events which led inexorably to the commissioning of Battos by Apollo,²¹⁹ such as Triton’s gift of Libyan earth,²²⁰ the Argonauts’ coupling with Lemnian women,²²¹ and eventually the settlement of Thera.²²² The combination of “historical” and mythical events glorifies the colonization of Cyrene.

Pythia 5, which celebrates the same chariot victory as the previous poem, also embellishes Cyrene’s foundation in its praise of Arkesilas – “king of great cities” (5.16 [Sandys, LCL]). Mythical elements are ubiquitous in this poem as well, which configures Cyrene’s identity not only in relation to its *metropolis* Thera²²³ but also to the Trojan Antenoridai, credited with settling Libya prior to Battos and his men.²²⁴ The Theraean settlers’ piety toward their mythical counterparts – who “came with Helen after they saw their homeland go up in smoke” (5.83–88 [Sandys, LCL]) – generated goodwill between the two groups. More to the point, the continuity forged by the poem between historical and prehistorical settlements validates Cyrene, which by some reckonings lay near the southern boundary of the civilized world.

Yet it is Apollo’s actions which most legitimate Cyrene. Pindar celebrates Apollo’s role as *Archegetes* (founder). He settled “in Lakedaimon and in Argos and holy Pylos the valiant descendants of Herakles and Aigimios” (5.69–72 [Sandys, LCL]) and was responsible, too, for the colonization of Cyrene’s *metropolis*, Thera.²²⁵ These prior instances of colony-founding provided a

²¹⁷ Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece*, 35–113.

²¹⁸ 4.277–299.

²¹⁹ 4.50–56, 259–262.

²²⁰ 4.37.

²²¹ 4.50–51, 252–256.

²²² 5.257–258.

²²³ 5.75.

²²⁴ 5.83–86.

²²⁵ 5.75.

meaningful precedent for Apollo's sovereignty over Cyrene's foundation.²²⁶ The festival of Karneian Apollo²²⁷ at Cyrene, therefore, not only commemorated the ties between Cyrene, Thera, and Sparta,²²⁸ but also celebrated Apollo's role in planting each city. Yet Apollo's activity through Battos, Cyrene's "steward" (ταμίαια),²²⁹ once again reveals the convergence of the mythical and historical.²³⁰ Apollo turns his chosen instrument's "outlandish speech" (γλώσσαν ... ὑπερποντίαν) to an advantage – dispersing "loudly roaring lions"²³¹ to ensure the foundation of Cyrene (5.57–62 [Sandys, LCL]).²³² His appointment by the colonizing god – coupled with his own founding acts – secured Battos's heroic stature among Cyreneans.²³³

Finally, *Pythia* 9 – penned to celebrate Telesikrates's victory in the race of armor²³⁴ – is likewise conspicuous for merging myth and history. This phenomenon is manifest early on: Pindar represents Cyrene as an eponymous nymph whom Apollo seized and brought to Libya.²³⁵ Later, the poet describes how "she rules her city, one most beautiful and famous for prizes in the games" (9.68–70 [Sandys, LCL]). Once again Apollo, paramount to the foundation of Cyrene, bridges the gap between historical and mythical. He is responsible not only for transplanting the nymph to Libya, but also for eventually "gathering an island people [Theraeans]" to the colony (9.54–55 [Sandys, LCL]). Thus – as in *Pythia* 4 and 5 – Cyrene's mythical and historical pedigree converge to legitimate the colony.

2.3.2 Colonization in the Classical Period

As in the Archaic period, colonization in the Classical period could assume many forms and advance many aims. Perhaps more so than before, it functioned as a geo-political stratagem for expanding the influence of a *polis*, especially such as Athens. Naturally, in such instances it was important that the colony reflect the interests of the *metropolis*, and there were various mechanisms to facilitate this outcome – economic, military, institutional, religious. A

²²⁶ 5.60–63.

²²⁷ 5.77–81. Cf. Callimachus, *Hymn. Apoll.* 72–73; Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, 147.

²²⁸ Callimachus, *Hymn. Apoll.* 69–89.

²²⁹ 5.62.

²³⁰ *Pythia* 5 ultimately weaves together "historical" and mythical reminiscences to celebrate Cyrene's prosperity (5.55–57), and therefore its steward, King Arkesilas (5.103).

²³¹ Cf. Pausanias 10.15.7.

²³² Pindar goes on to celebrate Battos's founding deeds (5.89–93), which earned him a burial within the city walls, "at the end of the agora" (5.93 [Sandys, LCL]).

²³³ 5.94–95.

²³⁴ 9.1–2, 71–75.

²³⁵ 9.1–8.

colony might be required to fulfill financial obligations to its *metropolis*,²³⁶ come to its aid in wartime, adopt concordant forms of government,²³⁷ and even share cultic commitments.²³⁸ Of course, this is to imagine the ideal relationship between *metropolis* and colony (notably from the point of view of the former).

The accounts discussed below present a more complex portrait of colonization in this period. They illustrate, for example, that while a *metropolis* such as Athens sought to control its colonies, internal and external forces sometimes rendered tenuous its relationship with colonies.²³⁹ They also demonstrate how other concerns such as the role of the founder and divine sanction continued to shape reflections about colonization.

2.3.2.1 *Metropolis and Colony*

The accounts discussed here focus on the colonies of Thracian Chersonese, Amphipolis, and Epidamnus. Together they illustrate the ambivalent relationship between a *metropolis* and its colony, the first two depicting a mother city's claims on its colony via the founder, and the third portraying the breakdown in relations between colony and *metropolis*.

Colonization as Reclamation: Athens and Miltiades the Younger's Colonization of Thracian Chersonese

Herodotus depicts the colonization of Thracian Chersonese as a sort of reclamation project, in which the founder acts on behalf on the *metropolis* and represents a legitimating link to the territory claimed. These events occurred prior to the height of the Athenian Empire but nevertheless during a period when her rulers, the Peisistratids, sought to bolster Athens' influence abroad – in this case, in Thrace. Miltiades the Elder had led a prior private settlement venture to Thracian Chersonese late in the sixth century BCE, having been invited to do so by the Delonci tribe.²⁴⁰ Miltiades's efforts did not produce a colony per

²³⁶ Such obligations might have included paying taxes and relinquishing natural resources. See Figueira, "Colonisation in the Classical Period," 2:450–51. Exploitation of colonies was also the norm in the Hellenistic period. See Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, 21, 42, 64–65.

²³⁷ E.g., Athenian colonies Amphipolis and Thurii embraced democratic principles such as self-selection and equal allotment of land, while Sparta's colony Heraclea inherited the oligarchic government of its *metropolis*. See Thucydides 1.19.1; Cf. Figueira, "Colonisation in the Classical Period," 2:482–83.

²³⁸ E.g., the putative foundation decree of Brea obligates the colony to dedicate at Athens a cow and panoply for the Great Panathenaea and a phallus for the Dionysia (IG 1³ 46, lines 15–17).

²³⁹ Indeed, Thucydides credits the breakdown in relationship between Corcyra and its colony Epidamnus as a major cause of the Peloponnesian War. See below.

²⁴⁰ Herodotus 6.35.

se but did secure for him rule over parts of the Chersonese,²⁴¹ an outcome later exploited by Peisistradid Athens.

According to Herodotus, sometime after the death of Miltiades the Elder, and that of his successor Stesagoras, the Athenian tyrants sought to consolidate their position in Thrace. To this end, they sent “Miltiades son of Cimon ... in a trireme to the Chersonese, there to take control of the country” (4.39 [Godley, LCL]) – endeavoring, in other words, to help the nephew inherit his uncle’s rule.²⁴² This was an adroit maneuver. By commissioning Miltiades the Younger, and thus exploiting the genealogical connection between the two founders, the tyrants hoped to establish and legitimate Athens’ role as *metropolis* of the Chersonese colony.²⁴³ Though it may have been short-lived, Miltiades’s rule on behalf of Athens anticipated later efforts by the *polis* to employ colonization – and founders – to advance its interests abroad.

Representatives of the Metropolis: Amphipolis and Her Founders

Thucydides’s remarks on Amphipolis highlight the strategic but fraught nature of colonization in the Classical period. The true measure of Amphipolis’ significance (in geo-politics) was the conflict it occasioned between Athens and Sparta at the time of the Peloponnesian War. Long coveting the land, formerly known as Ennea-Hodoi, Athens had sought to colonize it on several prior occasions. During the time of Pericles, she made yet another attempt to bring Amphipolis within her orbit, deeming it “useful ... for the importation of timber for ship-building and for the revenue it produced,” as well as advantageous as a bulwark against further Spartan advances (4.108.1 [Smith, LCL]). Athens indeed succeeded in colonizing Amphipolis. However, Sparta was not content to let this outcome stand, and under Brasidas wrested control of the colony

²⁴¹ Cornelius Nepos, purporting to describe the actions of Miltiades the Younger, seems to incorporate details from the Elder’s earlier venture. Miltiades in this reportage is both military leader and city planner: He “dispersed the forces of the barbarians, ... gained possession of the entire region that he had in view, ... [and] fortified strategic points with strongholds” (*Milt.* 1.2.1 [Rolfe, LCL]). Miltiades is also community organizer: He “settled on farms the company which he had brought with him” and then “organized the colony with the utmost impartiality” (*Milt.* 1.2.1–3 [Rolfe, LCL]), the final statement perhaps referencing the fixing of laws.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, 194. Figueira, “Colonisation in the Classical Period,” 2:430.

²⁴³ According to Cornelius Nepos, Miltiades did little to dispel the notion that he acted as an agent of Athens: He “continued to do his duty by the Athenians, who had sent him to Thrace” (*Mil.* 1.4 [Rolfe, LCL]). Herodotus even tells us that Miltiades leveraged Athenian claims in the Chersonese to justify possession of nearby Lemnos, for which he cited a legendary promise of the islanders to cede their territory “when a ship shall accomplish her voyage with a north wind from your country to ours in one day” (Herodotus 6.139.4 [Godley, LCL]).

from Athens.²⁴⁴ This dealt a blow to the Athenian Empire, depriving it of ship-building resources and emboldening those under its yoke. By contrast, this victory enhanced the position of Sparta. Not only was she able to check Athens, but by her “gentle” treatment of Amphipolis’s inhabitants, she was also able to cast herself as the liberator of Greece.²⁴⁵ Therefore, given the strategic nature of colonization in this period, the case of Amphipolis illustrates how the fortunes of a colony might reflect the fortunes of the mother city.

There are two additional points of interest in Thucydides’s report about Amphipolis. The first of these is the mixed character of the colony, which effectively undermined Athens’ hopes of controlling it. Thucydides reports, in fact, that “few of the citizens [of Amphipolis] were Athenians, the greater number being a mixed multitude” (4.106 [Smith, LCL]). Athens faced a similar situation in Thurii, where her settlers were joined by an equal or greater number of Sybarites. The conflict spawned by this mixed membership seems to have been generated by the two very different styles of governance preferred by the respective constituents, democratic in the case of the Athenian settlers and aristocratic in the case of the Sybarites.²⁴⁶ In Amphipolis, however, general resentment against Athenian hegemony seems to have motivated the non-Athenian inhabitants to transfer their loyalty to Sparta, despite the fact that Athens had established some favorable terms for the settlers. Indeed, it was due to such terms that the Spartan general Brasidas felt compelled to promise “full equality” and preservation of property to those willing to remain in the colony.²⁴⁷ Thucydides’s account reveals, at any rate, that as a mixed colony Amphipolis faced internal as well as external threats.

The second point of interest in Thucydides’s account is the way in which the competing founders represent the interests of the *metropolis*. Athens, for her part, dispatched Hagnon as *oikist* when she made her successful attempt to colonize Amphipolis under Pericles. As founder, Hagnon’s actions were those of military leader and civic planner. He “drove out the Edonians and settled the place” (4.102.3 [Smith, LCL]), oversaw the construction of a fortification wall, and named the city after characteristics of the nearby river.²⁴⁸ It is clear that Hagnon did all these things on behalf of Athens, just as Miltiades the Younger had acted in the interests of the *metropolis* in Thracian Chersonese.²⁴⁹ That he at least symbolized Athenian interests is clear from what happened after Amphipolis fell into Sparta’s hands. Following the death of Brasidas the Spartan

²⁴⁴ Argilians and other neighboring peoples helped Brasidas secure control to the former Athenian colony (4.103.1–5).

²⁴⁵ Cf. 4.108.2–3.

²⁴⁶ See Diodorus 12.11.1–3.

²⁴⁷ 4.106.1–4.

²⁴⁸ 4.102.3–4.

²⁴⁹ In fact, Hagnon seems to have returned to Athens after founding Amphipolis. Cf. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*, 228–34.

general, the inhabitants of the colony gave him the title of *oikist*, “pulling down the edifices of Hagnon and obliterating whatever was likely, if left standing, to be a reminder of his settlement” (5.11.1 [Smith, LCL]). In other words, they transferred the role of founder from Hagnon the Athenian to Brasidas the Spartan, and with it the founder’s cult. Beyond their religious significance, these events indicate how a founder often represented the *metropolis* in a colony. Similarly, Hagnon and Brasidas’s fate as founders mirrored the position of Athens and Sparta, respectively, in Amphipolis.

Changing a Metropolis: Thucydides and the Case of Epidamnus

Appearing early in his *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Thucydides’s account of Epidamnus, originally a colony of Corcyra in Illyria,²⁵⁰ illustrates what was at stake in the designation of a *metropolis*. In the first place, the historian implies that the city was viewed as a strategic asset by the two main combatants in the story, Corcyra and its own *metropolis*, Corinth. The former considered the colony an entity to be exploited, and likely had installed its own partisans in leadership positions.²⁵¹ The latter, meanwhile, envisioned an intimate relationship with Epidamnus as a way to counter Corcyra’s growing strength. Bringing these two objectives into conflict was Epidamnus’ desire to be transferred to Corinth – that is, to have the Peloponnesian *polis* be certified as the colony’s new *metropolis* –, which it submitted to Delphi as an inquiry.²⁵²

Thucydides’s narrative exploits the symbolism of *metropolis* to bolster the case for such a transfer. Epidamnus and Corinth alike could appeal to certain expectations of the *metropolis-apoikia* relationship – or at least violations of them. Epidamnus’ complaint was most acute since the colony was buffeted by the attacks of “barbarian” and exiled leaders alike. Yet Corcyra, instead of supporting its colony – even after ambassadors offered supplication in the temple of Hera in the *metropolis* –, ignored the threat. Later it even insisted that the colony “receive back their exiles” (1.26.3 [Smith, LCL]).²⁵³ Therefore, from the perspective of Epidamnus, Corcyra had neglected the responsibilities of defense that fell within its purview as *metropolis*. By contrast, Corinth acted the part of *metropolis* and “gladly sent the desired aid to Epidamnus” in the form of “settlers and ... a garrison [of troops]” (1.26.1–3 [Smith, LCL]).

The contrast between Corinth and Corcyra runs deeper. On the one hand, the narrative portrays Corinth, whatever its ulterior motives, as diligent in its attentiveness to the *metropolis*-colony relationship. Indeed, the Peloponnesian city’s current assistance followed a precedent of intimate ties between it and

²⁵⁰ Thucydides 1.24.2; Strabo 7.5.8.

²⁵¹ 1.26.3.

²⁵² Representatives from Epidamnus “inquired of the god, whether they should deliver their city to the Corinthians” (Thucydides 1.25.1 [Smith, LCL]).

²⁵³ 1.26.3.

Epidamnus, which the latter makes clear in its initial plea for Corinthian support. While not the *metropolis*, Corinth had contributed settlers at the foundation of the colony – and even supplied the *oikist*!²⁵⁴ Therefore, Corinth’s past and present assistance demonstrate its suitability as a *metropolis*. On the other hand, the narrative depicts Corcyra as insufficiently observant of its responsibilities, not only with respect to its colony, Epidamnus, but also to its own *metropolis*, Corinth. Thucydides represents this assessment as part of Corinth’s logic for supporting Epidamnus.²⁵⁵ Not only, he claims, were the Corinthians inclined to accept Epidamnus’ request since they “considered that the colony belonged to them quite as much as to the Corcyraeans,” but also because they hated the way the Corcyraeans “neglected the mother-city” (1.25.3 [Smith, LCL]). Such “neglect” was manifest in Corcyra’s failure to show proper deference to its *metropolis* at festivals and during sacrificial rites.²⁵⁶ Though brief, Thucydides’s comments on Corinth’s perception of Corcyra are important; they deepen the contrast drawn between the two cities. The former was appropriately committed to the mutual obligations binding the *metropolis* and colony, while the latter was inexcusably negligent of this fundamental relationship. As Thucydides frames the matter, this contrast bolsters Epidamnus’ case to be transferred to a new *metropolis*, Corinth, while also explaining why Delphi approved the colony’s (implicit) request.

2.3.2.2 Religious Sanction

Religious sanction retained an important role in colonization during the Classical period, even as *poleis* undertook colonization for strategic reasons. At least, this is the impression given by accounts of colonization in this period. The reports discussed below illustrate the different forms that such sanction could take, including oracles, visions, *mantic* interpretation, and cult(ic) transfers.

Manteis and Xenophon’s Would-Be Colony on the Black Sea Coast

Xenophon offers a firsthand account of the attempted use of divination to legitimate the foundation of a colony. Reporting on his travels with fellow Greek soldiers in *Anabasis*, the Athenian narrates how he contemplated πόλιν κατοικίσαντας near the Black Sea, reasoning that his well-trained hoplites could easily secure the territory for Greece.²⁵⁷ To this end, he requested the services of a *mantis*, Silanus, to interpret sacrifices in order to discern the gods’

²⁵⁴ Thucydides claims that this practice was of great antiquity (1.24.2).

²⁵⁵ This policy decision was concocted to undermine the interests of Corcyra.

²⁵⁶ 1.25.4. Thucydides attributes the colony’s behavior to its own ascension in wealth in naval prowess.

²⁵⁷ *Anab.* 5.6.15–16.

will. In this particular instance, the *mantis* undermined Xenophon's plan, exposing his intentions to the rank-and-file soldiers who, for the most part, were eager to return home.²⁵⁸ This incident reveals the diviner's influence. For had he offered a positive interpretation of the sacrifices, it likely would have validated planting a colony. Yet Silanus's disclosure to the troops introduced suspicion concerning Xenophon's motives.²⁵⁹

Ironically, this suspicion later tainted perceptions of the interpretation offered by a *mantis* on the question whether the Greeks ought to depart from their encampment. The negative verdict prompted some to charge that Xenophon – owing to his desire τὸ χωρῖον οἰκίσσαι – had “induced the soothsayer [τὸν μάντιν] to declare that the sacrifices were not favourable for departure” (*Anab.* 6.4.14 [Brownson, LCL]). Though angry, the soldiers complied with this interpretation and subsequent ones which similarly pronounced negative verdicts. Xenophon's narrative thus reveals the weight assigned to diviners. While not immune from the suspicion of manipulation, they bore a mandate to interpret the gods' will and were thus capable of influencing momentous decisions.

The Transfer of the Panionia to Ephesus according to Diodorus

Diodorus's narrative about the transfer of a festival – celebrated by nine Ionian cities – is not technically about colonization; yet it does illuminate the relation between sacred transfers and territorial claims.²⁶⁰ An “outbreak of wars” in Mycale had made it necessary to relocate the Panionia to the environs of Ephesus.²⁶¹ To ensure the sanctity of this transfer, the oracle instructed the consulting representatives that “copies [must be made] of the ancient ancestral altars at Helice” (15.49.1–2 [Sherman, LCL]), presumably to be installed at the festival site. The legitimacy of the transfer depended not just on Delphi's authorization but also on ancient connections. Diodorus's mention of “ancestral” points to this conclusion as does his aside that Helice was “situated in what was then known as Ionia, but is known now as Achaia” (15.49.1–2 [Sherman, LCL]). However dubious, Diodorus's narrative thus implies that the Ionian cities could invoke an ancient association with the Peloponnese to ratify their decision to copy the Helicean altars. In turn, this right to copies of the altars ensured the propriety of the transfer, thus facilitating the relocation of the Panionia.

²⁵⁸ As was Silanus himself (5.6.17–18).

²⁵⁹ Silanus reported that “Xenophon wanted them to settle down, so that he could found a city and win for himself a name and power” (5.6.18 [Brownson, LCL]). Cf. Sarah Brown Ferrario, “Xenophon's Hellenica and Anabasis,” in *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 368.

²⁶⁰ In chapter 4, I discuss a formal cult transfer during colonization, that of Ephesian Artemis's transfer to Massalia.

²⁶¹ 15.49.1–2.

Of course, religious sanction is critical to the transfer's legitimacy. In addition to the contemporary oracle received by the Ionian representative, Diodorus provides two other indications of divine support. The first was an ancient oracle²⁶² with which the people of Helice were familiar; this in essence predicted that Ionians would come to sacrifice at the altar of Poseidon, and that this would coincide with the city's suffering.²⁶³ Fear of the oracle caused the residents of Helice to resist the common decision of the Achaeans to accommodate the Ionian wishes. Instead, they "scattered the sacred possessions of the Ionians and seized ... their representatives"²⁶⁴ (15.49.3 [Sherman, LCL]). The second indication of divine support for the Ionians came in response to this act of "sacrilege."²⁶⁵ Poseidon, according to Diodorus's sources,²⁶⁶ revealed his wrath in the form of an earthquake and flood. Thus, a clear thread in Diodorus's account is the conviction that divine forces support using the replicas as a basis for the transfer of the Panionia.

Pausanias and the Refoundation of Messene

Pausanias's account of the refoundation of Messene illustrates how multiple forms of divine sanction might contribute to the legitimation of a colony. Here I discuss the role played by visions, oracles, *manteis*, and a cult transfer.

Visions, oracles, and manteis. Pausanias's account of the refounding of Messene features several visions, which occur at different points in the narrative and, correspondingly, serve different functions. The refoundation transpired after Thebes defeated Sparta – Messene's enemy – at the battle of Leuctra. At this time, Messenians were dispersed around the Mediterranean because of their prior defeat at the hands of Sparta.²⁶⁷ Some, accepting the invitation of Anaxilas of Rhegion, had settled at Zancle; a greater multitude had taken up residence in Libya, responding to an invitation from the Greek dynasty there. Representatives of these scattered Messenians receive the initial visions. In Zancle (Sicily), a priest of Heracles Manticlus²⁶⁸ had a dream-vision (ὄνειρατος ἰδεῖν ὄψιν) in which Zeus invited Heracles "as a guest (ξενίᾳ) to Ithome" (4.26.3 [Jones, LCL]) – the signature mountain in Messene. Meanwhile, Comon, leader (ἡγεμῶν) of the Messenian Greeks in Libya, dreamt that he "lay with his dead mother, but that afterwards she came to life again" (4.26.3

²⁶² Παλαιὸν λόγιον. Later Diodorus refers to the saying as τὸν χρησμόν (15.49.2).

²⁶³ 15.49.2.

²⁶⁴ Τοῦς ... θεωρούς.

²⁶⁵ Ἡσέβησάν τε εἰς τὸ θεῖον (15.49.3).

²⁶⁶ Ἄνθ' ὧν φασι (15.49.3).

²⁶⁷ Pausanias attributes Messene's downfall to the wrath of the Dioscuri (4.26.6–7).

²⁶⁸ The Messenian Manticlus had purportedly established the cult of Heracles Manticlus in Zancle (Pausanias 4.23.10).

[Jones and Ormerod, LCL]). In actuality, neither vision facilitates the return of Messenians to their homeland; however, they both provide sanction for the event through retrospective interpretation. Pausanias's comments about the dream of Comon are instructive. The leader originally supposed his dream to forecast a more modest success, the recovery of Naupactus as consolation territory granted by the Athenians. Yet Thebes' defeat of Sparta at Leuctra secured the more favorable interpretation – repatriation of the Messenian homeland.²⁶⁹ Therefore, viewed from the perspective of later events, the visions anticipate and signal divine favor for the resettlement of Messene.

If the initial visions sanction Messene's refoundation, the interpretation of *manteis* and additional visions facilitate it. Epaminondas, who supervised the project, received the first of these subsequent visions. He saw "an ancient man,²⁷⁰ closely resembling a priest of Demeter," who urged him to "restore to the Messenians their fatherland and cities" (4.26.6–7 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]). As commander of the Thebans, whose victory over Sparta made Messenia's rehabilitation possible, it was only natural that Epaminondas should experience this vision. Like founders in other accounts,²⁷¹ initially the Theban was doubtful about the task before him. However, in this case the vision overcame rather than caused Epaminondas's uncertainty.²⁷²

Pausanias's account notes how another figure involved in the refounding of Messene – the Argive general Epiteles – also received visions. The acknowledgment of Epiteles at this point in the narrative likely stems from a tradition prioritizing Argos' role in Messene's rebirth.²⁷³ At any rate, Pausanias's narrative casts the revelation to Epiteles as belonging to the same process of replanting a desolate community. Indeed, as the text stands, the ancient man who communicated the authorization to Epaminondas likewise confided in Epiteles, presumably in a vision as well. Yet Epiteles received distinctive revelation as well. A dream (ὁ ὄνειρος) directed the Argive to a location on Mount Ithome, where "he ... [would find] yew and myrtle growing" ... [and there to recover] the old woman ... [who] shut in her brazen chamber ... was overcome and well-nigh fainting" (4.26.8 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]). Epiteles's search yielded an urn containing inscribed "mysteries of the Great Goddess" (4.26.8 [Jones and

²⁶⁹ 4.26.3–4.

²⁷⁰ Elsewhere, Pausanias reports the tradition that "the man who appeared to Epiteles and Epaminondas in their sleep was Caucon, who came from Athens to Messene the daughter of Triopas at Andania" (4.26.8 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]).

²⁷¹ Most notably Battos (Herodotus 4.154b–161) and Myscellus (Strabo 6.1.12; Diodorus 8.17; Ovid, *Metam.* 15.1–60).

²⁷² It did not hurt that the vision promised the founder a glorious legacy: "Thou shalt conquer whomsoever thou dost assail; and when thou dost pass from men, Theban, I will cause thy name to be unforgotten and give thee glory" (4.26.6 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]).

²⁷³ Pausanias introduces Epiteles as "the son of Aeschines, who had been chosen by the Argives to be their general and to refound Messene" (4.23.6 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]).

Ormerod, LCL]). (Years ago, it turns out, the Messenian King Aristomenes had deposited the mysteries as a surety of his people’s claim to the land.) Though at first glance Epiteles’s dream seems qualitatively different from Epaminondas’s vision, they serve a similar purpose in the narrative: to facilitate the re-foundation of Messene. In fact, Epiteles related his dream to the Theban founder, encouraging him to open the urn. The mysteries are discovered, reestablishing a connection with Messene’s past and conferring legitimacy upon its re-foundation in the present.

Dream-visions thus operate in various ways in Pausanias’s narrative. As I have suggested, they foretell (through riddles) the re-foundation of Messene and facilitate its fulfillment via the actions of founders. These operations, of course, approximate the forms of sanction conveyed by oracles in other accounts. It is only appropriate, therefore, that Pausanias also marshals oracles in support of Messene’s re-founding: a Delphic oracle given long ago to King Aristodemus²⁷⁴ and an oracle of Bacis, which – taken as a harbinger of Sparta’s defeat – indicates how “Messene again shall be inhabited for all time” (4.27.4 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]).

Finally, Epaminondas also relied upon the interpretation of *manteis* to ensure that “the favour of the gods would follow” him to the site identified for the re-founding of Messene (4.27.5 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]).²⁷⁵ Their affirmative answer, in conjunction with the visions and oracles, assuaged Epaminondas’s concerns. He then proceeded to (re)found Messene.

Bone transfer and the re-founded Messene. Bone transfers also validated territorial claims.²⁷⁶ The act’s efficaciousness often derived from the owner of the bones’ deep ties to the land being settled or else to the present settlers. Both conditions apply to Pausanias’s remarks about the re-founded Messene. As I noted above, he relates how visions and oracles communicated divine approval for the restoration of the territory. Yet these revelatory incidents were not all that legitimated the re-foundation of Messene. In a different context, Pausanias comments on a *mneima* of Aristomenes – erected within the Messenian *Hierothesion* – beneath which lay the bones of the one-time king. Delphi had sanctioned the recovery of the king’s bones from Rhodes.²⁷⁷

Aristomenes’s significance in the collective consciousness partly hinged on the time of his kingship: He valiantly ruled Messenia at the time of its capture by Sparta. It follows, therefore, that when Epaminondas and his allies set out

²⁷⁴ 4.23.4. Cf. 4.12.7.

²⁷⁵ Pausanias 4.27.5.

²⁷⁶ E.g., Sparta purportedly stole the bones of Orestes to ensure the defeat of Tegea (Herodotus 1.67–68), and Cimon transferred Theseus’s bones to Athens after conquering Skyros (Plutarch, *Cim.* 8; *Thes.* 36). In these instances, of course, the bones are taken from the area conquered. But the effect is similar: to validate the actions of the conquering power.

²⁷⁷ 4.32.3.

to refound Messene and “summoned heroes to return and dwell with them ... [.] the loudest summons from all alike was to Aristomenes” (4.27.6–7 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]). The summons was more than a gesture of remembrance; it aimed at rehabilitating Messene by reaching back to a vibrant past, much like Epiteles’s recovery of the inscribed mysteries buried by this same king.²⁷⁸ As it turns out, Aristomenes was deeply invested in Messene’s future. Pausanias elsewhere relays the tradition that the king was “present [in non-mortal form] at the battle of Leuctra ... and that he helped the Thebans and was the cause of the Lacedaemonian disaster” (4.32.4 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]). Pausanias’s account, therefore, firmly establishes the significance of Aristomenes for Messenian identity. The transfer of his bones represented more than commemoration of the man; it validated the refoundation of the community.

2.3.3 Colonization in the Hellenistic Period

Colonization in the Hellenistic period was a complex phenomenon, in part because Alexander and his successors (e.g., the Ptolemies and Seleucids) acted on behalf of burgeoning kingdoms rather than individual *poleis*.²⁷⁹ Later narrative treatments thus focus on the “founders-kings” and the divine support claimed for their foundations.²⁸⁰ Below I discuss accounts of Alexander’s founding of his eponymous city in Egypt (Arrian, Plutarch, and Ps.-Callisthenes) and Seleucus Nicator’s founding of various cities in Syria and Anatolia (Malalas). What the accounts demonstrate, in different fashions and to different degrees, is the preeminent role of the founder in establishing each city and the importance of divine sanction – oracles, visions, signs, and seers (i.e., *manteis*) – in legitimating the outcome.

2.3.3.1 Alexander the Founder according to Arrian, Plutarch, and Ps.-Callisthenes

The narratives treated here foreground Alexander’s role in defining the shape of his eponymous colony in Egypt. Arrian remarks how “he himself marked out where the marketplace was to be built, how many temples there were to be and the gods, some Greek, and Isis the Egyptian, for whom they were to be erected, and where the wall was to be built” (*Anab.*1.5 [Brunt, LCL]). Similarly, Plutarch and Ps.-Callisthenes, while acknowledging the assistance of others,²⁸¹ portray Alexander as a hands-on founder, defining the boundaries and

²⁷⁸ 4.26.8.

²⁷⁹ For colonization in the Hellenistic period, see Cohen, *The Seleucid Colonies*; idem, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*.

²⁸⁰ See below.

²⁸¹ Plutarch acknowledges that Alexander was initially assisted by architects and then – in a vision (see below) – the wisest architect, Homer (*Alex.* 26.5–7). According to Ps.-

spaces of the city.²⁸² According to Ps.-Callisthenes, the founder then determined who would live within the city, made land allotments, and identified the inhabitants as Alexandrians.²⁸³

These accounts also agree that Alexander's actions proceeded from divine sanction, though their characterization of this sanction varies. Ps.-Callisthenes alone reproduces the customary sequence of Greek colonization accounts, with oracular consultation preceding the actual enterprise.²⁸⁴ In his narrative, the founder consults Ammon at his sanctuary in Libya. The response – revealed in a vision – details where Alexander is to plant the famed city:

O King, thus Phoebus of the ram's horns says to you:
 If you wish to bloom for ever in incorruptible youth,
 Found the city rich in fame opposite the isle of Proteus,
 Where Aion Ploutonios himself is enthroned as king,
 He who from his five-peaked mountain rolls round the endless world.
 (1.30 [Stoneman])

To highlight its importance, Ps.-Callisthenes also mentions the response at the end of his narrative – once the plans for the city had been finalized and orders given to commence building – as Alexander set out in search of “the Serapeum according to the oracle that had been given to him by Ammon” (1.32 [Stoneman]). If the oracle's book-ending position were not enough to highlight its significance, there is Ammon's direct commendation of Alexander: “you are born of my seed” (1.30 [Stoneman]). The natural inference is that the founder's actions might just as well have been those of the god. In this way, the narrative depicts the founding of Alexandria as a joint initiative of Ammon and Alexander.²⁸⁵

Though Arrian and Plutarch highlight Alexander's initiative²⁸⁶ – neither mentions an oracular consultation – they still embroider the founder's actions with divine favor. Even in Arrian's account (the most economical of the three),

Callisthenes, Alexander submits to the advice of architects to reduce the size of Alexandria, and that of builders to utilize stone foundations and employ water channels (*Romance* 1.31).

²⁸² Plutarch, *Alex.* 26.4–5; Ps.-Callisthenes, *Romance* 1.30.5.

²⁸³ 1.31.

²⁸⁴ 1.30. Ps.-Callisthenes does, admittedly, report that Alexander wished to “found a city to be named after himself, so that it should endure forever”; yet he has his hero seek assistance from the oracle in determining the city's location (1.30 [Stoneman]).

²⁸⁵ See Kostas Buraselis, “God and King as Synoikists: Divine Disposition and Monarchic Wishes Combined in the Traditions of City Foundations for Alexander's and Hellenistic Times,” in *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, ed. Lin Foxhall, Hans-Joachim Gehrke, and Nino Luraghi (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010), 265–74.

²⁸⁶ Plutarch focuses on Alexander's desire “to found a large and populous Greek city which should bear his name” (*Alex.* 26.4 [Perrin, LCL]). Arrian assigns the urge to fortuitous discovery: “It struck him that the position was admirable for founding a city there and that it would prosper” (*Anab.* 3.1.5 [Brunt, LCL]).

Alexander receives endorsement for his plans via the interpretation of *manteis*. Arrian relates how the founder, lacking means of marking the city's fortifications, adopted a soldier's idea to improvise via military meal rations. By these means, "the circle of the surrounding wall which he [Alexander] proposed to make for the city was worked out" (3.1–2 [Brunt, LCL]). Observing this manner of demarcation, the *manteis* prophesied that "the city would be prosperous in general, but particularly in the fruits of the earth" (3.2). It is hardly surprising that *manteis* would offer a favorable assessment of a plan predetermined by Alexander. Nevertheless, their judgment offers divine ratification for the founder's planting of Alexandria.

Plutarch reports a more elaborate version of this incident. He does so, however, only after revealing that Alexander's endeavor received the tacit support of Homer, who appeared to the founder in a vision. Echoing lines from the *Odyssey* – "Now, there is an island in the much-dashing sea, in front of Egypt; Pharos is what men call it" (26.5 [Perrin, LCL]) – the bard communicated guidance about the future city's identity: It should resemble Pharos. This guidance altered the initial plans of Alexander, who "by the advice of his architects was on the point of measuring off and enclosing a certain site for" the city (26.4–5 [Perrin, LCL]). The "Homeric vision" provided legendary support for the foundation of Alexandria. In Plutarch's account, the founder is quick to capitalize on the poet's assistance: He "said he saw now that Homer was not only admirable in other ways, but also a very wise architect, and [Alexander] ordered the plan of the city to be drawn in conformity with this site [Pharos]" (26.7–8 [Perrin, LCL]).

By the time Plutarch narrates the interpretation of the *manteis*, it is already clear from Homer's vision that Alexander enjoys support for his endeavor. Yet this is hardly the sole way in which Plutarch's account surpasses Arrian's in its depiction of divine sanction. Other details such as the omen contribute to the narrative's embellishment in this regard. To begin with, the interpretation of the *manteis* focuses not on Alexander's "barley-meal" markings, but rather the birds who swooped in and "devoured every particle of the barley-meal" (26.9 [Perrin, LCL]). By itself, Plutarch's focus on birds heightens the sacred texture of the narrative. While the founder, understandably, derives a negative meaning from the omen, his *manteis* provide reassurance of its positive forecast. Their interpretation outstrips in scope that of their counterparts in Arrian's narrative. The sanction signaled by the auspicious sign did not just apply to Alexandria: The city will produce abundant resources, becoming "a nursing mother for men of every nation" (26.10 [Perrin, LCL]). In other words, the sanction for Alexander's founding possesses universal implications.

What do these accounts communicate about Alexander the founder? His responsibilities are consistent with those of traditional Greek founders. He selected a site, marked out borders, and even allotted land. But more important, Alexander could claim divine support for his actions. Thus, Ps.-Callisthenes

bookends his account with Ammon’s oracle. And even Arrian and Plutarch, who acknowledge Alexander’s initiative, emphasize the immortal assistance rendered to him. Forms of such support include the vision of Homer²⁸⁷ and the omen as interpreted by *manteis*. Moreover, Plutarch’s embellishment of the latter to convey universal implications heightens the aura of divine providence. Alexander may indeed demonstrate more initiative than the typical Greek founder. But the sign of the birds, vision of Homer, and oracle of Ammon leave no doubt about divine cooperation.²⁸⁸

2.3.3.2 *The Foundations of Seleucus Nicator according to John Malalas*

The Byzantine author John Malalas remarks on colonization at various points in his sixth century CE chronicle. Malalas shows particular interest in the colonizing activity of Seleucus Nicator, whose ambition was to found many cities.²⁸⁹ The historical value of Malalas’s work is compromised by his suspect methodology, not to mention his distant removal from the events being narrated. However, my interest here rather concerns Malalas’s depiction, which shows the persistence of the “divine sanction” motif in connection with the establishment of cities.

Divine Signs and Seleucus’s Foundations

According to Malalas, Seleucus observed signs in connection with his foundation of Seleucia at Pieria, Antioch, Laodikeia, and Apam. The account of Seleucus’s foundation of Seleucia at Pieria establishes the pattern for the subsequent episodes. Seleucus ascended Mount Kasios and offered sacrifices to Zeus Kasios, followed by prayer for guidance in determining “where he should build a city” (199 [E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, Scott]). Immediately thereafter an eagle stole the meat from the sacrifice and deposited it near the sea, “below the old city at the trading-station known as Pieria” (199 [E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, Scott]). Receiving an answer to his prayer, Seleucus founded a city where the meat was dropped, naming it after himself. The Hellenistic king witnessed a similar portent after sacrificing to Zeus at Antigonía, which he did it for the express purpose of receiving a sign “to learn ... whether he ought to settle in the city of Antigonía ... or whether he ought not to settle in it but build another city in another place” (200 [E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, Scott]). Again, an eagle seized the sacrificial meat and made off with it, this time to Mount Silpios; opposite of this, Seleucus built a city and named it after his son, Antiochus Soter. Approximately the same series of events occurs at Laodikei: Seleucus “made the customary sacrifice to Zeus and when he asked where he should

²⁸⁷ Plutarch, *Alex.* 26.5–6.

²⁸⁸ Plutarch, *Alex.* 26.5–6.

²⁸⁹ Malalas 199.

build the city, an eagle came and seized some of the sacrifice” (203 [E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, Scott]). By the time Malalas gets around to relating the foundation of Apamaeia, the sacrifice and sign are such routine events that he mentions them in summary fashion, following his remarks about the founder’s fortification and naming of the city.²⁹⁰

Malalas forthrightly states Seleucus’s intention to found cities, so it is not surprising that the signs witnessed pertain to the site of the respective colony and not the act of colonizing itself. This depiction roughly corresponds to what we encountered above in the accounts of Alexander’s foundation. Nevertheless, the signs operate as *de facto* sanction since they provide divine guidance.

Seers and Seleucus’s Foundations

In his narrative about the foundation of Seleucus, Malalas merely observes how seers accompanied the king as he traced the meat carried by an eagle to Pieria. However, he reserves a more important role for the seers in his narrative about the foundation of Antioch. There he reports that the seers, along with the priest and Seleucus himself, beheld the eagle standing above the meat on Mount Silpios and rendered the judgment that it “is here that we must settle; we must not settle in Antigonía nor should it become a city, since the gods do not want this” (200 [E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, Scott]). Once again, the king’s desire to found cities fosters the impression that the seers merely ratify that decision. However, Seleucus’s acquiescence in consulting with the seers about the location of the colonies demonstrates deference to Zeus’s will.

2.3.4 Colonization of Rome

Like the Greeks, the Romans were active colonizers. Rome first established colonies throughout Italy and then, gradually, overseas.²⁹¹ However, the nature of such colonization changed as Rome herself underwent changes, from the early to late Republican period and then down to and throughout the Imperial period.²⁹² I have already mentioned some of the characteristics of Roman colonization in the different periods. Later I will discuss Rome’s colonization of Pisidian Antioch, the setting for Acts 13:13–52.²⁹³

2.3.4.1 Introduction

Here I treat several accounts of Rome’s own founding (Livy, Plutarch, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus). I show how these narratives stress in different but

²⁹⁰ Malalas 203.

²⁹¹ See Salmon, *Roman Colonization under the Republic*; Mario Torelli, *Tota Italia: Essays in the Cultural Formation of Roman Italy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 14–42.

²⁹² See the introduction above.

²⁹³ See chapter 5.

demonstrable ways the importance of the city’s origins, divine sanction, and founder. An important observation to make before beginning is that there was no single story of the foundation of Rome. Plutarch’s *Life of Romulus*, which discusses competing traditions, attests to this reality. Plutarch mentions numerous figures sometimes credited with the city’s foundation: Pelasgians;²⁹⁴ Trojans;²⁹⁵ Romanus, son of Odysseus and Circe;²⁹⁶ Romus, “sent from Troy by Diomedes” (2.1 [Perrin, LCL]); and Romis, a Latin tyrant.²⁹⁷ Plutarch even acknowledges disagreements about the identity of Romulus. Was he the son of Aeneas and Dexithea?²⁹⁸ Of Roma, one of the Trojan women?²⁹⁹ Of Aemilia and Mars?³⁰⁰ Or was he the offspring of a phantom phallus and King Tarchetius’s daughter – or rather her maidservant?³⁰¹ Plutarch ultimately accepts the genealogy of Romulus derived from the Greeks Diocles of Peparethus and Fabius Pictor, but his rehearsal of the available options sheds light on the competing traditions which sought to explain and valorize Rome’s origins.

2.3.4.2 *The Foundation of Rome according to Livy, Plutarch, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus*

Rome’s Origins

Each author anchors Romulus’s founding of Rome in a yet more distant – sometimes legendary or mythical – past. A case in point is Plutarch’s account, which cites a tradition linking the city’s planting to the Trojan War via Roma, a Trojan woman who set fire to her people’s fleeing ships in order to induce them to settle near the Tiber River. Finding the land bountiful, the Trojans established roots on the Palatine and rewarded Roma’s foresight by naming the city after her.³⁰² However, Plutarch ultimately endorses the tradition (likewise followed by Livy) linking Rome to Aeneas via the city’s early dynasty.³⁰³

Dionysius’s prehistory of Rome is driven by the premise that Rome is fundamentally Greek given the original settlers of the region. The mini-narratives of these early groups of settlers that comprise the prehistory employ many of the motifs seen in other colonization accounts. Dionysius first discusses the Aborigines. These early inhabitants of Italy were in fact descendants of the

²⁹⁴ 1.1–2.

²⁹⁵ 1.2.

²⁹⁶ 2.1.

²⁹⁷ Ibid.

²⁹⁸ 2.2–3.

²⁹⁹ 2.3.

³⁰⁰ Ibid.

³⁰¹ 2.3–6.

³⁰² *Rom.* 1.2–3.

³⁰³ *Rom.* 3.1–2.

Oenotrians, Arcadians³⁰⁴ who – led by Oenotrus – had emigrated from their homeland due to land shortage.³⁰⁵ They established various settlements in Italy,³⁰⁶ among which Lista was designated mother city.³⁰⁷ Dionysius echoes another colonization theme when he explains how the Aborigines, after originally settling along the seacoast from Tarentum to Posidonia, acquired the territory near what eventually became Rome: In accordance with a custom, parents consecrated some of their children to a deity, sending them out “to inhabit the land directed to them by heaven.”³⁰⁸ Thusly did the Aborigines establish colonies throughout central Italy.

According to Dionysius, the next group of Greeks who settled in Italy were the Pelasgians – originally from Haemonias, or Thessaly.³⁰⁹ The circumstances of their relocation³¹⁰ is familiar from other colonization accounts. Driven out of their homeland (crisis 1), the Pelasgians first went to dwell at Dodona, before being forced out due to land shortage (crisis 2) and an oracle (divine sanction). When they came to Italy, some settled in the coastal regions while others moved to the land of the Aborigines, therefore fulfilling the oracle at Dodona. The Aborigines welcomed the Pelasgians, and together they founded numerous (mixed) settlements.³¹¹ However, the Pelasgians were hardly the final Greek settlers in Italy prior to the time of Romulus.

After the Pelasgians, another group of Arcadians came to Italy. Once again Dionysius identifies both crisis and divine sanction as the motivations for this second wave of Arcadian colonization. *Stasis* had forced the Arcadians to leave their homeland under the leadership of Evander, son of Hermes and the nymph Themis. The then-ruler of the Aborigines, Faunus,³¹² welcomed the settlers,

³⁰⁴ See Tanja J. Scheer, “‘They That Held Arcadia’: Arcadian Foundation Myths as Intentional History in Roman Imperial Times,” in *Intentional History*, 275–98, on the legitimating value of ascribing colonization to Arcadians during the Roman period.

³⁰⁵ Cf. Plato, *Laws* 740e.

³⁰⁶ *Ant. rom.* 1.11.2–3.

³⁰⁷ *Ant. rom.* 1.14.6.

³⁰⁸ *Ant. rom.* 2.2; cf. 1.16.1–4. Dionysius explains this as a practice designed to achieve expiation or, alternatively, express thanksgiving for good fortune – whether for population growth or victory in war (*Ant. rom.* 1.16.2–3). For a similar practice involving a “human tithe,” see the discussion above of Rhegion’s foundation accounts (Strabo 6.1.6; Diodorus 8.23.1). Cf. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 37–41; Parke and Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, 1:55.

³⁰⁹ 2.1.3. Cf. Plutarch, who also notes a tradition that the Pelasgians “after wandering over most of the habitable earth and subduing most of mankind, settled down . . . , and that from their strength in war they called their city Rome” (*Rom.* 1.1 [Perrin, LCL]).

³¹⁰ *Ant. rom.* 1.17–21; 2.1.3.

³¹¹ *Ant. rom.* 1.20.5. Dionysius further reports how drought struck the Pelasgians because they failed to observe a human thanksgiving tithe, causing many to abandon their settlements (crisis 3) (*Ant. rom.* 1.23–24).

³¹² Faunus was himself of divine parentage, having been sired by Mars (1.31.2).

and Themis guided the new arrivals to the proper settlement site, which “is now near the middle of the city of Rome” (1.31.3 [Cary, LCL]). Straightaway the settlers constructed buildings and temples to authenticate their identity and connection with Arcadia.³¹³ The honors which the Romans paid Evander – performing annual sacrifices “in the same manner as to the other heroes and minor deities” (1.32.2 [Cary]) – reflect the early founder’s symbolic importance stemming from his Arcadian origins, divine parentage/guidance, and role in planting the colony.

The preceding waves of Greek settlements paved the way for those of mythical figures, Heracles and Aeneas. The former arrived in Italy after fighting in Erytheia (Spain). Always the wanderer, the club-bearer did not settle in Italy, but many among his Greek forces – and a small contingent of Trojan prisoners – planted communities near the ancient city Pallantium.³¹⁴ Once again Dionysius makes clear the geographical link between the early Greek settlement and the later Roman city: The colony site “is now called the Capitoline hill, by the men of that time, the Saturnian hill, or, in Greek, the hill of Cronus” (1.34.1–2 [Cary, LCL]).

Aeneas was the next illustrious figure to settle in the region. Dionysius insists that the Trojan and his companions had Greek origins,³¹⁵ ensuring the Hellenic foundations of Rome. The crisis that precipitated Aeneas and his party’s abandonment of their homeland is well known. The journey which the fleeing Trojans embarked on took them to Pallene, Delos, Cythera, Zacynthus, Leucas, Actium, Ambracia, Epirus, and Dodona,³¹⁶ before leading them farther west. Some Trojans settled in Sicily,³¹⁷ but Aeneas led others to Laurentum, where he planted a city named Lavinium.³¹⁸ The community contained a mixture of Trojans and natives (Aborigines). To promote unity, the inhabitants embraced a common identity as “Latins”³¹⁹ and combined “customs, laws, and religious ceremonies” (1.60.2 [Cary, LCL]). Years later, Aeneas’s son, Ascanius, and some of Lavinium’s inhabitants founded a city farther inland, which they named Alba.³²⁰ Romulus was descended from these kings at Alba and thus ultimately from Ascanius and his father. Indeed, the entirety of Dionysius’s prehistory – combining the Greek settlements of the Aborigines, Pelasgians,

³¹³ Dionysius identifies the Lycaean Pan as one such temple, which he reports was erected “by the direction of Themis” (*Ant. rom.* 1.32.3 [Cary, LCL]). He connects this temple and its temenos – where the settlers “raised an altar to the god and performed their traditional sacrifice” (*Ant. rom.* 1.32.5 [Cary, LCL]) – to the Lupercal festival practiced in his day.

³¹⁴ *Ant. rom.* 1.34.1.

³¹⁵ *Ant. rom.* 1.61.1–2.

³¹⁶ *Ant. rom.* 1.50–51.

³¹⁷ *Ant. rom.* 1.51.2.

³¹⁸ *Ant. rom.* 1.59.3.

³¹⁹ *Ant. rom.* 1.45.1; 1.60.2.

³²⁰ *Ant. rom.* 1.66.

Evander's Arcadians, Heracles's men, and now Aeneas and his son – anticipates and legitimates Rome's foundation.³²¹

The divine support received by Aeneas and Ascanius in a similar way functions to underwrite the founders' claim to the land.³²² Dionysius reports a two-part prophecy pertaining to Aeneas. He relates the first part after its fulfillment: The Trojans realized that they had fulfilled an oracle – whether from Dodona or a Sibyl in Erythrae³²³ – when, after eating the barley or wheaten cakes they had spread their food on, “one of Aeneas' sons” remarked “look you, at last we have eaten even the table” (1.55.3 [Cary, LCL]). The oracle had instructed that they were to “follow a four-footed beast as their guide, and wherever the animal grew wearied, there they should build a city” (1.55.4 [Cary, LCL]). Then, describing the fulfillment of the second part of the prophecy, Dionysius reports how Aeneas spotted a sow while the Trojans were sacrificing and followed it to the place which would become the site of the settlement. To allay the founder's misgivings, either a voice or a dream-vision confirmed the correctness of the site.³²⁴ This vision, along with the previous oracles, ensured that Aeneas's city-planting was divinely ordained. This led next to Ascanius's establishment of Alba – also in compliance with an oracle.³²⁵ Ultimately, the trail of settlements blazed by these Trojans leads to the foundation of Rome, the culmination of Dionysius's prehistory. The divine prophecies guiding Romulus's forebears encourages the impression – especially given Romulus's own miraculous life and exploits – that divine forces also underwrite the foundation of Rome.

Romulus the Founder

Romulus's miraculous birth. Romulus's story in each of the sources surveyed here reads similar to an account of dynastic origins.³²⁶ The stress on the figure's royal yet humble birth, together with his miraculous survival, contribute to this impression. In Livy, Plutarch, and Dionysius alike the story begins with an injustice, which drives the narrative of Romulus's early life. Amulius pushed his brother Numitor aside to become king of Alba Longa. To secure his reign

³²¹ Cf. *Ant. rom.* 1.60.3, where Dionysius identifies the “nations ... which came together and shared in a common life [κοινοσάμενα τοὺς βίους] and from which the Roman people derived their origin before the city they now inhabit was built” (Cary, LCL).

³²² Dionysius opens his account of the Trojans by insisting that Sibylline and Pythian oracles alike attest “to the arrival of Aeneas and the Trojans in Italy” (*Ant. rom.* 1.49.3 [Cary, LCL]).

³²³ *Ant. rom.* 1.55.4. According to Earnest Cary, 182–83, n. 2 (LCL), by associating the Sibyl with Mount Ida, Dionysius may have “confused the Sibyl of Marpessus in the Troad with the famous Sibyl of Erythrae in Ionia.”

³²⁴ *Ant. rom.* 1.56.1–5.

³²⁵ Ascanius acted “in pursuance of the oracle given to his father” (1.66.1 [Cary, LCL]).

³²⁶ See Cornell, “Gründer.”

Amulius appointed his brother's daughter – Rhea Silvia³²⁷ or Ilia³²⁸ – as the first vestal virgin, ensuring that she would not produce a contender to the throne. Already, however, forces were conspiring to thwart the king's plans: The young woman conceived twins by Mars, Amulius, or an unknown suitor.³²⁹ She was forced to expose the newborns,³³⁰ but miraculous events guaranteed that they survived into adulthood: A she-wolf suckled them,³³¹ and – according to Plutarch – a woodpecker fed them.³³² The woodpecker's reputation as a bird "sacred to Mars"³³³ reveals the god's personal investment in the survival of Rome's eventual founder.

Faustulus's rescue of the boys marks the beginning of their transition to adulthood – and with that, greatness. According to Dionysius, the shepherd discovered the infants at the spot where Arcadians had settled under Evander,³³⁴ a detail which links Roman "history" to an ancient and legitimizing past. Despite the fact that Romulus and Remus grew up in relative obscurity, their early life bore signs of greatness. Plutarch relates how they were sent away to Gabii for a highborn education.³³⁵ Dionysius emphasizes how they acquired a "dignity" and "elevation of mind" and were clothed with the mien of a "royal race" (1.79.10 [Cary, LCL]). Each of the accounts, moreover, hints at their acumen as leaders. They presided over a band of youths who conducted raiding and managed to orchestrate Amulius's downfall, restoring the kingdom to his elder brother Numitor.³³⁶ Indeed, Romulus and his brother's support of

³²⁷ Livy 1.3.11.

³²⁸ Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.76.3. In the same passage, Dionysius acknowledges that some identify the daughter as "Rhea, surnamed Silvia" (Cary, LCL). Plutarch reports that her "name is variously given as Ilia, or Rhea or Silvia" (*Rom.* 3.2 [Perrin, LCL]).

³²⁹ Plutarch mentions the first two possibilities (*Rom.* 14.2), Dionysius the latter two (*Ant. rom.* 1.77.1). Earlier Plutarch relates how the daughter of King Tarchetius (or her maid) was impregnated by a phantom phallus (*Rom.* 2.3–6). Possibly this encounter is what Dionysius refers to when he relates an alternative account about a "divine visitation" (*Ant. rom.* 1.77.2). For his part Livy, without betraying complete credulity, emphasizes Mars's involvement in the conception (1.4.2).

³³⁰ According to Dionysius, the twins were exposed in "an ark" (*Ant. rom.* 1.79.5 [Cary, LCL]).

³³¹ Dionysius relates an alternative rationalizing account in which Numitor substitutes other newborns for his grandsons and hands the latter over to Faustulus to raise. Unsurprisingly, given Dionysius's aims (see above), Faustulus could trace his ancestry back to the Arcadians, who settled the region under Evander. The "she-wolf" who suckled Romulus and Remus was really a herdsman's wife Laurentia, who earned the nickname "Lupa" from a promiscuous past (*Ant. rom.* 1.84).

³³² Plutarch, *Rom.* 4.2.

³³³ Plutarch, *Rom.* 4.2.

³³⁴ *Ant. rom.* 1.79.8.

³³⁵ *Rom.* 7.1; cf. Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.84.

³³⁶ Livy, Plutarch, and Dionysius agree that Remus's capture initiated Amulius's undoing. Dionysius, relying on Aelius Tubero, relates how the brother was taken while the youth were

Numitor advances our authors' main storyline: Their objective achieved, the brothers leave Alba Longa to found their own city.³³⁷

Thus, while the biographical sketches glorify Rome's founder and his brother, they also lay the groundwork for a civic foundation account. Moreover, the narratives of Livy, Plutarch, and Dionysius in their entirety showcase the colonizing perspectives we have highlighted in our model: a focus on origins, divine sanction, and founding acts.

Romulus's divine sanction. It was necessary, of course, that Romulus and Remus seek religious sanction before founding the colony. This did not involve oracular consultation as in instances of Greek colonization. Rather, Romulus and Remus turned to augury.³³⁸ They did so to resolve a dispute threatening their colonial ambitions.³³⁹ Livy reports that the brothers quarreled over who should give his name to the city and who should govern it.³⁴⁰ Plutarch and Dionysius, though, identify the site of the colony as the focus of the disagreement.³⁴¹ According to Dionysius, the dispute sprung from the rivalry which the

celebrating the Lupercalia – an “Arcadian festival instituted by Evander” (*Ant. rom.* 1.79–80 [Cary, LCL]). Dionysius and Plutarch remark how Numitor sensed Remus's greatness: He “observed his nobility of spirit, which he preserved even in distress” (Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.81.3 [Cary, LCL]); he “recognized that a divinity was assisting Remus” (Plutarch, *Rom.* 7.4 [Perrin, LCL]). Romulus and Remus thus help Numitor regain the kingdom by overthrowing Amulius. Dionysius adds additional details about Faustulus's role: He was responsible for disclosing Romulus's identity to him, as well as disclosing Romulus and Remus's fate to Amulius (*Ant. rom.* 1.80–82). The former revelation moves the actions forward by prompting Romulus's actions against the king. The latter legitimizes the regicide by exposing the true nature of the king, who upon hearing the news, resolves to kill his own brother. That the individual sent to imprison Numitor instead exposes the plot against his life underscores the king's unpopularity among his people, information that mitigates the regicide.

³³⁷ Livy (1.6.3) and Plutarch (*Rom.* 9.1) stress the desire of the brothers to found their own city. Dionysius (*Ant. rom.* 1.85.1–2) emphasizes the initiative of Numitor in providing Romulus and Remus with “independent rule” and removing potentially seditious inhabitants from Alba Longa.

³³⁸ Here another distinction from many Greek colonization accounts emerges. The would-be founders seek divine guidance after deciding to plant a colony – and only then in order to resolve their dispute.

³³⁹ Discord is common in colonization accounts. It can feature in the motivations to colonize (e.g., Strabo 6.3.2–3; Diodorus 8.21.2–3); the opposition encountered when attempting to colonize (e.g., Herodotus 1.165–167; Thucydides 6.4.1–2; Pausanias 10.10.6); and the “strife” between different groups that band together to colonize (e.g., Diodorus 12.9; Strabo 6.1.14).

³⁴⁰ 1.6.4.

³⁴¹ Romulus's preferred site was Roma Quadrata (Plutarch, *Rom.* 9.4) or the Palatine (Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.85.6), while Remus's was Remonium, a place on the Aventine (Plutarch, *Rom.* 9.4), or Remoria (Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.85.6).

brothers had fostered: They “divided the whole multitude [of settlers] into two parts,” leading each to champion “its own leader” (1.85.4 [Cary, LCL]). This discord spilt over to the relationship between the brothers. They were “no longer one in mind,” pursuing “superiority” over “equality” (1.85.5 [Cary, LCL]). Hence the need for augury to resolve their dispute.³⁴²

The result was that Remus saw six vultures, while Romulus saw twelve.³⁴³ Plutarch’s comment on the significance of vultures reveals why this outcome won for Romulus rather than his brother the right to be founder of the colony. Plutarch remarks that *manteis* prefer to observe these rather than other birds due to their “rare and intermittent ... appearance,” for that which “does not present itself naturally, nor spontaneously,” is clearer evidence of “a divine sending” (9.7 [Perrin, LCL]). The flight of twelve vultures across the observed space, therefore, revealed divine support for Romulus’s leadership.³⁴⁴ Soon after, Remus died,³⁴⁵ and Romulus went on to plant the city of Rome.

Romulus’s founding acts. Each of the narratives highlights the founder’s role in shaping the city. Their depictions of Romulus’s actions broadly coincide with cultural expectations about what a founder (especially Greek) does when planting a colony. This is true even in Livy’s account, the briefest of the three. Romulus is responsible for the city’s name.³⁴⁶ He also takes charge over the settlers, designating the city an asylum in order to incentivize settlement³⁴⁷ and

³⁴² Plutarch, *Rom.* 9.4; cf. Livy 1.6.4. Dionysius alone remarks that Amulius (as mediator) was responsible for proposing the consultation of “auspicious birds” to determine who “should rule the colony” (*Ant. rom.* 1.86.1 [Cary, LCL]).

³⁴³ Remus saw his vultures first (Livy 1.7.1–2; Plutarch, *Rom.* 9.4–5). Dionysius reports that Romulus sent messengers to get Remus before he had seen anything but that when Remus arrived, he actually did witness twelve vultures (1.86.4; cf. Plutarch, *Rom.* 9.5). Plutarch elsewhere depicts Romulus as a *mantis* (*Rom.* 7.1–2), who wielded the lituus used in divination (22.1–2).

³⁴⁴ Dionysius maintains that god “was thus directing him” (*Ant. rom.* 1.85.3 [Cary, LCL]), notwithstanding Romulus’s deceptive claim about seeing twelve vultures. Plutarch, speaking more generally about the founding of Rome, remarks that the “state would not have attained to its present power, had it not been of a divine origin, and one which was attended by great marvels” (*Rom.* 8.7 [Perrin]).

³⁴⁵ Remus was incensed over the outcome of the augury. Livy relates that he was killed in the battle that escalated from his angry words with Romulus (1.7.2–3). Plutarch reports that Remus leapt over Romulus’s trench wall in anger, only to be killed by his brother or his companion, Celer (*Rom.* 10.1–2; cf. Livy 1.7.2; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.87.4). Dionysius, by turn, suggests that Remus was killed in the wider conflict arising between his partisans and those of his brother (*Ant. rom.* 1.87.1–3).

³⁴⁶ 1.6.4.

³⁴⁷ 1.8.5–7.

dividing the new inhabitants into *curiae* and knights.³⁴⁸ Romulus also shaped the city's religious identity with a decidedly archaic emphasis. Livy relates, for instance, how the founder set the boundaries for the temple of Jupiter Fere-trius,³⁴⁹ a precursor to Jupiter Capitolina. Romulus also adopted rites which could be traced back to Evander. These, according to Livy, were the only foreign rites adopted by the founder; their ancient Arcadian origins made them that much more potent.³⁵⁰ Finally, besides determining the city's religious characteristics, Romulus gave "rules of law" for its governance.³⁵¹ Due to founding acts such as these, Romulus was credited with divinity by some.³⁵²

Plutarch's account is even more pronounced in its portrayal of Romulus as a colony founder. Like Livy he relates how Romulus gave the new settlement asylum status. But he adds, echoing the prioritization of divine guidance in accounts of Greek colonization, that Romulus was directed to do so by an oracle.³⁵³ Indeed, Plutarch's account – and its protagonist – demonstrates an appreciation for the formal nature of colony planting. Romulus is said to have recruited "men from Tuscany" to teach him the intricacies of founding a city. The Tuscans "prescribed details in accordance with ... sacred ordinances and writing, and taught them to him as in a religious rite."³⁵⁴ The founder, for his part, obediently carried out the symbolic tasks which would later function as a model for Roman colonization. He dug a circular trench (*mundus*) to receive the soil deposits from each native land represented among the diverse group of settlers, after which he marked out the boundary of the city, plowing a furrow around it with the aid of a bull and cow. Thus, he created the *pomerium*.³⁵⁵ Romulus, in other words, identified the formal spaces of the colony.

Plutarch also depicts Romulus's authority over the city's settlers – "colonists from Alba" (28.1 [Perrin, LCL]) – and its identity. Among the inhabitants, he divvied up not only the colony's land but also that which he and his followers had seized from conquered peoples.³⁵⁶ Moreover, as in Livy's account, the founder made distinctions among the settlers, a stratification which would continue to define Roman society. These decisions touched on issues relating to military service as well as more fundamental social relations, such as who qualified as patrician. Romulus shaped the colony in other ways: He created the

³⁴⁸ 1.13.6–8. Rome, therefore, differed from colonies established on the principle of equality. Cf. Thucydides 4.106.1–4; Figueira, "Colonisation in the Classical Period," 482–83.

³⁴⁹ 1.10.5–6.

³⁵⁰ Cf. Scheer, "'They That Held Arcadia'."

³⁵¹ Livy 1.8.1–3.

³⁵² Livy 1.16.

³⁵³ *Rom.* 9.3.

³⁵⁴ *Rom.* 11.1.

³⁵⁵ *Rom.* 11.1–3.

³⁵⁶ *Rom.* 17.1.

senate to govern Rome³⁵⁷ and established mixed institutions to ensure cooperation between the settlers and the Sabines from whom their wives were taken.³⁵⁸ Romulus's laws ranged from marital relations to murder.³⁵⁹ Overall, Plutarch's report leaves little doubt as to Romulus's supreme influence over the founding of Rome.³⁶⁰ No wonder, then, that some revered the founder as a god following his disappearance.³⁶¹

Dionysius's account also envisions Romulus as an exemplary founder. First, Romulus followed formal procedures in the creation of the colony, procedures essential for guaranteeing the legitimacy and safety of the new community. Even before the ritual plowing of the furrow commenced, Romulus conducted sacrifices, auspices, and an expiation ceremony requiring settlers to "leap over fires" in order to remove their guilt.³⁶² Similarly, following the ritual plowing, the founder sacrificed the bull and cow and performed rites over many other victims.³⁶³ Second, he helped determine the composition of the settlers, welcoming fugitives as participants in the colony³⁶⁴ and (forcibly) choosing Sabine wives for his settlers.³⁶⁵ Third, he supervised the planning of Rome's spaces. He oversaw the building of rampart, houses, and other public and private spaces.³⁶⁶ When – with the Sabine King Tatius – he enlarged the city, he built further altars to neighboring gods invoked by the colony in its battles.³⁶⁷

Finally, Romulus established institutions to mark the identity of the Roman people. He oversaw, for example, the type of government which would prevail in Rome.³⁶⁸ And he showed his *pietas* by consulting auspices to validate his rule.³⁶⁹ Beneath him, he created a series of magistrates such as senators, members of a gerousia-like council, and *celeres*.³⁷⁰ He also set in place laws and customs to govern Roman society. These were devised, in large part, to maintain order;³⁷¹ one way in which they did so was by formalizing the difference in status between members of Rome. According to Dionysius, the patronage

³⁵⁷ *Rom.* 13.1–6; cf. 20.1–3.

³⁵⁸ *Rom.* 21.1–5.

³⁵⁹ *Rom.* 22.1–4.

³⁶⁰ Toward the end of his profile, Plutarch notes how Romulus changed his ruling ways to that of a monarch before reverting back to populism (*Rom.* 26.1–2; 27.1–2).

³⁶¹ *Rom.* 27.7–8; 28.1–4.

³⁶² *Ant. rom.* 1.88.1–2.

³⁶³ *Ant. rom.* 1.88.2.

³⁶⁴ *Ant. rom.* 2.15.2–3.

³⁶⁵ *Ant. rom.* 2.30–31. Cf. Livy 1.9–13; Plutarch, *Rom.* 14–21.

³⁶⁶ *Ant. rom.* 2.3.1.

³⁶⁷ *Ant. rom.* 2.50.

³⁶⁸ *Ant. rom.* 2.3–4.

³⁶⁹ *Ant. rom.* 2.5.1–2.

³⁷⁰ *Ant. rom.* 2.12–13.

³⁷¹ *Ant. rom.* 2.9.1.

system – which extended to inhabitants in Roman colonies³⁷² – was an expression of this process, which “incentivized good deeds.”³⁷³ Romulus’s institutions also covered religious matters: He established temples and festivals, adjudicated among myths and cults, appointed priesthoods, and secured the influence of divination in Roman society.³⁷⁴ The establishment of these religious practice, like Romulus’s other acts, shaped the identity of Rome and firmly ensconced his status as its founder. The appearance of a solar eclipse at Romulus’s death, just as at his birth, proved beyond doubt his divine sanction.³⁷⁵

2.4 Conclusions

The foregoing discussion has demonstrated that a concern for origins, divine sanction, and the role of founder(s) pervades narratives about colonization in the ancient Mediterranean world. This is the case even though the specific articulation of these preoccupations varies as a function of the historical era and the interests of individual authors. In the chapters that follow, I argue that the colonization lens offers an illuminating way to read Acts of the Apostles. Not only does Luke’s narrative treat a comparable subject, the replication of a cult community, it utilizes common colonization motifs to do so. Indeed, like colonization accounts, Acts seeks to legitimate the foundation of communities scattered throughout the ancient Mediterranean world. I begin by discussing, in the very next chapter, Luke’s narrative about the foundation of the initial cult community in Jerusalem (Acts 1–5).

³⁷² *Ant. rom.* 2.11.1.

³⁷³ *Ant. rom.* 2.10.4.

³⁷⁴ *Ant. rom.* 2.22.

³⁷⁵ *Ant. rom.* 2.56.6–7.

Chapter 3

The Origins of the Cult Community in Jerusalem (Acts 1–5)

In the previous chapter, I not only introduced colonization in the ancient Mediterranean but provided a thick description of how it was portrayed in various accounts, both Greek and Roman. I now turn to the next stage of my argument. In what follows I demonstrate how colonization is a useful framework for analyzing Acts – both its structure and recurring motifs. Here, I test my hypothesis on Acts 1–5. Set in Jerusalem, these chapters function like a foundation account in their own right as well as the “origins” portion of a longer such narrative, which traces the replication of the mother community in locations such as Antioch of Syria (Acts 11:19–30; 13:1–3; 15:1–35)¹ and Antioch of Pisidia (13:13–52).² Acts 1–2 depicts the founder(s), Jerusalem origins, and – above all – divine sanction of the colonizing community.³ Acts 3–5, then, reports on the founding acts of the apostles in Jerusalem and the institutions of the community planted there.

3.1 The Community’s Founder(s), Origins, and Divine Mandate (Acts 1–2)⁴

3.1.1 *Founding Figure(s)*

Jesus is of defining importance for the communities established in his name throughout Acts. It comes as no surprise, then, that Luke takes care to link the apostles to him in the opening chapter of his narrative.⁵ Reports of Jesus’s post-

¹ See chapter 4.

² See chapter 5.

³ For the prevalence of these concerns (origins, founders, and divine sanction) in colonization accounts, see chapter 2 above.

⁴ Chapter 1 relates the founder’s words of farewell and his ascension (1:1–11) before depicting the early apostolic community, particularly its replenishment following Judas’s betrayal (1:12–26). Chapter 2 reports the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost (2:1–13), Peter’s speech interpreting the event’s significance (2:14–36), a call to repentance (2:37–41), and the defining marks of the community of Jesus followers (2:42–47).

⁵ Where the prologue ends is hotly debated. For a brief but helpful discussion of perspectives, see Pervo, *Acts*, 32–34. Scholars variously propose verse 2, 5, and 11. Since

resurrection words and actions (1:1–3) and his ascension (1:9–11) frame the announcement of the Holy Spirit’s coming and the colonizing mission (1:4–5; 6–8).⁶ Luke’s depiction of the post-ascension community also reaffirms its irrevocable connection to Jesus. The core members of the community comprise those in Jesus’s inner circle: the disciples, Mary the mother of Jesus, other women followers, and Jesus’s brothers. Further, their common (ὁμοθυμαδόν) practice of prayer in the upper room reflects a spirit of obedience to God’s will, which is fundamental to Luke’s earlier portrait of Jesus.⁷

Arguably, what Acts 1 relates is the transfer of Jesus’s responsibilities as founder to his apostles. But first: How is Jesus a founder? In the broadest sense, it is this embodiment of God’s will that defines him as such. This is nowhere clearer than in the opening chapters of Luke’s gospel. In Gabriel’s prophecy to Mary, the angel portrays Jesus as God’s royal representative, ruling over his people: οὗτος ἔσται ... υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται ... καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (1:32–33). Indeed, appointment by the deity is what distinguishes a founder, and this is articulated on two different occasions early in Luke. During the baptism of Jesus, the “voice from heaven” in effect declares his appointment (3:22), while after reading from the Isaiah scroll in the Nazareth synagogue, Jesus himself announces his calling (4:16–21).

The founder, of course, is appointed for a task.⁸ This is no less true for Jesus, who is chosen to usher in God’s salvation. Zechariah’s prophecy expresses this ardent expectation: Εὐλόγητός κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι ... ἤγειρεν κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυὶδ παῖδος αὐτοῦ (1:68–69).⁹ And other voices echo that of the aged priest. The angels appearing to the shepherds announce that ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον σωτὴρ ὃς ἐστὶν χριστὸς κύριος (2:11). And Simeon, when presented with Jesus at the temple, exclaims to the Lord, εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου (2:30). Luke develops this theme throughout his gospel. Jesus’s exorcisms and healing acts symbolize God’s salvation, while his teaching articulates its varied dimensions. The people’s reaction to Jesus is a reaction to God’s salvation, whether it be acceptance unto

“[g]enuinely new material begins in v. 15,” Pervo identifies verse 14 as the conclusion to the prologue (34).

⁶ The cult community’s expansion and replication begin after the founder’s ascension. I suggest below that this timing reflects the transformation of the disciples’ roles from followers to representatives, tasked with performing the responsibilities of founding figures in Jesus’s absence.

⁷ Luke 6:12; 19:46; 22:45.

⁸ For this basic conception of founder, as one chosen for a specific task, see Hanges, *Paul, Founder of Churches*, 5; idem, “The Greek Foundation-Legend,” 494–520.

⁹ In chapter 5, I discuss how the Lukan Paul, during his synagogue exhortation at Antioch of Pisidia, employs Davidic traditions in proclaiming Jesus savior (13:22–23, 32–37).

eternal life or rejection – exemplified in Jesus’s crucifixion – leading to condemnation.¹⁰

But in a more specific sense, Jesus resembles founders from colonization accounts. This is because his task of ushering in salvation entails the creation of a community. Once again, the early chapters of Luke are key in alerting us to this concern. We have already noted the angel’s declaration to Mary that Jesus would “reign over the house of Jacob forever”; “of his kingdom,” Gabriel pronounces, “there will be no end” (1:33). Moreover, the spirit-inspired Zechariah confidently announces how the redemption of God’s people is at hand (1:68), a view shared by the prophetess Anna, who ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς προσδεχομένοις λύτρωσιν Ἱερουσαλήμ (2:38). It is true that Jesus’s own teaching about the kingdom of God problematizes what it means for him to restore/redeem Israel,¹¹ but his appointment of twelve disciples/apostles (Luke 6:12–19; Acts 1:2) – who form the core of the post-resurrection community (Acts 1:12–26) – leaves little doubt that Luke’s Jesus seeks to (re)create a community out of Israel. Indeed, Jesus’s followers continue to rely on this hope, or at least their understanding of it (Luke 24:21; Acts 1:6). What they do not fully realize before the oracle in Acts 1:8 is that the founder’s openness to non-Jews¹² presaged a more robust ministry to gentiles following his ascension. This ministry ultimately initiates the creation of the community comprising both Jews and gentiles.

Thus, the introduction in Acts portrays Jesus as founder whose authority and practices define the identity of the community following in his wake.¹³ But if Luke depicts Jesus as founder, he nevertheless reserves a critical role for the apostles, the new leaders of the community. Most important, Luke signals their privileged relationship with the founder, reintroducing them as the “apostles whom ... [Jesus] had chosen” (1:2).¹⁴ Further, it was necessary to replenish their number following Judas’s betrayal (1:15–26) not simply because the Psalms had foretold it (v. 20), but more critically because Jesus had established the twelvefold leadership.¹⁵ In reconstituting the Twelve, the narrative thus reaffirms the continuity between the post-resurrection leadership (and the

¹⁰ See, for example, Luke 9:26; 10:10–16; 11:29–32; 12:8–9; 18:29–30; 20:9–18. Cf. 2:34–35.

¹¹ See Luke 4:43; 6:20; 7:28; 8:1, 10; 9:2, 11, 27, 60, 62; 10:9, 11; 11:2, 20; 12:31; 13:18, 20, 28–29; 14:15; 16:16; 17:20–21; 18:16, 24–25, 29; 19:11; 21:31; 22:16, 18, 29–30; Acts 1:3.

¹² See, e.g., Luke 7:1–10; 8:26–39; 10:25–37.

¹³ Cf. Hans Josef Klauck, *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity*, trans. Brian McNeil (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 7.

¹⁴ Compounding the awkward syntax of this verse are its variant readings. See Pervo, *Acts*, 36. Jesus’s commands to his apostles, however, shine through the murkiness.

¹⁵ Via his use of δεῖ (1:21), Luke signals that the divine will is at work even in this process of betrayal and replenishment. Cf. *ibid.*, 49, 51.

community it oversees) and the founder Jesus, who made the original appointments.¹⁶

But what is the nature of the apostles' leadership position? Along with James and Paul, they are the preeminent figures with whom the cult communities in Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, and beyond are identified in Acts. But how does their authority relate to that of Jesus, and what does this mean for their mandate? David Balch avers that Jesus occupies the role of founder in Luke–Acts.¹⁷ Yet the issue is a bit more complex. The previous chapter's discussion demonstrated a variety of perspectives about the number of figures responsible for founding a community. While indeed most accounts credit lone individuals with such feats, many reports or narratives identify multiple figures who occupy a founding role,¹⁸ whether in a parallel or hierarchical capacity. The apostles are certainly not Jesus's equal since it is his cult and its benefits which they spread. But they are – at least with respect to the communities founded – his associates, or better yet, his representatives. Prior to his ascension, Jesus designates the apostles as “my witnesses” (1:8; cf. 1:22; 10:41; 22:15), and shortly after Peter refers to them as participants in the founder's “ministry” (1:17). The following terminology reflects the distinction but similarity between the roles of Jesus and the apostles: Jesus is *the* founder while the apostles are founding figures.¹⁹

As founding figures, the apostles' authority is predicated on their relationship to the founder, a point conveyed by Peter's insistence that the one who replaces Judas (λαβεῖν τὸν τόπον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς

¹⁶ Luke 6:12–16. Recall from chapter 2 how the determination of “customs” (*nomima*) such as leadership institutions furnished a way for new communities to signal their putative origins.

¹⁷ Balch, “ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ,” 139–88.

¹⁸ See chapter 2. Examples: Acragas was founded by Aristonous and Pystilus (Thucydides 6.4.4); Ascra was founded by Ephialtes and Otus (Pausanias 9.29.1); Brea was founded by Democlidēs and ten *oikistae* (IG 1³ 46); Camarina was founded by Dascon and Menecolus (Thucydides 6.5.2–3); Cumae was founded by Megasthenes of Chalcis and Hippocles of Cumae (Strabo 5.4.4); Gela was founded by Antiphemus of Rhodes and Entimus of Crete (Thucydides 6.4.3; Diodorus 8.23.1); Heraclea Trachis was founded by Leon, Alcidas, and Damagon; Himera was founded by Eucleides, Simus, and Sacon (Thucydides 6.5.1); Messene was refounded by Epaminondas of Thebes and Epiteles of Argos (Pausanias 4.26–27); Thurii was founded by Lampon and Xenocritus of Athens (Diodorus 12.9f); Zancle was founded by Gorgus and Manticlus (Pausanias 4.23.5–7) or Perieres and Krataimenes (Callimachus 2 fr. 6[22]). Moreover, there appears to be no contradiction between there being a mortal and divine or semi-divine founder. See, for example, the founding of Abdera by Abderus (hero) and Timesias (mortal), and the founding of Cyrene by Apollo/Cyrene (god/nymph) and Battos (mortal). In the case of Rome, the senate would appoint a committee of figures to establish the colony. See Livy 4.10–11; 8.16.14; 9.28.8; 10.21.9; 32.29.3; 34.53.2; 39.55.5; Cicero, *Agr.* 1; *Agr.* 2.7.19; 2.32.

¹⁹ I include Paul in the latter category.

[1:25]) should have been among Jesus’s original followers (1:21). In their capacity as founding figures, the apostles perform the same word and deed ministry, focused on salvation, as Jesus. In other words, what we witness in this first chapter (especially vv. 1–11) is Jesus transferring to the apostles his responsibilities as founder.

3.1.2 Jerusalem Origins

The Jerusalem setting is also critical to Luke’s depiction of the Christian community’s origins. The narrative focuses on Jerusalem in the early chapters prior to the community’s replication in other locations within as well as outside of Judea.²⁰ This presentation fosters the impression that Jerusalem in effect is the mother city of the communities subsequently founded, which approximate colonies (*apoikiai*). Strengthening this impression are both the binding declarations of the Jerusalem leadership for new (gentile-based) communities and the narrative’s penchant for circling back to Jerusalem.²¹ By such devices, Luke signals the mother city’s preeminent importance.

Jerusalem’s identity as mother city also stems from its cultic significance. The city was the symbolic center of Judaism. This is an important fact for Luke who wishes to portray the cult as well as its replication outside Judea as the legitimate fulfillment of Judaism.²² Foregrounding the cult community’s origins in Jerusalem helps accomplish both tasks.²³ Yet there is another consequence of Jerusalem’s being the cult center of Judaism. As such, for many Jews it was the *omphalos*, or navel of the universe, occupying the center of the mental map²⁴ that was reserved for Delphi by many in the ancient Greek world.²⁵ Acts reveals something of this geographical sensibility since the Christian cult spreads outward from Jerusalem.

²⁰ Jerusalem remains the primary setting from 1:1–7:60.

²¹ Most notably Luke reports trips back to Jerusalem during the ministries of Peter and Paul (Acts 11; 15; 21–23; cf. 8:25). He also conveys the authority of the Jerusalem cult community through the supervisory role of its leading figures (8:14; 11:27) and decrees (15:19–33; 16:4). Even Paul, the founding figure of gentile Christian communities, recognized the city’s significance. He received implicit recognition from the apostles there following his appointment by the exalted Jesus (9:27); he determined it necessary to return to Jerusalem despite certain arrest (19:21; 20:16; 21:13); before Agrippa, he retraced pivotal stages of his life in the city – including his early years (26:4), persecution of Christians (26:10), and proclamation of the Jesus cult (26:10); finally, before the Jewish leaders in Rome, he stresses that he had been transported there from Jerusalem (28:17).

²² See Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*; idem, “Opening the Scriptures,” 199–217.

²³ Indeed, in Luke’s gospel Jesus resolutely set his sights on the city with his crucifixion looming (Luke 13:22; 19:28).

²⁴ Cf. Alexander, “Narrative Maps,” 97–132.

²⁵ Philip S. Alexander, “Geography and the Bible (Early Jewish),” *ABD* 2:982. Scott, “Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations,” 99–100 (see n. 53).

The comparison with Delphi is apropos in a further way. For Luke, Jerusalem functions as the appropriate setting for the divine will to be unveiled, much like Delphi was in the case of oracular responses. Before Jesus gave authorization for the spread of the cult (1:8), he instructed his followers to remain in the city for the τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς (1:4).²⁶ These words forge a connection between Jerusalem (as the site of the Holy Spirit’s outpouring) and the “father” (as the one who promised the Holy Spirit). This connection illuminates how Jerusalem functions as both mother city and cult center: It serves as a symbol of God’s past faithfulness together with his future plans.²⁷ Thus, it is here that the Lukan Jesus forecasts the cult’s replication, much like the Pythia at Delphi authorized overseas settlement.

3.1.3 Divine Sanction

3.1.3.1 Oracle of Colonization

Luke’s reference to the Spirit introduces the colonization venture – along with its divine sanction. Indeed, Jesus’s articulation of the mandate together with the Spirit’s advent in Acts 2 represent two forms of sanction.²⁸ Pervo, offering examples from novelistic literature, describes 1:8 as an “introductory oracle.”²⁹ I suggest that oracles of colonization offer another productive analogue. In this case Jesus’s authority to deliver the oracle of expansion rests on his resurrection and approaching ascension/exaltation, which Peter links to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in his Pentecost speech (2:32).³⁰

This brings us to how Luke portrays Jesus’s words in 1:4–8 as a form of divine sanction. First, he depicts the Holy Spirit as an enabling force. This active, personal role of the Holy Spirit is a recurrent motif in Acts. The Spirit operates in multiple ways: He marks new followers of Jesus (8:17; 9:17; 10:44/11:15; 19:6–7), empowers (10:38), enables proclamation (4:8; 4:39), undermines opposition (13:9), and causes multiplication (9:31). Here, Luke

²⁶ Cf. Luke 24:49, which also refers to the Holy Spirit as a “promise,” associates it with the “father,” and identifies its place of reception as Jerusalem. The words likewise anticipate the commission in 1:8 and the first fruits of its fulfillment in 2:1–4. (See Pervo, *Acts*, 34, on the relationship between and Acts 1.) Contrast Mark 16:7 where the disciples are told to go to Galilee.

²⁷ Luke demonstrates this connection in his gospel, *inter alia*, through figures such as Simeon and Anna (Luke 2:25–38).

²⁸ In the previous chapter, I demonstrated how foundations were reinforced with multiple expressions of divine or semi-divine sanction. See, for example, reports about the founding of Messene (Pausanias 4.26–27; 4.32.1), Massalia (Strabo 4.1.4–5), Croton (Strabo 6.1.12; Diodorus 8.17), Cyrene (Herodotus 4.150–161), and Cymos (Herodotus 1.165–167).

²⁹ Pervo, *Acts*, 43.

³⁰ Cf. *Ibid.*, 46. Klauck, *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity*, 6, compares Jesus’s resurrection to the apotheosis of Romulus. For examples of apotheosis in the ancient world, see Balch, “ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ,” 162, n. 72.

employs the evocative δύναμις (1:8; cf. Luke 24:49) to intimate how the Spirit will propel expansion while equipping the apostles to overcome the inevitable challenges they will face. Second, much like he contextualized the apostles' leadership, Luke associates the Holy Spirit with Jesus's ministry.³¹ He first announces this connection in 1:2, when summarizing Jesus's final instruction to the apostles,³² before elaborating on its importance for the upcoming venture: The Spirit will empower the founding figures to be μάρτυρες to the founder (1:8).³³

Third, like some oracular responses about colonization,³⁴ Jesus provides geographical clues to guide the mission.³⁵ The apostles are to act as Jesus's witnesses "in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth" (1:8). The primacy of Jerusalem in the list again reflects its position as mother city from which other communities are planted. At the same time, it is itself a place of mission for the movement, as Acts 2–7 make plain. The Jesus followers begin to replicate the community throughout Judea and Samaria in 8–11,³⁶ and then in other parts of the inhabited world in 13–26.³⁷

Luke highlights the divine basis for the community's expansion in at least one other way – namely, by presenting it as an unexpected mandate. This presentation recalls the "surprised *oikist*" motif in colonization accounts.³⁸ The apostles' expectation, at variance with the oracle, nurtures this impression. To Jesus's remarks on the imminent arrival of the Holy Spirit, the apostles responded by eagerly inquiring εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν Βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραήλ (1:6).³⁹ Jesus's retort seems to juxtapose a parochial concern for Israel alone with God's plan for universal blessing.⁴⁰ Luke employs

³¹ Jesus introduces the promised Holy Spirit as ἦν ἀκούσατέ μου, distinguishing it from John's baptism (1:4–5).

³² Luke reports that these instructions were communicated δια πνεύματος (1:2).

³³ See, for example, 8:29–40; 10:19–48 (cf. 11:12–18); 13:9–12.

³⁴ See chapter 2. Note particularly the accounts about the founding of Croton (Diodorus 8.17; Strabo 6.1.12), Cyrene (Herodotus 154–161), Gela (Diodorus 8.23.1), Rhegion (Diodorus 8.23.3; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 19.2.1), Syracuse (Pausanias 5.7.3), and Thurii (Diodorus 12.8.5).

³⁵ As Pervo, *Acts*, 43, notes, the oracle is "programmatic" rather than strictly complete. Judea represents the Jewish ministry; Samaria is transitional; and the "ends of the earth" denotes all other regions to which the message of Jesus will go.

³⁶ This replication, or formation of Christian colonies, begins in earnest with the dispersal of Christians via the persecution reported in 8:1. See chapter 4.

³⁷ The narrative returns to Jerusalem in Acts 9; 11–12; 15; 21–23.

³⁸ See chapter 2. Note particularly accounts about the founding of Croton (Diodorus 8.17; Strabo 6.1.12) and Cyrene (Herodotus 4.154–161).

³⁹ Cf. Luke 24:21.

⁴⁰ Scott, "Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations," 109, construes Jesus's words in 1:8 as an earnest response rather than rebuke; they demonstrate *how* the restoration of Israel will be accomplished.

a $\mu\epsilon\grave{\nu}/\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ construction to contrast the disciples' expectation with proper deference to the father's authority and timetable (1:6–7); with $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ he then redirects attention to the universal mandate. Founding figures will have further occasion to be surprised by the divine will in Acts.⁴¹ But the initial articulation of this mandate is critical: Coming at the outset of Acts, it establishes the divine origins of the colonizing program to sweep across the inhabited world.

3.1.3.2 Precipitation of Colonization (Acts 2)

If chapter 1 focuses on divine authorization for the community's replication, chapter 2 narrates the beginning stages of that process. The challenge for Luke is to convey the universal scope of Jesus's mandate while still adhering to its sequencing, which begins with the expansion in Jerusalem.

Divine Orchestration

Again, Luke stresses the divine orchestration of events in Jerusalem, claiming supernatural support for what many opponents might judge an unacceptable innovation within Judaism.⁴² Several features of the narrative reinforce this impression, beginning with the festal setting of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Pentecost recalls biblical and extra-biblical traditions,⁴³ beginning with Exodus in which God is depicted instituting the feast. Originally an agricultural festival, Pentecost later took on added significance. For instance, Jubilees connects the festival to the time Noah, linking it to covenant renewal.⁴⁴ Other Second Temple and even later rabbinic traditions associate Pentecost with the giving of the law at Sinai.⁴⁵ It is hard to ascertain which if any of these associations

⁴¹ Notably, Acts 1:1–19a (Saul/Paul) and 10:9–22 (Peter). On the latter passage, see Wilson, "Urban Legends," 77–99.

⁴² See below for the prominence of opposition as a motif in Acts. On supernatural support as a "strategy" of religious innovation, see Heidi Wendt, "James C. Hanges, Paul, Founder of Churches: A Study in Light of the Evidence for the Role of 'Founder-Figures' in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. A Review Essay," *R&T* 20 (2013): 295–96.

⁴³ Exod 34:22; Lev 23:5–22; Num 28:26–31; Deut 16:9–12; 2 Chr 8:13; Tobit 2:1; 2 Macc 12:31.

⁴⁴ Jub. 6:15–22. Scott, "Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations," 103–4, considers the Pentecost setting to be Luke's way of evoking the theme of covenant renewal. Gary Gilbert, "The List of Nations in Acts 2: Roman Propaganda and the Lukan Response," *JBL* 121 (2002): 504–5, objects that Jubilees imagines a festival celebrated exclusively by Jews, an outlook at odds with Luke's universalism. But this objection is not fatal. Luke is practiced in culling only that which he needs from traditions, eschewing the rest. See, for example, the quotation from Joel in 2:17–21, which ends on a positive universal note thus avoiding mention of the judgment of nations that follows. Luke's quotation of Isaiah 53:7–8a – but not 8b! – in Acts 8:32–33 also comes to mind.

⁴⁵ E.g., IQS 1.16–2.25. Sejin Park, *Pentecost and Sinai: The Festival of Weeks as a Celebration of the Sinai Event* (New York: T & T Clark, 2008), 160–67. Cf. Alexander J.

influenced Luke’s account in 2:1–4, given that they are not developed in a linear way in the following verses. While the mention of Pentecost in 2:1 may evoke any one of these separate traditions, the simplest conclusion is also the most illuminating: Luke found this festal setting felicitous both for showcasing God’s intervention and for providing a pretext for Jews born in the diaspora to be gathered together in Jerusalem (1:5–13).

Luke’s theophanic imagery further reinforces the divine instrumentality of the Holy Spirit’s outpouring. The narrative depicts both auditory and visual phenomena, describing the sudden arrival of a “sound” (ἦχος) from heaven similar to a “mighty rushing wind” (πνοῆς), which was then followed by the dispersal of “divided tongues as of fire” (διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρός) upon those present. Several of the terms employed in this description (ἦχος, πνοῆς, πυρός) appear throughout the LXX in association with the intervention of God at critical junctures in Jewish history.⁴⁶ Philo’s reflection on the giving of law at Sinai offers a further interesting analogue. While the Alexandrian correlates the seminal event with the feast of trumpets rather than Pentecost, like Luke he brings together auditory and visual phenomena, mentioning a “voice from out of the fire” (φωνὴ ... ἐκ μέσου τοῦ ῥυέντος) and articulate “language” (διάλεκτον).⁴⁷ Once again Luke’s dependence on any one of the cited parallels cannot be proven. However, it is clear that he adopts the Pentecost setting and theophanic language to depict the divine initiative at work in sending the Holy Spirit.⁴⁸ The gift of “other tongues” (v. 4), then, foreshadows and links the Holy Spirit to the replication of the cult community throughout the inhabited world.

Verse 4 is the climax of this first section since it elaborates on the nature of God’s new venture. If the previous verses – with their depiction of a sudden unexpected event – portray a divine hand at work, the spontaneous gift of foreign tongues in the present verse hints at the scope of the task initiated. In chapter two we demonstrated how the deity in colonization accounts often not only authorizes colonization but also designates (and describes) the site to be settled.⁴⁹ Here, the physical manifestation of deity through the filling of the Holy Spirit (ἐπλήθησαν ... πνεύματος ἁγίου) recalls prophetic traditions

M. Wedderburn, “Traditions and Redactions in Acts 2.1–13,” *JSNT* 55 (1994): 39, who argues that Luke “draws on but is not otherwise invested in the contrast between law- and spirit-giving which he finds in his sources.”

⁴⁶ Pervo, *Acts*, 61, n. 20, identifies Isa 66:15, 18 as an intertext.

⁴⁷ Philo, *Decal.* 46. Cf. Gerd Lüdemann, *Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1987), 41; Wedderburn, “Traditions and Redactions in Acts 2.1–13,” 36–37.

⁴⁸ Though see Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 147, who argues for a Davidic background.

⁴⁹ See footnote 23 above.

relating to God’s future bestowal of his Spirit,⁵⁰ including their universal overtones. More to the point, in the conceptual world of Acts it represents how God precipitates and guides events.⁵¹ Indeed, what follows establishes the pattern for such divine initiation: When filled with the Spirit, the cult community ἤρξατο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις (v. 4).⁵² In reporting this event, Luke may have drawn on a tradition of ecstatic speech, which makes marginal sense of the accusation of drunkenness by some Jews (v. 13); but if so, he has transformed it into a story about spontaneous speech in a foreign language – or xenoglossy.⁵³ This much is clear: The coupling of the Spirit’s empowerment⁵⁴ with foreign speech is a deliberate allusion to Jesus’s commission (1:4–5, 8; cf. Luke 24:49). Therefore, what chapter 2 relates is the divine initiation of that expansive plan of replication.⁵⁵

Geographical Symbolism: The List of Acts 2:9–11

From 2:5 on the narrative elaborates on the effects of the Spirit’s outpouring.⁵⁶ Luke telegraphs the far-reaching impact of this event through his focus, particularly in 2:5–13, on the Jews who witness the xenoglossia.⁵⁷ In foreshadowing the community’s replication, this section functions a bit like the geographical directions given to founders in colonization accounts, usually by the oracle. However, here – as with Jesus’s oracle in 1:8 – the geography evoked is more symbolic than prescriptive (see below); it signals the universal scope of the colonizing mission.

The exact identity of the Jews remains a problematic question. Luke seems keen on stressing their fidelity to Judaism, for he characterizes them as ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς (v. 5) despite the rather superfluous picture this produces of pious

⁵⁰ See, for example, Isa 44 and Ezek 36–37. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 246, characterizes the Lukan Jesus as a “relay” of the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Old Testament.

⁵¹ See e.g., 16:6, 7.

⁵² The bewildered diaspora-born Jews relate the content of this proclamation: τὰ μεγαλεῖα θεοῦ (2:11).

⁵³ Cf. 10:44–46; 19:6. Pervo, *Acts*, 59–60. Cf. John Pilch, *Visions and Healing in the Acts of the Apostles: How Early Believers Experienced God* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2004), 25–30.

⁵⁴ Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 242, proposes that elsewhere in Acts δύναμις functions at an implicit level to “link” the miracles of the apostles with the agency of the Spirit.

⁵⁵ See 2:33.

⁵⁶ First, in 2:5–13 Luke describes the audience; second, in 2:14–36 he has Peter provide a more explicit understanding of the event to those assembled; finally, in 2:37–41 he reports the combined effect of the outpouring and Peter’s interpretation upon the crowd. The concluding note in verse 41 makes clear that God’s goal in pouring out the Holy Spirit is the expansion of the Christian community: προσετέθησαν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκεῖνῃ ψυχαὶ ὡσεὶ τρισχίλια.

⁵⁷ Without explicit notice, the narrative transitions from the private setting of 2:1–4 to one capable of accommodating the larger group of Jews presupposed in 2:5–41.

Jews “dwelling” in Jerusalem (εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ κατοικοῦντες).⁵⁸ But he is just as adamant about the universal complexion of the audience. Luke’s confusing use of κατοικέω (2:5, 9, 14) prevents an unqualified judgment on whether the Jews are permanent residents of foreign lands – in Jerusalem for the festival – or rather should be counted among the city’s fulltime residents.⁵⁹ Either way, they seem to represent the diaspora as Luke portrays them. The narrative introduces them as hailing ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν (2:5); registers their surprise at hearing the apostles speaking in their respective native languages (2:8); and lists their disparate origins (2:9–11b).⁶⁰ Indeed, this list offers the most striking proof that the events in Acts 2 initiate the expansion of the community in Jerusalem while also forecasting its replication in regions far and wide.

Before discussing the list’s function, it is beneficial to consider its contents and background. *Prima facie*, the list demonstrates an intelligible structure.⁶¹ Nominative nouns describing peoples in verses 9a (Πάρθοι καὶ Μῆδοι καὶ Ἑλαμίται) and 11 (Κρητες καὶ Ἄραβες) bracket place references, which are introduced by substantival participles (οἱ κατοικοῦντες ... [9b]; οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ... [10b]). Moreover, the geographical movement of the list for the most part is circular – moving east to west before rounding back to Arabia in the east.⁶²

The contents of the list are puzzling upon first inspection. To begin with, it is odd that a tabulation of foreign peoples/nations should include Judea (2:9) – where the current action is set! Furthermore, the list perplexes because it identifies ancient kingdoms, those of the Medes and Elamites (2:9), alongside roughly contemporary ones like those of the Parthians and Romans (2:9, 10). Closer examination reveals that Luke’s interest in these “ancient” kingdoms

⁵⁸ Cf. Pervo, *Acts*, 65.

⁵⁹ Cf. Wedderburn, “Traditions and Redactions in Acts 2.1–13,” 40. Κατοικέω typically denotes permanent residence. *LSJ* s.v. κατοικέω. Yet it is not inconceivable that Luke uses the term in its customary way in 2:9, when appropriating his source, but in an altered (albeit atypical) fashion in 2:5, 14 to allude to members of the audience as “pilgrims.” Though creating problems for interpreters, this repeated use of κατοικέω – with different meanings notwithstanding – links Luke’s source material (i.e., the list) to his narrative.

⁶⁰ The amazed reaction of the Jews in verses 5–8 and 11b–13 – underscored in both instances by the use of ἐξίσταντο (2:5, 12) – frames this list. The charges of drunkenness by the ἕτεροι (v. 13) contributes to a mixed response typical of Lukan style. See, for example, Acts 3:9–10/4:1–18; 5:2–16/5:17–32; 13:4–8/12; 13:42–44, 48/13:45, 49–50; 14:11–18/14:19; 17:4/17:5–8; 17:32a/17:32b–34; 18:6, 12/18:7–10; 19:9/19:10–11, 17–20; 28:24a/28:24b.

⁶¹ Luke’s return to the amazement of the Jews in 2:11b–12 (beginning with ἀκούομεν λαλούντων αὐτῶν) suggests he might have inserted the list from another source. Gilbert, “The List of Nations in Acts 2,” 500–501, n. 13.

⁶² The placement of certain peoples upsets the neatness of the circle, especially the “Parthians” (v. 9), “residents of ... Judea” (v. 9), “visitors from Rome” (v. 10), and “Cretans” (v. 11).

was not anomalous. Curtius Rufus and Augustus, for example, pair the Medes with the Parthians in their respective works. The former identifies them as two of the powers vanquished by Alexander the Great.⁶³ The latter, in the *Res Gestae*,⁶⁴ declares how Parthian and Median kings (the same order as in Acts 2:9) sent supplications to him, and how he subsequently appointed kings for the nations, certifying their client status.⁶⁵ Just as remarkable, the Talmud mentions both the Median and Elamite peoples and their languages.⁶⁶ Such comparanda demonstrate that Luke's mention of the Medes and Elamites is not unprecedented. They do not, however, explain why Luke included these peoples in his list. After all, their inclusion – together with the exclusion of Macedonia and Greece – does not reflect Acts' geographical horizons.⁶⁷ How then are we to understand the list?

Almost certainly the list is representative. But what is its background, and what does it represent? Weinstock suggests that astrological speculation in the Persian period helps explain the list's origins.⁶⁸ On this reading, the original list would have featured twelve nations with each keyed to a specific zodiacal sign.⁶⁹ Weinstock surmises that Paulus of Alexandria's fourth century CE list of nations was based on such astrological speculation; comparing its content to Luke's list, he identifies parallels which lend support to his hypothesis about the background of such lists, more generally. Differences in the Acts 2 list are attributable not only to shifting trends in zodiacal speculation, but also changes in geo-political hegemony stemming from contemporary events. Therefore, in Weinstock's view the list represents the major powers of the world, considered from a cosmic perspective.

James M. Scott recognizes the universal dimensions of the list but looks to biblical traditions as its conceptual milieu. He argues that the impact of the Holy Spirit's outpouring upon Jewish pilgrims signals the restoration of Israel, thus anticipating the mission to the gentiles. He appeals to the correlation

⁶³ *Curt.* 6.3.3. Technically, the claim is anachronistic since the Parthian Empire existed as such from 247 BCE–224 CE.

⁶⁴ For more on the *Res Gestae*, particularly its placement and function in Antioch of Pisidia, see chapter 5.

⁶⁵ *Res Gestae* 32–33.

⁶⁶ See, for example, bŠabb. 115a; bMeg. 18a.

⁶⁷ Gilbert, "The List of Nations in Acts 2," 500–501, n. 13.

⁶⁸ Stefan Weinstock, "The Geographical Catalogue in Acts II, 9–11," *JRS* 38 (1948): 43–46. Cf., Franz Cumont, "La plus ancienne géographie astrologique," *Klio* 9 (1909): 263–73. For a dissenting perspective, see Bruce M. Metzger, "Ancient Astrological Geography and Acts 2:9–11," in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, ed. W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970), 123–33.

⁶⁹ With the aid of conjecture, namely, by positing additions to a hypothetical original list – e.g., "Jews and proselytes," "Cretans and Arabs," and "visitors from Rome" – one can arrive at the magic number twelve. See Pervo, *Acts*, 68; Klauck, *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity*, 10.

between Pentecost and covenant renewal in Jubilees, which he considers an important source for Luke,⁷⁰ as well as prophetic traditions linking renewal to the bestowal of God’s Spirit.⁷¹ Given that the Jews introduced in verse 5 have come to Jerusalem as pilgrims for the festival,⁷² this leaves us with an account of the ingathering and restoration of Israel in fulfillment of God’s promises.⁷³ Yet this is only part of the story. Since scriptures such as Isaiah 49:6 also inform the author’s outlook,⁷⁴ the episode possesses broader implications. Israel’s restoration carries with it an obligation:⁷⁵ to renew the mission to the nations.⁷⁶

According to Scott, the list in 2:9–11 elucidates the relationship between Israel and the nations, in effect anticipating the outreach to gentiles. It is a *pars pro toto* representation of “all 70 or 72 nations of the world to which the Jewish people had been scattered.”⁷⁷ But what could be the possible significance of the list if it does not cover Greece, Macedonia, Syria, and Cilicia – regions not only important in Acts but also with significant communities of Jews? Scott argues that the names in Luke’s list evoke Genesis 10 and traditions dependent upon it.⁷⁸ Correlating each of the names in the list with one of Noah’s son (Shem, Ham, or Japheth), Scott identifies a 3–9–3 structure, seen as evidence that Luke is working within the Table of Nations framework.⁷⁹ Luke’s incorporates the list into his account of Pentecost in order to signal the ingathering of the Jews from among the nations. The xenoglossia reverses the curse of Babel (Gen 11)⁸⁰ – after a certain fashion⁸¹ – and restores a harmonious

⁷⁰ Scott, “Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations,” 99–104.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 105–6. In particular, he cites Isa 11:1–9, 40; Ezek 36:26–27, 37.

⁷² Scott acknowledges but is not troubled by the atypical use of κατοικέω (vv. 5, 14) to denote temporary dwelling, which his interpretation demands. Nor does its alternative meaning in verse 9b give him pause. The idiosyncratic meaning of κατοικέω in verse 5 perhaps suggests that this verse “has a different provenance from that of the list of nations”; the juxtaposed traditions “create a second sense of the term” (*ibid.*, 106–7).

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 107.

⁷⁴ Indeed, Paul’s citation of this verse in Acts 13:47 confirms its significance for Luke. Cf. *ibid.*, 109.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 107. Scott points to evidence of this perspective in Luke’s gospel. He references the evangelist’s genealogy of Jesus (Luke 3:23–28) – comprising 77 or 72 ancestors – and his report about the mission of the 70/72 (Luke 10:1–24). Scott suggests that Luke deliberately chose these numbers to convey his concern for “the nations of the world,” an association influenced by Jub. 8–9 and ultimately Gen 10 (97).

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 108–10.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 113.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 177. Scott cites 1 Chr 1:1–2:2; Isa 66:18–20; and Jub. 8–9 as prominent examples. He contends that Jesus’s commission in 1:8 – as well as the structure of Acts *in toto* – is dependent on these traditions (122).

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 118–19, n. 124.

⁸⁰ Indeed, συγγέω several verses earlier (2:6) recalls Gen 11:7, 9. Cf. Pervo, *Acts*, 61.

⁸¹ The twist is that the wonder of Acts 2 consists in the apostles’ ability to speech different languages, rather than the restoration of a single language which all speak. Gilbert, “The List

universalism. At the same time, the *pars pro toto* list evokes a geographical expansiveness that looks forward to the gentile mission,⁸² which flows from the “mission in Jerusalem”⁸³ and occupies much of Acts from chapter 10 on.

Gary Gilbert considers the Roman imperial background more salient for understanding Luke’s list.⁸⁴ Not only was this Luke’s own context, but it was one that gave rise to varied attempts at mapping the inhabited world. Examples of this phenomenon include Pompey’s statue of the nations,⁸⁵ Agrippa’s map, the Prima Porta statue of Augustus’s breastplate, and Augustus’s *Res Gestae*.⁸⁶ Through such maps and lists, rulers projected claims over different territories. Similarly, Luke inserted such a list into his own narrative to assert the universal reach of Jesus’s authority.⁸⁷ Gilbert insists that the universal themes characteristic of Luke-Acts weigh in favor of this reading. What does this imply for Luke and his community’s relation to the empire? In using the list, Gilbert concludes, Luke “exploits Roman political ideology as a way to foster among its readers a clearer sense of their Christian identity and of the legitimacy of the church.”⁸⁸

Luke’s list can also be compared with architectural monuments. The relief program of the *Sebasteion* in Aphrodisias, a city in ancient Caria, offers a particularly vivid example of how representation could be leveraged to support colonizing claims.⁸⁹ Building on the complex began during the reign of Tiberius and was completed under that of Nero.⁹⁰ There, “two portico-like

of Nations in Acts 2,” 504, is mistaken in seeing this as evidence that Luke intends no reference to Gen 11. As elsewhere, Luke shows himself adept at both allusion and innovation.

⁸² Scott, “Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations,” 118–19, cites Hippolytus’s list (*Diaperismos*) as an analogue.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 122.

⁸⁴ Gilbert, “The List of Nations in Acts 2,” 497–529.

⁸⁵ Cf. Diodorus 40.4.1. The Sicilian discusses Pompey’s inscription which details his “achievements in Asia.” In addition to freeing various kingdoms from the threat of pirates, Pompey boasts of extending the “frontiers of the empire to the ends of the earth.”

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 511–18. Gilbert notes many more examples, which include (but are not limited to) Agrippa II’s speech (Josephus, *B.J.* 2.380), Virgil’s discussion of Rome’s future empire (*Aen.* 1.278–279), Pliny’s description of Pompey’s achievements (*Nat. Hist.* 7.98), and Herod’s theater inscription (Josephus, *A.J.* 15.272).

⁸⁷ Gilbert, “The List of Nations in Acts 2,” 508–9. He notes that Tertullian’s interpretation of Acts 2:9–11 makes precisely this argument.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 527.

⁸⁹ Building of the complex began during the reign of Tiberius and was completed under that of Nero. For the seminal research on the *Sebasteion* and its sculptures, see R. R. R. Smith, “The Imperial Reliefs from the *Sebasteion* at Aphrodisias,” *JRS* 77 (1987): 22–138; *idem*, “*Simulacra Gentium*: The *Ethne* from the *Sebasteion* at Aphrodisias,” *JRS* 78 (1988): 50–77. Cf. Keith Bradley, “On Captives under the Principate,” *Phoenix* 58 (2004): 298–318; and relevant portions of Douglas R. Edwards, *Religion and Power* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

⁹⁰ Smith, “*Simulacra Gentium*.”

buildings” featured “a total of 190 reliefs” across the façade in the upper two of their three-storeys.⁹¹ R. R. R. Smith demonstrates how the program symbolizes the expansive reach of the Roman Empire. The south portico does so through a scheme which pairs “emperors and gods above, Greek mythology below”; the north – our focus – through allegories above and *ethne* below.⁹²

Heterogeneity distinguished the fifty *ethne*.⁹³ Thirteen statue bases clearly identify foreign peoples and three specify islands (Sicily, Crete, Cyprus).⁹⁴ The surviving statue reliefs, for their part, display “a range of subtle differences of character and degree of civilization.”⁹⁵ For example, the “bared breast and the gesture of the crossed arms” of one figure signals a conquered *ethnos* – perhaps Dacians⁹⁶ – while the “[h]airstyle, dress and pose” of another “seem designed to characterize the figure as unambiguously Greek and ‘free’, as opposed to barbarian and captive” – possibly one of the Greek islands.⁹⁷ Why such representation? Smith suggests that the planners chose their figures due their “impressive unfamiliarity”⁹⁸ in order to make a resounding claim: The boundaries of Rome’s Empire “was coterminous with the ends of the earth.”⁹⁹ The visual representation, in other words, evoked universal sovereignty.

I would suggest that the variegated list in 2:9–11 likewise communicates a colonizing claim of vast proportions.¹⁰⁰ Its symbolism is such that features like the ancient peoples/kingdoms (Medes and Elamites) – even if not completely anomalous – enhance the list’s universal character and thus its claims, much like the *Sebasteion*’s “unfamiliar” *ethne*.¹⁰¹

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 51.

⁹² Two allegorical reliefs were found intact at the east end of the north portico and represent Day (Hemera) and Ocean (Okeanos). Smith suggests that their counterparts, night and earth, would have stood at the west end of the north portico. Thus, Day-Night and Ocean-Earth would have framed, as it were, the only slightly less expansive nature of Rome’s rule, embodied in the representation of the *ethne* in the façade of the second storey below. *Ibid.*, 53.

⁹³ They are heterogeneous with respect both to their “character and status” (*ibid.*, 58).

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 57. With the notable exception of the islands, the locations/peoples tend to correspond with Rome’s boundary or frontier regions. The representational dimension of the statues/inscriptions may also be deduced based on where they were located on the north portico: “Very broadly, the more western *ethne* inscriptions were found at the west end and the more eastern ones at the east end” (*ibid.*).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 60.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 65. Smith argues that the identity of the statues was inspired by a list of peoples/lands brought into the empire by Augustus; this list was kept in Rome and featured in the *Porticus ad Nationes*, itself the inspiration for the *ethne* featured in the funeral procession at the princeps’ funeral (*ibid.*, 71–75).

⁹⁸ For example, *Ethnous Besson*; *Ethnous Bosporon*; *Ethnous Dakon*; *Ethnous Iapodon*; *Ethnous Ioudaion*; *Ethnous Pirouston*.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 77.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Acts 14:15–17.

¹⁰¹ The anachronism therefore projects this claim on a temporal as well as spatial level.

The exact background of the list is difficult to determine. However, what the above approaches have in common is their recognition that the representative nature of Luke's list evokes universalism. Whether the list's source and/or content stems from specific Jewish traditions (Scott) or a background of astrological speculation (Weinstock) is to some extent beside the point. Gilbert is ultimately right that in the context of the Roman Empire such representations functioned as propaganda, conveying claims about territories conquered or otherwise possessed.¹⁰² Luke's list operates in a similar if less clear-cut way to forecast the colonizing spread of a cult community.

Of course, neither Jews nor Christians during the Hellenistic and Roman periods could claim universal influence in the same manner as Alexander, his successors, or the emperors of Rome. Instead, one way they asserted their global importance was through appeals to antiquity. Some Jews, for example, reached back to the putative influence of their ancestors,¹⁰³ presenting them as cultural benefactors.¹⁰⁴ Arguing on the basis of ancestors enabled one to be explicit about universal influence without directly challenging contemporary political systems and/or rulers. Josephus, for example, employs the language and concepts of colonization in depicting Abraham's actions. He describes how the father of the Jews desired to "make colonies" (ἀποικιστῶν) of his sons and grandsons,¹⁰⁵ which led *inter alia* to the establishment of Africa.¹⁰⁶ The implied point is that as a result of the colonizing activity of their ancestor, Abraham, the Jews of Josephus's day enjoy a greater cultural legacy than first meets the eye.

Philo addresses the position of contemporary Jews in a more direct way in his *Legatio ad Gaium*, a treatment which offers an interesting analogue to Acts 2. Philo's description like Josephus's employs colonization language and also assigns a consequential role to Jewish communities, one which is predicated

¹⁰² Per Curtius Rufus, for example, Alexander conquered "Caria, Lydia, Cappadocia, Phrygia, Paphlagonia, Pamphylia, Pisidia, Cilicia, Syria, Phoenicia, Armenia, Persia, Media, and Parthia" (*Curt.* 6.3.3). Cf. Klauck, *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity*, 10, who notes that this list happens to name "fourteen ... *membra*" just like Luke's – that is, if "Jews and proselytes" and "visitors from Rome" (2:10) are deemed redactional.

¹⁰³ For antiquity as an expression of power, see Edwards, *Religion and Power*, 28–48.

¹⁰⁴ For a survey of ancient to medieval views on cultural benefaction, see William F. McCants, *Founding Gods, Inventing Nations: Conquest and Culture Myths from Antiquity to Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012).

¹⁰⁵ Josephus is speaking about Abraham's children by his second wife. Other sources write of the exodus from Egypt and the establishment of Jerusalem using colonization motifs (e.g., Diodorus 34/35.1; 40.3.1–8; Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.73–92; 1.227–287; cf. *A.J.* 2.205–3.213; Philo, *Mos.* 1.34–163. Cf. Artap. 3.27.16). See the discussion below.

¹⁰⁶ *A.J.* 1.239. Cf. *A.J.* 1.120. Josephus cites Polyhistor as his source for this material, which is a rewriting of Gen 25:1–5. Polyhistor himself credits Kleodemus. See Sandra Blakely, "Alexander Polyhistor (273)," in *Brill's New Jacoby*, ed. Ian Worthington (accessed December 15, 2016).

on their embeddedness within the Roman Empire.¹⁰⁷ Resembling Acts 2, the Alexandrian delineates a list of nations populated, in part, by Jewish communities.¹⁰⁸ It is true, the nations listed do not correspond all that closely with those enumerated by Luke.¹⁰⁹ Yet the comparison is nevertheless illuminating based on the two sets of relationships which each list envisions – on the one hand, that between the various communities and Jerusalem, and on the other, that between the communities and the inhabited world. For Philo, these two sets of relationships are interrelated. He adopts colonization language to characterize the connectivity: Jerusalem is the mother city through which imperial favor radiates to “colonies” of Jews embedded within the various nations comprising the inhabited world.¹¹⁰

While Acts does not operate with the same explicit use of colony language, it portrays a similarly close relationship between the three entities. Events in the mother city, Jerusalem, possess a consequence for Jews associated with other lands (e.g., as represented by Luke’s list). These Jews represent colonies of sorts embedded in their native lands. Luke will later relate the spread of influence from the mother city outward through the activities of founding figures such as Paul. Here, however, he evokes this relationship through a depiction of how the Holy Spirit’s outpouring affects the diaspora-born Jews. Luke is further innovative in his construal of the relationship between the Jewish communities and the wider empire. It is not Rome’s goodwill which radiates to the colonies like in Philo. Rather, as demonstrated by later events, it is the Jesus cult that spreads from Jerusalem across the empire, often launching from Jewish colonies embedded within notable cities and islands such as Antioch of

¹⁰⁷ As Klauck, *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity*, 10, puts it, Philo represents diaspora Judaism “as a conscious politics of colonization conducted from the metropolis, Jerusalem.”

¹⁰⁸ Philo writes of colonies being sent into the “neighbouring lands Egypt, Phoenicia, the part of Syria called the Hollow and the rest as well and the lands lying far apart, Pamphylia, Cilicia, most of Asia up to Bithynia and the corners of Pontus, similarly also into Europe, Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedonia, Aetolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth and most of the best parts of Peloponnese ... [and] also the most highly esteemed of the islands Euboea, Cyprus, Crete ... [not to mention] the countries beyond the Euphrates [e.g., Babylon]” (*Legat.* 281–282 [Colson, LCL]).

¹⁰⁹ Gilbert, “The List of Nations in Acts 2,” 502. Klauck, *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity*, 11, speculates that Luke “employed an earlier text which listed synagogue communities in the successor kingdoms to Alexander from the perspective of the Jewish community in the Syrian capital, Antioch; this would explain why Syria itself is missing from the list.”

¹¹⁰ Cf. *Flacc.* 46. Philo elsewhere uses the language of colonization in a more allegorical fashion. For example, he depicts the souls of “wise men mentioned in the books Moses” as colonists upon earth, whose mother city is in heaven (*Conf.* 75–82). Cf. *QG* 3.45; *Congr.* 84; *Spec.* 3.111. Note also Josephus’s colonization language in *C. Ap.* 1.138. Citing Berossus, he refers to Jews placed as colonies (κατοικίας) in Babylon during their exile.

Syria, Cyprus, Antioch of Pisidia, Thessalonica, Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome. This expansion produces new colonies of Jesus followers across the empire.

Peter's Interpretation of the Divine "Speech-Act"

Peter's speech¹¹¹ articulates the significance of the Holy Spirit's outpouring and the gift of tongues, particularly to the colonizing mission authorized in 1:8.¹¹² As such Peter's actions approximate those of diviners (e.g., *manteis*) and professional interpreters (e.g., *chresmologoi*) who relay the will of god(s) in some colonization accounts.¹¹³ He draws generously on scripture (particularly Joel 3,¹¹⁴ Psalm 15,¹¹⁵ and Psalm 110¹¹⁶) in order to maintain that God's hand lies behind the events of Pentecost,¹¹⁷ and therefore behind the legitimacy of the Jesus followers and their new mission.

Peter's interpretation further expounds on the universal scope of the colonizing Christian movement. Indeed, God's exaltation of Jesus is what precipitated the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (2:33),¹¹⁸ setting into motion the colonizing mission that is the community's *raison d'être* in the founder's absence. The first verse of the Joel citation announces this universal ambition with its prediction of God's Spirit being poured out on "all flesh" (2:17), while the last forecasts the outcome: "everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved" (2:21).¹¹⁹ Moreover, while at first glance the crescendo flowing from the inverted pesherite exegesis¹²⁰ in verses 22–35 – "God has made him both

¹¹¹ Peter directs his words to ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἱερουσαλήμ (v. 14). Pervo, *Acts*, 72, renders this "Judeans, and all residents of Jerusalem," which acknowledges that the audience now comprises more than just the diaspora-born Jews.

¹¹² Ostensibly the speech was a response to the charge of drunkenness lodged by some members of the Jewish audience (v. 13). Pervo, *Acts*, 74, outlines one potential problem with this charge: It does not take account of the diaspora Jews' recognition of the language miracle (vv. 7–8, 12).

¹¹³ See the examples cited in the previous chapters. In this case, the speech interprets a symbolic event associated – but not identical with – the original "oracle" (i.e., 1:8).

¹¹⁴ Acts 2:17–21.

¹¹⁵ Acts 2:25–28.

¹¹⁶ Acts 2:34–35.

¹¹⁷ Luke's reading in 2:17 supplies the subject ὁ θεός and the specific time stamp ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις (cf. Joel 3:1 – μετὰ ταῦτα – followed by B, 076, sa^{ms}; 1175 witnesses to only a slightly less banal ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις), casting the outpouring as a climax in salvation history.

¹¹⁸ God orchestrated other areas of Jesus's ministry: He validated his legitimacy with "miracles and wonders and signs" (2:22); predetermined his death (2:23); and raised him (2:24). References to "Lord" at key junctures (2:20, 25, 34) link scriptural citations to Jesus and help substantiate Peter's culminating claim in verse 36 that "God has made him both Lord and Christ – this Jesus whom you crucified."

¹¹⁹ Luke implicitly transfers the judgment of gentiles announced by Joel (cf. Joel 3:4–15) to those Jews who reject Jesus (2:36; 40).

¹²⁰ See Pervo, *Acts*, 79, n. 40.

Lord and Christ” (2:36) – seems to have a Jewish audience in mind,¹²¹ Peter’s succeeding remarks envision a broader audience: Salvation¹²² is for “who are far off, everyone whom the Lord calls to himself” (v. 39b). In proclaiming the salvation of Christ, and foreshadowing its ever-widening reach, Peter thus operates as a representative of the founder, Jesus. The response to Peter’s call reveals his success in this role: “those who received his word were baptized, and there were added that day about three thousand souls” (2:41).

3.1.4 Summation

Before examining the colonizing mission in Acts 3–5, let us take stock of what our examination of Acts 1–2 has revealed. I have argued that these chapters introduce the origins of the colonizing mission. They acknowledge Jesus as *the* founder but relate how he transfers the responsibilities of this role to the apostles as his representatives. (In the next few chapters, I show how their activities closely resemble those of Jesus.) These chapters also testify to the importance of Jerusalem as the origin, or mother city, of the colonizing movement. Here the resurrected Jesus assembles his followers prior to his ascension and delivers his oracle (1:8). The Jerusalem setting of these events helps legitimate the colonies of Jesus followers planted around the Mediterranean, portraying them as a fulfillment of Judaism. Meanwhile, Jesus’s oracle introduces the colonizing mandate. It, along with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2, signals divine sanction for the universal venture.

3.2 The Colonizing Mission in Jerusalem (Acts 3–5)

If Acts 1–2 depicts divine initiation of the colonizing mission, 3–5 narrates its success in Jerusalem, the mother city.¹²³ Based on the previous chapter’s

¹²¹ Παῖς οἴκος Ἰσραὴλ [2:36a] ... ὑμῖν ... καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν [2:39a].

¹²² The reference to the Holy Spirit here in 2:38 links the passage back to the initial Joel citation (cf. 2:33).

¹²³ There are various ways of organizing the narrative which runs through to 8:3. Gregory E. Sterling, “‘Athletes of Virtue’: An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41–47; 4:32–35; 5:12–16),” *JBL* 113 (1994): 679, notes how Luke has ordered the material in “five extended narratives and three summaries.” The five narratives are found in 2:1–40; 3:1–4:31; 4:36–5:11; 5:12–42; and 6:1–8:3. It is also possible to see in 3:1–7:60 what Pervo, *Acts*, 97, calls a triplicate “pattern of cult foundation.” Cf. idem, *Profit with Delight*, 19–21; Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany Apostles*, 22–27. Pervo identifies the following basic elements in 3:1–4:22, 5:12–42 (with variation); and 6:8–7:60: “A. A miracle draws attention and followers. B. Teaching is addressed to those attracted by the wonder. C. Concerned and jealous Jewish officials arrest the missionary/ies. D. Legal action ensues. E. The eventual result is a miraculous vindication of the mission.” Reports about the community intervene in 2:42–46; 4:32–5:11; and 6:1–6. Growth reports occur in 2:47; 4:4; and 6:7.

discussion, we are primed for answers to two specific questions concerning the apostles' fulfillment of their mandate in 1:8 – namely, what are the foundational acts by which the Jerusalem community is established and what are its defining customs?

3.2.1 *Comparative Introduction*

Prior to discussing the foundation/expansion of the community of Jesus followers in Acts 3–5, it will be helpful to review some of the defining characteristics of foundations which surfaced in chapter 2. We have already touched on the most critical dimension of colonization: the divine mandate. Chosen by the deity, founders were tasked with planting new communities comprised at least partially of settlers from the mother city. They were responsible not only for leading the settlers to the new site – often aided by geographical clues from Apollo or some other divine agent – but also for organizing the new community as a civic entity. Thus, for example, founders marked out boundaries, divided land, sited temples, determined rituals, set festival dates, and established laws and institutions of governance. Whatever the particulars in each case, these decisions about social, cultic, and government matters defined the new colony both in its own eyes and that of its neighbors.

Most of the accounts surveyed in chapter 2 concern the establishment of Greek and Hellenistic colonies and of Rome herself, but colonization motifs were deployed in the description of other communities as well, not least Jewish.¹²⁴ We observed this earlier in Josephus and Philo's discussion of Jewish communities outside Judea. But it is also the case in depictions of the exodus and the foundation of Jerusalem.

Both Josephus and Philo, for example, portray Moses in ways resembling a founder.¹²⁵ Josephus employs the concepts – if not the technical terminology – of colonization in his account.¹²⁶ Most critical for Moses's legitimacy was his divine appointment.¹²⁷ Josephus hints at this when he relates how an Egyptian sacred scribe foretold Moses's birth and his liberation of the Israelites.¹²⁸ But he is more explicit when relating Moses's encounter with a divine voice from the burning bush, which appointed him “commander and leader” (στρατηγὸν καὶ ἡγεμόνα) to deliver the Hebrews.¹²⁹ But Moses's responsibilities did not

¹²⁴ See Menahem Stern, ed., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Science and Humanities, 1976–1980).

¹²⁵ Cf. Hanges, *Paul, Founder of Churches*, 105–29.

¹²⁶ *A.J.* 2.205–349.

¹²⁷ Josephus also embellishes Moses's personal character in order to burnish his credentials, stressing his virtue, wisdom, and understanding. See *A.J.* 2.205; 2.228–230. Cf. Acts 7:22; Sterling, “Opening the Scriptures,” 199–217.

¹²⁸ *A.J.* 2.205.

¹²⁹ *A.J.* 2.268.

end here: He also designed the government (πολιτείαν) and laws (νόμους) for the liberated community.¹³⁰ The Moses of Josephus’s account, therefore, resembles colony founders in two primary respects: First, he is divinely appointed to lead the community; second, he shapes its identity through civic determinations.

Philo’s treatment of Moses is even more blatant in its adoption of colonization motifs.¹³¹ This is especially apparent in his account of the burning bush.¹³² The voice spoke to him διὰ χρησμών¹³³ and announced how he would be the ἡγεμόνα¹³⁴ ἀποικίας¹³⁵ sent out from Egypt.¹³⁶ (Philo elsewhere relates how Moses led out the ἀποικίαν to “Phoenicia, and Coelesyria and Palestine, then called the land of the Canaanites” [*Mos.* 1.163 (Colson, LCL)].) Like Josephus (and Manetho below) Philo is also quite clear that Moses shaped the community’s identity through laws. He was the νομοθετῶν ἄριστος, and his οἱ νόμοι were κάλλιστοι.¹³⁷ In sum, while Philo does not focus on the foundation of a city per se, he employs the terminology and motifs of colonization: Moses acts based on a divine commission, leading out an *apoikia* and establishing its laws and hence identity.

¹³⁰ *A.J.* 3.213.

¹³¹ These emerge even prior to Philo’s narration of the actual exodus. Moses, who leads God’s people out of Egypt, is descended from the “founder” (ἀρχηγέτης) of the Jewish people, as part of the seventh generation raised in Egypt (*Mos.* 1.7; cf. 1.242). Elsewhere, Philo refers to the body of original settlers as τῶν τοῦ ἔθνους ἀρχηγῶν – “the founders of the nation” (*Mos.* 1.34).

¹³² Philo offers a robust allegorical interpretation of the burning bush’s significance: “for the burning bramble was a symbol of those who suffered wrong, as the flaming fire of those who did it. Yet that which burned was not burnt up, and this was a sign that the sufferers would not be destroyed by their oppressors, who would find that the aggression was vain and profitless while the victims of malice escaped unharmed. The angel was a symbol of God’s providence, which all silently brings relief to the greatest dangers, exceeding every hope” (*Mos.* 1.67 [Colson, LCL]).

¹³³ Cf. *Mos.* 1.73; 1.86; 1.173; and 1.264–299 (with respect to the mantic arts of Balaam).

¹³⁴ Cf. *Mos.* 1.236; 1.148; 1.243; elsewhere Philo describes God as the ἡγεμόνα τῆς ἀποικίας (*Mos.* 1.255) and τοῦ κόσμου (*Mos.* 1.284; cf. 1.318).

¹³⁵ Cf. *Mos.* 1.220; 1.233; 1.236; 1.237; 1.239; 1.253. Later, Philo relates how Balak was astonished when witnessing the “number and order” of the Hebrews, which “resembled a city (πόλις) rather than a camp” (*Mos.* 1.288 [Colson, LCL]).

¹³⁶ *Mos.* 1.71.

¹³⁷ *Mos.* 2.12. His laws were superior in part because they cohered with nature itself (*Mos.* 2.14). Thus, unlike laws of other entities, they “attract and win the attention of all, of barbarians, of Greeks, of dwellers on the mainland and islands, of nations of the east and the west, of Europe and Asia, of the whole habitable world from end to end [ἄπασαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀπὸ περάτων ἐπὶ πέρατα]” (*Mos.* 2.20 [Colson, LCL]).

Several other accounts do associate Moses with the foundation of a city – Jerusalem.¹³⁸ According to Manetho,¹³⁹ Moses was not responsible for planting the city but did lead a second wave of settlers there from Egypt.¹⁴⁰ These settlers, diseased as it happened, came together under the leadership of the priest Osarsiph, who later changed his name to Moses and laid down new laws for the community.¹⁴¹

Diodorus describes Moses’s role in the foundation of Jerusalem in two fragmentary sections.¹⁴² In the first he depicts the settlers as “impious” people, driven out of Egypt due to their “leprous marks.”¹⁴³ Banished from Egypt, the refugees organized themselves as τὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος and formalized outlandish νόμιμα.¹⁴⁴ He acknowledges Moses as τοῦ κτίσαντος τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα¹⁴⁵ and singles him out as responsible for the city’s “misanthropic and lawless customs” (34/35.1.3 [Walton]). Though far from favorable, this first report offers a colonizing view of Jerusalem’s “refounding,” reserving a major role for Moses as the one who establishes the city’s customs – and thus shapes its identity.

Diodorus’s second account, probably derived from Hecataeus of Abdera, adopts a less derisive tone.¹⁴⁶ He sets out to give an account of the τήν τε τοῦ ἔθνους τούτου ... κτίσιν as well as τὰ παρ’ αὐτοῖς ... νόμιμα (40.3.1).¹⁴⁷ Here, too, he relates how the Egyptians drove out Moses and his followers, blaming their disruptive rites and sacrifices for bringing pestilence upon the nation.¹⁴⁸ Hecataeus “telescoped all his info [about the Jews from Egypt] into

¹³⁸ Hadrian, of course, reconstituted Jerusalem as a Roman colony, renaming it Aelia Capitolina. For an analysis comparing the city’s foundation traditions in this period to those of other Palestinian cities, see Nicole Belayche, “Foundation Myths in Roman Palestine: Traditions and Reworkings,” in *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity*, ed. Tom Derks and Nico Roymans (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2009), 167–88.

¹³⁹ Josephus rehearses what he perceives as the error-riven account of Manetho while defending the antiquity of the Jewish people (*C. Ap.* 1.227–287; cf. 1.73–92). See Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 1:62–86.

¹⁴⁰ *C. Ap.* 1.228. Before Moses’s time, a contingent had left Egypt and settled in Judea, founding (κτίσαντες) Jerusalem and building its temple.

¹⁴¹ *C. Ap.* 1.250. Josephus agrees with Manetho’s portrait of Moses as lawgiver – though not much else.

¹⁴² Diodorus places part of the narrative on the lips of the advisors to King Antiochus, who is “laying siege to Jerusalem” (34/35.1 [Walton, LCL]).

¹⁴³ See Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 1:181–84.

¹⁴⁴ Diodorus 34/35.1.2.

¹⁴⁵ Diodorus 34/35.1.3 (cf. 34/35.1.4).

¹⁴⁶ See Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *The Image of the Jews in Greek Literature: The Hellenistic Period* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 90–135. Cf. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 1:20–35.

¹⁴⁷ Hecataeus omits geographical description thus abridging the pattern of Greek ethnographic reporting. See Bar-Kochva, *The Image of the Jews*, 96.

¹⁴⁸ Diodorus 40.3.1.

one generation, concentrating everything around the personality of Moses.”¹⁴⁹ Moses was the leader of the colony (τῆς ἀποικίας), founded (ἔκτισε) Jerusalem and other cities,¹⁵⁰ and assumed the position of lawgiver (ὁ νομοθέτης). In this latter role, he established all sorts of provisions germane to governance, religion, military defense, and land distribution in the colony.¹⁵¹ Again, Diodorus’s second report is more neutral in its attitude about the Jews. However, both accounts draw on colonization terminology and concepts in describing how Moses participated in founding Jerusalem and fixing its customs.

This brief survey establishes a nice departure point for our analysis of Acts 3–5. On the one hand, it shows how colonization motifs can be deployed in portraying Jewish figures such as Moses and achievements such as the exodus and the foundation of Jerusalem. On the other hand, it furnishes a set of comparisons by which to measure Luke’s depiction of the apostles’ actions in Jerusalem as well as the way of life, or institutions, of the community over which they preside.

Two caveats are in order at this point. First, Luke does not explicitly invoke colonization in Acts 3–5. He does not, for example, use colonization terminology in these chapters in the way that Philo does in his account of the exodus (e.g., ἀρχηγέτης, χρῆσιμός, and ἀποικία). However, both groups of figures are set apart for their role by divine appointment,¹⁵² Moses via the burning bush and the apostles – acting in their special capacity as “witnesses” – via the oracle of the risen Jesus.¹⁵³ Moses discharged his responsibilities by leading his people, founding sacred sites (in some accounts), and establishing customs. The apostles largely fulfill their roles by imitating the teaching/proclamation ministry of Jesus as I show below.

Yet their task brings them closer to Moses and other founders in at least two ways. First, their teaching and miracle working helps establish the community of Jesus followers and confirm them as its leaders.¹⁵⁴ Second, the apostles’ movements during their ministry amounts to a sort of spatial (re)configuration, which recalls the actions of Moses – at least in Diodorus’s (second) account – and that of most colony founders, who were responsible for determining important sites and their functions in new settlements. The apostles’ faithfulness

¹⁴⁹ Bar-Kochva, *The Image of the Jews*, 120.

¹⁵⁰ Diodorus 40.3.3.

¹⁵¹ Moses established (ἰδρύσατο) the temple; instituted worship and rituals; drew up laws (ἐνομοθέτησέ); ordered political institutions; made divisions of tribes according to the “perfect” number twelve; made provisions for warfare; annexed land and assigned equal allotments to private citizens – more to priests; and forbade selling plots so as to disadvantage those in power (40.3.4–8). Cf. Bar-Kochva, *The Image of the Jews*, 117.

¹⁵² Given the hostile tenor of their accounts, it is not surprising that Manetho and Diodorus fail to note Moses’s divine sanction.

¹⁵³ Cf. Acts 1:6–26.

¹⁵⁴ See 3:10–11; 4:4, 16–17, 21; 5:12–16.

to their mandate carries them through key parts of Jerusalem's civic landscape. For example, in 3:1–4:31, Peter and John begin their activities around the temple (3:1–4:2),¹⁵⁵ experience arrest and confinement (4:3), appear before the council (4:7–22), and then debrief in a private residence (4:23–31). Similarly, in 5:12–42, the apostles go from Solomon's Portico (5:12) to prison (5:18), later return to the temple (5:21), are next apprehended and brought to the meeting place of the council (5:27), subsequently return yet again to the temple (5:42), and then finally move through private dwelling places (5:42). Therefore, the temple, Solomon's Portico, and private areas all emerge as important spaces reconfigured by the apostles' activity. It is true that these leaders encounter opposition in their movements.¹⁵⁶ But such is no less typical of founders in many colonization accounts.¹⁵⁷ And setting a trend, to be followed in subsequent chapters,¹⁵⁸ the challenges paradoxically facilitate the founding figures' success¹⁵⁹ – here leading to the successful establishment of the cult community in Jerusalem.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁵ They begin at the gate before the temple (3:1–7), enter the temple (3:8), and exit the temple into Solomon's Portico (3:11). On the gate, see Christopher J. Cowton, "The Alms Trader: A Note on Identifying the Beautiful Gate of Acts 3.2," *NTS* 42 (1996): 475–76. On Solomon's Portico, and the likelihood that the site was a favorite of the Jesus community, see Pervo, *Acts*, 101, n. 42, who references John 10:23. Josephus credits Solomon himself with the portico's construction (*A.J.* 8.98; *B.J.* 5.185).

¹⁵⁶ Rejection/opposition is a recurring motif in Acts. For example, Paul experiences instances of rejection in most cities he visits: Damascus (9:19–25), Jerusalem (9:26–31; 21–23), Cyprus (Acts 13:4–12), Antioch of Pisidia (13:13–52), Iconium (14:1–7), Lystra (14:19–20), Philippi (16:16–24), Thessalonica (17:1–9), Beroea (17:13–14), Athens (17:32), Corinth (18:5–6, 12–17), Ephesus (19:9, 23–41), and Rome (28:19–31). Luke removes the surprise of such rejection/opposition. Scripture foreshadows it (28:26–28) as does divine revelation (9:16b; 20:23) and prophecy (21:10–11).

¹⁵⁷ See, for example, accounts concerning the foundation of Abdera (Pindar, *Paeon* 2; Herodotus 1.168; Plutarch, *Mor.* 96b); Amphipolis (Thucydides 1.100.3; 4.102–108; 5.11); Arcadia/Tegea (Herodotus 1.66); Camarina (Thucydides 6.5.2–3); Croton (Diodorus 8.17; Strabo 6.1.12); Cyrene (Herodotus 4.150–161); Cynos (Herodotus 1.165–167); Leontini (Thucydides 6.4.1–2); Messene (Pausanias 4.26–27; 4.32.1); Petelia (Strabo 6.1.3); Rhegion (Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 19.2); Syracuse (Thucydides 6.3.2–3); Taras (Diodorus 8.21.2–3; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 19.2; Strabo 6.3.2–3; Pausanias 10.10.6); Thracian Chersonese (Herodotus 6.35–37; Nepos, *Miltiades* 1.2); Thurii (Diodorus 12.9); and Zancle (Thucydides 6.4.4–6).

¹⁵⁸ See, e.g., Acts 8:1, 4; 11:19–20.

¹⁵⁹ By comparison, some colonization accounts appeal to prophecy of opposition as a way of vindicating failed settlements. See, for example, the oracles predicting Tegea's defeat of Sparta (Herodotus 1.66) and the Thracians defeat of Timesias of Clazomenae and his band of settlers (Plutarch, *Mor.* 812b), respectively.

¹⁶⁰ The summary statements of growth in Acts 2:41, 47; 4:4; 5:13–14; 6:7 reinforce this success.

A second caveat is that Luke does not explicitly say that the apostles established the institutions observed by the nascent community in Jerusalem,¹⁶¹ whereas the depictions of Moses by Josephus, Philo, and Diodorus all highlight his role in designing the community's laws and institutions. However, Luke connects the two by embedding his summaries of the community's way of life, or "institutions," within his report on the activities of the apostles. Indeed, the first summary (2:42–47) serves as a bridge between Peter's Pentecost speech and the healing of the cripple (3:1–10). Moreover, as I argue below, it ties the community to its founding figures by referencing the former's devotion to "the apostles' teaching" (2:42). The second summary (4:32–37) also functions as a bridge of sorts. It features as part of a more extended look at the community (4:23–5:11), which links two rounds of teaching/miracles performed by Peter, John, and the other apostles (3:1–4:22; 5:11–42). As with the first summary, Luke emphasizes the role of the apostles within the second summary itself,¹⁶² specifically by portraying their authority over the distribution of community resources (4:34–37). In sum, the structure of the narrative suggests a close connection between the apostles and the community's institutions, even if Luke does not explicitly say that the former established the latter.

In what follows, I discuss in turn each of these elements brought together by Luke: first, the activities of the apostles as they pertain to the establishment of the Jerusalem community; second, the defining practices, or institutions, of the Jerusalem community.

3.2.2 *The Founding Acts of the Apostles*

3.2.2.1 *The Pattern of Founding Acts*

Luke's depiction of the apostles in Acts 3:1–4:22 and 5:12–42 focuses on their miracle working and teaching/proclamation,¹⁶³ through such activities they plant the community of Jesus followers in Jerusalem. Together the miracles and proclamation explicate God's saving purposes construed as taking effect through Jesus the founder. The symbiotic relationship between speech and act

¹⁶¹ However, it must be noted that "institutions" served an important function as identity markers regardless of the founder's role in establishing them, for example, by linking the colony to its putative origins. See chapter 2 as well as the discussion further below.

¹⁶² The parts of the extended summary which frame it also stress the importance of the apostles. In the preceding passage (4:23–31), the community prays that the Lord will enable them "to speak your word with all boldness" (4:29), while the succeeding passage relates Peter's judgment of Ananias and Sapphira (5:1–11).

¹⁶³ Founding figures in Acts fulfill additional functions for communities already or nearly established. Besides continuing to teach (11:26; 15:35; 20:15–38) and heal (9:33–35; 9:36–42; 20:7–12), they impart the Holy Spirit (8:15–17; 19:1–7), "strengthen" (14:21–23; 15:32, 41; 16:5; 18:23), "encourage" (16:40; 20:1–2), and appoint leaders (14:23) for the various communities.

is especially apparent in the events of Acts 3–4.¹⁶⁴ Peter’s healing of the cripple (3:1–10)¹⁶⁵ conveys much about the apostles’ divine mandate. Rather than offer the expected alms, Peter provides restoration in “the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth” (3:6).¹⁶⁶ Attentive readers will have deduced from Peter’s speech in Acts 2 that this name is associated with a fuller form of “salvation” (2:21; cf. 4:12), a first fruit of which is the Holy Spirit (2:38), who marks out those belonging to the reconfigured community of God (cf. 2:39). Peter’s healing involves not only the restoration of the physically impaired, but also the acceptance of the socially marginalized,¹⁶⁷ as suggested by the healed man’s accompaniment of the apostles into the temple (3:8).¹⁶⁸

But the healing also symbolizes the possibility of corporate restoration. Peter articulates this connection both in his speech before the people (3:12–26) and his defense before the religious leaders (4:8–20), not least through his “word play on σώζειν,” which relates the “saving” of the cripple (4:9) to the salvation afforded through Jesus (4:12).¹⁶⁹ Both occasions – especially the first – represent the extension of forgiveness and salvation to Israel, a “second chance” after her prior rejection of Jesus (3:17; 4:10–11),¹⁷⁰ whom God had designated – through resurrection/exaltation (3:13; cf. 5:30–31) – as the

¹⁶⁴ The miraculous healing initiates the founding process: It elicits a wonderstruck reaction from the crowd (3:10); creates an opening for proclamation (3:11–26); and provokes the ire of the religious leaders (4:1–7), which affords the apostles yet another opportunity to expound their divine mandate (4:8–22).

¹⁶⁵ The episode recalls Jesus’s healing in Luke 5:17–26 and anticipates Paul’s healing in Acts 14:8–11. Cf. Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 2:50–51. Dennis Hamm, “Acts 3:12–26: Peter’s Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lame,” *PRSt* 11 (1984): 204. Paul Walaskay, “Acts 3:1–10,” *Int* 42 (1988): 172, notes the vestiges of ancient magic in the healing episode – specifically, the “use of divine names, the intense gaze of the magus, the power of the touch.”

¹⁶⁶ The reference to “silver and gold” evokes the stereotype of the avaricious and duplicitous miracle worker, a foil for the apostles – preoccupied entirely with their divine mandate. Cf. Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 30. Pervo, *Acts*, 100.

¹⁶⁷ Mikeal C. Parsons, “The Character of the Lame Man in Acts 3–4,” *JBL* 124 (2005): 295–312; idem, *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2011), 109–22. Luke’s concern for social acceptance is also reflected in his gospel – for example, in the parable of the feast (Luke 14:12–24).

¹⁶⁸ Parsons, “The Character of the Lame Man in Acts 3–4,” 309, suggests that the blind man’s “leaping” (3:8) represents an allusion to Isa 35:6 and the restoration of Israel. For how the “restoration” theme relates to the colonizing spread of the Christian community in Acts, see the discussion above on Acts 2.

¹⁶⁹ Hamm, “Acts 3:12–26,” 200.

¹⁷⁰ William S. Kurz, “Acts 3:19–26 as a Test of the Role of Eschatology in Lukan Christology,” *SBLSP* 11 (Missoula: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1977), 311–12.

ἀρχηγὸν¹⁷¹ τῆς ζωῆς (3:15).¹⁷² (That this phrase denotes Jesus’s role as “founder” of salvation is clear from the similar but more explicit expression in 5:31, ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα.) Israel can still participate in the “times of refreshing” (3:20) – symbolized by the reception of the Spirit, inaugurated at Pentecost (2:1–4) – and become part of God’s restoration of all things (3:21).¹⁷³ Peter appeals to legendary figures in Israel’s past to bolster the authority of his message about the restoration of Israel through Jesus’s mediation. Moses envisioned Jesus’s coming (3:22). Abraham received a covenant promising greatness for his offspring, namely, the blessing of “all the families of the earth” (3:25). Thus, as in Acts 2 the speech and its commensurate act¹⁷⁴ emphasize the divine sanction undergirding the hopeful message of a restored community. They also foreshadow God’s plan for replicating the community among other peoples, anticipating the remainder of Acts.

In Acts 5, likewise, “signs and wonders”¹⁷⁵ and proclamation facilitate the planting of the Christian community in Jerusalem. The connection between the two activities is less attenuated than in Acts 3–4, but it is nevertheless present. Besides evoking a place of philosophical discourse,¹⁷⁶ Solomon’s Portico (5:12) recalls the speech in 3:11–26, which similarly occurred in the vicinity of the temple. Luke’s note in 5:14 about the addition of πιστεύοντες to the community of the Lord confirms that the healings function as authenticating signs,¹⁷⁷ and the message to which they point is articulated by the angel freeing the apostles from prison, who instructs them to speak in the temple πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης (5:20). The inference is that the apostles’ subsequent teaching in the temple (5:21) pertained to this very message of life – or salvation.

¹⁷¹ On the background of this expression, and its use in the New Testament, see Paul-Gerhard Müller, *ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΑΡΧΗΓΟΣ: Der religionsgeschichtliche und theologische Hintergrund einer neutestamentlichen Christusprädikation* (Bern: H. Lang, 1973). Müller draws a parallel between the term and the use of the Hebrew word *nāsî* at Qumran to describe the Davidic Messiah (149–71). Pervo, *Acts*, 105, rightly identifies the broader context for Luke’s use of ἀρχηγός: “the world of Hellenism[’s] ... great interest in founders, inventors, discoverers, and origins of all sorts.”

¹⁷² Hamm, “Acts 3:12–26,” 202, notes how Luke characterizes the Jews’ “choice” of Barabbas instead of Jesus as choice of “death over life.”

¹⁷³ See Kurz, “Acts 3:19–26 as a Test,” for this understanding of the notoriously difficult verses 20–21. According to Kurz, the restoration began with Jesus’s resurrection but has yet to be consummated – hence the importance of the emphatic (in this reading) πάντων (3:21). Cf. Hamm, “Acts 3:12–26,” 211.

¹⁷⁴ Walaskay, “Acts 3:1–10,” 171–75, insists on the close continuity between chapters 2–4: Chapter 2 is about “the gift of the Spirit,” while 3–4 is about “the gift of healing” (172).

¹⁷⁵ Luke represents these as the work of the apostles collectively.

¹⁷⁶ Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 245.

¹⁷⁷ The ὥστε in 5:15 implies that the reception of healing presupposes the acceptance of the apostles as divine emissaries.

The apostles themselves delineate the connection between the miracle of healing and the message of salvation in their defense before the religious leaders. On this occasion they speak of how the exalted Jesus became “leader and savior” so that Israel might receive “repentance ... and forgiveness of sins” (5:31). As in Acts 3–4, therefore, the pairing of miracles and teaching/proclamation in Acts 5 reinforces an emphasis on the offer of restoration, depicted as “life” and “salvation.” Proof that this promise of restoration not only benefits the individual but also grows the community appears in Luke’s initial summary. He speaks of the “favor of the people” toward the apostles (5:13) and how throngs were added to the community (5:14). Here, as in Acts 2, he telegraphs the replication of the community outside Jerusalem, reporting that people from the nearby towns were attracted to the activity of the apostles (5:16).

3.2.2.2 *Divine Sanction of the Apostles’ Founding Acts*

Luke’s narration of the apostles’ miracle working and proclamation in Acts 3–5 repeatedly stresses the divine support for these activities. This sanction underscores their role as founding figures, while contrasting them with Jerusalem’s religious leaders. The narrative manifests this emphasis in various ways. First, the apostles’ performance of signs and proclamation of a divine message mirrors the *modus operandi* of Jesus;¹⁷⁸ Luke intends to show that their activities represent an extension of the founder’s divinely authorized mission. Thus, the apostles appeal to their position as “witnesses” of God’s resurrection/exaltation of Jesus – in effect, the appointment of him as mediator of forgiveness and life (3:15; 5:32).¹⁷⁹ Second, the apostles demonstrate a commitment to their task characteristic of founding figures. They resist the religious leaders’ charge not to speak or teach in Jesus’s name (4:18; 5:28), professing a determination to “obey God rather than man” (4:19–20; 5:29).

A third indicator of the apostles’ divine appointment is the link forged between their presence and the production of miracles. Luke reports that miracles were accomplished through “the hands of the apostles” (τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων; 5:12). Likewise, he relates the expectation that Peter’s shadow would bring healing to those upon whom it fell (5:15). The apostles’ status as divinely appointed figures – and not magic – is responsible for their symbolic acts of healings. Fourth, and finally, epiphanic signs testify to the divine legitimacy of the apostles’ activities. The earth shakes when the community gathers together to pray for further signs and bold speech (4:31). Moreover, an angel frees the imprisoned apostles and commands them to resume their task witnessing to salvation in Jesus’s name (5:20–21).¹⁸⁰ Each of these narrative

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. 4:29–31, where the community’s prayer for *παρηγορία* hinges on God’s appointment of Jesus.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. 12:5–19; 16:25–34. See Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*, 93–148.

features – the apostle’s connection with Jesus, the importance of their presence/touch in miracle working, and theophanic signs of support for their activity – points to the divine basis of the apostles’ activity. This divine authorization bolsters the apostles’ legitimacy as founding figures of the cult community in Jerusalem.

Luke reinforces the divine sanction of the apostles’ actions by contrasting it to the religious leaders’ resistance. The leaders reject the linkage Jesus’s name both to the general resurrection (4:2) as well as to the healing of the cripple (4:10); they go so far as to forbid teaching in Jesus’s name (4:18).¹⁸¹ The narrative’s judgment of the religious leaders’ motive cuts to the heart of the contrast between the two parties. The religious leaders are affronted at the usurpation of their authority and provoked by jealousy (5:17) at the popular reception of the apostles. By contrast, the apostles have their gaze fixed on the divine purposes of God, intent on fulfilling their mandate. In this case,¹⁸² the response of the crowds (3:10–11; 4:4, 21; 5:14) casts in high relief the obstinacy of their religious leaders.¹⁸³ Yet the leaders unwittingly testify to the legitimacy of the apostles. They are forced to concede that, with the healing of the cripple, “a notable sign” has been performed – one which “is evident to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem” (4:16), who recognize in it the hand of God (4:21). Further, Gamaliel proposes (5:34–39) deferring judgment on the new community until it can be determined from its success or failure whether God stands behind it.¹⁸⁴ Luke’s summary note at the close of the chapter spells out God’s verdict: “every day, in the temple and from house to house, they did not cease teaching and preaching that the Christ is Jesus” (5:42). Luke guides his reader to the conclusion that the apostles rather than the religious leaders are best suited to articulate God’s will and oversee the foundation of a restored people.

3.2.3 *The “Institutions” of the Jerusalem Community*

In addition to relating the actions of the apostles, Luke offers two summaries to describe the community they were instrumental in founding (2:42–47; 4:32–37). These reports function similar to the notices about community customs (*nomima*) in colonization accounts. The latter provide characterizations, usually brief, of the new community’s identity, including details such as civic

¹⁸¹ The religious leaders resurrect this prohibition in 5:28.

¹⁸² Yet the crowds are not always a reliable barometer of God’s verdict in Acts (see, e.g., 19:21–40; 21:27–36).

¹⁸³ In 4:25–28 the community explains the earlier opposition to Jesus by appealing to Psalm 2. This pesher interpretation envisions “Herod and Pontius Pilate” as the “kings and rulers,” respectively; unspecified “gentiles” as the “gentiles”; and “the peoples of Israel” as “the peoples.”

¹⁸⁴ Though his words are prescient, Gamaliel is not for Luke an admirable figure. Like the other religious leaders, he fails to embrace the message of the apostles. Cf. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, 198.

commitments, cultic practices, and leadership structure. In Luke's narrative the identity markers likewise play a critical role. Besides giving a snapshot of the new community, they indicate the set of practices through which new believers¹⁸⁵ are assimilated into the community.¹⁸⁶

Supporting this interpretation are the context and content of the reports. First, there is the placement of the initial report. It follows the outpouring at Pentecost and Peter's speech, which supplements the community with nearly three thousand new members (2:41).¹⁸⁷ Further, there is the example of Ananias and Sapphira embedded in the second summary (5:1–11). The husband and wife receive a fatal punishment for deviating from the community ideal via their deception, a consequence which underscores the constitutive importance of the customs. What these narrative features reveal is that the reports possess more than a structural significance;¹⁸⁸ they represent the identity of the community planted by the apostles.

Though different in emphasis, the passages reinforce one another in their portrait of this new community. The first report (2:42–47) lacks a clear-cut structure but provides a summary description of the community's formative practices (v. 42),¹⁸⁹ miracles of the apostles (v. 43), mode of life (vv. 44–46), ritual and fellowship (v. 46), and relation to God and others (v. 47a). The concern with fundamental practices such as "prayer" (v. 42), table fellowship (vv. 42, 46), and "wonders and signs" (v. 43) demonstrates the "unbroken continuity" of the community from Jesus's earthly ministry to the present era of the church.¹⁹⁰ The concluding note about the Lord multiplying τὸς σὺνζομένους

¹⁸⁵ Cf. *epoikoi* in the colonial context.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. S. Scott Bartchy, "Community of Goods in Acts: Idealization or Social Reality?," in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, ed. Birger A. Pearson (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 309–18. The reader is to infer that these *nomima* are (largely) determinative for the colonies formed as the Christian cult expands outward. Sterling, "'Athletes of Virtue,'" 691, argues that the conciseness of the remarks about Christian practice owes to the fact that Luke is writing to "insiders." According to Andreas Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem according to the Summaries in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 2:42–47; 4:32–37; 5:12–16)," in *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder*, ed. Julian V. Hills et al. (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998), 208–9, 217, the summaries were intended to have a normative function: Luke wished his readers to see that the ideals they represented were applicable to large (not just small) Christian communities.

¹⁸⁷ Luke's remarks resemble an ethnographic report. Cf. Sterling, "'Athletes of Virtue,'" 688.

¹⁸⁸ Undoubtedly, the summaries in Acts 2:42–47, 4:32–37, 5:12–16 do possess structural significance. See Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem"; Sterling, "'Athletes of Virtue,'" 682, 694.

¹⁸⁹ Luke's use of προσκαρτερέω – suggesting "devotion" – indicates the critical importance ascribed to these practices. Cf. Acts 1:14; 2:46; 6:4; 8:13; 10:7.

¹⁹⁰ Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem," 205 (cf. 208–9), connects the prayer practices to those of Jesus. See also my remarks above on Acts 1:14. Food

(v. 47b) bookends the entire section, suggesting that the community practices will shape the identity of new members as well.

Luke's report in Acts 4:32–5:11 complements the prior one.¹⁹¹ While unlike 2:42–47 there is no explicit mention of multiplication preceding it, there is a summary description of bold speech in the face of opposition (4:31). The language used – they “were filled with the Holy Spirit and were speaking the word of God with boldness” (4:31) – recalls the Pentecost outpouring of the Holy Spirit (2:1–4) and leads one to expect a similar result: an increase in those being baptized into the cult community (cf. 2:41). The report describes the life of the growing community in several parts: an idealized introductory statement stressing unanimity (4:32); a reference to the “witness” of the apostles (4:33); a “clarification” about the distribution of property to those in need (4:34–35; cf. 2:45);¹⁹² and two exemplars – a positive one in Barnabas (4:36–37) and a negative one in Ananias and Sapphira (5:1–11).¹⁹³ Concern for the proper sharing of property proceeds contributes to the purpose of the reports as whole, which is to depict a community whose identity revolves around its common life in Jesus.

Luke's portrait is not anomalous. Indeed, it shares affinities with ancient philosophical traditions,¹⁹⁴ particularly those that define and delineate the practices of true friendship.¹⁹⁵ Terms and phrases connoting common life – τῆ

and shared meals play a prominent role in Jesus's ministry in Luke's gospel. See Luke 5:27–32; 7:31–50; 9:12–17; 13:22–30; 14:7–24; 15:1–2; 15:11–32; 16:19–31; 22:14–38. Cf. David W. Pao, “The Lukan Table Fellowship Motif,” *JBL* 130 (2011): 131–34; Jerome H. Neyrey, “Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table Fellowship,” in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 361–87; Dennis E. Smith, “Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke,” *JBL* 106 (1987): 613–38; Philip F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 71–109. As for “wonders and signs,” Peter uses this very phrase to characterize Jesus's ministry during his speech at Pentecost (Acts 2:22).

¹⁹¹ Lindemann, “The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem,” 210, observes that the phrase “one heart and soul” (4:32) concisely “summarizes” the content in the first report.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 211.

¹⁹³ Cf. Sterling, “Athletes of Virtue,” 682: “The verbal similarities of 4:34–35; 4:37; and 5:1–2 demonstrate that 4:32–35 is designed as a lead-in to the two specific examples which follow.”

¹⁹⁴ Sterling, “Athletes of Virtue.” Cf. Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller*, 16–18, who compares Luke's report to ancient philosophical discussions like Plato's concerning the ideal *polis*.

¹⁹⁵ Alan C. Mitchell, “The Social Function of Friendship in Acts 2:44–47 and 4:32–37,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 255–72. Cf. Lucien Cerfaux, “La première communauté chrétienne à Jérusalem (Act., II, 41–V, 42),” in *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux: Études d'exégèse et d'histoire religieuse de Monseigneur Cerfaux* (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1954), 2:125–56.

κοινωνία (2:42), ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (2:44; 2:47),¹⁹⁶ ἅπαντα κοινά (2:44; 4:32), ψυχὴ μία (4:32), and ὁμοθυμαδόν (2:46; 4:24)¹⁹⁷ – pervade this idealizing discourse.¹⁹⁸

Iamblichus’s depiction of Pythagorean communities provides an illuminating comparison. The author remarks on how Pythagoras the founder instituted “cenobitic life” for his followers when settling in Croton.¹⁹⁹ Iamblichus characterizes the community as being “like-minded”,²⁰⁰ it is a product of Pythagoras’s vision of friendship, which he “discovered” and then legislated for his followers.²⁰¹ The commitment to common life in turn is responsible for the precept/practice of property sharing. Iamblichus describes this using various formulations:²⁰² They held “possessions in common (τάς ... οὐσίας κοινάς)” (6.30 [Dillon and Hershbelt]);²⁰³ “friends have things in common (κοινὰ τὰ φίλων)” (6.32 [Dillon and Hershbelt]); “that which is mine and that which belongs to another is the same (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐμὸν φθέγγεσθαι καὶ τὸ ἀλλότριον)” (30.167–168 [Dillon and Hershbelt]);²⁰⁴ “all things were common ... no one possessed anything privately” (ἴδιον δὲ οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ἐκέκτητο)” (30.168 [Dillon and Hershbelt]).²⁰⁵ Iamblichus’s descriptions of the common life, highlighted by the sharing of possessions and recurring use of κοινά and ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, resemble Luke’s report about the Christian community. In both accounts the handling of wealth is emblematic of the common life, representing an ideal established and passed down by the community’s founder.

Some of the same community ideals are represented in Jewish accounts. Josephus’s sketch of the so-called schools/sects or philosophies of Judaism offers one parallel.²⁰⁶ Among these, his description of the Essenes is most relevant,²⁰⁷

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Acts 2:1. Luke elsewhere uses this expression to describe two women in a parable (Luke 17:35), as well as opposition to “the Lord and ... his anointed” in a scriptural passage – Psalm 2:2 – appropriated by the community of Christians in Jerusalem (Acts 4:26).

¹⁹⁷ Cf. 1:14; 5:12; 15:25. Elsewhere Luke uses the term to depict the collective but passion-driven response of crowds (7:57; 8:6; 12:20; 18:12; 19:29).

¹⁹⁸ Mitchell, “The Social Function of Friendship,” 256. Sterling, ““Athletes of Virtue,”” 694.

¹⁹⁹ *De Vit. Pythag.* 6.30.

²⁰⁰ *De Vit. Pythag.* 6.30. Cf. Acts 4:32.

²⁰¹ *De Vit. Pythag.* 16.69.

²⁰² These formulations stem from a belief that at the heart of justice/righteousness is “the common and the equal (τὸ κοινὸν καὶ ἴσον)” (*De Vit. Pythag.* 30.167–168).

²⁰³ Cf. Acts 4:32.

²⁰⁴ Cf. Acts 4:32.

²⁰⁵ Cf. Acts 4:32, 45.

²⁰⁶ See *A.J.* 13.5.9 (τρεῖς αἰρέσεις); 18.1.2–6 (φιλοσοφίαί τρεῖς; yet note 18.1.6); *B.J.* 2.8.2–14 (Τρία ... παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις εἶδη φιλοσοφεῖται).

²⁰⁷ Josephus’s depiction of the Pharisees is somewhat relevant. For example, the “respect for the elderly” approximates the reverence toward the apostles (cf. Acts 2:42), and the

particularly the group's views about property ownership. Josephus remarks that the community held τὰ χρημάτων τε κοινά, explaining that the rich share their wealth with the poor.²⁰⁸ Both features – the emphasis on common (κοινά) property and elaboration how the wealthy assisted the needy – resembles Luke's depiction of the Jerusalem community. In *Bellum Judaicum*, Josephus offers a similar report about Essene sentiments and practices relating to possessions: Community members despise riches;²⁰⁹ are not “distinguished by greater opulence ... [from one] another” (18.2.3 [Thackeray]); jointly share possessions;²¹⁰ and engage in free exchange rather than buy or sell belongings.²¹¹ Therefore, notwithstanding differences in other matters, the tenor of Josephus's depiction of the Essenes resembles that of Luke's portrayal of the Jerusalem Christian community as far as the handling of possessions is concerned.

Philo's portrayal of the Therapeutae provides another compelling analogue.²¹² The Alexandrian describes a community fixated on the “heaven-sent passion of love” (*Contempl.* 2.12 [Colson]), leading to a focus on prayer and meditation,²¹³ allegorical interpretation of scripture,²¹⁴ and the writings of the founders.²¹⁵ With respect to possessions: Members relinquish them willingly since the mortal life is passing away; they do so because of “magnanimity,” not “carelessness,” in order to benefit others.²¹⁶ This commitment to using possessions to serve those in need resembles the emphasis of Luke's second report, especially 4:34–35.

What the comparanda discussed above demonstrates is that Luke's reports about the community of Jesus followers in Jerusalem participated in ongoing conversations about friendship and community life in the wider ancient Mediterranean milieu. His portrait, nevertheless, is distinctive in its emphases. To begin with, his accounts reveal a desire to break down the barriers of status,²¹⁷

Pharisees' concern for proper prayer and cultic practices (*A.J.* 18.1.3) resembles Luke's portrayal of similar commitments among the Christian community (cf. Acts 2:42, 46).

²⁰⁸ *A.J.* 18.1.5.

²⁰⁹ *B.J.* 2.8.3.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹¹ *B.J.* 18.2.4.

²¹² Philo, *De vita contemplativa*.

²¹³ *Contempl.* 3.27–28; 8.66.

²¹⁴ *Contempl.* 3.27–28; 10.75–77.

²¹⁵ *Contempl.* 3.28–29 (οὐ τῆς αἰρέσεως ἀρχηγείται).

²¹⁶ *Contempl.* 3.2.16.

²¹⁷ Cf. Mitchell, “The Social Function of Friendship,” 258, 272. Status reversal features once at 6:1–7 in the concern for care of widows and the broader interest in the “Hellenist” Jesus followers. See F. Scott Spencer, “Neglected Widows in Acts 6:1–7,” *CBQ* 56 (1994): 715–33; Joseph B. Tyson, “Acts 6:1–7 and Dietary Regulations in Early Christianity,” *PRSt* 10 (1983): 145–61. Luke thus builds on his gospel's portrayal of Jesus, depicting a Jerusalem Christian community that is inclusive in both principle and practice.

a concern apparent in the parts that describe the handling of possessions/property. This is especially true in the second report (4:32–5:11), which fills out the picture presented in the preceding one (2:42–47).²¹⁸ The earlier summary related how the believers possessed ἅπαντα κοινά (2:44) and elaborated that they sold τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις, distributing the proceeds to ἅν τις χρεῖαν εἶχον (2:45). The second summary, however, clarifies what Luke envisions by holding possessions in common:²¹⁹ Wealthy individuals sold their property – as needed – for the benefit of poor community members. This is a significant qualification. It envisions a community unified “across social lines,” in which its financially blessed members give without expectation of reciprocity.²²⁰ This vision of community life should be differentiated from friendship traditions in which the ideal is merely friendship between equals as well as the broader cultural environment, in which quid pro quo – benefaction for honor – was taken for granted.²²¹

The positive and negative exemplars illustrate what this Christian principle of identity looked like in practice. A man of status, Barnabas was willing to leverage his property for the sake of needy members in the community (4:36–37).²²² Like Judas (1:15–20),²²³ however, Ananias and Sapphira elevate money above the interests of the community (5:1–11). Technically, according to Peter their sin was not a failure to give but rather the misrepresentation of the gift (5:2). Yet the general tenor of the reports suggests that Ananias and Sapphira violated the “oneness” of the community with their half-hearted giving (cf. 4:32). Indeed, their actions are so antithetical to the community’s identity that Peter charges Satan²²⁴ with filling Ananias’s heart. Only thus could he and his wife lie to the Holy Spirit and God (5:3, 4, 9), who are ultimately responsible for the community’s establishment. Ananias and Sapphira, therefore, function as a foil to Barnabas. Together, the positive and negative exemplars illustrate the Jerusalem mother community’s distinctive identity.

Luke’s reports showcase another distinctive aspect of the Christian community’s identity: its apostolic leadership. Already the link with the founding actions of the apostles is apparent from how the reports are embedded within the

²¹⁸ Lindemann, “The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem,” 211.

²¹⁹ The *propositio* of the second report, however, resembles the general claim of the first report. See the use of τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, ἴδιον, and ἅπαντα κοινά in 4:32.

²²⁰ Mitchell, “The Social Function of Friendship,” 258, 266–67.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 259, 265.

²²² Barnabas is the perfect bridge figure: His Levitical roots underscore the Jerusalem origins of the Christian movement, while his Cyprian heritage anticipates the community’s replication elsewhere – not least, in Cyprus itself (Acts 13:12; cf. 11:19)! Cf. Craig C. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 105.

²²³ Cf. Mitchell, “The Social Function of Friendship,” 268.

²²⁴ And not the Holy Spirit!

narrative episodes of Acts 3–5. Yet, their significance for the self-understanding of the community emerges in at least two other important ways as Luke describes its formative practices.

The first indication of the apostle’s indispensable role in defining the community occurs in the first report. Luke describes how in addition to its assiduous practice of “fellowship” and the common meal, the community was devoted to the apostles’ teaching (τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων; 2:42).²²⁵ This act of devotion is significant because it grounds the identity of the community in the actions of its founding figures.²²⁶ (At the same time, since the apostles taught about the salvation of Jesus, the community’s devotion links it to the founder, Jesus.²²⁷) Luke’s homage in the subsequent verse to the τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα performed by the apostles (2:43) further confirms the importance of the apostles’ founding actions. Like the reference to their “teachings,” the comment on “wonders and signs” anticipates the actions of the apostles in the subsequent narrative (3:1–10; 5:12–16), explaining their inclusion in the report on the community’s common life. Furthermore, given that signs in Acts reinforce divine sanction, their appearance here helps legitimate both the community and its institutions.

Luke foregrounds the apostles’ relevance for community identity in a second way. He signals their involvement in one of its core practices, the distribution of property proceeds. Luke details how the apostles take responsibility for this process. Wealthy members of the community such as Barnabas and Ananias and Sapphira lay the money πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων (4:35, 37; 5:2). The act not only symbolizes the apostles’ authority over the distribution; it also signals the apostle’s authority over the community, given the importance of the practice for the latter’s identity.²²⁸

3.3 Conclusions

The foregoing discussion has shown how the early chapters of Acts describe the founding of the Christian community in Jerusalem. The apostles act as founding figures in this endeavor. They fulfill their commission as “witnesses” to the founder Jesus (1:8) through speech (proclamation) and acts (miracle

²²⁵ D (t vg^{MS}) also reads ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, bolstering the position of the Jerusalem leadership.

²²⁶ Cf. Lindemann, “The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem,” 204.

²²⁷ Cf. 4:33. Here Luke makes the link with Jesus explicit. He describes τὸ μαρτύριον which the apostles gave “the resurrection of Jesus.” Indeed, Luke is fond of using both μαρτύριον (Luke 5:14; 9:5; 21:13; Acts 7:44) and μάρτυς (Luke 11:48; 24:48; Acts 1:8, 22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 6:13; 7:58; 10:39, 41; 13:31; 22:15, 20; 26:16). Cf. Hamm, “Acts 3:12–26,” 203.

²²⁸ Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, 201–4.

working) which articulate the divine plan of salvation. They encounter opposition, like many founding figures, but prevail through boldness and divine assistance. They plant a community that is defined by its common life, embodied in customs such as shared meals, prayer, and distribution of resources to those in need. The concern for similar issues elsewhere in the narrative²²⁹ demonstrates that for Luke, they represent an “embodiment of Christian values.”²³⁰ It can be inferred, moreover, that the practices also function to integrate new members and identify subsequent communities as Christian. As for the apostles, their importance to the community’s identity is solidified by recollection of their founding acts along with their authority vis-à-vis the institutions described by Luke.

²²⁹ See the parallels adduced by Sterling, ““Athletes of Virtue,”” 280–82.

²³⁰ Sterling, ““Athletes of Virtue,”” 696. Cf. Lindemann, “The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem,” 217.

Chapter 4

Antioch of Syria – Colony *and* Mother Community

4.1 Introduction: The Pivotal Role of Antioch in Acts

Antioch of Syria plays a pivotal role in the cult community's replication in Acts. Its importance is reflected in the three sections (11:19–30; 13:1–2; 15:1–35) – roughly in the middle of the narrative – in which Luke portrays the circumstances of its foundation and its identity within the broader colonizing movement.¹ The significance of Antioch stems, in the first place, from the fact that it is here that the Jerusalem's community's first "colony" is planted. There had been active colonizing prior to this point, for example, in Samaria (8:4–25) and Caesarea (10:9–11:18), but it was here in Antioch that the first distinct community was founded, complete with nomenclature for its members ("Christians"; 11:26) and leadership institutions" (13:1).

Antioch's significance, in the second place, is bound up with its own role as mother city of second-generation colonies,² which is framed by the divine sanction in 13:2–3 and debriefing in 14:26–28. Appropriately, the most monumental of the colonizing efforts in Acts 13–14 occurs at another Antioch – located near Pisidia. In the next chapter, I will discuss Paul's synagogue speech in this second-generation colony, which constitutes a form of colonizing rhetoric. Here, though, my focus is on the community in Antioch of Syria, which Luke

¹ Furthermore, Luke associates Paul, the leading figure of the gentile mission, with the community in Antioch. He spends a lengthy time here with Barnabas (an entire year; 11:26), as is characteristic of important centers in Acts (cf. Acts 18:11; 19:10; Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012], 2:1847). It was here that Paul received his formal commissioning (13:2–3) and regrouped after his first colonizing venture though Cyprus and Anatolia (14:24–28; cf. 18:22–23). He also helped impart to the Antiochene community the institutions determined by the Jerusalem community (15:1–34). Of course, Luke's portrayal of the apostle's close association with Antioch does not necessarily reflect the historical Paul's own view. See, e.g., J. Peter Bercovitz, "Paul and Antioch: Some Observations," *PEGLMBS* 19 (1999): 87–101.

² Gela and Rome furnish analogies of colonies which became *metropoleis*. Settlers from Rhodes and Crete colonized Gela, which later planted its own colony, Acragas (Thucydides 6.4.3). From Alba Longa, Romulus founded Rome (Livy 1.1–17; Plutarch, *Rom.*; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.84–89; 2.3–50), which went on to plant numerous colonies. For an account of Roman colonization, see Salmon, *Roman Colonization under the Republic*.

depicts as a hinge in the fulfillment of Acts' governing oracle (1:8).³ I will demonstrate, using motifs from our colonization model, how the community is depicted as both colony and mother community.

In particular, I will focus on (a) the founding of the Antiochene community as a result of crisis, coinciding with the transfer of the Jesus cult and the formation of a mixed community, and (b) its emergence as mother community, validated by divine sanction and possessing institutions which reflect its role as a bridge between the colonizing movement's Jerusalem origins and its destination, second-generation colonies throughout the ancient Mediterranean world. But first it is useful to examine Antioch's history as a Hellenistic and Roman city.

4.2 Socio-Historical Sketch of Antioch

It is appropriate that Luke assigns Antioch a pivotal role as both colony of Jerusalem and mother city of mixed colonies. Founded to be a Hellenistic beacon in the east,⁴ the city went on to become the third greatest city in the Roman Empire,⁵ according to Josephus, boasting Hellenistic and Roman architectural monuments and hosting a cosmopolitan population of Macedonians, Greeks, Syrians, and Jews.

Seleucus Nicator I founded Antioch in 300 BCE,⁶ naming the city after his father. The king planted the city adjacent to the Orontes River on its left (west) and at the foot of Mount Silpius on its right (east) and peopled it with soldiers, Athenians and Macedonians, inhabitants of the recently sacked city of

³ Wayne A. Meeks and Robert L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 17, mention Paul's "one further, obscure visit" (Acts 18:22) as evidence of Antioch's diminishing importance for the apostle. Cf. Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983), 24. However, Meeks and Wilken err in conflating Paul's attitude with Luke's narrative objectives. The fact that the latter does have Paul make one more trip here – where he spends "some days" (18:23) before proceeding to assess the status of communities planted from this mother community – demonstrates its importance for the author. Cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), 235; Keener, *Acts*, 2:1847.

⁴ Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 11. Downey concludes that the city retained an "oriental element" due to its geography and "mixed" population, making it an ideal focal point for the Christian mission to the gentiles (12).

⁵ Josephus, *B.J.* 3.2.4; Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 12.

⁶ Strabo 16.2.4; Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2.39; *A.J.* 12.119; Malalas 199–200. The "archaeological evidence ... suggests that ... Antioch and Laodicea ... either were laid out by the same architect or followed the same general specifications in their designs" (Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 54, 71).

Antigonía, and Jews.⁷ These new colonists mingled with the progeny of settlers long since established in Syria.⁸ In founding Antioch, Seleucus sought to control an area with immense strategic value. The neighborhood was unusually fertile,⁹ teeming with timber,¹⁰ and sourced with water from multiple springs at nearby Daphne.¹¹ But in addition to these advantages, Antioch acted as a gateway in the Amuk plain,¹² which connected Anatolia in the north to Syria and Palestine in the south and offered a passageway into Mesopotamia.¹³ Antioch also provided ready access to the sea via her sister city to the south, Seleucia Pieria. The city roads built later reflected Antioch's "connectivity": one road stretched from Anatolia in the north to Seleucia Pieria in the south; another bisected the city, running from Beroea in the north to Daphne in the south.¹⁴

Antioch remained in Seleucid hands until 83 BCE.¹⁵ Seleucus Nicator established the city plan along the same lines as Antioch's sister city, Laodicea, and erected buildings such as a temple of Zeus Bottiaeus.¹⁶ Reportedly, he also installed statues of Tyche and Zeus Keraunios, symbolizing divine support for both the founder and his city.¹⁷ Seleucus is also credited with erecting the temple of Apollo at nearby Daphne.¹⁸ Antiochus III added a new living section on the city's island, encircled by the Orontes, and settled it with Greeks – probably veterans from his armies.¹⁹ Antiochus IV lavishly adorned Antioch as part of the "hellenizing zeal" which animated his rule.²⁰ He founded a new quarter to the east of the city, which he named Epiphania after himself, established an

⁷ Ibid., 79. David S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 1.

⁸ Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 57–65, 87, argues that Seleucus sought to make Seleucia Pieria his capital, but that his successor, Antiochus I Soter, transferred the capital to Antioch following his death.

⁹ Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 22.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., 19.

¹² Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 51–52, cites evidence of "other settlements in the Amuk plain and at the mouth of the Orontes." He also points to the settlement Al-Mina as evidence for an established Greek presence near what would become Antioch.

¹³ Ibid., 46.

¹⁴ Ibid., 16–17.

¹⁵ It was then that Armenia seized Antioch from a weakened Seleucid dynasty.

¹⁶ Malalas 200.20; Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 72.

¹⁷ Ibid., 73–77. Magnus Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation between Judaism and Christianity* (London: Routledge, 2003), 19; Isabella Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 40.

¹⁸ Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 85.

¹⁹ Ibid., 92.

²⁰ Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch*, 2. Cf. Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 95–107.

agora, built an aqueduct,²¹ and initiated numerous building projects. He purportedly broke ground on a bouleuterion and several temples,²² one dedicated to Zeus Olympios.²³ Like Seleucus Nicator, he also installed several monuments: the Charonion, a statue of himself “taming a bull,” and a statue of Zeus Nikephoros.²⁴ After the time of Antiochus IV, Antioch endured a precipitous decline until it finally fell into the hands of Armenia, who ruled the city from 83–66 BCE.

Rome inevitably brought an end to Armenia’s rule. From 67–65 BCE, she ruled Antioch through her Seleucid client, Philip II;²⁵ it was probably during this time that the Roman governor of Cilicia, Q. Marcius Rex, built a circus on the city’s island.²⁶ In 64 BCE Pompey officially annexed the city, though he “granted *libertas* to Antioch,” allowed repairs to the bouleuterion, and permitted the city to issue coins which “bore the title of *metropolis*.”²⁷ After his victory over Pompey, Caesar guaranteed “free” status to Antioch in 47 BCE, granting it the right to issue coinage with the title ANTIOXEΩΗ ΤΗΣ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΙΕΡΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΣΥΛΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΝΟΜΟΥ.²⁸ Caesar further embellished Antioch with monuments brimming with Roman symbolism: a Kaisarion basilica and statues of Caesar and the Tyche of Rome.²⁹ After Caesar’s assassination, the Parthians briefly occupied Antioch before it was restored to Roman rule by Antony – who himself died by suicide in 30 BC. Under Augustus, Antioch fared well. The *princeps* established the city as procuratorial seat of a new province, Syria, and assigned legions to barracks there. Further, it was during Augustus’s reign, and that of his successor Tiberius, that the colonnaded street running through the center of Antioch from Beroea to Daphne was built. (Reportedly, Herod the Great, a patron of many a Syrian city, contributed to this street’s adornment.³⁰) Augustus also established the Olympic Games at Antioch³¹ and planned improvements in the Epiphania quarter, likely completed in the time of Tiberius. This included construction of a street that “provided a main artery along the long axis of the area occupied by

²¹ Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch*, 2.

²² Malalas 205.14.19; 234.2–3; Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 100.

²³ Livy 41.20.9. Cf. Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 100.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 103–5.

²⁵ Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 140.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 73.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 145. Cf. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch*, 3.

²⁸ Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 140.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 154; Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch*, 3.

³⁰ Josephus, *B.J.* 1.425; *A.J.* 16.148; cf. Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 173–76; Carl H. Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” *JBL* 51 (1932): 147; John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 250.

³¹ Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch*, 3.

Seleucus's settlement and Epiphania"; temples of Jupiter Capitolinus, Dionysus, and Pan in or near Epiphania; and a public bath near the spring Olympias.³²

Antioch's fortunes waxed and waned under Augustus's successors. Trajan used the city as "headquarters" in his campaigns against Armenia and Mesopotamia. He also commissioned building activity in the city (perhaps in response to an earthquake which struck during his residence), including a new aqueduct and theater.³³ Commodus reinstated the Olympic Games in Antioch during his reign and constructed a new running track as commemoration.³⁴ Septimius Severus, however, downgraded Antioch's status in reaction to riots, "depriving it of the title of Metropolis and temporarily transferring the Olympic games to Issus."³⁵ Caracalla later restored both title and games and elevated Antioch by granting it the formal status of colony in 212 CE.³⁶ For brief periods which followed, the city fell under the control of other powers, only to be retaken by Rome. Valerian (253–260 CE) rebuilt Antioch after it was invaded and burned by Sapor I of Parthia. Then, under Diocletian (284–305 CE), the Romans recaptured Antioch from Queen Zenobia and Palmyra and subsequently reorganized the city.³⁷ This, of course, takes us well past the time period of Luke's narrative.

For a full appreciation of Luke's narrative, some awareness of Jewish life in Antioch is indispensable. A number of Antioch's original settlers were Jews who served as auxiliaries in Alexander and Seleucus's armies.³⁸ The Jewish community there would become one of the largest in antiquity. Kraeling estimates, for example, that there were 45,000 Jews living in Antioch during the time of Augustus, but that this number increased to 65,000 during the later Roman period.³⁹ While this figure is probably high, it does reflect Antioch's popularity among Jews. The reasons for this popularity were manifold.⁴⁰ The city early on served as an administrative and commercial center in the region, affording opportunities to well-connected Jews. Moreover, its location made it an ideal "waystation" for traffic to and from Asia Minor to the north (see above) while providing ready passageway to Jerusalem. Indeed, Antioch's Jews "cultivated their relation to kindred groups in Palestine."⁴¹

³² Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 174–82.

³³ *Ibid.*, 213–17.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 230–33.

³⁵ Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch*, 5.

³⁶ Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 244–46.

³⁷ Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch*, 6.

³⁸ Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.200; *A.J.* 12.119; Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," 130; Bernadette J. Brooten, "The Jews of Ancient Antioch," in *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*, ed. Christine Kondoleon (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 30.

³⁹ Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," 136.

⁴⁰ For the following points, see Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 1.

⁴¹ Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," 153–54.

The position of Jews in Antioch varied. Jews occupied all strata of Antiochene society,⁴² some flourishing as “free proprietors” with others eking out a living as “lowly tenants.”⁴³ It is doubtful that Seleucus granted Jews citizenship *en masse*, as Josephus implies, but individual Jews may have received this distinction at various times.⁴⁴ In general, Jews fared well during Seleucid rule. They were granted the right to follow their own laws and observe their own forms of worship.⁴⁵ The former allowance made it possible for Jews to purchase their own oil from money allocated by the gymnasiarchs.⁴⁶ The leadership of the Jewish community consisted of a *προστάτης* (head of council), *πρεσβύτεροι* (council of elders), and *ἄρχων* (probably the “head of the council of elders”).⁴⁷ The Jews possessed at least one synagogue in Antioch in the Hellenistic period – more were certainly built in the Roman period⁴⁸ – while the synagogue in nearby Daphne was renowned among their co-religionists.⁴⁹

Prior to the Roman period Jews endured minor hostility in Antioch, particularly in response to their alleged xenophobia.⁵⁰ Further, while they did not experience persecution under the Seleucids,⁵¹ their collective status must have fallen as a result of the hellenizing policies of Antiochus IV as well as the retaliatory actions of the Maccabees, who destroyed temples and depopulated cities.⁵² Yet Josephus tells us that matters improved for Jews under Antiochus’s successors.⁵³ During this time, they were purportedly able to persuade many gentiles to become Jews.⁵⁴ When Pompey arrived in Palestine, he scaled back the power and influence Jews had achieved under the Maccabean rulers.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 132–34.

⁴³ Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 10–13.

⁴⁴ Josephus, *A.J.* 12.119; *C. Ap.* 2.39; Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 245. Elsewhere, Josephus claims that rulers after Antiochus IV granted all Jews citizenship (*B.J.* 7.44). But as Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” 138, observes, Jews “belonged ... to the class of natives and foreigners, and were thus not genuine or even potential citizens.” Cf. Brooten, “The Jews of Ancient Antioch,” 30–31.

⁴⁵ Irina Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, vol. 5 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*, ed. Bruce W. Winter (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 129.

⁴⁶ Josephus, *A.J.* 12.120; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 129–30.

⁴⁷ Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 7. Cf. Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” 137; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 133.

⁴⁸ Cf. Josephus, *B.J.* 7.47; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 134–35.

⁴⁹ Malalas 10.45; Chrysostom, *Adv. Jud.* 1.6. On the number and possible appearance of Antiochene synagogues, see Brooten, “The Jews of Ancient Antioch,” 33–35.

⁵⁰ Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 248.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 249.

⁵² 1 Macc 5:68; 10:82–85; 13:47–48; Josephus, *A.J.* 13.356–364; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 130.

⁵³ For example, they returned votives seized from the Jerusalem temple (*B.J.* 7.43). Cf. Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” 146; Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 2–3.

⁵⁴ Josephus, *B.J.* 7.45.

However, Roman hegemony was relatively benign for Antiochene Jews until 39–40 CE, when Caligula attempted to install a statue of himself in the Jerusalem temple. This caused the Jews in Antioch to riot against the forces charged with carrying out the orders, led by Petronius the Roman proconsul stationed in Antioch.⁵⁵ Claudius restored equilibrium for the Jewish community in Antioch. He rescinded Caligula's edict in 41 CE and sent to Antioch a copy of his proclamation ending Caligula's pogroms in Egypt.⁵⁶ However, Jews faced another crisis in 70 CE when they were accused by Antiochus, one of their own, of conspiring to burn the city.⁵⁷ This accusation – together with the conflagration itself – instigated widespread persecution of Antiochene Jews. Yet order was once again restored. According to Josephus, during his reign Titus rejected a petition by residents to oust the Jews – or at the very least, remove from Antioch the bronze plaques which enshrining their privileges.⁵⁸ The social position of Jews must have suffered as a result of the accusation and riots of 70 CE,⁵⁹ but Jews nevertheless remained a visible part of Antiochene society throughout the Roman period. By the time of Libanius in the 4th century, the situation for Jews in Antioch was one of “relative peace,”⁶⁰ and there is evidence (e.g., Chrysostom's sermons) that they elicited admiration from Antioch's – now largely Christian – gentile population.⁶¹

This socio-historical sketch demonstrates why Antioch is a fitting site of transition in Luke's account of the colonizing Christian community. From Acts 11, the narrative traces its expansion from Jerusalem-Judea into the wider Mediterranean world. The city Antioch radiated Hellenistic and Roman culture by virtue of its history and monuments. At the same time, it possessed a connection with Jerusalem due to its sizeable Jewish population. Together, the Jews, on the one hand, and the Macedonian, Greek, and Syrian residents, on the other,

⁵⁵ Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” 149; Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 4; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 132. Cf. Philo, *Legat.* 185–190; 207; Josephus, *A.J.* 18.262–272. Malalas gives an entirely different explanation. The attack on Jews originated as a fight between blue and green factions in the circus (244–2

45). Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” 148, rightly casts doubt upon Malalas's account. Cf. Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch*, 115–16; Brooten, “The Jews of Ancient Antioch,” 31–32.

⁵⁶ Josephus, *A.J.* 19.279; Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” 149; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 132.

⁵⁷ Josephus, *B.J.* 7.46–60; Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” 151–52; Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*; Brooten, “The Jews of Ancient Antioch,” 32.

⁵⁸ Josephus, *B.J.* 7.100–113; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 130.

⁵⁹ Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” 153; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 133.

⁶⁰ Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” 158.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 156–57; Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 2, 32.

imparted to the city a “cosmopolitan” or mixed character analogous to the Christian community depicted in Acts.

4.3 Antioch, Colony of the Jerusalem Community

According to Acts, the founding of the Antiochene community was a direct result of trouble in the mother city: “those who were scattered because of the persecution that arose over Stephen traveled as far as Phoenicia⁶² and Cyprus and Antioch” (11:19). In giving such a prominent role to “crisis,” Luke adopts an explanation employed in many colonization accounts, including the ones we highlight in this chapter.

4.3.1 Crisis Origins

Of course, crisis could take many forms.⁶³ The Phocaeen settlers of Massalia in Strabo’s narrative faced an external threat: They were forced to flee their Ionian homeland as it was besieged by Persian forces.⁶⁴ Libanius’s reasons for the foundation of Antioch, on the other hand, are more complex – precisely because he reports multiple waves of foundation.⁶⁵ He recognizes the Hellenistic foundation of Antioch but grounds it in a still more ancient past.⁶⁶ Thus,

⁶² Cf. Acts 15:3; 21:2–5; 27:3; Keener, *Acts*, 4:1833–34. On the significance of Phoenicia, and its “world-famous cities rich in tradition,” see Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Between Damascus and Antioch* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 172 (and n. 893).

⁶³ See chapter 2. “Crisis” furnished communities with memorable etiologies. Cf. Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization*. Furthermore, in stressing exigency and/or divine providence, crisis accounts downplay less honorable catalysts like human ambition.

⁶⁴ 4.1.4–5.

⁶⁵ As the official sophist of Antioch, Libanius was in a prime position to witness Julian’s promotion of the empire’s “pagan” cultural heritage. His *Antiochikos* showcases this heritage at the local level. Cf. A. F. Norman, introduction to *Antioch as a Center of Hellenic Culture as Observed by Libanius*, ed. and trans. A. F. Norman (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), xii–xiii. (See this introduction for the general background of the oration. It represents a form of epideictic oratory [4], which Libanius delivered on the occasion of the Olympia in 354 CE, soon after he returned to Antioch from Constantinople [3].) Libanius celebrates Antioch’s urban achievements – its *boule* (11.133–149), hospitality (11.174), oratory (11.181–195), city planning (especially its colonnaded street; 11.196–262), and harbor (11.263–267). He also lauds Antioch’s natural features, such as its fertility (11.13–26), countless springs (11.27–28), climate (11.29–33), and felicitous distance from the sea (11.34–41). Notably, Libanius associates divine and semi-divine figures with each of these features. On Libanius’s approach to religion in his writings, see Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*, who contrasts his work with that of his pupil Chrysostom.

⁶⁶ Compare Dionysius’s prehistory of Rome (*Ant. rom.* 1.9–72; 2.1–2). Libanius’s prehistory (*Or.* 11.44–71) displays many of the motifs highlighted by our colonization model.

Seleucus Nicator and Alexander were preceded as city-founders by the likes of Triptolemus, Casus, Cypriots, and Heraclidae and Eleans (who planted nearby Heraclea/Daphne). There are notes of crisis in several parts of this composite foundation account. Triptolemus came to Antioch with a band of Argives in pursuit of Io, who – after being transformed into a cow by Zeus – fled into the region.⁶⁷ Subsequently, Casus and his fellow Cretans migrated to Syria. Consistent with cultural views concerning the sanction of such ventures, divine initiative was behind Casus' resettlement: Zeus wished the Syrian city “to grow from the best stock” (11.52 [Norman]).⁶⁸ However, the precipitating cause was the duress of Casus and his Cretan companions, who had been expelled from Crete by King Minos.⁶⁹ Coming to Syria, Casus reestablished the institutions of Triptolemus, which “had been for the most part changed” (11.53 [Norman]), and christened the new homeland Casiotis. Finally, there was the Heraclidae. Along with a contingent of Eleans, these legendary descendants of Heracles founded nearby Heraclea (later, Daphne) – “an extension of the city” (11.56 [Norman]) – after fleeing from King Eurystheus. These latter two stories about Casus and the Cretans, on the one hand, and the Heraclidae and Eleans, on the other, provide interesting comparisons to Luke's account because of the nature of the precipitating crisis: internal discord.

In this sense, Strabo's account(s) about the foundation of Taras is especially illuminating as it attributes the origins of the city in southern Italy to *stasis* in the mother city, Sparta.⁷⁰ Strabo offers two different accounts of the conflict and its resolution, derived from Antiochus and Ephorus, respectively. While differing in detail, both narrate how conflict between the majority Spartans and a related but marginalized body of residents served as the effective cause of Taras' settlement.

First, it stresses the origins of the early settlers – both the mythical/legendary (Zeus and Io, King Minos, and the Heraclidae) and the crisis-wrought (Casus and the Cretans, the Heraclidae) origins. Both valorize the colony: the former via illustrious and antique figures; the latter through memorable beginnings. Second, the prehistory portrays divine support for Triptolemus and Casus's settlements, which underwrites their claim to the land. Third, the prehistory celebrates various founders who – through introducing cult and institutions – shaped the colony's identity. In effect, the prehistory legitimates the more recent foundation of Antioch by Seleucus Nicator.

⁶⁷ *Or.* 11.44–52. Triptolemus eventually left the city but continued to receive honors commensurate with his status as founder.

⁶⁸ Cf. *Or.* 11.52, where Libanius notes how Zeus previously sanctioned Triptolemus's foundation.

⁶⁹ *Or.* 11.52–55.

⁷⁰ Diodorus 8.21.2–3; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 19.2; Strabo 6.3.2–3. Cf. Pausanias 10.10.6. On Taras and its foundation legends, see Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, 115–42. Hall, “Foundation Stories,” 2:412–22.

Antiochus identifies the disadvantaged-turned-colonizers as “Partheniae,”⁷¹ offering that they were children of helots who refused to join the Spartans in their war with Messenia.⁷² For this offence, the Spartans reduced the Partheniae to slave-like status. The marginalized Partheniae resolved to throw off the yoke of the Spartans, devising a plot that set to transpire during the Hyacinthian festival, at the temple of Apollo near Amyclaeum. However, a certain Phalanthus – whose donning of a cap (τῆν κυνήν)⁷³ was to set the plan in action – turned out to be a secret agent for the Spartans. The plot was exposed, and the uprising failed. The Spartans responded by dispatching Phalanthus to Delphi⁷⁴ in order to inquire about founding a colony⁷⁵; they intended for him, acting as *oikist*, to resettle the Partheniae who proved incapable of fleeing their masters’ reprisal. In response to the inquiry, the Pythia identified the territory to be settled and forecast the subjugation of its native inhabitants: “I give to thee Satyrium, both to take up thine abode in the rich land of Taras and to become a bane to the Iapygians” (6.3.2 [Jones]).⁷⁶ Oddly, Antiochus reports that the native “barbarian” natives (βάρβαροι) and Cretans actually welcomed Phalanthus and the settlers.

Ephorus also identifies the colonizers of Taras as Partheniae from Sparta but gives a different explanation of their identity.⁷⁷ They were the children of Spartan soldiers who, during the war with Messenia, were sent home to procreate with the women left behind. When the main body of the Spartans returned home from the war, they looked down upon the children who were born due to this *ad hoc* arrangement. With nothing to lose, being perceived as illegitimate, the Partheniae made common cause with the helots against the Spartans. Ephorus says the plot was to unfold in the marketplace – contra Antiochus – where conspirators (not Phalanthus) would raise “a Laconian cap” to commence the uprising. But the plot failed because some helots exposed it to the Spartans. In weighing how to respond, the Spartans took stock of the Partheniae’s unity of mind as well as their biological relation to the main body of Spartans, ultimately determining to send them out as a “colony.”⁷⁸ Ephorus does not report

⁷¹ Cf. Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 19.2. Diodorus identifies them as “Partheniae” and “Epeunactae” (8.21.2–3).

⁷² Strabo 6.3.2.

⁷³ Ibid. Ephorus identifies this as a “Laconian cap” (ibid., 6.3.3). Diodorus says that Phalanthus was to put on a “helmet” (8.21.2).

⁷⁴ Literally, “of god” (θεοῦ).

⁷⁵ Literally, “about a colony” (περὶ ἀποικίας).

⁷⁶ Strabo claims that the “Iapygians” were descendants of Daedalus through Iapyges (6.3.2).

⁷⁷ 6.3.3.

⁷⁸ Εἰς ἀποικίαν ἐξελθεῖν (6.3.3). Ephorus’s account reports a generous right of return: “If the place they took possession of [was not satisfactory they could] ... come on back and divide among themselves the fifth part of Messenia” (6.3.3 [Jones, LCL]).

a consultation at Delphi. He notes, however, that the Partheniae were able to found Taras after defeating the “barbarians” with the help of Achaeans already living in southern Italy.

Luke’s account of the founding of the Antiochene community also foregrounds crisis as an explanation. He credits it with dispersing members of the cult community to nearby lands, Antioch among them. Insofar as the colonizers faced the threat of physical attack, they were like the Phocaeans who fled Persian aggression. Yet the oppressors in this instance were the Jerusalem compatriots of the “scattered”; accordingly, the threat was born of *stasis* rather than external attack.⁷⁹ In this sense, the colonizers of the Antiochene community most resemble Casus and the Cretans (Libanius) and the Partheniae (Strabo), groups driven off by the dominant social and political forces in their homelands – Crete and Sparta, respectively. Of course, in Luke’s narrative, the colonists from Jerusalem were marginalized not primarily because of the circumstances of their birth (like the Partheniae), but rather on account of their adherence to the message about Jesus proclaimed by his witnesses, the apostles and Stephen.

Proclamation functions much like the conspiracy in Strabo’s narratives: It brings the lingering conflict to a head. This is largely because the proclamation also indicted the Jerusalem Jews and their religious leaders for rejecting Jesus, the Messiah and “prophet like Moses.”⁸⁰ The religious leaders’ response to the apostles in Acts 1–5 establishes a pattern of reprisal leading to relocation,⁸¹ a pattern repeated in the “scattering” of Jesus followers, first “throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria” (8:1), and then – in culminating fashion – to Antioch (11:19).⁸² Thus, as with the Partheniae, *stasis* precipitates the cult community’s colonizing spread. But whereas Strabo’s narratives depict colonization as the solution to this problem of *stasis*, Luke’s account, in its wider context, envisions it as step toward the fulfillment of the divine mandate of Acts 1–2.

4.3.2 Foundation through Cult Transfer

Owing to Luke’s “theology of crisis,” persecution facilitates not only the foundation of the Antiochene community but also the transfer of cult,⁸³ as is apparent in Luke’s remark that the “scattered” went about spreading their devotion

⁷⁹ Cf. Balch, “ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ,” 148, 154–74.

⁸⁰ Acts 3:14–15, 17; 4:10–12; 5:30–32; 7:51–53. Cf. David L. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 58.

⁸¹ See my discussion of spatial reconfiguration as a result of opposition in chapter 3.

⁸² Note the identical formulation in 8:4 and 11:19: Οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες.

⁸³ For studies related to cult transfers, see Garland, *Introducing New Gods*; Gebhard, “The Gods in Transit”; Blomart, “Transferring the Cults of Heroes in Ancient Greece”; Hanges, “The Greek Foundation-Legend”; idem, *Paul, Founder of Churches*.

through proclamation (11:19–20).⁸⁴ Religion played a practical and symbolic role in the foundation of ancient communities,⁸⁵ so it is only natural that relocation here should also occasion a cult transfer.

One example of this phenomenon is the tradition of Apollo Karneios's cult transfer as part of the colonizing efforts of Sparta. Supposedly, Heraclidae colonized Sparta; settlers from Sparta colonized the island Thera; and Theraeans colonized the Libyan city of Cyrene.⁸⁶ Each successive stage of settlement entailed a transfer of Apollo's cult, which shaped the identity of the respective cities while binding them together as a network.⁸⁷ According to Libanius, there were also cult transfers during the multiple foundations of Antioch. Triptolemus, when he gave up his search for Io and settled his Argive companions at the foot of Mount Silpius, transferred the cult of Zeus Nemeius to his new home, erecting there a temple to the god.⁸⁸ Moreover, when Alexander passed through the land following his defeat of Darius, he founded a city and transferred to it the cult of Zeus Bottiaeus, which his successor Seleucus continued to patronize.⁸⁹ Zeus was a prominent deity in Argos and Macedonia; the traditions about his cult transfer – in two different forms – linked Antioch both to its mythical and historical origins.⁹⁰ The same is true of the transfer of the Jesus cult to Antioch in Acts 11, insofar as the proclamation of “the word” (11:19)⁹¹

⁸⁴ Proclamation (along with “signs and wonders”) constitutes the chief founding deed in Acts. See chapter 3; Cf. Wilson, “Urban Legends,” 93.

⁸⁵ Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*; Parke and Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, 1:49–81; Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 154–65; Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization*, 15–30; Torelli, *Tota Italia: Essays in the Cultural Formation of Roman Italy*, 14–42; Edward Bispham, “Coloniae Deducere: How Roman Was Roman Colonization During the Middle Republic?,” in *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions*, ed. Guy Bradley and John-Paul Wilson (Swansea, Wales: The Classical Press of Wales, 2006), 73–160; Belayche, “Foundation Myths in Roman Palestine,” 167–88.

⁸⁶ See Pindar, *Pyth.* 5. Pindar explains how the mortal founder Battos played his proper role in spreading the cult: He “laid down a paved road, straight and level, to echo with horses’ hoofs in processions that honor Apollo” (5.91–93). Cf. Callimachus, *Hymn. Apoll.* 72–73; Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, 147.

⁸⁷ Compare Thucydides’s remarks about the transfer of Apollo’s cult to Sicily. He says that the Greeks colonizing the island erected an altar to Apollo *Archegetes* at Naxos (6.3.1–2), no doubt because the god was believed to have sanctioned the numerous settlement ventures in Sicily. See Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*, 19, 89, 140, 249; Donnellan, “Oikist and Archegetes in Context,” 41–67. Cf. Dominguez, “Greeks in Sicily,” 1:253–357.

⁸⁸ *Or.* 11.51.

⁸⁹ *Or.* 11.77, 88–93.

⁹⁰ According to Libanius, a dream instructed Antiochus II to transfer Isis to the city (*Or.* 11.114; cf. Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 91–92).

⁹¹ Acts 2:40, 41; 4:4, 29, 31; 6:2, 4, 7; 8:4, 14, 25; cf. 10:36, 44; 11:1; 12:24; 13:5, 7, 15, 26, 44, 48, 49; 14:3, 25; 15:7, 35, 36; 16:6, 32; 17:11, 13; 18:5, 11; 19:10, 20; 20:32, 35.

and “the Lord Jesus” (11:20) connects the new community to its origins in Jerusalem.⁹²

Strabo’s account of Massalia’s foundation, however, offers a particularly rich point of comparison since at the heart of the Phocaeen resettlement in southern Europe is the transfer of the Artemis cult.⁹³ (Strabo’s mention of the Artemision’s prominence establishes this focus at the outset.⁹⁴) The transfer is notable both for its reinforcing forms of divine sanction as well as for its shaping of Massalioi identity. The Phocaeen settlers, after consulting the Delphic oracle as was customary, were instructed to seek a guide (ἡγεμόνι) from the Ephesian Artemis.⁹⁵ In a dream-vision, the goddess designated a woman named Aristarcha⁹⁶ “to sail away with the Phocaeans, taking along a representation [ἄφιδρουμά] from among the sacred objects”⁹⁷ in the temple (Strabo 4.1.4 [Jones]). The vision thus interprets the original oracle: It identifies the guide through whose assistance the site is eventually settled and the cult transferred.

Strabo adduces several examples to demonstrate Massalia’s devotion to Artemis. Right away settlers erected a temple for the goddess, appointing Aristarcha priestess. Moreover, Massalia’s satellite cities likewise honored the goddess and preserved the “artistic design of the ‘xoanon’ [ξοάνου] and all the other usages [νόμιμα] precisely the same as is customary in the mother-city (4.1.4 [Jones]).”⁹⁸ Finally, Massalioi transferred the “sacred items of Ephesian Artemis”⁹⁹ to cities which they, in turn, founded (4.1.4 [Jones]).¹⁰⁰ The cult transfer, in other words, bound Massalia not only to its Ionian origins but also its civic networks in the west. These examples of devotion showcase the successful transfer of the Artemis cult, as well as how it shaped the identity of

⁹² Acts 2:21, 36; 4:33; 7:59; 8:16, 25; 9:5; 15, 17, 28, 42; cf. 10:36; 11:17; 13:12, 47, 48, 49; 14:23; 15:11, 26; 16:31, 32; 18:8, 25; 19:5, 13, 17; 20:21, 24, 35; 22:8, 10; 23:11; 26:15; 28:31.

⁹³ Strabo’s succinct remark about Massalia’s founding confirms, by comparison, his greater interest in the transfer it entailed: γενομένου δὲ τούτου καὶ τῆς ἀποκίτας λαβούσης τέλος. Cf. *Anab.* 5.3.4–13, where Xenophon describes his own transfer of the Artemis cult.

⁹⁴ Strabo’s claim that the temple of Delphinian Apollo “is shared in common by all Ionians, whereas the Ephesium is a temple dedicated solely to the Ephesian Artemis” (4.1.4 [Jones, LCL]) seems, at first glance, to get matters backwards. Yet this is precisely Strabo’s point: In her cultic practices, Massalia reversed what was the case in the homeland across the sea. See Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*, 73.

⁹⁵ 4.1.4.

⁹⁶ Aristarcha witnessed κατ’ ὄναρ τὴν θεόν (4.1.4).

⁹⁷ Ἀφιδρουμά τι τῶν ἱερῶν (4.1.4). On the transfer of cult objects, see Irad Malkin, “What Is an ‘Aphidruma’?,” *CIAnt* 10 (1991): 77–96.

⁹⁸ Strabo points to a replica of this xoanon on the Aventine Hill to prove the onetime close relationship between Massalia and Rome (4.1.5).

⁹⁹ Τὰ ἱερὰ τῆς Ἐφεσσίας Ἀρτέμιδος.

¹⁰⁰ For example, in Iberia. See 4.1.5.

the colonized territory. Given the role of Apollo and Artemis, they also manifest, however obliquely, the fulfillment of a larger divine plan.

As I have suggested, cult transfer is likewise at the heart of Luke's account in Acts 11:19–30. The proclamation of the “scattered,” as well as the exhortation of Barnabas, ultimately gives birth to the Antiochene community. The transfer, moreover, shapes the identity of the new community. While this process does not entail the erection of temples or veneration of relics (as in the case of Massalia), it does establish the new community's devotion to Lord Jesus. Luke documents this in both internal and external ways. First, there is an influx of devotees,¹⁰¹ reported via the language of repentance/conversion (ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον; 11:21; cf. 11:24).¹⁰² Second, outsiders recognize the distinctiveness of the devotees as a group, declaring them Χριστιανούς (11:26) – partisans of Jesus Christ. These internal and external signs of devotion confirm the successful transfer of the cult.

But where are the expected signs of divine sanction? In the immediate context, it is true, Luke does not report oracles or dream-visions such as one finds in Strabo's account of the Phocaeen foundation of Massalia. Nor does he indicate direct guidance from the Holy Spirit. Yet the broader context of Acts suggests that God approves of and provides for the transfer. Three considerations demonstrate this: First, the mandate in Acts 1–2 informs the entire narrative, expressing the colonizing will of God. Thus, the attentive reader is well aware that the *telos* of episodes such as occurs in Antioch is witness to Jesus as well as community foundation. Second, opposition in Acts – of which “scattering” is a byproduct – reveals itself as one of God's favored means of spreading the cult. The pattern of opposition and proclamation is ubiquitous in Acts.¹⁰³ Far

¹⁰¹ The leadership institutions (13:1) further testify to how the transfer shaped community identity. See below.

¹⁰² See Luke 1:16–17; 17:4, Acts 3:19; 14:15; 15:19, 26:18, 20; 28:27. Cf. Deut 4:30; 30:2, 8, 10; 1 Sam 7:3; 1 Kgs 8:33, 47–48; 2 Chr 6:37–38; 15:4; 30:6, 9; Neh 1:9; 2:6; 9:26, 29; 77:34; Job 22:23; 36:10; Ps 7:13; 21:28; 50:15; Isa 6:10; 19:22; 31:6; 44:22; 45:22; 55:7; Jer 3:10, 12, 14, 22; 4:1; 5:3; 8:4; 9:4; 15:19; 18:8; 24:7; 41:10, 15; Lam 3:40; Ezek 14:6; 18:30; Hos 3:5; 5:4; 6:1; 7:10; 11:5; 12:7; 14:2–3; Joel 2:12–13; Amos 4:6, 8–11; Hag 2:17; Zech 1:3; Jdt 5:19; Tob 13:6; 14:6; Sir 5:7; 17:25, 29; 21:6; Matt 13:15; Mark 4:12; 2 Cor 3:16; 1 Thess 1:9; Jas 5:19–20; 1 Pet 2:25.

¹⁰³ See chapter 3 on opposition in Acts 3–5. Cf. Acts 4:25–28; 8:1; 9:19–25, 26–31; 13:4–12; 13:13–52; 14:1–7, 19–20; 16:16–24; 17:1–9, 13–14, 32; 18:5–6, 12–17; 19:9, 23–41; 28:19–31.

from merely a literary contrivance that propels the narrative forward, it reflects Luke's theological program, wherein opposition is associated with the rejection of God and linked to God's plan both for restoring Israel and grafting in gentiles.¹⁰⁴ This viewpoint, of course, is on clearest display in the resistance to founding figures – men like Jesus, the apostles, and Paul who are chosen to proclaim God's will.¹⁰⁵ Luke depicts them as rejected prophets in the tradition of Moses.¹⁰⁶ However, within the framework of God's colonizing plan, rejection serves a greater purpose: To spread the cult through proclamation and/or signs and wonders. This occurred a few chapters earlier in the wake of Stephen's stoning (8:4–5) and now here again in Antioch.

Third and finally, positive results also signal divine approval of the cult transfer.¹⁰⁷ This is most evident when it comes to the preaching of the “scattered” – Luke declares ἦν χεῖρ τοῦ κυρίου μετ' αὐτῶν (11:21) – but it is hard not to draw the same conclusion about the reaction to Barnabas's exhortation. After all, Luke reveals his source of empowerment: ἦν ... πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου (11:24). This description evokes active assistance rather than mere approval. Together, therefore, these three considerations confirm God's sanction and its extent: He authorizes the cult's transfer to Antioch, endorses its means, and establishes its results. Constituting an unfolding of the divine will, the transfer is thus akin to the spread of Artemis's cult to Massalia.

4.3.3 Constitution as a “Mixed” Community

Also noteworthy about Luke's foundation account is that the transfer of cult leads to the formation of a mixed community, comprising Jews and gentiles alike. To have two or more different *ethne* band together to form a colony was a common occurrence in the ancient world.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 31, 34.

¹⁰⁵ Note Acts 9:15b–16 (cf. Acts 20:23; 21:10–11): “[Paul] is an instrument whom I have chosen to bring my name before gentiles and kings and before the people of Israel; I myself will show him how much he must suffer for the sake of [ὑπὲρ] my name” (NRSV). Cf. José Severino Croatto, “Jesus, Prophet Like Elijah, and Prophet-Teacher Like Moses in Luke-Acts,” *JBL* 124 (2005): 455, 63.

¹⁰⁶ David P. Moessner, “Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet Like Moses in Acts,” *SBLSP* 22 (1983): 203–12. Cf. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, 72–76; Richard J. Dillon, “The Prophecy of Christ and His Witnesses According to the Discourses of Acts,” *NTS* 32 (1986): 548.

¹⁰⁷ Acts 11:21, 24; cf. 2:41, 47; 4:4; 5:13–14; 6:7. However, on the rationalization of “failure” in colonization accounts and Acts, see chapter 5.

¹⁰⁸ See, e.g., Acanthus (Plutarch, *Quaest. rom.* 298a–b); Amphipolis (Thucydides 4.106); Apollonia (Strabo 7.5.8); Cumae (Strabo 5.4.4); Gela (Diodorus 8.23.1; Thucydides 6.4.3); Heraclea Pontica (Justin 16.3.4–7; Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argon.* 2.846–850); Ionia (Herodotus 1.146–147); Naucratis (Herodotus 2.178); Neapolis (Strabo 5.4.7); Parium (Strabo 13.1.14); Rhegion (Strabo 6.1.6); Rome (Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 2.2.2; 1.45; Plutarch, *Rom.*

Most often mixed membership was the product of exigency. This was true, for example, in the crisis-driven foundation of Taras. “Barbarians” and Cretans, who had themselves earlier settled in Italy,¹⁰⁹ welcomed Phalanthus and the Phartheniae upon their arrival; thus, the colony assumed a mixed character. The mixed character of the Antiochene community likewise arose from the *ad hoc* nature of the foundation, or rather due to the intermingling of the new arrivals with prior residents. The “intermingling,” to be exact, consists of the spread of the cult through proclamation.¹¹⁰

This spread occurs in two waves: The first in the immediate aftermath of the Jerusalem *stasis*, when Jesus followers fanned out to “Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch” (11:19), and the second somewhat later, when “men from Cyprus and Cyrene”¹¹¹ came to Antioch (11:20). Settlement in multiple waves was also common in ancient colonization.¹¹²

Significant here is the respective targets of the outreach. The first group engaged the Jewish populations in the city, while the second made inroads with

21.1–5); Samos (Iamblicus 2.3.4); Siris (Strabo 6.1.14); Thurii (Diodorus 12.9); Zancle (Callimachus 2 fr. 6 [22]).

¹⁰⁹ The Cretans had been “driven off their course to Taras” while attempting to return to Crete from Sicily after Minos’s death (Strabo 6.3.2 [Jones]). The welcome now extended by the Cretans validates the settlement claims of the new Spartan settlers. Cf. Himera (Thucydides 6.5.1) and Rhegion (Strabo 6.1.6).

¹¹⁰ The scattered Jesus followers *λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον* (11:19) and *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν* (11:20).

¹¹¹ On Jewish communities in Cyrene, see Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 232–40. Jack T. Sanders, “Jewish Christianity in Antioch before the Time of Hadrian: Where Does the Identity Lie?,” in *SBLSP 31* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 350, cites Luke’s “muddled” account in these verses as evidence of the ahistorical nature of his testimony. However, the questions he raises – how were the Cypriots/Cyreneans scattered?; “why did they go to Antioch?; how would Cyreneans have come to be among a group which went to Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch? – are indeed just that: questions rather than improbabilities.

¹¹² Often the *metropolis* retained the right to send later waves of settlers to its colonies. See Graham, *Colony and Mother City*, 111–12. Strabo’s account of the foundation of Mas-salia (discussed above) seems to depict a later wave of settlement. See Jean-Paul Morel, “Phocaeon Colonisation,” in *Greek Colonisation*, 1:364–66. Note also how the third generation King Battos invited other Greeks to join the settlement in Cyrene (Herodotus 4.160–161). Moreover, according to Libanius, Antiochus III brought in Aetolians, Cretans, and Euboeans to reinforce Antioch (*Or.* 11.19). Cf. Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 92–93.

the “Hellenists,” or gentiles (11:19–20).¹¹³ Therefore, as with the foundation of Taras, the intermingling with native inhabitants – in this instance, through cult transfer – produces a mixed community. This community profile is apposite given historical Antioch’s identity as a Hellenistic city that played host to numerous Jewish residents.¹¹⁴

The fortunes of amalgamative communities were correspondingly mixed. Such unions often produced internal divisions. This occurred, for example, when Athens tried to form colonies in Thurii¹¹⁵ and Amphipolis,¹¹⁶ blending its own settlers with prior inhabitants of the respective regions.¹¹⁷ Conflicts over loyalties and institutions (cf. Acts 15) threatened – and in the latter instance undermined – the integrity of these communities. However, there was a potential silver lining. A city’s incorporation of different *ethne* lent it a “cosmopolitan” ethos, or at least this was Libanius’s judgment about his native Antioch.¹¹⁸ Recall that he portrayed the city as being settlement in waves over the course of many centuries.¹¹⁹ First, Triptolemus and the Argives colonized the land. The latter, in turn, welcomed Casus when he came to Syria with his Cretan companions. Next, Casus received the Cypriots escorting their island princess to Syria as Casus’s wife-to-be. Finally, Heraclidae and Eleans came to Syria and founded nearby Heracleia/Daphne. Following these prehistorical founders,

¹¹³ Here I adopt the explanation which Keener, *Acts*, 2:1842, offers for the tricky term “Hellenists”: It probably connotes “hellenizing non-Greek” (cf. 6:1) but here is roughly equivalent to “gentile” given the intended contrast with “Jews” in 11:19. Evidence of gentile “attraction to Jewish rites” in Antioch makes it feasible that this was one of the first places – if not the first – where such conversions occurred. Cf. Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 33; Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 13.

¹¹⁴ See above.

¹¹⁵ Diodorus 12.9.

¹¹⁶ Thucydides 4.102–108.

¹¹⁷ See, also, the foundations of Cumae, Acanthus, Siris (Graham, *Colony and Mother City*, 16); Sybaris (Aristotle, *Pol.* 5.2.10); and Trachinian Heraclea (Diodorus 14.38.4).

¹¹⁸ Cf. Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 27.

¹¹⁹ Libanius, *Or.* 11.52–77.

Alexander¹²⁰ and then Seleucus Nicator¹²¹ arrived and refounded the city.¹²² The earlier prehistorical waves of settlement, giving birth to a mixed population, proved a net benefit for Hellenistic and Roman Antioch: They enriched the city with the “ancient lineage of the Argives, the law-abiding nature of the

¹²⁰ *Or.* 11.72–76. Libanius calls Alexander “one of our founders” (11.77 [Norman]). Purportedly planting the city when he passed through Syria following his defeat of Darius, he assumed the responsibilities of a typical Greek founder: He ornamented the city with a fountain and other buildings, named the citadel Emathia (after his homeland), and instituted the cult of Zeus Bottiaeus. But the task of completing the foundation of Hellenistic Antioch fell to Alexander’s successor, Seleucus.

¹²¹ *Or.* 11.85–104. Libanius stresses the divine basis for Seleucus’s foundation of Antioch. Seleucus beheld an auspicious sign while sacrificing at Antonia (cf. Malalas, 199–200): An eagle swooped down, snatched up the meat from the altar, and carried it off. The eagle, which was sent by Zeus, deposited the meat on the altar to Zeus Bottiaeus (cf. Malalas, 200). The sign’s significance was transparent: Zeus wished Seleucus to found a city there. The sign validates the king’s project in at least two ways. First, it shows Zeus’s support of Seleucus. Just as the god earlier had summoned Casus to Syria, he inspires Seleucus’s foundation; this leads Libanius to conclude that the “king of heaven ... became our founder” (11.88 [Norman]). This claim positioned Antioch above rival cities. Cf. Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*, 161. Second, the sign valorizes the king via association with Alexander. Seleucus erected an altar to Zeus at the site to which he was directed, much like his predecessor patronized the god’s cult. (The Diadochoi frequently tried to capitalize on their ties to Alexander. See Richard A. Billows, *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism* [Leiden: Brill, 1995], 34–44.)

Seleucus was an exemplary founder in Libanius’s telling. He shaped the colony’s spaces, assembling builders for construction projects and marking out boundaries himself, including those for the city’s famous colonnades. Recalling Alexander’s foundation of his eponymous city in Egypt (Plutarch, *Alex.* 26; Ps.-Callisthenes 1.30–31; cf. Arrian, *Anab.* 3.1.5–2.1), Seleucus “marked the length and breadth of the colonnades and streets by a trail of flour which ships then at anchor on the river had brought up” (11.90 [Norman]). He named the city Antioch after his father (but cf. Malalas 200). He also shaped the colony’s population, mixing soldiers and settlers transferred from Antigonía with the resident population, which comprised Argives, Cretans, and descendants of the Heraclidae. This gave the city its cosmopolitan character. (Yet Seleucus was deliberate in “hellenizing the natives” by which means he promoted a common identity for the city’s “mixed” population [11.103 (Norman)].) Seleucus’s founding acts positioned Antioch as “first” among the many cities planted by the Seleucid king (11.102).

¹²² Libanius informs us that Seleucus founded countless other colonies – more than either the Athenians or Milesians had established in their day (11.102). For the significance of this comparison, at least with respect to Athens, see Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*, 161. On Athenian colonization in the Classical period, see Figueira, “Colonisation in the Classical Period,” 2:427–523. On Seleucus’s colonies, see Cohen, *The Seleucid Colonies*; idem., *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*; Billows, *Kings and Colonists*. Antioch maintained its preeminence among cities founded in Syria. Libanius called it the “source of other cities” (11.100 [Norman]), richly deserving the *metropolis* title it was periodically awarded by the Romans.

Cretans, the royal ancestry of Cyprus and the divine descent from Heracles” (*Or.* 11.57 [Norman]).¹²³

From Luke’s perspective, the positive value of the mixed population at Antioch is not (as in Libanius’s account) from its contribution to the community as such, but rather its fulfillment of the divine will. Above, I suggested that this will was manifest in the birth of the community both as a product of crisis and through the transfer of cult. Here I wish to demonstrate how, in the context of three earlier episodes in Acts,¹²⁴ the foundation of the Antiochene community as a mixed community functions as a pivotal development in the fulfillment of the divine mandate first articulated in 1:8.

4.3.3.1 Precursor: Acts 8 (Philip’s Ministry)

The events in chapter 8 represent the first major expansion of the colonizing movement outside Jerusalem in Acts and are spearheaded by Philip, who transfers the Jesus cult to the people of Samaria-Sebaste (8:4–13), an Ethiopian along the road from Jerusalem to Gaza (8:26–39), and townspeople along the coast from Azotus to Caesarea (8:40). As in the case of Antioch later, the crisis of persecution in Jerusalem precipitates this flurry of colonizing, and Philip exemplifies “those who were scattered [who] went about preaching the word” (8:4; cf. 8:35, 40). His proclamation¹²⁵ and “signs” (8:5–6)¹²⁶ recall the apostles’ founding acts in Jerusalem.¹²⁷ Appropriately enough, the initial expansion occurred in the much-colonized city of Samaria-Sebaste.¹²⁸ The mission showed signs of success. The people of Samaria-Sebaste believed and were baptized (8:12) and received the Holy Spirit when Peter and John came on

¹²³ “Note then that the best and noblest from all these sources flowed together here, as though to a place divinely appointed to receive men worthy of admiration. These roots united their several virtues in us alone” (11.57 [Norman]).

¹²⁴ In the immediate context, the Lord’s multiplication (11:21, 24; see above) followed by Barnabas’s oversight (11:22–24; see below) offer evidence of divine approval.

¹²⁵ The summarized message of Philip (8:5) recalls that of Peter and the apostles (2:36–38; 3:18–20), with the notable omission of a reference to Jesus’s suffering/dying. (There is likewise no stress on this in the summary of the Cyreneans’ preaching in Antioch [11:20].)

¹²⁶ By juxtaposing Philip’s signs with the magical arts of Simon, or rather the crowds’ response to both, Luke underscores the authenticity of the former’s divine mandate. People were riveted by both Philip and Simon (see the forms of προσέχω in vv. 6, 10). Ultimately, they committed themselves to the latter when they “believed” and “were baptized” (v. 12).

¹²⁷ See chapter 3 on the tasks performed by founding figures in Acts.

¹²⁸ Samaria suffered much at the hands of foreign powers. Assyria subjugated Samaria (2 Kgs 17:24; Josephus, *A.J.* 9.288), Alexander destroyed it (Yitzhak Magin, Haggai Misgav, and Levana Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations, Volume 1: The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions* [Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2004], 9), and Rome ruled over her (Craig Koester, “The Savior of the World [John 4:42],” *JBL* 109 [1990]: 675). Prior to Rome’s ascension, the Maccabean John Hyrcanus proved a scourge to Samaria (Josephus, *A.J.* 13.254–257; *B.J.* 1.62–63).

behalf of the mother community in Jerusalem (8:14–17).¹²⁹ Indeed, the results nearly produce a colony of Jesus followers (9:31; 15:3).

Success followed Philip's additional activities. His preaching/interpretation¹³⁰ led to the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch (8:38). Consistent with the expectations of our colonization framework, this transpired through divine agency. The Holy Spirit directed Philip to go to the wilderness region in the south, along the road to Gaza (8:26), and commanded him to join the chariot driven by the official of Queen Candace (8:29).¹³¹ Luke likely intends this episode to presage the geographic expansion of the colonizing movement,¹³² with Africa approximating the "ends of the earth" (cf. 1:8) and the eunuch representing unclean gentiles.

Finally, Philip's proclamation along the coast from Azotus to Caesarea (8:40) suggests that there were other cities targeted throughout Judea.¹³³ Caesarea was one of these. The "brothers" sent Paul here after he was threatened in Jerusalem (9:30), and he stayed here – with Philip no less – on his final return to the mother city (21:8). The presence in Caesarea of Philip, his four prophesying daughters (21:9), and "disciples" (21:6) envisions a core group of Jesus followers in the city, as does Luke's report about the arrival of Agabus (21:10–11).¹³⁴ There is no indication from Luke that Philip preached to anyone but Jews. However, Peter's visit to Cornelius in 10:9–11:18 suggests the potential for a mixed community of Jesus followers in Caesarea.¹³⁵

¹²⁹ The dispatchment of Peter and John and their impartation of the Holy Spirit (8:17) extends the Jerusalem mother community's authority over the new Jesus followers in Samaria-Sebaste (cf. Acts 11:22–26 and the discussion below). Peter and John's work continues beyond the city. Echoing 8:4b–5, Luke reports that they preached "the good news to many villages of the Samaritans" (8:25 NRSV).

¹³⁰ Luke underscores "the suffering servant motif" in keeping with his theme of opposition. See Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 43.

¹³¹ Directives such as these represent forms of divine sanction. See chapter 2 on how divine sanction operates in colonization accounts as well as chapter 3 on how it is deployed in the early chapters of Acts.

¹³² A comparison with Acts 2 illustrates the progress of the colonizing mission. There, the narrative telegraphs the mission by focusing on foreign-born Jews dwelling in Jerusalem (2:5–13); here, the narrative focuses on a foreign gentile returning to his country after worshipping in Jerusalem (8:27; cf. 2:1, 5).

¹³³ Cf. Acts 9:32–35 (Lydda and Sharon); 9:36–43 (Joppa). The narrative likewise suggests that there were early communities of Jesus followers in Damascus (9:2, 10, 19) and Phoenicia (11:19; cf. 15:3; 21:1–6).

¹³⁴ Cf. Acts 11:27–28.

¹³⁵ See the discussion of Acts 10:9–11:18; cf. Wilson, "Urban Legends," *JBL* 120 (2001): 77–99.

4.3.3.2 Precursor: Acts 9:1–31 (Paul’s Commission)

The commission of Paul in Acts 9:1–19a also prefigures the formation of the mixed community in Antioch – especially given its articulation of a gentile mission. As with the apostles in 1:8, the nature of Paul’s appointment grants legitimacy to his colonizing work. His visionary experience (9:8; cf. 22:3–16; 26:9–18) was akin to a prophetic call,¹³⁶ which not only revealed to him the risen Jesus but also led to his commission.¹³⁷ The surprising nature of this total experience underscores its functionality as divine sanction.¹³⁸ The surprise relates both to the vision and the related commission.

In the first place, Saul sees the same (Lord) Jesus whose followers he is persecuting (9:5);¹³⁹ in the second, he is appointed to transfer this cult he ardently opposed, spreading it among both Jews and gentiles (9:15). The declaration that Paul “must suffer for the sake of my name” (9:16) couches his commission in prophetic terms, linking this colonizing work to earlier luminaries of the movement – Jesus, the apostles, and Stephen.¹⁴⁰ In the immediate aftermath of his commission, Paul preaches solely to Jews in Damascus and Jerusalem (9:19b–30). True, his disputation with the Hellenistic Jews (9:29) anticipates the wider range of his ministry. Nevertheless, a more robust fulfillment of Paul’s mandate to spread the cult to gentiles as well Jews awaits his appointment in the mixed community at Antioch (13:2–3) – but before that, the momentous encounter between Peter and Cornelius in Caesarea.

4.3.3.3 Precursor: Acts 10:9–11:18 (Peter in Caesarea)

The mixed community at Antioch also builds upon the foundation laid by Peter’s encounter with Cornelius and his companions at Caesarea (10:9–11:18).¹⁴¹

¹³⁶ David Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 98, 202, 248.

¹³⁷ Ananias’s vision ultimately facilitates the commission (9:10–16). Though see 22:10; 26:16–17.

¹³⁸ See chapter 2 (the “surprised *oikist*”) and chapter 3 (the “surprised apostles”).

¹³⁹ Paul’s encounter recalls Stephen’s not least because of the pairing κύριος/Ἰησοῦς (7:59; 9:5; cf. 7:56). Stephen’s vision anticipates Paul’s since it bears witness to an exalted Jesus. Cf. David E. Aune, “Christian Prophecy and the Messianic Status of Jesus,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 415. Additionally, Paul’s subsequent ministry in Damascus and Jerusalem fits the mold of Stephen. See Conzelmann, *A Commentary on Acts of the Apostles*, 246. Cf. Moessner, “Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet like Moses,” 204, 208.

¹⁴⁰ See my comments on opposition to founding figures and the apostles in chapter 3; Moessner, “Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet like Moses,” 203–4; Croatto, “Jesus, Prophet Like Elijah,” 455, 463–64. Cf. Dillon, “The Prophecy of Christ and His Witnesses,” 548.

¹⁴¹ Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 14. Richard Bauckham, “James, Peter, and the Gentiles,” in *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul: Tensions in Early Christianity*, ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 116. Peter and James’s

Jewish and Greek influences marked Caesarea in the first century, making it an apt setting for this episode,¹⁴² which relates the inclusion of gentiles into the community of Jesus followers.¹⁴³ This process was divinely initiated. As in numerous colonization accounts, visions (τὰ ὀράματα; 10:3, 17, 19; cf. 11:5) convey God's sanction.¹⁴⁴ They do so in the first place by facilitating the establishment of mixed communities through specific guidance. Guidance in the form of directives and directions are common fare in colonization accounts (see above). Transmitted through oracles, visions, or prodigies, they enable founders to establish the proper site for colonies in fulfillment of their divine mandate.¹⁴⁵

In Acts 10–11, visions similarly operate – in concert with divine agents¹⁴⁶ – to lay the foundations for a mixed community at Caesarea.¹⁴⁷ The angel in Cornelius's vision instructed the centurion to fetch Peter from Joppa (10:5, 30–32; cf. 11:13–14), and the Holy Spirit commanded Peter to go with Cornelius's men on the grounds that he had sent them (10:19–20; cf. 11:12).¹⁴⁸ Such

citation of this episode in Acts 15:7–18 implies that it should be taken as a precedent (see below).

¹⁴² The “city was established on Hellenistic lines, yet had a majority Jewish population” (Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 252). Caesarea under Herod possessed an “amphitheatre, gymnasia, statues and temples” (ibid., 250). Like Sebaste, it also boasted a temple to the imperial cult. See Josephus, *B.J.* 1.403, 414; Heidi Hänlein-Schäfer, *Veneratio Augusti: Eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers* (Rome: G. Bretschneider, 1985), 201–3. Later Caesarea was promoted to a Roman colony (Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 258). Cf. Aryeh Kasher, *Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz-Israel: Relations of the Jews in Eretz Israel with the Hellenistic Cities During the Second Temple Period (332 BCE–70 CE)* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), 198–206, 240–46, 252–65, for one view of how Jews in Caesarea related to their rulers and gentile neighbors.

¹⁴³ Wilson, “Urban Legends,” 90.

¹⁴⁴ For visions in colonization accounts, see, e.g., Diodorus 7.5.1–7 (Ascanius and the foundation of Alba Longa); Plutarch, *Alex.* 26 (Alexander and the foundation of Alexandria); Ovid, *Metam.* 15.1–60 (Myscelus and the foundation of Croton); Pausanias 4.26–27 (Priest of Heracles, Epiteles, Aristodemus and the refoundation of Messene). For visions elsewhere in Acts, see 7:31 (Moses's vision of the burning bush); 9:10 (Ananias's vision); 9:12 (Paul's vision about Ananias); 16:9–10 (Paul's vision of the “Macedonian man”); 18:9 (Paul's vision in Corinth).

¹⁴⁵ See the examples marshalled in chapter 2.

¹⁴⁶ It is not uncommon in colonization accounts for there to be overlapping forms of divine sanction. Note, e.g., the oracle and vision in Strabo's account of Massalia's foundation (4.1.4–5); the multiple visions in Pausanias's account of Messene's refoundation (4.26.3–4), and the vision and prodigy in Plutarch's account of Alexandria's foundation (*Alex.* 26).

¹⁴⁷ Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 33.

¹⁴⁸ In Peter's case, the Holy Spirit's directive also serves an interpretive function. The apostle was “pondering the vision” (10:19; cf. 10:17) when Cornelius's emissaries arrived. The Holy Spirit, by telling Peter to go with them, hints that their presence is key to unlocking the meaning of the vision.

guidance highlights divine authorization of the meeting between the Jew Peter with the gentile Cornelius.

Just as important, there is a second way the visions sanction mixed communities: by providing a theological rationale. Peter's vision of the animal feast lowered down from heaven is the focal point here (10:9–16; cf. 11:5–17) since it articulates the *equal* basis upon which Jewish and gentiles can form mixed communities of Jesus followers. The “common” (κοινόν) and “unclean” (ἀκάθαρτον) animals correspond to impure and profane gentiles such as Cornelius.¹⁴⁹ Previously, they threatened contamination of the community, as is clear both from Peter's protestation that he has never eaten anything like this (10:14), and his assertion that it is “unlawful ... for a Jew to associate with or to visit a gentile” (10:28).¹⁵⁰ These statements contribute to the impression of Peter as a “surprised” agent, which – as when used of colony founders¹⁵¹ and founding figures such as the apostles¹⁵² – underscores the divine orchestration of the ensuing events. Indeed, this is the point of the vision and its interpretation as supplied by Peter: God has cleansed both the animals (10:15) and gentiles (10:28). God, therefore, provided the basis for mixed communities of Jews and gentiles, removing distinctions related to purity and sacredness. In this way, he ensured an equal status between the two groups (10:34–35; cf. 15:9).¹⁵³

The subsequent events represent the fulfillment of the divine will communicated in the visions. First, like a founder Peter acted in compliance with this will, extending the promise of forgiveness to Cornelius and his companions (10:36–43). Second, in a manner that recalls Acts 2:1–4, the Holy Spirit fell on the auditors,¹⁵⁴ causing them to speak in tongues (10:46).¹⁵⁵ Third, Peter gave instructions that they should be “baptized in the name of Jesus Christ” (10:48). These events signify the inclusion of gentiles into the larger community of Jesus followers; this reading is further confirmed by Peter's subsequent stay here.¹⁵⁶ This event at Caesarea establishes the precedent for mixed communities.

¹⁴⁹ See Bauckham, “James, Peter, and the Gentiles,” 104–5.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ See Herodotus 4.154–159 (Battos and the foundation of Cyrene); Diodorus 8.17 (Myscellus and the foundation of Croton); Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization*, 18.

¹⁵² See the discussion of Acts 1:6–8 in chapter 3.

¹⁵³ Cf. Bauckham, “James, Peter, and the Gentiles,” 105.

¹⁵⁴ Bauckham, “James, Peter, and the Gentiles,” 115, reads the Holy Spirit's activity as an allusion to Ezekiel's prophecy concerning the restoration of Israel.

¹⁵⁵ The amazed (ἐξίστημι) response of the onlookers binds these episodes together (2:7, 12; 10:45).

¹⁵⁶ Ἡρώτησαν αὐτὸν ἐπιμεῖναι ἡμέρας τινάς (10:48). Cf. Paul's longer stays at Antioch (11:26), Corinth (18:11), and Ephesus (19:10; 20:31) – all of which signal the importance of these cities in Luke's colonizing scheme.

These early episodes are “preparatory” for what begins in earnest at Antioch. Philip’s preaching in Samaria, along the road to Gaza, and in towns from Azotus to Caesarea began a pattern of ministry outside Jerusalem (8:4–13, 26–40). Paul is commissioned for a ministry to Jews and gentiles (9:15) – but before Antioch ministers primarily to Jews. Peter’s activities at Caesarea (10:9–11:18) establish a fuller precedent for the incorporation of gentiles into the community at Antioch and beyond (15:7–21). Since it involves an intentional targeting of gentiles on a large scale, and the foundation of the first mixed colony of Jerusalem, the events in Antioch reflect a culmination and extension of these earlier episodes.

4.3.4 Jerusalem Oversight

Because the community represents a replication of the mother city in Jerusalem, it is subject to the latter’s authority.¹⁵⁷ Jerusalem exercises its prerogative not only since the Antiochene community was founded by someone other than the apostles (“founding figures”)¹⁵⁸ or their representatives, but also because of its mixed membership stemming from the influx of a “great number” of gentiles (11:21).

Mixed membership posed a challenge for a city’s identity – including its relation to the *metropolis*. This was the case with Thurii, for example.¹⁵⁹ Athens sought to govern the colony according to democratic principles, while her partners (the local Sybarites) attempted to preserve their aristocratic prerogatives. With the serendipitous foundation of the Antiochene community, the challenge that faced the leaders of the Jerusalem community was one of discernment and continuity: Did the mixed community represent a legitimate fulfillment of the colonizing oracle in 1:8 and if so, how might its identity be intertwined with that of its mother community?

Jerusalem therefore sent Barnabas – who later enlisted the help of Paul, at that time in Tarsus – to assess (“he came and saw”; 11:23) the situation.¹⁶⁰ This supervision mirrors Jerusalem’s activity in earlier episodes. The mother community sent Peter and John to Samaria after hearing that many of its inhabitants

¹⁵⁷ Such oversight, of course, was not necessarily the status quo, especially during colonization in the Archaic period. See chapter 2; Osborne, “Early Greek Colonization?,” 255, 268; Figueira, “Colonisation in the Classical Period,” 2:427–28.

¹⁵⁸ See chapter 2 for the basis of this designation.

¹⁵⁹ Diodorus 12.9f.

¹⁶⁰ Donald Fay Robinson, “A Note on Acts 11:27–30,” *JBL* 63 (1944): 169–72, thinks that Acts 11:27–30 describes the same visit as 9:26–30, both of which correspond to Gal 1:18–24. On this view, Barnabas’s fetching of Paul from Tarsus (11:25–26a) is perhaps an “editorial cement to bind” together the narrative episodes (172).

had “received the word of God” (8:14).¹⁶¹ It tacitly endorsed Saul’s ministry (9:26–30), though he had already received divine sanction (9:3–19). And it weighed and approved the inclusion of gentiles upon learning that Cornelius and his companions had “received the word of God” (11:1). In each of these instances, Jerusalem’s oversight ensures that the expansion of the colonizing movement maintains continuity with its origins.

Barnabas performs the role in Antioch that Peter and John had in Samaria. He oversees what amounts to the formal foundation of the Antiochene community. Having demonstrated his allegiance to the Jerusalem leadership (4:36–37),¹⁶² Barnabas is an apt choice to represent the mother community. In fact, Luke’s description of him – a “good man, full of the holy spirit and of faith” (11:24) – echoes his characterization of the Seven, also recognized by the Jerusalem leadership (6:3, 5). Those who were “scattered” from Jerusalem promulgated the message about the Lord Jesus (11:20); Barnabas merely needed to confirm its effects (ἰδὼν τὴν χάριν [τὴν] τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐχάρη; 11:23a) and urge perseverance (παρκάλει πάντας τῆ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας προσμένειν τῷ κυρίῳ; 11:23b). The addition of still more members to the community (11:24; cf. 11:21), as in Jerusalem,¹⁶³ signals divine sanction for the formal founding of the Antiochene community overseen by Barnabas.

Paul’s role in the foundation of Antioch is more complicated since he came to Antioch at the invitation of Barnabas rather than Jerusalem.¹⁶⁴ Paul possessed his own divine mandate (9:15). But Luke still depicts his colonizing mission as an expression of the divine purpose which animates the Jerusalem community and its leadership. Barnabas once again establishes the link between Paul and Jerusalem,¹⁶⁵ bringing the former from Tarsus to help fortify the Antiochene community (11:25–26).¹⁶⁶ The two shore up the founding in the same way Jesus and the apostles did in the Jerusalem-Judea community:

¹⁶¹ This oversight was deemed necessary despite the fact that Philip performed founder-like actions: proclamation and signs (8:6–8; cf. chapter 2’s discussion of founding figures in Acts 3–5). Peter’s role here is distinguished by the mediation of the Holy Spirit (8:14–17).

¹⁶² See my discussion of these verses in chapter 2. Cf. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, 201–4.

¹⁶³ Acts 2:41, 47; 4:4; 5:13–14; 6:7.

¹⁶⁴ The introduction of Paul accomplishes at least two goals. First, it continues the alternating focus between Paul and Peter spanning Acts 9–12 (after which Paul assumes center stage for good). This pattern extends back to 2:14 if we assume that Stephen and the Hellenists prefigure Paul and his ministry. Second, it anticipates Paul’s commission to plant second-generation colonies on behalf of Antioch (13:2–3).

¹⁶⁵ Paul’s letters do not support the kind of partnership between Paul and Barnabas envisioned in Acts 11–15. See Bercovitz, “Paul and Antioch,” 91.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. 9:26–30. Properly speaking, therefore, Paul is not the founder of the “mixed” community at Antioch. Karl Löning, “The Circle of Stephen and Its Mission,” in *Christian Beginnings: Word and Community from Jesus to Post-Apostolic Times*, ed. Jürgen Becker (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1987), 117–18; Pervo, *Acts*, 290.

through teaching (11:26).¹⁶⁷ This teaching together with Barnabas's earlier encouragement reinforces the prior proclamation of the "scattered" who had come to Antioch. Barnabas and Paul, therefore, approximate the figures in Libanius's *Antiochikos* who came to the city after Triptolemus. Though representing a second wave of colonization, they also shored up Antioch's original identity. Casus embraced Triptolemus's institutions,¹⁶⁸ and Alexander and Seleucus alike honored the original founder's patron deity, Zeus.¹⁶⁹ But as I have shown, Barnabas and Paul not only promoted continuity in the community's development; they also ensured its continuity with and submission to the mother community in Jerusalem.

Luke binds the Christian community at Antioch to its Jerusalem origins in at least one other way: the famine relief visit (Acts 11:19–30). To begin with, the catalyst for the support of Jerusalem came, in a sense, from Jerusalem itself. Luke credits Agabus with soliciting Antioch's assistance through his prophecy about the famine to afflict the ὄλην τὴν οἰκουμένην (11:28–30). (Luke introduces Agabus as one of numerous prophets who came to Antioch from Jerusalem.¹⁷⁰) For its part, the Antiochene community responded by sending relief to the mother community. The act was not simply one of benefaction but symbolized cooperation with Jerusalem's authority.¹⁷¹ Policy for some colonial powers in the Classical and Hellenistic periods provides a useful analogue.¹⁷² Athens, for example, expected colonies like Amphipolis to direct natural as well as material resources to the *metropolis*.¹⁷³ The so-called foundation decree of Brea even announces the colony's responsibility to contribute offerings to Athens' Great Panathenaea and Dionysia festivals – a cow and panoply for the former, a phallus for the latter.¹⁷⁴ In Acts, the expression of διακονία (if not the word itself)¹⁷⁵ recalls the earlier distribution which helped define the identity of the Jerusalem community and certify the authority of the apostles (Acts 2:42–47; 4:32–5:11).¹⁷⁶ The famine relief accomplishes a similar function but at the inter-community level. It identifies the Antiochene community as a

¹⁶⁷ Luke 4:15, 31; 5:3, 17; 6:6; 13:10, 22; 19:47; 20:1, 21; 21:37; 23:5; Acts 1:1; 4:2; 5:21, 25, 42. See the discussion of founding actions in chapter 3.

¹⁶⁸ Or. 11.52–53.

¹⁶⁹ Or. 11.77. Triptolemus established the cult of Zeus Nemeius (later changed to Zeus Epicarpus); Alexander and Seleucus patronized the cult of Zeus Bottiaeus.

¹⁷⁰ Agabus's prophecy διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος connects the figure to Peter's citation of Joel in Acts 2:18.

¹⁷¹ Cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 20.49–53, who relates Queen Helena's support for Jerusalem during a famine.

¹⁷² Figueira, "Colonisation in the Classical Period," 2:450–51. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements*, 21, 42, 64–65.

¹⁷³ Thucydides 4.108.1.

¹⁷⁴ *IG* 1³46, lines 15–17.

¹⁷⁵ Though see 6:1.

¹⁷⁶ See chapter 3; Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*.

colony of the mother community in Jerusalem,¹⁷⁷ a link underscored by the selection of Barnabas and Paul – both recognized by the Jerusalem leadership (4:36–37; 9:27–28) – to deliver the assistance (11:30).¹⁷⁸

The Antiochene community's close ties to the mother city should not obscure the fact that Luke depicts its foundation as a pivotal point in the replication of the Jesus cult in fulfillment of the charter oracle (1:8). It is in this light that we should interpret Luke's remarks, linked to the "formal" founding acts of Barnabas and Paul in Antioch,¹⁷⁹ that "the disciples [here] were first called Christians" (11:26). At its inception, the term no doubt carried a derogatory connotation,¹⁸⁰ but Luke repurposes it (in line with later usage) to capture the shifting identity of the movement. The flow of Luke's narrative suggests that it was then and there that the movement gained the recognition of outsiders as an entity distinct from other streams of Judaism,¹⁸¹ and that this development occurred because the crisis-driven transfer of the Jesus cult had led to the formation of a mixed community in Antioch. In Acts, this turn of events is truly pivotal since Antioch subsequently commissions the founding of other mixed communities via cult transfer.

4.4 Antioch, Mother City of Second-Generation Colonies

At the outset of this chapter, I noted that the Antiochene community functions as a hinge in Acts, linking later episodes of mission in Cyprus, Anatolia, Macedonia, Greece, and, finally, Rome to the origins of the movement in Jerusalem. I have argued that a colonization framework nicely captures the community's distinctive role. In the first place, Luke depicts the community in Antioch as a colony planted by the mother community in Jerusalem. In so doing, he even draws on colonization motifs, which helps explain not only the focus on "crisis" origins, transfer of cult, and mixed Jewish-gentile membership, but also Jerusalem's oversight. In the second place, though, he portrays the Antiochene community as a mother community in her own right. Beginning with the commission of Barnabas and Paul in 13:2, she sponsors a wave of

¹⁷⁷ Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 31, note the similar relational dynamic between the Jews in Antioch and Jerusalem and the Christians in the two cities as portrayed by Acts.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Acts 15:2.

¹⁷⁹ The D text's τότε makes the timing of this identification even clearer. Justin Taylor, "Why Were the Disciples First Called 'Christians' at Antioch? (Acts 11, 26)," *RB* 101 (1994): 79.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 83–92; Cf. E. A. Judge, "Judaism and the Rise of Christianity: A Roman Perspective," *TynBul* 45 (1994): 366. Elias J. Bickerman, "The Name of Christians," *HTR* 42 (1949): 109–24, however, argues that the believers adopted the name "Christian" for themselves.

¹⁸¹ See Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 16.

colonizing, which – headlined by Antioch of Pisidia – runs through 14:28, at which point the founding figures return to report on their work.¹⁸² In the balance of this chapter, I demonstrate how divine sanction and institutions – leadership and religious – inform the Antiochene community’s status as commissioner of second-generation colonies.

4.4.1 Divine Sanction of Colonizing Ventures

As demonstrated in chapters 1 and 2, that which most validates colonizing ventures is divine support; the same holds true for the missions spearheaded by the Antiochene community. In the case of colonization, deities (typically Apollo), visions, and prodigies sanctioned and sometimes directed settlement enterprises. The injunction to found a colony might even come as a complete “surprise” further underscoring divine initiative.¹⁸³ Here in the present episode, the Holy Spirit plays a prominent role in orchestrating the expansion enterprise. This recalls Acts 1–2, where the Holy Spirit empowered believers not long after Jesus’s “surprising” oracle (1:6–8), thus initiating the colonizing mission.¹⁸⁴ With Jesus absent from the scene, the Holy Spirit communicates instructions not just empowerment. He employs the language of separation (ἀφορίζατε), used in a positive sense, to stress the divine nature of the mission helmed by Barnabas and Paul – leaders of the Antiochene community¹⁸⁵ and now founding figures of second-generation communities.¹⁸⁶ The sanction runs deeper than simple endorsement since the Holy Spirit communicates the mission as divine in its origination: τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς (13:2).¹⁸⁷

¹⁸² Cf. Acts 18:22–23. Paul’s return approximates the return of some Greek founders to their respective *metropoleis*. See, e.g., the cases of Lampon (Diodorus 12.9), Hagnon (Thucydides 4.102–108; 5.11), and Miltiades the Younger (Herodotus 6.35). Cf. Graham, *Colony and Mother City*, 35–39. Hellenistic founder-kings established cities largely for military and economic reasons and thus were not bound to them. See Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements*, 63–65. Cf. Billows, *Kings and Colonists*. In Roman colonization, the committee tasked with planting a colony was appointed by the senate, with the members (probably) free to return after discharging their duties. See Cicero, *Div.* 1.102; Livy 37.57.7; Ascon. Pis. 3; Cicero, *Att.* 4.1.4. And of course, emperor-founders (see Salmon, *Roman Colonization under the Republic*, 136–44) did not actually reside in Rome’s colonies.

¹⁸³ See, e.g., Herodotus 4.155; Diodorus 8.17; Ovid, *Metam.* 15.17–60.

¹⁸⁴ Apart from its empowering role in Acts 2:1–4, the Holy Spirit directs the colonizing mission in Acts 8:29, 39; 10:19 (cf. 11:12) and establishes full-fledged community members via its presence in 8:17; 10:44–45 (cf. 11:15); and 19:6.

¹⁸⁵ For ἀφορίζω used in the sense of “set apart for specific role or task determined by God,” see Num 18:24 LXX; Isa 29:22 LXX; 52:11 LXX; Ezek 45:1 LXX; 48:9 LXX; Rom 1:1; Gal 1:15.

¹⁸⁶ Merely two verses later, Luke reiterates that the men had been “sent out by the Holy Spirit” (13:3).

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Eph 2:10. This type of identification of a divine being with a particular venture is comparable to Artemis’s in the transfer of her cult to Massalia (Strabo 4.1.4–5) and Apollo’s

This appointment to a divine task recalls the Lord's identification of Paul as σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς during his commissioning (9:15; cf. 22:14; 26:16) and affirms the continuity of God's colonizing plan.

Implicitly, moreover, the portrayal of Paul and Barnabas as agents of God legitimates the Antiochene community. This is to say that Luke presents the mixed assemblage of Christians in Antioch as a mother community participating in the colonizing plan of God. The active role of the community approximates that of the *metropolis* in many instances of ancient colonization, particularly in the Classical and Roman (imperial) periods. In such instances, the mother city sent out colonies because of a vested interest in the outcome. This close connection did not apply in all (especially earlier) colonization contexts.¹⁸⁸ Sometimes, for instance, the very act of colonization presupposed a break of some kind between *metropolis* and settlement party.¹⁸⁹ The *oikist* embodied this ambivalent connection insofar as he, as representative of the divine will, occupied a nebulous space between the *metropolis* and the colony he founded.¹⁹⁰ In imperial contexts, however, the *metropolis* (e.g., Athens and Rome) more tightly controlled the goals and processes of colonization. In such cases, the founder(s) tended to be agents of the *metropolis*.¹⁹¹

Then there are instances in which the *metropolis* possessed a tangible stake in colonization but is presented as cooperating with the divine will.¹⁹² Such "cooperation" typifies Antiochene actions as mother community and is exemplified in two principal ways: in the setting of the call during "worship" and "fasting" and in the community's commission of Barnabas and Paul. The *setting* is significant because it reflects the pious orientation of the community, recalling the depiction of the Jerusalem community in Acts 2:42, 46. In Jesus's

in the foundation of Cyrene (Pindar, *Pyth.* 4, 5, 9; Callimachus *Hymn. Apoll.* 86; Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece*.

¹⁸⁸ Variety typified the relations between Greek colonies and their respective *metropoleis*. See Graham, *Colony and Mother City*.

¹⁸⁹ Though, as the case of Taras demonstrates, literary reports of discord between colonizers and their *metropolis* can be misleading as to the actual relations prevailing between the two entities. See Hall, "Foundation Stories," 420–21.

¹⁹⁰ Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*.

¹⁹¹ Hagnon, founder of Amphipolis, acted on behalf of Athens (Thucydides 4.102–108) as did Lampon and Xenocritus, founders of Thurii (Diodorus 12.9), and, in an earlier context, Miltiades the Younger, secondary founder of Thracian Chersonese (Herodotus 6.35–37; Graham, *Colony and Mother City*, 194; Figueira, "Colonisation in the Classical Period," 2:430). In the Roman period, an entire committee of founders (typically decemvirs) acted on behalf of the republic and then the empire. Livy 9.28.8; 10.21.9; 34.53.2; 39.55.5; Cicero, *Agr.* 2.7.19; 2.12.31; 2.17.43–46.

¹⁹² See, for example, Sparta's inquiry about conquering/controlling Tegea (Herodotus 1.66–68).

absence, worship and fasting created an environment ripe for divine revelation.¹⁹³

Equally significant, though, is the *manner* in which the community sends off its two most prominent members: by “fasting and praying” and laying hands on them. This collocation of actions suggests an official commission. Characters employ prayer, of course, at critical junctures throughout Acts. In several places, as here, prayer imparts solemnity as well as legitimacy in decisions about leadership. The disciples prayed when selecting Judas’s replacement (1:24). Paul prays for/with the Ephesian elders (20:36). And on two occasions in Acts, Luke couples prayer with fasting to describe the appointment of leaders. In 6:6, he links these two practices to the “laying on of hands,” anticipating the threefold practice here, in his portrayal of the Seven’s selection. And in 14:23, he reports that the practices were used by Paul and Barnabas after they had designated elders to oversee communities planted on their first colonizing venture. Considered in light of these other passages, the pairing of prayer with fasting and laying on hands in Acts 13 reinforces the impression that this amounts to a formal commissioning of Barnabas and Paul, not as elders or distributors of resources but as founding figures.

Yet, again, this formal commissioning represents an act of cooperation between the Antiochene community and the divine will delineated by the Holy Spirit. For this reason, Luke can claim that both entities “sent off” Barnabas and Paul (13:3–4).¹⁹⁴ Rather than diminish the Antiochene community’s authority, in the theological world of Acts, the community’s obedience to the Holy Spirit’s directive ensures its legitimacy, particularly in its new role as mother community of second-generation colonies. Acts 14:26–28 reveals the payoff of such cooperation. Paul and Barnabas, debriefing in Antioch following their early colonizing ventures, reported “all that God had done with them, and how he had opened a door of faith for the gentiles” (NRSV).¹⁹⁵

4.4.2 Community “Institutions”

Nothing validates colonizing efforts more than divine sanction. However, Luke’s depiction of the Antiochene community’s institutions also bolsters her legitimacy as a mother community. Above, I introduced and noted the importance of “institutions.”¹⁹⁶ They were the all-encompassing set of practices

¹⁹³ Cf. Luke 3:21; 5:35; 6:12–13; 9:18–27, 28–36; 11:1–4; 22:46; Acts 1:24; 9:11; 10:9 (cf. 11:5), 30; 12:12; 22:17.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Acts 15:28.

¹⁹⁵ The report apprised the Antiochene community of the colonizing performed under its aegis, and therefore representing oversight comparable to the visits that influential leaders of the Jerusalem community paid to Samaria (8:14–25) and Antioch (11:22–26).

¹⁹⁶ See chapter 2.

which governed a community's civic life and shaped its identity.¹⁹⁷ Formal laws qualified as institutions but so too did a community's form of government, festival calendar, and seminal religious practices. In the instance of colonization, institutions were critical because they helped determine what form of society a new community assume, for example, democratic or aristocratic. In Acts, of course, we have already encountered institutions which defined the Jerusalem community. Foremost among these were its apostolic leadership¹⁹⁸ and "common life," stamped by practices such as shared meals, prayer, and distribution of resources (Acts 2:42–47; 4:32–5:11).¹⁹⁹ But now, with the replication of the community outside Jerusalem, it is crucial that the mother community of second-generation colonization adopt institutions reflective of both its origins and horizons.²⁰⁰

4.4.2.1 Leadership Institutions

Having narrated its foundation just two chapters earlier, Luke begins Acts 13 by remarking on the Antiochene community's leadership institutions. It is true that Luke does not use the term "leader." But he foregrounds the institutions of "prophets and teachers"²⁰¹ and its occupants – "Barnabas; Simeon, called Nigger; Lucius of Cyrene; Manaen, one brought up with Herod the Tetrarch; and Saul" (13:1) –, leaving little doubt that these individuals preside over the newly planted community.²⁰² Indeed, it is the first such information Luke supplies about a community outside Jerusalem. In the earlier setting we meet the

¹⁹⁷ See the definition offered by Malkin (also quoted in chapter 2): Institutions (νόμιμα) were the "diacritical markers' of a community and involved social divisions such as the name and number of 'tribes,' sacred calendars, and types and terminologies of institutions and magistracies" (*A Small Greek World*, 55).

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*.

¹⁹⁹ See chapter 3.

²⁰⁰ We have already encountered some of the community's institutions: the preaching about τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν (11:20) and the identification of members – albeit by "outsiders" – as Χριστιανοῦς (11:26).

²⁰¹ Cf. 1 Cor 12:28; Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 35–36.

²⁰² Luke does not specify who delimited the leadership model. The founder and/or mother city probably determined such matters in newly founded colonies. This was purportedly the case when Romulus founded Rome. After he had secured the territory, mapped out its spaces, made land allotments, and enacted various laws, Romulus turned his attention to matters of leadership, creating the senate (Plutarch, *Rom.* 13.1–6; cf. 20.1–3; Livy 1.8; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 2.12.1–2) and establishing *gerousia* (Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 2.12.3) and *celeres* (Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 2.13.2). Plutarch reports that when Romulus himself was leader, he varied his style between that of a populist and monarch (*Rom.* 26.1–2; 27.1–2).

apostles²⁰³ and the seven Hellenists.²⁰⁴ Only later do we encounter the position of “elders” in Jerusalem²⁰⁵ as well as in the diaspora.²⁰⁶ By presenting Antiochene leadership institutions, Luke enhances the impression that the community represents the first bona fide colony of the Jerusalem community. As to be expected, therefore, the institutions signal a connection both with its mother community and its colonizing mission.

Alluding to origins was indeed one way a city’s institutions shaped its identity.²⁰⁷ This was especially the case during ancient colonization. Thucydides reports, for example, that the settlers from Gela who founded Acragas gave the colony Geloan *nomima* (“institutions”).²⁰⁸ Similarly, Massalia adopted the institutions of Ionia related to the cult of Ephesian Artemis,²⁰⁹ and Romulus when founding Rome incorporated the rites of Evander, who hailed from Arcadia.²¹⁰ Evidence of this phenomenon surfaces also in more detailed cases. So, for example, Sparta and its colony Taras adopted ephors as part of their respective leadership hierarchies²¹¹ – as did Heracleia, a colony of Taras.²¹² By the same token, Megara and many of its colonies possessed a “board of five magistrates ... *aisymnatai*.”²¹³ In other words, each of these decisions about leadership institutions alluded to the respective colony’s mother city as a potent means of shaping its own identity.

Something similar is at work in Antioch’s leadership institutions. Specifically, Luke’s presentation of the community’s leadership promotes continuity between it and the mother community; it does so in a threefold fashion. First, its framing of the institutions recalls Acts 1–2. There we learned both of the state of the Jerusalem’s community’s leadership (1:21–26) and its divine sanction (1:8; 2:1–4). Here, similarly, we meet the Antiochene community’s

²⁰³ Paul and Barnabas are later recognized as apostles too (14:4, 6, 14). There is some overlap in roles between the “apostles” and “witnesses,” which includes the Twelve (1:8, 22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 10:39, 41; 13:31), Barnabas and Paul (13:32; 22:15; 23:11; 26:16), and Stephen (22:20).

²⁰⁴ These are responsible for the daily distribution (6:1–7) but also occupy themselves with preaching (6:8–7:56; 8:4–13, 26–40).

²⁰⁵ Acts 11:30; 21:18. Used along with “apostles”: 15:2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16:4. The “elders” of the Jerusalem community provide a sharp contrast to the dominant religious leaders of Jerusalem (4:5, 8, 23; 5:21; 6:12; 22:5; 23:14; 24:1; 25:15).

²⁰⁶ Acts 14:23; 20:17.

²⁰⁷ Cf. Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, 78–79: “For Greeks in the fifth and fourth century it was almost self-evident that similarity in *nomima* implied a relationship of mother city and colony.”

²⁰⁸ 6.4.4.

²⁰⁹ Strabo 4.1.4–5. See above.

²¹⁰ Livy 1.3.

²¹¹ Malkin, *A Small Greek World*, 191, 195.

²¹² Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, 234.

²¹³ Malkin, *A Small Greek World*, 191, 195.

leadership (13:1; cf. 1:21–26) and witness its chief figures receiving their colonizing mandate (13:2–3; cf. 1:8; 2:1–4).²¹⁴ Second, it frames the leadership list with Barnabas and Saul, two figures approved by the Jerusalem community (13:1).²¹⁵ Certainly, the identity of the other leaders (Simeon, Lucius, and Manaen) is not without importance. Their geographic and ethnic diversity approximates the Antiochene community’s mixed character,²¹⁶ as well as that of its future colonies. Still, the leadership of Barnabas and Paul links the Antiochene and Jerusalem communities as part of the same colonizing network.²¹⁷

Finally, Luke’s identification of the Antiochene community’s leaders as προφήται καὶ διδάσκαλοι (13:1) also hints at the colonizing movement’s origins. Prophecy ultimately stems from the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost (2:17). In this instance and elsewhere (see 19:6) it appears to have a relatively wide distribution (i.e., among believers in a specific locale).²¹⁸ However, Luke also singles out particular individuals such as Agabus (11:28; 21:10),²¹⁹ Judas and Silas (15:32), Philip’s daughters (21:9), and, here, prophet-leaders in Antioch (13:1). Again, the pertinent point is that the prophetic gift depends upon the reception of the Holy Spirit first poured out at Pentecost. This originating event provides the implicit link between the Antiochene prophet leadership and the Jerusalem community.

Luke’s mention of “teachers” at Antioch (13:1) likewise evokes the colony’s origins. Specifically, it recalls the establishment of the Jerusalem community (Acts 1–5). Teaching, after all, was a characteristic founding act of both Jesus (1:1) and the apostles (4:2, 18; 5:21, 25, 28, 42). Significantly, Barnabas and

²¹⁴ See chapter 3. In the earlier instance, Luke sandwiches his depiction of the Jerusalem community’s leaders – the reconstituted Twelve (1:21–26) – between reinforcing forms of divine sanction: the oracle (1:8) and the Holy Spirit’s empowerment (2:1–4).

²¹⁵ See my comments above on Acts 11:22–26. Cf. 4:36–37; 9:27–30.

²¹⁶ Cf. Keener, *Acts*, 2:1983–90.

²¹⁷ Interestingly, the appointment of the “Hellenists” in Acts 6 foreshadows the connection between Jerusalem and Antioch. Luke lists among the seven appointed διακονεῖν τραπεζαῖς a certain Nicolaus, a proselyte of Antioch (6:5).

²¹⁸ The depiction of prophecy itself is varied in Acts. See E. Earle Ellis, “The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts,” in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, ed. W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), 56–67. Agabus is portrayed as a forecaster of the future. But as Ellis notes, prophets are also responsible for “the declaration of divine judgment (Acts 13:11; 28:25–28), and the employment of symbolic actions (Acts 21:11) [They also] expound the Scriptures and ‘exhort’ and ‘strengthen’ the disciples” (ibid., 56).

²¹⁹ In fact, Agabus played a key role in facilitating Antioch’s relationship with Jerusalem; his famine prophecy led to Paul and Barnabas’s relief visit on behalf of the colony. But Luke mentions Agabus as one of a number of prophets who “came down from Jerusalem to Antioch” (11:27). This allows for the possibility that some of the prophets formed part of the leadership now overseeing the Antiochene community, which would further strengthen the community’s ties with its mother community.

Paul then employed teaching to shore up the foundation of the Antiochene community (11:26). Teaching, therefore, serves as a link between the foundation of both entities – mother community (Jerusalem) and colony (Antioch). In effect, the institution of teacher in the Antiochene community preserves this continuity.

Implicit in what has been said is that the leadership institutions not only signal Antioch's connection to the Jerusalem community, they also demonstrate its alignment with the colonizing mission sanctioned there. Luke ties this mission to the gift of the Holy Spirit and prophecy – both depicted as eschatological events (1:8; 2:17). The goal of the end-times mission is universal salvation (2:21; cf. 3:24). As the prophet like Moses, Jesus represents salvation for those respond in belief – or else judgment for those who do not (3:13–26).²²⁰ Apostles like Peter execute their prophetic role by witnessing to Jesus's salvific mission (5:30–32).²²¹ So also with Paul: His commission (9:15) leads him to proclaim Jesus the savior in places such as Pisidian Antioch (13:23, 26), after first serving as a leader of Syrian Antioch (13:1).

Both and Paul and Peter's experiences in Acts demonstrate how the prophetic and teaching acts reinforce one other. This occurs precisely because the didactic reinterpretation of Israel's traditions and scriptures from the vantage point of Jesus's messianic status constitutes part of the prophetic task in Luke's narrative.²²² In sum, the prophet and teacher leadership positions in Antioch demonstrate the community's alignment with the colonizing mission in Jerusalem. They also signal the colony's readiness to take on its own responsibility as mother community.

4.4.2.2 Religious Institutions

What might be called “religious institutions” were just as important, especially since Antioch and its colonies had a mixed composition. As noted above, conflict often arose in communities comprising two or more different groups of settlers.²²³ In some mixed colonies, such as Rhegion, one group of settlers would come to dominate.²²⁴ Nevertheless, the challenge thrust upon such communities was to agree on institutions amenable to the different groups, or at

²²⁰ Moessner, “Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet Like Moses,” 203–12, rightly connects this proclamation with the rejection motif. Cf. Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 31.

²²¹ Cf. Aune, “Christian Prophecy and the Messianic Status of Jesus,” 421–22, on the “prophetic vision” of Jesus's exalted state which qualifies him as messiah (5:31).

²²² Cf. Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 56; Croatto, “Jesus, Prophet Like Elijah,” 461–462, 464. Luke associates “teaching” with the primary founding figures. See Luke 4:15, 31; 5:3, 17; 6:6; 11:1; 13:10, 22, 26; 19:47; 20:1, 21; 21:37; 23:5; Acts 1:1; 4:2, 18; 5:21, 25, 28, 42; 11:26; 15:1, 35; 18:11; 20:20; 21:21, 28; 28:31. There are two exceptions. Luke 12:12 refers to the teaching of the Holy Spirit and Acts 18:25 to that of Apollos.

²²³ See the examples listed above.

²²⁴ See Graham, *Colony and Mother City*, 17–20.

least reflective of the colony's mixed character. Himera, for example, adopted Chalcidic institutions since the main body of its settlers hailed from Chalcis while a smaller contingent contained fugitives from Syracuse.²²⁵ But compromise was sometimes necessary. With this aim in mind, no doubt, Gela's settlers who came from Rhodes and Crete adopted "Dorian institutions."²²⁶ These "semi-inclusive" institutions presumably furnished a common identity on the basis of which the different groups were to be integrated.²²⁷ Something analogous occurs in the determination of religious institutions in Acts 15.

In Acts 15 the challenge centers on the practice of circumcision – namely, whether it should be mandatory for gentiles members of the mixed community.²²⁸ Certain "men who had come down from Judea"²²⁹ insisted on the necessity of the rite for salvation (15:1).²³⁰ It was hardly unusual for a mother city – in this case, Jerusalem – to require that its colony abide by practices that were viewed as constitutive for its own identity. Luke does not explicitly state the motive of these anonymous individuals, but it was likely twofold: to ensure a full, proper conversion of gentiles incorporated into the "restored" Israel²³¹ and

²²⁵ Thucydides 6.5.1.

²²⁶ Thucydides 6.4.3. See the discussion of "sub-ethnic" *nomima* in chapter 2; Malkin, *A Small Greek World*, 74–75.

²²⁷ Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 143.

²²⁸ As Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 118, points out, behind the dispute lurked the related issues of boundaries for Jews and the possibility of moral purification for gentiles submitting to conversion.

²²⁹ Luke stops short of saying that these men represent the view of the Jerusalem leaders (cf. 15:24; Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 117), for he associates the latter's authority with a more moderate judgment about Antioch's institutions excluding circumcision (15:19–21).

²³⁰ The reception of "salvation" defines one as Christian. Those who have been "saved" are members of the community. See, e.g., 2:21, 40, 47; 4:9, 12; 11:14. What is in question here is whether circumcision is required for gentiles to be "saved." Luke does not denigrate circumcision *per se* (see Acts 7:58). But he largely presents it as a rite restricted in its importance to Jews and Jewish Christians (see Acts 15:5; 16:3; 21:21). Judge, "Judaism and the Rise of Christianity," 364–66, argues that Christian (especially Paul's) opposition to circumcision precipitated a split with Judaism, which did in fact occur at Antioch. Cf. Sanders, "Jewish Christianity in Antioch," 351. Taylor, "Why Were the Disciples First Called 'Christians,'" 86–87, argues, rather, that it was the claims about "Jesus's messianic status" which caused the split.

²³¹ It was only in post-biblical times that Jews envisioned the possibility of conversion, according to Shaye J. D. Cohen, "Conversion to Judaism in Historical Perspective: From Biblical Israel to Postbiblical Judaism," *CJ* 36 (1983): 32–33. This timing coincided with the loss of a strong national dimension in Judaism (32). In preexilic times, resident aliens (*ger*) dwelled in the land without having rituals imposed upon them (33). Later, with Israel's loss of sovereignty and the dispersion of Jews, *ger* attained the sense of "convert." Cf. Terrance Callan, "The Background of the Apostolic Decree," *CBQ* 55 (1993): 290. Prior to 70 CE, there was "active converting" on the part of some Jews, which corresponded with an openness toward Judaism among some sectors of the gentile populace (Cohen, "Conversion to Judaism in Historical Perspective," 36) – not least in Rome (Judge, "Judaism and the Rise

to eliminate the threat of contamination to Jewish members of the community who were sharing meals and spaces with gentile counterparts.²³² Imposing this institutional requirement in mixed Christian communities was problematic. On a practical level, it would certainly limit converts. But more germane for Luke, as discussed below, is that the insistence violated God's plan for the inclusion of gentiles. It is thus not surprising that the Judeans' insistence on circumcision stirred up discord²³³ with Paul and Barnabas.²³⁴ Luke depicts the Judeans' actions as "teaching"; this invites a contrast between these figures and the real prophet-teachers and founding figures of the Antiochene community. This contrast is essentially over the divine will and thus recalls the one forged earlier between Peter and John and Jerusalem's religious leaders (see Acts 3–5).²³⁵

What is at stake in the debate over institutions for mixed Christian communities is not only the identity of the Antiochene community, but also that of second-generation communities planted from the new mother city. The trouble stirred up by the men "from Judea" (15:1) follows Paul and Barnabas's return from and report about their colonizing ministry among the gentiles in Cyprus, Antioch of Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe (14:27) – ministry for which they were formally commissioned by the Antiochene community and the Holy Spirit (13:2–3). A similar sequence occurs during the so-called Jerusalem council: Paul and Barnabas report on God's work through them, which then elicits the troublesome intervention of some "believers" (15:4–5).²³⁶ The implication is that Antioch's institutions would then influence the identity of her colonies. The letter conveying Jerusalem's judgment makes this explicit by addressing not only "Antioch and Syria" but also "Cilicia" (15:23).²³⁷

What was thus at stake in the resolution in nothing short of the identity of the Antiochene community and her colonies, predicated on the full and equal inclusion of gentile members *as* gentiles.²³⁸ What remains for Luke to work out

of Christianity," 356–59). Later, rabbis formalized the "process of conversion" (Cohen, "Conversion to Judaism in Historical Perspective," 41). Prior to this it is doubtful that there were standardized rules for converts. Cf. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 115. Contra Callan, "The Background of the Apostolic Decree," 290.

²³² Cf. Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 91–142.

²³³ Or "strife" (στάσεως) and "dissension" (ζητήσεως). Here "strife" reflects both the situation in "mixed" community (see above) as well as opposition to founding figures (see chapter 3). It is notable that – unlike most colonization accounts – members of the mother community are responsible for instigating the "strife" in the colony.

²³⁴ See above on this characterization.

²³⁵ See chapter 3.

²³⁶ Luke's near identical wording links the two reports: ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν (14:27); ὅσα ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν μετ' αὐτῶν (15:4).

²³⁷ Paul and Barnabas traveled even farther than Cilicia. The province, in a way, is synecdoche for the expanding mission.

²³⁸ Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 50.

is how this was to be attained. And could it be accomplished in such a way as to legitimize designating mixed communities as the people of God?

These questions were not unique to the realm of early Christian expansion. Cultic identification – via commitment to patron deities – was an especially pressing concern in colonial contexts in the ancient Mediterranean world. Colonists in Sicily, for example, established a cult of Apollo *Archegetes* at Naxos²³⁹ to foster community and prevent conflict among the island’s various groups of Greek settlers.²⁴⁰ Similarly, according to Libanius, the cults of Zeus and Apollo were formative for the identity of Antioch and nearby Daphne, respectively.²⁴¹ Both readers and gentile “outsiders” in the narrative might readily associate the Antiochene community with the God of Israel. After all, it was the Lord who stood behind the receptive response of many gentiles;²⁴² moreover, non-believing observers identified community members as partisans of Christ (Χριστιανούς; 11:26)²⁴³ – whom Luke presents as God’s appointed founder.²⁴⁴ However, Judean “insiders” expressed qualms about the mechanisms for incorporating gentiles into this cultic community. While Barnabas’s oversight (11:22–24) might have allayed most of these concerns, it was still necessary to determine institutions to formalize the new identity of gentile members. Therefore, to answer the initial question: What is at stake is nothing less than the legitimacy of the Antiochene community and its colonies, founded in continuity with the sanctioning oracle (1:8) and outpouring of the Holy Spirit (2:1–4).

The Jerusalem community’s leadership plays an unequivocal role in determining what institutions should define the religious identity of the Antiochene

²³⁹ Thucydides 6.3.1–2; cf. Parke and Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, 1:66–67.

²⁴⁰ Graham, *Colony and Mother City*, 27. Malkin, “Apollo Archegetes and Sicily,” 959–72; idem., *Religion and Colonization*, 19. idem., *A Small Greek World*, 101–12; Donnellan, “Oikist and Archegetes in Context, 44.

²⁴¹ Libanius, *Or.* 11.52–99. Many foundation accounts depict the importance of religion and religious institutions in the establishment of a colony. See, for example, Livy and Dionysius’s accounts of the foundation of Rome. Dionysius remarks how Romulus not only established temples and festivals but also oversaw the approval of myths, and cults, and priesthoods (*Ant. rom.* 2.22). Livy, furthermore, notes how the founder adopted the rites passed down from Evander of Arcadia (*Ant. rom.* 1.7). Cf. chapter 2; Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*.

²⁴² See, e.g., Acts 11:21; 13:48.

²⁴³ See the discussion above. Aune, “Christian Prophecy and the Messianic Status of Jesus,” 410, argues that as a title “applied to Jesus,” Χρίστος did not conform to set Jewish notions about messiah, but rather “later [Christian] conceptions.”

²⁴⁴ Acts 1:6–8; 2:22–36; 3:13–26; 4:10–12, 27; 5:29–32. See chapter 3; Balch, “ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ,” 139–88.

community and its colonies.²⁴⁵ Indeed, as Graham has suggested, it was not uncommon for mother cities to make certain cultic demands of their colonies, or at least for colonies to maintain a religious connection to their mother cities. I have already pointed out Brea's responsibility – stipulated in the colony's so-called foundation decree – to make offerings at Athens's two famous festivals the Great Panathenaea and Dionysia. Graham adduces further examples: Didyma was bound to Miletus by the cult of Apollo;²⁴⁶ Gela submitted a dedication to Athena of Lindos;²⁴⁷ Astypalaea made an offering at Epidauros.²⁴⁸ He suggests as well that Argos, as mother city of both Cnossus and Tylissus, required its colonies to sacrifice to Argive deities.²⁴⁹ Rome, moreover, established the Capitoline Triad of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva in some of the colonies which she planted.²⁵⁰

In the case of the Antiochene community, the mother community had already asserted her authority by sending Barnabas (through whose efforts Paul also was brought over; 11:15–26) to put its imprimatur on the colony's foundation (11:22–25).²⁵¹ Barnabas and Paul themselves play a subordinate role in the determination of Antioch's institutions: They report on the *σημεία καὶ τέρατα* (15:12; cf. 15:4) and accompany the letter carrying Jerusalem's decision back to Antioch (15:22–26),²⁵² just as they had “carried” the issue in dispute to Jerusalem (15:2–4). In this matter, they are accountable to Jerusalem's leadership. It is Peter and (especially) James who wield power to determine Antioch and its colonies' institutions, and the space allotted to each one's speech supplies evidence of this weightier authority (15:7–11; 13–21).²⁵³

Together the speeches articulate God's will concerning the inclusion of gentile Christians. Peter's speech invokes the belief of gentiles at Caesarea and

²⁴⁵ The narrative structure likewise reflects Jerusalem's importance: The outer verses (15:1–2, 30–35) establish the Antiochene setting of the dispute, while the inner section (15:6–29) depicts the resolution of the issue in Jerusalem.

²⁴⁶ Graham, *Colony and Mother City*, 161.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 163–64.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 156.

²⁵⁰ Torelli, *Tota Italia*, 30, 134. One caveat: Gellius and those who follow him overstate the degree to which Rome (in the middle Republic) sought to make “little Romes” in its image. See Bispham, “*Coloniam Deducere*,” 73–160; Tymon C. A. de Haas, *Fields, Farms and Colonists: Intensive Field Survey and Early Roman Colonization in the Pontine Region, Central Italy* (Groningen: Barkhuis, 2011), 1:299–300.

²⁵¹ See above.

²⁵² Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 108, 112, doubts that Paul would have submitted to Jerusalem's resolution. He argues that the decree (Acts 15:20, 29) – contrary to Luke's presentation – was issued following both the Jerusalem visit related in Acts 15:3–17 and the so-called Antioch incident which Paul describes in Gal 2:11–18.

²⁵³ By contrast, the words of Paul and Barnabas receive short summaries (15:4, 12).

their reception of the Holy Spirit (Acts 10:9–11:18)²⁵⁴ as a precedent. James’s speech expands upon Peter’s in two ways. First, it interprets Peter’s experience in light of prophecy underscoring God’s plan both to restore Israel (15:15–16) and to rescue a gentile remnant (15:17–18).²⁵⁵ Second, it renders a “judgment” (δὶο ἐγὼ κρίνω; 15:15–21) about the most appropriate customs to facilitate the latter’s integration. The letter communicating this decision symbolizes the authority of the Jerusalem community over its Antiochene colony;²⁵⁶ Judas, Silas, Barnabas, and Paul’s accompaniment of the letter bolsters this impression (15:22, 32–33).²⁵⁷

The resolution handed down by the Jerusalem leadership established a set of religious institutions designed to foster a common identity among the mixed Christian communities in Antioch and her colonies, while imposing minimal “trouble” (15:19; cf. 15:10). However, it was necessary that the decision carry the proper authority to secure its acceptance. Peter and James’s involvement, it is true, lent gravitas to both the proceedings and the resolution; yet this by itself was hardly sufficient to win approval for the full inclusion of gentiles “as they are” without there also being a divine basis²⁵⁸ for this development. The same emphasis on divine initiative features prominently in colonization accounts more generally, as I have shown.²⁵⁹ Recall, for example, how Zeus in Libanius’s *Antiochikos* summoned Casus – the “flower of the Cretans” – to Syria because he wanted the new settlement to be peopled with “the best stock.”²⁶⁰ Paul and Barnabas’s reports alone helps establish such divine initiative since they declare how God was working through them (15:4, 12). But wishing to further stress the continuity of the colonizing movement from its inception to the current stage of gentile outreach beyond Jerusalem-Judea prompts Luke to place on the mouths of Peter and James a fuller articulation of God’s will concerning gentile inclusion. Again, their speeches are complementary: Peter’s cites precedent for God’s current work among gentiles (15:7–11), while James’s provides further interpretation of this precedent (15:13–18) and then renders a final judgment (15:19–21).

²⁵⁴ Peter stresses divine sanction for *his* role: “God made a choice ... that by *my* mouth the gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe” (15:7).

²⁵⁵ It is notable, in light of Paul’s presentation of Jesus as heir to the promises given to David in Acts 13, that James here draws on Amos 9:11–12 to sanction the inclusion of gentiles as a fulfillment of God’s promise to “rebuild the tent of David ... that the remnant of humankind may seek the Lord, and all the gentiles who are called by my name” (15:16–17). Cf. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 182–92.

²⁵⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 114.

²⁵⁷ The parallel roles of Judas and Silas is seen how both “encourage” (15:32; cf. 15:31) and elicit a warm response (15:33; cf. 15:31).

²⁵⁸ Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*, 50, 52. Bauckham, “James, Peter, and the Gentiles,” 120.

²⁵⁹ See the examples cited in chapter 2.

²⁶⁰ *Or.* 11.52–53.

Peter insists that God's initiative drives the mission to the gentiles and cites his outreach to Cornelius as proof.²⁶¹ Above I noted how the narrative in Acts 10–11 employs “dream-visions” (10:3, 17, 19; cf. 11:5) as well as an angel (10:5, 30–32; cf. 11:13–14) and the Holy Spirit's prodding (10:19–20; cf. 11:12) to underscore the divine forces responsible for dissolving the boundary markers that separated gentiles from full and equal inclusion in the colonizing community.²⁶² Here Peter makes the same point drawing on the language of election. While acknowledging his own proclamation (διὰ τοῦ στόματος μου), he subordinates it to God's sovereign choice to have the “gentiles ... hear the world of the gospel and believe” (15:7).

This choice entails two interacted corollaries that reinforce divine initiative. First, God marked the authenticity of their belief by giving gentile converts the Holy Spirit “just as he did to us” (15:8). Initiation into the community in Acts involved belief, baptism, and the reception of the Holy Spirit.²⁶³ Just as Peter had pointed to God's “choice” as the reason why the gentiles hear and believe (15:7), so too he presents the gift of the Holy Spirit as something orchestrated by God; he declares the latter's knowledge of their uprightness (15:8; cf. 5:1–11) and sanction of their inclusion (15:8). Second, God's choice and gift of the Holy Spirit ensured that this inclusion would occur on a full and equal basis. In the context of mixed colonies, with parties from two or more different points of origin, “equality of rights” often served as a pivotal term of settlement; it helped protect against potential divisions among settlers.²⁶⁴ For the gentiles at Caesarea, Peter insists that it was God's will for there to be “no distinction” (οὐθὲν διέκρινεν) between Jews and gentiles – “us and them” (ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν) – such as customarily marked relations between Jews and their gentile counterparts, even those attracted to the synagogue and Judaism. Once again, this dissolution of distinctions had not simply come to be—God had brought it about. He had “cleansed ... [the] hearts” of gentiles (15:9). Therefore, they could be full and equal members of the community without fear of their profaning or (morally) polluting Jewish members.²⁶⁵

²⁶¹ Cf. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 122.

²⁶² On boundary-drawing in the Second Temple period, see Bauckham, “James, Peter, and the Gentiles,” 97–98.

²⁶³ Acts 2:38, 41; 8:12–17, 36; 10:44–48; 11:21; 13:12, 48; 16:14–15, 30–34.

²⁶⁴ Athens, for instance, established its two colonies Amphipolis and Thurii on democratic principles and equal allotments of land. Brasidas, the Spartan general, promised full equality to Amphipolis's inhabitants to win their support against the colony's erstwhile mother city, Athens (Thucydides 4.106.1–4). See chapter 2; Figueira, “Colonisation in the Classical Period,” 2:482–83. Other examples: Moses provided equal allotments to the settlers of Jerusalem (Diodorus 40.3.1–8); Aeneas conferred equal rights upon the natives when founding Lavinium (Livy 1.2); Romulus promised “equal terms” to the Sabines whom he overcame and then incorporated into Rome (Plutarch, *Rom.* 16.4).

²⁶⁵ Bauckham, “James, Peter, and the Gentiles,” 104–5, cf. 120.

Peter bases his conclusions (οὖν; 15:10) about the institutions gentiles in mixed Christian communities must – or rather need not – adopt (cf. 15:5) on God’s earlier inclusion of gentiles at Caesarea. In doing so, he pits those who wish to make it difficult for gentiles to be assimilated on a full and equal basis against God and his appointed founding figures, thus recalling the opposition in Acts 3–5.²⁶⁶ The former are “putting God to the test” (15:10) since he has already revealed his will in the matter (15:7) and – by granting the Holy Spirit and cleansing (15:8–9) – made it so that there is no obstacle to prevent gentiles from intermixing with Jewish believers. In language that echoes 13:3, Peter says that by pushing “circumcision and the law” (15:5), those believers impose “a yoke on the neck (ζυγόν) on disciples that neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear” (15:10). By contrast, Peter and the founding figures proclaim the colonizing message of salvation “through the grace of the Lord Jesus” (15:11), which again prioritizes divine initiative. This proclamation represents the “terms” guaranteeing equal rights and identity to gentiles and Jews within mixed Christian communities.²⁶⁷

James also stresses God’s initiative behind the outreach to and inclusion of gentiles. Indeed, James’s judgment (δλό; 15:19) – more detailed than Peter’s – about institutions for gentile members of the mixed Christian community (15:19–21) rests upon this assessment. Like Peter, he invokes episode at Caesarea to support his conviction, employing assertive language to describe God’s own colonizing activity:²⁶⁸ “God first²⁶⁹ visited to take (ἔπεσεκέψατο λαβεῖν) from the gentiles a people for his name” (15:14).²⁷⁰ This language of election echoes Peter’s in 15:7. But James expounds even further than Peter on how God expressed his will at Caesarea – interpreting the event through the lens of scripture (15:15–18).²⁷¹ Drawing on Amos 9:11–12 LXX, James brings together the fate of Israel and gentiles. The “words of the prophets” which he cites declare God’s intention to “rebuild the tent of David,” or to “restore it” (15:16), with the explicit goal that “a remnant [οἱ κατάλοιποι] of mankind²⁷² may seek the Lord” (15:17). The perspective that gentile fortunes are linked to

²⁶⁶ See chapter 3.

²⁶⁷ Cf. Wilson, “Urban Legends,” 90.

²⁶⁸ Cf. Apollo’s founding of Cyrene (Pindar, *Pyth.* 5, 9; Callimachus, *Hymn. Apoll.*; Calame, *Myth and History*).

²⁶⁹ “First” (πρῶτον; 15:14) identifies the Caesarea episode as an early precedent-setting event in the life of the colonizing community, similar to Peter’s “in the early days” (ἀφ’ ἡμερῶν; 15:7).

²⁷⁰ Cf. Deut 18:5; 21:5 where similar language describes the “setting apart” of Levites.

²⁷¹ Here James performs a prophetic role – interpreting current events in light of scripture (see above). He thus approximating the function of a *chresmologos*. Cf. Thucydides 8.1; Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*, 73.

²⁷² The LXX refers to a remnant of “mankind” (τῶν ἀνθρώπων) in place of the MT’s “of Edom” (Amos 9:12).

the restoration of Israel is one that has marked the narrative since Acts 1–2.²⁷³ It is also felicitous to Luke’s purposes that the passage in Amos uses the language of election to qualify the more general reference to the remnant: “gentiles who are called by my name” (τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ’ οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομα μου; 15:17). This “calling” echoes both James and Peter’s own earlier points about God’s decisive plan to reach gentiles (15:7, 14).²⁷⁴

James’s conclusion is the same as Peter’s: Since God has authorized the colonizing mission to the gentiles, Jewish members should not obstruct it (μὴ παρενοχλεῖν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔθνῶν ἐπιστρέφουσιν τὸν θεόν; 15:19; cf. 15:10). His “judgment” produces a compromise²⁷⁵ which takes account of the Jewish origins of the movement as well as the mixed nature of the Antiochene community and its colonies. James’s judgment excludes the most rigorous of the proposed institutions, circumcision (15:1, 5), while insisting on abstention from τῶν ἀλισθημάτων καὶ τῆς πορνείας καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ καὶ αἵματος.²⁷⁶

It may be, as Borgen argues, that the stipulations in 15:20 (cf. Acts 15:29) actually originated as a catalogue of vices.²⁷⁷ Nevertheless, Luke represents them as part of a decree adjudicated and circulated by the Jerusalem leadership,²⁷⁸ thus reaffirming the mother community’s jurisdiction over its

²⁷³ See Acts 1:6–8 and 2:1–41, together with my comments on these passages in chapter 3.

²⁷⁴ The final note that the Lord “makes these things known from of old” (γνωστὰ ἀπ’ αἰῶνος; 15:17–18) validates the present inclusion of gentiles (cf. 15:7, 14).

²⁷⁵ Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 145, argues that the compromise was struck in response to the “Antioch incident” reported in Gal 2:11–18.

²⁷⁶ The stipulation is repeated in a slightly variant form in 15:29 and 21:2, the main difference being the order of stipulations. All the passages foreground the requirement to abstain from meat offered to idols. Acts 15:23 positions πορνεία second in the list, followed by “strangled” and “blood.” Acts 15:29 and 21:25 situates πορνεία last while placing αἷμα before πνικτός. Peder Borgen, “Catalogues of Vices, the Apostolic Decree, and the Jerusalem Meeting,” in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*, ed. Jacob Neusner et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 136, sees the different formulations as evidence that, historically, the stipulations were not the outcome of a formal council.

On the prohibition against eating meat sacrificed to idols, see Exod 34:15 (cf. Dan 1:8). For legislation against different kinds of πορνεία, see Lev 18:6–23. For the stipulations against eating anything “strangled” (the word πνικτός is not used in the corresponding LXX passages) or with “blood” in it – prohibitions that often appear together – , see Gen 9:4; Lev 3:17; 7:26; 17:3–4, 10, 14; 19:26; Deut 12:16, 23; 15:23 (cf. 1 Sam 14:33). Cf. Callan, “The Background of the Apostolic Decree,” 289, for other prohibitions against strangulation in Hellenistic Jewish sources.

²⁷⁷ Borgen, “Catalogues of Vices,” characterizes “new life” through the Spirit as the corresponding virtue (132).

²⁷⁸ Cf. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 114. Antioch’s acceptance of Jerusalem’s terms and emissaries (15:32–33) signals a corresponding acceptance of its right as mother community to shape the colony’s institutions.

“colony.”²⁷⁹ For Luke, Jerusalem’s influence over the Antioch’s institutions ensure the continuity of the colonizing project, which is fundamental to its legitimacy. The continual sway of the mother community remains in force as Paul, later, passes on to other colonies the institutions decided by Jerusalem (see 16:4).

Yet Jerusalem’s decision does not forge compromise for the sake of compromise. Rather, it facilitates the integration of gentiles while announcing the identity of the mixed communities of which they are an equal part. The exclusion of circumcision makes clear that ease of integration was a chief goal of the decision; so too does the language of the letter communicating Jerusalem’s decision along with Antioch’s response to it. The Jerusalem “apostles and elders” (15:23) stress their opposition to institutions deemed too difficult to bear for gentile members of the Antiochene community. They deny backing their own members *ἐτάραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγοις ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν* (15:24) and announce their intention *μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν Βάρος* (15:28) beyond the four-fold stipulation. The disavowal of those who “troubled” (*ἐτάραξαν*) and were “unsettling” (*ἀνασκευάζοντες*) the community – and of “burden” (*βάρος*) itself – demonstrates the leadership’s support for gentile inclusion. By the same token, Antioch’s joyful response to the letter (15:31) shows that they, like the Jerusalem leadership, envision its provisions as supplying a non-onerous mechanism for the integration of gentile members.²⁸⁰

At the same time, the prohibitions included in the compromise furnish identity markers for the mixed community. They accomplish this largely via their allusion to Jewish traditions. The prohibitions’ exact source is allusive, but they seem to be drawn from scriptures such as, but perhaps not limited to, Leviticus 17–18.²⁸¹ There might not have been an established norm which governed common meal practices between Jews and gentiles,²⁸² but a list of prohibitions such as Luke’s – featuring idolatry and *porneia*, common in anti-gentile invective²⁸³ – would have helped underscore the Jewish origins of the mixed Christian communities in Antioch and beyond.²⁸⁴ More to the point, these institutions would have signaled a common identity that was predicated on the worship of the Jewish god, similar to how Massalia, its satellite cities, and its colonies were

²⁷⁹ Cf. *ibid.*

²⁸⁰ Cf. Borgen, “Catalogues of Vices,” 136.

²⁸¹ See Callan, “The Background of the Apostolic Decree,” 284–97, who adduces a wider range of relevant passages, such as Lev 20:2–3 and Ezek 14:7–8.

²⁸² Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 115. *Contra* Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 118–22.

²⁸³ Bauckham, “James, Peter, and the Gentiles,” 97, 120. Cf. Borgen, “Catalogues of Vices,” 131–32.

²⁸⁴ Bauckham, “James, Peter, and the Gentiles,” 120, argues that “the offences which are prohibited in Leviticus 17–18 and in the apostolic decree are those which were most often regarded as constituting the moral impurity of Gentiles.”

defined by devotion to Artemis and her cult.²⁸⁵ Or how, according to Libanius, the cult of Zeus marked Antioch, and that of Apollo defined Daphne. The cult practices entailed part of the complex of institutions identifying the respective cities, just as the prohibitions do for mixed communities such as the one at Antioch.

As Luke employs it, the list of prohibitions offers a means of incorporating gentiles into the restored Israel in accordance with the will of God. Again, that this expansion of the cult reflects a higher purpose is the lesson Peter and James gleaned from the episode at Caesarea (Acts 15:7–9; 14–18). The Spirit had already cleansed the heart of gentiles (15:8–9; cf. 10:4–47; 11:15–17),²⁸⁶ rendering acceptable an erstwhile profane and (morally) impure people.²⁸⁷ Therefore, in their letter to the Antiochene community, “the [Jerusalem] apostles and the elders” cite the authority of the Holy Spirit in announcing their decision not to “burden” gentiles with an arduous method of inclusion (15:28). The institutions articulated represent the implications of an identity already mapped out by divine initiative.²⁸⁸

4.4.3 Conclusion: The Antiochene Community’s Colonies

The Antiochene community, beginning as a colony of Jerusalem and founded as the result of crisis and through cult transfer, has emerged as a mother city in her own right – of second-generation, mixed colonies like herself. The community possesses its own institutions of leadership and religious identity. Even more crucial, her colonizing ventures are legitimized by the initiative of the Holy Spirit. Because of its dual role as colony and mother community, Antioch thus occupies a pivotal place in Acts, expressing the expansion of the colonizing movement well beyond its origins in Jerusalem-Judea and, eventually, all the way to Rome. The Antiochene community sponsors the first wave of this mission, which runs through Acts 14 and sees its founding figures, Paul and Barnabas, attempt to replicate the cult community in Antioch of Pisidia – “Little Rome” of the East.

²⁸⁵ Or Sicily (Thucydides 6.3.1–2) and Cyrene (Herodotus 4.158; Pindar, *Pyth.* 4, 5, 9; Callimachus, *Hymn. Apoll.* 86) to Apollo; Messene to Demeter (Pausanias 4.26–27); Alexandria (along with Apollo) to Isis (Arrian 3.1.5–2.1).

²⁸⁶ Bauckham, “James, Peter, and the Gentiles,” 115, identifies Ezekiel’s promise of the role of the Spirit in “the restoration of Israel” (Ezek 11:17–21; 36:25–27, 29, 33; 39:29) behind Luke’s depiction here.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 120; cf. 97–98, 104–5, 118.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*; Borgen, “Catalogues of Vices,” 136.

Chapter 5

Pisidian Antioch and the Rhetoric of Second-Generation Colonization

5.1 Introduction: The Significance of Acts 13

This chapter is a natural sequel to the previous one. In chapter 4, we discussed the replication of the cult community in Antioch of Syria. “Crisis” in the mother community – namely persecution – precipitated the foundation of the new colony (11:19), involving the transfer of cult and yielding a mixed membership. We argued that this development represents a transition in Acts. This is demonstrated not only by the mixed Jewish-gentile membership (11:19–21), but also by the depiction of Antioch of Syria as a mother city in its own right, boasting a formal leadership (13:1) and a divine mandate that sponsors further colonization outside the land of Israel, led by Barnabas and Saul (13:2–3). I have identified this subsequent enterprise as second-generation colonization for the following reasons: It is spearheaded by Jerusalem’s colony; it occurs outside the land of Israel; and, characteristically, it entails the formation of mixed communities akin to that of the mother community, Syrian Antioch.

Paul and Barnabas’s activities at Antioch of Pisidia transpire during the initial wave of second-generation colonization, which spans Acts 13–14. At the end of this first venture, the founding figures consolidate their efforts in Lystra, Iconium, and Pisidian Antioch (14:21) and return to the mother community in Antioch of Syria to report on God’s work through them (14:26–27). Within this broader colonizing mission, the episode at Antioch of Pisidia is especially significant judged from the space allotted to it (40 verses). There are different dimensions to this significance. Note, for instance, that when paired with the prior episode at Cyprus (13:4–12), it completes a picture of Paul performing miracles (blinding Elymas; 13:11) and teaching (exhorting synagogue goers; 13:16–41) – hallmark activities of founding figures in Acts.¹ Moreover, in both this episode and the one in Lystra (14:8–20a), Paul gives speeches which involve “rewriting history”² in cultic contexts: “the center of Jewish cult

¹ Clare K. Rothschild, “Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13: The Denouement of the South Galatian Hypothesis,” *NovT* 54 (2012): 345; Pervo, *Acts*, 331. Cf. chapter 3.

² See Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, “Paul’s Speeches at Pisidian Antioch and Lystra: ‘Mise en histoire’ and Social Memory,” in *Actes du 1er Congrès international sur Antioche*

symbolized by the meeting in the synagogue on the one hand, and the gentile cult on the other, symbolized by the sacrificial cult and the temple of Zeus” (14:11–13).³

Finally, the Antiochene speech for the first time reveals the content of Paul’s message,⁴ and as such is analogous to Jesus’s inaugural sermon in Luke 4 and Peter’s in Acts 2.⁵ As Strauss notes, Peter and Paul provide “exemplary models of Luke’s view of the apostolic and Pauline kerygma to Jews,” and their speeches and the chapters in which they fall are “programmatically for Luke’s promise-fulfillment motif.”⁶ At the same time, bearing in mind Paul’s mandate to βασιτάσαι τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐν ὅπιοις ἐθνῶν ... υἱῶν τε ... Ἰσραήλ (9:15), it is significant that Paul should deliver the discourse in Antioch. As I demonstrate below, this colony – which was of great strategic importance to Rome in securing the central and southern regions of Anatolia – imitated the imperial capital via both its institutions and architectural monuments. Luke arguably places this episode in Antioch to anticipate the spread of the colonizing message to Rome (28:14–31).⁷ Thus the speech functions to legitimate second-generation colonization in one of the most Roman of colonies, Antioch of Pisidia. “Paul” accomplishes this by portraying the replication of Christianity here as a natural development in line with the founding of the cult community in Jerusalem, initiated by Jesus and carried forward by the apostles as his representatives.

de Pisidie, ed. Thomas Drew-Bear, Mehmet Taşalan, and Christine M. Thomas (Lyons: Université Lumière-Lyon 2, UMR 5649 du CNRS, 2002), 33–43.

³ Destro and Pesce, “Paul’s Speeches at Pisidian Antioch and Lystra,” 37.

⁴ Cf. John Eifion Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2014), 169. While Luke elsewhere has depicted Paul proclaiming/teaching (9:20, 28; 11:25–26), he “delays” an explanation of the full content of the apostle’s message until now, once the cult has spread outside Judea and Syria, possibly to build “expectation.” See Pervo, *Acts*, 332. Wenxi Zhang, *Paul Among the Jews: A Study of the Meaning and Significance of Paul’s Inaugural Sermon in the Synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13:16–41) for His Missionary Work among the Jews* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 151.

⁵ Graydon F. Snyder, “The God-Fearers in Paul’s Speech at Pisidian Antioch,” in *Actes du 1er Congrès international sur Antioche de Pisidie*, 45. Zhang, *Paul Among the Jews*; Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary*, 331.

⁶ Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 131.

⁷ Rothschild, “Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13,” 346–48. Rothschild argues that Acts 13 and 28 form an inclusio, bolstered in part by the preaching to Jews in both contexts (350). It is also significant that shortly before, the narrative shifts from referring to its protagonist as Saul to identifying him by his Roman name, Paul (13:13). Cf. Keener, *Acts*, 2:2021: “the primary reason for Luke’s transition at this point is that Paul’s ministry to Gentiles begins here, inviting Paul as well as Luke to shift to emphasis on his Roman name.”

5.2 Socio-Historical and Architectural Sketch of Antioch of Pisidia

A sketch of Antioch's history and monuments will help give a sense of the city's importance, especially in the early- to mid-imperial periods, and thus underscore the significance of Paul and Barnabas's venture there. This will lay the foundation for our examination of Acts 13. As we shall see, Antioch modeled itself after its mother city, Rome. It is for this reason an apt site for the Lukan Paul to expound the rhetoric of second-generation colonization, which began in earnest at Syrian Antioch and eventually reaches all the way to the empire's capital.

By the time Acts was written, Antioch had a well-established history as a colonized city.⁸ Prior to the Romans, sometime in the 3rd century BCE, the Seleucids (probably Antiochus I or II) colonized the inland city⁹ – which adjoined the Sultan Dağ Mountains and relied on the nearby Anthius River for its water¹⁰ – populating it with settlers from Magnesia-on-the-Meander.¹¹ Doubtless, they had a similar motive to the Romans who came later: control of the rugged interior of southern Anatolia. The Hellenistic rulers tried to inculcate the colony with their culture. By 200 BCE, Antioch already boasted the institutions of a “fully developed Greek *polis*”: *boule*, *demos*, *strategi*, *gramma-teis*.¹² Little has been excavated of the original Seleucid colony. However, it is likely that Antioch in this early period also featured quintessential Hellenistic buildings such as a theater, stadium, and temples.¹³ The evidence is secure, at least, for the erection of the sanctuary of Mên Askaênos atop Kara Kuyu east of Antioch,¹⁴ along with cultic activity there,¹⁵ beginning in the 2nd century BCE. For a time, the Attalids assumed nominal control of Antioch and the surrounding region, and later evidence of ties between what became Roman

⁸ On Antioch's history and monuments, see Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*; Stephen Mitchell and Marc Waelkens, *Pisidian Antioch: The Site and Its Monuments* (Swansea: Duckworth, 1998); Elaine K. Gazda and Diana Y. Ng, eds., *Building a New Rome: The Imperial Colony of Pisidian Antioch (25 BC–AD 700)* (Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, 2011).

⁹ Adrian J. Ossi and J. Matthew Harrington, “Pisidian Antioch: The Urban Infrastructure and Its Development,” in *Building a New Rome*, 15.

¹⁰ Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 42–44.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹² *Ibid.*, 72.

¹³ Ossi and Harrington, “Pisidian Antioch,” 17.

¹⁴ Katharine A. Raff, “The Architecture of the Sanctuary of Mên Askaênos: Exploration, Reconstruction, and Use,” in *Building a New Rome*, 151–52.

¹⁵ Lori Khatchadourian, “The Cult of Mên at Pisidian Antioch,” in *Building a New Rome*, 153–55.

Antioch and Pergamum suggest this was an impressionable period.¹⁶ The city formally came under Rome's purview when Attalus III died. However, it was only with the Galatian tetrarch Amyntas's death that the Romans (under Augustus) felt compelled to administer Antioch directly.¹⁷

Augustus founded *Antiocheia Caesarea* in 25 BCE as part of the new province of Galatia; later, the city achieved the status of *colonia*.¹⁸ Roads helped link interior cities like Antioch – along with the other Pisidian colonies founded around the same time – to the coast.¹⁹ Antioch was well positioned with respect to many of the minor roads,²⁰ and she stood along another road built only three decades later to secure Pisidia, the *via Sebaste*.²¹ As was his *modus operandi* concerning overseas colonies, Augustus settled Antioch with veterans from his legions²² – in this case from the V and the VII legions, whose soldiers largely hailed from northern and central Italy.²³ Most of the preexisting population of Greco-Phrygians remained, though the vast majority would have been incorporated into the colony as *incolae*, devoid of the citizen rights afforded to the new colonists.²⁴ Only the richest would enter the ranks of the city's elite and become “cultural liaisons” between the native population and new Roman colonists.²⁵ Yet despite this denial of privileges, native residents would have participated alongside new colonists “in the processes of becoming involved in the Empire,”²⁶ simply by virtue of their use of the colony's urban spaces (see below) and ritual practices. And, indeed, the planners of Antioch had taken care to model the colony after Rome itself.

These efforts at imitation are apparent in the colony's social and political organization, as well as in its architecture. Like Republican Rome, Antioch was

¹⁶ Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 125–27.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 28–29.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 34–37, 137.

¹⁹ Actually, Antioch lay in Phrygia not Pisidia. See Strabo 12.6.4; 8.14.

²⁰ Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 13, 18, 42.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 39.

²² *Ibid.*, 15; Salmon, *Roman Colonization under the Republic*, 141. Alcock, “Roman Colonies in the Eastern Empire,” 314, notes the continued presence of Roman soldiers in the colony following its founding.

²³ Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 60; Benjamin Rubin, “Ruler Cult and Colonial Identity: The Imperial Sanctuary at Pisidian Antioch,” in *Building a New Rome*, 33.

²⁴ Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 75.

²⁵ Rubin, “Ruler Cult and Colonial Identity,” 34.

²⁶ Rebecca Sweetman, “Introduction: 100 Years of Solitude: Colonies in the First Century of Their Foundation,” in *Roman Colonies in the First Century of Their Foundation*, ed. Rebecca J. Sweetman (Oxford: Oxbow, 2011), 1, 5, remarks that in most instances of Roman colonization native elements showed “greater participation” than is traditionally recognized. Cf. Alcock, “Roman Colonies in the Eastern Empire,” 315, nevertheless, who argues that the “epigraphic record makes clear that Antioch's political and economic life was dominated for centuries by the coloni and their descendants.”

divided up into *vici* (or “wards”) corresponding to the seven hills – again imitating Rome – upon which the city was built. Those naming the *vici* further reinforced the allusion by identifying them with Rome’s topography and seminal figures in its history. Like Rome initially, too, Antioch’s citizens were organized into tribes, which formed the basis for their voting.²⁷ By the same token, Antioch’s *ordo* followed that of the empire’s first city, comprising most notably the *populus*, *duoviri*, and *quaestors and aediles*.²⁸ As Levick observes, “the colonial government of Antioch was startling in the purity of its Roman forms and in the fidelity it showed to blueprints drawn up in the late Republic.”²⁹

Antioch’s Rome-centric *ethos* was reflected in its city planning and architecture, as well. Typical of a Roman colony, the intersection of the main north-south (*cardo maximus*) and east-west streets (*decumanus maximus*) – in this case at the end of the city – imposed order on Antioch’s urban environment. The planners likely also constructed in the northeast part of the city a Nymphaeum, which opened up into a platea (a paved area) that “may have been one of the important civic and commercial centers in the early days of the colony,”³⁰ possibly named the Augusta Platea if a nearby inscription is a relevant guide. The platea whose remains have been most thoroughly excavated, however, was positioned to the southeast of Antioch’s urban space. Discovery of Hellenistic coins suggest the area was popular even prior to Roman control, but the colonists repurposed it for their needs as a multi-purpose urban center, complete with “shops, bars, and restaurants lining the north and south sides of the platea.”³¹ This civic space has been identified as the “Tiberia Platea” on the basis of a nearby inscription, but its architectural context links it more intimately with the colony’s founder, Augustus.

Via a 12-step stairway that led to the propylon at its summit, the Tiberia Platea fed into the imperial cult complex, which was positioned at the eastern side of the city. The course as well as the destination proclaimed Antioch’s imperial ties. Indeed, features of the complex such as its “long axial development, with the temple awaiting the visitor at its end,” recall the forum of Augustus in Rome.³² The staircase itself featured an inscribed copy of the *Res Gestae*, the first-person reportage of Augustus’s achievements.³³ According to Suetonius, the *princeps* instructed that the declaration be inscribed on bronze tablets and placed in front of his mausoleum,³⁴ but the only surviving copies

²⁷ Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 76–78.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 78–90.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 91.

³⁰ Ossi and Harrington, “Pisidian Antioch,” 19.

³¹ Rubin, “Ruler Cult and Colonial Identity,” 41.

³² Alcock, “Roman Colonies of the Eastern Empire,” 316.

³³ The remains of the *Res Gestae* are preserved in the Yalvaç museum in Turkey.

³⁴ *Aug.* 101.4.

belong to the Galatian cities of Ankara, Apollonia, and Antioch.³⁵ This geographical placement of the *Res Gestae* would have acted as ideological glue linking the eastern – and notoriously “troublesome” – region of the empire to Rome itself.³⁶ The *Res Gestae* would have had a special effect in the most prestigious of the “Pisidian” colonies, Antioch. Here the copy was inscribed in Latin,³⁷ catering to the language of the veteran soldiers comprising the core of the colony’s population. Its placement on the stairway was not incidental. Güven observes that the Romans “trained themselves to ‘remember’ ideas locating ideas in space.”³⁸ In this instance the looming imagery of the propylon framed the declarations of the *Res Gestae*, rendering a sort of “visual code,” which relayed official Roman propaganda.³⁹ For the citizens and *incolae* of Antioch, the *Res Gestae* and its architectural context would have functioned as a “form of mapping for organizing memory,”⁴⁰ inviting them to recall their Augustan origins.

The *Res Gestae* covers much ground. Broadly, it addresses Augustus’s honors, awarded by the senate, which piled up through his celebrated accomplishments (1–14); Augustus’s benefactions to citizens and veterans alike, including his currency, games, and spectacles (15–24); and Augustus’s martial and peacetime achievements (25–35).⁴¹ The tone of the documents is measured; nevertheless, the figure that emerges is larger-than-life, even indispensable. Augustus brought order to geo-politics. Not only did he restore the republic,⁴² he also “placed the whole world under the sovereignty of the Roman people” (*Res Gest. Divi Aug. preface* [Shipley, LCL]), bringing to heel the Dacians⁴³ and other newly subjected peoples.⁴⁴ Meanwhile he planted colonies throughout “Africa, Sicily, Macedonia, both Spain, Achaia, Asia, Syria, Gallia Narbonensis, Pisidia” (*Res Gest. Divi Aug. 28* [Shipley, LCL]), in order both to provide land for his veterans and to ensure the Roman character of regions under imperial control. Through these means, the *Res Gestae* implies, Augustus established a Roman order which presided over far-off places such as Pisidian Antioch.

³⁵ See Suna Güven, “Displaying the *Res Gestae* of Augustus: A Monument of Imperial Imagery for All,” *JSAH* 57 (1998): 30–45.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 40.

³⁷ The *Res Gestae* at Ankara, affixed to the Temple of Rome and Augustus, was written in Greek and Latin; the copy at Apollonia was written in Greek. Güven, “Displaying the *Res Gestae* of Augustus,” 33, argues that the Latin copy in Antioch reflects that colony’s character as a “simulacrum of Rome.”

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 40.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ See Frederick W. Shipley, “Introduction to the *Res Gestae* of Augustus,” LCL, 336.

⁴² *Res Gest. Divi Aug. 1* (cf. 34).

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 30.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 26.

Augustus proved worthy of veneration not only on account of his empire-building, but also due to his beneficence and piety. He showcased his generosity to the general public with games and spectacles; yet he was equally attentive to his soldiers, at one point awarding 10,000 sesterces to veteran colonists.⁴⁵ Augustus demonstrated his piety to the gods by constructing and repairing temples around Rome, such as the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine hill⁴⁶ and the Temple of Mars Ultor.⁴⁷ In this way, Augustus claims that he patronized 82 temples in Rome. The homeland could not contain his piety: In Asia he replaced votive objects which Antony and his supporters seized from regional temples.⁴⁸

Augustus's achievements, beneficence, and piety established him as a mediator-like figure between his subjects and the gods. No wonder that the senate decreed fifty-five times that "thanks should be rendered to the immortal gods" (Res Gest. Divi Aug. 4 [Shipley, LCL]) on his behalf; or that it stipulated that "every fifth year vows should be undertaken for my health by the consuls and the priests" (Res Gest. Divi Aug. 9 [Shipley, LCL]); or that it "consecrated ... an altar to Fortuna Redux" in his honor, where "the pontiffs and the Vestal virgins ... [were to] perform a yearly sacrifice" (Res Gest. Divi Aug. 11 [Shipley, LCL]); or that it established "an altar to Pax Augusta in the Campus Martius" on which "the magistrates and priests and Vestal virgins [were] to make annual sacrifice" (Res Gest. Divi Aug. 12 [Shipley, LCL]); or even that the entire populace sacrificed "at all the couches of the gods" (Res Gest. Divi Aug. 9 [Shipley, LCL]) on Augustus's behalf. Given these sentiments in the *Res Gestae*, it is apropos that the inscription's placement in Antioch coincided with an ascent to the Augustan arch, which led into a civic space devoted to worship of the emperor.

The staircase ascended to a triple-arched propylon saturated with Augustan imagery. There were also allusions to the local god Mên Askaênos, who "appears in the attic frieze of the propylon dressed as a youthful warrior wearing a horned helmet and a sword scabbard slung across his chest."⁴⁹ Mên played an important role in the identity of Antioch. To the east of the city of Antioch stood his sanctuary, containing two temples (one within the *temenos*), a small theater or odeion, and nearly 20 single- and double-self-standing rooms – most likely designed for dining and other ritual-related activities.⁵⁰ The sanctuary probably originated in the Hellenistic period, but it enjoyed a "renaissance ...

⁴⁵ Ibid., 15.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 19.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 21.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 24.

⁴⁹ Rubin, "Ruler Cult and Colonial Identity," 42.

⁵⁰ Raff, "The Architecture of the Sanctuary of Mên Askaênos," 31.

in the Antonine period and beyond,”⁵¹ underscored by a statue of Cornelia Antonia that was discovered in its premises.⁵² Moreover, among the significant number of inscriptions found in the sanctuary are many dedications from Italians,⁵³ including both free-standing and *naiskoi* inscriptions.⁵⁴ Possibly, as Lane argues, the Romans patronized the cult in part due to the felicitous linguistic connection between the epithet of Mên and Ascanius, the son of Aeneas – and thus between the cult and the Romans, who traced their origins to Anatolia through descent from the Trojan hero.⁵⁵ Indeed, numismatic and iconographic evidence throughout Asia Minor testifies to the popularity of Mên during the Roman period.⁵⁶

But the Romans probably also saw an “ideological benefit” in promoting this cult in Antioch,⁵⁷ near the rough and tumble region of Pisidia. Doing so was a savvy means of fostering common identity among the colony’s heterogeneous – Italian and Greek-Phrygian – residents; indeed the dedicatory inscriptions eschew ethnic or geographical identity and instead focus on the devotee’s familial bonds and/or membership in the *xenoi tekmoreioi*, the cult association.⁵⁸ Common devotion to the cult, in addition to Rome’s own putative links to the god through Aeneas, would have furnished a vehicle “to reinforce Roman authority in Anatolia.”⁵⁹ Arguably, the allusion to Mên on the propylon amid images associated with Augustus represents an early expression of this same instinct to co-opt the Anatolian god for service of a Roman-centric worldview.

The neighboring articulations, at any rate, loudly proclaimed the preeminence of the Roman founder of Antioch. Sculptures on the exterior (western) and interior (eastern) faces of the propylon “celebrated the victories of Augustus on land and sea.”⁶⁰ The attic frieze displayed weapons and trophies and Augustus’s astrological sign, Capricorn, while victories, *genii*, and captive barbarians adorned the arch spandrels of both sides.⁶¹ Statues on the attic, circa 2 meters in height, featured the *princeps* himself alongside members of the

⁵¹ Khatchadourian, “The Cult of Mên at Pisidian Antioch,” 164; cf. 172. Raff, “The Architecture of the Sanctuary of Mên Askaênos,” 151–52.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 161–62.

⁵³ Andrea U. De Giorgi, “Colonial Space and the City: Augustus’s Geopolitics in Pisidia,” in *Roman Colonies in the First Century of Their Foundation*, 141.

⁵⁴ Khatchadourian, “The Cult of Mên at Pisidian Antioch,” 164.

⁵⁵ Eugene N. Lane, “The Italian Connection: An Aspect of the Cult of Men,” *Numen* 22 (1975): 236–37.

⁵⁶ Lane, “The Italian Connection”; Ulrich W. Hiesinger, “Three Images of the God Mên,” *HSCP* 71 (1967): 303–10; Khatchadourian, “The Cult of Mên at Pisidian Antioch,” 158–64.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 172.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 158, 164, 172.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 164.

⁶⁰ Rubin, “Ruler Cult and Colonial Identity,” 42.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

imperial family and the goddess Victoria.⁶² This heavy use of Augustan imagery was fitting given the destination of those walking through the arch – the imperial temple complex.

The complex provided an arena to celebrate Antioch's imperial origins. The imperial cult temple, of course, served as the focal point for imperial cult worship. However, those who entered through the arch were immediately encircled by a colonnaded plaza, complete with single-story porticos and a limestone-paved floor designed to facilitate foot traffic during processions. As Rubin observes, the porticos were multi-functional: They offered shelter for festival participants, housed honorific statues, and provided an "architectural frame" for the temple positioned at the end of the complex.⁶³ The typically Roman temple (platform, prostyle, Corinthian order) was adorned with images heralding the *Pax Romana*, from the vegetal frieze on the cella's exterior wall, possibly inspired by sculpture on the *Ara Pacis*, to the bucrania and fruit-laden garland on the pedimental frieze.⁶⁴ The temple also contained six akroteria, some of which allude to Cleopatra as well as Artemis, patron deity of Magnesia-on-the-Maeander (Antioch's *metropolis* in the Hellenistic period) and sister of Apollo, Augustus's patron deity.⁶⁵ The most likely candidate for the temple's dedicatory inscription leaves little doubt about Augustus's place among the gods. The tripartite inscription, which might have stood on the altar, dedicates the structure to Jupiter Optimus, Augustus, and the Genius of the Colony. The position of his name in the dedication casts Augustus as a sort of "liminal" figure, enabling him to act "in effect, as Jupiter's chosen agent on earth."⁶⁶ For locals, one of the most tangible expressions of Augustus's mediatorial responsibilities was his role as founder of their colony, Antioch.

In the second century, Antioch would build another structure that tapped into the symbolism of its founding, the arch of Hadrian and Sabina.⁶⁷ This arch was erected in the southwest part of Antioch's urban space and led northward into a "highly functional urban space,"⁶⁸ or platea. The platea was bordered by shops on the east and (possibly) west sides and bifurcated by a stepped cascade running down the center and culminating in a semi-circular fountain, which stood inside the arch's entryway. Evocative sculptures embellished the

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid., 45–47.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 49.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 50.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 55.

⁶⁷ At a later stage, the arch was "converted into a true closeable gate." Adrian J. Ossi, "The Arch of Hadrian and Sabina at Pisidian Antioch: Imperial Associations, Ritual Connections, and Civic Euergetism," in *Building a New Rome*, 88. Moreover, four statue bases meant for holding "reclining animals, such as lions, or for small equestrian statues" were mounted in front of the arch (ibid., 91).

⁶⁸ Ibid., 106.

southern and northern façades of the arch. On the southern side of the arch, the central spandrels depict bound captives kneeling beside torches and wreaths. (This imagery projecting Roman dominance anticipates similar depictions in the relief program of the Sebasteion in Aphrodisias, such as a subdued Britannia and Armenia.)⁶⁹ The spandrels of the side passageway of the southern facade, meanwhile, feature *genii* connected by rows of garlands, at the center of which stands bucrania. Above the spandrel sculptures runs an inscription dedicating the arch to Hadrian and his wife Sabina, and above the inscription runs a frieze populated with military symbols and creatures, such as hippocamps, tritons, and winged figures.

The northern façade likewise bustles with suggestive imagery. The spandrels of the central archway portray kneeling figures holding out military emblems, while those of the side passageways depict winged victories linked by rows of garland, again joined at the center by bucrania.⁷⁰ The inscription above credits Gaius Julius Asper Pansinianus with dedicating the arch. Meanwhile, vegetal imagery such as palmettes feature in the frieze that runs above the inscription. Taken as a whole, the arch's imagery proclaims the military victories and prosperity ushered in by the Romans under Hadrian. The fact that the arch stood in such a busy urban space, and that it was dedicated by one of the local elites, conveyed Antioch's participation in this Roman-ordered universe.

But this is hardly the extent of the arch's symbolic potency: It also linked Antioch's Roman present to its Roman past. As Ossi observes, the broader context for the arch's dedication was intercity competition, played out in literary and architectural arenas and most often predicated on claims to the greatest antiquity – usually of the mythical variety. As a relatively recent foundation, however, Antioch instead staked its reputation on the city's identity as a Roman colony.⁷¹

In view of this approach, it is significant that the occasion of Pansinianus's dedication may have been a visit to the city by the current emperor, Hadrian. For Hadrian's Arch, through its architecture and imagery, alludes to Augustus's Arch – erected roughly at the time of Antioch's foundation as a Roman colony. Like its predecessor, the arch of Hadrian and Sabina is triple-bayed; and the two are of similar width. The likeness of imagery of the latter arch to that of the former is particularly striking, however. This is especially true of the friezes: Both depict tritons with trophies and weapons and armor of various kinds. It is also the case with the spandrel sculptures featuring winged figures with rows of garland between them – both *genii* holding grapes and victories

⁶⁹ See chapter 3.

⁷⁰ The bucrania here possibly allude to Mên. See Ossi, “The Arch of Hadrian and Sabina at Pisidian Antioch,” 101–4, who speculates that the arch might “have been a major architectural marker along the [hypothetical] processional route” between the extramural sanctuary of the god and the imperial cult complex.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 107.

grasping “emblems of victory such as wreaths or palm fronds.”⁷² Ossi demonstrates persuasively, moreover, that the imitative impulse is also revealed in two other sculptures in Hadrian’s arch: The hippocamps in the frieze (representing Hadrian) correspond to the Capricorn (representing Augustus) in the earlier arch; a fragment depicting a bent knee in the spandrel of the central passageway probably corresponds to the bound captive motif in the arch of Augustus.⁷³ These parallels served more than an aesthetic function: They linked Antioch’s present to its defining past as a colony founded by Augustus,⁷⁴ effectively casting Hadrian as a “second founder.”⁷⁵

5.3 Paul’s Speech: The Rhetoric of “Second-Generation” Colonization

5.3.1 Introduction

The above sketch of Antioch’s history and architecture conveys the city’s ideological orientation toward Rome. Luke had a purpose in locating Paul’s inaugural sermon in this colony. Though he may not have possessed any source material about an apostolic stint here,⁷⁶ he was surely cognizant of the city’s pretensions to be a simulacrum of Rome. Like the city itself, Luke’s narrative evinces an ideological character: It aims at the foundation of a new Christian colony based on the conviction that Jesus is God’s appointed savior for Jews and Godfearers alike. The sermon functions in part to establish continuity between this aim and Jewish sacred history. But to be sure, Rome looms large in Luke’s account. Paul’s founding acts in this Roman colony anticipates his eventual voyage to the empire’s capital, a successful outcome of his colonizing mandate (9:15).⁷⁷

⁷² Ibid., 97.

⁷³ Ibid., 98.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 100.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 108.

⁷⁶ Or so the dearth of descriptive detail about the city itself seems to suggest. Ibid., 342–43. Cf. Keener, *Acts*, 2:2032. Peter Pilhofer, “Luke’s Knowledge of Pisidian Antioch,” in *Actes du Ier Congres international sur Antioche de Pisidie*, 77–83. Pilhofer tempers skepticism about Luke’s knowledge of the area, concluding that there is some “truth contained in this section [of Acts], i.e., information which is in accord with local conditions” (83).

⁷⁷ Rothschild, “Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13,” 348–49. Cf. Stephen Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 2:7; Keener, *Acts*, 2:2036. The Roman character of the colony also supports an analogy of civic ties: between historical Rome and its colony Pisidian Antioch, on the one hand, and between Luke’s depiction of the Syrian Antioch’s community and that of its colony Pisidian Antioch, on the other. In chapter 4, I demonstrated how Syrian Antioch functions as mother city due to its leadership institutions, identity markers, and above all, the divine sanction it received for its

Luke's founding account of the Antiochene community involves many of the elements which characterize both prior and succeeding episodes: shifting locations,⁷⁸ multiple characters,⁷⁹ and mixed results.⁸⁰ But the centerpiece of the narrative is the speech, which runs from verse 16 through verse 41. Paul is invited to give it by the ἀρχισυνάγωγοι following the reading of the law and prophets (13:15).⁸¹ After relating their departure from Cyprus, Luke rushes Paul and his companions to this moment in the synagogue at Antioch,⁸² pausing only to report their intermediate stop in Perge (13:13).⁸³ In having him gesture with his hand – κατασείσας τῆ χειρὶ (13:16) – , Luke has Paul take “the stance of a Hellenistic orator,”⁸⁴ thereby heightening anticipation of his speech. The speech itself represents an opportunity, near the outset of Paul's founding activities, to delineate the rationale of second-generation colonization.

Various approaches are employed to identify the speech's structure.⁸⁵ Drawing on rhetorical traditions in Classical Greece, Kennedy concludes that Paul's Antiochene speech represents a form of epideictic rhetoric, whose purpose is

colonizing mission. Recall that the community sent out Barnabas and Saul/Paul in cooperation with the Holy Spirit's mandate (13:2, 4). From there they first headed to Cyprus, where they preached in the synagogues at Salamis (13:4–5) before crossing the island to Paphos, where Saul blinded Elymas the *magus* winning the conversion of the proconsul Sergius Paulus (13:6–12). After leaving Cyprus, Paul and Barnabas (minus John) make their way to Pisidian Antioch via Perge (13:13), though this would not have been a “feasible” itinerary. See Rothschild, “Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13,” 343.

⁷⁸ Entrance into and exit from the synagogue is marked at 13:14 and 13:42, respectively. Luke is less specific about where Paul and Barnabas visit outside the synagogue, though his remarks imply movement about the city (13:43–44). In 13:50–51 he records their forced departure from Antioch.

⁷⁹ Aside from Paul and his companions (13:13; including Barnabas [13:46]), Luke introduces οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι (13:15); Jewish and gentile synagogue goers (13:16, 26, 38); both Jewish and gentile converts (13:43) and Jewish opponents (13:45, 50) from this group; new gentile converts (13:48); “devout women of prominence” and “the first men of the city” whom Jews incite against Paul and Barnabas (13:50).

⁸⁰ See 13:43, 45, 48–49, 50.

⁸¹ These “officials” were likely to have been benefactors, whether Jewish or gentile. See Keener, *Acts*, 2:2046.

⁸² Cf. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 148; Rothschild, “Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13,” 345.

⁸³ Keener, *Acts*, 2:2045, suggests that Paul gave his “word of exhortation” on the Sabbath following his arrival in Antioch.

⁸⁴ Marion L. Soards, *The Speeches of Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 81. Cf. George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 124.

⁸⁵ For different proposals, see Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 62–68; Keener, *Acts*, 2:2053–55. Keener himself settles on the following division: Proem (13:16); *Narratio* (13:17–31); *Propositio* (13:32); *Probatio* (13:33–37); Deliberative *peroration* (13:38–41).

to sway opinion.⁸⁶ He determines that there are five sections to it: a formal proem in verse 16; a narration in verses 17–25; a proposition in verse 26; a proof in verses 27–37; and an epilogue in verses 38–41.⁸⁷ Wills looks to other examples of discourse in Hellenistic Judaism and early Christianity for guidance. He deduces three major divisions based on patterns he discovers in other literature from this milieu. He designates verses 16b–37 as exempla constituting salvation history (vv. 16b–33a) and scriptural allusions (vv. 33b–37); verses 38–39 as a conclusion that “carries the weight of a designated truth”; and verses 40–41 as logically following exhortation.⁸⁸ Kilgallen analyzes the speech based on temporal indicators. This scheme produces a division between those verses that relate events in the ancient (vv. 17–22) and recent (23–31a; 33–37) past, on the one hand, and those that depict present events (vv. 31b–32; 38–41).⁸⁹ The reason why verses 33–37 revert to the recent past is so that Paul can “show how witness and scripture combine to make ... [the resurrection] the essential condition of salvation for the Antiocheans.”⁹⁰ As suggested by the οὖν in verse 38, *inter alia*, the “climactic” verses of the sermon are 38–39.

Strauss and Holladay’s understanding of the speech’s structure is nearest to my own.⁹¹ Strauss divides the speech according to the “three major addresses”: ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται (v. 16); Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν (v. 26); and ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί (v. 38). This yields a two-part sermon (16b–25; 26–37) followed by a direct exhortation to the audience (vv. 38–41).⁹² Holladay’s scheme has the advantage of isolating discrete moments in the speech, five to be exact.⁹³ Section one relates Israelite history from Abraham⁹⁴ to David (vv. 17–22). Section two brings Israelite history from David up to Jesus (vv. 23–25), whose significance is the focal point of the following two sections. Section three introduces Jesus as the “message of salvation” (vv. 26–

⁸⁶ Cf. Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 66.

⁸⁷ Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 124–25. Kennedy neglects to include verses 38–39 in the epilogue.

⁸⁸ Lawrence Wills, “The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity,” *HTR* 77 (1984): 279. Wills tentatively suggests that this form – of which he adduces numerous examples in Hellenistic Judaism, New Testament, and early Christian literature – is traceable “to the innovations in Greek oratory in the fifth century BCE” (297).

⁸⁹ John J. Kilgallen, “Acts 13:38–39: Culmination of Paul’s Speech in Pisidia,” *Biblica* 69 (1988): 487–89.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 488–89.

⁹¹ However, this does not negate the value of the other structural proposals.

⁹² Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 156. See also Pervo, *Acts*, 335; Zhang, *Paul Among the Jews*, 122–24; Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 62. Cf. Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 79, who further identifies verses 46–47 as an epilogue.

⁹³ See Carl Holladay, *Acts: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2016), 275–79.

⁹⁴ Contra Pervo, *Acts*, 335, who claims that the “historical review begins with the sojourn in Egypt” (rather than with Abraham or Moses).

31), while section four expounds the related theme of his resurrection (vv. 32–37). Finally, section five extends the message of salvation – along with a warning – to the Antiochenes (vv. 38–41). In my own analysis, I will refer alike to Strauss and Holladay's organizational schemes. For while the three addresses (vv. 16b, 26, 38) do probably dictate the formal structure of the sermon, much like Peter's Pentecost speech in Acts 2, the five-fold division favored by Holladay helps isolate the thematic movements which occur at different junctures (vv. 17, 23, 26, 32, 38).

One way or another, each of the analyses of the speech's structure at least implicitly recognizes the climactic nature of the last several verses, where the rehearsal of Israelite history culminating in Jesus's appearance pays out in the form of salvation offered: "Therefore, let it be known to you, brothers, that through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed. By him, everyone who believes is delivered from all those sins which you were not able to be delivered by the law of Moses" (vv. 38–39). This closing appeal suggests that the proclamation of salvation represents the chief strategy employed by Paul (and Barnabas) as they to seek to "plant a colony" of Christians at Antioch.

5.3.2 *The Ancestral Prehistory (13:17–22)*

5.3.2.1 *Introduction*

When approaching the speech as colonizing rhetoric, we can begin to see how Luke lays the groundwork for the final appeal in 13:38–41. This first section – or subsection – offers a retelling of Israel's history (vv. 17–22), what might be called an ancestral prehistory.⁹⁵ Jeska has shown that summaries of Israelite history were not uncommon in Jewish works of antiquity; while not a distinct genre, they represented a "Strukturelement" in addresses, prayers, hymns and songs, vision reports and interpretation, and prophetic and divine speech.⁹⁶ Here, the survey anticipates the present work of God among the Antiochenes and thus serves as a kind of prehistory.

I have also discussed a number of other pre-histories which function as examples of proto-colonization in Greek and Roman contexts. In fact, above I noted that while the colonists of Antioch preferred to stress the city's foundation under Augustus, neighboring cities distinguished themselves through claims to ancient origins which predated historical foundations of the Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. Similar examples of this phenomenon abound from other parts of the ancient Mediterranean world. These

⁹⁵ Cf. Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 82: Verses 17–23 offer a "retelling of events in Genesis, Exodus 6, Deuteronomy 1 and 7, Joshua 14–17, 1 Samuel 7–10, 15–16, and 2 Samuel 7 and 22."

⁹⁶ Joachim Jeska, *Die Geschichte Israels in der Sicht des Lukas: Apg 7,2b-53 und 13,17-22 im Kontext antik-jüdischer Summarien der Geschichte Israels* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 21–22.

include: the Dorian and Ionian migrations;⁹⁷ Croton's settlement by "Achaean" returning from the Trojan War⁹⁸ – or else by its eponymous founder;⁹⁹ Sicily's occupation by Cyclopes and Laestrygonians;¹⁰⁰ Cyrene's colonization by Euphemus via a gift of earth,¹⁰¹ the Trojan Antenoridai,¹⁰² and the eponymous nymph seized by Apollo;¹⁰³ Rome and/or its surrounding territory's founding by "Aborigines,"¹⁰⁴ Pelasgians,¹⁰⁵ Arcadians,¹⁰⁶ Hercules,¹⁰⁷ Aeneas,¹⁰⁸ and his son Ascanius;¹⁰⁹ and Antioch of Syria's colonization by Triptolemus and the Argives,¹¹⁰ Casus and the Cretans,¹¹¹ Cypriots,¹¹² Heraclidai and Eleans,¹¹³ and eventually Alexander.¹¹⁴

In some cases, proto-colonization licensed the transfer of cult.¹¹⁵ Thus, the foundation of Cyrene involved the transfer of Apollo's cult in Pindar's accounts,¹¹⁶ and the foundations of Syrian Antioch entailed the transfer of Zeus's cult according to Libanius.¹¹⁷ These examples of proto-colonization furnished ancient reference points for later (historical) generations wishing to articulate and legitimate their settlement/residence in the land. In like manner, the pre-history in Paul's sermon is designed to root the Antiochene's experience of the colonizing message of salvation (13:26, 32–41)¹¹⁸ in ancient realities – namely, God's former savings acts on behalf of his people.

⁹⁷ On the Dorian migration, see Tyrtaeus, *Eunomia*; Pindar, *Pyth.* 5.75; Herodotus 9.26; Thucydides 1.12. On the Ionian migration, see Solon fr. 4a; Pherecydes fr. 155; Herodotus 1.145; Thucydides 1.12. Cf. chapter 2.

⁹⁸ Strabo 6.1.12.

⁹⁹ Ovid, *Metam.* 15.9–18; cf. chapter 2.

¹⁰⁰ Thucydides 6.2.1–2; cf. chapter 2.

¹⁰¹ Pindar, *Pyth.* 4.23; cf. Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, 163.

¹⁰² Pindar, *Pyth.* 5.83–86.

¹⁰³ Pindar, *Pyth.* 9.1–8; cf. chapter 2.

¹⁰⁴ Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.11–15; 2.1.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.17–30.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 1.31–33; 2.1.3–4.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 1.34; 2.1.4.

¹⁰⁸ Livy 1.1–17; Plutarch, *Rom.*; Dionysius 1.34–65.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 1.66; cf. chapter 2.

¹¹⁰ Libanius, *Or.* 11.52.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.* 11.52–53.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 11.54.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 11.56.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 11.77; cf. chapter 4.

¹¹⁵ See chapters 2 and 4.

¹¹⁶ Pindar, *Pyth.* 4, 5, and 9.

¹¹⁷ Libanius, *Or.* 11.

¹¹⁸ For the argument that salvation in Acts functions as the means of colonization, see chapter 2.

5.3.2.2 Prehistory as Preparation: The Sovereign and Providential Care of God

Indeed, it is clear that the verses leading up to verse 23, where Luke introduces the savior Jesus, are preparatory since they stress "God's sovereign choice and providential care for his people."¹¹⁹ We have demonstrated in previous chapters that the emphasis on divine initiative is one which typifies many colonization accounts. Here we encounter it in the way God's actions serve as the catalyst for most of what occurs in Israel's history.¹²⁰ He "chose our fathers" (v. 17a), "made the people great" in Egypt (v. 17b), "led them out" of Egypt (v. 17c), "put up with/cared for them in the wilderness" (v. 18), "destroyed seven nations" (v. 19), "gave them judges until Samuel" (v. 20), "gave" and "removed" Saul (v. 21), and "raised up David" (v. 22b). The primary act ascribed to the people, requesting a king (v. 21a), is one which God revokes with his removal of Saul (v. 22a).¹²¹ His replacement of Saul with David – ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃ ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου (v. 22) – , therefore, restores the emphasis on divine orchestration in Israel's history.¹²² And it is here, too, when God's providential care begins to assume a more specific shape since Luke's Paul informs us that it was from David's¹²³ "seed" (τοῦ σπέρματος) that "God brought to Israel a savior as he promised" (v. 23). The remaining parts of the speech unpack the significance of this statement about Jesus's relation to David.

In fact, one can make out an "arc" in the narrative that runs from Abraham (alluded to in v. 17a) to David (vv. 22) and then finally to Jesus (vv. 23).¹²⁴ But Luke needs only five verses to advance the narrative up to David (vv. 17–21) and then merely an additional two to bring it home to Jesus (vv. 22–23).¹²⁵ In Stephen's speech, by comparison, the narrative of Israel's history requires forty-six verses to reach David.¹²⁶ In other words, just as Luke rushes Paul and

¹¹⁹ Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 158. Cf. Pervo, *Acts*, 335; Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 82.

¹²⁰ Keener, *Acts*, 2:2050, writes of the "pattern of God's working throughout biblical history, particularly in the key moments revealing the development of his plan."

¹²¹ Sean M. McDonough, "Saul to Paul, Again," *JBL* (2006): 390–91, suggests that Paul's name change from Saul in 13:9, 13 is in part meant to forge a parallel with the "negative role" played by Saul in this Antiochene speech.

¹²² Cf. Zhang, *Paul Among the Jews*, 132.

¹²³ Τοῦτο, which refers to David, is set in the frontal position and as such is emphatic.

¹²⁴ Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 94.

¹²⁵ This despite the fact that the history leading up to the judges is (following the NA²⁸ editors) to have lasted "for about four hundred fifty years" (ὡς ἔτεσιν τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντήκοντα; v. 20). The D-text tradition witnesses to an alternative identifying the period of the judges as lasting four hundred fifty years. See the discussion by Holladay, *Acts*, 266.

¹²⁶ However, Paul "develops at greater length the point of 7:45–46 [relating to David] in 13:19–22" (Keener, *Acts*, 2:2060).

his companions to the synagogue in Antioch, he rushes the apostle to the subject of King David and his heir Jesus, which then dominates the remainder of the discourse (vv. 22–39). This stands in tension with other historical surveys in the Hebrew Bible,¹²⁷ where “it is the entry into the land which is seen to be the fulfillment of God’s promise to Abraham.”¹²⁸ We will see that behind the reference to ἡ ἐπαγγελία fulfilled in Jesus’s life, death, and resurrection¹²⁹ stands God’s promises to David in 2 Sam 7:11–16.¹³⁰ It is also possible that God’s rehearsal of Israel’s history in 2 Sam 7:6–11a establishes the pattern for Paul’s prehistory,¹³¹ or at least provides its “conceptual framework.”¹³² Therefore, we might say that just as God’s recitation prepared the way for his gracious promises to David in 2 Samuel 7, Paul’s recitation prepares for Jesus’s fulfillment of those promises in Acts 13. It is thus worth reflecting on a few moments in the prehistory to consider their “preparatory” value – in anticipation both of Jesus and the Antiochenes’ encounter with his salvation.

Paul’s address at the very beginning of the sermon signals how Luke wishes to connect the experience of Antiochenes to the sacred history of God’s gracious actions on behalf of his people: ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν (13:16b). Ἰσραηλῖται anticipates Ἰσραήλ – or, τοῦ λαοῦ Ἰσραήλ – in verse 17, linking Paul’s audience with the recipients of God’s favor in the narrative which follows. Further, the address of “those who fear God” (οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν) implies that Israel’s history is also of relevance to the non-Jews present. Despite Kraabel’s assertions,¹³³ there were certainly gentiles at the time who, though stopping short of full conversion, attended the synagogue and/or were attracted to ethical aspects of Judaism.¹³⁴ The term which

¹²⁷ Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 79–82, lists ten: Deut 6:20–24; 26:5–9; Josh 24:2–13; 1 Sam 12:8–13; Neh 9:6–13; Ps 78:5–72; 105; 106, 135; and 136. Cf. Jeska, *Die Geschichte Israels in der Sicht des Lukas*, 44–115.

¹²⁸ Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 82.

¹²⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, 207: “One of the major themes [of the speech is that] ... Jesus represents the climax of God’s dealings with the people elected by God (13.23, 32).”

¹³⁰ See Dale Goldsmith, “Acts 13:33–37: A Peshon on II Samuel 7,” *JBL* 87 (1968): 321–24.

¹³¹ J. W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Company, 1954), 172.

¹³² Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 150. Cf. J. W. Bowker, “Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form,” *NTS* 14 (1967–1968): 104; Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 77–78, 84, 90.

¹³³ A. Thomas Kraabel, “The Disappearance of the ‘Godfearers,’” *Numen* 28 (1981): 113–26.

¹³⁴ Paula Fredriksen, “If It Looks like a Duck, and It Quacks like a Duck ...: On Not Giving up the Godfearers,” in *A Most Reliable Witness: Essays in Honor of Ross Shepard Kraemer*, ed. Susan Ashbrook Harvey (Providence: Brown University Press, 2015), 25–34, argues for the validity of the concept of Godfearer in antiquity – even if not as a technical category of individuals. Cf. John Gager, “Jews, Gentiles, and Synagogues in the Book of

that came to refer to such people by the third century was θεοσεβής. Writing much earlier, however, Luke employs different terminology to refer to gentiles who revered the God of the Jews: φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν (10:2, 22, 35; 13:16, 26); σεβομενή τὸν θεόν (16:14; 18:7; cf. 18:13); and sometimes just σεβομένοι (13:43, 50; 17:4, 17).

To further complicate the identification of such gentiles, Luke uses these terms in different ways.¹³⁵ His normal use of σεβόμενος – whether with or without τὸν θεόν – seems to designate those gentiles who were merely attracted to Judaism without converting. However, in 13:43 προσηλύτων modifies τῶν σεβομένων, confirming that the referents are gentiles who converted to Judaism. Based on this meaning here, Morgan-Wynne argues that “God-fearer” in 13:16 and 26, though a different phrase in the Greek (φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν), bears the same sense.¹³⁶ But this cannot be proved beyond a doubt, since elsewhere Luke seems to use the phrase to denote gentile sympathizers – not full converts (10:2, 22, 35). Likely he employs φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν in the sermon in the same general way, to designate gentiles attracted to Judaism. Then, as the narrative progresses, he employs σεβομενή (with modifiers) to refer to more specific classes of people – God-fearing proselytes (13:43) and women of high standing (13:50). Paul’s address in 13:16, 26 is intended to show that the unfolding of God’s relationship with Israel is one that concerns both Jews (ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλιταί) and gentiles (οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν).

As I have suggested, the ancestral prehistory anticipates the encounter with the savior Jesus later in the speech. We see this preparatory function in God’s benevolent actions on behalf of his people, both prior to and once they had come into the land of Canaan. God’s affection and providence spans multiple “moments” in Israel’s history: election (v. 17a), sojourn in Egypt (παροικία ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτου; v. 17b), exodus (v. 17c), wilderness wandering (v. 18), conquest and settlement (v. 19), time of the judges (v. 20a), period of Samuel (v. 20b), and monarchy (vv. 21–22). Paul’s description of each moment is concise. However, reading his overall rehearsal in light of Stephen’s in Acts 7 amplifies the sovereign and providential care of God throughout Israel’s history.¹³⁷

Acts,” *HTS* 79 (1986): 91–99; Snyder, “The Godfearers in Paul’s Speech at Pisidian Antioch,” 45–52.

¹³⁵ Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 73.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 70.

¹³⁷ There are differences between the speeches’ setting, purpose, and even content. Stephen’s takes place in Jerusalem before the Sanhedrin (7:12); Paul’s occurs in a diaspora synagogue μετὰ δὲ ἀνάγνωσιν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν (13:15). Stephen’s speech offers a roundabout defense of himself while condemning the hardheartedness of Jerusalem’s religious leaders (7:51–53); Paul’s concentrates on the extension of salvation to his hearers (13:38–39). These varied purposes in turn help explain one of the chief differences in content: Stephen’s speech provides much more detail about the ancestral traditions, particularly as related to Moses (7:27–29, 35a, 39–43), in order to develop the pattern of

Choosing a People

Several examples illustrate this amplification. At the very beginning of the prehistory, Paul's assertion that ὁ θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου Ἰσραὴλ ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πατέρας (v. 17a)¹³⁸ recalls the appearance of Ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης to Abraham (7:2); his command to leave behind his relatives and homeland (7:3); his promise of land both to him and his descendants (7:3, 5); his prophecy about their future; and his establishment of διαθήκην περιτομῆς (7:8) – seven verses in all.¹³⁹ It is clear in Stephen's fuller treatment that God's calling of Abraham amounts to the election of a people, a point which Paul's briefer remark makes through its allusion to "our ancestors" (τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν; 13:17a). Emphatic for both is God's sovereign initiative in choosing Abraham and his offspring. For it is ultimately this that legitimates the patriarchs and the prehistory as a whole. Ironically, the choice of a people in the prehistory anticipates God's appointment of gentiles following Paul's speech (13:48).

Exalting a People

Paul next alludes to the παροίκια ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτου (v. 17b). This period too, as Luke depicts it, witnesses to God's beneficent oversight. Naturally, of course, the reference to Egypt triggers ambivalent associations. On the one hand, conjures Joseph's brothers' treachery, responsible for bringing him to Egypt, and later Pharaoh's enslavement of the "Israelites." On the other hand, it was there that God protected and elevated Joseph, appointed Moses, and

salvation/rejection; he then applies this pattern to the religious leaders (7:51–53; cf. chapter 3). Paul does not explicitly discuss Moses and the giving of the law. See Pervo, *Acts*, 354. Paul's most lengthy explication concerns the appearance of salvation in the recent past and present (vv. 23–41). When Stephen fixes his gaze on the present it is to show that the religious leaders, in killing Jesus, fit the same pattern of rejection as their "fathers" (cf. Acts 3:8–12); the transition is abrupt and the remarks brief and cutting (7:51–53). By contrast, when Paul gives his speech in Pisidian Antioch, he is in a hurry to explain the salvation now offered to his Jewish and "God-fearing" auditors.

There are still further differences between the two speeches. Paul's remarks on the ancestral prehistory include a verse about the judges and Samuel the prophet (13:20) – Stephen's does not – and devotes slightly more space to coverage of Israel's kings, though with a focus on Saul and David (13:21–23) rather than David and Solomon (cf. 7:46–47). This latter difference stems from the fact that while Stephen wishes to make a point about God's dwelling place, and thus must include Solomon who built the temple, Paul desires to show how Jesus, as the offspring of David, fulfills the promises made to his ancestor (see 13:23, 33–35). Paul's omission of Solomon makes sense in light of this aim: Including the king would unnecessarily weaken the link between David and Jesus. Interestingly, however, Paul's speech – unlike Stephen's – makes a point of commenting on the appointment and removal of Saul (vv. 21–22). See McDonough, "Saul to Paul, Again," 390–91.

¹³⁸ See, e.g., Gen 12–35; Deut 4:37; 7:7; 10:15.

¹³⁹ By the same token, in the entirety of the first verse (13:17) Paul references traditions enumerated by Stephen in 35 verses (7:23–36a).

finally delivered his people (which Paul next mentions). In his own fashion, Stephen notes each of these events in Acts 7. Yet he lumps them all under the umbrella of God's providence, having God announce beforehand to Abraham that his descendants (σπέρμα αὐτοῦ) would be πάροικον ἐν γῆ ἄλλοτρίᾳ καὶ δουλώσουσιν but finally ἐξελεύσονται καὶ λατρευσουσίν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ (7:6–7). The culmination of this prophecy – worship in the land – underscores how the interim history of the descendants moves inexorably toward the fulfillment of God's promise to their "father," Abraham (7:5).¹⁴⁰ In Stephen's speech, therefore, Luke places the Egyptian experience within the overall framework of God's favor toward his people.

In the first place, then, Paul's remark that God ὑψώσεν ("lifted up, exalted") his people¹⁴¹ (v. 17b) during the sojourn probably to some degree reflects God's care for his chosen people. But the word seems to imply more than this – even a thriving. In this sense, it recalls Stephen's remark that the people ηὔξησεν ... καὶ ἐπληθύνθη ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ (7:17b), itself reminiscent of the Septuagint.¹⁴² I would argue, however, that it likewise triggers an association with the portrayal of Joseph and Moses in Stephen's speech (Acts 7).¹⁴³

In Acts 7 Stephen is keen to emphasize how both figures excelled in Egypt. Though the patriarchs sold Joseph into slavery in Egypt, God gave him χάριν καὶ σοφίαν ἐναντίον Φαραώ¹⁴⁴ and even made him ἡγούμενον ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον¹⁴⁵ καὶ [ἐφ'] ὅλον τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ (7:10).¹⁴⁶ In his depiction of Moses, Luke employs a pattern of verbs characterizing his birth (ἐγεννήθη; 7:20), upbringing (ἀνετρέφη/ἀνεθρέψατο; 7:21), and education (ἐπαιδεύθη;

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 82.

¹⁴¹ Τὸν λαόν. D and several other witnesses read διὰ τὸν λαόν. But as Pervo, *Acts*, 328, observes, this "leaves ὑψώσιν without an object" (328).

¹⁴² See Exod 1:7: οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ ηὔξηθησαν καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν.

¹⁴³ The fact that Paul compared with Stephen (7:20–44) omits subsequent mention of Moses's role in leading the people out of Egypt (7:36), as well as his reception of "living oracles" (7:38), does not preclude a possible allusion here. There are concrete reasons for such omissions. First, the disparaging remark about the law in 13:39 provides a motive for not reporting Moses's reception of the law. Second, Luke's preference in this speech for developing the relationship between Jesus and another hero, David, further explains the omission. Neither points, however, prove a bias against Moses. After all, we saw Luke draw parallels between Jesus and Moses in Acts 1–5. By the same logic, nor do the points preclude an allusion to his upbringing in Egypt.

¹⁴⁴ Joseph speaks of finding χάριν when he approached Pharaoh's household to inquire about burying his father (Gen 50:4 LXX). The text does not mention σοφία. This term, as used in Acts 7:10, likely refers to Joseph's interpretation of dreams, foresight in saving Egypt during famine, or both. Artapanus also lauds Joseph's wisdom (see below). Earlier, the narrator reports how Joseph found grace/favor with Potiphar (Gen 39:4 LXX) and the jailor (Gen 39:21). Similarly, Jacob and his sons show concern about finding grace/favor with Joseph (Gen 43:14 LXX; 47:25, 29 LXX).

¹⁴⁵ Gen 41:43; cf. 49:26.

¹⁴⁶ Gen 41:40.

7:22).¹⁴⁷ At each stage there is something remarkable about Moses. At birth, he was ἦν ἄστεῖλος τῷ θεῷ (“beautiful before God”) (7:20a). And aside from the first three months of his life, when he was “raised in his father’s house” (7:20b), Moses was brought up by Pharaoh’s daughter “as her own son” (7:21b) and “instructed in all the wisdom [σοφίᾳ] of Egypt” (7:22a). From this point on Luke shapes Stephen’s retelling of Moses’s exploits to fit the pattern of salvation-rejection directed at the Jerusalem religious leaders. However, the introduction of Moses is intriguing in its own right. For though it agrees in broad strokes with exodus traditions (mediated by the Septuagint), it is exceptional in how it depicts Moses’s status as one divinely appointed by the God of Israel’s ancestors but equipped with the best learning Egypt has to offer. In fact, the “wisdom of the Egyptians” (7:22) recalls the “favor and wisdom” that God gave Joseph in the sight of Pharaoh (7:10). And while fond of irony, Luke does not seem to give the phrase this tinge of meaning, as if Moses’s subsequent attempt to save the children of Israel – when ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπισκέψασθαι τοὺς ἀδελφούς (7:23) – entailed a rejection of Egyptian in favor of Jewish culture. For his very next declaration portrays the Egyptian-educated Moses in the same terms applied to Jesus and the apostles, the founding figures of Acts: ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ (7:22b).¹⁴⁸

Luke’s rendering of patriarchal history, therefore, presents Joseph and Moses as excelling during their respective times in Egypt – ruling (Joseph) and acquiring an excellent education (Moses). While Paul’s reference to Israel’s exaltation involves their numerical increase (7:17), it is likely that it also evokes the positive fortunes of Joseph and Moses as related by Stephen six chapters earlier. Arguably, the presentation in both instances is meant to reaffirm God’s salvation-historical purposes and life itself outside the land of Israel. In the case of Paul, more specifically, it anticipates and bolsters the extension of God’s favor to Antiochenes.

The patriarchs as cultural benefactors. Luke was not alone in adapting Jewish traditions to fit and legitimate life and interactions in the diaspora. Some Hellenistic Jewish authors, for example, imagined the patriarchs as cultural benefactors or innovators.¹⁴⁹ According to Josephus, Abraham was recognized as a “wise man” by Egyptians, and he was responsible for passing along knowledge of arithmetic and astronomy.¹⁵⁰ Pseudo-Eupolemus echoes this sentiment,¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁷ See Sterling, “Opening the Scriptures,” 210, who notes that Luke later applies the same “schema” to Paul’s life (Acts 22:3).

¹⁴⁸ See chapter 3.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. *Ibid.*, 204–8.

¹⁵⁰ *A.J.* 1.167–168.

¹⁵¹ See Ps.-Eup. 1.3–4. Citations of Jewish fragments are from Carl Holladay, *Historians*, vol. 1 of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983).

explaining how Abraham taught his knowledge of astrology – or knowledge about the “movements of the sun and moon” (1.4 [Holladay]) – to the Phoenicians after he migrated to their land.¹⁵² When he later migrated to Egypt, Abraham passed along his knowledge of astrology and other sciences to the priests of Heliopolis.¹⁵³

But Abraham was not alone among the patriarchs in benefiting other nations. Artapanus relates how Joseph's time in Egypt was marked by greatness and service. He was renowned for his wisdom, which he relied on – along with his position as finance minister – to enrich the country;¹⁵⁴ he also helped the Egyptians divide their land and discovered measurements.¹⁵⁵ After his people migrated to Egypt and became numerous, they founded temples in both Athos and Heliopolis.¹⁵⁶ Artapanus lavishes even greater praise upon Moses. Far from being merely a patriarch of the Jews, Moses was a benefactor of Egyptians and, indeed, all peoples. In the first place he was the teacher of Orpheus. But he also invented an assortment of objects and occupations: boats, construction devices, (Egyptian) weaponry, tools for drawing water, and philosophy.¹⁵⁷ And he left a special imprint on Egyptian society due to his division of the land into *nomes*, designating a god for each, and his assignment of sacred letters for the Egyptian priests.¹⁵⁸ For this latter act the priests “deemed [Moses] worthy of divine honor,” referring to him as Hermes (3.6 [Holladay]), while the masses of people adored him for the entirety of his contributions.¹⁵⁹ Moses and his followers even founded a city at Hermopolis.¹⁶⁰ Such examples highlight the cultural benefactions of the patriarch, often with a claim to chronological priority implied or outright stated. Claiming patriarchal benefactions was a means some Hellenistic Jews employed to justify their status outside the land of Israel – among other nations. One might say that the patriarchs in these accounts function as proto-colonizers of a cultural kind.

The patriarchs' connection with foreign lands. In addition to the emphasis on cultural benefaction, Gregory Sterling has shown how some Jewish authors appeal to the patriarchs' ancient association with particular locations. Cleodemus Malchus, for example, associates Abraham with Libya through his son Iaphras, whose daughter married Heracles – “from which union came the later

¹⁵² Ps.-Eup. 1.8–9. He credits Enoch with the discovery of astrology.

¹⁵³ Ps.-Eup. 1.8.

¹⁵⁴ Artap. 2.4.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 3.4.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 3.4–6.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, 3.3.

kings of Libya.”¹⁶¹ Pseudo-Eupolemus links Abraham both to “Phoenicia” – territory with which the Samaritans “had proximity ... and ties” – and Mount Gerizim.¹⁶² Finally, Artapanus’s fragments stress Abraham, Joseph, and Moses’s connection with Egypt.¹⁶³ In placing the patriarchs in Samaria, Libya, and Egypt, respectively, these Hellenistic Jewish authors contributed to “the establishment of their identity in a place removed from the Temple.”¹⁶⁴

The patriarchs as colonizers. Finally, Josephus and Philo adopt the language of colonization to depict the movement and settlement of Jews.¹⁶⁵ Josephus remarks, for example, that after God confounded those attempting to build the tower of Babel, he sent them out as “colonies” to lands which he chose.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, Abraham sought to settle in “colonies” the sons and grandson who issued from his later-in-life marriage to Keturah. As a result, “they took possession of Troglodytis and that part of Arabia Felix which extends to the Red Sea ... [and] Libya” (1.239–240 [Thackeray, LCL]). Philo adopts colonization language and motifs to describe settlement both in Egypt and in the land of Israel. He relates how famine first drove τῶν τοῦ ἔθνους ἀρχηγῶν to Egypt, and how much later Moses¹⁶⁷ – the “seventh in descent” from Ἰδοῦδαίων ἔθνους ἀρχηγέτης¹⁶⁸ – sought to “send a colony” to Phoenicia, Coelesyria, and Palestine¹⁶⁹ after being appointed leader¹⁷⁰ by an oracle of God.

But this was not to be the permanent destination of all Jews. Elsewhere, Philo unabashedly describes how he and many of his Jewish contemporaries dwelled outside the land of Israel. He characterizes these Jewish communities in the diaspora as “colonies” that possessed a symbiotic relationship with their mother city, Jerusalem. The examples demonstrate how Josephus and Philo appropriated colonization as a conceptual framework to normalize – even legitimate – Jewish life outside the land of Israel. In this, they represent part of a larger phenomenon whereby traditions and priorities are reshaped for this same purpose. I have suggested that this is what Luke does in Stephen and Paul’s speeches in Acts 7 and 13, respectively. The Lukan Paul lifts up examples of God’s faithfulness to the patriarchs in order to anticipate as well as

¹⁶¹ Sterling, “Opening the Scriptures,” 203.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 205.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 206–8.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 202.

¹⁶⁵ See chapter 3.

¹⁶⁶ *A.J.* 1.120–121.

¹⁶⁷ *Mos.* 1.34.

¹⁶⁸ *Mos.* 1.7.

¹⁶⁹ *Mos.* 1.163.

¹⁷⁰ *Mos.* 1.70–71. Cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 2.268.

legitimate the Antiochenes' experience of blessing – that is, salvation – outside the land of Israel.

Raising up David

David represents the second major “moment” of God’s sovereign care for his people in the ancestral prehistory.¹⁷¹ This is shown in the first place, as noted above, by God’s installation of David in place of Saul. Luke’s choice of verbs here casts the difference between the two figures in high relief. While God gave (ἔδωκεν) the people Saul as a concession to their request, he raised (ἤγειρεν) David on his own initiative, an act that anticipates the description of Jesus’s resurrection – using the same verb – in verses 30 and 37.¹⁷²

The supporting citation¹⁷³ that follows reinforces the depiction of David as God’s chosen ruler, while also providing a rationale for his selection: εὐφρον Δαυιδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου (13:22). No verse in the Septuagint attests to the citation in this form. Rather, Luke seems to have brought together three different verses: 1 Samuel 13:14; Psalm 89:21; and Isaiah 44:28.¹⁷⁴ The first of these, 1 Samuel 13:14 LXX, shares the same background as Paul’s rehearsal: the remove of Saul and his replacement with David. Moreover, it too characterizes the person in view as “a man [ἄνθρωπον rather than ἄνδρα] after the [Lord’s] heart” (κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ [instead of μου]), though one who is sought

¹⁷¹ Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 47–59, notes that works such as Psalms of Solomon, Isaiah, 1 Enoch, and 4 Ezra bear witness to a Davidic expectation in some Jewish circles prior to Luke’s time.

¹⁷² Cf. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 156, 165; Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 67.

¹⁷³ Note that the relative clause introducing the citation – ὃ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας – casts it as a form of “witness,” a favorite concept of Luke’s.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Charles Kingsley Barrett, “Old Testament History According to Stephen and Paul,” in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986), 60; Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 158. Bowker, “Speeches in Acts,” 104, demurs. Following Max Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 21–26, he suggests that Luke has instead relied on an Aramaic Targum on 1 Sam 13:14. But in “the Targum the phrase עבִיד רַעוּתִי is a substitute for the Hebrew (and LXX) ‘after his own heart.’” How does Bowker explain this? “At some point, possibly when the discourse was being incorporated into Acts, an attempt was made to make the quotation conform to the LXX, and that was done in the simplest way possible, by allowing the two versions to stand side by side.” Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 76, suggests that Luke might have drawn on a testimonium source on the basis that 1 Clement 18:1 also brings together Ps 89:20 and 1 Sam 13:14. Neither of these conjectures is any more convincing than the possibility that Luke drew on the three texts because of how they served his theological *Tendenz*.

(ζητήσῃ) rather than found (εὑρον).¹⁷⁵ Then, Psalm 89:20 LXX supplies “I found David” (εὑρον Δαυιδ), while Isaiah 44:28 provides the qualification that David “will do all my will” (πάντα τὰ θελημάτα μου ποιήσῃ), which Luke slightly modifies by placing the verb with its object in the emphatic frontal position.

At any rate, the twofold thrust of the citation is clear. In the first place, David emerges as God’s chosen ruler/agent, a viewpoint consistent with themes elsewhere in Luke’s two-volume work (e.g., Luke 1–2, Acts 2, and Acts 15), as Strauss has shown.¹⁷⁶ In the second place, David’s suitability stems from his projected responsiveness to God’s will. Both of these characteristics harmonize with what we have come to expect of founding figures. Their authority derives from their divine selection, and they are responsible for fulfilling its mandate.¹⁷⁷ In colonization accounts, this mandate is to plant a city; in Acts, it is to replicate the cult community. The founding figures discussed in chapters 3 and 4 managed this through the announcement of restoration/salvation. The David of Paul’s speech anticipated these activities since he embodied God’s gracious will as well as being the genealogical bridge to the savior, Jesus (v. 23).¹⁷⁸

5.3.3 *The Colonizing Message for Antioch (13:23–41)*

5.3.3.1 *Introduction*

I have discussed how the ancestral history functions as a precursor, a sort of proto-colonizing message, in preparation for what follows in Paul’s speech. In doing so, it legitimates the prospective community in Antioch as a replication of the community of Jewish believers in Jerusalem, who share the same ancestral traditions. But with the transition from David to Jesus “the savior” in verse 23, the speech moves from the distant to the recent past¹⁷⁹ and thus to the colonizing message proper.

5.3.3.2 *Announcing the Colonizing Message*

Jesus the Savior – Culmination of the Prehistory

The two sections constituted by verses 23–25 and 26–31 (following Holladay) introduce the message about Jesus; in it, Luke accomplishes two feats. First, he links Jesus to the prehistory of God’s interactions with his people in the

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Stephen’s similar language in Acts 7: εὔρεν χάριν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 46). But whereas Stephen mentions David to make an argument which relativizes the temple, Paul does so to foreground the salvific purposes of God.

¹⁷⁶ Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*.

¹⁷⁷ For this reason, they occupy a liminal state between God and men.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Rom 1:3–4.

¹⁷⁹ The speech briefly moves to the present in verse 26, only to revert back to the recent past. Cf. Kilgallen, “Acts 13:38–39,” 487.

preceding verses (vv. 17–22). He does this relying on the connections of genealogy, on the one hand, and promise-fulfillment, on the other. Luke says that it was “from this one’s¹⁸⁰ offspring [ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος]” that “God has brought [ἤγαγεν] to Israel¹⁸¹ a savior, Jesus.” 2 Samuel 7:12 LXX stands behind the use of σπέρμα here, as the argumentation in verses 32–37 all but assures. This guarantees that the genealogical connection also implies God’s favor toward and through Jesus, which brings us to the second means of connection: that of promise-fulfillment. Paul represents God’s “leading forth” (ἤγαγεν) of Jesus the savior as the fulfillment of a promise, or κατ’ ἐπαγγελίαν (v. 23). The “promise,” as Strauss argues, is a reference to God’s promises to David in 2 Samuel 7:4–17,¹⁸² above all his pledge to raise up a successor from his descendants.¹⁸³ However, Morgan-Wynne is not altogether wrong in seeing a wider referent for “promise,”¹⁸⁴ since the selection of David as ruler and the appearance of Jesus as a savior-ruler effectively represents the culmination of the sovereign and providential rule of God over his people.¹⁸⁵ “Promise” is the conceptual glue uniting Jesus to the prehistory.

The reflection on John the Baptist (13:24–25) similarly bolsters this view of Jesus,¹⁸⁶ while also introducing an all-important *topos*: the proper response to the message concerning Jesus. The “evocation” of Malachi 3:1–2, through such

¹⁸⁰ Luke fronts τοῦτο for emphasis. Note D’s alternative reading: ὁ οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ. Observe that in addition to replacing τοῦτο with the (more typical) pronoun αὐτοῦ and restoring God to the frontal position, this reading also implies an even stronger (if still inferential) connection with the preceding verse by virtue of the οὖν.

¹⁸¹ Zhang, *Paul Among Jews*, 134, observes that the use of ἤγαγεν and Ἰσραὴλ here in verse 23 creates an inclusion with verse 17. A number of witnesses (C D 33. 323. 453. 614. 945. 1241. 2818 gig sys a mae; Thret) read ἠγείρεν in place of ἤγαγεν, influenced by the use of the verb in the previous verse (v. 22).

¹⁸² Cf. Ps 131:11–12 LXX. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 36, reflecting on 2 Sam 7, argues that the “Deuteronomistic promise of a place of rest and security for Israel following the exodus (Deut. 3:20; 12:9–10; Josh. 1:15) and her ‘planting’ in the land (Exod. 15:17) is here expanded and applied to the Davidic dynasty.”

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 165.

¹⁸⁴ Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 91, 118. He bases his understanding of “promise” partially on the fact that in vv. 32–33 Paul announces that τῆν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν have been fulfilled.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 207: “One of the major themes [of Paul’s speech is that] ... Jesus represents the climax of God’s dealings with the people elected by God (13.23, 32).” Keener, *Acts*, 2:2063, observes that the sending of Jesus as savior “continues the pattern of divine leadership summarized in 13:20, since some judges were “saviors” (Judg 3:9, 15; Neh 9:27); the cognate verb σώζω frequently applies to the judges (Judg 2:16, 18; 3:9, 31; 6:14, 15, 36, 37; 7:2, 7; 8:22; 10:1; 13:5) and to the first kings (1 Sam 9:16; 10:1, 27; 11:3; 2 Sam 3:18).”

¹⁸⁶ It is also possible to look at these verses as proof supporting Paul’s claim in verse 23, paralleling the scriptural proof in vv. 32–37. So Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 156–57. Cf. Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 84; Kilgallen, “Acts 13:38–39,” 488–89.

“odd language” as *πρὸ προσώπου*,¹⁸⁷ ensures that John and his proclamation of repentance in preparation for the savior represent a seamless continuation of God’s interactions with his people. He is a bridge figure, in fact: reminiscent of the prophets of old but also a proto-witness like the apostles who follow. Moreover, his demand for repentance (v. 24)¹⁸⁸ and reception of Jesus (v. 25) is a reminder that the colonizing community only takes root where the founder’s message is received. John is thus an exemplar of positive response in contrast to the religious leaders in the verses which follow (vv. 26–31).¹⁸⁹

Jerusalem’s Rejection of Jesus: Negative Example and Justification of Second-Generation Colonization

The second feat Luke accomplishes in these two sections is to legitimate the spread of the colonizing mission to Antioch as a second-generation extension of the mission in Jerusalem. He accomplishes this, above all, through the use of direct address: “Brothers, sons of the family of Abraham and those among you who fear God” (*Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβρααὰμ καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν*; v. 26). This direct address orients the events in Jerusalem to the present,¹⁹⁰ signaling their weighty significance for the Antiochenes,¹⁹¹ description notwithstanding the past tense employed in the subsequent rehearsal of events.¹⁹² Indeed, Paul describes “the message of this salvation” (*ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας*; v. 26) as something that has been sent to all Jews and Godfearers.

What the direct address does, therefore, is link the Jerusalem Jews’ rejection of Jesus with the Antiochene Jews’ encounter of him via the colonizing message proclaimed by Paul. This connection functions in two primary ways. First, it presents the response of the Jews in Jerusalem as a negative example meant

¹⁸⁷ Pervo, *Acts*, 337.

¹⁸⁸ John is said to proclaim “a baptism of repentance” (*βάπτισμα μετανοίας*; cf. Acts 19:4). Note the importance of repentance in Luke’s work, especially as a precursor to forgiveness: Luke 3:3, 8; 5:32; 10:13; 11:32; 13:3, 5; 15:7, 10; 16:30; 17:3; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 3:19; 5:31; 8:22; 11:18; 17:30; 19:4; 26:20. The mention of “repentance” (*μετανοία*) in 13:24 anticipates the remarks about “forgiveness of sins” (*ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν*) in 13:38–39. See Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 60–61, on the importance of “forgiveness” in Luke-Acts.

¹⁸⁹ John recognizes and accepts (see 13:25) while the religious leaders display ignorance and reject (see 13:27). Cf. Acts 4:36–5:11 as another juxtaposition of positive and negative exemplars.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Keener, *Acts*, 2:2056.

¹⁹¹ Thus, although the following section (vv. 32–37) marks the first consistent use of the present tense, it possesses a resumptive quality. It routes the discussion back to Paul’s overriding concern, the reception of salvation by the Antiochenes, pressed home in vv. 38–41.

¹⁹² Cf. Kilgallen, “Acts 13:38–39,” 487.

to inform the response of the Antiochenes.¹⁹³ This function becomes apparent when read alongside the positive example of how John the Baptist responded to the coming of Israel's savior (13:24–25). The message is clear: Jews and Godfearers in Antioch should not mimic how their Jerusalem counterparts reacted.

A comparison of Paul's words with that of Peter and the other apostles in Acts 2–5 helps clarify the instructional value invested in the Jerusalem Jews' rejection. These early chapters are consistent in stressing the following items: Jesus's crucifixion/rejection by the Jews and their leaders (2:30; 3:13, 15; 4:11; 5:20); his resurrection/exaltation/glorification by God (2:24, 32; 3:15; 4:10; 5:31);¹⁹⁴ his salvific benefits, notably forgiveness (2:38; 3:19–26 [especially v. 19]; 4:31; 5:31); and his witnesses (2:32; 3:15; 5:32). Peter emphasizes that the Jews responsible for Jesus's death acted out of ignorance (3:17), while insisting that God brought about the outcome as a fulfillment of prophecy (3:18). Yet it is the aim of these rehearsals of Jesus's proclamation, and the response to it, which is striking: They furnish one more opportunity for Jerusalem Jews to repent and receive the salvific benefits mediated by Jesus. Hence the indispensable role played by the apostles. As "witnesses" to Jesus, they are uniquely qualified to extend this second chance.

The pattern of preaching regarding Jesus and his reception is similar in Acts 13, but to a different effect. Echoing Peter's proclamation, Paul speaks of the ignorance (ἀγνοήσαντες; cf. 3:17 – κατὰ ἄγνοιαν) of the Jerusalem Jews,¹⁹⁵ due to which they unwittingly fulfilled the prophets (13:27; cf. 3:17–18); Jesus's betrayal/execution by his people with Pilate's assistance (13:28; cf. 2:30; 3:13, 15; 4:11; 5:20); Jesus's resurrection by God (13:30; cf. 2:24, 32; 3:15; 4:10; 5:31); and his subsequent appearance to "witnesses" (13:31; cf. 2:32; 3:15; 5:32). That one element which appears to be missing, the delineation of Jesus's benefits (2:38; 3:19–26; 4:31; 5:31), Paul has in fact highlighted as the grounds for the appeal in both 13:26 and 13:32–33. This is a clue to the function of the rehearsal of Jesus's reception in Jerusalem as Paul reports it: It serves as

¹⁹³ See Keener, *Acts*, 2:2052, who observes a number of parallels between Peter and Paul's accusations in Acts 2 and 13, respectively.

¹⁹⁴ In fact, Luke represents God's resurrection of Jesus as the decisive response to the Jews' rejection. Cf. Zhang, *Paul Among Jews*, 139; Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 102, 108. This juxtaposition runs through verse 31: The Jewish opponents executed (Deut 21:23 LXX probably stands behind the use of ξύλον in verse 29; cf. *ibid.*, 108) the guiltless one on Pilate's authority and had him buried, but "God raised him from the dead" (ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν; 13:28–30). Jesus's appearance afterwards "for many days ... to those who had come with him from Galilee to Jerusalem" (13:31) certifies the decisive triumph achieved through Jesus's resurrection.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. 2:23. Irony centered on ignorance and fulfillment is hardly atypical in Luke-Acts. See Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 85. Cf. Keener, *Acts*, 2:2067, who also notes such irony as an example of rhetoric's aim "to turn potential disadvantages [i.e., Jesus's execution] into advantages."

a lesson concerning how the Antiochene Jews and Godfearers must not respond to the message of salvation.

This brings us to the second effect of linking the direct address to the account of the Jerusalem Jews' rejection: It both anticipates and justifies Paul's appeal to the experience of salvation among the Antiochenes in 13:33.¹⁹⁶ It achieves this by offering an implicit explanation of how the colonizing message spread to the audience in Pisidian Antioch. Luke's reader by now is well familiar with the portrayal of replication through crisis. Opposition in Jerusalem led to a "scattering" of community members, which spread the colonizing message to Samaria (8:1–25) as well as Syrian Antioch (11:19–30). As I discussed in chapter 4, the latter episode proved pivotal since it precipitated the foundation of a new cult community, itself to become mother community of second-generation colonies such as Pisidian Antioch. The Jews and Godfearers in Antioch now find themselves the potential beneficiary of this "replication through rejection," as Paul and Barnabas promulgate the message of salvation in hopes of establishing a community of Jesus followers in the Roman colony.

5.3.3.3 Explaining the Colonizing Message

Introduction

Having offered positive and negative examples of response, Paul returns in the next section to the appearance of salvation among the Antiochene Jews and Godfearers.¹⁹⁷ Paul's claim – in the present tense – *Καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα* (v. 32) reminds readers of his appointment by the mother (13:3). Moreover, as it follows soon after his remarks on Jesus's appearance to his apostles (13:31), the proclamation calls to mind Paul's own commissioning as *μάρτυς* by the risen Lord (9:15–16; 22:14–15; 26:16–18). In this very speech, Paul has proved himself suited for this role based on his ability to discern God's purposes by interpreting Israel's history (13:17–25) and deciphering sacred oracles (13:26, 29) in the manner of a *chresmologos*.¹⁹⁸ We are further reminded in what follows (vv. 32–37) – as Paul unpacks the claim that Jesus is the savior from the line of David (v. 23) – that the founding figures in

¹⁹⁶ There is, of course, a third effect of linking direct address to the account of the Jerusalem Jews' rejection of Jesus: It foreshadows the similar rejection to occur in Antioch (see 13:45–51).

¹⁹⁷ The speech's progression from rejection of the savior in Jerusalem to the (attempted) spread of his cult in Pisidian Antioch recalls the, by now, familiar colonizing pattern, which has led to propagation of the salvation message in different locales – within the urban environment of Jerusalem (1–7; cf. chapter 3), throughout Judea and Samaria (8–11; cf. chapter 4), and finally to inhabitants of Syrian Antioch (11:19–30; cf. chapter 4).

¹⁹⁸ See remarks about this term as it relates to colonization in chapters 2 and 4.

Acts perform the role of μάρτυς.¹⁹⁹ They witness to the salvation/restoration ushered in by Jesus in order to replicate the cult community.

The Promise Fulfilled

In his good news announcement²⁰⁰ to the Antiochenes, Paul interprets the appearance of Jesus the savior as a fulfillment among the "children" of promises that were made to the "fathers": τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν γενομένην, ὅτι ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν τοῖς τέκνοις [αὐτῶν] ἡμῖν (13:32–33a). This claim links the prospective colony of Jesus followers in Antioch to the ancestral prehistory delineated in 13:17–22. This is not an uncommon phenomenon. I have demonstrated how many colonization accounts appeal to prior explorations or settlements to legitimate present communities. We have also seen how Luke himself – particularly in Acts 7 and 13 – appeals to the experiences of patriarchs such as Abraham, Joseph, and Moses to validate, in a broad sense, life outside the land of Israel. But he is also capable of marshalling patriarchal history to bolster his message about the present experience of salvation. He often deploys πατέρας on these occasions to evoke the traditions of Israel's patriarchs.²⁰¹ Luke tailors the history to serve the needs of the argument. Thus, for example, Stephen's speech appropriates patriarchal history in order to demonstrate that the Jerusalem religious leaders were repeating the pattern of rejecting/salvation established by their forbearers in the wilderness.²⁰²

Here, however, Paul leverages the ancient patriarchal history to validate his message of salvation's appearance in new and different contexts. As we have seen, he renders this claim more credible by not only portraying Jesus as the offspring of David (13:23), but also the Jews and Godfearers²⁰³ in Antioch as descendants of the patriarchs (13:26).²⁰⁴ In linking the contemporary manifestation of God's salvation to the promises made to the patriarch, Paul ultimately depicts it as the culminating moment in Israel's history, which led to the formation of the new cult community in Jerusalem and its replication in Antioch

¹⁹⁹ See chapters 3 and 4.

²⁰⁰ Luke is fond of using forms of the verb εὐαγγελίζω. See Luke 1:19; 2:10; 3:18; 4:18, 43; 7:22; 8:1; 9:6; 16:16; 20:1; Acts 5:42; 8:4, 12, 25, 35, 40; 10:36; 11:20; 13:32; 14:7, 15, 21; 15:35; 16:10; 17:18.

²⁰¹ See Acts 3:13, 25; 5:30; 15:10; 22:14; 26:6.

²⁰² Indeed, the highest density of references to πατέρας in Acts occurs in Stephen's speech: 7:11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 32, 38, 39, 44, 45, 51, 52.

²⁰³ While Paul addresses Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί (v. 26), it may be that this includes gentile sympathizers. He uses the identical address in verse 38, which introduces an appeal to both Jews and ὁ πιστεύων (v. 39). Cf. Zhang, *Paul Among Jews*, 148.

²⁰⁴ Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραάμ (13:26). The D text ensures that the connection is made between Paul and his Antiochene audience, on the one hand, and the patriarchs, on the other, by qualifying πατέρας with ἡμῶν (13:32). E lat syP also witness to this reading.

of Syria. Likewise, the present experience and embrace of salvation would constitute the foundation or colonizing act of yet another new cult community, this time in Antioch of Pisidia.

But what exactly is the “promise” being fulfilled? The answer to this question helps fill out the content of the salvation announced by Paul, the potential founder of the community in Pisidian Antioch. The reference to *ἐπαγγελίαν* (13:32) echoes the thought of verse 23, which links the fulfillment of the promise – *κατ’ ἐπαγγελίαν* – to the appearance of Jesus the savior. But nowhere else in the speech to this point does Paul mention the word “promise.” God’s acts thus far, as will be recalled, include his election of the people (13:17a); his exaltation of them in Egypt (13:17b); his deliverance of them (13:17c); his patience toward them in the wilderness (13:18); his destruction of opposing forces and distribution of land as their inheritance (13:19); and his provision of rulers – judges first (13:20) and after that, kings (13:21–22). The inheritance of land would seem to be one candidate for the promise God fulfilled. Indeed, in Acts 7 Stephen explicitly refers to the “promise” God made to Abraham, namely, that he would give the land to him “as a possession and to his offspring after him” (7:5). However, while Stephen later mentions the dispossession of “the nations that God drove out before our fathers” (7:45), he does not stress the inheritance of land as the climax of Israel’s history.²⁰⁵

Nestled in God’s promise to Israel is an additional claim which may be of importance, namely, his forecast to Abraham that after their sojourn in Egypt, his descendants will return and *λατρεύσουσίν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ* (7:7). This prediction envisions a nation which, chosen and then delivered by God, gratefully binds itself to his rule in perpetuity. Arguably, Paul’s speech in Acts 13 implies a similar ideology. God chose Israel as a nation for himself, made it great, delivered it, destroyed its enemies, led it into the land, and provided it with rulers. David among the ancient predecessors was the ideal ruler since he embodied the will of God (13:22). Indeed, as quickly becomes clear in the remainder of this section, Paul has David in mind when he refers to promises made to the “fathers.”

Here as in 13:23 there is an allusion to God’s promise to bless David in 2 Samuel 7:4–17. The promise emphasizes the establishment of David’s descendants as a dynasty of rulers: “I will raise up [*ἀναστήσω*] your offspring [*σπέρμα*] after you, who shall come from your own body, and I will establish his kingdom” (2 Samuel 7:12 LXX).²⁰⁶ God underscores how this rule is to

²⁰⁵ Contra many other summaries of Israelite history. See Jeska, *Die Geschichte Israels in der Sicht des Lukas*. Cf. Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 82. Stephen’s not-so-subtle critique of the temple-centered cult, predicated on the observation that the creator God’s throne is in heaven (7:48–50), also relativizes the significance of one land.

²⁰⁶ God also announces how David *οἰκοδομήσει μοι οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί μου* (13:13). Yet we have seen how Luke relativizes the importance of the temple in Stephen’s speech

have no end: "I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever" (2 Samuel 7:13b LXX); "Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever" (2 Samuel 7:16 LXX).²⁰⁷ What God promises is a secure rule for David's line. But it is not just the dynasty of Davidic rulers which matters, I suggest, but also what that is meant to symbolize – specifically, God's rule over his people. Indeed, in Psalm 131 LXX God makes the promise contingent on compliance with the will of God: "If your sons keep my covenant and my decrees that I shall teach them, their sons also, forevermore, shall sit on your throne" (131:12 LXX). Paul's characterization of David as a "man after God's own heart" (13:22) clarifies that he adhered to God's covenantal will. So, also, it is implied that Jesus the savior represents the sovereign will of God. In doing so, he ushers in the fulfillment of the promise made to David – thus becoming ruler for eternity.

The appointment of Jesus as fulfillment. The function of this portion of the speech is to support the claims about Jesus made in verses 23–31, namely, that he is the savior (σωτήρ) appointed and vindicated by God (13:23, 30–31). The Lukan Paul accomplishes this by depicting the circumstances of Jesus's ministry, death, and resurrection as a fulfillment of God's plan.²⁰⁸ In Luke's colonizing narrative, this objective in turn legitimates the Christian community – including prospective members in Antioch – since it links it both to legendary "ancestors" and the divine sanction they enjoyed.

Paul's argument here for the fulfillment of salvation history marks a shift in his speech. Recall that his earlier summarization of Israel's history (13:16–25), with the exception of verse 22, relied mostly on allusions to biblical and extra-biblical traditions. Here, however, Paul buttresses his claims about God's actions through Jesus using direct citation of Scripture – specifically, Psalm 2:7 LXX, Isaiah 55:3 LXX, and Psalm 15:10 LXX. As Soards observes, Luke takes these passages, originally associated with different moments in the life of God's servant and repurposes them as references to Jesus.²⁰⁹

(7:47–50). Further, he does not even mention the temple in connection with David in Paul's speech; he focuses on the importance of David as Jesus's forbearer – and what this signifies about the latter's status.

²⁰⁷ David echoes this promise in 2 Sam 22:51: "He [God] shows steadfast love to his anointed [χριστῶ]; to David and his descendants [τῶ σπέρματι] forever."

²⁰⁸ Holladay, *Acts*, 272. This part of Paul's speech echoes Peter's Pentecost speech in Acts 2, especially verses 22–36. See Michel Quesnel, "Paul prédicateur dans les Actes des Apôtres," *NTS* 47 (2001): 479; Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 86. Cf. Pervo, *Acts*, 337: "Luke wishes to show the commonality of the 'gospel' of Peter and Paul." The effect of this, by the same token, is to link the prospective community in Antioch to the one in Jerusalem.

²⁰⁹ Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 86. Cf. Goldsmith, "Acts 13:33–37," 324: The "complex of OT citations [2 Samuel 7:11–16; Ps. 2.7b; Isa 53.3b; Ps. 15.10b] in Acts 13:33–37 is ... carefully conceived on linguistic and theological grounds to show the Jews *how* God fulfilled his promise to David in II Samuel 7 – namely, by raising Jesus from the dead."

The citations help advance the central argument of verses 32–37, which, as Holladay has argued, is two-fold: that “God ‘raised’ Jesus in the sense of selection among the people of Israel, as God had done with earlier leaders ... [and] that he also raised him from the dead.”²¹⁰ The progression of this argument is not surprising given, as noted above, that this section bolsters the previous one, where Paul first announced the appearance of Jesus (v. 23) and then his resurrection through God’s orchestration (v. 30). The first citation, Psalm 2:7, thus substantiates the assertion that Jesus is God’s chosen savior.²¹¹ By “raising him” God has fulfilled his promise to the ancestors (v. 33a).²¹² In other words, ἀνίστημι here functions much like ἐγείρω does in verse 22²¹³ – to signify the act of appointment, in this case as savior.²¹⁴ Moreover, the citation, especially the first part (ὕιός μου εἶ σύ), recalls the words spoken by the “voice from heaven” at Jesus’s baptism: σὺ εἶ ὁ ὕιός μου (Luke 3:22). Given this allusion, the “‘raising’ of Jesus would thus encompass his life and ministry understood as a single whole.”²¹⁵ But the multivalence of ἀνίστημι in Luke-Acts²¹⁶ creates space for Luke to further reinforce and even develop his

²¹⁰ Holladay, *Acts*, 272.

²¹¹ The formal introduction of the citation underscores its role as proof: ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ (13:33b). Cf. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 164, who argues that Psalm 2:7 also serves to “introduce the resurrection argument which follows [in vv. 34–37].”

²¹² Ἄναστήσας is instrumental.

²¹³ Rightly, Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 162: Luke does not “distinguish ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι.”

²¹⁴ The enthronement context of the Psalm (see Keener, *Acts*, 2:2070) provides another suggestive connection to David. The kinship language (ὕιός μου; γεγέννηκά σε) at any rate highlights Jesus’s special relationship with God. See Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 163, who argues more generally that divine sonship and David descent together provide the key for understanding Luke’s messianic theology, as attested most notably in Luke 1:32, 35 (cf. 92–95). This view of messiahship, Strauss suggests, is anticipated by Romans 1:3–4 (62). Cf. Robert F. O’Toole, “Luke’s Understanding of Jesus’s Resurrection-Ascension-Exaltation,” *BTR* 9 (1979): 112: “Here, sonship, the throne of David father, and a kingdom which will last forever are interrelated.”

²¹⁵ Holladay, *Acts*, 272.

²¹⁶ Sometimes Luke uses ἀνίστημι in the simple sense of “stand up” or “arise” (see Luke 22:45; Acts 10:26; 12:7; 26:30). Frequently he employs the term to announce the commencement of some other action (Luke 1:39; 4:16, 29, 38; 6:8; 10:25; 11:7, 32; 15:18, 20; 17:19; 23:1; 24:12, 33; Acts 1:15; 5:6, 17, 34; 6:9; 8:26; 9:6, 11, 18, 39; 10:13, 20, 23; 11:7, 28; 13:16; 14:20; 15:7; 20:3; 22:10, 16; 23:9). Occasionally, he will utilize it to reference the appointment of someone to a particular position (Acts 3:22, 26; 5:36; 7:18, 37; 26:16). In still other instances Luke appropriates it to describe the process or outcome of healing (Acts 9:34; 14:10). Finally, as he does in the following verse (13:34),²¹⁶ Luke uses ἀνίστημι to signal resurrection (Acts 2:24, 32; 10:41; 17:3, 31).

argument that Jesus is God's appointed savior, which he capitalizes on in the following verses.

The resurrection of Jesus as fulfillment. In these next few verses, Luke advances beyond the simple assertion that the appearance of Jesus as savior fulfills God's plan, arguing that his resurrection does as well. This development hinges on the repetition of ἀνίστημι, this time clearly meant to refer to resurrection: ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν (v. 34a). Luke's reference here to incorruptibility (μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν) "anticipates" the midrashic exegesis at the end of the section, the point of which is that Jesus is the heir of the promises spoken to David – since he alone is not subject to decay (13:36–37).²¹⁷ Luke introduces both concepts, resurrection and incorruptibility, with a ὅτι clause.²¹⁸ By foregrounding this clause, he signals resurrection/incorruptibility as the subject matter *and* points forward to the scriptural citations – introduced by οὕτως εἶρηκεν ὅτι – which demonstrate its place in the purposes of God.

The aim of both citations is to substantiate the claim that Jesus's resurrection fulfills God's promise to the ancestors but among contemporary Jews and God-fearers. They accomplish this in tandem with Isaiah 55:3 introducing the "holy and sure things" (τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά) to be explicated in Psalm 15:10. A critical piece of this interpretation is how Luke has applied this prophecy, originally about the hope of restoration for Israel while in exile,²¹⁹ to the experience of his contemporaries. As Holladay has observed, the plural ὑμῶν facilitates this application, since it "links with the 'you' (pl.) in Acts 13:22 and, by extension, 'their children – to us,' in verse 33."²²⁰ David's relation to these "holy and sure things" promised to the audience is at first glance ambiguous. However, since on our understanding the third citation unpacks the second – notably, it is introduced by διότι καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ –, it is significant that it comes from Psalm 15:10. The point seems to be that David is the one who makes the promise, and he makes it with "Paul" and his Jewish contemporaries in view.²²¹

²¹⁷ Holladay, *Acts*, 273. Cf. Peters argumentation in 2:24–28.

²¹⁸ This is an instance of prolepsis (BDF §476[3]). Cf. the translation in Pervo, *Acts*, 329. Admittedly, beginning the sentence with ὅτι δέ seems to invite confusion, which witnesses such as D ameliorate by reading ὅτε, thus making the clause temporal. Alternatively, one might take ὅτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν as causal. This would make God's giving of the "holy and trustworthy things of David" contingent upon the resurrection, a plausible reading given the importance Luke ascribes to the resurrection in Jesus's exaltation/en-thronement.

²¹⁹ Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 86.

²²⁰ Holladay, *Acts*, 272. Luke's changes to Isa 55:3 include "eliminating the promise that God 'will make ... an everlasting covenant' and altering 'I will make' ... to 'I will give' ..." (ibid).

²²¹ See *ibid.*, 273.

The nature of the promise, then, becomes clear in this third citation: It relates to incorruptibility. But though the psalmist declares that you (i.e., God) “will not give your holy one to see decay,” τὸν ὅσιόν σου can only refer to Jesus in Luke’s hands, given his claim about the fulfillment of God’s promise among contemporary Jews (and Godfearers). In other words, in Luke’s appropriation, the ancestor David did not promise that God would secure his own incorruptibility but rather Jesus the savior’s, something that was accomplished through the resurrection. Of course, Luke elsewhere links resurrection and incorruptibility. In his Pentecost speech,²²² Peter draws on the same passage to validate his claim that “God raised (ἀνέστησεν) him [Jesus] up, loosing the pangs of death, because it was not possible for him to be held by it” (2:24).²²³ In fact, Peter exploits the entirety of Psalm 15:8–11 LXX to depict the resurrection as the fulfillment of God’s oath to David that “he would set one of his descendants (ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ) on the throne” (2:30). Though more compressed, this portion of Paul’s speech in Antioch advances the same argument: resurrection = incorruptibility = fulfillment of Davidic (i.e., ancestral) promises.

But Paul is not finished. He offers one last piece of evidence to demonstrate that the resurrection qualifies Jesus not merely as a successor of David but as the exclusive heir of his promises. The argument here – proceeding by contrast (μὲν ... δέ) – again follows the same logic employed by Peter in Acts 2: By virtue of his death and burial, David was corruptible (Δαυιδ μὲν γὰρ ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ ὑπηρετήσας τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλῇ ἐκοιμήθη καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶδεν διαφθοράν); hence, he is not the one spoken of in scripture. Yet by virtue of his resurrection, Jesus was not corruptible (ὅν δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν, οὐκ εἶδεν διαφθοράν); therefore, he *is* the one spoken of in scripture. Luke’s reference to the will of God here (τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλῇ) lends credence to the argument that it is Jesus not David who embodies the fulfillment of God’s promises (13:36–37; cf. 2:29–32).²²⁴

5.3.3.4 Pressing Home the Colonizing Message (13:38–41)

Building on what has come before, the next and final section functions as the climax of Paul’s speech; it represents the formal transfer of the colonizing message to Antioch via direct appeal. The inferential nature of the direct address – γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν²²⁵ – as well as the appeal to ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί (recalling v. 26) suggests that the current colonizing is an extension of the work of salvation in Jerusalem, and in the ancestral prehistory before that (13:17–

²²² See Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 123.

²²³ In the earlier instance, as here, Luke embeds his claims about the resurrection within the larger argument that Jesus is the ruler-savior (see 2:21, 32–36).

²²⁴ Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 86.

²²⁵ This address echoes Peter’s in 2:14. See *ibid.*, 87.

25).²²⁶ Structurally, the formal transfer of the colonizing message features both the appeal proper (13:38–39) and a warning (13:40–41).

The Colonizing Message in Nuce

The first subsection relates the content of the colonizing message while also pointing to its implications for the Antiochene community. Paul focuses here on the benefits secured through Jesus (διὰ τούτου). Earlier in the speech, Paul spoke of Jesus σωτήρα (13:23; cf. 5:31) and cast the news of his appearance as the ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας (13:26; cf. 4:12; 13:47; 16:7). What he does in the present context is unpack the significance of this salvation – what it means for the Antiochenes. In doing so, Paul characterizes salvation as the forgiveness of sins (ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν),²²⁷ though he is careful to present it as a message proclaimed (καταγγέλλεται) rather than accomplished, contingent as it is upon acceptance.²²⁸

Continuity in the message. This presentation of salvation harmonizes with the earlier portrayal of John's proclamation – that is, "proclaiming a baptism of repentance" (προκηρῦξαντος ... βάπτισμα μετανοίας; 13:24) as preparation for receiving "forgiveness of sins" (ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν; 13:38). Similarly, Paul's depiction of salvation here recalls Peter's Pentecost speech. There, of course, Peter referred to how God made Jesus κύριον ... καὶ χριστόν (2:36). But he goes on to relate how it is necessary, in light of Jesus's anointment,²²⁹ for everyone to "repent and be baptized ... in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sins" (2:38).²³⁰ And shortly after, Peter characterizes the proper response to his message about Jesus as the path of salvation: σώθητε ἀπὸ τῶς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιάς ταύτης (2:40). Therefore, Paul's portrayal of salvation as forgiveness of sins closely resembles Peter's. This not only reinforces the connection between the two founding figures; it also contributes to the depiction of the prospective community in Antioch as a replication of the cult community which originated in Jerusalem, largely as a response to Peter's speech.

Implications of the message. The remainder of verses 38–39 expounds on the implications of this forgiveness of sins, particularly for the Antiochene

²²⁶ One might also say that the contemporary proclamation represents a culmination of the recent past as well based upon verse 32, which extends to Antioch the announcement of God's fulfilled promises, subsequent to the narration of the appearance and rejection of Jesus in Jerusalem.

²²⁷ Cf. Luke 24:46–48; Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 60, 159.

²²⁸ See my comments above on 13:25–31.

²²⁹ The Jews had inquired: τί ποιήσωμεν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί; (2:37).

²³⁰ See Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 87.

audience.²³¹ Paul portrays this state brought about by Jesus (ἐν τούτῳ) as one of “freedom” or “release”: δικαιούται (13:39).²³² But characteristic of Acts, this freedom is accessible only to the one who embraces the message – whom Paul describes as πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων. (This characterization ensures that salvation is not restricted to Jews but open to gentiles as well.²³³) We have observed this emphasis on proper response in Paul’s remark on John (vv. 24–25), on the one hand, and the Jews and religious leaders of Jerusalem (vv. 27–29), on the other; it will resurface in the quotation of scripture in verses 40–41. Here it is sufficient to note that throughout Acts the believing response of audiences effectively completes the colonizing process initiated by the proclamation and miracles of founding figures – in fulfillment of their “witnessing” mandate.

Rather than merely promise freedom and forgiveness of sins, Paul pictures what this might mean for the identity of the Antiochene community. Throughout this study I have referred to the importance of identity markers in the establishment of new communities. Identity markers, as I explained in the introduction, helped insiders as well as outsiders distinguish one community from another. Perhaps most important, they helped articulate the relationship between a colony and its mother city. Thus, we saw in chapter 3 how the formative practices of the Jerusalem community distinguished it from the broader culture while linking it to the ministry of Jesus, its original founder. In similar fashion, the proclamation of τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν in Syrian Antioch (11:20) signaled a connection between this new cult community and the one in Jerusalem from which it originated, as did its leadership institutions. Later the “council” convened in Jerusalem earmarked essential practices to further underscore the mother-child relationship between these two communities (15:19–21; 28–29).²³⁴ However, the other side of the coin was that the practice of circumcision was set to the side for the predominantly gentile community of Syrian Antioch. This reformulation of identity markers sets the stage for Paul’s comment in 13:38b, which elaborates on the promise of freedom/justification (v. 39a) just as this elaborates on “forgiveness of sins” (v. 38b).²³⁵

²³¹ Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 127, takes the καί – omitted by some witnesses (P⁷⁴ A C* D t w vgst) – as exegetical. He is quite right in remarking that vv. 38–39 elaborate on the “substance of ‘the word of salvation’ sent to the congregation (‘to us,’ v. 26)” (128).

²³² The verb δικαιόω used in the passive could be translated as “justified” in vv. 38 and 39. Either way, it is likely that it is designed to evoke Pauline theology. So Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 174; Pervo, *Acts*, 340.

²³³ Cf. 10:43. As Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 87, notes, Peter signaled a similar perspective with his citation of Joel 3 LXX in 2:21: “it shall come to pass that everyone who calls upon the name of the Lords shall be saved.”

²³⁴ James’s concluding words could easily apply to the Jews and Godfearers in Pisidian Antioch: “For from ancient generations Moses has had in every city those who proclaim him, for he is read ever Sabbath in the synagogues” (15:21).

²³⁵ Cf. Pervo, *Acts*, 339–40.

The freedom that Antiochenes who believe can hope to experience is "from all those sins [πάντων ὧν] from which you were unable to be freed by the law of Moses [οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν νόμῳ Μωϋσέως]" (v. 39). As it turns out, the clarification speaks to the means of salvation just as much as it does to its content, pitting the effectiveness of Jesus's salvation against the perceived inefficacy of the law.²³⁶ From the perspective of Acts, the latter is due, ultimately, not to any flaw in the law itself but rather Jewish inability to keep it.²³⁷ All the same, this characterization of the law in negative terms may help explain why Paul's summary of Israelite history contains no reference to the law comparable to the λόγια ζῶντα featured in Stephen's speech (7:38). As noted above, Paul's ancestral prehistory builds toward the climax which is the proclamation of the colonizing message to the patriarchs' descendants, the Jews and God-fearers of Antioch; it is thus tailored to fit this situation. The Antiochenes first and foremost are defined by the promises given to David – or rather, by their response to the fulfilment of these promises in Jesus. The latter embodies God's gracious rule through his offer of forgiveness of sins. In essence, what verse 39 accomplishes is to validate the identity Paul envisions for his audience, and it does so by focusing on its antithesis – identity circumscribed by an ineffectual law.

As noted above, Paul's characterization of the law anticipates the meeting in Jerusalem over identity markers (Acts 15).²³⁸ There, the issue is whether it was necessary for new gentiles adherents to be circumcised in compliance with the demands of the law (15:1–2; 5–21). At several points the narrative casts the law as an onerous responsibility: Peter describes it as a "yoke (ζυγόν) ... that neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear [ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι]" (15:10); James determines not to "trouble (παρενοχλεῖν) gentiles who turn to God" with provisions such as circumcision (15:19); and the letter from the Jerusalem leadership relates the decision "to lay no greater burden (βάρος)" upon gentile community members (15:28). This understanding of the law and its minimal relevance applied to the gentile community members of Antioch of Syria and its colonies. The four-fold prohibition (15:19–21; cf. 15:29; 21:25)

²³⁶ See Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 128–29, 153.

²³⁷ Cf. 7:53; Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 87. Keener, *Acts*, 2:2078, notes a "tension between the positive character of the law and its inability to save." Pervo, *Acts*, 340, sees the claim in verse 39b as "as somewhat etiolated reflection of Paul's arguments with 'Judaizing' Christians." Zhang, *Paul Among the Jews*, 148–49, argues that "Paul is affirming that Mosaic Law has lost its function to be a means of justification for all the people." It is dubious, though, whether a majority of ancient Jews believed that the law by itself – absent God's grace – provided justification. See E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977). Paul's claim may simply mean that justification through Jesus was the solution for a problem which the law could not – and was not meant to – fully address.

²³⁸ See chapter 4.

– with its focus on idolatry and *porneia* – was deemed sufficient to bind gentiles in mixed communities to the Jewish (and Jerusalem) origins of the cult.²³⁹ Paul’s speech in Acts 13, of course, does not mention the prohibition since it has not yet occurred. However, his negative characterization of the law anticipates the decisions made concerning the identity markers of Antioch of Syria and its colonies in Acts 15.²⁴⁰ As such, it strengthens the impression – signaled by the commission in 13:2–4 and reinforced by the debriefing in 14:26–28 – of Pisidia Antioch as a second-generation offspring of Syrian Antioch. Like its mother community, the cult community in Antioch of Pisidia was to be defined by its mixed membership.

Warning: Response to the Message

But for the moment Paul’s focus remains on his current audience, comprised largely of Jews familiar with the scriptures. Whereas verses 38–39 express the implications of Jesus’s salvation for this audience, however, verses 40–41 fire a warning shot against a potential failure to accept the colonizing message. John the Baptist, recall, modeled the proper response to God’s appointed savior (vv. 24–25), while the Jerusalem Jews pursued the path of rejection (vv. 27–29). The latter’s response looms large in this passage: Not only did it facilitate, by God’s providence, the spread of the colonizing message beyond Israel and thus eventually to Antioch, it also functions now as a negative exemplar for Paul’s Antiochene audience – compelling their reception of the salvation message. But true to form, the Lukan Paul further elaborates his caution using a passage of scripture. Taken from Habakkuk, the passage represents part of an oracle describing how God was going to use the “Chaldeans” – that is, Babylonians – to punish Judah. However, Paul repurposes the passage to warn against rejecting the ἔργον which God has brought about through Jesus’s resurrection (v. 41; cf. vv. 32–37).²⁴¹

Warning as divine foreknowledge. But the citation of Habakkuk does more than issue a warning. It also demonstrates divine foreknowledge as it anticipates the response of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι in 13:45,²⁴² which is of critical significance insofar

²³⁹ As Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 182, observes, the purpose of Acts 15 is to demonstrate that the inclusion of gentiles “was initiated and preordained by God.” He notes that this is strikingly illustrated through James’s citation of Amos 9:11–12.

²⁴⁰ This characterization of the law likewise anticipates the positive reception of Paul’s message by τὰ ἔθνη (vv. 48–49) versus οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι (v. 45).

²⁴¹ In the present context, “work” denotes “Jesus’s resurrection and the salvation which he can give to men and women” (Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech [Acts 13]*, 130).

²⁴² See Quesnel, “Paul prédicateur dans les Actes des Apôtres,” 472. Pervo, *Acts*, 341.

as it influences Paul and Barnabas's subsequent efforts. The founders' reaction ultimately shapes the outcome of the colonizing mission in Antioch.

Paul introduces the passage with the warning: Βλέπετε οὖν μὴ ἐπέλθῃ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις (13:40). The οὖν binds these two verses – and they outcome they warn against – to the preceding announcement that forgiveness of sins and therefore salvation has now made available to the Jews and Godfearers of Antioch (vv. 38–39). They are to “watch out” or “beware” (Βλέπετε) because, as detailed in verses 23–37, this moment represents the fulfillment of God's promises to the ancestors. The audience, however, finds itself in danger of fulfilling a prophecy that Paul has refashioned to describe an unbelieving response to God's saving action through Jesus. A hefty number of witnesses²⁴³ have supplied ἐφ' ὑμῶς to clarify that it is the Antiochenes who will be affected, countering the odd use of ἔρχομαι without an object.²⁴⁴ The reference to τοῖς προφήταις, moreover, links the current audience to the Jerusalem Jews who did not understand “the prophets” and, therefore, ironically fulfilled them (13:27). In like fashion, the Antiochenes' rejection of the salvation ushered in by Jesus would represent a failure to understand the prophets (see 13:15) and, at the same time, a fulfillment of the prophetic warning related in verse 41.

Continuity in the warning. Paul's citation, though a reconfiguration of Habakkuk 1:5, connects with several ideas in the immediate context; for this reason, it all the more effectively demonstrates God's foreknowledge of how the colonizing effort will fare in Antioch. Paul quotes Habakkuk 1:5 thus:

ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί,
καὶ θαυμάσατε καὶ ἀφανίσθητε,
ὅτι ἔργον ἐργάζομαι ἐγὼ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν,
ἔργον δ' οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἂν τις ἐκδιηγῆται
ὑμῖν.

To begin with, οἱ καταφρονηταί – a rare word appearing merely three times in the LXX (twice in Habakkuk²⁴⁵ and once in Zephaniah) and once in the NT (here in Acts 13:41) – evokes disbelief and rejection, an apt characterization both of the Jerusalem Jews' response to Jesus the savior and that of the Antiochene Jews (see v. 45). Luke's citation omits the verb ἐπιβλέψατε²⁴⁶ and

²⁴³ A C E L Ψ 097. 81. 323. (614). 945. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. M gig vg sy co; Bas.

²⁴⁴ See Pervo, *Acts*, 329, who describes this reading as “an obvious improvement the removal of which would be inexplicable.”

²⁴⁵ Instead of ἴδετε οἱ καταφρονηταί (“Behold/look scoffers”) the MT reads ראו בגייתם (“Look at/among the nations”). 1QpHab 1 also provides some support for καταφρονηταί. See Barrett, “Old Testament History According to Stephen and Paul,” 59. Thus, Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 129, concludes that καταφρονηταί is taken either from the LXX or a Hebrew Vorlage.

²⁴⁶ MT: ויבטלו.

adverb θαυμάσια,²⁴⁷ presumably for stylistic reasons (i.e., to avoid repetitive-ness). The imperative θαυμάσατε (“be amazed”) anticipates the initial response of the synagogue-goers after this sermon; many begged for an encore the following Sabbath (13:42), with some even continuing to follow Paul and Barnabas once they had left the synagogue (13:43). In Acts, at any rate, “amazement” characteristically captures the immediate reaction to a divine work and does not necessarily imply lasting belief,²⁴⁸ as the current episode well demonstrates.

Ἀφανίσθητε (“perish”)²⁴⁹ seems much better suited to its original context as a reference to the invading Babylonian forces,²⁵⁰ but it applies here, too, given the looming rejection of the colonizing message by many of the Jewish auditors. Paul and Barnabas’s reaction is to say to the Jews speaking out against them, οὐκ ἀξιόους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς (v. 46). The command to “perish” foreshadows this withdrawal of “eternal life.”²⁵¹ There are not strong verbal links between the following statement, which provides the cause (ὅτι) for amazement and perishing, and the immediate context. But the ἔργον ἐργάζομαι ἐγὼ ἐν ἡμέραις ὑμῶν most naturally refers to the events of the recent past and the present as related in Paul’s speech – that is, the advent of Jesus the savior (v. 23b), his appearance in Jerusalem (vv. 27–32), and finally the proclamation of him in Antioch (vv. 26, 32–37). Ἡμέραις recalls the appearance of Jesus τοῖς συναναβάσιν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ (v. 31), but in this subsection the weight of the reference falls upon the conveyance of Jesus’s salvation to the Antiochenes (thus “in *your* days”) via Paul’s proclamation.

It is therefore felicitous that the Habakkuk citation depicts the denouement of God’s plan as a “work/deed” which he accomplishes. For this is how Luke depicts Paul’s activity in connection with his current colonizing mission, both at his commissioning (13:2) and in his debriefing before the mother community in Antioch of Syria (14:26).²⁵² It is important to note once again that this blurring of lines between the work of founding figures and divine forces is characteristic of colonizing accounts. For it is precisely in fulfilling the will of God that the founding figure demonstrates the veracity of his vocation.

²⁴⁷ θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια renders the infinitive absolute תמהו תמהו (MT).

²⁴⁸ See Acts 2:7; 3:12; 4:13. Cf. Zhang, *Paul Among the Jews*, 150, who speaks of the “ambivalent response to salvation.”

²⁴⁹ While ἀφανίσθητε appears in the LXX passage, there is not a comparable Hebrew word to be found in the MT passage. Cf. Barrett, “Old Testament History According to Stephen and Paul,” 59.

²⁵⁰ Cf. Keener, *Acts*, 2:2090.

²⁵¹ In light of the actual responses of the audience, we might even take the καί linking the two imperatives in a temporal sense: “be amazed” and *then* “perish.”

²⁵² Cf. 15:38.

Yet the final statement – a relative clause introduced by the emphatic repetition of ἔργον – once more anticipates the rejection of the colonizing message of salvation: ὃ οὐ πιστεύσητε ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται ὑμῖν. In the present context, the concessive clause at the end provides an apt depiction both of Paul's current sermon and the rebuttal (ἀντίλεγον) that some Antiochene Jews lodge against what was, presumably, a similar discourse the following Sabbath (v. 45). The reference to *not believing* here thus foreshadows the Jews' rejection of the message that promises justification, or release from sins, for πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων (13:38).²⁵³ Therefore, in terms of formal function the citation in verse 41 acts as a warning to complement the elaboration of (potential) benefits in the preceding verse.

The verbal and conceptual links highlighted above between the text cited by "Paul" and his narrative setting thus possesses an additional function: to project divine foreknowledge of rejection to come by many Antiochene Jews. Much, otherwise, would seem to ride on the response of these synagogue-goers since Luke's narrative has consistently portrayed belief as critical player in the successful replication of the cult, much as repentance is a prerequisite for the forgiveness of sins.²⁵⁴ However, the oracle of "the prophets," much like an oracle of Delphi, validates the outcome as part of the wider purposes of God.

5.3.4 Summation: The Rhetoric of "Second-Generation" Colonization

I have argued that Paul's synagogue speech in Pisidian Antioch expresses the rhetoric of second-generation colonization. It seeks, in other words, to legitimate the replication of the cult community in the wider Mediterranean world – no less here, in a colony otherwise noted for its symbols of Roman hegemony. To accomplish these ends, Luke has woven familiar colonizing motifs into Paul's speech. In the first two sections of the speech (13:17–22; 23–25), he presents an ancestral prehistory to ground the Antiochenes' present encounter of the salvation message; demonstrating this function, *inter alia*, are the direct forms of address in verses 16, 26, and 38. Paul's narrative legitimates the prospective community by enveloping its members in a history directed God and typified by seminal moments outside the land of Israel. God's benefaction of his people in Egypt (v. 17), for example, offers a precedent for the current unveiling of salvation in Antioch – much like proto-colonizing heroes served as forerunners for Greek and Roman colonists.

The rhetoric of colonization is also manifest in the depiction of founding figures and the colonizing message. David provides the genealogical link (τούτου ... ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος; v. 23) to Jesus; further, as one committed to God's will (τὰ θελήματά; v. 22) he anticipates the founder of the new cult

²⁵³ See Quesnel, "Paul prédicateur dans les Actes des Apôtres," 472.

²⁵⁴ See, Luke 3:3, 8; 5:32; 11:32; 13:3, 5; 15:7, 10; 16:30; 17:3, 4; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 3:19; 5:31; 8:22; 11:18; 13:24; 17:30; 19:4; 20:21; 26:20.

community. The other founding figures in the speech likewise act on behalf of a higher purpose: The apostles serve as Jesus's "witnesses" (v. 31) and Paul and Barnabas "proclaim the good news" that God has brought his promises to fulfillment (vv. 32–33).

As elsewhere in Acts,²⁵⁵ the fulfillment of God's purposes creates an opportunity to receive God's salvation. This, indeed, is the colonizing message. Implicitly, salvation envisions the beneficent rule of God. Explicitly, it entails the forgiveness of sins, or – according to the rhetoric of second-generation colonization – justification not possible through the law (v. 39). By virtue of his resurrection, Jesus the savior acts as guarantor of both. But for the message of salvation to successfully replicate the cult community, it must prompt a believing response. The Jerusalem Jews' rejection of the savior provides the Antiochenes with a negative exemplar (vv. 27–31), while simultaneously explaining how the cult spread – namely, through opposition (or "crisis") – a familiar motif of colonization accounts.

Meanwhile, the direct address in verses 38–41 represents the formal extension of the colonizing message to the Antiochenes. The attached warning (vv. 40–41) anticipates the rejection by many of the Jews addressed by Paul (v. 45) but with it, as we shall see, the extension of the message to gentiles (vv. 46–49). Drawing on scripture, the warning implies the foreknowledge of God and thus validates this turn of events even before it occurs.

5.4 The Outcome of Second-Generation Colonization at Antioch

Paul's speech (vv. 16–41) legitimates the replication of the Christian cult in Antioch, but what follows (vv. 42–52) concerns the outcome of this colonizing effort. It does so in two movements: verses 42–43 portray the initial response of the synagogue goers to Paul's sermon, while verses 44–52 depict an additional reaction by multiple entities: "the whole city" (v. 44); "the Jews" (v. 45); Paul and Barnabas (vv. 46–47); gentiles (v. 48); "the Jews" again in collusion with "women in high standing" and "the leading men of the city;"²⁵⁶ Paul and Barnabas again (v. 51); and finally "the disciples" (v. 52). This latter sequence of reactions – ultimately facilitating Paul and Barnabas's departure from the Roman colony – influences the complexion of the community planted in

²⁵⁵ E.g., Acts 2, 3–5. See chapter 3.

²⁵⁶ Pilhofer, "Luke's Knowledge of Pisidian Antioch," 83, argues that by τοὺς πρώτους τῆς πόλεως Luke signifies "the leading magistrates of the *Colonia Caesarea Antiocheia*." This is not implausible given Luke's penchant for bringing the movement's founding figures into contact with religious and political officials. See, e.g., Acts 3–5; 12:1–19; 13:7–12, 15; 14:13; 16:38; 18:8, 14–16, 17; 19:31, 35; 21:37–39; 22:24–29; 24:1–27; 25:1–12, 13–27; 26:1–32; cf. 28:7–10. Cf. Keener, *Acts*, 2:2103.

Antioch and with it, any judgment about the entire venture's success. These two issues serve as foci in the remaining remarks.

5.4.1 *The Foundation of a "Mixed" Community*

I have characterized Paul's sermon as the rhetoric of second-generation colonization because it legitimates the replication of the cult community outside the land of Israel. This is precisely what occurred at Syrian Antioch, where such replication yielded a mixed community comprising both Jews and gentiles. Of course, this expansiveness of mission manifested itself earlier in Acts via Jesus's colonizing oracle (1:8); the Holy Spirit's outpouring at Pentecost and Peter's interpretive speech (2:1–40); Stephen's speech (7:1–53); the ministry of Philip in Samaria, to the Ethiopian Eunuch, and throughout the coastal region of Judea (8:4–40); the commissioning of Paul (9:1–30); and Peter's visit to Cornelius at Caesarea (10:1–11:18). However, as Luke reconstructs events, it was at Antioch where the first full-fledged community of Jews and gentiles was formed. This community was equipped with leadership and religious institutions reflecting both its relationship to the mother community and its mixed membership. Second-generation colonization began with the commissioning of Paul and Barnabas as founding figures to plant communities on behalf of Antioch of Syria, a new mother community (13:2–4). We should naturally expect Antioch of Pisidia as the most notable among these new communities to reflect the mother community's identity, particularly its mixed composition.

Luke signals the mixed – Jewish and gentile – composition of the Antioch community in multiple ways. In fact, Paul's speech telegraphs this development. At two critical junctures Paul addresses non-Jews as οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν (13:16, 26). The first comes at the beginning of the speech (v. 16) while the second falls at the point of transition, as we have seen, from God's activities in the ancient past to his work in the recent past and present through Jesus (v. 26). The references and their placement demonstrate that Paul considers gentiles who attach themselves to Judaism to be eligible for the blessings of salvation – in continuity with Israel's sacred history. Furthermore, Paul's culminating exhortation in verses 38–41 appears to be directed at Jews and gentiles alike based on the general reference to πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων in verse 39. In fact, Paul maintains that salvation through Jesus is more effective than the law of Moses (see above). This perspective reveals an openness to gentile adherents.

Subsequent events validate this impression of openness to Jews and gentiles alike. There is, first of all, the initial response once Paul concludes his discourse and leaves the synagogue with Barnabas. By itself the plea for an encore – παρεκάλουν εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ λαληθῆναι αὐτοῖς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα (v. 42) – indicates more about the persuasiveness of Paul's words than it does about the genuineness of the listeners' response; public opinion can prove fickle. But

Luke follows this by narrating what occurs between the first and second trips to the synagogue.²⁵⁷ During this time, many Jews and gentile converts to Judaism followed Paul and Barnabas. The language of “following” (ἀκολουθέω) appears to imply acceptance and belief, but the word appears too infrequently in Acts to be conclusive. In his gospel, Luke employs the concept of “following” to depict both discipleship and its costs.²⁵⁸ But he also utilizes the same word to describe the mass following Jesus acquired during his ministry.²⁵⁹ So based on language alone, the claim that many synagogue goers “followed” Paul and Barnabas cannot rule out the possibility – especially in light of the quite contrary reaction of “the Jews” in verse 45 – that this initial response is one of superficial attraction rather than genuine belief. More conclusive, however, is Paul and Barnabas’s response. Luke relates that προσλαλοῦντες αὐτοῖς ἐπειθον αὐτοὺς προσμένειν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 43). This plea resembles exhortation that is elsewhere directed at those who genuinely the colonizing message of salvation.²⁶⁰ Therefore, it is likely that we encounter here a believing response from both Jews and gentile converts to Judaism. These individuals form the core of the mixed community founded at Pisidian Antioch.²⁶¹

A shift in target audience further influences the development of a mixed membership. Whereas initially gentiles became part of the community through their prior attachment to Judaism, now they join its ranks as a result of deliberate outreach by Paul and Barnabas. Luke attributes this change in colonizing strategy to the jealousy of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, who ἀντέλεγον τοῖς ὑπὸ Παύλου λαλουμένοις Βλασφημοῦντες (v. 45).²⁶² One might be tempted to view Paul and Barnabas’s subsequent “turning” (στερόμεθα; v. 46) to gentiles as reactionary or else a sensible response motivated by self-preservation. Yet Luke’s

²⁵⁷ Cf. Pervo, *Acts*, 342: “The narrator’s intentions [in vv. 42–43] are to set the stage for the return visit [to the synagogue], yet to assure readers that some had been won over.”

²⁵⁸ Luke 5:11, 27–28; 9:23, 57, 59, 61; 18:22, 28, 43.

²⁵⁹ Luke 7:9; 9:11; 23:27.

²⁶⁰ See Acts 11:23; 18:27; 20:32.

²⁶¹ Cf. Morgan-Wynne, *Paul’s Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 38, who argues that v. 43 constitutes “the founding of the Christian community in PA.”

²⁶² Tannehill, “Israel in Luke-Acts,” 77, notes that Jewish rejection is a recurrent characteristic in the mission speeches (2:23, 36; 3:13–15; 4:10–11; 5:30; 10:39; 13:27–29). Daniel Lynwood Smith, “Interrupted Speeches in Luke-Acts,” *JBL* 134 (2015): 191, characterizes the Jews’ response as an “interruption.” The “interruption” here and at 13:48 serves to demonstrate “the volatility of the apostolic (and dominical) message – especially its twin focus on the resurrection of Jesus and the availability of salvation to the gentiles – and to highlight the different audience responses.”

protagonists invest it with theological significance: The deliberate rejection of God's witnesses²⁶³ triggers God's plan of outreach to gentiles.

Nevertheless, this "turning to gentiles" does not abrogate the mission to Jews. Luke understands the universal mission as an extension of the restoration of Israel.²⁶⁴ Here, even, he has Paul claim ὑμῖν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 46). Keeping in mind that some Jews had already embraced the colonizing message, becoming part of the newly planted cult community, it is easier to grasp that the subsequent rejection of these other Jews does not imply wholesale opposition by God's people – but rather, divisions within their midst.²⁶⁵ As is characteristic of Luke's narrative of replication, opposition such as this serves as a mechanism to expand the cult community, here among gentiles.²⁶⁶ Paul henceforth does not abandon the Jews; rather, "to the Jew first, then to the gentile" functions as an implicit blueprint for the spread of the colonizing message of salvation in Philippi (16:16–40), Thessalonica (17:1–9), Athens (17:16–34), Corinth (18:1–17), and Ephesus (18:19–21; 19:1–20).²⁶⁷

Luke's appropriation of Isaiah 49:6 to substantiate the appeal to gentiles reinforces two points: God²⁶⁸ has orchestrated this plan *and* he has chosen Paul and Barnabas to implement it. Both principles harmonize with colonizing motifs seen from the beginning of Acts. Concerning the first, however: Whereas at the very beginning of Acts it was the oracle of the resurrected Jesus (1:8) that sanctioned the mission to Jerusalem and beyond, and thus outreach to gentiles as well as Jews, in his absence it is prophecies from scripture which perform this role. Peter was a trailblazer in his use of scriptural interpretation to

²⁶³ This rejection recalls the Jerusalem Jews' rejection of the disciples (Acts 3–5), Stephen (Acts 7), and before that, Jesus (Luke 22–24). According to Stephen, the pattern of rejection goes back even further – to the Israelites' rejection of Moses (7:27, 53).

²⁶⁴ See Acts 1:6–8. Cf. Scott, "Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations," 87–123; chapter 3.

²⁶⁵ See Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 15. Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 168, notes that such divisions fulfill Simeon's prophecy in Luke 2:34. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 119, notes that this oracle is "the first time in the narrative that opposition, conflict and division are associated with the coming of Jesus." Cf. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*, 26. Quesnel, "Paul prédicateur dans les Actes des Apôtres," 473–74, observes that the opposition to Paul mirrors that which Jesus encountered following his inaugural synagogue sermon.

²⁶⁶ See chapters 2 and 3. Cf. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*, 31; Pervo, *Acts*, 334–35; Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 71.

²⁶⁷ Keener, *Acts*, 2:2097.

²⁶⁸ The κύριος in the introduction to the quotation (οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος) probably refers to God not Jesus (cf. 13:44, 48, 49). So also Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 133.

sanction universal outreach (2:16–21, 39; cf. 10:43); he was followed by Philip (8:30–35), James (15:15–18), and now Paul.

This brings us to the second principle: the appointment of Jesus’s representatives, founding figures in Acts.²⁶⁹ Using Isaiah 49:6, Paul and Barnabas cast their mandate as a calling to extend salvation to gentiles, with τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν elaborating on τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν (13:47).²⁷⁰ The extent of the salvation bearing mission – ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς – evokes Jesus’s oracle in 1:8.²⁷¹ As noted above, Paul’s speech envisions himself and Barnabas as agents on a mission (from Syrian Antioch) to spread the message of salvation (v. 32). Yet there are two differences between the earlier and present contexts: First, the speech’s target audience was Jews and gentiles attached to Judaism; second, the speech seemingly prioritizes the witness of Jesus’s disciples (13:31).²⁷² But when it comes to the gentile mission, Paul and Barnabas take a back seat to no one. In Luke’s view, scripture authorizes their witness similar to the manner the Lord’s appearance underwrote the disciples’. Yet in this respect, Paul’s experience is not so different after all; scripture merely bolsters the sanction already claimed by the apostle due to his own encounter with the resurrected-exalted Lord. His work in Antioch – building on Cyprus – helps to inaugurate the mission forecast back in 9:15.²⁷³

The results stemming from Paul and Barnabas’s shift in target audience further contributes to the mixed character of the Antiochene community. As elsewhere in Acts, it is belief which leads to membership in the community. In response to Paul and Barnabas’s declaration, the gentiles “rejoiced”²⁷⁴ and “glorified the word of God.” Surely not all gentiles responded positively to the colonizing message, but for Luke it is merely important that ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον (13:48),²⁷⁵ since this underscores divine

²⁶⁹ Recall that we identify the apostles as founding figures first because of their responsibility for fulfilling a divine mandate and second due to their role in planting communities through proclamation and miracle working. See chapter 3.

²⁷⁰ On the use of the articular infinitive for the second of two infinites to add “clarity,” see BDF §400(2). See §157(5) for the use of εἰς in the preceding object accusative plus cognate accusative construction (σε εἰς φῶς).

²⁷¹ See the comments on this verse in chapter 3. Here we have confirmation that “ends of the earth” symbolizes mission to gentiles. Cf. *ibid.*, 135.

²⁷² See *ibid.*, 113.

²⁷³ Technically, Barnabas did not receive a direct mandate from the Lord as had both the disciples and Paul. However, he was “set apart” by the Holy Spirit and “anointed” by the mother community at Antioch of Syria (13:2–3). Being a companion of Paul, moreover, he participates in the same divinely sanctioned mission to the gentiles. However, Paul assumes greater importance as founding figure in the gentile mission, which Luke signals beginning in 13:13 by listing him first alongside Barnabas and other “companions.”

²⁷⁴ Luke elsewhere associates rejoicing with the inclusion of gentile converts. See Acts 8:39; 11:23; 15:31.

²⁷⁵ Cf. Acts 18:10.

orchestration of the colonizing process. Just as the Jews who rejected the message of salvation saw “eternal life” withdrawn from them (v. 46), those gentiles who believe find themselves its unexpected recipients.²⁷⁶ The near equivalent of salvation, “eternal life” guarantees the latter’s membership in the cult community formed at Antioch, in turn further ensuring that community’s mixed composition.

5.4.2 The Colonization of Pisidian Antioch – A Success?

So, was Paul and Barnabas’s colonizing mission at Pisidian Antioch successful? Begging this question is the fact that active opposition from many Jews (v. 45), and their incitement of “women of high standing and the leading men of the city,” ultimately “drove them out of their district” (13:50). On Acts’ own terms, however, the answer is quite simply yes. Opposition of “natives” to the colonizing mission is a recurrent theme throughout the narrative; yet here and often, it further contributes to the spread of the message. Luke thus relates the positive response of many Antiochenes. Implicitly, this leads to the creation of a mixed community as, first, some Jews and Godfearers embraced Paul’s message (v. 43) and, then, many other gentiles believed (v. 47).

Further signaling success are two summary statements. The first appears after the conversion of gentiles: διεφέρετο δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου δι’ ὅλης τῆς χώρας²⁷⁷ (13:49). As elsewhere in Acts, this remark denotes the effective spread of the colonizing message. The second summary statement occurs at the conclusion of chapter 13: οἱ τε μαθηταὶ ἐπληροῦντο χαρᾶς καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου (v. 52). In Luke’s second volume, the “filling” of the Holy Spirit and/or the presence of “joy” occur in the context of conversion and community formation presided over by the apostles.²⁷⁸ In some cases, indeed, the “filling” of the Holy Spirit is the mechanism which produces or formalizes community membership.²⁷⁹ Here, at the very least, it signifies the successful replication of the cult community in Antioch.

Finally, the colonizing mission in Antioch represents a success since it was orchestrated by God. There are various indicators of this viewpoint throughout the chapter. First, Paul’s sermon suggests that the mission in Antioch is an extension of God’s plan, which began with his choice of Israel (v. 16), led to

²⁷⁶ Keener, *Acts*, 2:2092, notes that the contrast between Jewish and gentile responses “serves an ironic purpose: the failure of those one expected to repent was particularly noteworthy, as was the positive response of the outsiders. One could not predict the results of one’s sowing (Luke 8:4–15).”

²⁷⁷ Pilhofer, “Luke’s Knowledge of Pisidian Antioch,” 82, observes that while Luke nowhere describes Antioch as a colony (cf. 16:12), here he uses the official term for territory over which a colony has control, ἡ χώρα.

²⁷⁸ See, e.g., 8:39; 11:23; 15:31. Cf. Keener, *Acts*, 2:2101.

²⁷⁹ Acts 2:1–4, 38; 8:15; 10:44–45; 11:15–17; 15:8; 19:6.

his “raising up” of David (v. 22), and culminated in his sending of the savior Jesus – whom he resurrected (vv. 23–37). The warning in the sermon also demonstrates divine foreknowledge that some Jews would reject Jews (v. 40). Second, the oracle in v. 47 reinforces the idea that it was God’s plan all along to use Paul and Barnabas to bring salvation to gentiles, fulfilling Paul’s mandate (9:15) – and prior to that, Jesus’s oracle (1:8). Third, Luke’s report in v. 48 clarifies that those gentiles believing unto eternal life do so because of the “appointment” of the Lord. In other words, he controls the results of the second-generation colonizing mission to gentiles, just as he did Israel’s sacred history. Finally, the Holy Spirit’s filling of disciples at the conclusion of the Pisidian Antioch episode reveals divine superintendence (v. 52). From the beginning of Acts, after all, the Holy Spirit has revealed itself to be the source of divine empowerment for the colonizing mission. Its present manifestation certifies the success of God’s plan to replicate the cult community in Antioch.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

In this study, I have articulated a colonization framework (chapter 2) – developed from accounts of Greek and Roman colonization – and employed it to analyze Acts of the Apostles (chapters 3–5). The motifs comprising this model are of cultural and not merely literary significance, since they reflect how communities in the ancient Mediterranean world validated their identity.

For analyzing Acts' formal features, the colonization framework yields two major benefits. First, at the macro level, it calls renewed attention to the subject matter of Luke's narrative – the replication of the Christian cult community. Successive acts of community replication commonly characterized ancient colonization. Rhodes and Crete founded Gela, which in turn founded Acragas. From Alba Longa, Romulus went on to found Rome, which later founded numerous colonies of its own. The Christian community follows a similar pattern of replication in Acts.

Beginning in Jerusalem (chapter 3), the cult community expands in a significant way to Antioch of Syria – Acts 11:19–30; 13:1–3 (chapter 4). Then the colony assumes the role of mother community and engages in its own acts of colonization, planting second-generation communities in cities such as Antioch of Pisidia – Acts 13:13–52 (see chapter 5). Indeed, I have argued that the establishment of a colony in this second Antioch anticipates the replication of the Christian community in Rome, the culminating point of Luke's narrative (Acts 28). But prior to reaching this destination, the cult community expands to eminent cities such as Philippi (Acts 16), Corinth (Acts 18), and Ephesus (Acts 19).

Second, at the micro level, reading Acts through the lens of ancient colonization illuminates key *topoi*. Receiving the lion's share of attention in this study are motifs relating to origins, divine sanction, and founder(s). I have shown how these concerns typify accounts of community foundation in the ancient Mediterranean world. In Acts, they broadly correspond to the emphasis on the Jerusalem origins of the cult community, the divine initiative of both Jesus and the Holy Spirit, and the seminal acts of apostolic figures – particularly, Peter and Paul.

I have illustrated how Jerusalem functions like a *metropolis* of the Christian cult community in general and Antioch of Syria in particular (chapters 3–4). The city's antiquity and religious significance confer legitimacy upon the col-

onies founded in Acts. Though *stasis* in Jerusalem precipitated the founding of Antioch of Syria, this memorable “origins story” actually strengthens the symbolic connection between mother community and colony.

Further, both the nomenclature (“Christians”; 11:26) and leadership institutions (“prophets and teachers”; 13:1–2) of the colonists in Antioch signal the new community’s link to its origins. Finally, the visits by the Jerusalem apostles and their emissaries reinforce the mother community’s oversight (11:22–26).

As is often the case in colonization accounts, there is ambivalence in the *metropolis-colony* relationship, stemming mostly from the mixed membership of the new Christian communities. However, the narrative successfully negotiates these challenges. For example, the community in Antioch of Syria adopts religious institutions – determined by the leaders of the Jerusalem community – that function as a compromise means of incorporating gentile members, one which nevertheless projects a common community identity (15:19–20). The presence of “Godfearers” in Antioch of Pisidia helps facilitate the inclusion of gentile members, which Paul depicts as the fulfillment of God’s purposes. He elaborates this theological rationale by linking them along with his Jewish auditors to the ancestral prehistory (13:16–41). This prehistory anchors the prospective Christian community in a distant salvation-historical past.

I have argued that the legitimacy of colonizing community portrayed in Acts derives above all from its divine sanction. Luke represents this sanction in various ways. Jesus’s oracle in 1:8 authorizes the replication of the Christian community, while the Holy Spirit’s outpouring in 2:1–4 precipitates it. Divine initiative continues to orchestrate the community’s expansion throughout the narrative. Epiphanic signs (4:31) and angelic assistance (5:20–21) evidence support for the community’s growth within Jerusalem. A vision by Peter legitimates gentile inclusion at Caesarea (10:9–11:18). The Holy Spirit leads Philip and Peter alike to proclaim the gospel in areas beyond Jerusalem (8:4–40; 10:9–11:18). And, he appoints Paul and Barnabas to colonize on behalf of the mother community, Syrian Antioch (13:1–4). Finally, divine sanction reveals itself in Paul’s sermon at Antioch of Pisidia. Here, as interpreter of sacred traditions, Paul demonstrates God’s plan of expansion to include both Jews and Godfearers outside the land of Israel (13:16–41).

Finally, I have illustrated how the apostles such as Peter and Paul function like founding figures. While Jesus is *the* founder, these individuals act as his representatives in their capacity as “witnesses.” Their chief qualification is their *surprising* divine mandate (1:8; 9:15). As founding figures, they replicate the cult community through words and symbolic actions heralding God’s salvation through the risen Jesus. Further, they help shape the identity of newly founded communities by determining, interpreting and overseeing institutions (2:42–47; 4:32–5:11; 13:39; 15:7–29). By such means, the founders fulfill their divine mandate.

This brief summary of the preceding chapters (3–5) demonstrates the usefulness of the colonization framework for analyzing the formal features of Acts. This analysis could be extended beyond Acts 15 – where I leave off – to consider Paul’s visits to prominent cities such as Philippi (16:12–40), Thessalonica (17:1–9), Athens (17:16–34), Corinth (18:1–17), Ephesus (19:1–41), and finally Rome (28:14–31). How does the portrayal of community foundations compare with depictions in the first half of Acts – where the colonizing mission originates and just begins its second-generation transition?

In carrying the analysis forward, one might zoom in on Luke’s deployment of one or more of the colonizing *topoi* outlined in this book. So, for example, it quickly becomes clear that Acts continues to stress the origins and common identity of the newly founded communities. Paul conveys the institutions formulated by the Jerusalem leadership to new communities (16:4). Moreover, he appeals to scriptures and Jewish ancestors to anchor prospective communities in the distant salvation-historical past (e.g., 17:2–3; 20:23–24). Further, through return visits, he and his associates shore up the cultic identity of recently established communities (15:36–41; 18:23; cf. 14:21–28). Finally, Paul famously returns to Jerusalem prior to his capture and eventual voyage to Rome (21:1–17).¹ Each of these features further supports the supposition that the Christian movement in Acts resembles a colonizing network, whose members are bound to a common identity and a mother community in Jerusalem.

Divine sanction continues to act as a catalyst for the replication of the cult community. The Holy Spirit still plays a prominent role in this respect. In a couple instances – acting the part of tour guide – he provides a divine corrective to prospective plans (16:6, 7).² Yet elsewhere the Spirit formalizes the foundation of a cult community, “falling on” believers newly baptized into “the name of the Lord Jesus” (19:5–6; cf. 10:44–45).³ In addition to the Holy Spirit, visions continue to be another vehicle for articulating the divine will (16:6–10; 18:9–10). Both forms of sanction thematize the divine initiative which propels the expansion of the Christian cult.

Paul as founder remains the chief agent responsible for establishing and molding the identity of communities. The spoken word continues to be a prime means by which this is accomplished (16:13, 32; 17:10, 16–31; 18:5, 11, 19; 19:8–9; 28:23–24, 30). But the founder(s) also performs symbolic acts which include baptism (16:15, 33; cf. 8:38; 10:48), exorcism (16:18), and healing (28:8–9). He encounters opposition in the form of profiteers (16:16–24), skeptical Athenians (17:32a), Jewish exorcists (19:13–17), magic (19:18–20), and

¹ Significantly, the report, response, and remarks about institutions (20:17–25) upon Paul’s return to Jerusalem recalls his and Barnabas’s debriefing in Antioch together with its aftermath (14:21–15:35).

² Cf. chapter 2.

³ The Holy Spirit also, in effect, forecasts Paul’s mission to Rome – announcing that he will be handed over to the “gentiles” (21:11; cf. 9:15–16)

the Artemis cult (19:23–41). Though managing to overcome most of these challenges, Paul is not always successful. Like many founders, he sometimes encounters intractable resistance. Indeed, Luke portrays the negative reaction given by the Jews in Thessalonica as a foil for the receptive response of the Berean Jews (17:1–15; cf. 13:26–41). Nevertheless, Paul and his associates carry on, reconfiguring space through their founding actions (cf. chapter 3) – performed in synagogues (16:13[?]; 17:1, 10, 17; 18:4, 19, 26; 19:8), the *agora* (17:17); the *Areopagus* (17:22–34); private residences (18:7; 28:8), a lecture hall (19:9), and more places besides. In so doing, Paul fulfills his divine mandate to carry Jesus’s name “before gentiles and ... the people of Israel” (9:15).

The above observations mostly concern the formal characteristics of Acts, but the colonization framework also clarifies the function of the narrative. Why did Luke shape the narrative as he did? I argue that like other foundation accounts, Acts validates the network of Christian communities via a memorable tale of beginnings, which employs motifs that were ready at hand, reflecting culturally patterned ways of construing community origins. These motifs embroiler the foundation “histories” of many of the cities visited by Paul in Acts. Like Philo before him, Luke leverages colonization *topoi* in order to legitimate minority communities embedded in these great cities of the Roman Empire. According to Acts of the Apostles, the earliest Christian communities – no less than their civic hosts – boasted memorable origins, divine sanction, and illustrious founders.

Appendix

Abridged Chart of Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman Colonies

Colony	Source	Origin (Metropolis, Legendary)	Founder(s)	Sanction
Acrae	Thucydides 6.5.2	Syracuse		
Acragas	Thucydides 6.4.4	Gela	Aristonous, Pystilus	
Abdera	Herodotus 1.168	Teos	Timesios of Clazomenae	
	Plutarch, <i>Mor.</i> 96b; cf. <i>Mor.</i> 812b	Clazomenae?	Timesios	oracle (predicting conflict)
	Strabo 14.1.30	Teos		
	Pindar, <i>Paeon</i> 2	Teos	Abderus (hero); Timesios	
Acanthus	Thucydides 4.84	Andros		
	Plutarch, <i>Quaest. rom.</i> 30, 298a–b	Chalcis and Andros		
Alba Longa	Livy 1.1–17		Ascanius (son of Aeneas)	
	Diodorus 7.5.1–7		Ascanius	oracle, vision
Alexandria	Arrian 3.1.5– 3.2.1		Alexander	oracle, <i>manteis</i>
	Plutarch, <i>Alexander</i> 26f		Alexander	vision, omen, <i>manteis</i> , oracle
	Pseudo- Callisthenes 1.30–31		Alexander	oracle, omen
Amphipolis	Thucydides 4.102–108; 5.11	Athens > Sparta	Hagnon (Athenian) Brasidas (Spartan)	
	Polyaenus, <i>Strat.</i> 6.5.3			oracle

Colony	Source	Origin (Metropolis, Legendary)	Founder(s)	Sanction
Antioch of Syria	Appian, <i>Syriaca</i> 57		Seleucus Nicator	
	Libanius, <i>Or.</i> 11	1. Argos 2. Crete 3. Cyprus 4. Elea (with Heraclidae)	1. Triptolemus 2. Casus 5. Alexander 6. Seleucus Nicator	2. Zeus 6. Omen: Eagle of Zeus
	Malalas 199– 200		Seleucus Nicator	omen: eagles; priests and augurs
Apamea	Appian, <i>Syriaca</i> 57		Seleucus Nicator	
	Malalas 202–4		Seleucus Nicator	omen: eagle
Apollonia (Illyria)	Thucydides 1.26.2	Corinth		
	Strabo 7.5.8	Corinth and Corcyra		
	Pausanias 5.22.3–4	Corcyra		Phoebus (i.e., Apollo founded)
Arcadia	Herodotus 1.66	Sparta (attempted)		
Ascra	Pausanias 9.29.1 (cf. Strabo 9.2.35)		Ephialtes and Ottus (sons of Poseidon)	
Camarina	Thucydides 6.5.2–3	Syracuse	Dascon and Menecolus	
Casmenae	Thucydides 6.5.3	Syracuse		
Caulonia	Strabo 6.1.10	Achaean		
Cerasus	Xenophon, <i>Anabasis</i> 5.3.2–3	Sinope		
Chones	Strabo 6.1.3	Petelia		
Cnossus	Strabo 10.4.8		Minos	
Croton	Strabo 6.1.12	Achaea	Myscellus	oracle(s)
	Diodorus 8.17	Achaea	Myscellus of Rhype	oracle(s)
	Dionysius 1.26.1–2	(1) Pelasgians (2) Romans		

Colony	Source	Origin (Metropolis, Legendary)	Founder(s)	Sanction
	Ovid, <i>Metam.</i> 15.1–60 (cf. Diodorus 4.24.7)		Myscelus of Argos	prophecy, dream-vision
Cumae (Italy)	Strabo 5.4.4	Chalcis and Cumae (Greece)	Megasthenes (Chalcis) and Hippocles (Cumae)	
Cyrene	Diodorus 8.29–30		Battos	oracle
	Herodotus 4.150–161	Thera	Battos	oracle(s)
	Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> 4	Thera	Battos	oracle, prophecy (Medea)
	Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> 5	Trojan Antenoridai, Thera	Battos	oracle
	Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> 9	Apollo/Cyrene, Thera	Apollo/Cyrene (Nymph)	
	Callimachus, <i>Hymn to Apollo</i> 2.86		Apollo/Cyrene (Nymph), Battos	Apollo (i.e., oracle)
Cyros (= Corsica)	Herodotus 1.165–167	Phocaeans		oracle (misinterpreted)
Cythera	Dio Chrysostom 30.26	Sparta		
Cythnos	Dio Chrysostom 30.26	Athens		
Epidamnus	Strabo 7.5.8 (cf. Thucydides 1.25.1)	Corcyra		
Enos	Strabo 7. fr. 51 (52)	Mitylenaeans and Cumaeans (earlier, Alope- connesians)		
Gela	Thucydides 6.4.3	Rhodes and Crete	Antiphemus (Rhodes) and Entimus (Crete)	
	Herodotus 7.153 (cf. 154)	Rhodes	Antiphemus	

Colony	Source	Origin (Metropolis, Legendary)	Founder(s)	Sanction
	Diodorus 8.23.1	Rhodes and Crete	Antiphemus and Entimus	oracle
	Pausanias 8.46.2	Dorians	Antiphemus	
Heracleia	Thucydides 3.92.1–4	Sparta		
Heracleia Pontica	Justin 16.3.4–7	Megara and Boeotia	Gnesiochos (Megara)	oracle
	Apollonius of Rhodes 2.846– 850	Boeotia and Nisaia		Apollo
Himera	Thucydides 6.5.1	Chalcidians from Zancle and fugitives from Syracuse	Eucleides, Simus, Sacon (Chalcidians)	
Jerusalem	Diodorus 34/35.1	Impious men from Egypt with leprous marks	Moses	
	Hecataeus of Abdera (Diodorus 40.3.1–8)	Foreigners driven out of Egypt	Moses	
Loadicea	Appian, <i>Syriaca</i> 57	Seleucus Nicator		
Leontini	Thucydides 6.4.1–2	Settlers from Megara (previously Chalcis)	Lamis	
Locri Epi- zephyrii	Strabo 6.1.7	Locri	Evantes	
Lysiacheia	Strabo 7. fr. 51 (5)		Lysimachus ("founding king")	
Massalia	Strabo 4.1.4–5	Phocaea	Aristarcha (?)	oracle, dream- vision
Megara Hy- blaea	Thucydides 6.4.1	Settlers originally from Megara		
Messene (refound- ing)	Pausanias 4.26–27 (cf. 9.14.5)	Thebes, Argos	Epaminondas (Thebes) and Epiteles (Argos)	dream- vision(s), apparition ("ancient man"), Bacis oracle, mystery cult

Colony	Source	Origin (Metropolis, Legendary)	Founder(s)	Sanction
Mylae	Diodorus 14.87.1–3	Rhegion (settlers: fugitives from Catane and Naxos)		
Naucratis	Herodotus 2.178	<i>Emporion</i> represented by Greeks (e.g., Aegina, Samos, Miletus)		
Naxos (Italy)	Thucydides 6.3.1–2	Chalcis	Thucles	oracle (?) [altar to Apollo <i>Archegetes</i>]
Neapolis	Strabo 5.4.5–9	(refounded) Chalcis, Pithecosa, Athens		oracle
Parium	Strabo 13.1.14	Miletus, Erythrae, Paros; Rome		
	Strabo 7.1.2	Erythrae		
Petelia	Strabo 6.1.3	Meliboea	Philoctetes	
Potidaea	Thucydides 1.56; 1.60.1; 1.66.6	Corinth		
Rhegion	Diodorus 8.23.1	Chalcis		oracle
	Dionysius 19.2	Chalcis	Artimedes	oracle
	Pausanias 4.23.6	Messene	Alcidamidas	
	Strabo 6.257.6	Chalcis		oracle
	Strabo 6.1.6	Chalcis and Messenians	Antimnestus	oracle
Rome	Livy 1.1–17	Alba Longa	Romulus	augury
	Diodorus 8.2– 6		Romulus	augury
	Plutarch, <i>Romulus</i>		Romulus	augury, founding ritual

Colony	Source	Origin (Metropolis, Legendary)	Founder(s)	Sanction
	Plutarch, <i>Romulus</i> [other options rejected]	1. Pelasgians (1.1–2) 2. Fleeing Trojans (1.2)	3. Romanus (son of Odysseus and Circe) 4. Romus (2.1) 5. Romis, tyrant of Latins 6. Romulus a. son of Aeneas b. son of Roma c. son of Mars d. son of maidservant, daughter of King of Albans	
	Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1–2	Alba Longa (previously: Aborigines, Pelasgians, Arcadians, Trojans [and Aeneas])	Romulus	auspices, founding rituals
Samos	Iamblichus, <i>De vita pythagorica</i> 2.3–4	Mixed group of settlers: Cephalonia, Arcadia, Thessaly; <i>epoikoi</i> : Athenians, Epidaurians, Chalcidians	Ancaeus	oracle
Samothrace	Strabo 7.50a	Samos (Samians from Mycale)		
Scylletium	Strabo 6.1.10	Athens	Menetheus	
Scriphos	Dio Chrysostom 30.26	Athens		
Seleucia	Appian, <i>Syriaca</i> 57		Seleucus	

Colony	Source	Origin (Metropolis, Legendary)	Founder(s)	Sanction
Seleucia on the Mediterranean	Apian, <i>Syriaca</i> 57		Seleucus	“portent of thunder”
Seleucia at Pieria	Malalas 199		Seleucus	omen: eagle, augury
Seleucia on the Tigris	Apian, <i>Syriaca</i> 58		Seleucus	“portent of thunder,” voice interpreted as divinity
Selinus	Thucydides 6.4.2	Megara Hyblaea	Pammilus of Megara	
Sicily	Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.22	Sicels fleeing from Italy		
Siris	Strabo 6.1.14	Thurii and Taras (latter considered <i>metropolis</i>)		
Stratonicea	Appian, <i>Syriaca</i> 57		Seleucus	
Syracuse	Thucydides 6.3.2–3	Corinth	Archias (one of Heraclidae)	
	Plutarch, <i>Moralia</i> 772d–773b		Archias (one of Heraclidae)	oracle
	Strabo 8.6.22		Archias of Corinth	oracle (?)
	Pausanias 5.7.2–3		Archias of Corinth	oracle
	Diodorus 8.10.1–3		Archias of Corinth	oracle
Taras	Strabo 6.3.2	Sparta (Partheniae)	Phalanthus	oracle
	Strabo 6.3.3	Sparta (Partheniae)	Phalanthus	
	Diodorus 8.21.2–3	Sparta (Epeunactae)	Phalanthus	oracle
	Pausanias 10.10.6	Sparta	Phalanthus	oracle
Tenedos	Diodorus 5.83		Tennes son of Cycnus (king of Colone in Troad)	
Thapsus	Thucydides 6.4.1	(settlers originally from Megara)	Lamis	

Colony	Source	Origin (Metropolis, Legendary)	Founder(s)	Sanction
Thera	Herodotus 4.146–150	Sparta	Theras	
Thracian Chersonese	Herodotus 6.35–37	(from Athens)	Miltiades the Elder	oracle
	Nepos, <i>Miltiades</i> 1.2	Athens	Miltiades the Younger	oracle
	Strabo 7. fr.51 (52)	Miletus, Clazomenae; Athens		
Thurii	Diodorus 12.9f	Athens (joined by Sybarites and other Greeks)	Lampon and Xenocritus	oracle
Tripodisci	Pausanias 1.43	Argos	Coroebus	oracle
Trotilus	Thucydides 6.4.1	Megara	Lamis	
Zancle	Thucydides 6.4.4–6	“Pirates” from Cumae, Chalcidians	Perieres (Cumae), Crataemenes (Chalcis)	
	Pausanias 4.23.5–7	Messene	Gorgus and Mantichus	

Bibliography

- Alcock, Susan E. "Roman Colonies in the Eastern Empire: A Tale of Four Cities." Pages 297–329 in *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters: Comparative Perspectives*. Edited by Gil J. Stein. Santa Fe: School of Research Press, 2005.
- Alexander, Loveday. "'In Journeying Often': Voyaging in the Acts of the Apostles and in Greek Romance." Pages 69–96 in *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles*. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- . "Narrative Maps: Reflections on the Toponymy of Acts." Pages 97–132 in *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles*. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Geography and the Bible (Early Jewish)." *ABD* 2:977–88.
- Aune, David. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- . *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1987.
- . "Christian Prophecy and the Messianic Status of Jesus." Pages 404–22 in *The Messiah: Developments in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Balch, David. "ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ – Jesus as Founder of the Church in Luke-Acts, Form and Function." Pages 139–88 in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*. Edited by Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.
- Bar-Kochva, Bezalel. *The Image of the Jews in Greek Literature: The Hellenistic Period*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. "Old Testament History According to Stephen and Paul." Pages 57–69 in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986.
- Bartchy, S. Scott. "Community of Goods in Acts: Idealization or Social Reality?" Pages 309–18 in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Bauckham, Richard. "James, Peter, and the Gentiles." Pages 91–142 in *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul: Tensions in Early Christianity*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Belayche, Nicole. "Foundation Myths in Roman Palestine: Traditions and Reworkings." Pages 167–88 in *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity*. Edited by Tom Derks and Nico Roymans. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2009.
- Bérard, Jean. *La colonisation grecque de l'Italie Méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'Antiquité: l'histoire et le légende*. 2nd ed. Paris: Universitaires de France, 1957.
- Bercovitz, J. Peter. "Paul and Antioch: Some Observations." *PEGLMBS* 19 (1999): 87–101.

- Betz, Hans Dieter. "Transferring a Ritual: Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Romans 6." Pages 240–71 in *Paulinische Studien: Gesammelte Aufsätze III von Hans Dieter Betz*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Bickerman, Elias J. "The Name of Christians." *HTR* 42 (1949): 109–24.
- Billows, Richard A. *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Bispham, Edward. "Coloniam Deducere: How Roman Was Roman Colonization During the Middle Republic?" Pages 73–160 in *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions*. Edited by Guy Bradley and John-Paul Wilson. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2006.
- Blakely, Sandra. "Alexander Polyhistor (273)." *BNJ*. Accessed December 15, 2016.
- Blomart, Alain. "Transferring the Cults of Heroes in Ancient Greece: A Political and Religious Act." Pages 85–98 in *Philostratus's Heroikos: Religion and Cultural Identity in the Third Century C.E.* Edited by Ellen Bradshaw Aitken and Jennifer K. Berenson Maclean. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Boardman, John. *The Greeks Overseas: Their Colonies and Trade*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1980.
- Bonz, Marianne Palmer. *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Borgen, Peder. "Catalogues of Vices, the Apostolic Decree, and the Jerusalem Meeting." Pages 126–41 in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*. Edited by Jacob Neusner et al. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Bovon, Francois. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950–2005)*. 2nd ed. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Bowker, J. W. "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form." *NTS* 14 (1967–1968): 97–111.
- Bradley, Guy, and John-Paul Wilson. *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2006.
- Bradley, Keith. "On Captives under the Principate." *Phoenix* 58 (2004): 298–318.
- Brooten, Bernadette J. "The Jews of Ancient Antioch." Pages 29–37 in *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*. Edited by Christine Kondoleon. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Brown, Raymond E., and John P. Meier. *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- Buraselis, Kostas. "God and King as Synoikists: Divine Disposition and Monarchic Wishes Combined in the Traditions of City Foundations for Alexander's and Hellenistic Times." Pages 265–74 in *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*. Edited by Lin Foxhall, Hans-Joachim Gehrke, and Nino Luraghi. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2010.
- Calame, Claude. *Myth and History in Ancient Greece: The Symbolic Creation of a Colony*. Translated by D. W. Berman. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Callan, Terrance. "The Background of the Apostolic Decree." *CBQ* 55 (1993): 284–97.
- Cerfaux, Lucien. "La première communauté chrétienne à Jérusalem (Act., II, 41–V, 42)." Pages 125–56 in vol. 2 of *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux: Études d'exégèse et d'histoire religieuse de Monseigneur Cerfaux*. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1954.
- Cohen, Getzel M. *The Seleucid Colonies: Studies in Founding, Administration and Organization*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1978.

- . *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. “Conversion to Judaism in Historical Perspective: From Biblical Israel to Postbiblical Judaism.” *CJ* 36 (1983): 31–45.
- Concannon, Cavan. “When You Were Gentiles”: *Specters of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul’s Corinthian Correspondence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by G. Buswell. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1961.
- . *A Commentary on Acts of the Apostles*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Cornell, Timothy J. “Gründer.” *RAC* 12.
- Cowton, Christopher J. “The Alms Trader: A Note on Identifying the Beautiful Gate of Acts 3.2.” *NTS* 42 (1996): 475–6.
- Croatto, José Severino. “Jesus, Prophet Like Elijah, and Prophet-Teacher Like Moses in Luke-Acts.” *JBL* 124 (2005): 451–65.
- Cumont, Franz. “La plus ancienne géographique astrologique.” *Klio* 9 (1909): 263–73.
- D’Agostino, Bruno. “The First Greeks in Italy.” Pages 201–37 in vol. 1 of *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*. Edited by Gocha R. Tsetskhladze. Boston: Brill, 2006.
- De Giorgi, Andrea U. “Colonial Space and the City: Augustus’s Geopolitics in Pisidia.” Pages 135–49 in *Roman Colonies in the First Century of Their Foundation*. Edited by Rebecca Sweetman. Oxford: Oxbow, 2011.
- de Haas, Tymon C. A. *Fields, Farms and Colonists: Intensive Field Survey and Early Roman Colonization in the Pontine Region, Central Italy*. Groningen: Barkhuis, 2011.
- Demougín, Ségolène, and John Scheid, eds. *Colons et colonies dans le monde romain*. Rome: École française de Rome, 2012.
- Descoedres, Jean-Paul, ed. *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Destro, Adriana, and Mauro Pesce. “Paul’s Speeches at Pisidian Antioch and Lystra: ‘Mise en histoire’ and Social Memory.” Pages 33–43 in *Actes du Ier Congrès international sur Antioche de Pisidie*. Edited by Thomas Drew-Bear, Mehmet Taşalan, and Christine M. Thomas. Lyon: Université Lumière-Lyon 2, UMR 5649 du CNRS, 2002.
- Dillon, Richard J. “The Prophecy of Christ and His Witnesses According to the Discourses of Acts.” *NTS* 32 (1986): 544–56.
- Doeve, J. W. *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*. Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Company, 1954.
- Dominguez, Adolfo J. “Greeks in Sicily.” Pages 253–357 in vol. 1 of *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*. Edited by Gocha R. Tsetskhladze. Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Donnellan, Lieve. “Oikist and Archegetes in Context: Representing the Foundation of Sicilian Naxos.” Pages 41–67 in *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses*. Edited by Naoise Mac Sweeney. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.
- Dougherty, Carol. *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Downey, Glanville. *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Dunbabin, Thomas J. *The Western Greeks: The History of Sicily and South Italy from the Foundation of the Greek Colonies to 480 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948.
- Edwards, Douglas R. *Religion and Power*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

- Ellis, E. Earle. "The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts." Pages 56–67 in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.
- Esler, Philip Francis. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Ferrario, Sarah Brown. "Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*." Pages 341–76 in *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Figueira, Thomas. "Colonisation in the Classical Period." Pages 427–523 in vol. 2 of *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*. Edited by Gocha R. Tsetskhladze. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Fentonrose, Joseph. *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Fredriksen, Paula. "If It Looks like a Duck, and It Quacks like a Duck ...: On Not Giving up the Godfearers." Pages 25–34 in *A Most Reliable Witness: Essays in Honor of Ross Shepard Kraemer*. Edited by Susan Ashbrook Harvey. Providence: Brown University Press, 2015.
- Gager, John. "Jews, Gentiles, and Synagogues in the Book of Acts." *HTS* 79 (1986): 91–99.
- Garland, Robert. *Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion*. London: Duckworth, 1992.
- Gazda, Elaine K., and Diana Y. Ng, eds. *Building a New Rome: The Imperial Colony of Pisidian Antioch (25 BC–AD 700)*. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, 2011.
- Gebhard, Elizabeth R. "The Gods in Transit: Narratives of Cult Transfer." Pages 451–76 in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Religion and Philosophy*. Edited by Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Gibert, Pierre. *Bible, mythes et récits de commencement*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1986.
- Gilbert, Gary. "The List of Nations in Acts 2: Roman Propaganda and the Lukan Response." *JBL* 121 (2002): 497–529.
- Goldsmith, Dale. "Acts 13:33–37: A Peshet on II Samuel 7." *JBL* 87 (1968): 321–24.
- Gorman, Vanessa B., and Eric W. Robinson, eds. *Oikistes: Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Graham, A. J. *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*. 2nd ed. Chicago: Ares, 1983.
- . "Abdera and Teos." *JHS* 112 (1992): 44–73.
- . "The Ὀρκιον Τῶν Οἰκιστῆρων of Cyrene." Pages 83–112 in *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Greco, Emanuele. "Greek Colonisation in Southern Italy." Pages 169–200 in vol. 1 of *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*. Edited by Gocha R. Tsetskhladze. Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Güven, Suna. "Displaying the Res Gestae of Augustus: A Monument of Imperial Imagery for All." *JSAH* 57 (1998): 30–45.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by Bernard Noble, Gerald Shinn, and R. W. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
- Hall, Jonathan M. "Foundation Stories." Pages 383–426 in vol. 2 of *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*. Edited by Gocha R. Tsetskhladze. Boston: Brill, 2008.
- . *A History of the Archaic Greek World, Ca. 1200–479 BCE*. 2nd ed. Malden: Wiley Blackwell, 2014.
- Hamm, Dennis. "Acts 3:12–26: Peter's Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lame." *PRSt* 11 (1984): 199–217.

- Hanges, James Constantine. "The Greek Foundation-Legend: Its Form and Relation to History." *SBLSP* 34 (1995): 494–520.
- . *Paul, Founder of Churches: A Study in Light of the Evidence for the Role of "Founder-Figures" in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. WUNT 292. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Hänlein-Schäfer, Heidi. *Veneratio Augusti: Eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers*. Rome: G. Bretschneider, 1985.
- Heiserman, Arthur. *The Novel before the Novel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Hengel, Martin, and Anna Maria Schwemer. *Between Damascus and Antioch*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Herrmann, Peter. "Teos and Abdera im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Ein neues Fragment der Teiorum Dirae." *Chiron* 11 (1981): 1–30.
- Hiesinger, Ulrich W. "Three Images of the God Mên." *HSCP* 71 (1967): 303–10.
- Hill, Craig C. *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Holladay, Carl R. *Historians*. Vol. 1 of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
- . *Poets*. Vol. 2 of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1989.
- . *Acts: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016.
- Hurst, Henry R., and Sara Owen, eds. *Ancient Colonizations: Analogy, Similarity and Difference*. London: Duckworth, 2005.
- Jervell, Jacob. *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Jeska, Joachim. *Die Geschichte Israels in der Sicht des Lukas: Apg 7,2b–53 und 13,17–25 im Kontext antik-jüdischer Summarien der Geschichte Israels*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Judge, E. A. "Judaism and the Rise of Christianity: A Roman Perspective." *TynBul* 45 (1994): 355–68.
- Kaizer, Ted, Anna Leone, Edmund Thomas, and Robert Witcher, eds. *Cities and Gods: Religious Space in Transition*. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- Kasher, Aryeh. *Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz-Israel: Relations of the Jews in Eretz Israel with the Hellenistic Cities During the Second Temple Period (332 BCE–70 CE)*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Kennedy, George A. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Khatchadourian, Lori. "The Cult of Mên at Pisidian Antioch." Pages 153–72 in *Building a New Rome: The Imperial Colony of Pisidian Antioch (25 BC–AD 700)*. Edited by Elaine K. Gazda and Diana Y. Ng. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, 2011.
- Kilgallen, John J. "Acts 13:38–39: Culmination of Paul's Speech in Pisidia." *Biblica* 69 (1988): 480–506.
- Klauck, Hans Josef. *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity: The World of the Acts of the Apostles*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
- Koester, Craig. "The Savior of the World (John 4:42)." *JBL* 109 (1990): 665–80.
- Kraabel, A. Thomas. "The Disappearance of the 'God-Fearers.'" *Numen* 28 (1981): 113–26.
- Kraeling, Carl H. "The Jewish Community at Antioch." *JBL* 51 (1932): 130–60.

- Kurz, William S. "Acts 3:19–26 as a Test of the Role of Eschatology in Lukan Christology." *SBLSP* 11 (1977): 309–23.
- Lane, Eugene N. "The Italian Connection: An Aspect of the Cult of Men." *Numen* 22 (1975): 235–39.
- Leschhorn, Wolfgang. *Gründer der Stadt: Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1984.
- Levick, Barbara. *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Levinskaya, Irina. *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*. Vol. 5 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Lindemann, Andreas. "The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem According to the Summaries in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 2:42–47; 4:32–37; 5:12–16)." Pages 202–18 in *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder*. Edited by Julian V. Hills et al. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998.
- Löning, Karl. "The Circle of Stephen and Its Mission." Pages 103–31 in *Christian Beginnings: Word and Community from Jesus to Post-Apostolic Times*. Edited by Jürgen Becker. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1987.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. *Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary*. London: SCM Press, 1987.
- Magin, Yitzhak, Haggai Misgav, and Levana Tsfania. *The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions*. Vol. 1 of *Mount Gerizim Excavations*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2004.
- Malkin, Irad. "Apollo Archegetes and Sicily." *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa* 16 (1986): 959–72.
- . *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- . "What Is an 'Aphidruma'?" *ClAnt.* 10 (1991): 77–96.
- . *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- . *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- . *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Marguerat, Daniel. *The First Christian Historian: Writing the "Acts of the Apostles"*. Translated by Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery, and Richard Bauckham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- McCants, William F. *Founding Gods, Inventing Nations: Conquest and Culture Myths from Antiquity to Islam*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- McDonough, Sean M. "Saul to Paul, Again." *JBL* (2006): 390–91.
- Meeks, Wayne A., and Robert L. Wilken. *Jews and Christians in Antioch*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Metzger, Bruce M. "Ancient Astrological Geography and Acts 2:9–11." Pages 123–33 in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970.
- Mitchell, Alan C. "The Social Function of Friendship in Acts 2:44–47 and 4:32–37." *JBL* 111 (1992): 255–72.
- Mitchell, Stephen. *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993–1995.
- Mitchell, Stephen, and Marc Waelkens. *Pisidian Antioch: The Site and Its Monuments*. Swansea: Duckworth, 1998.

- Moessner, David P. "Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet Like Moses in Acts." *SBLSP* 22 (1983): 203–12.
- Morel, Jean-Paul. "Phocaean Colonisation." Pages 359–428 in vol. 1 of *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*. Edited by Gocha R. Tsetskhladze. Boston: Leiden, 2006.
- Morgan-Wynne, John Eifion. *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*. Eugene: Pickwick, 2014.
- Müller, Paul-Gerhard. *XPICTOΣ APXHTOΣ: Der religionsgeschichtliche und theologische Hintergrund einer neutestamentlichen Christusprädikation*. Bern: H. Lang, 1973.
- Nasrallah, Laura. "The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Cities, and Hadrian's Panhellion." *JBL* 27 (2008): 533–66.
- _____. *Christian Responses to Roman Art and Architecture: The Second-Century Church amid the Spaces of Empire*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table Fellowship." Pages 361–87 in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.
- Nilsson, Martin P. *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1951.
- Oltean, Ioana. *Dacia: Landscape, Colonization and Romanization*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Osborne, Robin. "Early Greek Colonization? The Nature of Greek Settlement in the West." Pages 251–70 in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*. Edited by Nick Fisher and Hans Van Wees. London: Duckworth, 1998.
- Ossi, Adrian J. "The Arch of Hadrian and Sabina at Pisidian Antioch: Imperial Associations, Ritual Connections, and Civic Euergetism." Pages 85–108 in *Building a New Rome: The Imperial Colony of Pisidian Antioch (25 BC–AD 700)*. Edited by Elaine K. Gazda and Diana Y. Ng. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, 2011.
- Ossi, Adrian J., and J. Matthew Harrington. "Pisidian Antioch: The Urban Infrastructure and Its Development." Pages 11–32 in *Building a New Rome: The Imperial Colony of Pisidian Antioch (25 BC–AD 700)*. Edited by Elaine K. Gazda and Diana Y. Ng. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, 2011.
- O'Toole, Robert F. "Luke's Understanding of Jesus's Resurrection-Ascension-Exaltation." *BTR* 9 (1979): 529–55.
- Pao, David W. "The Lukan Table Fellowship Motif." *JBL* 130 (2011): 127–44.
- Park, Sejin. *Pentecost and Sinai: The Festival of Weeks as a Celebration of the Sinai Event*. New York: T & T Clark, 2008.
- Parke, Herbert. W., and Donald E. W. Wormell. *The Delphic Oracle*. 2 vols. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. "The Character of the Lame Man in Acts 3–4." *JBL* 124 (2005): 295–312.
- _____. *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2011.
- Parsons, Mikeal C., and Richard I. Pervo. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Pervo, Richard I. *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- _____. *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*. Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2006.

- . *Acts: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.
- Pilch, John. *Visions and Healing in the Acts of the Apostles: How Early Believers Experienced God*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2004.
- Pilhofer, Peter. "Luke's Knowledge of Pisidian Antioch." Pages 77–83 in *Actes du 1er Congres international sur Antioche de Pisidie*. Edited by Thomas Drew-Bear, Mehmet Taşlıalan, and Christine M. Thomas. Lyons: Université Lumière-Lyon 2, UMR 5649 du CNRS, 2002.
- Plümacher, Eckhard. *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Prehn. S.v. "Ktistes." *RE* 11.2.22. Cols. 1149–50.
- Prinz, Friedrich. *Grundungsmythen und Sagenchronologie*. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1979.
- Quesnel, Michel. "Paul prédicateur dans les Actes des Apôtres." *NTS* 47 (2001): 469–81.
- Raff, Katharine A. "The Architecture of the Sanctuary of Mên Askaënos: Exploration, Reconstruction, and Use." Pages 131–52 in *Building a New Rome: The Imperial Colony of Pisidian Antioch (25 BC–AD 700)*. Edited by Elaine K. Gazda and Diana Y. Ng. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, 2011.
- Robbins, Vernon. "Luke-Acts: A Mixed Population Seeks a Home in the Roman Empire." Pages 202–21 in *Images of Empire*. Edited by Loveday Alexander. JSOTSup 122. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Robinson, Donald Fay. "A Note on Acts 11:27–30." *JBL* 63 (1944): 169–72.
- Rothschild, Clare K. "Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13: The Denouement of the South Galatian Hypothesis." *NovT* 54 (2012): 334–53.
- Rubin, Benjamin. "Ruler Cult and Colonial Identity: The Imperial Sanctuary at Pisidian Antioch." Pages 33–60 in *Building a New Rome: The Imperial Colony of Pisidian Antioch (25 BC–AD 700)*. Edited by Elaine K. Gazda and Diana Y. Ng. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, 2011.
- Rutherford, Ian. *Pindar's Paean: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Salmon, Edward T. *Roman Colonization under the Republic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Sanders, Jack T. "Jewish Christianity in Antioch before the Time of Hadrian: Where Does the Identity Lie?" *SBLSP* 31 (1992): 346–61.
- Sandwell, Isabella. *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Scheer, Tanja J. "'They That Held Arcadia': Arcadian Foundation Myths as Intentional History in Roman Imperial Times." Pages 275–98 in *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*. Edited by Lin Foxhall, Hans-Joachim Gehrke, and Nino Luraghi. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010.
- Scott, James M. "Luke's Geographical Horizon." Pages 483–544 in *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting*. Edited by David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf. Vol. 2 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- . "Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations." Pages 87–123 in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles*. Edited by Jostein Adna and Hans Kvalbein. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Selvidge, Marla. "The Acts of the Apostles: A Violent Aetiological Legend." *SBLSP* 25 (1986): 330–40.

- Shipley, Frederick. "Introduction to the *Res Gestae* of Augustus." LCL. London: William Heinemann, 1924.
- Sleeman, Matthew. *Geography and the Ascension Narrative in Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Slingerland, Dixon. "'The Jews' in the Pauline Portions of Acts." *JAAR* 54 (1986): 305–21.
- Smith, Daniel Lynwood. "Interrupted Speeches in Luke-Acts." *JBL* 134 (2015): 177–91.
- Smith, Dennis E. "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke." *JBL* 106 (1987): 613–38.
- Smith, R. R. R. 1987. "The Imperial Reliefs from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias." *JRS* 77 (1987): 22–138.
- . "*Simulacra Gentium*: The *Ethne* from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias." *JRS* 78 (1988): 50–77.
- Snyder, Graydon F. "The God-Fearers in Paul's Speech at Pisidian Antioch." Pages 44–52 in *Actes du 1er Congrès international sur Antioche de Pisidie*. Edited by Thomas Drew-Bear, Mehmet Taşalan, and Christine M. Thomas. Lyon: Université Lumière-Lyon 2, UMR 5649 du CNRS, 2002.
- Soards, Marion L. *The Speeches of Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
- Spencer, F. Scott. "Neglected Widows in Acts 6:1–7." *CBQ* 56 (1994): 715–33.
- Sterling, Gregory. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "'Athletes of Virtue': An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41–47; 4:32–35; 5:12–16)." *JBL* 113 (1994): 679–96.
- . "'Opening the Scriptures': The Legitimation of the Jewish Diaspora and the Early Christian Mission." Pages 199–217 in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*. Edited by David P. Moessner. Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999.
- Stern, Menahem ed., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Science and Humanities, 1976–1980.
- Stoneman, Richard. *The Ancient Oracles: Making the Gods Speak*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Sweetman, Rebecca, ed. *Roman Colonies in the First Century of Their Foundation*. Oxford: Oxbow, 2011.
- . "Introduction: 100 Years of Solitude: Colonies in the First Century of Their Foundation." Pages 1–6 in *Roman Colonies in the First Century of Their Foundation*. Edited by Rebecca J. Sweetman. Oxford: Oxbow, 2011.
- Talbert, Charles. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.
- Tannehill, Robert C. "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story." *JBL* 104 (1985): 69–85.
- . *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Taylor, Justin. "Why Were the Disciples First Called 'Christians' at Antioch? (Acts 11, 26)." *RB* 101 (1994): 75–94.
- Tiede, David L. *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Torelli, Mario. *Tota Italia: Essays in the Cultural Formation of Roman Italy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Tsetskhladze, Gocha R., ed., *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2006–2008.

- . “Introduction: Revisiting Ancient Greek Colonisation.” Pages xxiii – lxxxiii in vol. 1 of *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*. Edited by Gocha R. Tsetskhladze. Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Tyson, Joseph B. “Acts 6:1–7 and Dietary Regulations in Early Christianity.” *PRSt* 10 (1983): 145–61.
- Vallet, Georges. *Rhegion et Zancle: Histoire, commerce et civilisation de cités chalcidiennes du détroit de Messine*. Paris: de Boccard, 1958.
- Van Dommelen, Peter, and Nicola Terrenato. *Articulating Local Cultures: Power and Identity under the Expanding Roman Republic*. JRASS 63. Portsmouth: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2007.
- Walaskay, Paul. “Acts 3:1–10.” *Int* 42 (1988): 171–75.
- Wallace-Hadrill, David S. *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Weaver, John. *Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004.
- Wedderburn, Alexander J. M. “Traditions and Redactions in Acts 2.1–13.” *JSNT* 55 (1994): 29–39.
- Weinstock, Stefan. “The Geographical Catalogue in Acts II, 9-11.” *JRS* 38 (1948): 43–46.
- Wendt, Heidi. “James C. Hanges, Paul, Founder of Churches: A Study in Light of the Evidence for the Role of ‘Founder-Figures’ in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. A Review Essay.” *R & T* 20 (2013): 292–302.
- Wilcox, Max. *The Semitisms of Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Wills, Lawrence. “The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity.” *HTR* 77 (1984): 277–99.
- Wilson, Walter. “Urban Legends: Acts 10:11–11:18 and the Strategies of Greco-Roman Foundation Narratives.” *JBL* 120 (2001): 77–99.
- Zetterholm, Magnus. *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation between Judaism and Christianity*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Zhang, Wenxi. *Paul Among the Jews: A Study of the Meaning and Significance of Paul’s Inaugural Sermon in the Synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13:16–41) for His Missionary Work among the Jews*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011.

Index of Ancient Sources

Hebrew Bible and Septuagint

<i>Genesis (Gen)</i>		23:5–22	95
9:4	165		
10	14, 100	<i>Numbers (Num)</i>	
10:2–5	14	18:24	151
10:6–20	14	28:26–31	95
10:21–31	14		
11	101	<i>Deuteronomy (Deut)</i>	
11:7	101	1	181
11:9	101	3:20	193
12–35	186	4:30	137
39:4	187	4:37	186
39:21	187	6:20–24	184
41:40	187	7	181
41:43	187	7:7	186
43:14	187	10:15	186
47:25	187	12:9–10	193
47:29	187	12:16	165
49:26	187	12:23	165
50:4	187	15:23	165
		16:9–12	95
<i>Exodus (Exod)</i>		18:5	164
1:7	187	21:5	164
6	181	21:23	195
15:17	193	26:5–9	184
34:15	165	30:2	137
34:22	95	30:8	137
		30:10	137
<i>Leviticus (Lev)</i>		<i>Joshua (Josh)</i>	
3:17	165	1:15	193
7:26	165	14–17	181
17–18	166	24:2–13	184
17:3–4	165		
17:10	165	<i>Judges (Judg)</i>	
17:14	165	2:16	193
18:6–23	165	2:18	193
19:26	165		
20:2–3	166		

3:9	193		
3:15	193		
3:31	193		
6:14	193		
6:15	193		
6:36	193		
6:37	193		
7:2	193		
7:7	193		
8:22	193		
10:1	193		
13:5	193		
<i>1 Samuel (1 Sam)</i>			
7–10	181		
7:3	137		
9:16	193		
10:1	193		
10:27	193		
11:3	193		
12:8–13	184		
13:14	191		
14:33	165		
15–16	181		
<i>2 Samuel (2 Sam)</i>			
3:18	193		
7	181, 184, 193		
7:4–17	193, 198		
7:6–11	184		
7:11–16	184		
7:12	193, 198		
7:13	199		
7:16	199		
22	181		
22:51	199		
<i>1 Kings (1 Kgs)</i>			
8:33	137		
8:47–48	137		
<i>2 Kings (2 Kgs)</i>			
17:24	142		
<i>1 Chronicles (1 Chr)</i>			
1:1–2:2	14, 100		
		<i>2 Chronicles (2 Chr)</i>	
		6:37–38	137
		8:13	95
		15:4	137
		30:6	137
		30:9	137
		<i>Nehemiah (Neh)</i>	
		1:9	137
		2:6	137
		9:6–13	184
		9:26	137
		9:27	193
		9:29	137
		<i>Job (Job)</i>	
		22:23	137
		36:10	137
		<i>Psalms (Ps)</i>	
		2	116
		2:2	119
		2:7	199, 200
		7:13	137
		15	105
		15:8–11	202
		15:10	199, 201
		21:28	137
		50:15	137
		77:34	137
		78:5–72	184
		89:20	191
		89:21	191
		105	184
		106	184
		110	105
		131	199
		131:11–12	193
		131:12	199
		135	184
		136	184
		<i>Isaiah (Isa)</i>	
		6:10	137
		19:22	137
		29:22	151
		31:6	137
		35:6	113

44	97	45:1	151
44:22	137	48:9	151
44:28	191, 192		
45:22	137	<i>Daniel (Dan)</i>	
49:6	100, 213, 214	1:8	165
52:11	151	11	14
53:3	199		
53:7–8	95	<i>Hosea (Hos)</i>	
55:3	199, 201	3:5	137
55:7	137	5:4	137
66:15	96	6:1	137
66:18	96	7:10	137
66:18–20	14, 100	11:5	137
		12:7	137
<i>Jeremiah (Jer)</i>		14:2–3	137
3:10	137		
3:12	137	<i>Joel (Joel)</i>	
3:14	137	2:12–13	137
3:22	137	3	105
4:1	137	3:1	105
5:3	137	3:4–15	106
8:4	137		
9:4	137	<i>Amos (Amos)</i>	
15:19	137	4:6	137
18:8	137	4:8–11	137
24:7	137	9:11–12	164
41:10	137	9:12	164
41:15	137		
		<i>Habakkuk (Hab)</i>	
<i>Lamentations (Lam)</i>		1:5	207
3:40	137		
		<i>Haggai (Hag)</i>	
<i>Ezekiel (Ezek)</i>		2:17	137
11:17–21	167		
14:6	137	<i>Zechariah (Zech)</i>	
14:7–8	166	1:3	137
18:30	137		
36–37	97	<i>Malachi (Mal)</i>	
36:25–27	167	3:1–2	194
36:26–27	100		
36:29	167		
36:33	167		
36:37	100		
39:29	167		

<i>Jubilees (Jub.)</i>		1.70–71	1.90
6:15–22	95	1.71	108
8–9	14	1.73	108
		1.86	108
<i>Megillah (bMeg)</i>		1.148	108
18	99	1.163	190
		1.173	108
<i>Milhamah (War Scroll–1QM)</i>		1.236	108
2.10–14	14	1.242	108
		1.243	108
<i>Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab)</i>		1.255	108
1	207	1.264–299	108
		1.284	108
<i>Philo</i>		1.288	108
<i>De confusione linguarum (Conf.)</i>		1.318	108
75–82	104	2.12	108
		2.14	108
<i>De congressu eruditionis gratia (Congr.)</i>		2.20	108
84	104	<i>In Flaccum (Flacc.)</i>	
		46	104
<i>De decalogo (Decal.)</i>		<i>Legatio ad Gaium (Legat.)</i>	
46	96	185–190	130
		207	130
<i>De specialibus legibus (Spec.)</i>		279–329	14
3.111	104	281–282	104
<i>De vita contemplativa (Contempl.)</i>		<i>Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesis (QG)</i>	
2.12	120	3.45	104
3.2.16	121		
3.27–28	120	<i>Pseudo-Eupolemus (Ps.-Eup.)</i>	
3.28–29	121	1.3–4	188–89
8.66	120	1.8–9	189
10.75–77	120	<i>Serek Hayaḥad (Community Rule–1QS)</i>	
<i>De vita Mosis (Mos.)</i>		1.16–2.25	96
1.34	108, 190	<i>Shabbat (bŠabb)</i>	
1.34–163	103	115	99
1.67	108		
1.163	108		
1.7	108, 190		

New Testament and Early Christian Literature

<i>Matthew (Matt)</i>		<i>Mark (Mark)</i>	
13:15	137	4:12	137
		16:7	93

<i>Luke (Luke)</i>		7:22	197
1-2	192	7:28	90
1:16-17	137	7:31-50	118
1:19	197	8:1	90, 197
1:32	200	8:4-15	215
1:32-33	89	8:10	90
1:33	90	8:26-39	90
1:35	200	9:2	90
1:39	200	9:5	122
1:68	90	9:6	197
1:68-69	89	9:11	90, 212
2:1-2	13	9:12-17	118
2:10	197	9:18-27	153
2:11	89	9:23	212
2:25-38	93	9:26	90
2:30	89	9:27	90
2:34	213	9:28-36	153
2:34-35	90	9:57	212
2:38	90	9:59	212
3:3	194	9:60	90
3:8	194	9:61	212
3:18	197	9:62	90
3:21	153	10:1-24	100
3:22	89, 200	10:9	90
3:23-28	100	10:10-16	90
4:15	149	10:11	90
4:16	200	10:13	194
4:16-21	89	10:25	200
4:18	197	10:25-37	90
4:29	200	11:1-4	153
4:31	149	11:1	157
4:38	200	11:2	90
4:43	90, 197	11:7	200
5:3	149, 157	11:20	90
5:11	212	11:29-32	90
5:14	122	11:32	194, 200, 209
5:17	149	11:48	122
5:17-26	113	12:12	157
5:27-28	212	12:31	90
5:27-32	118	13:3	194, 209
5:32	194, 209	13:5	194, 209
5:35	153	13:10	149, 157
6:6	149, 157	13:18	90
6:8	200	13:20	90
6:12	89	13:22	92, 149, 157
6:12-13	153	13:22-30	118
6:12-19	90	13:26	57
7:1-10	90	13:28-29	90
7:9	212	14:7-24	118

14:15	90	24:49	93, 94, 97
15:1–2	118		
15:7	194, 209	<i>John</i>	
15:10	194, 209	10:23	111
15:11–32	118		
15:18	200	<i>Acts</i>	
15:20	200	1	89
16:16	90, 197	1–2	106, 134, 137, 151, 155, 165
16:19–31	118		
16:30	194, 209	1–5	25, 87, 134, 156, 187
17:3	194, 209		
17:4	137	1–7	1, 24, 196
17:19	200	1–11:18	12
17:20–21	90	1:1	149, 156, 157
17:35	119	1:1–3	89
18:16	90	1:1–11	88, 92
18:22	212	1:1–19	95
18:24–25	90	1:1–7:60	92
18:28	212	1:2	88, 90, 94
18:29	90	1:3	90
18:29–30	90	1:4	93, 95, 97
18:43	212	1:4–5	89, 94, 97
19:11	90	1:4–8	93
19:28	92	1:5	88
19:46	89	1:5–13	95
19:47	149, 157	1:6	90, 94
20:1	149, 197	1:6–7	95
20:9–18	90	1:6–8	89, 146, 151, 160, 165, 213
20:21	149, 157, 209		
21:13	122	1:6–26	110
21:31	90	1:8	3, 13, 36, 90, 91, 93, 94, 97, 100, 105, 106, 107, 122, 125, 142, 143, 144, 147, 150, 155, 156, 157, 160, 211, 213, 214, 216, 218
21:37	149, 157		
22–24	213		
22:14–38	118		
22:16	90		
22:18	90		
22:29–30	90		
22:45	89, 200	1:8–9	1
22:46	153	1:9–11	89
23:1	200	1:11	88
23:5	149, 157	1:12–26	88, 90
23:27	212	1:14	117, 119
24	93	1:15	89, 200
24:12	200	1:15–20	121
24:21	90, 94	1:15–26	90
24:33	200	1:17	91
24:46–48	203	1:20	90
24:47	194, 209	1:21	90, 92
24:48	122	1:21–26	155, 156

1:22	91, 122, 155	2:24	105, 195, 200, 202
1:24	153	2:25	105
1:25	92	2:25–28	105
2	21, 93, 99, 106, 113, 143, 169, 192, 195, 199, 202, 210, 213	2:29–32	202
2–4	118, 146	2:30	195, 202
2–5	195	2:32	93, 122, 155, 195, 200
2–7	94	2:32–36	202
2:1	95, 119, 143	2:33	97, 105, 106
2:1–4	1, 36, 93, 95, 97, 114, 155, 156, 160, 215, 218	2:34	105
2:1–13	88	2:34–35	105
2:1–40	106, 211	2:36	105, 106, 136, 203, 212
2:1–41	165	2:36–38	142
2:1–8:25	14	2:37	203
2:4	106	2:37–41	88, 97
2:5	97, 98, 100, 143	2:38	106, 113, 163, 194, 195, 203, 209, 215
2:5–8	98	2:39	106, 113, 214
2:5–11	14	2:40	105, 135, 158, 203
2:5–13	97, 143	2:41	97, 106, 111, 117, 118, 135, 138, 148, 163
2:5–41	97	2:42	112, 117, 119, 120, 122, 152
2:6	100	2:42–46	106, 117
2:7	146, 208	2:42–47	88, 112, 116, 118, 121, 149, 154, 218
2:7–8	105	2:43	117, 122
2:8	98	2:44	119, 121
2:9	98, 100	2:44–46	117
2:9–11	97–105	2:45	118, 121
2:10	98, 102	2:46	117, 119, 120, 152
2:11	97, 98	2:47	106, 111, 117, 118, 119, 138, 148, 158
2:11–13	98	3–4	113, 114, 115
2:12	98, 105, 146	3–5	88, 106, 106–22, 107, 110, 137, 148, 159, 164, 210, 213, 219
2:13	97, 98, 105	3:1–7	111
2:14	98, 100, 148, 202	3:1–10	112, 113, 122
2:14–36	88, 97	3:1–26	1
2:16–21	214	3:1–4:2	111
2:17	105, 156, 157	3:1–4:22	106, 112
2:17–21	105	3:1–4:31	106, 111
2:17–35	2	3:6	113
2:18	149	3:8	113
2:20	105	3:8–12	186
2:21	105, 113, 136, 157, 158, 202, 204		
2:22	105, 118		
2:22–35	205		
2:22–36	160, 199		
2:23	105, 195, 212		

3:9–10	98	4:21	110, 116
3:10	113	4:23	155
3:10–11	110, 116	4:23–31	112
3:11	111	4:23–5:11	112
3:11–26	113, 114	4:24	119
3:12	208	4:25–28	116, 137
3:12–26	113	4:26	119
3:13	113, 195, 197	4:27	160
3:13–15	212	4:29	112, 135
3:13–26	157, 160	4:29–31	115
3:14–15	134	4:31	115, 118, 135, 195, 218
3:15	114, 115, 122, 155, 195	4:32	118, 119, 121
3:17	113, 134, 195	4:32–35	118
3:17–18	195	4:32–37	112, 116, 117
3:18–20	142	4:32–5:11	106, 118, 121, 149, 154, 218
3:18	195	4:33	118, 122, 136
3:19	137, 194, 195, 209	4:34–35	118
3:19–26	195	4:34–37	112
3:20	114	5:34–39	116
3:21	114	4:35	122
3:22	114, 200	4:36–37	118, 121, 148, 150, 156
3:22–25	2	4:36–5:11	106, 194
3:24	157	4:37	118, 122
3:25	114, 197	4:39	93
3:26	200	4:45	119
4:1–7	1, 113	5	115
4:1–18	98	5:1–2	118
4:2	116, 149, 156, 157	5:1–11	112, 117, 118, 121, 163
4:3	111	5:2	121, 122
4:4	106, 110, 111, 116, 135, 138, 148	5:2–16	98
4:5	155	5:3	121
4:7–22	111	5:4	121
4:8	93, 155	5:6	200
4:8–20	113	5:9	121
4:8–22	113	5:11–42	112
4:9	113, 158	5:12	111, 114, 115, 119
4:10	116, 195	5:12–16	110, 117, 122
4:10–11	113, 212	5:12–42	106, 111, 112
4:10–12	134, 160	5:13	115
4:11	195	5:13–14	111, 138, 148
4:12	113, 158, 203	5:14	114, 115, 116
4:13	208	5:15	114, 115
4:13–22	1	5:16	115
4:16	116	5:17	116, 200
4:16–17	110	5:17–18	1
4:18	115, 116, 156, 157		
4:19–20	115		

5:17–32	98	7:7	198
5:18	111	7:8	186
5:20	114, 195	7:10	187, 188
5:20–21	115, 218	7:11	197
5:21	111, 114, 149, 155, 156, 157	7:12	185, 197
5:22–42	1	7:14	197
5:25	149, 156, 157	7:15	197
5:27	111	7:17	187, 188
5:28	115, 156, 157	7:18	200
5:29	115	7:19	197, 200
5:29–32	160	7:20	187, 188, 197
5:30	197, 212	7:20–44	187
5:30–31	113	7:21	187, 188
5:30–32	134, 157	7:22	107, 188
5:31	115, 157, 194, 195, 203, 209	7:23	188
5:32	115, 122, 155, 195	7:23–36	186
5:34	200	7:27	213
5:34–39	116	7:27–29	185
5:36	200	7:31	145
5:42	111, 116, 149, 156, 157, 197	7:32	197
6	156	7:35	185
6:1	140, 149	7:36	187
6:1–6	106	7:37	200
6:1–7	120, 155	7:38	187, 197, 205
6:1–8:3	106	7:39	197
6:2	135	7:39–43	185
6:3	148	7:44	122, 197
6:4	117, 135	7:45	197, 198
6:5	148, 156	7:45–46	183
6:6	153	7:46	192
6:7	106, 111, 135, 138, 148	7:46–47	186
6:8–15	1	7:47–50	198
6:8–7:56	155	7:48–50	198
6:8–7:60	106	7:51	197
6:9	200	7:51–53	134, 185, 186
6:12	155	7:52	197
6:13	122	7:53	205, 213
7	7, 185, 186, 190, 197, 198, 213	7:54–8:3	1
7:1–53	211	7:56	144
7:2	186	7:57	119
7:2–50	2	7:58	122, 158
7:3	186	7:59	136, 144
7:5	187, 198	8	142–43
7:6–7	187	8–11	94, 196
		8:1	94, 111, 134, 137
		8:1–4	1
		8:1–25	196
		8:3	106

8:4	111, 134, 135, 142, 197	9:6	200
8:4-5	138, 143	9:8	144
8:4-13	142, 155	9:10	143, 145
8:4-25	124	9:10-16	144
8:4-40	211	9:11	153, 200
8:5	142	9:12	145
8:5-6	142	9:15	136, 138, 144, 147, 148, 152, 157, 169, 178, 216, 218, 220
8:6	119, 142	9:15-16	196, 219
8:6-8	148	9:16	111, 144
8:10	142	9:17	93, 136
8:12	142, 197	9:18	200
8:12-17	163	9:19	143
8:13	117	9:19-25	111, 137
8:14	92, 135, 148	9:19-30	144
8:14-13	147	9:20	169
8:14-17	143, 148	9:26-30	147, 148
8:14-25	153	9:26-31	137
8:15	215	9:27	92
8:15-17	112	9:27-28	150
8:16	136	9:27-30	156
8:17	1, 83, 143, 151	9:28	136
8:22	194, 209	9:29	144
8:25	92, 135, 136, 143, 197	9:30	143
8:26	143, 200	9:31	93, 143
8:26-39	142	9:32-35	143
8:26-40	14, 147, 155	9:33-35	112
8:27	143	9:34	200
8:29	143, 151	9:36-42	112
8:29-40	94	9:36-43	143
8:30	214	9:39	200
8:30-35	214	9:42	136
8:32-33	2, 95	10-11	145, 163
8:35	142, 197	10:1-11:18	1, 2, 23, 211
8:36	163	10:2	185
8:38	143, 219	10:3	145, 163
8:39	151, 215	10:3-6	1
8:39-40	1	10:4-47	167
8:40	2, 142, 143, 197	10:5	145, 163
9	94	10:7	117
9-12	148	10:9	153
9:1-30	211	10:9-16	146
9:1-31	144	10:9-22	95
9:1-19	144	10:9-11:18	124, 143, 144-47, 147, 162, 218
9:1-28:31	14	10:10-17	1
9:2	143	10:13	200
9:3-19	148	10:14	146
9:5	136, 144		

10:15	146	11:19–21	168
10:17	145, 163	11:19–30	4, 25, 88, 124, 137, 149, 196, 217
10:19	1, 145, 151, 163	11:20	136, 139, 142, 148, 154, 197, 204
10:19–20	145, 163	11:21	137, 138, 142, 147, 148, 160, 163
10:19–48	94	11:22–24	142, 160
10:20	200	11:22–25	161
10:22	185	11:22–26	143, 153, 156, 218
10:23	200	11:23	147, 148, 212, 215
10:26	200	11:24	137, 138, 142, 148
10:28	146	11:25–26	147, 148
10:30	153	11:26	112, 124, 137, 146, 149, 150, 154, 157, 160, 218
10:30–32	145, 163	11:27	92, 147, 156
10:34–35	146	11:27–28	143
10:35	185	11:27–30	147
10:36	135, 136, 197	11:28	156, 200
10:36–43	146	11:28–30	149
10:38	93	11:30	150, 155
10:39	122, 155, 212	12	23, 24
10:41	91, 122, 155, 200	12:1–19	210
10:43	214	12:5–19	115
10:44	93, 135	12:7	200
10:44–45	151, 215, 219	12:12	153
10:44–46	97	12:20	119
10:44–48	163	12:24	136
10:45	146	13	154, 168–216, 190, 195, 197, 198, 206
10:46	146	13–14	124, 168
10:48	146, 219	13–26	94
11	92	13:1	10, 124, 137, 154, 156, 157, 168
11–12	94	13:1–2	124, 218
11–15	148	13:1–3	4, 25, 88, 217
11:1	136	13:1–4	218
11:4–10	1	13:2	150, 151, 179, 208
11:5	145, 153, 163	13:2–3	124, 144, 148, 156, 159, 168, 214
11:5–17	146	13:2–4	1, 36, 206, 211
11:7	200	13:3	151, 164, 196
11:12	1, 145, 151, 163	13:4	179
11:12–18	94	13:3–4	153
11:13–14	145, 163	13:4–5	179
11:14	158	13:4–8	98
11:15	93, 151	13:4–12	111, 137, 168
11:15–17	167, 215	13:4–14:28	4
11:15–26	161		
11:17	136		
11:18	194, 209		
11:19	1, 121, 131, 134, 135, 139, 140, 143, 168		
11:19–20	10, 111, 135, 140, 168		

13:5	135	13:23–37	207, 216
13:6–12	1, 179	13:23–41	186, 192–209
13:7	135	13:24	194, 203, 209
13:7–12	210	13:24–25	193, 195, 204, 206
13:9	1, 93	13:25	194
13:9–12	94	13:25–31	203
13:11	156, 168	13:26	135, 157, 179, 180, 182, 185, 192, 194, 195, 196, 197, 197, 202, 203, 208, 209, 211
13:12	98, 121, 136, 163	13:26–31	180–81, 192, 194
13:13	169, 179, 198, 214	13:26–37	180
13:13–52	1, 4, 25, 77, 88, 111, 137, 217	13:26–41	220
13:14	179	13:27	194, 195, 207
13:15	135, 179, 185, 207, 210	13:27–29	204, 206, 212
13:16	179, 180, 181, 184, 185, 200, 209, 211, 215	13:27–31	210
13:16–25	199	13:27–32	208
13:16–43	1	13:27–37	180
13:16–37	180	13:28	180, 195
13:16–41	2, 168, 210, 218	13:28–30	195
13:16–43	1	13:29	196
13:17	181, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 198, 209	13:30	191, 195, 200
13:17–21	183	13:30–31	199
13:17–22	180, 181, 193, 197, 209	13:31	122, 155, 195, 196, 208, 210, 214
13:17–23	181	13:31–32	180
13:17–25	180, 196, 202–3	13:32	155, 179, 181, 184, 193, 196, 197, 198, 203, 214
13:17–31	179	13:32–33	195, 197, 210
13:18	183, 185, 198	13:32–37	89, 179, 181, 193, 194, 196, 200, 206
13:19	183, 185	13:32–41	182
13:19–22	183	13:33	196, 200, 201
13:21–22	186	13:33–35	186
13:20	183, 185, 186, 198	13:33–37	180, 199
13:21	183	13:34	200, 201
13:21–22	185, 198	13:34–37	200
13:21–23	186	13:36–37	201, 202
13:22	183, 191, 193, 198, 199, 200, 201, 209, 216	13:37	191
13:22–23	89, 183	13:38–39	180, 181, 185, 203, 206, 207, 209
13:22–39	184	13:38–41	179, 180, 181, 194, 202–9, 210, 211
13:23	157, 181, 183, 184, 186, 192, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 203, 208, 209	13:38	179, 181, 203, 204, 209
13:23–25	180, 192, 209	13:39	187, 197, 204, 205, 210, 211, 218
13:23–31	180, 199		

13:40	207, 216	14:19–20	111, 137
13:40–41	180, 204, 206	14:20	200
13:41	206, 207	14:21	168, 197, 219
13:42	179, 208, 211	14:21–23	112
13:42–43	210, 212	14:21–28	219
13:42–44	98	14:21–15:35	219
13:42–52	210	14:23	112, 136, 153, 155
13:43	2, 179, 185, 208, 212, 215	14:24–28	124
13:43–44	179	14:25	135
13:44	135, 210, 213	14:26	208
13:44–52	210	14:26–27	168
13:45	1, 98, 179, 206, 207, 209, 212, 215	14:26–28	124, 153, 206
13:45–51	196	14:27	4, 159
13:46	179, 208, 212, 213, 215	14:28	124, 151
13:46–47	210	15	4, 92, 94, 140, 158, 192, 205, 206, 219
13:46–49	210	15:1	157, 158, 159, 165
13:47	100, 136, 203, 215, 216	15:1–2	161, 205
13:48	98, 135, 136, 160, 163, 186, 210, 212, 213, 214, 216	15:1–34	124
13:48–49	206	15:1–35	4, 25, 88, 124
13:48–50	2, 179	15:2	150, 155
13:49	135, 136, 213, 215	15:2–4	161
13:49–50	98	15:3	131, 143, 143
13:50	1, 179, 185, 215	15:3–17	161
13:50–51	179	15:4	155, 159, 161, 162
13:51	210	15:4–5	159
13:52	210, 215, 216	15:5	158, 164, 165
14	21, 167	15:5–21	205
14:1–7	1, 111, 137	15:6	155
14:3	135	15:6–29	161
14:4	155	15:7	135, 162, 163, 164, 165, 200
14:5–7	1	15:7–9	167
14:6	155	15:7–11	161, 162
14:7	197	15:7–18	145
14:8–11	113	15:7–21	147
14:8–20	168	15:7–29	218
14:10	200	15:8	163, 215
14:11–13	169	15:8–9	164, 167
14:11–18	98	15:9	146, 163
14:13	210	15:10	162, 164, 165, 197, 205
14:14	155	15:11	136, 164
14:15	137, 197	15:12	161, 162
14:15–17	102	15:13–18	162
14:19	1, 98	15:13–21	161
		15:14	164, 165
		15:14–18	167
		15:15–16	162

15:15–18	2, 164, 214	16:15	219
15:15–21	162	16:16–24	1, 111, 137, 219
15:16	164	16:16–40	213
15:16–17	162	16:18	219
15:17	164, 165	16:25–34	115, 163
15:17–18	162, 165	16:30–34	163
15:19	137, 162, 164, 165, 205	16:31	136
15:19–20	10, 218	16:32	135, 136, 219
15:19–21	158, 162, 164, 204, 205	16:33	219
15:19–33	92	16:38	210
15:20	161, 165	16:40	112
15:21	204	17	21
15:22	155, 162	17:1	220
15:22–26	161	17:1–9	1, 111, 137, 213, 219
15:23	155, 159, 165, 166	17:1–15	220
15:24	166	17:2–3	219
15:25	119	17:3	200
15:26	136	17:4	2, 98
15:28	153, 166, 167, 205	17:5–7	1
15:28–29	204	17:5–8	98
15:29	10, 161, 165, 205	17:5–9	1
15:30–35	161	17:10	219, 220
15:31	162, 166, 215	17:11	135
15:32	112, 156, 162	17:12	2
15:32–33	162, 165	17:13	1, 135
15:33	162	17:13–14	111, 137
15:35	112, 135, 157, 197	17:16–31	219
15:36	135	17:16–34	1, 213, 219
15:36–41	219	17:17	220
15:38	208	17:18	197
15:41	112	17:30	194
16	21, 24, 217	17:31	200
16:1–40	1	17:32	137
16:3	158	17:16–34	1, 213, 219
16:4	92, 155, 166, 185	17:22–31	14
16:5	112	17:22–34	220
16:6	97, 135, 219	17:30	209
16:7	97, 203, 219	17:31	200
16:6–10	1, 219	17:32	98, 111, 219
16:9–10	145	17:32–34	98
16:10	197	18	217
16:11–40	1	18:1–11	1
16:12	214	18:1–17	1, 213, 219
16:12–40	219	18:4	220
16:13	219, 220	18:5	135, 219
16:14–15	163	18:5–6	111, 137
16:14	219	18:6	1, 98
		18:7	185, 220

18:7–10	98	20:7–12	112
18:8	136, 210	20:15–38	112
18:9	145	20:16	92
18:9–10	219	20:17	10, 155
18:9–11	1	20:17–25	219
18:10	214	20:20	157
18:11	124, 135, 146, 157, 219	20:21	136, 209
18:12	98, 119	20:23–24	219
18:12–17	1, 111, 137	20:23	111, 138
18:13	185	20:24	136
18:14–16	210	20:31	146
18:17	210	20:32	135, 212
18:19	219, 220	20:35	135, 136
18:19–21	1, 213	20:36	153
18:22	125	21–23	92, 94, 111
18:22–23	124, 151	21:1–6	143
18:23	112, 125, 219	21:1–17	219
18:25	136, 157	21:2	165
18:26	220	21:2–5	131
18:27	212	21:6	143
19	217	21:8	143
19:1–7	112	21:9	143, 156
19:1–20	1, 213	21:10	156
19:1–41	1, 219	21:10–11	111, 138, 143
19:4	194, 209	21:11	156, 219
19:5	136	21:13	92
19:5–6	219	21:18	155
19:6	151, 215	21:21	157, 158
19:6–7	1, 93	21:25	10, 165, 205
19:8–9	219	21:27–30	1
19:8	220	21:27–36	116
19:9	1, 98, 111, 137, 220	21:28	157
19:10	2, 124, 135, 146	21:37–39	210
19:10–11	98	22:3	188
19:13	136	22:3–16	144
19:13–17	219	22:5	155
19:17	136	22:8	136
19:17–20	98	22:10	136, 144, 200
19:18–20	219	22:14	152, 197
19:20	135	22:14–15	196
19:21	92	22:15	91, 122, 155
19:21–40	116	22:16	200
19:23–41	1, 111, 137, 220	22:17	153
19:29	119	22:20	122, 155
19:31	210	22:22–40	1
19:35	210	22:24–29	210
20:1–2	112	23:9	200
20:3	200	23:11	136, 155
		23:12–22	1

23:14	155	<i>Romans (Rom)</i>	
24:1	155	1:1	151
24:1–9	1	1:3–4	192, 200
24:1–27	210		
25:1–12	1, 210	<i>1 Corinthians (1 Cor)</i>	
25:15	155	12:28	154
25:13–27	210		
26:1–32	210	<i>2 Corinthians (2 Cor)</i>	
26:4	92	3:16	137
26:6	197		
26:9–18	144	<i>Galatians (Gal)</i>	
26:10	92	1:15	151
26:15	136	1:18–24	147
26:16	122, 152, 155, 200	2:11–18	161, 165
26:16–17	144		
26:16–18	196	<i>Ephesians (Eph)</i>	
26:18	137	2:10	151
26:20	137, 194, 209		
26:30	200	<i>1 Thessalonians (1 Thess)</i>	
27:3	131	1:9	137
28	217		
28:7–10	210	<i>James (Jas)</i>	
28:8	220	5:19–20	137
28:8–9	219		
28:11–16	1	<i>1 Peter (1 Pet)</i>	
28:14–31	169, 219	2:25	137
28:17	92		
28:19–31	111, 137	<i>1 Clement</i>	
28:23–24	219	18:1	191
28:24	2, 98		
28:24–27	1	<i>Chrysostom</i>	
28:25–27	2	<i>Adversus Judaeos (Adv. Jud.)</i>	
28:25–28	156	1.6	129
28:26–28	111		
28:27	137		
28:28–31	2		
28:30	219		
28:31	136, 157		

Greek and Latin Literature

Antiochus of Syracuse (<i>FGrHist</i>)	2.846–850	138
555 F9	43	
	<i>Aristotle</i>	
Apollonius of Rhodes	<i>Politica (Pol.)</i>	
<i>Argonautica (Argon.)</i>	1303 (a25)	30

1274	43	<i>De Lege Agraria (Agr.)</i>	
		1.5.16	28
Arrian		2.4.10	28
		2.7.19	91, 152
<i>Anabasis (Anab.)</i>		2.12.31	28, 152
3.1.5–2.1	37, 73–76, 167	2.17.43–46	152
		2.32	91
Aristaenetus (<i>FGrHist</i>)		<i>Epistulae ad Atticum (Att.)</i>	
771 F1	39	4.1.4	151
Asconius		<i>Orationes philippicae (Phil.)</i>	
<i>On Cicero, In Pisonem (Ascon. Pis.)</i>		2.102	28
3	151	13.31	28
Augustus		Cornelius Nepos	
<i>Res Gestae (Res Gest. Divi Aug.)</i>		<i>Miltiades (Milt.)</i>	
1–14	173	1.2.1–4	65
4	174	1.2	111
9	174	Curtius Rufus	
12	174	6.3.3	99, 103
15–24	173	Diodorus	
25–35	173	1.87.1–3	44
28	173	7.5.1–7	145
32–33	99	8.10	53, 59
34	173	8.17	34, 52, 55, 93, 94, 111, 146, 151
101	172	8.17.1	49–51
Callimachus		8.18.1	50
<i>Aetia (Aet.)</i>		8.21.2	133
2 fr. 6 [22]	30, 42, 91, 139	8.21.2–3	29, 34, 83, 111, 132, 133
<i>Hymnus in Apollinem (Hymn. Apoll.)</i>		8.23.1	39, 40, 44, 52, 55, 60, 79, 91, 94, 138
69–89	63, 152	8.23.1–2	30, 34
72–73	36, 63	8.23.2–6	43–47
60–65	33	8.23.3	94
72–73	135	12.8.5	34, 94
86	33, 152, 167	12.9	30, 34, 36, 83, 91, 111, 139, 140, 151, 152
Cicero		12.11.1–3	66
<i>Epistulae ad Atticum (Att.)</i>		12.35.3	33
4.1.4	151	14.38.4	140
<i>De divinatione (Div.)</i>		15.49.1–3	69–70
1.102	151	34/35.1	28
		34/35.1.1–4	109–110

40.3.1	109	1.79–180	83
40.3.1–8	163	1.79.5	82
40.3.3	110	1.79.8	82
40.3.4–8	110	1.80–82	83
40.4.1	101	1.81.3	83
		1.84	82
Dionysius of Halicarnassus		1.84–89	124
		1.85.1–2	82
<i>Antiquitates romanae (Ant. Rom.)</i>		1.85.3	84
1–2	35	1.85.4	84
1.7	160	1.85.5	84
1.9–72	131	1.85.6	83
1.11–15	182	1.86.1	84
1.11.2–3	79	1.86.4	84
1.14.6	79	1.87.1–3	84
1.16.2–3	79	1.87.4	84
1.17–21	79	1.88.1–2	86
1.17–30	182	1.88.2	86
1.18	34	1.88–89	36
1.20.5	79	2.1	182
1.23–24	79	2.1–2	131
1.26.1–2	48	2.1.3	79
1.31–33	182	2.1.3–4	182
1.31.3	80	2.1.4	182
1.32.2	79, 80	2.2	79
1.32.3	80	2.2.2	138
1.34	182	2.3–4	86
1.34–65	182	2.3–50	124
1.34.1	80	2.3.1	86
1.34.1–2	80	2.5.1–2	86
1.45	138	2.9.1	86
1.45.1	80	2.10.4	87
1.49.3	81	2.11.1	87
1.50–51	80	2.12–13	86
1.51	34	2.12.1–2	154
1.51.2	80	2.12.3	154
1.55	34	2.13.3	154
1.55.3	81	2.15.2–3	86
1.55.4	81	2.22	87, 160
1.56.1–5	81	2.30–31	86
1.59.3	80	2.50	86
1.60.2	80	2.56.6–7	87
1.60.3	81	19.2	111, 132, 133
1.61.1–2	80	19.2.1	94
1.66	80, 182	19.2.1–22	43–47
1.66.1	81		
1.76.3	82		
1.77.1	82	Heraclides Lembos (<i>FGrHist</i>)	
1.77.2	82	25 F219	43

Herodotus		11.44–71	131
		11.51	135
<i>Historiae (Hist.)</i>		11.52	37, 132
1.50–61	32	11:52–53	149, 162, 182
1.66	35, 111	11.52–55	132
1.66–68	152	11.52–77	140
1.67–68	72	11.52–99	160
1.145	182	11.53	132
1.145–148	32	11.54	182
1.146–147	138	11.56	132, 182
1.165–167	29, 35, 83, 93, 111	11.57	142
1.168	29, 111	11.72–76	141
2.178	38, 138	11.77	135, 141, 149, 182
4.39	65	11.85–104	141
4.150–161	49, 55–61, 93, 111	11.88	141
4.151	29	11.88–93	135
4.154–159	146	11.102	141
4.154–161	71, 94	11.103	141
4.155	49, 151	11.114	135
4.158	167	11.133–149	131
4.160–161	139	11.174	131
6.35	64, 151	11.181–195	131
6.35–37	37, 38–39, 111, 152	11.196–262	131
6.139.4	65	11.263–267	131
7.153	39, 42		
7.154–157	42	Livy	
9.26	182	1.1–17	35, 124, 182
		1.2	163
Iamblichus		1.3	155
		1.3.11	82
<i>De vita pythagorica (De Vit. Pythag.)</i>		1.4.2	82
2.3.4	139	1.6.3	83
6.30	119	1.6.4	83, 84
6.32	119	1.7.1–2	85
16.69	119	1.7.2	84
30.167–168	119	1.7.2–3	84
50	51	1.8	154
		1.8.1–3	85
Justin		1.8.5–7	84
15.3.4–7	29	1.9–13	86
16.3.4–7	59, 138	1.10.5–6	85
		1.13.6–8	85
Libanius		1.16	85
		4.10–11	28, 91
<i>Oration (Or.) 11: Antiochikos</i>		8.16.14	28, 91
11.13–26	131	9.28.8	28, 91, 152
11.27–28	131	10.21.9	91, 152
11.29–33	131	11.19	139
11.34–41	131	32.29.3	91
11.44–52	132		

34.53.2	91, 152	10.15.7	63
35.53.2	28		
37.57.7	151	Pherecydes	
39.55.5	28, 91, 152	fr. 155	32, 182
41.20.9	127		
		Pindar	
Malalas		<i>Olympionikai (Ol.)</i>	
10.45	129	6.6–8	53
199–200	125	<i>Paeon (Paeon.)</i>	
199–203	35, 76–77	2	37
200	141	<i>Pythian Odes (Pyth.)</i>	
205.14.19	127	4	61, 62, 152, 167, 182
234.2–3	127	5	36, 61, 62–63, 135, 152, 164, 167, 182
244–245	130	9	61, 63, 152, 164, 167, 182
Menander Rhetor (Greek) (<i>Men. Rhet. Gr.</i>)			
3.442.44	34		
Ovid		Plato	
<i>Metamorphoses (Metam.)</i>		<i>Laws (Laws)</i>	
15.1–60	35, 51–52, 71, 145	708	29
15.9–18	182	740	29, 79
15.17–60	151	<i>Republic (Republic)</i>	
Pausanias		4.427	33
<i>Graeciae descriptio (Descr.)</i>		Pliny	
1.43	29	<i>Naturalis historia (Nat.)</i>	
4.4.1	45	4.45	38
4.12.7	72	7.98	101
4.23.5–7	30, 42, 43–46, 60, 91	Plutarch	
4.23.10	70	<i>Alexander (Alex.)</i>	
4.26–27	30, 35, 70–73, 91, 93, 111, 145, 167	26	35, 145
4.26.3–4	145	26.4–10	73–76
4.32.1	93, 111	<i>Cimon (Cim.)</i>	
4.32.4	73	8	72
5.7.3	59	<i>Moralia (Mor.)</i>	
5.22.3	33	96	111
5.22.4	33	772	53–54
5.7.3	34, 54–55	772–773	59
8.46.1–3	42	772–777	29
8.46.2	39	773	54
9.29.1	30, 91		
10.10.6	83, 111, 132		
10.10.6–8	34–35		

812	111	Pseudo-Callisthenes	
		1.30	34
<i>Quaestiones romanae et graecae</i>		1.30–31	35, 37, 74–76
(<i>Quaest. rom.</i>)		1.30.5	74
30	31	1.31	74
<i>Romulus (Rom.)</i>		Pseudo-Skymnos	
1–2	78	726–733	38
1–4	36		
1.1–2	78	Solon	
1.2–3	78	fr. 4a	32, 182
1.2	78		
2.1	78	Strabo	
2.2–3	78	<i>Geographica (Geogr.)</i>	
2.3	78	4.1.4	136
2.3–6	78, 82	4.1.4–5	35, 36, 60, 93, 131, 145, 151, 155
3.1–2	78	4.1.5	39, 136
3.2	82	5.4.4	30, 31, 91, 138
4.2	82	5.4.7	138
7.1	82	6.1.2	94
7.1–2	84	6.1.3	29, 111
7.4	83	6.1.6	43–47, 79, 138, 139
8.7	84	6.1.12	34, 48–51, 52, 71, 94, 111, 182
9.1	83	6.1.14	30, 83, 139
9.3	85	6.3.2	133, 139
9.4	83, 85	6.3.2–3	29, 34, 60, 83, 111, 132
9.4–5	84	6.3.3	133
9.5	84	7.5.8	33, 67, 138
9.7	84, 85	7.6.1	38
10.1–2	84	7 fr. 52 (52)	30
11.1	85	8.6.22	54, 59
11.1–3	85	8.14	169
13.1–6	86, 154	12.6.4	169
14–21	86	13.1.14	138
14.2	82	16.2.4	125
16.4	163		
17.1	85	Suetonius	
20.1–3	86, 154	<i>Divus Augustus (Aug.)</i>	
21.1–5	86, 138–39	101.4	172
22.1–2	84		
22.1–4	86	Theopompus (<i>FGrHist</i>)	
26.1–2	86, 154	115 fr.358	39
27.1–2	86, 154		
27.7–8	86		
28.1	85		
28.1–4	86		
<i>Theseus (Thes.)</i>			
36	72		

Thucydides		6.5.2–3	30, 91, 111
1.12	32, 182	8.1	164
1.24.2	36, 44, 67, 68		
1.25–26	67–68	Timaeus (<i>FGrHist</i>)	
1.26.2	33	566 fr.43	43
1.100.3	111		
3.86.2	43	Tyrtaeus	
3.92.5	30, 36	<i>Eunomia</i>	182
4.102–108	65–66, 111, 140, 151, 152		
4.106	138	Varro	
4.106.1–4	85, 163	<i>De lingua latina (Ling.)</i>	
4.108.1	149	5.143	28
5.11	37, 66–67, 111, 151		
6.2.1–2	32, 182	Vergil	
6.3.1–2	32, 135, 160, 167	<i>Aeneid (Aen.)</i>	
6.3.2	53, 59	1.278–279	101
6.3.2–3	111	7	28
6.4.1–2	83, 111		
6.4.2	44	Xenophon	
6.4.3	30, 39, 40, 43, 91, 124, 138, 158	<i>Anabasis (Anab.)</i>	
6.4.4	30, 91, 155	5.3.4–13	136
6.4.4–5	39	5.6.15–18	29, 68–69
6.4.4–6	42, 111	6.4	35
6.4.5	44	6.4.3–5	29
6.5.1	30, 31, 91, 139, 158	6.4.14	69

Index of Modern Authors

- Alcock, Susan E. 28, 171, 172
Alexander, Loveday, 14–15
Alexander, Philip S. 92
Aune, David 6, 144, 157, 160
- Balch, David 24–25, 91, 93, 134, 160
Barclay, John M. G. 127, 129, 139, 145
Bar-Kochva, Bezalel 109, 110
Barrett, Charles Kinsley 191, 207, 208
Bartchy, S. Scott 117
Bauckham, Richard 144, 146, 158, 159,
162, 163, 166, 167
Belayche, Nicole 109, 135
Bérard, Jean 39
Bercovitz, J. Peter 124, 148
Betz, Hans Dieter 20
Bickerman, Elias J. 150
Billows, Richard A. 141, 151
Bispham, Edward 135, 161
Blakely, Sandra V, 103
Blomart, Alain 19, 134
Boardman, John 16, 39, 42, 43, 50
Bonz, Marianne Palmer 11
Borgen, Peder 165, 166, 167
Bovon, Francois 9, 97
Bowker, J. W. 184, 191
Bradley, Guy 16
Bradley, Keith 101
Brooten, Bernadette J. 128, 129, 130
Brown, Raymond E. 125, 140, 150, 154,
157, 158
Bruce, F. F. 125
Buraselis, Kostas 74
- Calame, Claude 17, 18, 33, 62, 152, 164
Callan, Terrance 158, 159, 165, 166
Cary, Earnest 81
Cerfaux, Lucien 119
- Cohen, Getzel M. 16, 28, 64, 73, 141,
149, 151
Cohen, Shaye J. D. 158, 159
Concannon, Cavan 20
Conzelmann, Hans 10, 12–15
Cornell, Timothy J. 28, 33, 81
Cowton, Christopher J. 111
Croatto, José Severino 138, 144, 157
Cumont, Franz 99
- D'Agostino, Bruno 43, 44
De Giorgi, Andrea U. 175
De Haas, Tymon C. A. 161
Demougin, Ségolène 16
Descœudres, John-Paul 18
Destro, Adriana 169
Dillon, Richard J. 138, 144
Doeve, J. W. 184
Dominguez, Adolfo J. 39, 42, 52, 135
Doniger, Wendy 23
Donnellan, Lieve 32, 135, 160
Dougherty, Carol, 18–20, 29, 131, 135,
146
Downey, Glanville 125, 126, 127, 128,
135, 139
Dunbabin, Thomas J. 34, 42, 43, 44, 50,
52
- Edwards, Douglas R. 102, 103
Ellis, E. Earle 156
Esler, Philip F. 118, 166
- Ferrario, Sarah Brown 69
Figueira, Thomas 27, 38, 64, 65, 85,
141, 147, 149, 152, 163
Fontenrose, Joseph 17, 33
Fredriksen, Paula 184
- Gager, John 184–85

- Garland, Robert 19, 134
 Gazda, Elaine K. 170
 Gebhard, Elizabeth 19–20, 29, 134
 Gibert, Pierre 8
 Gilbert, Gary 95, 98, 99, 101–3, 104,
 Goldsmith, Dale 184, 199
 Gorman, Vanessa B. 16
 Graham, A. J. 29, 30, 32, 36, 38, 43, 45,
 52, 55, 135, 139, 140, 151, 152, 157,
 160, 161
 Greco, Emanuele 43
 Güven, Suna 173
- Haenchen, Ernst 10, 115
 Hall, Jonathan M. 29, 32, 45, 47, 132,
 152,
 Hamm, Dennis 113, 114, 122
 Hanges, James Constantine 20–21, 29,
 89, 107, 134
 Hänlein-Schäfer, Heidi 145
 Harrington, J. Matthew 170, 172
 Heiserman, Arthur 9
 Hengel, Martin 131
 Herrmann, Peter 29
 Hiesinger, Ulrich W. 175
 Hill, Craig C. 122, 158, 159, 161, 163,
 165, 166
 Holladay, Carl V. 180–81, 183, 189,
 192, 199, 200, 201
 Hurst, Henry R. 16
- Jervell, Jacob 213
 Jeska, Joachim 181, 184, 198
 Johnson, Luke Timothy 113, 116, 122,
 138, 148, 149, 154
 Judge, E. A. 150, 158, 158–59,
- Kaizer, Ted 16
 Kasher, Aryeh 145
 Keener, Craig S. 125, 131, 140, 156,
 169, 178, 179, 183, 193, 194, 195,
 200, 205, 208, 210, 213, 215
 Kennedy, George A. 179, 180
 Khatchadourian, Lori 170, 175
 Kilgallen, John J. 180, 192, 193, 194
 Klauck, Hans Josef 90, 93, 99, 103, 104
 Koester, Craig 142
 Kraabel, A. Thomas 184
 Kraeling, Carl H. 127, 128, 129, 130
- Kurz, William S. 113, 114
- Lane, Eugene N. 175
 Leschhorn, Wolfgang 32, 33, 42,
 Levick, Barbara 16, 28, 170–72
 Levinskaya, Irina 129, 130
 Lindemann, Andreas 117, 118, 121,
 122, 123
 Löning, Karl 148
 Lüdemann, Gerd 96
- Magin, Yitzhak 142
 Malkin, Irad 16–20, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36,
 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50,
 55, 63, 66, 79, 132, 135, 136, 152,
 154, 155, 158, 160, 164, 182
 Marguerat, Daniel 8
 McCants, William F. 103
 McDonough, Sean M. 183, 186
 Meeks, Wayne A. 125, 128, 129, 130,
 140, 144, 150
 Meier, John P. 125, 140, 150, 154, 157,
 158
 Metzger, Bruce M. 99
 Misgav, Haggai 142
 Mitchell, Alan C. 118, 119, 120, 121
 Mitchell, Stephen 170, 178
 Moessner, David P. 138, 144, 157
 Morel, Jean-Paul 139
 Morgan-Wynne, John Eifion 169, 179,
 180, 183, 184, 185, 187, 191, 193,
 194, 195, 198, 202, 203, 204, 205,
 206, 207, 212, 213
 Müller, William S. 114
- Nasrallah, Laura 21,
 Neyrey, Jerome H. 118
 Ng, Diana Y. 170
 Nilsson, Martin P. 17
 Norman, A. F. 131
- Oltean, Ioanna 16
 Osborne, Robin 27, 38, 58, 147
 Ossi, Adrian J. 170, 176, 177
 Owen, Sara 16
 O'Toole, Robert F. 200
- Pao, David W. 118
 Park, Sejin 95

- Parke, Herbert W. 17, 32, 33, 34, 43,
79, 135, 160
- Parsons, Mikeal C. 9, 113
- Pervo, Richard I. 1, 9–10, 88, 89, 90,
93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 105, 106,
111, 113, 114, 148, 169, 180, 183,
186, 187, 194, 199, 201, 204, 205,
206, 207, 212, 213,
- Pesce, Mauro 168–69
- Pilch, John 97
- Pilhofer, Peter 178, 210, 215
- Plümacher, Eckhard 6, 118
- Prehn 33
- Prinz, Friedrich 32, 33
- Quesnel, Michel 199, 206, 209, 213
- Raff, Katharine A. 170, 174, 175
- Ricoeur, Paul 8
- Robbins, Vernon 13
- Robinson, Donald Fay 147
- Robinson, Eric W. 16
- Rothschild, Clare K. 167, 169, 178, 179
- Rubin, Benjamin 171, 172, 174, 175,
176
- Rutherford, Ian 29–30
- Salmon, Edward T. 16, 28, 77, 124,
151, 171
- Sanders, E. P. 205
- Sanders, Jack T. 139, 158
- Sandwell, Isabella 126, 131, 141
- Scheer, Tanja J. 79, 85
- Scheid, John 16
- Schwemer, Anna Maria 131
- Scott, James M. 13–14, 92, 94, 95, 100–
101, 213
- Selvidge, Marla 21–22
- Shiple, Frederick W. 173
- Sleeman, Matthew 12–13, 15
- Smith, Daniel Lynwood 212
- Smith, Dennis E. 118
- Smith, R. R. 101, 102
- Snyder, Graydon F. 169, 185
- Soards, Marion L. 179, 180, 181, 183,
193, 195, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204,
205
- Soja, Edward 12
- Spencer, F. Scott 120
- Sterling, Gregory 6–8, 92, 106, 107,
117, 118, 119, 123, 188, 189, 190
- Stern, Menahem 107, 109
- Stoneman, Richard 34, 47
- Strauss, Mark L. 96, 162, 169, 179,
180–81, 183, 184, 191, 192, 193,
200, 204, 206, 213
- Sweetman, Rebecca 16, 171
- Talbert, Charles 9, 115
- Tannehill, Robert C. 113, 212
- Taylor, Justin 150, 158
- Tiede, David L. 134, 138, 143, 145,
157, 159, 162, 213
- Terrenato, Nicola 16
- Torelli, Mario 77, 135, 161
- Tsfania, Levana 142
- Tsetskhladze, Gocha R. 16, 33
- Tyson, Joseph B. 120
- Vallet, Georges 42, 44,
- Van Dommelen, P. 16
- Waelkens, Marc 170
- Walaskay, Paul 113, 114,
- Wallace-Hadrill, David S. 126, 127, 128
- Weaver, John 23–24, 115
- Wedderburn, Alexander J. M. 95–96, 98
- Weinstock, Stefan 99, 103
- Wendt, Heidi 95
- Wilcox, Max 191
- Wilken, Robert L. 125, 128, 129, 130,
140, 144, 150
- Wills, Lawrence 180
- Wilson, John-Paul 16
- Wilson, Walter 1, 3, 22–23, 95, 135,
143, 145, 164,
- Wormell, Donald E. W. 17, 32, 33, 34,
43, 79, 135, 160
- Zetterholm, Magnus 126, 130
- Zhang, Wenxi 169

Index of Subjects

- Aborigines, 78–80, 182, 226
Abraham, 7, 103, 114, 180, 183–90, 194, 197–98
Acragas, 30, 39, 40, 42, 91, 124, 155, 217
Actaeon, 53, 59
Aeneas, 78, 80, 81, 163, 175, 182, 221, 226
Aeneid, 11
Aeschylus, 34
Agabus, 143, 149, 156
Alba Longa, 81, 83, 124, 145, 217, 221, 225, 226
Alcidamidas, 43, 45, 46, 225
Alexander, 27, 37, 51, 73, 74, 75, 77, 92, 95, 99, 103, 104, 128, 132, 135, 141, 142, 145, 149, 182, 221, 222
Alexander Polyhistor, 103
Alexandria, 35, 73, 74, 75, 145, 167, 221
Al-Mina, 126
Alpheius, 34, 54, 55
Amphipolis, 30, 64, 65, 66, 111, 138, 140, 149, 152, 163, 221
Amulius, 81, 82, 84
Ananias and Sapphira, 112, 117, 118, 121, 122
Anatolia, 73, 124, 126, 150, 169, 170, 175
Anaxilas, 45, 46, 70
ancestor(s), 2, 3, 19, 56, 69, 100, 103, 181, 185, 186, 188, 191, 192, 197, 199, 200, 201, 202, 205, 207, 209, 218, 219
angel(s), 1, 89, 90, 108, 114–15, 145, 163, 218
Anna the Prophetess, 90, 93
Antimnestus, 44, 46
Antioch of Pisidia, 2, 4, 28, 30, 32, 77, 88, 89, 99, 105, 111, 151, 157, 159, 167, 168–216, 217, 218
Antioch of Syria, 1, 4, 76, 88, 104, 105, 124–67, 168, 170, 178, 182, 196, 197, 204, 205, 206, 208, 211, 214, 217, 218, 222
Antiochus I (Soter), 76, 126, 170
Antiochus II, 135, 170
Antiochus III, 126, 139
Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), 126, 127, 129
Antiochus of Syracuse, 31, 43, 44, 45, 46, 53, 132, 133
Antiphemus, 30, 39, 41, 42, 91, 223, 224
Aphrodisias, 101–2, 177
Apollo, 32–36, 38, 41, 43, 45–47, 49–51, 54–59, 62–63, 91, 107, 126, 133, 135, 136, 137, 151, 160, 161, 164, 167, 176, 182, 222, 223, 224, 225
Apollo *Archegetes*, 32, 135, 160, 234
Apollo Karneios, 36, 63, 135
Apollonia, 30, 33, 38, 138, 173, 222
Apollonia (in Galatia), 173
apologetic historiography, 6–8
Arcadia, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 111, 155, 160, 182, 222, 226
Archaic period, 2, 4, 16, 18, 27, 32, 37, 38–63, 147, 181
Archias, 34, 53, 54, 55, 59, 227
architecture, 28, 101–2, 125, 169, 170–78
Arethusa, 34, 54, 55
Argonauts, 55, 56, 62
Aristarcha, 51, 136, 224
Aristodemus, 45, 72, 145
Aristomenes, 72
Arkesilas, 62, 63
Artemis, 19, 36, 40, 69, 136, 138, 151, 155, 167, 176, 220
Artimedes, 43, 44, 46, 47, 225
Ascanius, 80, 81, 145, 175, 182, 221
Asclepius, 19
astrology, 99, 103, 175, 189

- Athena, 42, 161
- Athens, 1, 19, 27, 30, 36, 52, 63–67, 71, 72, 91, 111, 140, 141, 147, 149, 152, 161, 163, 213, 219, 221, 223, 225, 226, 228
- augury, 83, 84, 225, 227
- Augustus, 11, 13, 42, 99, 101–2, 127–28, 171–78, 181
- Babel, 100, 190
- Bacchiads, 52
- Barnabas, 4, 118, 121–23, 124, 137, 138, 142, 147–50, 151–56, 159–62, 167, 168, 170, 179, 181, 196, 207–19
- Battos, 33, 49, 56–63, 71, 91, 135, 139, 146, 223
- Berosus, 104
- biography, 9, 83
- Black Sea, 33, 35, 38, 55, 68
- bones of Orestes, 72
- Brasidas, 65–67, 163, 221
- Brea, 30, 36, 64, 91, 149, 161
- Caesarea, 1, 124, 142–47, 161–67, 211, 218
- Capitoline Hill, 80
- Casus, 132, 134, 140, 141, 149, 162, 182, 222
- Chalcis, 30, 31, 32, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 91, 158, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226, 228
- chresmologos*, 105, 164, 196
- Cimon, 65, 72
- citizen, citizenship, 29, 60, 61, 66, 110, 129, 171, 172, 173
- Classical period, 2, 4, 8, 16, 27, 30, 36, 37, 39, 52, 63, 64–73, 85, 135, 141, 149, 152, 179, 181
- coinage, 43, 50, 127, 172
- Comon, 70–71
- Corcyra, 30, 33, 52, 53, 64, 67, 68, 222, 223
- Corinth, 1, 2, 19, 20, 30, 33, 52, 53, 54, 67, 104, 105, 111, 145, 146, 213, 217, 219, 222, 225, 227, 231
- Cornelius, 23, 65, 143–48, 163, 211
- Corobius, 57, 58
- Crete, 30, 39, 40, 41, 42, 57, 58, 61, 91, 98, 99, 102, 104, 124, 132, 133, 134, 139, 140, 141, 142, 158, 162, 182, 217, 222, 223, 224
- crisis, 3, 4, 18, 19, 28, 29, 32, 45, 53–55, 79, 80, 125, 130–34, 139, 142, 150, 167, 168, 196, 210
- Croton, 32, 34, 35, 37, 48–53, 55, 59, 62, 93, 94, 111, 119, 145, 146, 182, 222
- cult transfer, 3, 16, 19, 20, 29, 35, 37, 41–42, 66, 68, 69–70, 72–73, 89, 92, 125, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 140, 142, 144, 150, 151, 167, 168, 182, 202, 203
- Cyprus, 102, 104, 105, 111, 121, 124, 131, 139, 142, 150, 159, 168, 179, 214, 222
- Cyrene, 17, 29, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 49, 55–63, 91, 93, 94, 111, 135, 139, 146, 152, 154, 164, 167, 182, 223
- Cyrmos, 35, 93, 111, 223
- Dacia, 102, 173
- Daphne, 126–127, 129, 132, 140, 160, 167
- David, 89, 96, 114, 162, 164, 180, 183, 186, 187, 191–93, 196–202, 205, 209, 216
- Delos, 19, 33, 80
- Delphi, 16, 17, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 67, 68, 69, 72, 79, 92, 93, 133, 134, 135, 136, 209, 232, 235
- Demeter and Persephone, 42, 71, 167
- diaspora, 7, 14, 32, 96, 97, 98, 104, 105, 155, 185, 188, 190
- Diocles, 78
- Diogenes Laertius, 9
- Dionysia, 64, 149, 161
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 6, 24, 77, 78, 226, 227
- disciples, 9, 89, 90, 93, 95, 143, 150, 153, 156, 164, 210, 213, 214, 216
- divination, 16, 68, 84, 87
- Dodona, 34, 79, 80, 81
- Dorian, 31, 32, 39, 40, 158, 182
- drought, 29, 55, 57, 79
- dynastic founders, 52, 58, 70, 78, 81

- Egypt, 14, 37, 38, 73, 75, 103, 104, 108,
 109, 130, 141, 180, 183, 185, 186,
 187, 188, 189, 190, 198, 209, 224
 Entimus, 30, 39, 41, 91, 223, 224
 Epaminondas, 30, 71, 72, 91, 224
 Ephesus, 1, 13, 69, 105, 111, 146, 213,
 217, 219
 Ephorus, 132, 133
 epic, 11, 19
 Epidamnus, 64, 67, 68, 223
 Epidaurus, 161
 Epitales, 30, 71, 73, 91, 145, 224
 Essenes, 119
 etiology, 48, 52, 54, 57
 Eupolemus, 7, 103, 188, 190
 Euripides, 34
 Evander, 79, 81, 82, 83, 85, 155, 160
 exodus, 3, 103, 107, 108, 110, 185, 193

 Fabius Pictor, 78
 Faustulus, 82, 83
 founder cult, 37, 63, 67

 Galatia, 171
 Galilee, 93, 195
 Gela, 30, 31, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 55, 91,
 94, 124, 138, 155, 158, 161, 217, 221,
 223
 genre, 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 24, 26, 181
 geography, 1, 6, 7, 12–15, 26, 34, 41, 47,
 49, 52, 55, 80, 92, 94, 97–105, 107,
 109, 125, 175
gerousia, 86, 154
 Godfearer, 178, 184, 185, 194, 195, 196,
 197, 201, 202, 204, 205, 207, 215, 218
 Greek novel, 9–11, 14, 15, 21, 93
 Grinnus, 56–61

 Hadrian, 21, 109, 176–78
 Hagnon, 66, 151–52, 221
 Harpagus, 35
 healing, 89, 112–16, 200, 219
 Hecataeus of Abdera, 109, 224
 Helen, 62
 Heliopolis, 189
 Hellenistic period, 2, 4, 7, 8, 16, 20, 25,
 27, 28, 37, 64, 73–77, 95, 103, 107,
 125, 129, 130, 131, 140, 141, 144,
 145, 149, 151, 165, 172, 174, 176,
 181, 189, 221
 Heracles/Hercules, 32, 51–52, 62, 70,
 80, 81, 132, 142, 145, 182, 189
 Heraclidae, 132, 135, 140–41, 182, 222,
 227
 Hermes, 79, 189
 hero, 7, 18, 33, 35, 43, 44, 51, 52, 73, 74,
 80, 91, 175, 187, 209, 221
 Himera, 30, 31, 91, 139, 158, 224
 historiography, 6–11
 Holy Spirit, 1, 3, 4, 15, 27, 36, 88, 89, 93,
 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 104, 105, 106, 112,
 113, 118, 121, 137, 142, 143, 145,
 146, 148, 151, 153, 156, 157, 159,
 160, 162, 163, 164, 167, 179, 211,
 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219
 Homer, 11, 34, 73, 75, 76
 hospitality, 51, 52, 131
 human tithe, 43, 44, 46, 79

 imperial cult, 145, 172, 176, 177
incolae, 171, 173
 Ionia, 30, 32, 36, 40, 69, 70, 81, 131,
 136, 138, 155, 182
 Ithome, 45, 70, 71

 James, 13, 20, 91, 95, 99, 146, 161, 162,
 164, 165, 167, 204, 205, 206, 214,
 229, 233, 236, 238
 Jason, 62
 Jerusalem, 1, 3, 4, 7, 13, 15, 25, 27, 28,
 30, 36, 87, 88–123, 124, 125, 128,
 129, 130, 131, 134, 136, 139, 142,
 143, 144, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152,
 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159,
 160, 161, 162, 163, 165, 166, 167,
 168, 169, 185, 188, 190, 192, 194,
 195, 196, 197, 199, 202, 203, 204,
 205, 206, 207, 208, 210, 213, 217,
 218, 219, 224
 Jesus's ascension, 12, 68, 88, 89, 90, 91,
 93, 106
 Joseph, 17, 120, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190,
 197
 Judea, 3, 7, 19, 29, 31, 91, 92, 94, 98,
 107, 109, 130, 134, 143, 148, 158,
 159, 162, 167, 169, 196, 211
 Julius Caesar, 13

- Juno, 161
 Jupiter, 85, 128, 161, 176
- κατοικέω, 98, 100, 105
 king as founder, 27, 28, 73, 151
 Kleodemus, 103
ktisis (foundation narrative), 15, 16, 22, 24
- Lampon, 30, 36, 91, 151, 152, 228
 Laurentia, 82
 legend, 7, 17, 18, 32, 33, 42, 44, 48–52, 61, 65, 75, 78, 114, 132, 199
 Lemnos, 62, 65
 Libya, 33, 34, 38, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 70, 74, 189, 190
 lituus, 84
- Macedonia, 33, 99, 100, 104, 135, 150, 173
 magic, 99, 113, 115, 219
 Magna Graecia, 43
 Magna Mater, 19
 Manetho, 28, 108, 109, 110
 Manticlus, 30, 70, 91, 228
mantis, 35, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 84, 105, 108, 221
 maps, 12–15, 92, 101, 154, 173
 Mars, 78, 79, 82, 226
 Massalia, 19, 30, 35, 40, 60, 69, 93, 131, 136–38, 139, 145, 151, 155, 166, 224
 material culture, 2, 8, 17, 23, 24, 25, 43, 89, 98, 103, 106, 149, 178
 Medea, 56, 62, 223
 Medes and Elamites, 98–99, 102
 Mên Askaênos, 170, 174–75
 Mesopotamia, 14, 126, 128
 Messene, 30, 35, 45, 46, 70, 71, 72, 73, 91, 93, 111, 145, 167, 224, 225, 228
 Messenia, 45, 71, 72, 133
 Miletus, 30, 38, 141, 161, 225, 228
 Miltiades (Elder and Younger), 37, 38, 39, 64, 65, 66, 111, 151, 152, 228
 Minerva, 161
 Minyans, 56
 mixed community, 1, 3, 4, 10, 24, 30, 31, 33, 34, 40, 43, 46, 66, 79, 80, 86, 98, 125, 131, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 152, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 206, 211, 212, 214, 215, 218
- Moses, 7, 10, 104, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 134, 138, 145, 157, 163, 180, 181, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 197, 204, 205, 211, 213, 224
 motif, 3–4, 8, 12, 19, 22–25, 27–37, 38, 49, 59, 76, 78, 87, 88, 93–95, 103, 107–12, 125, 131, 143, 150, 157, 169, 178, 190, 209, 210, 213, 217, 220
 Mount Silpius, 125, 135
mundus, 85, 86
 Myscellus/Mycelus, 48–52, 71, 145, 146, 222, 223
 myth, 7, 17, 18, 21, 24, 32, 48, 51, 53, 61–63, 78, 80, 102, 132, 135, 177
- Naucratis, 38, 138, 225
 Naxos, 32, 135, 160, 225, 231
 Noah, 95, 100
nomima (institutions), 4, 10, 22, 24, 25, 30, 31, 37, 40, 63, 86, 87, 88, 91, 107, 110, 112, 116–23, 124–25, 132, 137, 140, 149, 151, 153–67, 169, 170, 178, 204, 211, 218, 219
nomos (law), 30, 33, 40, 43, 51, 52, 65, 80, 85, 86, 95, 96, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 129, 141, 154, 164, 179, 181, 186, 187, 205, 206, 210, 211
 nostoi, 32
 Numa, 51
 Numitor, 81, 82, 83
- Odyssey, 75
oikist, 17, 18, 24, 29, 30, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 66, 68, 91, 133, 152
 opposition, 1, 3, 4, 83, 93, 95, 111, 116, 118, 119, 123, 134, 137, 138, 143, 144, 158, 159, 164, 166, 210, 213, 215, 219
 oracle of Bacis, 72, 224
 oracle, 1, 3, 13, 16–19, 32–36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 76, 79, 81, 83, 85, 90, 93, 94, 97, 105, 106, 110, 111, 125, 136, 137, 145, 147, 150, 151,

- 156, 160, 187, 190, 196, 206, 209,
211, 213, 214, 216, 218, 221, 222,
223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228
- Ortygia, 34, 54–55
- Panathenaea, 64, 149, 161
- Panionia, 69, 70
- Partheniae, 133, 134, 227
- patriarchs, 7, 32, 186–90, 197, 205
- patron god, 36, 38
- Paulus of Alexandria, 99
- Peisistratids, 64–65
- Pelagians, 78–80, 182, 222, 226
- Peloponnesian War, 64, 65, 67
- Pentecost, 88, 93, 95–106, 112, 114, 117,
118, 156, 181, 199, 202, 203, 211
- Pericles, 65, 66
- persecution, 1, 3, 9, 92, 94, 129, 131,
134, 142, 168
- Persia, 7, 29, 99, 103, 131, 134
- Phalanthus, 34, 133, 139, 227
- Philip, 92, 118, 127, 142, 143, 147, 148,
156, 211, 214, 218, 229, 232
- Philippi, 1, 2, 13, 24, 111, 213, 217, 219
- Phocaea, 35, 40, 131, 134, 136, 137, 223
- Phoenicia, 103, 104, 108, 131, 139, 143,
190
- plague, 29, 59
- Platea, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 172
- Pompey, 101, 127, 129
- portent, 37, 76, 227
- Poseidon, 53, 54, 70, 222
- prayer, 13, 76, 89, 115, 117, 120, 123,
153, 154
- prehistory, 48, 51, 62, 78, 80, 81, 82,
131, 140, 141, 181–92, 197, 202, 205,
209, 218
- priest, 35, 42, 58, 70, 71, 77, 89, 109, 136
- prophecy, 2, 3, 11, 13, 51, 58, 62, 81, 89,
111, 146, 149, 156, 157, 162, 186,
187, 195, 201, 213, 223
- prophet, 90, 134, 138, 156, 157
- purification, 18, 25, 53, 158
- Pythagoras, 119
- Pythia, 33, 35, 41, 45, 49, 58, 59, 60, 62,
63, 81, 93, 133
- Remus, 82, 83, 84
- Res Gestae*, 13, 99, 101, 172, 173, 174
- Rhea Silvia, 82
- Rhegion, 30, 34, 35, 37, 42–47, 60, 70,
79, 94, 111, 138, 139, 157, 225
- rhetoric, 4, 124, 170, 178–210, 211
- Rhodes, 30, 39–41, 72, 91, 124, 158,
217, 223, 224
- ritual, 20, 28, 36, 37, 86, 117, 171, 174,
225
- Roman Empire, 3, 7, 13, 33, 102, 103,
104, 125, 220, 236
- Roman period, 2, 8, 37, 103, 152, 181
- Rome, 1, 4, 11, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 29,
35, 51, 77–87, 91, 92, 98, 99, 101–5,
107, 111, 124, 125, 127, 128, 131,
136, 138, 142, 145, 150, 151, 152,
154, 155, 158, 160, 161, 163, 167,
169, 170–178, 182, 217, 219, 225
- Romulus, 78–87, 93, 124, 154, 155, 160,
163, 217, 225, 226
- salvation history, 3, 13, 105, 180, 199
- Samaria, 3, 91, 94, 124, 134, 142, 143,
147, 148, 153, 190, 196, 211
- sanctuary, 19, 74, 170
- savior, 89, 115, 157, 178, 183, 185, 192,
193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199,
200, 201, 202, 206, 207, 208, 210, 216
- second-generation colonization, 4, 31,
44, 124, 125, 148, 151, 153, 154, 159,
167, 168, 169, 170, 179, 194, 196,
206, 209, 210, 211, 216, 217, 219
- Seleucia Pieria, 76, 77, 126, 227
- Seleucus Nicator, 35, 51, 73, 76, 77, 125,
126, 127, 128, 129, 132, 135, 141,
149, 222, 224, 226–27
- sibyl, 81
- Sicily, 32, 34, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 52,
54, 55, 70, 80, 102, 135, 139, 160,
167, 173, 182, 227
- Simeon, 89, 93, 213
- Sinai, 95, 96, 235
- Solomon's Portico, 111, 114
- southern Italy, 31, 32, 34, 35, 38, 42, 44,
46, 48, 132, 134
- space, 7, 12, 13, 15, 74, 85, 86, 111, 141,
154, 159, 171
- Sparta, 17, 27, 29, 35, 36, 45, 46, 52, 55,
56, 61, 63, 64, 65–67, 70, 71, 72, 111,

- 132–34, 135, 139, 152, 155, 163, 182,
221, 222, 223, 224, 227, 228
- stasis*, 13, 24, 29, 30, 39, 42, 79, 132,
134, 139, 218
- Stephen, 7, 131, 134, 138, 144, 148, 155,
183, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 192,
197, 198, 205, 207, 208, 211, 213
- Suetonius, 172
- surprised *oikist*, 3, 29, 37, 49, 59, 94, 144
- Sybaris, 50, 66, 140, 147, 228
- synagogue, 4, 89, 104, 124, 129, 163,
168, 179, 184, 185, 208–13
- Syracuse, 29, 34, 42, 52–55, 59, 94, 111,
158, 222, 224, 227
- table fellowship, 25, 117
- Table of Nations, 14, 100–101
- Taras, 29, 34, 35, 47, 54, 60, 111, 132–
34, 139, 140, 152, 155, 227
- Tegea, 35, 72, 111, 152
- Tenea, 54
- Thebes, 30, 70, 71, 73, 91, 224
- theophany, 96, 116
- Thera, 36, 55–61, 62, 135, 223, 228
- Therapeutae, 120
- Theras, 55, 56, 61, 228
- Thessalonica, 1, 105, 111, 213, 219, 220
- Thracian Chersonese, 37, 38, 64, 66,
111, 152, 228
- Thurii, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 64, 66, 91, 94,
111, 139, 140, 147, 152, 163, 227, 228
- topos*, 2, 8, 19, 20, 23, 30, 193, 217, 219,
220
- Trajan, 128
- tripod, 50
- Triptolemus, 132, 135, 140, 149, 182
- Trojans, 62, 182
- Tyche, 126, 127
- vestal virgins, 82
- vision, 1, 3, 8, 13, 27, 35, 37, 51, 52, 68,
70–73, 74, 75, 76, 81, 97, 119, 121,
136, 137, 144, 145, 146, 151, 157,
163, 181, 218, 219, 221, 223, 224
- Xenocritus, 30, 36, 91, 152, 228
- Xenophon, 35
- Zancle, 30, 42, 44, 45, 46, 70, 91, 111,
139, 224, 228
- Zeus, 34, 70, 76, 77, 126, 132, 135, 141,
149, 160, 162, 167, 169, 182, 222