Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

____________________________ ______________

Eric C. Moore Date

Claiming Places: Reading Acts of the Apostles as a Colonizing Narrative

By

Eric C. Moore
Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Division of Religion
New Testament

Carl Holladay, Ph.D.
Advisor

Sandra Blakely, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Luke Timothy Johnson, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Vernon Robbins, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Walter Wilson, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Accepted:

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

Date

Claiming Places: Reading Acts of the Apostles as a Colonizing Narrative

By

Eric C. Moore
Th.M., Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, 2007; M.Div., Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005; B.A., University of Missouri, 2000

Advisor: Carl Holladay, Ph.D.

An abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in New Testament
2017

Abstract

Claiming Places: Reading Acts of the Apostles as a Colonizing Narrative
By Eric C. Moore

Claiming Places employs ancient colonization as an analytic framework to study Acts of the Apostles. Its value lies in the way it identifies cultural *topoi* related to colonization in the Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods; demonstrates how they are expressed in literary and material accounts of colonization; and utilizes them as a framework for analyzing Acts.

The layout of the work is designed to highlight the benefit of the colonization framework. Chapter 1 surveys other approaches to Acts while outlining my own. I argue that using colonization as a cultural lens generates insights not fully accounted for in literary and geographical approaches to Luke's work. Chapter 2 delineates the analytic framework. I lay out three overarching motifs common in reflections about colonization in ancient sources: origins, divine sanction, and founder(s). I then trace expressions of these motifs in accounts about colonization in different historical periods. In chapter 3, I demonstrate how the colonization model allows us to analyze Acts 1–5 as an account of the origins of the "colonizing community." Jerusalem functions like the mother city of Christian "colonies," the apostles like founding figures, and Jesus's oracle (1:8) and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (2:1–4) like forms of divine sanction. In chapter 4, I show how Antioch of Syria plays a pivotal role in Acts (11:19–30, 13:1–3, 15:1–35), with the community there functioning like a colony of the Jerusalem community in addition to a mother city of its own. As a "colony," its beginnings were precipitated by "crisis"; facilitated by cult transfer; and marked by a "mixed" Jewish-gentile membership possessing distinctive nomenclature ("Christians"). As a mother city, Antioch initiated the further replication of the Christian community in accordance with divine sanction (13:1–3). Chapter 5 focuses on Paul's speech in Antioch of Pisidia as a sort of rhetoric of "second-generation" colonization, or replication outside Jerusalem-Judea. I suggest that the speech employs colonizing *topoi* to legitimate this expansion. Finally, in chapter 6 I summarize my conclusions while suggesting the value of the colonization framework in identifying and explaining the prominence of characteristic features in Acts.

Claiming Places: Reading Acts of the Apostles as a Colonizing Narrative

By

Eric C. Moore
Th.M., Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, 2007; M.Div., Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005; B.A., University of Missouri, 2000

Advisor: Carl Holladay, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in New Testament
2017

BRIEF TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1	Introduction: The Present Project and Its Approach to Acts		**1**
	1.1	Introduction: Reading Acts as a Colonizing Narrative	**1**
	1.2	Other Ways of Reading Acts: A History of Scholarship	**2**
		1.2.1 Genre Debates	**2**
		1.2.2 Geographical Studies	**9**
		1.2.3 Foundation Analyses	**18**
	1.3	The Argument and Outline of this Project	**33**
Chapter 2	Ancient Colonizing Motifs—A Framework for Analyzing Acts		**38**
	2.1	Introduction	**38**
	2.2	Colonization in the Ancient Mediterranean World	**39**
		2.2.1 A Variegated Phenomenon	**39**
		2.2.2 Colonization Motifs	**41**
	2.3	Colonization Accounts: Case Studies	**57**
		2.3.1 Colonization in the Archaic Period	**57**
		2.3.2 Colonization in the Classical Period	**110**
		2.3.3 Colonization in the Hellenistic Period	**131**

		2.3.4 Colonization of Rome	**141**
	2.4	Conclusions	**160**
Chapter 3	The Origins of the Cult Community in Jerusalem (Acts 1–5)		**162**
	3.1	The Community's Founder(s), Origins, and Divine Mandate (Acts 1–2)	**163**
		3.1.1 Founding Figure(s)	**163**
		3.1.2 Jerusalem Origins	**170**
		3.1.3 Divine Sanction	**172**
		3.1.4 Summation	**198**
	3.2	The Colonizing Mission in Jerusalem (Acts 3–5)	**199**
		3.2.1 Comparative Introduction	**199**
		3.2.2 The Founding Acts of the Apostles	**210**
		3.2.3 The "Institutions" of the Jerusalem Community	**219**
	3.3	Conclusion	**230**
Chapter 4	Antioch of Syria: Colony *and* Mother Community		**232**
	4.1	Introduction: The Pivotal Role of Antioch in Acts	**232**
	4.2	Socio-Historical Sketch of Antioch	**234**

4.3 Antioch, Colony of the Jerusalem Community **245**

4.3.1 Crisis Origins **245**

4.3.2 Foundation through Cult Transfer **252**

4.3.3 Constitution as a "Mixed" Community **254**

4.3.4 Jerusalem Oversight **275**

4.4 Antioch, Mother City of Second Generation Colonies **281**

4.4.1 Divine Sanction of Colonizing Ventures **283**

4.4.2 Community "Institutions" **288**

4.4.3 Conclusion: The Antiochene Community's Colonies **314**

Chapter 5 Pisidian Antioch and the Rhetoric of Second Generation Colonization **316**

5.1 Introduction: The Significance of Acts 13 **316**

5.2 Socio-Historical and Architectural Sketch of Antioch **319**

5.3 Paul's Speech: The Rhetoric of "Second Generation" Colonization **337**

5.3.1 Introduction **337**

5.3.2 The Ancestral Prehistory (13:17–22) **343**

5.3.3 The Colonizing Message for Antioch (13:23–41) **365**

5.3.4 Summation: The Rhetoric of "Second Generation" Colonization **401**

5.4 The Outcome of Second Generation Colonization at Antioch **403**

5.4.1 The Foundation of a "Mixed" Community **404**

5.4.2 The Colonization of Pisidian Antioch—A Success? **413**

Chapter 6 Conclusion **416**

Appendix Abridged Chart of Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman Colonies **422**

Bibliography **429**

DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 Introduction: The Present Project and Its Approach to Acts 1

1.1 Introduction: Reading Acts as a Colonizing Narrative 1

1.2 Other Ways of Reading Acts: A History of Scholarship 2

1.2.1 Genre Debates 2

1.2.2 Geographical Studies 9

1.2.3 Foundation Analyses 18

1.2.3.1 Greek and Roman Accounts 18

1.2.3.2 Acts of the Apostles 26

1.3 The Argument and Outline of this Project 33

Chapter 2 Ancient Colonizing Motifs—A Framework for Analyzing Acts 38

2.1 Introduction 38

2.2 Colonization in the Ancient Mediterranean World 39

2.2.1 A Variegated Phenomenon 39

2.2.2 Colonization Motifs 41

2.2.2.1 Origins 41

2.2.2.2 Divine Sanction 48

2.2.2.3 Founder(s) **54**

2.3 Colonization Accounts: Case Studies **57**

2.3.1 Colonization in the Archaic Period **57**

2.3.1.1 The Foundation of Gela **59**

2.3.1.1.1 Gela's Joint Settlement and Dorian "Institutions" according to Thucydides **60**

2.3.1.1.2 Gela's Founding Oracle according to Diodorus **62**

2.3.1.1.3 Cult Transfers at Gela according to Pausanias and Herodotus **64**

2.3.1.2 The Foundation of Rhegion **66**

2.3.1.2.1 Mixed Traditions and Mixed Foundation: Strabo and the Joint Settlement of Rhegion **67**

2.3.1.2.2 Guiding Riddle: The Foundation Oracle of Rhegion according to Diodorus and Dionysius **75**

2.3.1.3 The Foundation of Croton **77**

2.3.1.3.1 Legendary Precursor in Strabo's Account of the Founding of Croton **77**

2.3.1.3.2 The Oracle and the "Surprised" Founder in Diodorus's Account of the Founding of Croton **79**

2.3.1.3.3 Legend, Myth, and Divine Sanction in Ovid's Account of the Founding of Croton **83**

2.3.1.4 The Foundation of Syracuse **86**

2.3.1.4.1 Crisis and Solution: The Foundation of Syracuse according to Plutarch and Diodorus **87**

2.3.1.4.2 Geography and the Mandate of Apollo: The Founding Oracle according to Pausanias **91**

2.3.1.5 The Foundation of Cyrene **92**

2.3.1.5.1 Counter Narratives and the Role of a *Metropolis:* The Foundation of Cyrene according to Herodotus **93**

2.3.1.5.2 Convergence of Myth and History in Pindar's Poems about the Foundation of Cyrene **106**

2.3.2 Colonization in the Classical Period **110**

2.3.2.1 *Metropolis* and Colony **112**

2.3.2.1.1 Colonization as Reclamation: Athens and Miltiades the Younger's Colonization of Thracian Chersonese **112**

2.3.2.1.2 Representatives of the *Metropolis:* Amphipolis and Her Founders **114**

2.3.2.1.3 Changing a *Metropolis:* Thucydides and the Case of Epidamnus **118**

2.3.2.2 Religious Sanction **121**

2.3.2.2.1 *Manteis* and Xenophon's Would-Be Colony on the Black Sea **121**

2.3.2.2.2 The Transfer of the Panionia to Ephesus according to Diodorus **123**

2.3.2.2.3 Pausanias and the Refoundation of Messene **125**

2.3.2.2.3.1 Visions, Oracles, and *Manteis* **125**

2.3.2.2.3.2 Bone Transfer and Refounded Messsene **130**

2.3.3 Colonization in the Hellenistic Period **131**

2.3.3.1 Alexander the Founder according to Arrian, Plutarch, and Ps.-Callisthenes **132**

2.3.3.2 The Foundations of Seleucus Nicator according to John Malalas **138**

2.3.3.2.1 Divine Signs and Seleucus's foundations **138**

2.3.3.2.2 Seers and Seleucus's Foundations **140**

2.3.4 Colonization of Rome **141**

2.3.4.1 Introduction **141**

2.3.4.2 The Foundation of Rome according to Livy, Plutarch, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus **143**

2.3.4.2.1 Rome's Origins **143**

2.3.4.2.2 Romulus the Founder **150**

2.3.4.2.2.1 Romulus's Miraculous Birth **150**

2.3.4.2.2.2 Romulus's Divine Sanction **153**

2.3.4.2.2.2 Romulus's Founding Acts **155**

2.4 Conclusions **160**

Chapter 3 The Origins of the Cult Community in Jerusalem (Acts 1–5) **162**

3.1 The Community's Founder(s), Origins, and Divine Mandate (Acts 1–2) **163**

3.1.1 Founding Figure(s) **163**

3.1.2 Jerusalem Origins **170**

3.1.3 Divine Sanction **172**

3.1.3.1 Oracle of Colonization **172**

3.1.3.2 Precipitation of Colonization **176**

3.1.3.2.1 Divine Orchestration **176**

3.1.3.2.2 Geographical Symbolism: The List of Acts 2:9–11 **181**

3.1.3.2.3 Peter's Interpretation of the Divine "Speech-Act" **196**

3.1.4 Summation **198**

3.2 The Colonizing Mission in Jerusalem (Acts 3–5) **199**

3.2.1 Comparative Introduction **199**

3.2.2 The Founding Acts of the Apostles **210**

3.2.2.1 The Pattern of Founding Acts **210**

3.2.2.2 Divine Sanction of the Apostles' Founding Acts **215**

3.2.3 The "Institutions" of the Jerusalem Community **219**

3.3 Conclusions **230**

Chapter 4 Antioch of Syria: Colony *and* Mother Community **232**

4.1 Introduction: The Pivotal Role of Antioch in Acts **232**

4.2 Socio-Historical Sketch of Antioch **234**

4.3 Antioch, Colony of the Jerusalem Community **245**

4.3.1 Crisis Origins **245**

4.3.2 Foundation through Cult Transfer **252**

4.3.3 Constitution as a "Mixed" Community **254**

4.3.3.1 Precursor: Acts 8 (Philip's Ministry) **266**

4.3.3.2 Precursor: Acts 9:1–31 (Paul's Commission) **268**

4.3.3.3 Precursor: Acts 10:9–11:18 (Peter in Caesarea) **270**

4.3.4 Jerusalem Oversight **275**

4.4 Antioch, Mother City of Second Generation Colonies **281**

4.4.1 Divine Sanction of Colonizing Ventures **283**

4.4.2 Community "Institutions" **288**

4.4.3.1 Leadership Institutions **289**

4.4.3.2 Religious Institutions **295**

4.4.3 Conclusion: The Antiochene Community's Colonies **314**

Chapter 5 Pisidian Antioch and the Rhetoric of Second Generation Colonization **316**

5.1 Introduction: The Significance of Acts 13 **316**

5.2 Socio-Historical and Architectural Sketch of Antioch **319**

5.3 Paul's Speech: The Rhetoric of "Second Generation" Colonization **337**

5.3.1 Introduction **337**

5.3.2 The Ancestral Prehistory (13:17–22) **343**

5.3.2.1 Introduction **343**

5.3.2.2 Prehistory as Preparation **346**

5.3.2.2.1 Choosing a People **352**

5.3.2.2.2 Exalting a People **353**

5.3.2.2.2.1 The Patriarchs as Cultural Benefactors **357**

5.3.2.2.2.2 The Patriarchs' Connection with Foreign Lands **360**

5.3.2.2.2.3 The Patriarchs as Colonizers **361**

5.3.2.2.3 Raising Up David **362**

5.3.3 The Colonizing Message for Antioch (13:23–41) **365**

5.3.3.1 Introduction **365**

5.3.3.2 Announcing the Colonizing Message (13:23–31) **366**

5.3.3.2.1 Jesus the Savior— Culmination of the Prehistory **366**

5.3.3.2.2 Jerusalem's Rejection of Jesus: Negative Example and Justification for Second Generation Colonization **369**

5.3.3.3 Explaining the Colonizing Message (13:32–37) **373**

5.3.3.3.1 Introduction **373**

5.3.3.3.2 The Promise Fulfilled **374**

5.3.3.3.2.1 The Appointment of Jesus as Fulfillment **379**

5.3.3.3.2.2 The Resurrection of Jesus as Fulfillment **382**

5.3.3.4 Pressing Home the Colonizing Message (13:38–41) **386**

5.3.3.4.1 The Colonizing Message in *Nuce* **387**

5.3.3.4.1.1 Continuity in the Message **387**

5.3.3.4.1.2 Implications of the Message **388**

5.3.3.4.2 Warning: Response to the Message **388**

5.3.3.4.2.1 Warning as Divine Foreknowledge **394**

5.3.3.4.2.2 Continuity in the Warning **396**

5.3.4 Summation: The Rhetoric of "Second Generation" Colonization **401**

5.4 The Outcome of Second Generation Colonization at Antioch **403**

5.4.1 The Foundation of a "Mixed" Community **404**

5.4.2 The Colonization of Pisidian Antioch—A Success? **413**

Chapter 6 Conclusion **416**

Appendix Abridged Chart of Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman Colonies **422**

Bibliography **429**

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE PRESENT PROJECT

1.1 Introduction: Reading Acts as a Colonizing Narrative

This project explores Acts of the Apostles against the backdrop of ancient colonization. Colonization was a widespread and long-running phenomenon in antiquity.[1] This study engages perspectives about colonization from the Greek (Archaic and Classical), Hellenistic, and Roman (Republican and Imperial) worlds. My goal is to develop a framework using textual and material accounts of colonization which can then be used to illuminate Luke's narrative. This is neither a purely historical nor literary study. I am not after *what really happened,* whether in the formation of colonies or in Acts. Nor am I proposing a link via genre between colonization accounts and Acts. Rather, I hope to shed light on the cultural assumptions governing textual and material

[1] I define colonization loosely throughout this study. There are grounds for doing so: First, many early Greek efforts focused on the establishment of *emporia* (or trading ports) rather than *poleis*. Second, settlement parties did not always act at the behest of a *metropolis*. Third, settlement parties frequently were comprised of members of two or more *poleis*. Fourth, those colonized sometimes adopted the perspectives of the colonizers, particularly their legitimating legends. Fifth, "colonizing strategies" are reflected in attempts to claim, manage, or settle territories, attempts which nevertheless do not constitute "colonization" in a technical sense. See Irad Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden: Brill, 1987); idem, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); idem, *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

accounts of colonization, and demonstrate how this understanding might be exploited to analyze Acts—a narrative also about community replication.

1.2 Other Ways of Reading Acts: A History of Scholarship

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 analytic frameworks for describing its subject matter.

1.2.1 Genre Debates

One prominent approach to locating Luke's work within its ancient context involves considerations of genre. Many scholars, for example, have identified historiography as the genre of Acts. Plümacher argues this position based on the purported resemblances between literary techniques in Acts, on the one hand, and in the works of those such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Livy, on the other.[2] Examples of such techniques include the author's use of archaizing speeches, adaptation of literary models, and construction of dramatic episodes. For some, "historiography" is

---

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

too broad a category to be illuminating. Thus, David Aune characterizes the two-volume work as a piece of general history.[3] Gregory Sterling rejects this classification and argues instead that Luke-Acts comprises apologetic historiography, a subgenre flourishing during the Roman period but having roots in the ethnographic tradition of Herodotus.[4] What distinguishes this type of historiography is the privileging—and Hellenization—of native sources interpreted through the self-legitimating lens of subject peoples. Treating literary features according to their function moves Sterling's study beyond mere literary analysis and toward considerations of social context. His conclusion regarding Luke-Acts is noteworthy: While designed primarily for insiders,

---

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

[4] Gregory Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992). Sterling's work constitutes the most sustained argument for Luke-Acts as any form of historiography. To substantiate his classification, Sterling analyzes the content, form, and function of selected works from the fifth century BCE to the second century CE. Herodotus's works attempt to situate different 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.

the work's utility would have been wider, owing "to the interplay between the group and the larger outside world."[5]

The arguments in favor of historiography have not silenced debate. Charles Talbert, for example, voices a dissenting view: Luke-Acts constitutes a biographical work. He suggests that parallels between Jesus and his followers in Luke's gospel and Acts offer convincing proof that the two-part work is comparable to Diogenes Laertius's *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*.[6] Talbert's thesis, however, has won few adherents. One complaint is that it neglects the historical and theological dimensions of Luke's work.[7] Another, more damning still, is that Acts appears to contain few of the features constitutive of the ancient genre of biography.[8]

---

[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 provided Jews access to venerable histories on par—from their perspective—with the legendary and mythological narratives of their neighbors. Yet for these traditions to function effectively, they must conform to general Hellenistic conventions. Sterling argues that this is what witness in the works of those such as Artapanus, 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).

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

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

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

Pervo's take on Acts is a most adventurous one: He reads it as a Greek novel.[9] He justifies this classification on the basis of the entertaining character of the work. Luke narrates imprisonment, shipwreck, escapes, trials, persecution, martyrdom, mobs, assembles, humor/wit, irony, pathos, exotica, speeches, and snippets of high society. Even the scenes of "local color" identified by Conzelmann[10] reflect a proclivity of ancient novelist writings in Pervo's estimation. In sum, Luke has creatively shaped his material for edifying and entertainment purposes. Seen in a negative light, this judgment undermines the classification of Acts as historiography, but seen in a positive light, it offers a fuller appreciation of how Acts successfully meets the standards of the Greek novelistic tradition.[11]

---

[9] 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 A. 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).

[10] See below.

[11] 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—notably, Haenchen—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

Marianne Palmer Bonz, however, rejects the Greek novel argument as "trivializing" and counters that with its wide-open scope, interconnected storyline, and thematic development, Luke-Acts emulates the epic tradition.[12] As for the historiography classification, she attributes it to a misreading of a narrative that is hardly persnickety about factual accuracy. By way of laying the groundwork for her argument, Bonz outlines some of the characteristic themes in epic and formulates their social and historical importance. Thus, she highlights common plot devices such as reversal, prophecy, allusions/ambiguity, journey, divine mission, et cetera. The devices themselves are fairly stock in character; their shape in any given epic is largely determined by prevailing political and social conditions at the time of the author. Bonz illustrates, for example, how Virgil's *Aeneid* adopted many of these thematic elements from Homeric epic but reshaped them to maximum effect in order to glorify Rome's beginning from a distinctly Augustan perspective. Later epics would contest or nuance this Augustan-centric view of the empire deploying these very same themes. Despite

---

(Luke-)Acts precludes appreciation for how such passages contribute to the entertaining character of the narrative.

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

the fact that Luke-Acts is prose, therefore, Bonz argues that it deserves to be classified as epic due to this thematic consistency.

While each of these arguments as to genre yields important insights about (Luke-)Acts, especially its creative construal of Christian beginnings, none is unassailable. Thus, many of the themes/plot devices Bonz wishes to assign to epic (e.g., divine mission, prophecy, allusion) characterize genres other than epic as well.[13] Pervo's treatment of Acts' entertaining style successfully undermines the staid profile of Luke as reporter of historical events. Yet, by the same token, in seeking to undermine the historiography classification, he underplays the communal dimensions of Acts. He cites the work's lack of concern for institutional matters as evidence that Luke did not "intend to describe the history of the Christian mission,"[14] but fails to give due weight to the significance of founding figures for the self-definition of movements and communities.[15]

---

[13] Bonz, it must be acknowledged, admirably illustrates how the recasting of themes and traditions tacks closely to the historical/social context(s) of the authors of such works.
[14] Pervo, *Profit with Delight*, 131.
[15] 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).

Talbert's position on Luke-Acts (i.e., as biography) is subject to the same criticism when the individualistic implications of the genre argument are given full play. However, Talbert has at least alerted us to important, overlapping features in Luke's characterization of Jesus and his followers; this attunes us to how subsequent readers of Luke-Acts might construe their own identity in light of the founder(s) of Christianity.

Likewise, Sterling's contribution has encouraged a more robust examination of how "native works" function via reinforcing self-perceptions among various peoples in the Roman Empire. Thus, he astutely observes that works such as Luke-Acts are primarily directed to insiders, but insiders who need to speak with the same cultural vocabulary as their outsider neighbors.[16] My contention is that more focus needs to be

---

[16] Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition,* 629. 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 comparative materials drawn from the Jewish diaspora (especially the authors of the so-called 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 the Jewish community living there. In this manner, figures such as Moses and Abraham are akin to cult heroes or colony founders around whom local mythological traditions develop

trained on the latter side of the equation, namely, what the community's broader environment means for how Acts is conceived and constructed. I argue that for Luke's narrative to bear the sort of cultural relevance implied by Sterling's position, it must resonate with customary ways of depicting beginnings. While helpful, generic debates of the type discussed above do not adequately capture this culturally contextualized way of envisioning identity.

1.2.2 Geographical Studies

An alternate yet fruitful approach to Luke's expansive narrative considers the author's use of geography. Pioneering this approach was Hans Conzelmann. Though not the first to see that geography features largely in Luke-Acts, Conzelmann nevertheless applied more rigor than most in working out its role in advancing the author's literary and theological aims; this he did in the context of studies focused on

---

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.

Luke's redaction.[17] Thus he sheds light on the author's depiction of villages, cities, and regions as well as natural, political, and sacred landscapes. Above all, Conzelmann relates his geographical treatment to Luke's schematization of (salvation-) history in light of the parousia's delay, which unfolds in the periods of Israel, Jesus, and the church, respectively. Thus, Conzelmann observes how Luke's gospel restricts Jesus's ministry to Jerusalem/Judea and Galilee while Mark has him passing through Samaria; he attributes this portrayal to Luke's desire to introduce Samaria in connection with the church's mission, depicted in Acts.[18] In sum, for Conzelmann the salient factors behind Luke's geographical depiction are theological in nature.

More recently Matthew Sleeman has picked up on Conzelmann's geographical and theological interests but worked them out along theoretical lines.[19] 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,

---

[17] Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. G. Buswell (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1961); idem, *Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963).
[18] Where literary data—such as Luke's descriptions of travel to and from various places—do not readily yield to theological analysis, Conzelmann has recourse to the author's reliance on sources. See, especially, *The Theology of St. Luke.*
[19] Matthew Sleeman, *Geography and the Ascension Narrative in Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

second space, and third space schema as a way of analyzing the different dimensions of spatiality in the first part of Acts. We are told that first space represents real 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, those in the remainder of the narrative.[20] Despite Sleeman and Conzelmann's many helpful insights regarding the theological implications of geography, however, neither adequately explains how a composition like Acts would have resonated in its wider ancient context (i.e., beyond "Luke's community").[21]

---

[20] Thus, Sleeman offers a solution to a literary and theological quandary, which is the risen Lord's absence throughout most of Acts.

[21] 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, JSOTSS 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

Someone who has thought much about the relevant background(s) of Luke's geography is James C. Scott.[22] He argues that Luke-Acts is governed by two separate geographical horizons: The third Gospel's (signaled by the census in Luke 2:1–2), with Rome at the center and movement extending throughout the inhabited world, and that of Acts, with Jerusalem at the center and movement extending outward to the "ends of the earth" (Acts 1:8). Scott surveys various ways of conceptualizing geography in ancient writings, such as *periplus*-oriented descriptions and more theoretical-based approaches. He then turns to geographical views coincident with Rome's emergence as Mediterranean superpower, emerging in such projects as Julius Caesar's survey of the world, Agrippa's world map, and Augustus's *Res Gestae.*

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 time. Thus, "Jews had by the first century A.D. assimilated the Graeco-Roman world of their

---

material that might further illuminate Luke's claiming and (re)configuring of spaces for the Christian movement.

[22] James M. Scott, "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; idem, "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.

Roman overlords" while mapping onto it their traditional way of constructing the world.[23] 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)."[24] 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,[25] but 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).[26]

---

[23] Scott, "Luke's Geographical Horizon," 492.
[24] Ibid., 501. In support of his position Scott maintains that later Jewish texts such as 1 Chr 1:1–2.2; Dan 11; Isa 66:18–20; Jub. 8–9; 1 QM 2.10–14; Josephus, *A.J.* 1.120–147; Philo, *Legat.* 279–329 all assume the Table of Nations partitioning.
[25] 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.
[26] Ibid., 540–41. Scott also argues for allusions to the Table of Nations in Paul's speech in 17:22–31.

Loveday Alexander's work on the geography of Acts also considers the narrative in its ancient literary context.[27] 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' descriptions of place, often focusing on cities, are at variance with Paul's own scattered accounts of his trips, which in general rely on regional references. Further, she observes very different attitudes toward sea voyage, with Acts effectively glorifying it as the means of carrying Paul (and early Christianity by implication) across the Mediterranean all the way to Rome, and Paul by contrast accepting it with some measure of distaste.

Indeed, comparison offers Alexander with a fruitful way of considering Acts' geography more generally. Employing "voyage" as the middle term, Alexander reads Acts alongside Greek novels. She readily concedes that Acts displays a certain affinity

---

[27] 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 Toponomy of Acts," in *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context,* 97–132.

with *periplus* literature, and thus that it occasionally strikes a dissonant chord with the world of the novels on account of its "topographical factuality."[28] 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."[29]

Alexander's discussion of "mental mapping" adds a further level of sophistication to her studies on the geography in Acts, by allowing her to consider the role humans play in structuring 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, with toponyms furnishing 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

[28] Ibid., 116.
[29] Idem, "'In Journeying Often,'" 74.

provide a window into worldviews less frankly displayed in other ancient texts."[30] Geographical description, in other words, possibly reflects biases in how the world is perceived.

The fundamental contribution of Alexander and Scott's works is just this: showing how the 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 way than either Conzelmann's theologically-oriented work or Sleeman's theory-driven construal. Scott's studies foster greater appreciation for how subservient Jews and Christians might formulate views of the inhabited (i.e., Roman) world using native traditions, and thus stake out their identity in it. Alexander widens the analysis by showing how the geography of Acts might compare with other works of the time outside the Jewish-Christian trajectory, notably the Greek novels. Yet neither scholar fully directs geographical insights to the issue of how Luke depicts Christian beginnings.

[30] Idem, "Narrative Maps," 113.

Here Laura Nasrallah's study is relevant since she is interested in relating the geographical ambitions of Acts to a plausible historical context.[31] 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 *paidea* 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 Luke-Acts imagines a Christianity rooted in civic ties forged through Paul's travels. It 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."[32]

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)

---

[31] Laura Nasrallah, "The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Cities, and Hadrian's Panhellion," *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 University Press, 2010).

[32] Idem, "The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Cities, and Hadrian's Panhellion," 550.

dimensions of Acts by comparing the establishment 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, with the result that when she explores how Luke formulates *paidea* in Acts 2, 14, 16, and 17, she opts not to exploit her own comparison of Acts with foundation accounts. We will see that a third set of studies do indeed probe this comparison.

1.2.3 Foundation Analysis

1.2.3.1 Studies of Greek and Roman Accounts

Before looking at approaches to Acts as foundation narrative, I will introduce a few works by scholars outside the field of biblical studies, who examine *ktisis* accounts and/or the broader context of colonization.[33] What these studies have shown quite

---

[33] 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. H. R. Hurst and Sara Owen, eds., *Ancient Colonizations: Analogy, Similarity and Difference* (London: Duckworth, 2005), demonstrates how colonization was a varied

clearly is that the subject matter may be explored from a number of intriguing perspectives. Irad Malkin's *Religion and Colonization* represents a historical investigation of sorts.[34] Using literary, epigraphic, and archaeological sources, Malkin seeks to reconstruct the constituent elements of Greek colonization, especially in the Archaic period. As the title suggests, he is particularly keen to show how religious conceptions shaped colonial endeavors, beginning with Delphic authorization but including divination, transfer of sacred fire, siting of sacred precincts, and establishment of the

---

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), considers spatial repercussions of colonization. Getzel M. Cohen, *The Seleucid Colonies: Studies in Founding, Administration and Organization (*Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1978), and, *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 examine Roman colonization. An early study by 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 Demougin 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 work 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 N. 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.

[34] Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece.*

oikist cult.[35] Not all foundation accounts feature every element of this process, nor does every reported account factually recreate the original venture. Yet Malkin's task here involves sifting generally reliable reportage from later legendary accretions—and conceptualizing the basic elements in the former. What he finally presents, one might say, is a culturally patterned way of thinking about colonization in ancient Greece.

Subsequent works assessing Greek colonization have drawn more attention to the functional aspects of the foundation narratives themselves. Carol Dougherty in *The Poetics of Colonization,* for instance, works to isolate key features in the narratives and explain how they represent exigencies in the Greek experience as well as attempts to resolve them.[36] Hence, for example, the phenomenon of murderous founders correlates with the concerns of purification in society; the riddle of the oracle—and its identification of impossible sites to colonize—parallel the unknowns of colonization itself; and the *oikist* cult symbolically resolves the initial crisis. Hers is not necessarily a diachronic approach. Dougherty considers early and late representations alongside

---

[35] The seminal work on the oracle of Delphi is H. W. Parke and D. 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).

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

each other as variations of the basic pattern of crisis, consultation, foundation, and resolution.

Two aspects of Dougherty's work are particularly commendable. First, she recognizes the "present" uses of foundation narratives in Greek colonial experiences.[37] That such narratives would have utility in later contexts is evident enough from the fact of their use down through to the Roman period. Yet Dougherty suggests that they served their purpose even in the Greek colonial contexts themselves—for example, to obscure the violent nature of colonial conquests, to justify local traditions, et cetera. Second and related, Dougherty notes the flexibility or malleability of the colonization metaphor, which enabled it to be appropriated in many different literary and social contexts. She brings this out especially in her analysis of Pindar's poetry in the second half of the work, highlighting the comparison of athletic victories to successful colonization endeavors.[38]

---

[37] Ibid., 5.
[38] Ibid., 103–56.

Though concerned mainly with cult transfers, Elizabeth Gebhard's article "The Gods in Transit" deserves mention here as well.[39] Gebhard in fact links the thematic form of cult transfer stories to earlier narrative types recounting the founding of colonies and/or cults.[40] These early accounts were themselves derived from epic and elegiac poetry. Given this argument, it is not surprising that Gebhard finds little historical value in such material; instead, she avers that the creative deployment of *topoi* determine their shape and contents.[41] Her study is thus concerned with detailing the common elements in cult transfer narratives, and utilizing this broader understanding to analyze variations in specific cases—for example, Artemis's transfer to Massalia, Serapis's to Delos (etc.), Asclepius's to Corinth (etc.), and Magna Mater's to Rome. She isolates a number of recurring thematic elements in such narratives,

---

[39] Elizabeth R. Gebhard, "The Gods in Transit: Narratives of Cult Transfer," in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Religion and Philosophy*, ed. A. Y. Collins and M. 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 protecting function in the ancient *polis*.

[40] Cf. 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* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012); idem, "The Greek Foundation-Legend: Its Form and Relation to History," *SBLSP* 34 (1995): 494–520.

[41] Gebhard, "The Gods in Transit," 453–54.

including the following: (1) crisis; (2) oracular appeal; (3) oracular response; (4) difficulties experienced; (5) god/goddess's arrival; (6) and establishment of sanctuary/erection of image.[42] Gebhard's work has the benefit of noting similarities across different types of stories—cult transfers, and colony and cult foundations—and of observing *topoi* in the narratives themselves. With respect to the first point, she shares much in common with both Malkin and Dougherty.[43] Yet in formulating her argument in such exclusively literary terms, she eschews the historical and cultural questions addressed by the others.[44]

Malkin's later works are concerned with the socio-political relevancy of foundation narratives.[45] Two studies focus especially on the function of myth in such

---

[42] Ibid., 455.

[43] Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece,* subsumes cult transfers and introductions under colonization in his study.

[44] Dougherty certainly follows a literary approach (thus her concern for the *poetics* of colonization), but she nevertheless argues for the utility of the stories in actual experiences of *polis* life.

[45] His most recent work 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.

accounts.[46] His *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* explores the relationship between mythical or legendary narratives on the one hand, and territorial ambitions and identities on the other, with particular reference to Sparta's colonizing activities.[47] A follow-up work, *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity,* further expands his exploration of how myth functions within history.[48] His interest, in other words, is in the "'active' role of myth in filtering, shaping, and mediating cultural and ethnic encounters."[49] Thus, as might be expected, Malkin shows little interest in reconstructing factual events beneath the strata of mythical retellings; rather he chooses to focus on the "dynamism between that which 'happens' . . . and that which is continuously influenced by observation."[50] By presenting his concerns in this way, Malkin's approach reveals some affinity with Dougherty's, which emphasizes the

---

[46] Martin P. Nilsson, *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1951), investigates the varied application of myth throughout Greek society. Claude Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece: The Symbolic Creation of a Colony,* trans. D. W. Berman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), illustrates the tricky business of defining myth using different retellings of the foundation of Cyrene.
[47] Malkin, *Myth and Territory*.
[48] Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus*.
[49] 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.
[50] Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus*, 7.

present use of foundation narratives.[51] Where he differs, however, is in his diachronic method and rigorous use of material evidence to supplement the literary sources.

It is impossible to discuss every issue emerging from these studies, but we may point to a few broad themes that are relevant to our study. The first of these relates to the form and content of foundation stories. What, for example, are the typical elements against which to judge variations? How crucial is the divine guidance or the articulation of sacred spaces? Then there is also the question of the nature of the stories. Are they merely literary creations without any historical merit? Or, do they in some way reflect culturally patterned ways of seeing and describing colonization endeavors? Further, where lies the dynamism, if such exists, between "real" history and the poetic elements in foundation accounts: Is it merely in the *post facto* literary retelling or is not also in the structuring of experiences affected by colonization?

---

[51] Carol Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization.*

1.2.3.2 Studies of Acts

Some have begun to explore how foundation accounts relate to Acts and other biblical traditions.[52] Marla Selvidge, for example, characterizes Luke's work as a kind of foundation myth in her article "The Acts of the Apostles: A Violent Aetiological Legend."[53] She begins by highlighting some features of the work that identify it as part of the broader aetiological type. Thus, she notes the thematic development of the *dynamis* of God.[54] This emphasis on God's power, Selvidge observes, functions as a sanction for the narration of the Christian movement's expansion throughout Acts.[55] She further picks up on the frequency of conflict permeating the narrative of Acts. By virtue of devoting so much space to instances of Christian-Jewish and Christian-Roman discord, the book of Acts normalizes such conflict and—in Selvidge's against-the-grain reading—validates the violent character of the account as a whole. But since Selvidge mostly focuses on episodes of violence in Acts, she does not pause to consider how this and other thematic elements contribute to the narrative's nature as foundation

---

[52] Hanges, *Paul, Founder of Churches,* considers Paul's role in this wider context.
[53] Marla Selvidge, "The Acts of the Apostles: A Violent Aetiological Legend," *SBLSP* 25 (1986): 330–40.
[54] Ibid., 331–33.
[55] Ibid., 334.

literature. She fails, in other words, to explain how the themes she identifies relate to the patterned way foundation narratives—such as in the Greek and Roman contexts—are told.

Wilson rectifies this oversight with his suggestive comparison of Acts to Greek and Roman *ktisis* narratives.[56] He bases the comparisons in part on readership expectations for such a broadly historical writing as Acts. Thus he argues that the narrative would have been viewed as a story about institutional beginning akin to the plethora of stories enshrining civic and cultic beginnings throughout the Mediterranean world.[57] 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."[58] He draws on primary texts to articulate various components of foundation narratives. But rather than differentiate between historical events and mythical elaborations, Wilson prefers to speak of "strategies of colonial storytelling."[59] His design is not to argue that Luke

---

[56] Wilson, "Urban Legends: Acts 10:11–11:18 and the Strategies of Greco-Roman Foundation Narratives," *JBL* 120 (2001): 77–99.
[57] Ibid., 77–78.
[58] Ibid., 80.
[59] Ibid., 81.

consciously “drew on such foundational tales in framing history [in Acts], or that he wanted this audience to construe the church as a *polis*,” but instead to illuminate “the general fund of narrative and tropological strategies that Luke shared with other Greco-Roman writers who were also telling stories about the origins of their communities.”[60]

Wilson’s approach moves beyond the identification of Acts as political history (see above) as well as a general characterization of it as foundation narrative. The fruitfulness of seeing Acts’ literary patterns as “strategies” is on full display in Wilson’s treatment of Acts 10:1—11:18, the story of Peter and Cornelius and the beginning of a gentile Christian community. Here Wilson identifies a number of features that correlate with recurrent elements in other foundation tales, including (1) the unexpected nature of the foundation enterprise; (2) the divine initiative underlying it; (3) the conflict associated with its impetus; (4) the new—oftentimes multiethnic—social character engendered by the foundation; (5) and the ambiguous nature of the colony’s relationship with the mother city. These similarities, he suggests “point to a shared

[60] Ibid., 79.

context of cultural phenomena and the literary representation of those phenomena that could be pressed into the service of communal self-definition and apologetic."[61]

Wilson's cogent, thorough, and methodologically sound study makes a convincing case for exploring Acts alongside other foundation accounts in Greek and Roman literature. However, work remains to be done, such as examining the relation between foundation accounts and colonization more broadly. Moreover, since Wilson limits his investigation to Acts 10:1—11:18, the opportunity is ripe to investigate other passages which most exemplify "Christianity's transformation from a small band of Galileans following Jesus into a vast, multicultural network of urban churches,"[62] as well as to consider Acts in its entirety as—what I will call in this study—a colonizing narrative.

Two other pieces of scholarship deserve mention before I outline the characteristics and parameters of my own study. John Weaver's dissertation–turned book "Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles" examines prison-

---

[61] Ibid., 98.
[62] Ibid., 78.

escapes against the background of similar episodes in Greek and Roman literature.[63] Like Wilson, Weaver does not argue for direct literary dependence but rather highlights recurring literary patterns to better understand how the prison-escapes in Acts function in their narrative context. In so doing, Weaver follows Wendy Doniger's definition of "micromyth," entailing a "reduction of different mythic stories to a shared progression of events."[64] The general pattern he deduces in prison-escapes (as plots of epiphany) includes, in chronological order, (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. Weaver examines each of these elements in different mythical and historical accounts before turning to Acts, where he explores three discrete sections: Chapters 1–7; 12; and 16.

There are a number of helpful features in Weaver's work. His construal of myth identifies shared similarities across literary accounts, while at the same time allowing for flexible application depending on a given work's narrative arc. Further, he understands that mythical accounts such as plots of epiphany typically serve

---

[63] Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004).
[64] Ibid., 28.

legitimating functions, both in the narrative itself as well as the (implied) social context. These perspectives motivate Weaver to ask *how* narrative features sanction the respective stories about Christian origins. Thus, Weaver's examination of Acts 1–7 explores what prison-escapes contribute to the narrative depicting Christian origins in Jerusalem: Acts 12, that of group validation; Acts 16, that of cult foundation in a civic context. The geographical and narrative context of the latter leads Weaver to explore the intersection between cult and foundation stories as well as how they relate to the prison-escape component. He argues that there is broad correlation between what happens in the verses framing the prison-escape in chapter 16 and the strategies deployed in foundation narratives. Here he delineates a number of the same features as does Wilson. However, given the parameters of his own study, Weaver does not consider how foundation stories relate to other episodes in Acts. Nor does he explore the nature of the relationship between foundation stories and colonization *per se.*

Like Wilson and Weaver, Balch compares the story of Acts with *ktisis* narratives.[65] Balch argues that this analogy is justified not so much due to genre—whether biography or history—but rather on account of the aims of the narrative. Seen this way, Luke-Acts is concerned with recounting the origins of Christianity as a social and religious movement. Jesus thus functions as the movement's founder (=*oikist*) in the Gospel of Luke, while figures such as Peter and Paul assume a similar role in the Acts of the Apostles. Balch notes further correlations between Acts' narrative and that of other Greek and Roman foundation stories, such as divine initiative, record of growth, mixing of inhabitants, and the presence of conflict (or *stasis*)—often initiated by the founder in Acts—but chooses to devote the bulk of his attention to one particular feature of Acts: constitutional changes.

To this end, Balch compares the depiction of constitutional changes represented in the works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Plutarch. He observes that the treatment of the constitution's fate as remaining static or changing is invariably a product of the

[65] 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.

respective author's aims vis-à-vis his subject matter, whether it be legitimation (Dionysius) or comparison (Plutarch). Arguing that priestly versus prophetic traditions in biblical materials offer a backdrop for understanding Christian and Jewish controversies surrounding table fellowship and purification issues in Acts, Balch suggests that these very same issues roughly correspond with constitutional precepts in the Greek and Roman contexts. Yet for this comparison to work, he must nuance the comparison between early Christian communities and *poleis*. Thus he explains the former's institutional-like self-understanding with an appeal to the translocal nature of Hellenistic Judaism.[66] While not fully worked out, Balch's study like Wilson's demonstrates the potential for viewing the book of Acts in light of broader foundation themes.

1.3 The Argument and Outline of this Project

In this study, I exploit the comparison between the foundation of cities and the expansion of the Christian community in Acts. I do so using the cultural framework of

[66] Ibid., 184–86. This construal simultaneously undermines the objection that Jesus and his apostles did not found cities and invites comparison with the ambivalent relationship between *metropoleis* and *poleis*.

colonization. I use the term "colonization" rather than "foundation" for three primary reasons. First, it seems best to use a term not commonly associated with a particular genre or subgenre since the accounts engaged in this study come in different forms—literary and material, narrative and report. Second, the term invites consideration of the larger phenomenon on colonization which looms large behind many of these accounts. Third, "colonization" simply proves more beneficial as a category for analyzing Acts. It captures both the subject matter of Acts, the replication of the Christian community, as well as its depiction via motifs frequently observed in narratives and reports about colonization. These motifs help illuminate critical features in Acts such as the importance of Jerusalem, the role of the Holy Spirit, and the prominence of Jesus and the apostles. Ultimately, I contend that these cultural motifs function to legitimate the expansion of the Christian community. My argument proceeds as follows:

Following this introduction, chapter 2 elucidates the colonization framework used throughout this study. I begin by introducing and illustrating key concerns of colonization accounts. Then, I offer an analysis of individual narratives depicting colonization in the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods, and the colonization of

Rome. By proceeding in this fashion, I hope to provide a richly textured portrayal of how colonizing motifs manifest themselves in specific accounts of colonization. This discussion will set the table for our analysis of Acts in the succeeding chapters.

In chapter 3, I argue that Acts 1–5 functions as 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 the 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 colonizing.

Chapter 5 focuses on the replication of the community in Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13:13–52), foremost of the sites that Paul visits on 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," replication of the Jesus movement outside the land producing "mixed" (Jewish-gentile) communities. Indeed, this is the type of community which emerges as a result of Paul and Barnabas's proclamation. The successful outcome is precipitated in no small measure by the opposition of other Jews and the gentiles, opposition which is common fare in colonization accounts as well as in Acts.

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.

CHAPTER 2: COLONIZING MOTIFS—AN ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

The aim of this project is to illustrate the benefit of analyzing Acts of the Apostles as a colonizing narrative about the replication of the Christian cult. In the present chapter, the objective is to articulate the analytic framework used throughout the remainder of the study, relying on accounts of colonization from Greek and Roman antiquity. In drawing a comparison between these accounts and Acts I am not suggesting that Luke's narrative is, formally speaking, about colonization. Rather, what I argue is that conceptualizing Acts as a colonizing narrative on the basis of the framework developed in this chapter illuminate several critical features of the work, especially the importance of Jerusalem, the prominence of figures such as Peter and Paul, and the role of divine directives via Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and dream-visions. Each legitimates the expansion of the Christian community throughout the Mediterranean world. I begin by introducing Greek and Roman colonization and the motifs frequently employed in depicting it. Then, I provide an analysis of narratives and reports concerning colonization in different historical periods.

2.2 Colonization in the Ancient Mediterranean World

2.2.1 A Variegated Phenomenon

Colonization in antiquity was a variegated phenomenon, displaying different characteristics in different periods, not to mention within each period. Some generalizations are possible. In the Archaic period, private settlement ventures featured more prominently than was the case during later eras.[67] 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.[68] Alexander and his Hellenistic successors planted many colonies as founder-kings; particularly in the later instances, these foundations tended to involve rather disruptive processes of depopulation and resettlement.[69]

---

[67] 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.

[68] See Thomas Figueira, "Colonisation in the Classical Period," *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas,* ed. Gocha R. Tsetskhladze (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 2:427–523.

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

Roman colonization itself was also quite varied.[70] Throughout most of the Republican period, colonization fell within the purview of the senate,[71] who appointed commissioners (decemvirs or triumvirs) to supervise the establishment of each respective colony.[72] With their mandate, the commissioners supervised the ritual foundation of the colony.[73] 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).[74] In the Imperial period, colonization furthered the geo-political aims of the empire, including expansion and consolidation. While many of the formal procedures of colonization went unchanged, the emperor assumed a symbolic role as founder of the colonies planted during his rule, much like that of the founder-kings in the Hellenistic period.[75] As will be seen in chapter 5, Roman colonies such as

---

[70] 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.

[71] See, e.g., Cicero, *Phil.* 13.31; Livy 8.16.14; 39.55.5.

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

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

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

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

Antioch of Pisidia foregrounded—through their architecture and ritual practices—the emperor's role in shaping their identity. From this brief overview, it is apparent that Greek and Roman colonization was a varied phenomenon. Nevertheless, there are recurrent motifs in colonization accounts representing fundamental ways that both contemporary and later authors reflected upon the phenomenon.

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.[76] A vivid way of achieving this purpose was to attribute a colony's beginnings to a memorable event, especially a crisis of some sort. Examples of crisis include overpopulation,[77] drought,[78]

---

[76] There are exceptions. Note, for example, the accounts of Jerusalem's foundation given by Manetho (related by Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.225–250) and Diodorus (34/35.1). See chapter three.

[77] See Plato: "As a final step,—in case we are . . . faced with a superabundance of citizens . . .,—there stills 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).

[78] See, e.g., the foundation of Cyrene (Herodotus 4.151).

plague,[79] Persian aggression,[80] and *stasis.*[81] Later, I will argue Luke's narrative also offers "crisis"—namely, *stasis*—as an explanation for the replication of the Christian community outside Palestine.[82] The plausibility of such crisis explanations is to be noted. However, as a means of legitimation it is just as important that these crisis accounts furnished memorable stories of origin.[83]

The most obvious way for a colony, or a colonization account, to emphasize origins is by underscoring the identity of the *metropolis,*[84] whether a Greek *polis* or Rome. Though not without its ambivalence, the colony-*metropolis* relationship

---

[79] See, e.g., the foundations of Tripodisci (Pausanias 1.43) and Herakleia Pontike (Justin 16.3.4–7).
[80] See, e.g., the foundations of Abdera (Herodotus 1.168) and Hyele (Herodotus 1.165–167).
[81] 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).
[82] See chapter 5.
[83] 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. Gebhard, "The Gods in Transit," 451–76. As a corollary of their focus on crisis, such accounts tend to downplay any economic and strategic motives for colonization. Seen in this light, the element of "crisis" functions similarly to the "surprised *oikist*" motif in some narratives, 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.
[84] 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: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, ed. Gocha R. Tsetskhladze (Boston: Leiden), 2:383–426.

possessed practical and symbolic importance[85] and was reinforced with obligations on both sides.[86] A colony also might link her origins to a particular *metropolis*/region by adopting laws and institutions which defined the latter. We see this, for example, in Acragas' implementation of Geloan institutions (*nomima*),[87] Massalia's appropriation of Ionian laws (*nomoi*),[88] and Antioch of Pisidia's organization into Roman *vici* along with her adoption of the Roman *ordo.*[89] I will demonstrate in the course of this study how Luke also prioritized the *metropolis* (first Jerusalem, then Antioch) when narrating the formation of new Christian communities.[90] In doing so, his account reflects a cultural *topos* relating to colonization.

---

[85] 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 mother-city! Indeed, a Teian inscription (*SEG* 31.985*)* published by P. 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 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.

[86] See the introduction to colonization in the Classical period below.

[87] See below.

[88] See chapter 4.

[89] See chapter 5.

[90] See chapters 3, 4, and 5.

Of course, the formation of "mixed" colonies, comprising settlers from more than one *polis,* problematized this straightforward relationship between colony and *metropolis.* Jointly-founded colonies were often required due to limitations of manpower. Strabo reports, for instance, how Milesians, Erythraeans, and Parians banded together to found Parium on the Hellespont, and how further southeast along the Gulf of Saros, Mytilenians and Cumaeans joined forces to plant Enos.[91] Elsewhere and much later, Corinth and Corcyra each contributed settlers to the Illyrian colony later christened Apollonia.[92] Necessity or not, the foundation of a "mixed" colony posed challenges for the colony's identity and her relationship with the *metropolis,*[93] as

[91] 7 fr. 51 (52).

[92] Strabo 7.5.8. There are countless other examples. Ascragas 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 Democlides and ten *oikistae* (*IG* 1^3 46); Camarina was founded by Dascon and Menecolus (Thucydides 6.5.2–3); Cumae was founded by Megasthenes of Chalcis and Hippokles 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); Heraclae Trachis was founded by Leon, Alcidas, and Damagon (Thucydides 3.92.5); 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]).

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

the discussion further below of Athens' colonization of Amphipolis and Thurii demonstrates.[94]

But it was possible for different participants in the settlement venture to forge compromise in the interest of unity and a common identity. Such compromise might focus narrowly on deciding a colony's *metropolis* and name.[95] 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."[96] In other words, *nomima* provided tangible expressions of a community's self-understanding. For "mixed" colonies such as Gela

[94] Stories of mixed settlements such Rhegion (discussed below) also offer an implicit rationale for the position of each *ethne* within the colony.
[95] See, for example, the colonization of Cumae in southern Italy. Euboeans from Chalcis and Cumae jointed 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 Thurii and Tarantini resolved a conflict over who would colonize Siris by agreeing to settle the territory together but with the determination that it be "adjudged the colony of the Tarantini" (6.1.14 [Smith]). But see Plutarch's account of the founding of Acanthus (*Quest. graec.* 30), coveted by Chalcidians and Andrians alike. He reports that the first to reach the land was to be granted the right to claim it for his *metropolis.* The Andrian scout launched his spear ahead into the land ahead of his Chalcidian counterpart to win it for Andros. However, in this particular case the dispute arising afterward demonstrates the failure of the solution to decide the *metropolis* of the joint settlement.
[96] Malkin, *A Small Greek World*, 55.

(see below) and Himera,[97] these identity markers—"Dorian" and "Chalcidian," respectively—provided a mechanism for unifying each community's disparate constituents while alluding to a dominant origin. Something similar, I will argue, occurs in the establishment of what I call "second-generation" Christian colonies, those formed outside Palestine and which contain both Jewish and gentile members.[98] Distinguishing marks such as nomenclature, leadership offices, and ethical norms lay the groundwork for a common community identity—one which is nevertheless rooted in the Jewish origins of the movement. This fundamental concern with identity is thus closely related to the question of origins.

Appealing to legendary or mythological figures[99] and traditions represents yet another way that colonization accounts legitimate colonies when explaining their origins. Traditions relating to the *nostoi*, the wandering of Heracles, and the Dorian and

---

[97] See Thucydides 6.5.1; cf. Malkin, *A Small Greek World,* 192.
[98] See chapters 4 and 5.
[99] Compare the analysis of "historical" founders by Wolfgang Leschhorn, *Grunder der Stadt: Studien zu einem politish-religiosen Phanomen der griechischen Geschichte* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GMBH, 1984), with that of divine and semi-divine figures by Friedrich Prinz, *Grundungsmythen und Sagenschonologie* (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1979).

Ionian migrations[100] function in this way.[101] In what follows below, we will see mythology appropriated to further adorn, for example, the origins of Croton in southern Italy. Still later in the study, I will argue that some Jewish authors likewise appealed to legendary traditions about the ancestors to validate their communities in the diaspora, and that Luke himself does something very similar on behalf of Christian communities—notably, in Antioch of Pisidia.[102] Here, I have attempted to show, more broadly, that origins assume in critical importance in colonization accounts, and that their legitimating function was open to expression in various ways, whether through a focus on "crisis" beginnings, a particular *metropolis,* or legendary/mythical figures or events.

---

[100] On the Ionian migration, see Solon fr. 4a; Pherecydes fr. 155; Thucydides 1.12. Cf. Herodotus 1.145–48. 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; Irad Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 43–45.

[101] 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).

[102] See chapter 5.

2.2.2.2 Divine Sanction

Colonization accounts (and often practices) prioritize the role that divine figures play in authorizing settlement ventures. Divine sanction takes many forms. The oracle of Delphi provided the most common form of sanction relating to 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.[103] 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 [ἱδρύσεις] 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 [ἐξηγητῇ] for all mankind in such matters . . ." (4.427b–c [Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL]). Callimachus traces the god's expertise to his

[103] 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. Della Sc. Norm. Super. Di 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.

own experience as founder of the island *polis* Delos,[104] which instilled in him a fondness for planting cities more generally.[105] The ubiquity of *poleis* named Apollonia after the god reveals that Thucydides, Plato, and Callimachus's view was not a novel one in ancient Greece.[106] Pinder'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.

---

[104] Among other accomplishments, Apollo constructed an altar and walls from horns (*Hymn. Apoll.* 60–65). Divine figures were frequently credited with founding cities in antiquity. See S. Prehn, "S.v. Ktistes," *RE*, 1922; Prinz, *Grundungsmythen und Sagenschonologie*; Cornell, "Gründer"; Leschhorn, *Grunder der Stadt;* Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece*; Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*; idem, *The Returns of Odysseus.*

[105] According to Callimachus, it also guaranteed the sagacity of his guidance to mortal founding figures such as Battos of Cyrene (*Hymn. Apoll.* 2.86).

[106] 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. Tsetskhladze, "Introduction: Revisiting Ancient Greek Colonisation," in *Greek Colonisation*, xxiii – lxxxiii. According to Diodorus, Thurii also claimed the god as its founder (12.35.3), the selection likely being 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 Apollonia so named itself in order to assert its 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]. Meanwhile, Strabo writes of Corinth and Corcyra founding Apollonia together [7.5.8].)

Most often, Apollo planted cities by proxy through his oracle at Delphi.[107] While the oracle's definitive origin eludes us,[108] sources such as Plutarch demonstrate the endurance of its cultural significance into the Roman period,[109] long after Delphi ceased to be a center of political importance. Literary accounts have various ways of depicting the oracle's place of authority in sanctioning colonization. Many times, for example, the oracle is portrayed as giving geographical directions which guide the founder in his

---

[107] 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 sanguine on this score.) 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. Their method of categorization further distinguishes 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*—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 (Menander, *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).

[108] 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.

[109] See, e.g., Plutarch, *Pyth. orac.; Def. orac.; E Delph.*

attempts to locate the proper site for the colony.[110] Such guidance might also take the form of a corrective,[111] or even be embedded in a riddle.[112] Those who pursued colonization on their own initiative were likely to meet with failure, as did Sparta when first seeking to colonize Tegea.[113] Mistaking the oracle's riddling response for

---

[110] 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 Arethusa" (Pausanias 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. T. 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 in turn designed for local consumption. See Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 46.

[111] 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.

[112] 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. 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 (μέτρῳ), but bread to eat without measure (ἀμετρί)" (12.8.5 [Oldfather, LCL]). The settlers located the spring Thuria and discovered in its vicinity a bronze pipe known as a μέδιμνος, which corresponds to the Athenian word for "corn measure" (cf. Liddell-Scott, s.v. μέδιμνος). There they founded Thurii. In the case of Taras, the riddle does not provide geographical clues but rather predicts the conquest of the land in southern Italy. (In chapter 4, I will discuss 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 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, was the founder able to perceive the oracle's meaning. When he did, Phalanthus seized the territory that would become Taras (10.10.7–8).

[113] Herodotus 1.66.

authorization, the Spartan forces "danced" to their demise.[114] Indeed, the riddling nature of Delphi's oracles predisposed them to misinterpretation, and such misinterpretation supplied a rationale for failed outcomes. Namely, the fault lay with the interpreter not the god.[115] Whichever of the forms taken by the oracle, the effect is the same: to emphasize Apollo's supremacy over 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,[116] Strabo's about the foundation of Massalia,[117]

---

[114] The oracle pronounced: "Lands Tegeaean 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).

[115] See Herodotus's account of the foundation of Elea (1.165–67). Besieged by Harpagus the Median general, Phocaeans deserted their homeland and set out for Cyrnos, "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 Cyrnos—the narrative reports how "a man of Poseidonia [clarified] that when the Pythian priestess spoke of founding a settlement and of Cyrnus, it was the hero that she signified and not the island" (1.167 [Godley, LCL]).

[116] Ovid, *Metam.* 15.1–60. See below.

[117] Strabo 4.1.4–5. See chapter 4.

and Pausanias's relating to the refoundation of Messene.[118] So too do divine signs, like those in accounts of the foundation of Alexandria[119] and Rome,[120] and the interpretation of *manteis,* such as found in reports on Seleucus Nicator's foundations[121] and Xenophon's would-be settlement near the Black Sea.[122] In the context of colonization, cult transfers constitute particularly powerful forms of divine sanction since they entail the corresponding replication of gods and goddesses—for example, Apollo Karneios from Thera to Cyrene[123] and Artemis Ephesia from Ionia to Massalia.[124] These examples[125] underscore how divine sanction in its various forms plays 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 forms of divine sanction, and do so in service of a similar aim—legitimating the replication of the Christian community.

---

[118] Pausanias 4.26–27. See below.
[119] Ps.-Callisthenes 1.30–31; Plutarch, *Alex.* 26. See below.
[120] Livy 1.1–17; Plutarch, *Rom.;* Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1–2. See below.
[121] Malalas 199–201. See below.
[122] Xenophon, *Anab.* 6.4. See below.
[123] Pindar, *Pyth. 5;* Callimachus, *Hymn. Apoll.* 72–73. Cf. Malkin, *Myth and Territory*, 147. See chapter 4.
[124] Strabo 4.1.4–5.
[125] Though I do not treat it much in this study, the Roman foundation ritual functions as yet as yet another form of divine sanction. See Plutarch, *Rom.* 1–4; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.88–89.

2.2.2.3 Founder(s)

The founder's prominent role 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.[126] The founder sometimes acted as a representative of the *metropolis*[127] and at other times as more of an individual leader. Rather than diminish the value of "founder" as an analytic category, such diversity—when accounted for—provides for typological flexibility. This becomes evident when I

---

[126] 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* 1^3 46), which specifies that "Democlides shall establish the colony with full powers to the best of his ability" (*IG* 1^3 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.

[127] 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.*

discuss the role of the apostles and Paul as founding figures acting as representatives of *the* founder, Jesus, and on behalf of the Jerusalem mother community.[128]

Such variation aside, there was common assent about one thing: the founder's divine charter. That the founder(s) acted with a divine calling—and not just on the basis of his own initiative or that of the *metropolis*—typified 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.[129] 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

---

[128] See chapter 3.
[129] See below.

through oracles, visions, portents, cult transfers, or founding rituals. This divine backing imbued the founder's actions with a sacred legitimacy.[130]

And what was the essence of the founder's responsibility? Community formation. He helped create the new community and shape its identity. The details of this process varied. However, 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.[131] Other responsibilities would have included marking out boundaries, as Alexander does when founding his eponymous city in Egypt;[132] identifying sacred sites; and establishing institutions. Whatever the case, fundamental for our purpose is the founder's leadership in the formation of the new community. In analyzing Acts, I will highlight how the apostles such as Peter and Paul play an equally fundamental role both in creating the community (via proclamation and miracle working) and presiding over the shaping of its identity. And like colony founders, they do so in fulfilment of a divine charter.

---

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

[131] Herodotus 6.35–37.

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

2.3 Colonization Accounts: Case Studies

The 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 in that period. The accounts which follower, 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 the different ways they are often expressed. This discussion will fill out my analytic framework in preparation for reading Acts as a colonizing narrative 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, likely, were precipitated by hardship 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.[133] Most settlement parties originated as private enterprises, led by charismatic individuals and accompanied by elite aristocrats seeking opportunities for betterment abroad.[134] Such was probably the norm for Greek colonization in southern Italy and Sicily.[135] Colonies did, however, engage in practices which highlighted a genetic relationship with their respective *metropolis,*[136] particularly those of a religious nature.[137] At any rate, most of the narratives which have come down to us are concerned with identifying the founder(s) and his divine mandate, and focus on the *metropolis* as the origin though not necessarily the orchestrator of the colonization endeavor.[138] This is true also of the accounts surveyed below, with the possible exception of Herodotus's narrative about the foundation of Cyrene.

---

[133] Though Corinthian colonization during this period represents a partial exception. See below.
[134] Figueira, "Colonisation in the Classical Period," 2:427–28. Cf. Osborne, "Early Greek Colonization?, 255, 268.
[135] 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).
[136] 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."
[137] 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), Miletian settlers paid homage to their patron god, Apollo (Ps.-Skymnos 726–33; Pliny, *Nat.* 4.45; Strabo 7.6.1).
[138] 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

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.[139] Thucydides (6.4.3) and Diodorus (8.23.1) attribute the city's name to the nearby river.[140] An alternate tradition suggests the city's name derives from the *oikist* Antiphemus's laughter when hearing the oracular response (see below).[141] Gela founded her own colony Acragas (modern-day Agrigento) in the sixth century BCE,[142] which would achieve even greater prominence in the Classical period.[143] The accounts of Thucydides and Diodorus discussed below mention Gela as an example of a joint settlement, with the former commenting on how the different parties were integrated in the new colony, and the latter elaborating on the

---

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

[139] J. Bérard, *La colonisation grecque de l'Italie Méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'Antiquité*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Universitaires de France, 1957), 225–35.

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

[141] Aristaenetus *FGrHist* 771 F1; Theopompus *FGrHist* 115 F358.

[142] Thucydides 6.4.4.

[143] See Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, 177.

colony's founding oracle. The accounts of Pausanias and Herodotus, in turn, report cult-related transfers that occurred at Gela—one (Pausanias) presumably at its founding and the other (Herodotus) at a later period.

2.3.1.1.1 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 endeavor by Crete. Herodotus maintains: κτιζομένης Γέλης ὑπὸ Λινδίων τε τῶν ἐκ Ῥόδου καὶ Ἀντιφήμου.[144] Pausanias's reference—Ἀντίφημος ὁ Γέλας οἰκιστής—also assumes Rhodian initiative, which he situates within the broader migration of Dorians to Sicily.[145] However, Thucydides and Diodorus[146] portray the settlement as a joint initiative of Rhodians and Cretans led by Antiphemus and Entimus, respectively.[147] Possibly, conflict at home stimulated the participation of the Rhodians,[148] who were

---

[144] 7.153.

[145] 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.

[146] Didodorus may relied on Thucydides or a tradition in common with him.

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

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

then joined by compatriots from Lindus already possessing a foothold in Sicily.[149] Herodotus and Pausanias's concentration on the Rhodian element suggests that the eventual domination of that segment influenced traditions about Gela's origins.[150]

Thucydides's account, though brief, offers an illuminating glimpse at how identity was negotiated in the "mixed" colony.[151] He notes that the preeminent civic landmark was associated with Rhodes (τὸ δὲ χωρίον οὗ νῦν ἡ πόλις ἐστὶ . . . Λίνδιοι καλεῖται).[152] 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.[153] Often they signaled a connection between a colony and its *metropolis;* for instance, Gela was said to have given Geloan *nomima* to her colony, Acragas.[154] However, at her own foundation Gela adopted "Dorian" *nomima.* These "sub-ethnic" *nomima* appear to represent a comprise designed to assimilate the respective groups of settlers predicated on the legend of common

---

[149] Ibid., 1:279–83.
[150] Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 53.
[151] 6.4.3.
[152] The reference here is to Lindos in Rhodes.
[153] Malkin, *A Small Greek World,* 189–204.
[154] Thucydides 6.4.4–5.

Dorian descent.[155] 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.[156] 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.[157] 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 how the Dorian *nomima* of Gela did for her two sets of settlers. And to reiterate: Since Gela was a joint settlement, her decision in favor of these "institutions" constituted a form of compromise.

2.3.1.1.2 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 this concern

---

[155] 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.
[156] 4.1.5. Here *nomoi* approximates *nomima.*
[157] For a discussion of Massalia's founding, see chapter 4.

was manifested—in cultic transfers. Here I discuss the founding oracle of Gela. Apollo's jurisdiction over colonization means that his sanction was important in legitimating a new foundation. 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 gave the following response:

> Entimus and thou, illustrious Craton's son
>
> Sagacious [δαΐφρον], fare ye two forth to Sicle,
>
> On her fair soil to dwell, where ye shall build
>
> A city (δειμάμενοι πτολίθρον), home for men of Crete and Rhodes,[158]
>
> E'en Gela, at the sacred (ἁγνοῦ) river's mouth

---

[158] 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 allusion to his "illustrious" parentage (Κράτωνος ἀγακλέος) and sagacity (δαΐφρον).

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 (Σικελήν) and specific geographical markers (πὰρ προχοὰς ποταμοῖο Γέλα . . . ἁγνοῦ). It is equally clear, however, 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 provide 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 demonstrates how he offers his guidance.

2.3.1.1.3 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 relates

that Antiphemus installed in the colony an *agalma*[159] fashioned by the legendary Daedalus.[160] The *oikist* supposedly seized the image as spoils following the sack of Omphace, a city not far inland from coastal Gela.[161] 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).[162] 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

---

[159] "A statue in honour of a god." Liddell-Scott, 7th ed., s.v. ἄγαλμα.

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

[161] 8.46.2–3.

[162] 7.153.

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 (ἱροφάνται τῶν θεῶν)" (7.153 [Godley, LCL]).[163]

2.3.1.2 The Foundation of Rhegion

Rhegion (Reggio Calabria) lies at the extreme southwestern tip of Italy, nearly opposite of Zancle[164] 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.[165] Here I focus on accounts of the city's foundation contained in Strabo, Diodorus, and Dionysius, highlighting in the first place its identification as a joint settlement and in the second reports of its founding oracles.

---

[163] 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.

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

[165] 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.

2.3.1.2.1 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 material[166] to spin his account.[167] By contrast, several other authors—both contemporary and later—identify a single *ethne* responsible for settling the colony. For instance, Diodorus[168] and Dionysius[169] give credit to Chalcidians for planting Rhegion,[170] while Pausanias

---

[166] 6.1.6. Strabo relies on Antiochus (*FGrHist* 555 F9), Heraclides Lembos (*FGrHist* 25 F219), and probably Timaeaus (*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).

[167] 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]).

[168] 8.23.2. Diodorus offers a description of the Chalcidian settlers—which resembles Strabo's initial report (see below)—before delineating the oracular sanction and its fulfillment.

[169] *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).

[170] See Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas,* 171–72, for material culture evidence supporting early Euboean exploration and settlement in Magna Graecia and Sicily. 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.

acknowledges Alcidamidas and the Messenians.[171] 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 Apollo[172]—an expedient due to crop failure per Strabo.[173] To this contingent, Strabo continues, were joined "others from their homeland" (6.1.6 [Jones]).[174] While precedent exists for the human tithe, particularly in legendary accounts,[175] the significance of the practice in the present instance is that it underscores Delphi's role in colonization.[176] Strabo's alternative version, taken from Antiochus, credits Zancle with initiating the settlement of Rhegion.[177] The "Zancleans," he relates, "sent for the Chalcidians and appointed Antimnestus their founder (οἰκιστήν)" (6.1.6 [Jones, LCL]).[178] Zancle's initiative is quite

---

[171] 4.23.6.

[172] Ἀνατεθέντες (Diodorus 8.23.2) or δεκατευθέντες (Strabo 6.1.6). Strabo casts this earlier dedication as a response to an oracle—κατὰ χρησμόν (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.

[173] Cf. Heraclides Lembos 25: διὰ λιμόν. See introduction on the different reasons given for colonization.

[174] Neither Diodorus nor Strabo's first version identifies an *oikist.*

[175] Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 37–38.

[176] 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]).

[177] 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.

[178] Antiochus 555 fr. 9.

comprehensible since it stood opposite the straits of Messina in Sicily and had itself been planted by Chalcidians.[179]

Dionysius also connects Rhegion to Chalcis yet in a different fashion—through an *oikist* named Artimedes.[180] The relation of Dionysius's account to Strabo's[181] 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 when planting a second-generation colony to adopt a founder from its *metropolis*.[182] 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

---

[179] 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.
[180] "Artimedes of Chalcis had an oracle (λόγιον εἶχεν)" (*Ant. rom.* 19.2.1 [Cary, LCL]).
[181] That is, Antiochus's account.
[182] 1.24.2; cf. 6.4.2, 5. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization,* 32.

expelled the native inhabitants of the territory.[183] 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 Timaeaus and Heraclides Lembos.[184] According to the latter source, the Chalcidians and Messenians made a joint settlement at the grave site of Iokastos, a local hero,[185] before receiving an oracle to found a city elsewhere. Strabo, however, has the Messenians approach Delphi separately after they are 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 a certain Alcidamidas, 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 beside the point. More relevant is the manner in which the reference to Alcidamidas serves "to legitimate the pedigree of Anaxilas [tyrant of Rhegion] . . . whose great-

---

[183] *Ant. rom.* 19.2.1.

[184] Malkin, *Religion and Colonization,* 32.

[185] Honoring local heroes is a practice commonly noted in foundation accounts. See ibid., 35.

grandfather was said to have originated in the Peloponnesian Messenia."[186] This tradition, likely from Pausanias's source, reflects a desire on the part of Anaxilas and the Messenian population of Rhegion to embellish their bonds with Messene.[187] The same motive likely undergirds Strabo's second account, even though it does not identify a Messenian *oikist.* Its emphasis on the participation of settlers from Messene sufficiently conveys the significance of Messenian influence in Rhegion.[188] 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 reserves a preeminent role for the oracle.[189] 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

---

[186] Hall, "Foundation Stories," 2:392. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization,* 33, accepts Messenian incorporation under Alcidamidas.

[187] In fact, Thucydides credits Anaxilas with renaming Zancle "Messene" (6.4.6).

[188] 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 from the foundation of the colony.

[189] I discuss both oracles below.

responsible for defiling maidens sent to perform religious rights at Limnae.[190] Messenian representatives solicit Delphi's advice on how they "might be saved [σωθεῖεν],"[191] 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).[192] Beyond land, the oracle's response promises cleansing from the impurity clinging to the Messenians. Most important, perhaps, is what Strabo's oracle accomplishes for the Messenians settled in Rhegion: empowerment. Strabo hints that the oracle's authorization enhanced the Messenian position. Though the Messenians joined Chalcidians who were already intent on settling Rhegion, the oracle's sanction for their relocation explains 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]).

[190] Cf. Pausanias 4.4.1.

[191] 6.1.6. Apollo's response parallels the inquiry: οὐ . . . ἀπολωλέναι αὐτούς, ἀλλὰ σεσῶσθαι.

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

In conclusion, our sources differ in their characterization of Rhegion's original settlers.[193] There is a strong insistence in several of the treatments about the Chalcidian character of its new inhabitants. Diodorus[194] and Strabo[195] contribute to this impression by incorporating the tradition about a prior tithe 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* (Artimedes) aligns his account in emphasis with those of Diodorus and Strabo, even if it differs in particulars.[196] Other accounts foreground Messenian participation in the new settlement. Pausanias suggests that the colony's *oikist* came from Messene.[197] The tradition seems to have legitimized rulers such as Anaxilas via a link to Messene. The tradition which Strabo

---

[193] Recall that founders link Rhegion to one or the other *metropolis* in several of the accounts. Thus, Alcidamidas evokes Rhegion's Messenian influence (Pausanias 4.23.6), Artimedes its Chalcidian identity (Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 19.2.1), and Antimnestus its combined Zanclean/Chalcidian roots (Strabo 6.1.6).
[194] 8.23.2.
[195] 6.1.6.
[196] *Ant. rom.* 19.2.1.
[197] 4.23.6.

relays about Messenian participation alongside the Chalcidian settlers seems tailored for a similar purpose.[198]

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 therefore had been driven out by Sparta.[199] Second, Apollo is responsible for bringing the two groups together to form a new community.[200] 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.

---

[198] 6.1.6.

[199] Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 33–34.

[200] Ibid.

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

Also instructive are the oracles reported in Diodorus[201] and Dionysius's[202] accounts of the foundation of Rhegion.[203] Of the two oracles, Dionysius's—purportedly received[204] by Artimedes of Chalcis—is the briefer. The oracle instructs the *oikist* to establish a settlement[205] where "he should find the male covered by the female" (τὸν ἄρρενα ὑπὸ τῆς θηλείας ὀπυιόμενον) (19.2.1 [Cary, LCL]). Diodorus transmits an expanded form of the oracle, allegedly directed to the consecrated Chalcidians[206]:

> Where Apsia, most sacred river, falls
>
> Into the sea, and as one enters it
>
> The female weds/covers the male (τὸν ἄρσενα θῆλυς ὀπυίει), a city found (πόλιν οἴκιζη),

---

[201] 8.23.2.

[202] 19.2.1–2.

[203] Cf. Strabo 6.1.6.

[204] Λόγιον εἶχεν (19.2.1).

[205] Ἀυτόθι μένειν καὶ μηκέτι προσωτέρω πλεῖν (19.2.1).

[206] See the discussion of Rhegion's founding above.

Thou there, the land of Auson is thy gift (διδοῖ 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.[207] 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,"[208] and 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,[209] here as often using local geography. Indeed, while highlighting the knowledge differential between Apollo and mortal inquirers, the riddle ensures the reputation of the founder able to tap into the god's omniscience.

---

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

[208] 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' oracle in Dionysius (19.1). Hall, "Foundation Stories," 2:401.

[209] On the riddles ascribed to the Delphic oracle, see Stoneman, *The Ancient Oracles: Making the Gods Speak,* 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.[210] Strabo, Diodorus, and Ovid's accounts of the foundation illustrate a preoccupation with familiar concerns: the origin, founder, and divine sanction of the colony.

2.3.1.3.1 Legendary Precursors in Strabo's Account of the Founding of Croton

In colonization accounts, a concern with "origins" sometimes extends to the legendary 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 Mysellus 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, "put in there [near Croton] and disembarked for an inspection of the region" (6.1.12 [Smith,

[210] The city later became a Roman colony named "Cortona/Corthonia" (Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.26.1–2).

LCL]). However, seizing the moment, the captive Trojan women aboard burned the Achaean ships, and stranded their occupants in southern Italy. Strabo offers this narrative by way of etymology for the river Neaethus, “to burn ships” (νέας αἐθεῖν). Though the legend casts the foundation as a product of necessity, it nevertheless portrays it as fortuitous, given the land’s fertility, 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]).[211] Within Stabo’s account, therefore, the legendary Achaean settlement at Croton provides a precedent for later settlements; together, they help legitimate the foundation of Myscellus foundation, which is narrated next.[212]

---

[211] About these settlements, Strabo further adds ὧν αἱ πλείους ἐώνυμοι τῶν Τρώων ἐγένοντο (6.1.12).
[212] On the use of legendary or mythological traditions to justify colonization, see Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*; idem, *The Returns of Odysseus*.

2.3.1.3.2 The Oracle and the "Surprised" Founder in Diodorus's Account of the Founding of Croton

Diodorus gives a particularly colorful account of how 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 initial statement to this effect is rather succinct— τοῦ θεοῦ φήσαντος Ἀχαιοῖς Κρότωνα κτίζειν.[213] 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.[214] The element of surprise hinges on the actual expectation of the founder, who had approached the oracle because of his difficulty begetting children (περὶ τέκνων γενέσεως). Myscellus, however, receives a startling response: "Myscellus, too short of back,[215] beloved art thou of him, even Apollo, who works afar, and he will give

[213] 6.1.12.

[214] We encounter this "surprised *oikist*" motif again in Herodotus's account of the foundation of Cyrene (4.150–61; see below).

[215] Compare Myscellus's physical deformity with the stuttering of Battos, founder of Cyrene (Herodotus 4.155)

thee children; yet this first is his command, Kroton the great to found (οἰκῆσαί σε Κρόωνα μέγαν)[216] amidst fair fields" (8.17.1 [Oldfather, LCL]). Note that the Pythia actually addresses 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 rather than crookedness of back.[217] 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.[218] What it does do is underscore the initiative of Apollo rather than the mortal founder.

Two additional oracles bolster this impression. The first seeks to remedy the founder's confusion[219] at "the reference to Croton" (8.17.1 [Oldfather, LCL]), with the Pythia identifying geographical signposts to guide him:

---

[216] The reference to the city's greatness is a striking feature given the third oracle delivered to Myscellus (Diodorus 8.17; cf. Strabo 6.1.12). See below.

[217] Cf. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 44.

[218] "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).

[219] Τοῦ δὲ Κρότωνα ἀγνοοῦντος εἰπεῖν πάλιν τὴν Πυθίαν (Diodorus 8.17).

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 (ἡ 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,

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 is designed to aid the founder in locating the proper site for the colony. As such, it reinforces Myscellus's dependence on Apollo.[220]

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

[220] The "list of place names implies that the *oikist* does not know the route, that he is divinely guided" (Malkin, *Religion and Colonization,* 45).

north,[221] desiring to plant (κτίσαι) a colony there, instead.[222] (With only minor differences,[223] this oracle corresponds to the second oracle reported by Strabo.[224])

> Mycellus, too short of back,[225] in searching things
> Other than god commands (παρὲκ θεοῦ), thou seekest naught
> But tears. Approve the gift (δῶρον) the god doth give.
> (Diodorus 8.17 [Oldfather, LCL])

At root the oracle is a rebuke of Myscellus.[226] 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 well-defended Sybaris. Yet the oracle offers a carrot to go along with the stick. In following the oracles guidance, Myscellus would be securing a "gift" (δῶρον) from the god.[227] Here the force of the oracle's corrective

---

[221] Τὴν περὶ Σύβαριν χώραν θαυμάσας (Diodorus 8.17).
[222] 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 λῷε εἴη ταύτην ἀντ' ἐκείνης κτίζειν) (6.1.12 [Oldfather, LCL]).
[223] Most notably, Strabo reads "outside you" (παρὲκ σέθεν) in place of Diodorus's "outside god" (παρὲκ θεοῦ) and (likely) "morsels" (κλάσματα) instead of Diodorus's "tears" (κλαύματα).
[224] Strabo does not mention any oracle corresponding with Diorodus's second oracle.
[225] Βραχύνωτε. Strabo mentions the founder's deformity as an aside: "Myscellus was a hunchback as it happened" (6.1.12 [Jones, LCL]).
[226] Strabo's alternative wording, παρὲκ σέθεν, implies the same idea—"away from the path designated for you."
[227] Compare the reference to Κρότωνα μέγαν in the first oracle (Diodorus 8.17).

applies not just to the location of the territory, but also the evaluation of it. The founder's perception of Croton is myopic: There is more there than meets the eye. Diodorus's subsequent demeaning judgment of the Sybarites—"slaves to their belly and lovers of luxury" (8.18.1 [Oldfather, LCL])[228] confirms the superiority of Croton and thus the oracle's wisdom.[229] The corrective lesson of the oracle is this: It is best for the founder of the colony to follow Apollo's judgment rather than his own instincts.

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

Like Strabo's account of the foundation of Croton, Ovid's account also embellishes its subject with legendary and mythological traditions. Yet Ovid brings Croton into the orbit of Rome by setting his account of the city's beginning within the larger framework of traditions about Numa, who is introduced 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

[228] 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.

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

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 hears 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,[230] Hercules in his wanderings had received hospitality from a certain Croton, in gratification for which he promised 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]).[231] Myscelus fulfilled this prophecy when he founded Croton—so named after this man who showed 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 introduces another form of divine sanction encountered in

---

[230] On Myscellus (so speleed in the Greek accounts, see Strabo 6.1.12; Diodorus 8.17. Cf. Diodorus 4.24; Iamblichus, *Vita pythagorae* 50.

[231] Cf. Heraclides Lembos 68.

colonization accounts, the vision.[232] 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]).[233] Here the vision not only commissions the (implied) founding of a colony, but also, like the oracle recounted by Diodorus, dangles a geographical clue—the river "Aesar"[234]—to help guide the 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.[235] Yet while the compliance renders a further vision unnecessary,[236] it does not terminate the hero's assistance. Hercules intervenes again to overturn a guilty verdict against

[232] Details and functions of visions vary throughout foundation accounts. They can introduce the topic of colonization and/or provide directions or clarification about related matters. See, further, the discussion of Alexander and Seleucus's visions below and that of Aristarcha in chapter 4.
[233] The passage continues: "and he threatened him with many fearful things should he not obey" (*Metam.* 15.17 [Miller, LCL]).
[234] Cf. Diodorus 8.23.1.
[235] 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]).
[236] Compare the follow-up oracles in Strabo (6.1.12) and Diodorus (8.17).

Myscelus,[237] facilitating the founder's safe departure. Once free, Myscelus successfully locates the river Aesar and founds Croton as instructed.[238]

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 the man Croton is important: It offers an etiology for Hercules's commitment to founding the colony.

2.3.1.4 The Foundation of Syracuse

The Corinthians founded Syracuse sometime around 734 BCE, perhaps as a hedge against other settlements on Sicily, like those undertaken by the Euboeans who had begun to exploit the commercial potential of the island's coastal regions.[239] The Baccalids ruled Corinth at the time Syracuse was founded. Their successors in the seventh century BCE were assertive in utilizing colonization to consolidate the

---

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

[238] 15.56–57.

[239] Dominguez, "Greeks in Sicily,"253–357; cf. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*. Corinth planted Corcyra not long after (ca. 730 BCE).

influence of Corinth, thus anticipating a feature of foreign policy which characterized Greek powers such as Athens and Sparta in the Classical period.[240] 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.[241] 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 Corcyra—which was founded not long after (ca. 730 BCE)—enjoyed greater independence than the other colonies and thrived to the point that they came to rival Corinth itself.[242]

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

Most of our sources identify Archias as the founder of Syracuse,[243] 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

[240] Though see Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece,* 115–50, who qualifies this assessment.
[241] Ibid., 30–31.
[242] Cf. Ibid., 150–51.
[243] Cf. Pindar (*Ol.* 6.6–8), who celebrates the (elite) Hagesias as "fellow-founder" (συνοικιστήρ) of Syracuse.

came from Antiochus, native son of Sicily, which partially explains his legitimating identification of Archias as "one of the Heracleidae."[244] However, I focus here on the accounts of Plutarch and Diodorus, which relate the foundation of Syracuse to crisis in the *metropolis* Corinth involving bloodshed and a divine curse. These narratives are particularly interesting because they demonstrate 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 who accompanied him to the home of Melissus, Actaeon's father.[245] 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—

---

[244] 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]).
[245] Either drunk (Diodorus 8.10) or "as in a drunken folic" (Plutarch, *Mor.* 772 [Fowler, LCL]).

such as Melissus, friends, and other residents of the house (Diodorus) or neighbors (Plutarch)—on the other hand.[246]

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" (αὐχμός καὶ λοιμός) upon the city complicit in Actaeon's death due to its inaction. Given the origin of the crisis, its solution had to involve appeasement of the god responsible, Poseidon. According to Plutarch, the Corinthians consulted an oracle "concerning relief" (περὶ ἀπαλλαγῆς) and learned that they could satisfy Poseidon's wrath by punishing those who had responsible for Actaeon's death. Archias, among those consulting the oracle, surmised that returning to Corinth was not a viable option, so he chose to sail to Sicily where he planted the colony Syracuse.[247] Archias's self-exile both satisfied (at least in part) the justice sought by Melissus as well as brought an end to Corinth's hardships.

---

[246] 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.
[247] Or: πλεύσας δ' εἰς τὴν Σικελίαν Συρακούσας ἔκτισας (*Mor.* 772).

These accounts are revealing. In the first place, they demonstrate how the founder might be a flawed individual. In this instance, Archias committed a terrible act which brought pain and suffering to his homeland, Corinth. But in the second place, such accounts reveal how colonization can represent a solution to crisis. Or put another way, depictions of the foundation of Syracuse, as well as some other colonies,[248] demonstrate how crisis can function as an explanation of colonization—one which offers a memorable tale of beginnings that focuses on pollution and divine expiation rather than human 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

---

[248] For example, Taras. See chapter 4.

for the planting of the colony.[249] At any rate, accounts such as Pausanias's are more explicit about Archias's divine mandate.[250]

2.3.1.4.2 Geography and the Mandate of Apollo: The Founding Oracle 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, and bequeathed their names to these eponymous bodies of water in Ortygia.[251] For 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

---

[249] Strabo's account of nearby Tenea is also of interest here (8.6.22). The city formed part of the territory of Corinthia. Its good fortunes up to Strabo's time stemmed in no small part to its siding with the general Mummius and the Romans in their conquests. 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.

[250] Pausanias gives a terse introduction to the oracle received by Archias: Ἀρχίαν τὸν Κορίνθιον ἐς τὸν Συρακουσῶν ἀποστέλλων οἰκισμόν (5.7.3).

[251] Cf. Plutarch's assertion that at Syracuse Archias "became the father of two daughters, Ortygia and Syracusa" (773 [Fowler, LCL]).

> 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,[252] the identification of local geographical features meant to guide the *oikist* also glorified the colony, linking it to Apollo's knowledge of the land 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, and eastward along the Adriatic, Aegean, and Black

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

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.

2.3.1.5.1 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 (4.150–53) and Cyrenean (4.154–56) version. These demonstrate how a city's origins were often contested, including its *metropolis*. (These accounts follow Herodotus's report on the founding of Thera.[253]) 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 certain hardships.[254] The common version into which both accounts merge[255] reports that the Greeks settled on the offshore island of Platea for two years prior to moving inland to

[253] According to Herodotus, the Spartan Theras presided over the founding of the eponymous city, which boasted Minyae—descendants of the Argonauts—among its settlers (4.148–49).
[254] Drought (4.151) and unspecified difficulties (4.156), respectively.
[255] 4.156–58. A. J. Graham, "The Ὅρκιον Τῶν Οἰκιστήρων of Cyrene," in *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 87. Contra Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, 60.

Aziris on the insistence of a subsequent oracle;[256] seven years later the settlement party moved to a place called κρήνην . . . Ἀπόλλωνος, which became the eventual site of Cyrene.[257] Later—"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.[258] 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,[259] on the one hand, and between Cyrene

---

[256] 4.157.

[257] 4.158.

[258] "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]).

[259] Further, the genealogy cements Thera's association with Sparta. Cf. 4.147–149.

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 χρᾷ)—after offering a hecatomb on behalf of Thera—and receiving the unexpected command "to found a city in Libya" (κτίζειν ἐν Λιβύνῃ πόλιν).[260] To be sure, Grinnus is accompanied by a delegation that includes Battos the eventual founder of Cyrene.[261] 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.[262]

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

---

[260] 4.150.

[261] 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 [cf. 4.146]).

[262] 4.148. Pindar links Euphemus more directly to the Cyrenean foundation via Medea's foundation (Pindar, *Pyth.* 4.9–58).

the king rather than the oracle; he is, in effect, a 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" (ἡεγμόνα 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,[263] "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, they were compelled to consult Delphi again. The response which Herodotus reports—προέφερε . . . τὴν ἐς Λιβύην ἀποικίην[264]—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

[263] Presumably King Grinnus was dead by this point.
[264] 4.151.

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.[265] As with Herodotus's subsequent remarks about the Samians who sail by and restock the Cretan's provisions, initiating friendship (φιλίαι) between themselves and the people of Thera and (eventually) Cyrene,[266] Corobius's insertion into the narrative offers an etiology for an amicable affiliation between Crete and the other two cities.[267] 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 at the outset this focus with his

---

[265] 4.151.
[266] 4.152.
[267] Notably, the Cyrenean version provides a different explanation for Crete's link with Cyrene. See below.

extended delineation of the origins of the *oikist.* 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, where she became the concubine of Polymnestus.[268] The Cyrenean account of Battos's parentage, of course, has no more claim on originality than does its Theraean counterpart[269]; 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.[270] 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 later account

[268] 4.154–55.
[269] 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)."
[270] 4.151–52.

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 oracle 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 begun by the *oikist.*[271] However, the narrative is quite explicit that Battos came to Delphi soliciting a response περὶ τῆς

[271] "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).

φωνῆς,[272] 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 over his voice, the Pythia redirects his attention to a different subject, the founding of a colony in Libya. This 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.[273] 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

---

[272] 4.155.

[273] 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 and in reply were instructed to found Herakleia Pontike (Justin 16.3.4-7).

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. Paradoxical, at first glance, this attention extends to 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 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 [ἀποικίζειν] in Libya, but where shall I acquire the power [δυνάμι) 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 serve 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,[274] as suggested by other foundation accounts foregrounding the flaws of founders.[275] Like stories concentrating on societal discord more broadly,[276] narratives which focus 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 symbolize the foundation itself.

Portraying a galvanizing determination to plant the colony, the remainder of the Cyrenean version continues to differentiate Battos from his Theraean *metropolis.*

---

[274] Recall that Grinnus had neglected the oracle's instruction in the Theraean version (4:150–51).

[275] See, e.g., above on Archias's accidental murder of Actaeon leading 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).

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

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 Platea[277]—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 Βάττῳ] 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 identity Battos as "leader and king,"[278] 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

---

[277] 4.151.
[278] Cf. 4.156.

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. This response apparently stemmed from fear that Thera would continue to endure hardship should the colony remain unplanted in violation of the oracle's instruction. The reaction worked: Compelled to sail back (ὀπίσω πλώειν), the founder and his settlement party initially planted a colony (ἔκτισαν) at Platea.[279] When his colony failed, they consulted Delphi yet again and a received third oracle referencing "Libya's pastures," which corrected the settlement "off the Libyan coast" (4.156 [Godley, LCL]). They went on to found Cyrene in Libya proper. But it is important to see that they did so under duress from their *metropolis*.[280] 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.

---

[279] 4.156.

[280] Thera still occupies the role of *metropolis* in the Cyrenean version.

To summarize, the Theraean and Cyrenean reported by Herodotus offer two different perspectives on the role of the *metropolis,* Thera.[281] 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 and 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 had a reduced role in Thera as concubine and at any rate 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

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

Battos and the settlers seals the latter's relative independence from Thera. The citizens of the *metropolis* repel the settlers upon their 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—sending ahead 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 plays a secondary role when compared with Battos. We encounter, in other words, an ambivalent relationship between *metropolis* and *apoikia.*

2.3.1.5.2 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.[282] (Indeed, for this reason Calame draws on these odes to deconstruct the categories "myth" and "history."[283]) The celebration of a victory by King Arkesilas's athlete in the chariot race at the Pythian Games of 462 BCE is the

[282] *Pyth.* 4, 5, and 9.

[283] Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece,* 35–113.

occasion for *Pythia* 4. The poem, crafted as an appeal on behalf of the exiled Damophilos,[284] 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 concerned "a root of famous cities" planted within Libya (4.13–16 [Sandys, LCL]). Thus, similar to Ovid's Croton account, the prophecy and events associated 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,[285] such as Triton's gift of Libyan earth,[286] the Argonaut's coupling with Lemnian women,[287] and eventually the settlement of Thera.[288] By combining "historical" and mythical traditions, these events glorify the colonization of Cyrene.

[284] 4.277–99.
[285] 4.50–56; 259–62.
[286] 4.37.
[287] 4.50–51; 252–56.
[288] 5.257–58.

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* Thera,[289] but also to the Trojan Antenoridai, credited with settling Libya prior to Battos and his men.[290] 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 whose actions 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 also for the colonization of Thera, Cyrene's *metropolis*.[291] These prior

---

[289] 5.75.

[290] 5.83–86.

[291] 5.75.

instances of colony-founding provided a meaningful precedent for Apollo's sovereignty over Cyrene's foundation.[292] The festival of Karneian Apollo[293] at Cyrene, therefore, not only commemorated the ties between Cyrene, Thera, and Sparta,[294] but also celebrated Apollo's role in planting each city. Yet Apollo's activity through Battos, Cyrene's "steward" (ταμία),[295] once again reveals the convergence of the mythical and historical.[296] Apollo turns his chosen instrument's "outlandish speech" (γλῶσσαν . . . ὑπερποντίαν) to an advantage—dispersing "loudly roaring lions"[297] to ensure the foundation of Cyrene (5.57–62 [Sandys, LCL]).[298] Battos's appointment by the colonizing god—coupled with his own founding acts—secured Battos's stature as hero among Cyreneans.[299]

---

[292] 5.60–63.
[293] 5.77–81. Cf. Callimachus, *Hymn. Apoll.* 72–73; Malkin, *Myth and Territory*, 147.
[294] Callimachus, *Hymn. Apoll.* 69–89.
[295] 5.62.
[296] 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).
[297] Cf. Pausanias 10.15.7.
[298] Pindar goes on to celebrate Battos's founding actions (5.89–93), which earned him a burial within the city walls, "at the end of the agora" (93 [Sandys, LCL]).
[299] 5.94–95.

Finally, *Pythia* 9—penned to celebrate Telesikrates's victory in the race of armor[300]—is likewise conspicuous for the way it merges myth and history. This characteristic emerges early on: Pindar represents Cyrene as an eponymous nymph whom Apollo seized and brought to Libya.[301] 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 gain Apollo, paramount to the foundation of Cyrene, bridges the space between the historical and mythical. He is responsible not only for transplanting the nymph to Libya, but also for later "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, 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 Athens'. Naturally, in such

[300] 9.1–2; 71–75.
[301] 9.1–8.

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 colony might be required to fulfill financial obligations to her *metropolis,*[302] come to her aid in wartime, adopt concordant forms of government,[303] and even share cultic commitments.[304] 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 her colonies, internal and external forces sometimes rendered tenuous her relationship with the colonies.[305] They also demonstrate how other concerns such as the role of the founder and divine sanction continued to shape reflections about colonization.

[302] 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.
[303] 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 her *metropolis*. See Thucydides 1.19.1; Cf. Figueira, "Colonisation in the Classical Period," 2:482–83.
[304] E.g., the putative foundation decree of Brea obligates the colony to dedicate at Athens a cow and panoply for the Great Panathenaia and a phallus for the Dionysia (*IG* 1^3 46, lines 15–17).
[305] Indeed, Thucydides credits the breakdown in relationship between Corcycra and her colony Epidamnus as a major cause of the Peloponnesian War. See below.

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 her colony, the first two depicting a mother city's claims on her colony via the founder, and the third portraying the breakdown in relations between colony and *metropolis.*

2.3.2.1.1 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.[306] Miltiades's efforts did not produce a colony per se, but it did secure for him rule over parts of the Chersonese,[307] an outcome which was 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.[308] 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

---

[306] Herodotus 6.35.

[307] Cornelius Nepos, purporting to describe the actions of Miltiades the Younger, seems to incorporate details from the Elder's earlier venture. Miltiades 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.

[308] Ibid., 194. Figueira, "Colonisation in the Classical Period," 2:430.

legitimate Athens' role as *metropolis* of the Chersonese colony.[309] 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 her interests abroad.

2.3.2.1.2 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 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,

[309] 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]).

LCL]).[310] Athens indeed succeeded in colonizing Amphipolis. However, Sparta was not content to let this outcome stand, and under Brasidas wrested the colony from Athens.[311] This dealt a blow to Athens' empire, depriving her of shipbuilding resources and emboldening those under her 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.[312] Therefore, given the strategic nature of colonization in this period, one thing the case of Amphipolis illustrates is 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 helped undermine Athens' hopes to control 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

[310] Hence Athens' distress when they lost Amphipolis to Sparta.
[311] Argilians and other neighboring peoples helped Brasidas secure control to the former Athenian colony (4.103.1–5).
[312] Cf. 4.108.2–3.

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.[313] 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.[314] 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

---

[313] See Diodorus 12.11.1–3.
[314] 4.106.1–4.

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 the characteristics of the nearby river.[315] 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.[316] 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 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 founders often represented their *metropolis* in a colony. Similarly, Hagnon and Brasidas's fate as founders mirrored the position of Athens and Sparta, respectively, in Amphipolis.

---

[315] 4.102.3–4.

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

2.3.2.1.3 Changing a *Metropolis:* Thucydides and the Case of Epidamnus

Appearing early in *The Peloponnesian War*, Thucydides's account of Epidamnus, originally a colony of Corcyra in Illyria,[317] 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 as an entity to be exploited, and likely had installed its own partisans in leadership positions.[318] 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.[319]

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

[317] Thucydides 1.24.2; Strabo 7.5.8.
[318] 1.26.3.
[319] Representatives from Epidamnus "inquired of the god, whether they should deliver their city to the Corinthians" (Thucydides 1.25.1 [Smith, LCL]).

was most acute for 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 Corcyra even insisted that the colony "receive back their exiles" (1.26.3 [Smith, LCL]).[320] Therefore, from the perspective of Epidamnus, Corcyra had neglected the responsibilities of defense which 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 Epidamnus, which the latter makes clear in the initial plea for Corinthian support. While not the *metropolis,* Corinth had contributed settlers at the foundation of the colony—and even supplied the *oikist*![321] Therefore, Corinth's past and present assistance demonstrate its

---

[320] 1.26.3.

[321] Thucydides claims that this practice was of great antiquity (1.24.2).

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.[322] 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.[323] 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 matters, this contrast bolsters Epidamnus' case to transfer to the new *metropolis,* Corinth, which also explains why Delphi approved the colony's (implicit) request.

---

[322] This policy decision was concocted to undermine the interests of Corcyra.
[323] 1.25.4. Thucydides attributes the colony's behavior to its own ascension in wealth in naval prowess.

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.

2.3.2.2.1 *Manteis* and Xenophon's Would-Be Colony on the Black Sea

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 the possibility of πόλιν κατοικίσαντας near the Black Sea, reasoning that his well-trained hoplites could easily secure the territory for Greece.[324] To this end, he requested the services of a *mantis,* Silanus, to interpret sacrifices in order to discern the gods' will. In this particular instance, the *mantis* undermined Xenophon's plan, exposing his intentions to

[324] *Anab.* 5.6.15–16.

the rank-and-file soldiers who, for the most part, were eager to return home.[325] This incident reveals the diviner's influence. For had he offered a positive interpretation of the sacrifices, it surely would have supplied the basis for a colony. Yet Silanus's disclosure to the troops introduced suspicion about Xenophon's motives.[326] 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 χωρίον οἰκίσαι—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 still carried a mandate to interpret the will of the gods and were therefore capable of influencing momentous decisions.

---

[325] As was Silanus himself (5.6.17–18).

[326] 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 in *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 368.

2.3.2.2.2 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.[327] An "outbreak of wars" in Mycale had made it necessary to relocate the Panionia to the environs of Ephesus.[328] 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" (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 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 Achaïa" (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

[327] I discuss a formal cult transfer during colonization—that of Ephesian Artemis's transfer to Massalia—in chapter 4.
[328] 15.49.1–2.

altars. In turn, this right to copies of the altars ensured the propriety of the transfer, thus facilitating the relocation of the Panionia.

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 oracle[329] 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.[330] 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[331]" (49.3 [Sherman, LCL]). The second indication of divine support for the Ionians came in response to this act of "sacrilege."[332] Poseidon, according to Diodorus's sources,[333] revealed his wrath in the form of an earthquake and flood. Thus, a clear thread in

---

[329] Παλαιὸν λόγιον. Later Diodorus refers to the saying as τὸν χρησμόν (15.49.2).
[330] 15.49.2.
[331] Τοῦς . . . θεωρούς.
[332] Ἠσέβησάν τε εἰς τὸ θεῖον (15.59.3).
[333] Ἀνθ' ὧν φασι (15.49.3).

Diodorus's account is the conviction that divine forces support using the replicas as a basis for the transfer of the Panionia.

2.3.2.2.3 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, oracle, *manteis,* and cult transfer.

2.3.2.2.3.1 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.[334] 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

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

visions. In Zancle (Sicily), a priest of Heracles Manticlus[335] had a dream-vision (ὀνείρατος 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 (ἡγεμών) 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 [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.[336] Therefore, viewed from the perspective of later events, the visions anticipate and signal divine favor for the resettlement of Messene.

---

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

[336] 4.26.3–4.

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,[337] 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,[338] initially the Theban was doubtful about the task before him. However, in this case the vision overcame rather than caused Epaminondas's uncertainty.[339]

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'

---

[337] Elsewhere, Pausanias reports the tradition that "the man who appeared to Epiteles and Epaminondas in their sleep was Caucon, who from Athens to Messene the daughter of Triopas at Andania" (4.23.8 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]).

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

[339] 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]).

role in Messene's rebirth.[340] 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 also confided in Epiteles, presumably also in a vision. 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 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 similar purposes in the narrative: to facilitate the refoundation of Messene. In fact, Epiteles related his dream to the Theban founder, encouraging him to open the urn.

[340] 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]).

The mysteries are discovered, reestablishing a connection with Messene's past and conferring legitimacy upon its refoundation in the present.

Dream-visions thus operate in various ways in Pausanias's narrative. As I have suggested, they foretell (through riddles) the refoundation of Messene and facilitate its fulfillment via the actions of founding figures. 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 refounding: a Delphic oracle given long ago to King Aristodemus[341] and an oracle of Bacis, which—taken as a harbinger of Sparta's defeat—indicated 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 refounding of Messene (4.27.5 [Jones and Ormerod, LCL]).[342] Their affirmative answer, in conjunction with the visions and oracles, helped assuage Epaminondas's concerns. He then proceeded to (re)found Messene.

---

[341] 4.23.4. Cf. 4.12.7.

[342] Pausanias 4.27.5.

2.3.2.2.3.2 Bone transfer and the refounded Messene. Bone transfers also validated territorial claims.[343] The act's efficaciousness often derived from the owner of the bone's deep ties to the land being settled or else to the present settlers. Both conditions apply to Pausanias's remarks about the refounded 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 refoundation 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.[344] 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 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

---

[343] E.g., Sparta purportedly stole the bones of Orestes to ensure her 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 legitimate the actions of the conquering power.

[344] 4.32.3.

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.[345] 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 refoundaiton of the community.

2.3.3 Colonization in the Hellenistic Period

Colonization in the Hellenistic period was a complicated phenomenon, in part because Alexander and his successors (e.g., the Ptolemies and Seleucids) acted on behalf of burgeoning kingdoms rather than individual *poleis*.[346] Later narrative treatments thus focus on the "founders-kings" and the divine support claimed for their foundations.[347]

---

[345] 4.26.8.

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

[347] See below.

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,[348] portray Alexander as a hands-on

[348] 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.-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 (1.31).

founder, defining the boundaries and spaces of the city.[349] According to Ps.-Callisthenes, the founder then determines who will live within the city, makes land allotments, and identifies the inhabitants as Alexandrians.[350]

These accounts also agree that Alexander's actions proceeded from divine sanction, though they vary in their characterization of it. Ps.-Callisthenes alone reproduces the customary sequence of Greek colonization accounts, with oracular consultation preceding the actual enterprise.[351] In this case 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,

---

[349] Plutarch, *Alex.* 26.4–5; Ps.-Callisthenes, *Romance* 1.30.5.

[350] 1.31.

[351] 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]).

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]). One could infer that the founder's actions might just as well have been those of the god. The narrative, therefore, portrays the founding of Alexandria as a joint initiative of Ammon and Alexander.[352]

Though Arrian and Plutarch highlight Alexander's initiative[353]—neither mentions an oracular consultation—they still embroider the founder's actions with

---

[352] 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.

[353] 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.* 3.5 [Brunt, LCL]).

divine favor. Even in Arrian's account, the most economical of the three, 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 with the help of military meal rations. Through 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 provides 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. Alexander recognizes this role in Plutarch's account: "Homer was not only admirable in other ways, but also a very wise architect, and . . . [ordering] the plan of the city to be drawn in conformity with this site [Pharos]" (26.7–8 [Perrin, LCL]).

When Plutarch gets around to narrating the interpretation of the *manteis,* it is already clear from Homer's vision that Alexander has support for his endeavor. Yet this is not the only way in which Plutarch's account surpasses Arrian's in its depiction of 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 entails 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 book-ends 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 Homer[354] 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.[355]

[354] Plutarch, *Alex.* 26.5–6.
[355] Plutarch, *Alex.* 26.5–6.

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.[356] 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 is on Malalas's depiction itself, which shows the persistence of the "divine sanction" motif in connection with the establishment of cities.

2.3.3.2.1 Divine Signs and Seleucus's Foundations

According to Malalas, the signs observed by Seleucus were connected with his foundation of Seleucia at Pieria, Antioch, Laodikeia, and Apam. The account of Seleucia's foundation at 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

---

[356] Malalas 199.

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 Antigonia, which he did with the explicit expectation of receiving a sign "to learn . . . whether he ought to settle in the city of Antigonia . . . 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 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.[357]

[357] Malalas 203.

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.

2.3.3.2.2 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 Antigonia nor should it become a city, since the gods do not want this" (200 [E. Jeffreys, M. Jefreys, 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

The Romans like the Greeks engaged in colonization. Rome first established colonies throughout Italy and then, gradually, overseas.[358] However, the nature of such colonization changed as Rome herself underwent changes, from the early to late Republican period and then up to and throughout the Imperial period.[359] 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.[360]

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 demonstrable ways the importance of the city's origins, divine sanction, and founder.

---

[358] 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.
[359] See the introduction above.
[360] See chapter 5.

An important observation to make before beginning is that there was no single story of the foundations 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;[361] Trojans;[362] Romanus, son of Odysseus and Circe;[363] Romus, "sent from Troy by Diomedes" (2.1 [Perrin, LCL]); and Romis, a Latin tyrant.[364] Plutarch even acknowledges disagreements about the identity of Romulus. Was he the son of Aeneas and Dexithea?[365] Of Roma, one of the Trojan women?[366] Of Mars and Aemilia and Mars?[367] Or was he the offspring of a phantom phallus and King Tarchetius's daughter or her maidservant?[368] 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 that sought to valorize Rome's origins.

---

[361] 1.1–2.
[362] 1.2.
[363] 2.1.
[364] Ibid.
[365] 2.2–3.
[366] 2.3.
[367] Ibid.
[368] 2.3–6.

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

2.3.4.2.1 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 highlights a tradition links 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 planted roots on the Palatine and rewarded Roma's foresight by naming the city after her.[369] However, Plutarch ultimately endorses the tradition—also followed by Livy—which links Rome to Aeneas via its early dynasty.[370]

Dionysius's prehistory of Rome is driven by the premise that Rome is fundamentally Greek due to the peoples who originally settled the region. The mini-narratives of these early groups of settlers comprising the prehistory employ many of the motifs seen in other colonization accounts. Dionysius first discusses the Aborigines.

---

[369] *Rom.* 1.2–3.
[370] *Rom.* 3.1–2.

These early inhabitants of Italy were in fact descendants of the Oenotrians, Arcadians[371] who—led by Oenotrus—had emigrated from their homeland due to land shortage.[372] They established various settlements in Italy,[373] among which Lista was designated as "mother city."[374] 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 the eventual city of 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."[375] Thus, the Aborigenes established colonies throughout central Italy.

---

[371] See Tanja J. Scheer, "'They That Held Arcadia': Arcadian Foundation Myths as Intentional History in Roman Imperial Times," in *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece,* ed. Lin Foxhall, Hans-Joachim Gehrke, and Nino Luraghi (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010), 275–98, on the legitimating value of ascribing colonization to Arcadians during the Roman period.

[372] Cf. Plato, *Laws* 740e.

[373] *Ant. rom.* 1.11.2–3.

[374] *Ant. rom.* 1.14.6.

[375] *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.

According to Dionysius, the next group of Greeks who settled in Italy were the Pelasgians— originally from Haemonias, or Thessaly.[376] The circumstances of their relocation[377] 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 1). When they came to Italy, some settled in the coastal regions while others moved to the land of the Aborigines, therefore fulfilling the Dodona oracle. The Aborigines welcomed the Pelasgians, and together they founded numerous ("mixed" identity) settlements.[378] The Pelasgians, however, were hardly the last of the Greeks to settle in Italy before 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

---

[376] 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]).
[377] *Ant. rom.* 1.17–21; 2.1.3.
[378] *Ant. rom.* 1.20.5. Dionysius (*Ant. rom.* 1.23–24) further reports how drought struck the Pelasgians because they failed to observe a human thanksgiving tithe, causing many to abandon their settlements (crisis 3).

under the leadership of Evander, son of Hermes and the nymph Themis. The then-ruler of the Aborigines, Faunus,[379] welcomed the settlers, 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.[380] 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, which stems from his Arcadian origins, divine parentage and guidance, and role in planting the colony.

The preceding waves of Greek settlements paved the way for those of mythical figures, Hercules 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 of his Greek force—and a small contingent of Trojan prisoners—planted communities near

---

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

[380] 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.

the ancient city, Pallantium.[381] 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,[382] ensuring the Hellenic foundations of Rome. The crisis which 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,[383] before leading them father west. Some Trojans settled in Sicily,[384] but Aeneas led others to Laurentum—where he planted a city named Lavinium.[385] The community contained a mixture of Trojans and natives (Aborigines). To promote unity, the inhabitants embraced a common identity as "Latins"[386] and

---

[381] *Ant. rom.* 1.34.1.

[382] *Ant. rom.* 1.61.1–2.

[383] *Ant. rom.* 1.50–51.

[384] *Ant. rom.* 1.51.2.

[385] *Ant. rom.* 1.59.3.

[386] *Ant. rom.* 1.45.1; 1.60.2.

combined “customs, laws, and religious ceremonies” (1.60.2 [Cary, LCL]). Years later, Ascanius, Aeneas’s son, along with some of Lavinium’s inhabitants founded a city farther inland which they named Alba.[387] Romulus was descended from these kings at Alba, and ultimately from Ascanius and his father. Indeed, the entirety of Dionysius’s prehistory—combining the Greek settlements of the Aborigines, Pelasgians, Evander’s Arcadians, Hercules’s men, and now Aeneas and his son—prepares for and legitimates Rome’s foundation.[388]

The divine support received by Aeneas and Ascanius functions in a similar way—to underwrite the founders’ claim to the land.[389] Dionysius reports a two-part prophesy 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 Erythrae[390]—when, after eating the parley or wheaten cakes they had spread their food

---

[387] *Ant. rom.* 1.66.

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

[389] 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]).

[390] *Ant. rom.* 1.55.4. According to 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.”

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.[391] 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.[392] 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 by encourages the impression—especially given Romulus’s own miraculous life and exploits—that divine forces are also behind the foundation of Rome.

[391] *Ant. rom.* 1.56.1–5.
[392] Ascanius acted “in pursuance of the oracle given to his father” (1.66.1 [Cary, LCL]).

4.3.4.2.2 Romulus the Founder

4.3.4.2.2.1 Romulus's miraculous birth. Romulus's story in each of the sources surveyed reads like an account of dynastic origins to some degree.[393] 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 Amulius appointed his brother's daughter— Rhea Silvia[394] or Ilia[395]—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.[396] She was forced to expose the newborns,[397] but

---

[393] See Timothy J. Cornell, "Gründer." *RAC* 12.
[394] Livy 1.3.11.
[395] 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])
[396] Plutarch mentions the first two possibilities (*Rom.* 14.2), Dionysius the latter two (1.77.1). Earlier Plutarch relates how the daughter of King Tarchetius (or her maid) was impregnated by a phantom phallus (2.3–6). Possibly this encounter is what Dionysius refers to when he relates an alternative account about a "divine visitation" (1.77.2). For his part Livy, without betraying complete credulity, emphasizes Mars's involvement in the conception (1.4.2).
[397] According to Dionysius, the twins were exposed in "an ark" (*Ant. rom.* 1.79.5 [Carey, LCL]).

miraculous events ensured that they survived into adulthood: A she-wolf suckled them,[398] and—according to Plutarch—a woodpecker fed them.[399] The woodpecker's reputation as a bird "sacred to Mars"[400] 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,[401] 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.[402] 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

---

[398] Dionysius relates an alternative rationalizing account in which Numitor substitutes other newborns for his grandsons and hands the latter over to Faustulus to raise. Not surprising given Dionysius's aims, 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 had earned the nickname "Lupa" from a promiscuous past (1.84).

[399] Plutarch, *Rom.* 4.2.

[400] Plutarch, *Rom.* 4.2.

[401] *Ant. rom.* 1.79.8.

[402] *Rom.* 7.1; cf. Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.84.

the accounts, moreover, hints at their acumen as leaders. They presided over a band of youths who conducted raiding, and managed to orchestrate the overthrow of Amulius, restoring the kingdom to his elder brother Numitor.[403] Indeed, Romulus and his brother's support of Numitor advances our authors' main storyline: Their objective achieved, the brothers leave Alba to found their own city.[404]

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

---

[403] 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 celebrating the Lupercalia-—an "Arcadian festival instituted by Evander" (*Ant. rom.* 1.79–80 [Carey, LCL]). Dionysius and Plutarch remark how Numitor sensed Remus's greatness: He "observed his nobility of spirit, which he preserved even in distress" (Dionysius 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 (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 which mitigates the regicide.

[404] 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.

4.3.4.2.2.2 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.[405] They did so to resolve a dispute threatening their colonial ambitions.[406] Livy reports that the brothers quarreled over who should give his name to the city and who should govern it.[407] Plutarch and Dionysius, though, identify the site of the colony as the focus of the disagreement.[408] According to Dionysius, the dispute sprung from the rivalry which the 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.

---

[405] 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 to resolve their dispute.

[406] 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 experienced in attempting to colonize (e.g., Herodotus 1.165–67; Thucydides 6.4.1–2; Pausanias 10.10.6); and the "strife" between the different groups banding together to colonize (e.g., Diodorus 12.9f; Strabo 6.1.14).

[407] 1.6.4.

[408] 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).

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.[409]

The result was that Remus saw six vultures, while Romulus saw twelve.[410] Plutarch’s comment on the significance of vultures reveals why this outcome won for Romulus the right to be the founder of the colony rather than his brother. 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

[409] 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 [Carey, LCL]).
[410] 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), equipped with the lituus used in divination (22.1–2).

Romulus's leadership.[411] Soon after Remus died,[412] and Romulus went on to plant the city of Rome.

4.3.4.2.2.2 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.[413] He also takes charge over the settlers, designating the city an asylum to incentivize settlement[414] and dividing the new inhabitants into curiae and knights.[415] Romulus also shaped the city's religious identity with a decidedly archaic emphasis. Livy relates, for instance, how the founder set the

---

[411] Dionysius claims, notwithstanding Romulus's deceptive claim about seeing twelve vultures, that god "was thus directing him" (*Ant. rom.* 1.85.3 [Cary, LCL]). 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" (8.7 [Perrin]).

[412] Remus was incensed over the outcome of the augury. Livy relates that he was killed in the battle which escalated from his angry words with Romulus (1.7.2–3). Plutarch reports that in Remus's leapt over Romulus's trench wall in anger and was killed by either 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 that arose between his partisans and those of his brother (*Ant. rom.* 1.871–3).

[413] 1.6.4.

[414] 1.8.5–7.

[415] 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.

boundaries for the temple of Jupiter Feretrius,[416] 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 Arcadian origins made them attractive and potent.[417] Finally, besides determining the city's religious characteristics, Romulus gave "rules of law" for its governance.[418] Due to this and his other founding acts, Romulus was credited with divinity by some.[419]

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 Greek colonization accounts, that Romulus was directed to do so by an oracle.[420] 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 . .

[416] 1.10.5–6.
[417] Cf. Scheer, "'They That Held Arcadia'."
[418] 1.8.1–3.
[419] 1.16.
[420] *Rom.* 9.3.

. sacred ordinances and writing, and taught them to him as in a religious rite."[421] 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 by 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.[422] 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.[423] 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

---

[421] *Rom.* 11.1.

[422] *Rom* 11.1–3.

[423] *Rom* 17.1.

colony in other ways: He created the senate to govern Rome[424] and established "mixed" institutions to ensure cooperation between the settlers and the Sabines from whom their wives were taken.[425] Romulus's laws ranged from marital relations to murder.[426] Overall, Plutarch's report leaves little doubt as to Romulus's supreme influence over the founding of Rome.[427] No wonder, then, that some revered the founder as a god following his disappearance.[428]

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.[429] Similarly, following the ritual plowing, the founder sacrificed the bull and cow

---

[424] *Rom* 13.1–6; cf. 20.1–3.
[425] *Rom* 21.1–5.
[426] *Rom* 22.1–4.
[427] Toward the end of his profile, Plutarch notes how Romulus changed his ruling ways to that of a monarch and then again to populism (*Rom* 26.1–2; 27.1–2).
[428] *Rom* 27.7–8; 28.1–4.
[429] *Ant. Rom.* 1.88.1–2.

and performed rites over many other victims.[430] Second, he helped determine the composition of the settlers, welcoming fugitives as participants in the colony[431] and (forcibly) choosing Sabine wives for his settlers.[432] Third, he supervised the planning of Rome's spaces. He oversaw the building of rampart, houses, and other public and private spaces.[433] When—with the Sabine King Tatius—he enlarged the city, he built further altars to neighboring gods invoked by the colony in its battles.[434]

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.[435] And he showed his *pietas* by consulting auspices to validate his rule.[436] Beneath him, he created a series of magistrates such as senators, members of a gerousia-like council, and celeres.[437] He also set in place laws and customs to govern Roman society. These were devised, in large part, to maintain order;[438] one way in which they did so

---

[430] *Ant. rom.* 1.88.2.

[431] *Ant. rom.* 2.15.2–3.

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

[433] *Ant. rom.* 2.3.1.

[434] *Ant. rom.* 2.50.

[435] *Ant. rom.* 2.3–4.

[436] *Ant. rom.* 2.5.1–2.

[437] *Ant. rom.* 2.12–13.

[438] *Ant. rom.* 2.9.1.

was by formalizing the difference in status between members of Rome. According to Dionysius, the patronage system—which extended to inhabitants in Roman colonies[439]—was an expression of this process, which "incentivized good deeds."[440] 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.[441] 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, rendered his divine support unquestionable.[442]

2.4 Conclusions

Our foregoing discussion has demonstrated that concern for origins, divine sanction, and the role of founder(s) pervade narratives about colonization in the ancient Mediterranean world—up to and including the foundation of Rome. This is the case even though the specific articulation of these preoccupations varies as a function

---

[439] *Ant. rom.* 2.11.1.

[440] *Ant. rom.* 2.10.4.

[441] *Ant. rom.* 2.22.

[442] *Ant. rom.* 2.56.6–7.

of the historical era and the interests and/or proclivities of individual authors. In the following chapters, I argue that Acts of the Apostles may also be read as a colonizing narrative. Not only does it treat a comparable subject matter, it also utilizes the motifs outlined above to do so. Such affinity is natural: Like colonization accounts, Acts seeks to legitimate the foundation of (Christian) communities throughout the ancient Mediterranean world.

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 depicted in various accounts, both Greek and Roman. I now turn to the next stage of my argument. In what follows I contend that analyzing Acts as a colonizing narrative illuminates the work's structure and recurring motifs. Here, I test my hypothesis on Acts 1–5. Set in Jerusalem, these chapters function as both a colonizing narrative in their own right, as well as the "origins" portion of a longer such narrative that traces the replication of the mother community in places like Antioch of Syria (Acts 11:19–30; 13:1–3; 15:1–35)[443] and Antioch of Pisidia (13:13–52).[444] Acts 1–2 portrays the founder(s), Jerusalem origins, and above all divine sanction of the "colonizing" community.[445] Acts 3–5, then, reports on the founding acts of the apostles in Jerusalem and the "institutions" of the community planted there.

---

[443] See chapter 4.
[444] See chapter 5.
[445] For the prevalence of these concerns (origins, founders, and divine sanction) in colonization accounts, see the previous chapter.

3.1 The Community's Founder(s), Origins, and Divine Mandate (Acts 1–2)[446]

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.[447] Reports of Jesus's post-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).[448] Luke's post-ascension depiction of the community also reaffirms its irrevocable connection with 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

---

[446] Chapter 1 relates the founder's words of farewell and his ascension (1:1–11) before depicting the early apostolic community, particularly its replenishment in the aftermath of 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).
[447] The ending of the prologue 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 "[g]enuinely new material begins in v. 15," Pervo identifies verse 14 as the conclusion to the prologue (34).
[448] The cult community's expansion and replication begins after the ascension of its founder. 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.

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.[449]

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 Ἰακὼβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (1:32–3). 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), and after Jesus reads from the Isaiah scroll in the Nazareth synagogue, he himself announces his calling (4:16–21).

Of course, the founder is appointed for a task[450]—and this is true of Jesus. He is chosen so that he might usher in God's salvation. Zechariah's prophecy expresses this

---

[449] Luke 6:12; 19:46; 22:45.

[450] 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.

ardent expectation: Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι . . . ἤγειρεν κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυὶδ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ (1:68–69).[451] And other voices echo that of the aged priest. The angels appearing to the shepherds announce that ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον σωτὴρ ὅς ἐστιν χριστὸς κύριος (2:11). And Simeon, when presented with Jesus at the temple, exclaimed to the Lord, εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου (2:30). Luke's gospel from this point on develops this theme. Jesus's exorcisms and acts of healing symbolize God's salvation, while his teaching articulates its different dimensions. The people's reaction to Jesus is a reaction to God's salvation, whether acceptance resulting in eternal life or rejection—culminating in Jesus's crucifixion—resulting in condemnation.[452]

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 new community, or rather the restoration of one. Once again, the early chapters of Luke are key in alerting us to this concern. We have already noted the angel's declaration to

[451] In chapter 5 we discuss how Luke's Paul draws on Davidic traditions while proclaiming the savior Jesus in his synagogue exhortation at Antioch of Pisidia (13:22–23, 32–37).
[452] 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.

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 announced that the redemption of God's people was at hand (1:68), a view shared by the prophetess Anna, who ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς προσδεχομένοις λύτρωσιν Ἰερουσαλήμ (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,[453] 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 sought to (re)create a community from Israel. Jesus's followers, indeed, continued to rely on this hope, or at least their understanding of it (Luke 24:21; Acts 1:6). What they did not fully realize up until the oracle in Acts 1:8 was that the founder's openness to non-Jews,[454] far from being an anomaly, presaged a more robust ministry to gentiles following his ascension. This ministry initiated the creation of the restored community, which was to comprise both Jews and gentiles.

---

[453] 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.

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

Thus, Luke's introduction in Acts portrays Jesus as the founder whose authority and practices define the identity of the community following in his wake.[455] 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).[456] Further, it was necessary to replenish their number following Judas's betrayal (1:15–26) not merely because it was foretold by the Psalms (v. 20), but more critically because their twelvefold leadership was the manner of "governance" established by Jesus.[457] In reconstituting the Twelve, the narrative thus reaffirms the continuity between the post-resurrection leadership—and the community it oversees—and the founder Jesus, who was responsible for the original appointments.[458]

---

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

[456] 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.

[457] 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.

[458] Luke 6:12–16. Recall from chapter 2 how the determination of "customs" (*nomima)* such as leadership institutions served as one way new communities announced their putative origins.

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 reserves the role of founder for Jesus in Luke–Acts.[459] 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 most accounts, indeed, credit lone individuals with such feats, many reports or narratives mention the leadership of multiple figures,[460] whether operating in a parallel or

[459] Balch, "ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ," 139–88.

[460] See chapter 2. Examples: Ascragas 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 Democlides and ten *oikistae* (*IG* 1[3] 46); Cararina was founded by Dascon and Menecolus (Thucydides 6.5.2–3); Cumae was founded by Megasthenes of Chalcis and Hippokles 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); Heraclae 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.

hierarchical capacity. The apostles are certainly not Jesus's equal since it is his cult and 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.[461] 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 replaced Judas (λαβεῖν τὸν τόπον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς [1:25]) had to 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, as we shall see below. In other words, what we witness in this first chapter, especially in the verses 1–11, is Jesus transferring to the apostles his responsibilities as founder.

[461] I would include Paul and, to a lesser extent, the Hellenists in the latter category.

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,[462] prior to the community's replication in other locations within and outside of Judea. This manner of presentation yields the impression that Jerusalem is, in effect, the mother city of the subsequent founded communities (akin to *apoikia),* an impression strengthened by the declarations of the Jerusalem leadership—meant to be binding on other communities—as well as the narrative's penchant for circling back to the city.[463] With these features Luke signals the preeminent importance of the mother city.

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

[462] Jerusalem remains the primary setting from 1:1–7:60.

[463] 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, founding figure of gentile Christian communities, relegated an important status to the city. 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 even in the face of certain arrest (19:21; 20:16; 21:13); he retraced before Agrippa 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, he is careful to note before the Jewish leaders in Rome that he had been transported there from Jerusalem (28:17).

not only to narrate the cult community's replication outside Judea,[464] but also to portray the cult as the legitimate fulfillment of Judaism. Foregrounding the community's origins in Jerusalem helps accomplish both tasks.[465] 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 map[466] that was reserved for Delphi by many in the ancient Greek world.[467] Acts reveals something of this geographical sensibility since the Christian cult spreads outward from Jerusalem.

The comparison with Delphi is apropos in a further way. Jerusalem, for Luke, functions as the appropriate setting for the unveiling of the divine will, much as Delphi was for 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

---

[464] See Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition;* idem, "'Opening the Scriptures'," 199–217.
[465] Indeed, in Luke's gospel Jesus resolutely set his sights on the city as his crucifixion loomed (Luke 13:22; 19:28).
[466] Cf. Alexander, "Narrative Maps," 97–132.
[467] 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).

πατρός (1:4).[468] 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), which sheds light on how Jerusalem functions as both mother city and cult center: It serves as a symbol of God's past faithfulness as well as his future plans.[469] Jesus articulates the cult's expansion at Jerusalem, much like the *Pythia* at Delphi communicated authorization for 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.[470] Pervo, offering examples from

---

[468] Cf. Luke 24.49, which also refers the Holy Spirit as a "promise," associates it with the "father," and identifies its reception 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. Contrast Mark 16:7, where the disciples are told to go to Galilee. See Pervo, *Acts,* 34, on the relationship between Luke 24 and Acts 1.

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

[470] I demonstrated in the previous chapter 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 Cyrnos (Herodotus 1.165–67).

novelistic literature, describes 1:8 as an "introductory oracle."[471] I suggest that oracles of colonization offer another illuminating 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).[472]

This brings us to the first of several ways in which Luke emphasizes that Jesus's words in 1:4–8 do indeed carry the force of divine sanction. He presents the Holy Spirit as an enabling force. This active, personal role of the Holy Spirit is a recurring motif throughout 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 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, akin to how he contextualized the apostles' leadership, Luke associates the

---

[471] Pervo, *Acts,* 43.

[472] 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.

Holy Spirit with Jesus's ministry.[473] He first announces this connection in 1:2, when summarizing Jesus's final instruction to the apostles,[474] before elaborating on its importance for the upcoming venture: The Spirit will empower the founding figures to be μάρτυρες to *the* founder (1:8).[475]

Third, like some oracular responses about colonization,[476] Jesus provides geographical clues to guide the mission.[477] 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 chapters 2–7 make plain. The Jesus followers begin to replicate the

---

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

[474] Luke reports that these instructions were communicated δὶα πνεύματος (1:2).

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

[476] See chapter 2. Note particularly the accounts about the founding of Croton (Diodorus 8.17; Strabo 6.1.12), Cyrene (Herodotus 154–61), 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).

[477] 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.

community throughout Judea and Samaria in chapters 8–11,[478] and then in other parts of the inhabited world in chapters 13–26.[479]

Luke highlights the divine basis for the community's expansion in at least one other way—by presenting it as an unexpected mandate. His presentation of the apostles' expectation nurtures this impression, which resembles the "surprised *oikist*" motif in colonization accounts.[480] Their hope is at variance with the oracle's pronouncement. The founder had remarked on the imminent arrival of the Holy Spirit, and the apostles responded by eagerly inquiring εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν Βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραήλ (1:6).[481] In response, Luke seems to juxtapose a parochial concern for Israel alone with God's plan for universal blessing.[482] He uses a μὲν/δέ construction to contrast the disciples' expectation with proper deference to the father's authority and timetable (1:6–7); with ἀλλά he then redirects attention to the

---

[478] 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.
[479] The narrative returns to Jerusalem in Acts 9, 11–12, 15, 21–23.
[480] See chapter 2. Note particularly accounts about the founding of Croton (Diodorus 8.17; Strabo 6.1.12) and Cyrene (Herodotus 154–61).
[481] Cf. Luke 24:21.
[482] 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.

universal mandate. Founding figures will also be surprised by the divine will elsewhere in Acts.[483] But the initial articulation of this mandate is the most significant: 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.

3.1.3.2.1 Divine Orchestration

Again, Luke stresses the divine orchestration determining the events in Jerusalem, claiming supernatural support for what opponents might judge to be unacceptable innovation within Judaism.[484] Several features of the narrative reinforce

---

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

[484] 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

this impression, beginning with the festal setting of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Pentecost recalls biblical and extra-biblical traditions,[485] beginning with Exodus, where the narrative depicts God as instituting the feast. It was originally an agricultural-based festival but later took on other significance. Jubilees, which connects Pentecost to the time Noah, links the festival to covenant renewal.[486] Other Second Temple and even later rabbinic traditions correlate Pentecost with the giving of law at Sinai.[487] It is hard to ascertain which if any of these associations 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 chose this festal setting as congenial for

---

of the Evidence for the Role of 'Founder-Figures' in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. A Review Essay," *R&T* 20 (2013): 295–96.

[485] 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.

[486] 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," 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 in Joel. Luke's quotation of Isaiah 53:7–8a—but not 8b!—in Acts 8:32–33 also comes to mind.

[487] E.g., 1 QS 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. A. J. 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."

showcasing the intervention of God, while also providing a plausible occasion for the pilgrimage of diaspora residents to 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" (ἤχος) from heaven similar to a "mighty rushing wind" (πνοῆς), which was then followed by the dispersal of "divided tongues as of fire" (διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσει πυρός) upon those present. Several of the terms employed in this description (ἤχος, πνοῆς, πυρός) appear throughout the LXX in association with the intervention of God at critical junctures in Jewish history.[488] 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, he like Luke brings together auditory and visual phenomena, mentioning a "voice from out of the fire" (φωνὴ . . . ἐκ μέσου τοῦ ῥυέντος) and articulate "language" (διάλεκτον).[489] Once again Luke's dependence on any one of the cited parallels cannot

---

[488] Pervo, *Acts,* 61, n. 20, identifies Isaiah 66:15, 18 as an intertext.

[489] 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.

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.[490] 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.[491] Here, the physical manifestation of deity through the filling of the Holy Spirit (ἐπήσθησαν . . . πνεύματος ἁγίου) recalls prophetic traditions relating to God's future bestowal of his Spirit,[492] including the universal overtones that pervade such traditions. More to the point, in the thought

---

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

[491] See footnote 23 above.

[492] See, for example, Isaiah 44 and Ezekiel 36–37. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 246, characterizes the Lucan Jesus as a "relay" of the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Old Testament.

world of Acts it represents God's manner of precipitating and guiding events.[493] Indeed, what follows establishes the pattern for such divine initiation: When filled with the Spirit, the cult community ἤρξατο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις (v. 4).[494] 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 the story into one about spontaneous speech in a foreign language, or xenoglossy.[495] This much is clear: The coupling of the Spirit's empowerment[496] 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.[497]

---

[493] See e.g., 16:6, 7.
[494] The bewildered diaspora-born Jews relate the content of this proclamation: τὰ μεγαλεῖα θεοῦ (2:11).
[495] 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, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2004), 25–30.
[496] 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.
[497] Cf. 2:33.

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

From 2:5 on the narrative elaborates on the effects of the Spirit's outpouring.[498] Luke telegraphs the far-reaching impact of this event through his focus, particularly in 2:5–13, on the Jews who witness the xenoglossia.[499] 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 symbolic more than prescriptive (see below), signaling 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 Jews "dwelling" in Jerusalem (εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ κατοικοῦντες).[500] But he is just as adamant about the

---

[498] First, in 2:5–13 Luke describes the audience; 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 ἐκείνῃ ψυχαὶ ὡσεὶ τρισχίλιαι.
[499] 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.
[500] Cf. Pervo, *Acts,* 65.

universal complexion of the audience. Luke's confusing use of κατοικέω (2:5, 9, 14) precludes an unqualified judgement 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.[501] Either way, in Luke's depiction they seem to embody the diaspora. 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).[502] Indeed, this list offers the most striking proof that the events in chapter 2 initiate the expansion of the community in Jerusalem while also forecasting its replication in regions far and wide.

---

[501] 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, way 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.

[502] 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.

Before discussing the list's function, it will be beneficial to describe its contents and theories about its background. *Prima facie* the list possesses an intelligible structure.[503] Nominative nouns describing peoples in verses 9a (Πάρθοι καὶ Μῆδοι καὶ Ελαμῖται) and 11 (Κρῆτες καὶ Ἄραβες) bracket place references, which are introduced by substantival participles (οἱ κατοικοῦντες . . . [9b]; οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες . . . [10b]). Moreover, the geographical movement of the list is for the most part circular—moving east to west before rounding back to Arabia in the east.[504]

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 more contemporary ones like those of the Parthians and Romans (2:9, 10). However, closer examination reveals that interest in these "ancient" kingdoms was not anomalous. Curtius Rufus and Augustus, for example, pair the Medes with the Parthians in their respective works. The

---

[503] 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.

[504] 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).

former identifies them as two of the powers vanquished by Alexander the Great.[505] The latter, in the *Res Gestae,*[506] declares how Parthian and Median kings (in this order, the same as in Acts 2:9) sent supplications to him, and how subsequently he appointed kings for the nations, an act which certified their client status.[507] Perhaps just as remarkable, the Talmud mentions both the Median and Elamite peoples and their languages.[508] These comparanda demonstrate that Luke's own mention of the Medes and Elamites is not unprecedented. But they do not reveal why Luke included them in his list. After all, the inclusion of these kingdoms/peoples, as well as the exclusion of Macedonia and Greece, does not reflect the geographical horizon of Acts.[509] How then are we to understand the list?

Almost certainly the list is representative. But what is its background, and further, what does it represent? Weinstock suggests that astrological speculation in the

---

[505] *Curt.* 6.3.3. Technically, the claim is anachronistic since the Parthian Empire existed as such from 247 BCE–224 CE.
[506] For more on the *Res Gestae,* particularly its placement and function in Antioch of Pisidia, see chapter 5.
[507] *Res Gestae* 32–33.
[508] See, for example, bSabb. 115a; bMeg 18a.
[509] Gilbert, "The List of Nations in Acts 2," 500–501, n. 13.

Persian period helps explain the list's origins.[510] On this reading the original list would have featured twelve nations, each keyed to a specific zodiacal sign.[511] 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 finds a number of parallels that offer support for his hypothesis about the background of such lists generally. Differences in the Acts 2 list are attributable not only to shifting trends in zodiacal speculation, but also changes in geo-political hegemony due to contemporary events. Therefore, per Weinstock's view the list represents the major powers of the world, considered from a cosmic perspective.

James C. Scott recognizes the universal dimensions of the list but looks to biblical traditions as its milieu. He argues that the impact of the Holy Spirit's outpouring upon Jewish pilgrims signals the restoration of Israel, and through this

---

[510] Stefan Weinstock, "The Geographical Catalogue in Acts II, 9-11," *JRS* 38 (1948): 43–46. Cf., Franz Cumont, "La plus ancienne géographic 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.

[511] 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.

anticipates the mission to the gentiles. He appeals to the correlation between Pentecost and covenant renewal in Jubilees, which he considers an important source for Luke,[512] as well as prophetic traditions linking renewal to the bestowal of God's Spirit.[513] Given that the Jews introduced in verse 5 have come to Jerusalem as pilgrims for the festival,[514] this leaves us with an account of the ingathering and restoration of Israel in fulfillment of God's promises.[515] Yet this is only part of the story. Since scriptures such as Isaiah 49:6 also inform the author's outlook,[516] the episode possesses broader implications. Israel's restoration carries with it an obligation:[517] to renew the mission to the nations.[518]

---

[512] Scott, "Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations," 99–104.
[513] Ibid., 105–6. In particular, he cites Isa 11:1–9, 40; Ezek 36:26–27, 37.
[514] 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).
[515] Ibid., 107.
[516] Indeed, Paul's citation of this verse in Acts 13:47 confirms its significance for Luke. Cf. ibid., 109.
[517] Ibid., 107. Scott points to evidence of this perspective in Luke's gospel. He references the evangelist's genealogy of Jesus (Luke 3:23–8)—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).
[518] Ibid., 108–10.

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."[519] 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 evokes Genesis 10 as well as other dependent traditions.[520] 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, which he takes as evidence that Luke is working within the Table of Nations framework.[521] Luke's purpose in incorporating the list in his account of Pentecost is to signal the ingathering of the Jews from among the nations. The xenoglossia reverses the curse of Babel (Gen 11)[522]—after a certain fashion[523]—restoring a harmonious

---

[519] Ibid., 113.
[520] 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).
[521] Ibid., 118–19, n. 124.
[522] Indeed, συγχέω several verses earlier (2:6) recalls Gen 11:7, 9. Cf. Pervo, *Acts,* 61.
[523] 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 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.

universalism. At the same time, the *pars pro toto* list conveys a geographical expansiveness that looks forward to the gentile mission,[524] which flows from the "mission in Jerusalem"[525] and occupies much of Acts beginning in chapter 10.

Gary Gilbert considers the Roman imperial background more salient for understanding Luke's list.[526] Not only was this Luke's own context, but it was one which gave rise to varied attempts at mapping the inhabited world, including Pompey's statue of the nations,[527] Agrippa's map, the Prima Porta statue of Augustus's breastplate, and Augustus's *Res Gestae.*[528] Through such maps and lists rulers projected claims over various territories. Similarly, Luke inserted such a list into his own narrative to assert the universal reach of Jesus's authority.[529] Gilbert insists that the universal themes

---

[524] Scott, "Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations," 118–19, cites Hippolytus's list (*Diamerismos*) as an analogue.
[525] Ibid., 122.
[526] Gary Gilbert, "The List of Nations in Acts 2," 497–529.
[527] 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."
[528] 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.* 1.278-79), Pliny's description of the achievements of Pompey (*Nat. Hist.* 7.98), and Herod's theater inscription (Josephus, *A.J.* 15.272).
[529] Gilbert, "The List of Nations in Acts 2," 508–9. He notes Tertullian's interpretation of Acts 2:9–11, which makes just this argument.

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."[530]

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.[531] Building on the complex began during the reign of Tiberius and was completed under that of Nero.[532] There, "two portico-like buildings" featured "a total of 190 reliefs" across the façade in the upper two of their three-storeys.[533] R. R. R. Smith argues convincingly that the program symbolizes the expansive reach of the Roman Empire. The south portico does so through a scheme which pairs "emperors and gods above,

---

[530] Ibid., 527.
[531] 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).
[532] Smith, "*Simulacra Gentium.*"
[533] Ibid., 51.

Greek mythology below"; the north—our focus—through allegories above and *ethne* below.[534] Heterogeneity distinguished the fifty *ethne*.[535] Thirteen statue bases clearly identity foreign peoples and three specify islands (Sicily, Crete, Cyprus).[536] The surviving statue reliefs, for their part, display "a range of subtle differences of character and degree of civilization."[537] For example, the "bared breast and the gesture of the crossed arms" of one figure signals a conquered *ethnos*—perhaps the Dacians[538]—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.[539] Why such representation? Smith suggests that the

[534] 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.

[535] They are heterogeneous with respect both to their "character and status" (Ibid., 58).

[536] 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).

[537] Ibid., 60.

[538] Ibid., 63.

[539] 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).

planners chose their figures due their "impressive unfamiliarity"[540] in order to make a resounding claim: the boundaries of Rome's empire "was coterminous with the ends of the earth."[541] 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.[542] 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.*[543]

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,

---

[540] For example, *Ethnous Besson; Ethnous Bosporon; Ethnous Dakon; Ethnous Iapodon; Ethnous Ioudaion; Ethnous Pirouston.*

[541] Ibid., 77.

[542] Cf. Acts 14:15–17.

[543] The anachronism therefore projects this claim on a temporal as well as spatial level.

conveying claims about territories conquered or otherwise possessed.[544] Luke's list operates in a similar if less clear-cut way to forecast the "colonizing" advance of the Jesus followers.

Of course, neither Jews nor Christians were in a position in the Hellenistic and Roman periods to 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,[545] presenting them as cultural benefactions.[546] Arguing on the basis of one's ancestor came with an upside: One could be more explicit about universal influence without directly challenging contemporary political systems and/or rulers. Josephus, for example, employs the language and concepts of colonization but associates them with Abraham. He describes how the father of the

---

[544] 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.

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

[546] 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).

Jews desired to "make colonies" (ἀποικιῶν) of his sons and grandsons,[547] one result of which was the establishment of Africa.[548] Josephus's implied point is that Jews wield influence in the inhabited world as a result of the colonizing activity of their ancestor, Abraham.

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 on their embeddedness within the Roman Empire.[549] Resembling Acts 2, the Alexandrian delineates a list of nations populated, in part, by Jewish communities.[550] It is true, the

---

[547] 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; 1.227–87; cf. *A.J.* 2.205–3.213; Philo, *Mos.* 1.34–163. Cf. Artapanus 3.27.16; Pseudo-Eupolemus; Theodotus). See the discussion below.

[548] *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).

[549] 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."

[550] 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

nations listed do not correspond all that closely with those enumerated by Luke.[551] 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 this connectivity: Jerusalem is the "mother city" through which imperial favor radiates to "colonies" of Jews, which are embedded within the various nations comprising the inhabited world.[552]

While Luke does not operate with the same explicit use of "colony" language, he assumes similarly close relationships between the three entities. Events in the mother city, Jerusalem, are consequential for Jews associated with other lands—as represented

---

of the islands Euboea, Cyprus, Crete . . . [not to mention] the countries beyond the Euphrates [e.g., Babylon]" (*Legat.* 281–82 [Colson, LCL]).

[551] 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."

[552] 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 Berosus, he refers to Jews placed as colonies (κατοικίας) in Babylon during their exile.

by Luke's list. These Jews represent "colonies" of sorts 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 by depicting 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 good will which radiates to the colonies. Rather, as later events demonstrate, it is the Jesus cult which spreads across the empire from its Jerusalem origin, often launching from Jewish "colonies" embedded within prominent islands or cities such as Antioch of Syria, Cyprus, Antioch of Pisidia, Thessalonica, Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome. This expansion produces new "colonies" of Jesus followers across the empire.

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

Peter's speech[553] articulates the significance of the Holy Spirit's outpouring and the gift of tongues, particularly to the colonizing mission authorized in 1:8.[554] 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.[555] He draws generously on scripture (particularly Joel 3,[556] Psalms 15,[557] and Psalms 110[558]) to show that God's hand lies behind the events of Pentecost,[559] 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

---

[553] Peter directs his words to ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἰερουσαλήμ (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.

[554] 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' cognizance of the language miracle (vv. 7–8, 12).

[555] 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).

[556] Acts 2:17–21.

[557] Acts 2:25–28.

[558] Acts 2:34–35.

[559] 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.

Holy Spirit (2:33),[560] setting into motion the colonizing mission that acts as the community's *raison d'etre* 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).[561] Moreover, while at first glance the crescendo flowing from the inverted pesherite exegesis[562] in verses 22–35—"God has made him both Lord and Christ" (2:36)—seems to have a Jewish audience in mind,[563] Peter's succeeding remarks demonstrate that he envisions a broader audience: Salvation[564] 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

---

[560] 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."
[561] Luke implicitly transfers the judgment of gentiles announced by Joel (cf. Joel 3:4–15) to those Jews who reject Jesus (2:36; 40).
[562] See Pervo, *Acts,* 79, n. 40.
[563] Πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ [2:36a] . . . ὑμῖν . . . καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν [2:39a].
[564] The reference to the Holy Spirit here in 2:38 links the passage back to the initial Joel citation (cf. 2:33).

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, who act as his representatives. (In the next few chapters we observe how their activities closely resemble those of Jesus himself.) 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 by portraying them as a legitimate fulfillment of Judaism. Meanwhile, Jesus’s oracle introduces the “colonizing” mandate. It, along with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2, signal divine sanction for a venture depicted as universal in scope.

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

If Acts 1–2 depicts divine initiation of the colonizing mission, what follows in 3–5 is Luke's narration of its success in Jerusalem, the mother city.[565] Based on the previous chapter's discussion, we are conditioned to expect answers to two specific questions related to the apostles' fulfillment of their mandate in 1:8—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

[565] There are various ways of organizing the narrative which runs up through 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.

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 governance and laws. 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.[566] 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.

---

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

Both Josephus and Philo, for example, portray Moses in ways resembling a founder.[567] Josephus employs the concepts—if not the technical terminology—of colonization in his account.[568] Most critical for Moses's legitimacy was his divine appointment.[569] Josephus hints at this when he relates how an Egyptian sacred scribe foretold Moses's birth and his liberation of the Israelites.[570] 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.[571] But Moses's responsibilities did not end here: He also designed the government (πολιτείαν) and laws (νόμους) for the liberated community.[572] The Moses of Josephus's account, therefore, resembles colony founders in two primary respects: First, he is divinely appointed to lead the community, and second, he shapes its identity through his civic determinations.

---

[567] Cf. Hanges, *Paul, Founder of Churches,* 105–29.
[568] *A.J.* 2.205–349.
[569] Josephus also embellishes Moses's personal character to burnish his credentials, especially his virtue, wisdom, and understanding. See *A.J.* 2.205; 2.228-30. Cf. Acts 7:22; Sterling, "'Opening the Scriptures,'" 199–217.
[570] *A.J.* 2.205.
[571] *A.J.* 2.268.
[572] *A.J.* 3.213.

Philo's treatment of Moses is even more blatant in its adoption of colonization motifs.[573] This is especially apparent in his account of the burning bush.[574] The voice spoke to him διὰ χρησμῶν[575] and announced how he would be the ἡγεμόνα[576] ἀποικίας[577] sent out from Egypt.[578] (Philo elsewhere relates how Moses led out the ἀποικίαν to "Phoenicia, and Coelesyria and Palestine, then called the land of the Canaanites" [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.[579] In sum, while Philo does not

---

[573] 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 ἀρχηγετῶν—"the founders of the nation" (*Mos.* 1.34).

[574] 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]).

[575] Cf. *Mos.* 1.73; 1.86; 1.173; and 1.264–99 (with respect to the mantic arts of Balaam).

[576] 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).

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

[578] *Mos.* 1.71.

[579] *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

focus on the foundation of a city per se, he employs the terminology and motifs of colonization: Moses acts on a divine commission, leading out an *apoikia* and establishing its laws and hence identity.

Several other accounts do associate Moses with the foundation of a city, Jerusalem.[580] According to Manetho,[581] Moses was not responsible for planting the city, but did lead a second wave of settlers out of Egypt to Jerusalem.[582] These settlers, diseased individuals, were brought together by the priest Osarsiph, who later changed his name to Moses and laid down new laws for the community.[583]

---

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 [ἅπασαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀπὸ περάτων ἐπὶ πέρατα]" (*Mos.* 2.20 [Colson, LCL]).

[580] 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.

[581] Josephus rehearses what he perceives as the error-riven account of Manetho while defending the antiquity of the Jewish people (*C. Ap.* 1.227–87; cf. 1.73–92). See Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 1:62–86.

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

[583] *C. Ap.* 1.250. Josephus agrees with Manetho's portrait of Moses as lawgiver, though not with much else.

Diodorus describes Moses's role in the foundation of Jerusalem in two fragmentary sections.[584] In the first he depicts the settlers as "impious" people, driven out of Egypt due to their "leprous marks."[585] Banished from Egypt, the refugees organized themselves as τὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος and formalized outlandish νόμιμα.[586] He acknowledges Moses as τοῦ κτίσαντος τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα[587] 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," which reserves a major role for Moses, who shapes the city's identity by fixing its customs.

Diodorus's second account, probably derived from Hecataeus of Abdera, adopts a less derisive tone.[588] He sets out to give an account of the τήν τε τοῦ ἔθνους τούτου . . . κτίσιν as well as τὰ παῤ αὐτοῖς . . . νόμιμα (40.3.1).[589] Here, too, he relates how the

---

[584] Diodorus places part of the narrative on the lips of the advisors of King Antiochus, who is "laying siege to Jerusalem" (34/35.1 [Walton, LCL]).
[585] See Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism,* 1:181–84.
[586] Diodorus 34/35.1.2.
[587] Diodorus 34/35.1.3 (cf. 34/35.1.4).
[588] 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.
[589] Hecataeus omits geographical description thus abridging a pattern of Greek ethnographic reporting. See Bar-Kochva, *The Image of the Jews,* 96.

Egyptians drove out Moses and his followers, blaming their disruptive rites and sacrifices for bringing pestilence upon the nation.[590] Hecataeus "telescoped all his info [about the Jews from Egypt] into one generation, concentrating everything around the personality of Moses."[591] Moses was the leader of the colony (τῆς ἀποικίας), founded (ἔκτισε) Jerusalem and other cities,[592] and assumed the position of lawgiver (ὁ νομοθέτης). As lawgiver, he established all sorts of provisions germane to governance, religion, military defense, and land distribution in the colony.[593] Diodorus's second report is more neutral in its attitude about the Jews. However, both accounts draw on colonization terminology and concepts to describe how Moses participated in founding and fixing the customs of Jerusalem.

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

590 Diodorus 40.3.1.
591 Bar-Kochva, *The Image of the Jews,* 120.
592 Diodorus 40.3.3.
593 Moses established (ἱδρύσατο) 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.

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 compare Luke's depiction of the apostles' actions in Jerusalem and the way of life, or "institutions," of the community founded there.

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, χρησμός, and ἀποικία). However, both groups of figures are set apart for their role by divine appointment,[594] Moses via the burning bush and the apostles—acting in the special capacity as "witnesses"—via the oracle of the risen Jesus.[595] 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 argue below.

---

[594] It is not surprising that Manetho and Diodorus do not stress Moses's divine sanction, given the hostile tenor of their accounts.

[595] Cf. Acts 1:6–26.

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.[596] 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 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),[597] 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

---

[596] See 3:10–11; 4:4, 16–17, 21; 5:12–16.

[597] 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 C. 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).

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.[598] But this is no less typical than founders in many other colonization accounts.[599] And setting a trend followed in subsequent chapters,[600] the challenges, ironically, facilitate the founding figures' success[601]—leading to the successful establishment of the community of Jesus followers in Jerusalem.[602]

---

[598] 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 Pisidea (13:13–52), Iconium (14:1–7), Lystra (14:19–20), Philippi (16:16–24), Thessalonica (17:1–9), Beraea (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).

[599] See, for example, accounts concerning the foundation of Abdera (Pindar, *Paean 2;* Herodotus 1.168; Plutarch, *Mor.* 96b); Amphipolis (Thucydides 1.100.3; 4.102–8; 5.11); Arcadia/Tegea (Herodotus 1.66); Camarina (Thucydides 6.5.2–3); Croton (Diodorus 8.17; Strabo 6.1.12); Cyrene (Herodotus 4.150–61); Cyrnos (Herodotus 1.165–67); 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).

[600] See, e.g., Acts 8:1, 4; 11:19–20.

[601] 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.

[602] 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,[603] whereas the depictions of Moses by in 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 also emphasizes the role of the apostles within the second summary itself,[604] specifically

---

[603] 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 her origins—real or purported. See chapter 2 as well as the discussion further below.

[604] 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).

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 will 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 and 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;[605] through these activities they plant the community of Jesus followers in Jerusalem. Together the miracles and proclamation explicate God's saving purposes interpreted as taking effect through Jesus the founder.

---

[605] 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; 15:41; 16:5; 18:23), "encourage" (16:40; 20:1–2), and appoint leaders (14:23) for the various communities.

The symbiotic relationship between act and speech is especially apparent in the events of Acts 3–4.[606] Peter's healing of the cripple (3:1–10)[607] 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).[608] Attentive readers will have deduced from Peter's speech in Acts 2 that this name is to be 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

[606] 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), affording the apostles yet another opportunity to expound their divine mandate (4:8–22).
[607] 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," *PRS* 11 (1984): 204. Paul Walaskay, "Acts 3:1–10," *Int* 42 (1988): 172, notes the vestiges of ancient magic in the healing episode—specificially, the "use of divine names, the intense gaze of the magus, the power of the touch."
[608] The reference to "silver and gold" evokes the stereotype of the avaricious and duplicitous miracle worker, which Luke juxtaposes to the apostles, who are preoccupied entirely with their divine mandate. Cf. Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 30. Pervo, *Acts,* 100.

the socially marginalized,[609] as suggested by the healed man's accompaniment of the apostles into the temple (3:8).[610]

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 σῴζειν," which relates the "saving" of the cripple (4:9) to the salvation afforded through Jesus (4:12).[611] 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),[612] whom God had designated—through resurrection/exaltation (3:13; cf.

---

[609] 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, TX: 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).
[610] 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.
[611] Hamm, "Acts 3:12–26," 200.
[612] William S. Kurz, "Acts 3:19–26 as a Test of the Role of Eschatology in Lukan Christology," *SBLSP* 11 (Missoula, MT: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1977), 311–12.

5:30–31)—as the ἀρχηγὸν[613] τῆς ζωῆς (3:15).[614] (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).[615] 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 associated act[616] emphasize the divine sanction undergirding the message of hope concerning a restored

---

[613] 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 *nāśî* 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."

[614] Hamm, "Acts 3:12–26," 202, writes, evocatively, of how Luke characterizes the Jews' "choice" of Barabbas instead of Jesus as choice of "death over life."

[615] 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.

[616] Walaskay, "Acts 3:1–10," 171–75, maintains 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).

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"[617] 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 there. Besides evoking a place of philosophical discourse,[618] Solomon's Portico (5:12) recalls the speech in 3:11–26, which also 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,[619] 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. The apostles themselves explicate this connection between the miracle of healing and the message of salvation in their defense before the religious leaders. On

[617] Luke represents these as the work of the apostles collectively.
[618] Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles,* trans. and ed. Bernard Nobel et al. (Westminster Press, 1971), 245.
[619] The ὥστε in 5:15 suggests that reception of healing presupposes the acceptance of the apostles as divine emissaries.

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 how 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 their 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;[620] Luke intends to show that their activities represent an extension of the founders' 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 divine forgiveness and life (3:15; 5:32).[621] Second, the apostles demonstrate a commitment to their task which is appropriate for founding figures. They resist the religious leaders' charge not to speak or teach in Jesus's name (4:18; 5:28), instead 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 anticipation that Peter's shadow would bring healing to those upon whom it fell (5:15). The presence of the apostles, as divinely appointed figures, is responsible for the symbolic acts of healings—not the performance of magic. 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

---

[620] Cf. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*.
[621] Cf. 4:29–31, where the community's prayer for παρρησία hinges on God's appointment of Jesus.

bold speech (4:31). And an angel frees the imprisoned apostles and commands them to resume their task witnessing to the salvation mediated in Jesus's name (5:20–21).[622] Each of these narrative features—the apostle's connection with Jesus, the importance of their presence/touch in miracle-working, and ephiphanic signs of support for their activity—points to the divine basis of the apostles' activity. This divine authorization, in turn, bolsters the legitimacy of the apostles as founding figures of the Christian community in Jerusalem.

Luke reinforces the divine sanction of the apostles' actions via contrast with the resistance of Jerusalem's religious leaders. The leaders reject how the apostles link Jesus's name both to the general resurrection (4:2) as well as the healing of the cripple (4:10); they go so far as to forbid them from teaching in Jesus's name (4:18).[623] The narrative's judgment of their motive also gets to the heart of the contrast between the two parties. The religious leaders, affronted at the usurpation of their authority, are 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 and consequently seek to

---

[622] Cf. 12:5–19; 16:25–34. See Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany,* 93–148.
[623] The religious leaders resurrect this prohibition in 5:28.

fulfill their mandate. In this case,[624] the response of the crowds (3:10–11; 4:4; 4:21; 5:14) casts in high relief the obstinacy of their religious leaders.[625] 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 of the new community until it can be determined from its success or failure whether God stands behind it.[626] 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 the religious leaders are best suited to articulate the will of God.

---

[624] Though the crowds are not always a reliable barometer of God's verdict in Acts (see, e.g., 19:21–40; 21:27–36).

[625] In 4:25–28 the community explains the earlier opposition to Jesus by appealing to Psalms 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."

[626] Even though his words are prescient, for Luke Gamaliel is not an admirable figure since he fails like the other religious leaders to embrace the message of the apostles. Cf. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, 198.

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 established due to their efforts and those of Jesus before them (2:42–47; 4:32–37). These reports function akin to the notices about community customs (*nomima)* in colonization accounts. The latter offer characterizations—invariably brief—of the new community's identity entailing such information as civic commitments, cultic practices, and leadership structure. In Luke's narrative the identity markers also play a critical role. Besides giving a snapshot of the new community, they indicate the set of practices through which new believers[627] are assimilated into the community.[628] The context and content of the reports alike support this interpretation of their function. First, there is the placement of the initial report. It follows the Pentecost

---

[627] Cf. *epoikoi* in the colonial context.

[628] 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, PA: Trinity Press, 1998), 208–9, 217, Luke wished his readers to see that the ideals represented in summaries were applicable to large (not just small) Christian communities.

outpouring and Peter's speech, which supplements the community with nearly three thousand new members (2:41).[629] 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 with their deception, a consequence that presses home the fundamental significance of the customs. These features of the narrative indicate that the reports possess more than a mere structural significance;[630] they foreground the identity of the community planted by the apostles.

Though different in emphasis, the passages reinforce one another in their portrait of the 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),[631] 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

---

[629] Luke's remarks resemble an ethnographic report. Cf. Sterling, "'Athletes of Virtue,'" 688.
[630] Inarguably, the summaries in Acts 2:42–47, 4:32–37, 5:12–16 possess structural significance. Cf. Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem"; Sterling, "'Athletes of Virtue,'" 682, 694.
[631] 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.

ministry to the present era of the church.[632] The concluding note about the Lord multiplying τοὺς σῳζομένους (v. 47b) bookends the entire section thus suggesting that the community practices will shape the identity of its new members as well.

Luke's report in Acts 4:32–5:1–11 complements the prior one.[633] While there is no explicit mention of multiplication preceding it unlike 2:42–47, 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 (cf. 2:41). The report describes the life of the growing community, this time in three parts: an idealized introductory statement stressing unanimity (4:32); a reference to the

---

[632] 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 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, MA: 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 in his speech at Pentecost (Acts 2:22).

[633] 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.

"witness" of the apostles (4:33); a "clarification" about the distribution of property to those in need (4:34–35; cf. 2:45);[634] and two exemplars—a positive one in Barnabas (4:36–37) and a negative one in Ananias and Sapphira (5:1–11).[635] 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,[636] particularly those concerned with defining and delineating the practices of true friendship.[637] Terms and phrases connoting common life—τῇ

---

[634] Ibid., 211.

[635] 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."

[636] Sterling, "'Athletes of Virtue.'" Cf. Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller*, 16–18, who compares Luke's report to philosophical discussions such as Plato's about the ideal *polis*.

[637] 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.

κοινωνίᾳ (2:42), ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (2:44; 2:47),[638] ἅπαντα κοινά (2:44; 4:32), ψυχὴ μία (4:32), and ὁμοθυμαδόν (2:46; 4:24)[639]—are indicative of this idealizing discourse.[640]

Iamblichus's depiction of Pythagorean communities offers an illuminating comparison. The author explicitly remarks how Pythagoras the founder instituted "cenobitic life" for his followers when settling in Croton.[641] Iamblichus characterizes the community as being "like-minded";[642] it is a product of Pythagoras's vision of friendship, which he "discovered" and then legislated for his followers.[643] The commitment to common life in turn is responsible for the practice/precept of property sharing. Iamblichus describes this by means of various formulations:[644] They held "possessions in common (τάς . . . οὐσίας κοινάς)" (6.30 [Dillon and Hershbell]);[645] "friends have things in common (κοινὰ τὰ φίλων)" (6.32 [Dillon and Hershbell]); "that

---

[638] 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—Psalms 2:2—which the community of Christians in Jerusalem apply to themselves (Acts 4:26).
[639] 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).
[640] Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship," 256. Sterling, "'Athletes of Virtue,'" 694.
[641] *De Vit. Pythag.* 6.30.
[642] *De Vit. Pythag.* 6.30. Cf. Acts 4:32.
[643] *De Vit. Pythag.* 16.69.
[644] These formulations stem from the belief that at the heart of justice/righteousness is "the common and the equal (τὸ κοινὸν καὶ ἴσον)" (*De Vit. Pythag.* 30.167–68).
[645] Cf. Acts 4:32.

which is mine and that which belongs to another is the same (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐμὸν φθέγγεσθαι καὶ τὸ ἀλλότριον)" (30.167–68 [Dillon and Hershbell]);[646] "all things were common . . . no one possessed anything privately" (ἴδιον δὲ οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ἐκέκτητο)" (30.168 [Dillon and Hershbell]).[647] 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 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.[648] Among these, Josephus's description of the Essenes is most relevant,[649] particularly his comments about the group's views about property ownership. Josephus

---

[646] Cf. Acts 4:32.

[647] Cf. Acts 4:32, 45.

[648] See *A.J.* 13.5.9 (τρεῖς αἱρέσεις); 18.1.2–6 (φιλοσοφίαι τρεῖς; yet cf. 18.1.6); *B.J.* 2.8.2–14 (Τρία . . . παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις εἴδη φιλοσοφεῖται).

[649] Josephus's depiction of the Pharisees is relevant to some extent. For example, the "respect for the elderly" approximates the reverence toward the apostles (cf. Acts 2:42), and the 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).

remarks that the community held τὰ χρήματά τε κοινά, explaining that the rich share their wealth with the poor.[650] Both features—the emphasis on common (κοινά) property and elaboration how the wealthy assisted those in need—resembles Luke's depiction of the Jerusalem community. In *Bellum judaicum,* Josephus offers a similar report about the Essenes' sentiments and practices relating to possessions: Community members despise riches;[651] are not "distinguished by greater opulence . . . [from one] another" (18.2.3 [Thackeray]); jointly share possessions;[652] and engage in free exchange rather than buy or sell belongings.[653] Therefore, notwithstanding differences in other matters, the tenor of Josephus's depiction of the Essenes resembles that of Luke's portayal of the Jerusalem Christian community when it comes to the handling of possessions.

Philo's portrayal of the Therapeutae provides another compelling analogue to Luke's community reports.[654] The Alexandrian describes a community fixated on the "heaven-sent passion of love" (2.12 [Colson]), which leads to a concentrated focus on

---

[650] *A.J.* 18.1.5.
[651] *B.J.* 2.8.3.
[652] Ibid.
[653] *B.J.* 18.2.4.
[654] Philo, *De vita contemplative.*

prayer and meditation,[655] allegorical interpretation of scripture,[656] and the writings of the founders.[657] With respect to possessions: Members relinquish them willingly since the mortal life is passing away; and they do so because of "magnanimity," not "carelessness," in order to benefit others.[658] This concern to use possessions for the benefit of those in need resembles the emphasis of Luke's second report, especially 4:34–35.

The comparanda discussed above demonstrate how Luke's reports concerning the community of Jesus followers in Jerusalem participated in ongoing conversations about friendship and community life in the ancient Mediterranean world. Luke's portrait is nevertheless distinctive in its emphases. To begin with, his accounts reveal a concern to break down the barriers of status,[659] a concern apparent in those parts describing the handling of possessions/property. This is especially true in the second

---

[655] *Contempl.* 3.27–28; 8.66.
[656] *Contempl.* 3.27–28; 10.75–77.
[657] *Contempl.* 3.28–29 (οἳ τῆς αἱρέσεως ἀρχηγέται).
[658] *Contempl*. 3.2.16.
[659] Cf. Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship," 258, 272. Status reversal features once at 6:1–7 in the concern for the 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," *PRS* 10 (1983): 145–61. Luke thus builds on the portrait of Jesus in his gospel depicting the Christian community in Jerusalem as inclusive in principle and practices.

report (4:32–5:11), which fills out the picture presented in the first report (2:42–47).[660] The earlier summary had related how the believers possessed ἅπαντα κοινά (2:44) and elaborated that they sold τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις, distributin the proceeds to ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχον (2:45). The second one, however, clarifies what Luke envisions by holding possessions in common:[661] 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.[662] This vision of community life deviates from many friendship traditions in which friendship between equals is assumed, as well as the cultural world in which it is embedded where quid pro quo—benefaction for honor—was taken for granted.[663]

The positive and negative exemplars illustrate what this Christian principle of identity looked like in practice. As the man of status, Barnabas demonstrated an willness to leverage his property for the sake of needy members in the community

---

[660] Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem," 211.
[661] 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.
[662] Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship," 258, 266–67.
[663] Ibid., 259, 265.

(4:36–37).[664] Like Judas (1:15–20),[665] however, Ananias and Sapphira put the interests of money above those of the community (5:1–11). Technically, Peter maintains that the sin consisted in the couple misrepresenting the extent of their generosity, rather than the failure to give per se (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 Satan[666] with filling Ananias's heart. Only thus could he and his wife lie to the Holy Spirit and God (5:3, 4, 9) who is responsible for the community's foundation. Ananias and Sapphira, therefore, function as a foil to Barnabas. Both exemplars illustrate the distinctive identity of the mother community in Jerusalem.

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 narrative episodes

---

[664] 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 (Acts 13:12; cf. 11:19)! Cf. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 105.

[665] Cf. Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship," 268.

[666] And not the Holy Spirit!

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 διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων; 2:42).[667] This act of devotion is significant because it grounds the identity of the community in the actions of its founding figures.[668] (At the same time, since the apostles taught about the salvation of Jesus, the community's devotion links it to *the* founder, Jesus.[669]) 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), elucidating their inclusion in the report on the

---

[667] D (t vg^MS) also reads ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ, which bolsters the position of the Jerusalem leadership.
[668] Cf. Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem," 204.
[669] 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 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.

community's common life. Furthermore, given that signs in Acts reinforce divine sanction, their mention here helps legitimate both the community and its "institutions."

Luke foregrounds the apostles' relevance for community identity in a second way. He embeds 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.[670]

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" of the founder Jesus (1:8) through speech (proclamation) and acts (miracle working) articulating the divine plan

---

[670] Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, 201–4.

of salvation. Like many founding figures they encounter opposition, but they prevail through their boldness and due to the divine sanction undergirding their actions. They plant a community defined by its common life, embodied in distinctive customs such as shared meals, prayer, and distribution of resources to those in need. The concern for such issues elsewhere in the narrative[671] demonstrates that despite the uniqueness of these discrete reports in Luke's work, they represent an "embodiment of Christian values."[672] Moreover, inferentially, the practices are designed to integrate new members and identify subsequent communities as Christian. The apostles' importance to community identity is marked by recollection of their founding acts and recognition of their authority vis-à-vis the "institutions" outlined by Luke.

[671] See the parallels adduced by Sterling, "'Athletes of Virtue,'" 280–82.
[672] 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—which Luke allocates to portraying the circumstances of its foundation and identity within the broader "colonizing" movement.[673] 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

[673] 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 Paul's own view. See, e.g., J. Peter Bercovitz, "Paul and Antioch: Some Observations," 19 (1999): 87–101.

city" of second-generation colonies,[674] 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—Pisidia Antioch. 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 depicts as a hinge in the fulfillment of Acts' governing oracle (1:8).[675] 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"

---

[674] For analogies of colonies which became *metropoleis*, see Gela and Rome. Settlers from Rhodes and Crete colonized Gela, which later planted its own colony, Acragas (Thucydides 6.4.3). From Alba, Romulus founded Rome (Livy 1.1–17; Plutarch, *Rom.;* Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.84–9; 2.3–50), which went on to plant numerous colonies. For an account of Roman colonization, see Salmon, *Roman Colonization under the Republic*.

[675] 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* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1951), 235; Keener, *Acts,* 2:1847.

community, and (b) its emergence as mother community, validated by divine sanction and possessing "institutions" that reflect its role as a bridge between the colonizing movement's Jerusalem origins and its horizon, "second generation" colonies throughout the Mediterranean. But first it is beneficial 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 such a pivotal role as both colony of Jerusalem and mother city for "mixed" colonies. Founded to be a Hellenistic beacon in the east,[676] the city went on to become the third greatest city in the Roman Empire,[677] according to Josephus, boasting Hellenistic and Roman architectural monuments and featuring a cosmopolitan population of Macedonians, Greeks, Syrians, and Jews.

---

[676] 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).

[677] Josephus, *B.J.* 3.2.4; Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 12.

Seleucus Nicator I founded Antioch in 300 BCE,[678] 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 Antigonia, and Jews.[679] These new colonists mingled with the progeny of settlers long since established in Syria.[680] In founding Antioch, Seleucus sought to control an area with immense strategic value. The neighborhood was unusually fertile,[681] teemed with timber,[682] and was sourced with water from multiple springs at nearby Daphne.[683] But in addition to these advantages, the location of Antioch was a "gateway" of sorts in the Amuk plain,[684] which connected Anatolia in the north to Syria and Palestine in the south and offered a passageway into

---

[678] 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).

[679] Ibid., 79. D. S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 1.

[680] Downey, *A History of Antioch,* 57–65, 87, argues that Seleucus sought to make Seleucia Pieria his capital, but Antiochus I Soter, his successor, transferred the capital to Antioch following his death.

[681] Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 22.

[682] Ibid.

[683] Ibid., 19.

[684] 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 importance of Al-Mina as a settlement as evidence for an established Greek presence near what would become Antioch.

Mesopotamia.[685] Antioch also provided ready access to the sea via her sister city to the south, Seleucia Pieria. The city's roads, built at a later time, reflected Antioch's "connectivity": one road stretched from Anatolia in the north to Seleucia Pieria in the south; another bisected the city, running from Berea in the north to Daphne in the south.[686]

Antioch remained in Seleucid hands until 83 BCE.[687] 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.[688] Reportedly, he also installed statues of Tyche and Zeus Keraunios, symbolizing divine support of both the founder and his city.[689] Seleucus is also credited with erecting the temple of Apollo at nearby Daphne.[690] 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.[691] Antiochus IV lavishly

---

[685] Ibid., 46.

[686] Ibid., 16–17.

[687] It was at this time that Armenia seized Antioch from a weakened Seleucid dynasty.

[688] Malalas 200.20; Downey, *A History of Antioch*, 72.

[689] 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* (Cambride: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 40.

[690] Downey, *A History of Antioch,* 85.

[691] Ibid., 92.

adorned Antioch as part of the "Hellenizing zeal" which animated his rule.[692] He founded a new quarter to the east of the city, which he named Epiphania after himself, established an *agora*, built an aqueduct,[693] and began work on numerous building projects. He purportedly broke ground on a bouleuterion and several temples,[694] one of which was that of Zeus Olympios.[695] Like Seleucus Nicator, he also installed several monuments: the Charonion, a statue of himself "taming a bull," and a statue of Zeus Nikephoros.[696] After the time of Antiochus IV, Antioch endured a precipitous decline until it finally fell into the hands of Armenia, who ruled her 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;[697] it was probably during this time that the Roman governor of Cilicia, Q. Marcius Rex, built a circus on the city's island.[698] 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

---

[692] Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch,* 2. Cf. Downey, *A History of Antioch,* 95–107.
[693] Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch,* 2.
[694] Malalas 205.14.19; 234.2–3; Downey, *A History of Antioch,* 100.
[695] Livy 41.20.9. Cf. Downey, *A History of Antioch,* 100.
[696] Ibid., 103-5.
[697] Downey, *A History of Antioch,* 140.
[698] Ibid., 73.

the title of *metropolis*."[699] After his victory over Pompey, Caesar guaranteed "free" status to Antioch in 47 BCE, granting it rights to issue coinage with the title ΑΝΤΙΟΧΕΩΗ ΤΗΣ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΙΕΡΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΣΥΛΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΝΟΜΟΥ.[700] Caesar further embellished Antioch with monuments that brimmed with Roman symbolism: a Kaisarion basilica and statues of Caesar and the Tyche of Rome.[701] 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* awarded the city the distinction of serving as the procuratorial seat of the new province of Syria, assigning 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 Beorea to Daphne was built. (Reportedly, Herod the Great, who patronized many Syrian cities, contributed to the adornment of this street.[702]) Augustus also established the Olympic Games at Antioch[703] and planned improvements

---

[699] Ibid., 145. Cf. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch,* 3.
[700] Downey, *A History of Antioch,* 140.
[701] Ibid., 154; Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch,* 3.
[702] 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.
[703] Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch,* 3.

in the Ephiphania quarter, which likely were completed in the time of Tiberius. These included the construction of a street which "provided a main artery along the long axis of the area occupied by Seleucus' settlement and Epiphania"; temples of Jupiter Capitolinus, Dionysus, and Pan in or near Epiphania; and a public bath near the spring Olympias.[704]

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.[705] Commodus reinstated the Olympic Games in Antioch during his reign and constructed a new running track as commemoration.[706] 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."[707] Caracella later restored both the title and the games, and even elevated Antioch when he granted it the formal status

---

[704] Downey, *A History of Antioch,* 174–82.
[705] Ibid., 213–17.
[706] Ibid., 230–33.
[707] Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch,* 5.

of colony (212 CE).[708] Brief periods followed during which the city fell under the control of other powers, only to be retaken by Rome. Valerian rebuilt Antioch (253–60 CE) after it was invaded and burned by Sapor I of Parthia. Then the Romans, in Diocletian's reign (284–305 CE), captured and reorganized the city after it had fallen into the hands of Palmyra to be ruled by Queen Zenobia.[709] This, of course, takes us well past the time period of Luke's narrative.

For a full appreciation of Luke's narrative, it helps to be aware of Jewish life in Antioch. Some of the original settlers of Antioch were Jews who served as auxiliaries in Alexander and Seleucus' armies.[710] 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 that number increased to 65,000 during the later Roman period.[711] This number is probably too high but it gives a sense of Antioch's popularity among Jews. The reasons for this popularity were manifold.[712]

---

[708] Downey, *A History of Antioch,* 244–46.

[709] Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch,* 6.

[710] 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.

[711] Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," 136.

[712] For the following points, see Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 1.

The city early on served as an administrative and commercial center in the region, affording opportunities to Jews who were well-connected. 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."[713]

The position of Jews in Antioch varied. Jews occupied all strata of Antiochene society,[714] some flourishing as "free proprietors" with others eking out a living as "lowly tenants."[715] It is doubtful that Seleucus granted Jews citizenship *en masse,* as Josephus implies, but individual Jews may have received this distinction at various times.[716] 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.[717] The former allowance made it possible for Jews to purchase their own oil from money allocated by the

---

[713] Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," 153–54.
[714] Ibid., 132–34.
[715] Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch,* 10–13.
[716] 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.
[717] Irina Levinskaya, *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), 129.

gymnasiarchs.[718] 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").[719] The Jews possessed at least one synagogue in Antioch in the Hellenistic period—more were certainly built in the Roman period[720]—and the synagogue in Daphne was renowned among their co-religionists.[721]

Prior to the Roman period Jews endured minor hostility in Antioch, particularly in response to their alleged xenophobia.[722] Further, while they did not experience persecution under the Seleucids,[723] 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.[724] But Josephus tells us that matters improved for Jews under Antiochus' successors.[725] During this time,

---

[718] Josephus, *A.J.* 12.120; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 129–30.
[719] 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.
[720] Cf. Josephus, *B.J.* 7.47; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 134–35.
[721] 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.
[722] Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 248.
[723] Ibid., 249.
[724] 1 Macc 5:68; 10:82–85; 13:47–48; Josephus, *A.J.* 13.356–64; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 130.
[725] 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.

purportedly, they were even able to persuade many Gentiles to become Jews.[726] When Pompey arrived in Palestine he scaled back the power and influence Jews had achieved under the Maccabean rulers. However, Roman hegemony remained relative amenable for Jews in Antioch up until 39–40 CE, when Caligula attempted to install a statue of himself in the Jerusalem temple. This caused Antioch's Jews to riot against the forces charged with carrying out the orders, who were led by Petronius, the Roman proconsul stationed in Antioch.[727] 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.[728] However, Jews faced another crisis in 70 CE when they were accused by Antiochus, one of their own, of hatching a plan to burn the city.[729] This accusation—not to mention the actual conflagration—brought

[726] Josephus, *B.J.* 7.45.
[727] 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.* 185–90; 207; Josephus, *A.J.* 18.262–72. Malalas gives an entirely different explanation. The attack on Jews originated as a fight between blue and green factions in the circus (244–45). Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," 148, rightly casts doubt upon Malalas' account. Cf. Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch,* 115–16; Brooten, "The Jews of Ancient Antioch," 31–32.
[728] Josephus, *A.J.* 19.279; Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," 149; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 132.
[729] 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.

about widespread persecution of Antiochene Jews. Yet order was once again restored. Josephus reports that during his reign, Titus rejected a petition from Antioch's residents to expel Jews—or at the very least, remove from the city the bronze plaques enshrining their privileges.[730] The social position of Jews in Antioch must have suffered as a result of the accusation and riots of 70 CE,[731] 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,"[732] and there is evidence (see Chrysostom's sermons) that they elicited admiration from Antioch's—now largely Christian—gentile population.[733]

This socio-historical sketch demonstrates why Antioch is fitting as a transition site in Luke's colonizing narrative, which in Acts 11 begins to move outward from Jerusalem-Judea into the wider Mediterranean world. By virtue of its history and monuments, Antioch radiated Hellenistic and Roman culture. At the same time, its considerable population of Jews signaled a connection with Jerusalem. Together, the

---

[730] Josephus, *B.J.* 107–13; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 130.
[731] Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," 153; Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 133.
[732] Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," 158.
[733] Ibid., 156–57; Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 2, 32.

Jews and the Macedonian, Greek, and Syrian residents imparted to the city a "cosmopolitan" or "mixed" heritage—analogous to the 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 Phoenicia[734] 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.[735] The Phocaean settlers of Massalia in Strabo's narrative faced an external threat: They were forced to flee their Ionian

---

[734] 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).

[735] 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 deflect attention from less seemly catalysts, such as human ambition.

homeland as it was being besieged by Persian forces.[736] Libanius's reasons for the foundation of Antioch, on the other hand, are more complex—precisely because he reports multiple waves of foundation.[737] He recognizes the Hellenistic foundation of Antioch but grounds it in a still more ancient past.[738] Thus, Seleucus Nicator and Alexander were preceded as city-founders by the likes of Triptolemus, Casus, Cypriots, and Heraclidae and Eleans (who planted nearby Hercleia/Daphne). There are notes of

---

[736] 4.1.4–5.

[737] As the official sophist of Antioch, Libanius was in a prime position to witness Julian's efforts at promoting the empire's "pagan" cultural heritage. His *Antiochikos* showcases this heritage at the local level. See 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 (11.181–95), city planning (especially its colonnaded street; 11.196–262), and harbor (11.263–67). 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.

[738] 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. First, it stresses the origins of the early settlers—both the mythological/legendary (Zeus and Io, King Minos, and the Heraclidae) and the crisis-wrought (Casus and the Cretans, the Heraclidae). 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.

crisis in several parts of this composite foundation account. Tripotlemus 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.[739] Subsequently, Casus and his fellow Cretans migrated to Syria. Consonant with widely-held views about 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]).[740] However, the precipitating cause was the duress of Casus and his Cretan companions, who had been expelled from Crete by King Minos.[741] 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 Heracleia (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

---

[739] *Or.* 11.44–52. Triptolemus eventually left the city but continued to receive honors commensurate with his status as founder.
[740] Cf. *Or.* 11.52, where Libanius notes how Zeus previously sanctioned Triptolemus's foundation.
[741] *Or.* 11.52–55.

Eleans, on the other, provide the best 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 even more illuminating as it attributes the origins of the city in southern Italy to *stasis* in the mother city, Sparta.[742] 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 "real" Spartans and a related but disadvantaged body of residents served as the effective cause of the settlement of Taras.

Antiochus identifies the disadvantaged-turned-colonizers as "Partheniae,"[743] children of helots who refused to join the Spartans in their war with Messenia.[744] 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 was set to transpire during the Hyacinthian festival at the temple of Apollo, near Amyclaeum. However, a certain Phalanthus—who was to signal the plot's commencement by

---

[742] Diodorus 8.21.2–3; Dionysios, *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.

[743] Cf. Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 19.2. Diodorus identifies them as "Partheniae" and "Epeunactae" (8.21.2–3).

[744] Strabo 6.3.2.

donning a cap (τὴν κυνῆν)[745]—turned out to be a secret agent for the Spartans. The plot was exposed, and the conspiracy failed. The Spartans responded by dispatching Phalanthus to Delphi [746] to inquire about founding a colony[747]; they intended for him, acting as *oikist,* to resettle those Partheniae who had not been able to flee their masters' reprisal. In her response, Delphi identified the territory to be settled and even forecast the subjugation of the natives: "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]).[748] Oddly, Antiochus reports that the native "barbarians" (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.[749] 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,

---

[745] Ibid. Ephorus identifies this as a "Laconian cap" (ibid., 6.3.3), while Diodorus says that Phalanthus was to put on a "helmet" (8.21.2).
[746] Literally, "of god" (θεοῦ).
[747] Literally, "about a colony" (περί ἀποικίας).
[748] Strabo claims that the "Iapygians" were descendants of Daedalus through Iapyges (6.3.2).
[749] 6.3.3.

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."[750] Ephorus does not report a consultation at Delphi. He notes, however, that the Partheniae were able to found Taras after defeating the "barbarians" with the help of the Achaeans who lived in southern Italy.

Luke's account of the founding of the Antiochene community also foregrounds crisis. 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,

[750] 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]).

they were like the Phocaeans who fled Persian aggression. Yet the oppressors in this instance were the Jerusalem compatriots of the "scattered," and the threat was, accordingly, born of *stasis*—not external attack.[751] 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 respective homelands, Crete and Sparta respectively. The "colonists" from Jerusalem, of course, were marginalized not because of the circumstances of their birth like the Partheniae, but rather because of their adherence to the message proclaimed about Jesus 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 in large part because the proclamation contained an indictment of the Jerusalem Jews and their religious leaders for rejecting Jesus, the Messiah and prophet like Moses.[752] The religious leaders' response to the apostles in Acts 1–5 establishes a pattern of reprisal leading to relocation,[753] a pattern repeated in the persecution-

---

[751] Cf. Balch, "ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ," 148, 154-74.
[752] 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.
[753] See my discussion of spatial reconfiguration as a result of opposition in chapter 3.

induced "scattering" of Jesus followers, first "throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria" (8:1), and then—in culminating fashion—to Antioch (11:19).[754] Thus, as with the Partheniae, *stasis* precipitates the cult community's first act of "colonization." 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,[755] as is apparent in Luke's remark that the "scattered" went about spreading their devotion through proclamation (11:19–20).[756] Religion played a practical and symbolic role in the

---

[754] Note the identical formulation in 8:4 and 11:19: Οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες.

[755] 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"; 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; Hanges, "The Greek Foundation-Legend"; idem, *Paul, Founder of Churches.*

[756] Proclamation (along with "signs and wonders") constitutes the chief founding deed in Acts. See chapter 3; Cf. Wilson, "Urban Legends," 93.

foundation of ancient communities,[757] 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, Heracleidae colonized Sparta; settlers from Sparta colonized the island Thera; and Theraeans colonized the Libyan city of Cyrene.[758] Each successive stage of settlement entailed a transfer of Apollo's cult, which shaped the identity of the respective cities while binding them all together as a network.[759] According to Libanius, there were 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 homeland, erecting a temple to the god

---

[757] 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, "Coloniam 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.
[758] 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*, 147.
[759] 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 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.

there.[760] Moreover, when Alexander passed through the land following his defeat of Darius, he founded a city and transferred there the cult of Zeus Bottiaeus, which his successor Seleucus continued to patronize.[761] Zeus was a prominent deity in Argos and Macedonia, and therefore the traditions about his cult transfer—in two different forms—linked Antioch to its mythological and historical origins alike.[762] The same is true of the transfer of the Jesus cult to Antioch in Acts 11, insofar and the proclamation of the "the word" (11:19)[763] and "the Lord Jesus" (11:20) links the new community to its origins in Jerusalem.[764]

Strabo's account of Massalia's foundation, however, offers a particularly rich point of comparison since at the heart of the Phocaean resettlement in southern Europe is the transfer of the Artemis cult.[765] (Strabo's stress on the prominence of the

---

[760] *Or.* 11.51.
[761] *Or.* 11.77, 88–93.
[762] 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).
[763] 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.
[764] Acts 2:21, 36; 4:33; 7:59; 8:16; 25; 9:5; 15, 17, 28, 42; cf. 10:36; 11:17; 13:12; 13:47, 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.
[765] Strabo's rather succinct remark about Massalia's founding confirms, by comparison, his greater interest in the transfer it entailed: γενομένου δὲ τούτου καὶ τῆς ἀποικίας λαβούσης τέλος. Cf. *Anab.* 5.3.4–13, where Xenophon relates an account of his own transfer of the Artemis cult.

Artemision announces this focus at the outset.[766]) The transfer is notable both for the reinforcing forms of divine sanction it received as well as for how it shaped Massaliot identity. The Phocaean settlers, after consulting the Delphic oracle as was customary, were instructed to seek a guide (ἡγεμόνι) from the Ephesian Artemis.[767] In a dream-vision, the goddess singled out a woman named Aristarcha[768] and commanded her "to sail away with the Phocaeans, taking along a representation [ἀφίδρυμά] from among the sacred objects"[769] in the temple (Strabo 4.1.4 [Jones]). The vision thus interprets the original oracle: It reveals the guide through whose assistance the site will be settled and the cult transferred. Strabo adduces several examples of Massalia's thoroughgoing 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

---

[766] 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]) at first glance seems to get matters backwards. Yet this is precisely Strabo's point: in her cultic practices, Massalia reversed what was the case in her homeland across the sea. See Malkin, *Religion and Colonization*, 73.
[767] 4.1.4.
[768] Aristarcha witnessed κατ' ὄναρ τὴν θεόν (4.1.4).
[769] Ἀφίδρυμά τι τῶν ἱερῶν (4.1.4). On the transfer of cult objects, see Irad Malkin, "What Is an 'Aphidruma'?," *ClAnt* 10 (1991): 77–96.

[νόμιμα] precisely the same as is customary in the mother-city (4.1.4 [Jones]).”[770] Finally, Massiliotes transferred the “sacred items of Ephesian Artemis”[771] to cities which they in turn founded (4.1.4 [Jones]).[772] 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 the colonized territory. Furthermore, given the role of Apollo and Artemis herself, they point to—however obliquely—the fulfillment of a larger divine plan.

Cult transfer, as I have suggested, is at the heart of Luke’s account in Acts 11:19–30 as well. The proclamation of the “scattered,” as well as the exhortation of Barnabas, is what gives birth to the Antiochene community. The transfer, moreover, shapes the identity of the new community. While this process does not entail erection of temples or honoring of relics as in the case of Massalia, it does involve establishing the new community’s devotion to the Lord Jesus. Luke documents this in both internal and

[770] Strabo elsewhere mentions a replica of this xoanon on the Aventine Hill as evidence for the one-time close relationship between Massalia and Rome (4.1.5).

[771] Τὰ ἱερὰ τῆς Ἐφεσίας Ἀρτέμιδος.

[772] For example, in Iberia. See 4.1.5.

external ways: in the first place, through the influx of adherents,[773] which he reports using the language of repentance/conversion (ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον; 11:21; cf. 11:24)[774]; in the second, through outsiders' recognition of community members as 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 Phocaean 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 perceptive reader knows that the *telos* of episodes such as the one in Antioch is witness

---

[773] The community's leadership "institutions" (13:1) further indicates how the transfer shaped its internal identity. See further below.

[774] 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; 2 Kgs 8:33, 47, 48; 2 Chr 6:37, 38; 2 Chr 15:4; 30:6, 9; Neh 1:9; 2:6; 9:26, 29; Jdt 5:19; Tob 13:6; 14:6; Ps 7:13; 21:28; 50:15; 77:34; Job 22:23; 36:10; Sir 5:7; 17:25, 29; 21:6; Hos 3:5; 5:4; 6;1; 7:10; 11:5; 12:7; 14:2, 3; Amos 4:6, 8, 9, 10, 11; Joel 2:12, 13; Hag 2:17; Zech 1:3; 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; Matt 13:15; Mark 4:12; 2 Cor 3:16; 1 Thess 1:9; Jas 5:19; 20; 1 Pet 2:25.

to Jesus, not merely the foundation of a community. Second, opposition in Acts—of which "scattering" is a byproduct—manifests itself as one of God's favored means of spreading the cult. The pattern of opposition and proclamation is ubiquitous in Acts.[775] It is not just a literary contrivance meant to propel the narrative forward, but rather reflects Luke's theological program, which equates opposition with rejection of God and links it to his plan for restoring Israel and grafting in Gentiles.[776] 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 articulate God's will.[777] Luke depicts them as rejected prophets in the tradition of Moses.[778] 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 is what occurs just a few chapters earlier, in the wake of Stephen's stoning (8:4–5), and now here again in Antioch.

---

[775] 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; 14:19–20; 16:16–24; 17:1–9, 13–14, 32; 18:5–6, 12–17; 19:9, 23–41; 28:19–31.

[776] Cf. Tiede, *Prophecy and History,* 31, 34.

[777] Note Acts 9:16 (cf. Acts 20:23, 21:10–11): "[Paul] is a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel. For I will show him how much he must suffer for the sake of [ὑπὲρ] my name." Cf. J. Severino Croatto, "Jesus, Prophet Like Elijah, and Prophet-Teacher Like Moses in Luke-Acts," *JBL* 124 (2005): 455, 63.

[778] 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.

Third and finally, positive results also signal divine approval of the cult transfer.[779] This is most evident in the case of the preaching of those who were "scattered," since Luke explicitly says ἦν χεὶρ τοῦ κυρίου μετ' αὐτῶν (11:21), but it is hard not to draw the same conclusion about the reaction to Barnabas's exhortation, for Luke reveals his source of empowerment: ἦν . . . πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου (11:24). What we have here is not simple approval but active assistance. Together, therefore, these three considerations demonstrate the extent of God's sanction: he not only authorizes the cult's transfer to Antioch, but also endorses its means and establishes its results. The transfer represents the unfolding of the divine will and consequently is not dissimilar to the transfer of the Artemis 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 of Jews and Gentiles alike. To have two or more different *ethne* band together to form a colony was a common

---

[779] 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.

occurrence in the ancient world.[780] Most often "mixed" membership was the child of exigency. This was true, for example, in the crisis-driven foundation of Taras. "Barbarians" and Cretans, who had themselves earlier settled in Italy,[781] 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 seeming *ad hoc* nature of its foundation, or rather, the manner in which the new arrivals intermingled with prior residents. Here, of course, the "intermingling" amounts to the spread of the cult through proclamation[782] and occurs in two waves, the first in the immediate aftermath of the *stasis* in Jerusalem, as Jesus followers fanned out to "Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch" (11:19), and the second somewhat later, as "men

---

[780] 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.* 2.846–50); Ionia (Herodotus 1.146–7); 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.* 21.1–5); Samos (Iamblicus 2.3.4); Siris (Strabo 6.1.14); Thurii (Diodorus 12.9); Zancle (Callimachus 2 F6).

[781] The Cretans had been "driven off their course to Taras" while attempting to return to Crete from Sicily after Minos's death (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).

[782] The scattered Jesus followers λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον (11:19) and εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν (11:20).

from Cyprus and Cyrene"[783] came to Antioch (11:20). Settlement in multiple waves was also not uncommon in ancient colonization.[784] What is significant here is the target of the different groups' outreach: the first engaged the Jewish populations in the city, while the second made inroads with the "Hellenists," or Gentiles (11:19–20).[785] Therefore, as with the foundation of Taras, it is the intermingling with prior inhabitants—but through the targeted spread of the cult—which produces the "mixed"

[783] 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 (inherent) improbabilities.

[784] Often the *metropolis* retained the right to send later waves of settlers to her colonies. See Graham, *Colony and Mother City*, 111–12. Strabo's account of the foundation of Massalia (discussed above) seems to represent a later wave of settlement. See Morel, "Phocaean Colonisation," in *Greek Colonisation,* 1:364–66. Note also how King Battos of the third generation invited other Greeks to join the settlement in Cyrene (Herodotus 4.160–61). 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.

[785] Here I adopt the explanation which Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary,* 2:1842, offers for the tricky term "Hellenistis": 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. Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 33. Cf. Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 13.

community. Its composition is only fitting given Antioch's profile as a Hellenistic city which played home to a high number of Jewish residents.[786]

The fortunes of amalgamative communities were themselves mixed. Such unions often produced internal divisions. This occurred, for example, when Athens tried to form colonies in Thurii[787] and Amphipolis,[788] comprising its own settlers along with prior inhabitants of the respective regions.[789] Conflicts over loyalties and "institutions" (cf. Acts 15) threatened—and in the later instance undermined—the integrity of these communities. But this was not the inevitable consequence of "mixed" communities. The incorporation of various peoples could also benefit a colony by bequeathing a "cosmopolitan" ethos. This, at least, is Libanius' judgment about Antioch.[790] Recall that he provided for the settlement of the city in waves over the course of many centuries.[791] First, Tripotlemus and the Argives colonized the land. The latter, in turn, welcomed Casus when he came to Syria with his Cretan companions.

---

[786] See above.
[787] Diodorus 12.9.
[788] Thucydides 4.102–8.
[789] 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).
[790] Cf. Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 27.
[791] Libanius, *Or.* 11.52–77.

Next, Casus received the Cypriots who escorted their island princess to Syria as Casus' wife-to-be. Finally, Heraclidae and Eleans came to Syria and founded nearby Heracleia/Dapne. Only long after the time of these prehistorical founders did

Alexander[792] and then Seleucus Nicator[793] arrive and refound the city.[794] Yet the earlier waves of settlement, giving birth to a "mixed" population, proved a net benefit for

---

[792] *Or.* 11.72–76. Libanius calls Alexander "one of our founders" (11.77 [Norman]). He purportedly planted the city while passing through Syria after defeating Darius, and 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 Alexander's successor, Seleucus, had to complete the foundation of Hellenistic Antioch.

[793] *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' support of Seleucus. Just as the god earlier had summoned Casus to Syria, now he inspires Seleucus' founding; this leads Libanius to conclude that the "king of heaven . . . became our founder" (11.88 [Norman]). Such a claim was calculated to elevate Antioch above rival cities. Cf. Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity,* 161. Second, the sign valorizes the king via association with Alexander. Not only did his predecessor claim Zeus as a patron deity, but he also erected an altar at the site to which Antiochus is now directed. (The Diadochoi had a predilection for stressing 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' 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 founding of his eponymous city in Egypt (Plutarch, *Alex.* 26; Pseudo-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 population of the colony, mixing soldiers and settlers transferred from Antigonia with the resident population, comprising Argives, Cretans, and descendants of the Heraclidae, which gave the city its cosmopolitan character. (Yet Seleucus was deliberate in "hellenizing the natives" and thus promoting a common identity for the city's "mixed" population [11.103 (Norman)].) Seleucus' founding acts positioned Antioch as the "first" among many cities planted by the Seleucid king (11.102).

[794] Libanius informs us that Seleucus founded countless other colonies, more even than the Athenians and Milesians had 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 the cities founded in Syria. Libanius called it the

Hellenistic and Roman Antioch: they enriched the city with the "ancient lineage of the Argives, the law-abiding nature of the Cretans, the royal ancestry of Cyprus and the divine descent from Heracles" (*Or.* 11.57 [Norman)].[795]

From Luke's perspective, what secures the positive value of the "mixed" population at Antioch is not (as in Libanius' account) its contribution to the community as such, but rather its fulfillment of the divine will. Above I suggested how this will was manifest in the birth of the community *as* a product of crisis and *as* a transfer of cult. Here I wish to demonstrate how, in the context of three earlier episodes in Acts,[796] 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.

"source of other cities" (11.100 [Norman]), richly deserving of the title *metropolis,* which the Romans periodically sanctioned.

[795] "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]).

[796] 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.

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, 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 proclamation[797] and "signs" (8:5–6)[798] recall the apostles' founding acts in Jerusalem.[799] Appropriately enough, the initial expansion occurred in the much "colonized" city of Samaria-Sebaste.[800] The mission

---

[797] Philip's summarized message (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].)

[798] 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).

[799] See chapter 3 on the tasks performed by founding figures in Acts.

[800] Samaria suffered much at the hands of foreign powers. Assyria subjugated her (2 Kgs 17:24; Josephus, *A.J.*. 9.288), Alexander destroyed her (Y. 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 Hyracanus made himself a scourge to Samaria (Josephus, *A.J.* 13.254–57; *B.J.* 1.62–3).

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 behalf of the mother community in Jerusalem (8:14–17).[801] Indeed, the results nearly produce a "colony" of Jesus followers (9:31; 15:3).

Success followed Philip in his further activities. His preaching/interpretation[802] led to the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch—a gentile—into the colonizing movement (8:38). Consistent with our colonization framework, this came about 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).[803] Luke likely means for the episode to presage the geographic expansion of the colonizing movement,[804] with Africa approximating the "ends of the earth" (cf. 1:8) and the eunuch representing unclean gentiles.

---

[801] The sending of Peter and John and their impartation of the Holy Spirit (8:17) extends the authority of the Jerusalem mother community 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 gospel to many villages of the Samaritans" (8:25).

[802] Luke underscores "the suffering servant motif" in keeping with his theme of opposition. See Tiede, *Prophecy and History,* 43.

[803] Directives such as these represent forms of divine sanction. See chapter 2 for how divine sanction operates in colonization accounts as well as chapter 3 for how it is deployed in the early chapters of Acts.

[804] 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

Finally, Philip's proclamation along the coast from Azotus to Caesarea (8:40) suggests that there were other cities targeted throughout Judea.[805] 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) points to a core group of Jesus followers in the city, as does Luke's report about the arrival of Agabus,[806] who prophesies to Paul about his impending capture in Jerusalem (21:10–11). Luke gives no indication that Philip preached to anyone but Jews, but Peter's visit to Cornelius in 10:9—11:18 suggests that there was the potential for a "mixed" community of Jesus followers in Caesarea.[807]

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 with its embrace of the gentile mission. As

---

narrative focuses on a foreign gentile returning to his country after worshiping in Jerusalem (8:27; cf. 2:1, 5).

[805] Cf. Acts 9:32–35 (Lydda and Sharon); 9:36–43 (Joppa). The narrative also 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).

[806] Cf. Acts 11:27–28.

[807] Cf. the discussion of Acts 10:9—11:18; Wilson, "Urban Legends," *JBL* 120 (2001): 77–99.

with the apostles in 1:8, the nature of Paul's appointment lends legitimacy to his "colonizing" work. He had a visionary experience (9:8; cf. 22:3–16; 26:9–18), akin to a prophetic call,[808] which reveals to him the risen Jesus and leads to his commission; Ananias' vision (9:10–16) ultimately facilitates the latter.[809] The surprising nature of this total experience underscores its divine origin and thus enhances its viability as divine sanction.[810] The surprise relates both to the vision and the related commission. Saul sees the same (Lord) Jesus he is persecuting (9:5),[811] and is appointed to transfer the cult he hitherto staunchly opposed, taking it both to 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 his "colonizing" work to the earlier leaders of

---

[808] David Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 1983), 98, 202, 248.

[809] Though see 22:10; 26:16–17.

[810] Cf. chapter 2 (the "surprised *oikist*") and chapter 3 ("surprised apostles").

[811] 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 in bearing witness to an exalted Jesus. Cf. D. 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.

the movement, Jesus, the apostles, and Stephen.[812] In the immediate aftermath of his vision-inspired commission, Paul preaches only 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, but the fulfillment of his mandate to spread the cult to Gentiles as well Jews awaits the momentous encounter between Peter and Cornelius in Caesarea, followed by Paul's own commissioning in the "mixed" community at Antioch.

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).[813] Caesarea was a mixture of Jewish and Greek influences in the first century and so is an apt setting for this episode,[814] which relates the divinely initiated inclusion of gentiles

---

[812] 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.

[813] 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 citation of this episode in Acts 15:7–18 implies that it should be taken as a precedent (see below).

[814] 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 an imperial cult temple. See Josephus, *B.J.* 1.403, 414; Heidi Hänlein-Schäfer, *Veneratio Augusti: Eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers* (Rome:

into the community of Jesus followers.[815] Visions (τὰ ὁράματα; 10:3, 17, 19; cf. 11:5) are the vehicle for conveying the divine sanction,[816] as they are in some colonization accounts.[817] The first way they do so is by helping to facilitate the establishment of "mixed" communities through specific guidance. We have shown that guidance in the form of directives and directions are common fare in colonization accounts. Transmitted through oracles, visions, or prodigies, they enable the founder(s) to plant a new community at the appropriate site in fulfillment of his/their divine mandate.[818] In Acts 10–11, visions operate in a similar way—in conjunction with divine agents[819]—to lay the foundations for a "mixed" community at Caesarea.[820] The angel in Cornelius'

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 Ertez 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 the Jews in Caesarea related to their rulers and gentile neighbors.

[815] Wilson, "Urban Legends," 90.

[816] Cf. 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).

[817] See, e.g., Diodorus 7.5.1–7 (Ascanius and the foundation of Alba Long); 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).

[818] See the examples marshalled in chapter 2.

[819] In colonization accounts it is not unusual 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' account of Messene's refoundation (4.26.3–4), and the vision and prodigy in Plutarch's account of Alexandria's foundation (*Alex.* 26).

[820] Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 33.

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' men on the grounds that he had sent them (10:19–20; cf. 11:12).[821] Such guidance highlights the divine authorization of the meeting of the Jew Peter with the Gentile Cornelius.

Just as important is the 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 Jews 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.[822] Each was believed to threaten contamination, as is clear on the one hand from Peter's protestation that he has never eaten anything like this (10:14), and on the other his assertion that it is "unlawful . . . for a Jew to associate with or to visit anyone of another nation" (10:28).[823] These statements contribute to the

[821] 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' 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.
[822] See Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 104–5.
[823] Ibid.

impression of Peter as a "surprised" agent, which—as when used of colony founders[824] and founding figures such as the apostles[825]—underscores the divine orchestration of the ensuing events. Indeed, this is the point of the vision and its interpretation as given by Peter: God has cleansed 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).[826]

The subsequent events represent the fulfillment of the divine will communicated by the visions. First, Peter, as founding figure, acts in compliance with this will and extends the promise of forgiveness to Cornelius and his companions (10:36–43). Second, recalling Acts 2:1–4, the Holy Spirit falls on the auditors,[827] causing them to speak in tongues (10:46).[828] Third, Peter gave instructions that they should be "baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" (10:48). These events signify the inclusion of

---

[824] See Herodotus 154–59 (Battos and the foundation of Cyrene); Diodorus 8.17 (Myscellus and the foundation of Croton); Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization*, 18.

[825] See the discussion of Acts 1:6–8 in chapter 3.

[826] Cf. Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 105.

[827] Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 115, sees in the Holy Spirit's activity an allusion to Ezekiel's prophecy about the restoration of Israel.

[828] The amazed (ἐξίστημι) response of the onlookers binds together these episodes (2:7, 12; 10:45).

gentiles into the larger community of Jesus followers, which is further confirmed by Peter's stay here.[829] This event at Caesarea sets the necessary precedent for "mixed" communities.

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 established a pattern of ministry outside Jerusalem (8:4–13, 26–40). Paul assumes his colonizing responsibilities (9:15) once he is commissioned by the Holy Spirit and the community leaders at Antioch (13:3). Peter's activities at Caesarea (10:9—11:18) set a 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 represent a culmination and even extension of these earlier episodes.

---

[829] Ἠρώτησαν 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 reflect the importance of these cities in Luke's "colonizing" scheme.

4.3.4 Jerusalem Oversight

Yet because the community represents a replication of the mother city in Jerusalem, it is subject to the latter's authority.[830] Jerusalem exercises its prerogative not only since the Antiochene community was founded by someone other than the apostles ("founding figures"[831]) 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.[832] Athens sought to govern the colony following 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?

---

[830] 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.
[831] See chapter 2 for the basis for this designation.
[832] Diodorus 12.9f.

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.[833] This supervision mirrors Jerusalem's activity in earlier episodes. She sent Peter and John to Samaria after hearing that many of its inhabitants had "received the word of God" (8:14).[834] She tacitly endorsed Saul's ministry (9:26–30) though he had received divine sanction (9:3–19). And she weighed and approved the inclusion of Gentiles after hearing that Cornelius and his companions had "received the word of God" (11:1). In each one of these instances, Jerusalem's oversight ensures that the expansion of the colonizing movement does not occur at the cost of continuity with its origins.

Barnabas performs the role in Antioch that Peter and John did in Samaria. He oversees what amounts to the formal foundation of the Antiochene community. Barnabas, having already demonstrated his allegiance to the Jerusalem leadership (4:36–37),[835] is an apt choice to represent the mother community. In fact, Luke's

---

[833] 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. Barnabas's fetching of Paul from Tarsus (11:25–26a) may be an "editorial cement to bind" the narrative episodes together (172).

[834] This oversight was deemed necessary despite the fact that Philip performed "founding-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).

[835] See my discussion of these verses in chapter 2. Cf. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions,* 201–4.

description of him as a "good man, full of the holy spirit and of faith" (11:24), echoes the characterization of the Seven, also recognized by the Jerusalem leadership (6:3, 5). Those "scattered" from Jerusalem had 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 τῇ 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,[836] signals divine sanction for the formal founding of the Antiochene community as overseen by Barnabas.

Paul's role in the foundation of Antioch is more complicated since he came to Antioch through the efforts of Barnabas rather than Jerusalem.[837] 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

---

[836] Acts 2:41, 47; 4:4; 5:13–14; 6:7.

[837] 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).

leadership. Barnabas once again establishes the link between Paul and Jerusalem,[838] bringing the former from Tarsus to help fortify the Antiochene community (11:25–26).[839] The two shore up the founding in the same way Jesus and the apostles did in Jerusalem-Judea community: through teaching (11:26).[840] This teaching and Barnabas's earlier encouragement reinforces the proclamation of the "scattered" who had previously come to Antioch. Barnabas and Paul, therefore, approximate the figures in Libanius's *Antiochikos* who came to the city after Triptolemus. Though they represented a second wave of colonization, they also shored up Antioch's original identity. Casus embraced Triptolemus's institutions,[841] and Alexander and Seleucus alike honored the original founder's patron deity, Zeus.[842] But as I have shown, Barnabas and Paul not only

---

[838] 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.

[839] 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.

[840] 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. Cf. the discussion of founding actions in chapter 3.

[841] *Or.* 11.52–53.

[842] *Or.* 11.77. Triptolemus established the cult of Zeus Nemeius (later changed to Zeus Epicarpius); Alexander and Seleucus patronized the cult of Zeus Bottiaeus.

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 ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην (11:28–30). (In fact, Luke introduces Agabus as one of numerous prophets who came to Antioch from Jerusalem.[843]) Further, for their part, the Antiochene community responded by sending relief to its mother community, an act which was not simply benefaction but a symbol of cooperation with Jerusalem's authority.[844] Policy for certain colonial powers in the Classical and Hellenistic periods provides a useful analogue.[845]Athens, for example, expected colonies such as Amphipolis to direct natural as well as material resources to the *metropolis*.[846] The so-called foundation decree of Brea even announces the colony's responsibility to

---

[843] Agabus' prophecy διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος connects the figure to Peter's citation of Joel in Acts 2:18.
[844] Cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 20:49–53, who relates Queen Helena's support for Jerusalem during a famine.
[845] Figueira, "Colonisation in the Classical Period," 2:450–51. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements,* 21, 42, 64–65.
[846] Thucydides 4.108.1.

contribute offerings to Athens' Great Panathenaea and Dionysia festivals—a cow and panoply for the former, a phallus for the latter.[847] In Acts, the expression of διακονία (if not the word itself)[848] recalls the earlier distribution that helped define the identity of the community in Jerusalem while certifying the authority of the apostles (Acts 2:42–47; 4:32—5:11).[849] The famine relief accomplishes a similar function but at the inter-community level: it identifies the Antiochene community as a "colony" of the mother community in Jerusalem,[850] a link underscored by the selection of Barnabas (4:36–37) and Paul (9:27–28)—both recognized by the latter—to deliver the assistance (11:30).[851]

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,[852]

---

[847] *IG* 1^3 46, lines 15–17.
[848] Though see 6:1.
[849] See chapter 3; Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions*.
[850] 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.
[851] Cf. Acts 15:2.
[852] 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.

that “the disciples [here] were first called Christians” (11:26). At its inception, the term no doubt had a derogatory connotation,[853] 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,[854] and that this development occurred because the crisis-driven transfer of the Jesus cult had resulted in the formation of a “mixed” community in Antioch. In Acts this turn of events proves to be pivotal as Antioch goes on to commission the founding of other “mixed” communities via the transfer of cult.

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 been arguing that a colonization framework nicely accounts for the community’s distinctive

[853] 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.
[854] See Meeks and Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch*, 16.

role. In the first place, Luke depicts the community in Antioch as a "colony" planted by the mother community in Jerusalem. In doing so, 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 "colonizing," which—headlined by Antioch of Pisidia—runs through 14:28, where the "founding figures" return and report on their work.[855] In the balance of this chapter I will demonstrate how divine sanction and institutions—leadership and religious—inform the Antiochene community's status as a founder of "second generation" colonies.

[855] Cf. Acts 18:22–23. Paul's return approximates the return of some Greek founders to their *metropoleis.* See, e.g., the cases of Lampon (Diodorus 12.9), Hagnon (Thucydides 4.102–8; 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 but 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 the colony was appointed by the senate, with the members (probably) free to return once they had discharged their duties. Cf. 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*, 136–144) did not reside in Rome's colonies.

4.4.1 Divine Sanction of the Colonizing Venture

As demonstrated in chapters 1 and 2, divine support is what most validates colonizing ventures, and the same is true of the missions spearheaded by the Antiochene community. In 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," underscoring divine initiative.[856] Here, as is common in Acts, it is the Holy Spirit who orchestrates the present enterprise. This recalls Acts 1–2, where the Holy Spirit empowered believers as a follow-up to Jesus's "surprising" oracle (1:6–8), and thus initiated the "colonizing" mission.[857] With Jesus absent from the scene, the Holy Spirit communicates instructions not just empowerment. He uses the language of separation (ἀφορίσατε)—in a positive sense—to stress the divine nature of the mission to be helmed by Barnabas and Paul as leaders of the Antiochene community,[858] and now founding figures of "second

[856] See, e.g., Herodotus 4.155; Diodorus 8.17; Ovid, *Metam.* 15.17–60.

[857] Apart from its empowering role in Acts 2:1–4, the Holy Spirit directs "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.

[858] 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.

generation" communities. (A mere two verses later Luke reiterates that the men had been "sent out by the Holy Spirit" [13:3].) The sanction clearly runs deeper than simple authorization since the Holy Spirit casts the mission as a divine one, depicted as τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς (13:2).[859] This appointment to a divine task recalls the Lord's identification of Paul as σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς as part of his commissioning (9:15; cf. 22:14; 26:16), which affirms the continuity of God's colonizing plan. By extension, this 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 Greek and Roman imperial periods; she would send out colonies due to a vested interest. Such a tight-knit connection was not applicable in all earlier contexts.[860] Sometimes, for instance, the very act of colonization

---

[859] Cf. Eph 2:10. This type of identification of a divine being with a particular venture is comparable to Artemis' in the transfer of her cult to Massalia (Strabo 4.1.4–5) and Apollo's in the foundation of Cyrene (Pindar, *Pyth.* 4, 5, 9; Callimachus *Hymn. Apoll.* 2:86; Calame, *Myth and History in Ancient Greece.*

[860] The safest conclusion is that variety typified the relations between colonies and their *metropoleis,* especially during Greek colonization. See Graham, *Colony and Mother City*.

presupposed a break of some kind between *metropolis* and settlement party.[861] The *oikist* often 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.[862] In imperial contexts, however, the *metropolis* (e.g., Athens and Rome) more tightly controlled the goals and processes of colonization. In such case, the founder(s) were agents of the *metropolis*.[863]

Then there are instances in which the *metropolis* possessed a tangible stake in colonization but is presented as cooperating with the divine will.[864] 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

---

[861] Though, as the case of Taras demonstrates, literary reports of discord between colonizers and their *metropolis* can be misleading as to the actual relations between two entities. See Hall, "Foundation Stories," 420–21.

[862] Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece.*

[863] Hagnon, founder of Amphipolis, acted on behalf of Athens (Thucydides 4.102–8), 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.

[864] See, for example, Sparta's inquiry about conquering/controlling Tegea (Herodotus 1.66–68).

orientation of the community, recalling the depiction of the Jerusalem community in Acts 2:42, 46. In Jesus's absence, worship and fasting created an environment ripe for divine revelation.[865]

Equally significant, though, is the *manner* in which the community sends off two of its members: by "fasting and praying" and laying hands on them. This collocation of actions is suggests an official commission. Characters employ prayer, of course, at critical junctures throughout Acts. In several places, as here, prayer is used in the context of leadership decisions. The disciples prayed when selecting Judas' replacement (1:24). Paul prayed 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—when portraying the selection of the Seven; in 14:23 he refers to the practices in relation to Paul and Barnabas's designation of elders to oversee communities planted on their first colonizing venture. When considered in light of these other passages, the pairing of prayer with fasting and laying on hands Acts 13 reinforces the impression

[865] 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.

that this amounts to a formal commissioning of Barnabas and Paul—in this case not as elders or distributers of resources but as founding figures.

Yet, again, this formal commissioning represents an act of cooperation between the Antiochene community and the divine will communicated by the Holy Spirit. For this reason, Luke can claim that both entities "sent off" Barnabas and Paul (13:3, 4).[866] Far from diminishing the Antiochene community's authority, in the theological world of Acts, the fact of its obedience to the Holy Spirit's directive legitimates the Antiochene community, particularly as mother community of "second generation" colonies. The payoff of the community's "cooperative" oversight is observed in 14:26–28, where Paul and Barnabus—debriefing in Antioch after their first colonizing ventures—reported "all that God had done with them, and how he had opened a door of faith to the Gentiles."[867]

---

[866] Cf. Acts 15:28.

[867] The report apprised the Antiochene community of the colonizing performed under its aegis, and therefore represents oversight comparable to the visits of influential leaders in the Jerusalem community to Samaria (8:14–25) and Antioch (11:22–26).

4.4.2 Community "Institutions"

Nothing validates colonizing efforts more than divine sanction. However, Luke's depiction of the Antiochene community's "institutions" contributes to the impression of her as a legitimate mother community. I have discussed "institutions" before.[868] They were the all-encompassing set of practices which governed a community's civic life and shaped its identity.[869] Formal laws may qualify as "institutions," but so too did a community's form of government, festival calendar, and seminal religious practices. "Institutions" were critical in the context of colonization because they helped determine what kind of an entity a new community would be—for example, whether democratic or aristocrat-led. In Acts, of course, we have already encountered "institutions" defining the Jerusalem community. Foremost among these were apostolic leadership[870] along with "common life," stamped by practices such as shared meals, prayer, and resource distribution (Acts 2:42–47; 4:32—5:11).[871] But now, with the

---

[868] See chapter 2.

[869] 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" (Irad Malkin, *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011], 55).

[870] Cf. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions*.

[871] See chapter 3.

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.[872]

4.4.3.1 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"[873] and the figures themselves—"Barnabas; Simeon, called Niger; Lucius of Cyrene; Manaean, one brought up with Herod the Tetrarch; and Saul" (13:1)—leaving little doubt that they preside over the newly planted community.[874] Indeed, it is the first such information Luke supplies about a community outside Jerusalem. There we

---

[872] We have already encountered 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).

[873] Cf. 1 Cor 12:28; Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 35–36.

[874] Luke does not specify who delimited the leadership model. It was probably the founder and/or mother cities who made such determinations in newly founded colonies. Such 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 tells us that when Romulus himself was leader, he varied his style from that of a populist and monarch (*Rom.* 26.1–2; 27.1–2).

meet the apostles[875] and the seven Hellenists.[876] Only later do we encounter the idea of "elders"—both in Jerusalem[877] and the diaspora.[878] That fact that we learn of the Antiochene community's leadership "institutions" enhances the impression that it is the first bona fide "colony" of the Jerusalem community. It is not surprising, therefore, that the "institutions" reflect a connection both with the mother community and its colonizing mission.

Signaling a link with its origins, indeed, was one way a city's "institutions" shaped its identity.[879] We see this especially in the case of ancient Greek colonization. Thucydides reports, for example, that the settlers from Gela who founded Acragas gave the colony Geloan *nomima* ("institutions").[880] Similarly, Massalia adopted the

---

[875] 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; 1:8; 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).
[876] 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).
[877] 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).
[878] Acts 14:23; 20:17.
[879] Cf. Malkin, *Myth and Territory*, 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."
[880] 6.4.4.

"institutions" of Ionia pertaining to the cult of Ephesian Artemis,[881] and when founding Rome, Romulus incorporated the rites of Evander, who hailed from Arcadia.[882] This phenomenon is also seen in more specifically detailed cases of the adoption of leadership "institutions." So, for example, Sparta and her "colony" Taras adopted ephors as part of their respective leadership hierarchies[883]—as did Heracleia, a colony of Taras.[884] By the same token Megara and many of her colonies possessed a "board of five magistrates . . . *aisymnatai.*"[885] These decisions about leadership "institutions" thus shaped the identity of the respective colonies by highlighting the relationship of each with her mother city.

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, and 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

---

[881] Strabo 4.1.4–5. See above.
[882] Livy 1.3.
[883] Malkin, *A Small Greek World,* 191, 195.
[884] Malkin, *Myth and Territory*, 234.
[885] Malkin, *A Small Greek World,* 191, 195.

meet the Antiochene community's leadership (13:1; cf. 1:21–26) and witness its chief figures receiving their mandate to "colonize" (13:2–3; cf. 1:8; 2:1–4).[886] Second, it frames the leadership list with two Jerusalem-approved figures—Barnabas and Saul (13:1).[887] Of course, the identity of the other leaders—Simeon, Lucius, and Manean—is hardly unimportant. Their geographic if not ethnic diversity approximates the Antiochene community's "mixed" character,[888] as well as that of its future "colonies." But the leadership of Barnabas and Paul links the Antiochene community to the Jerusalem community as part of the same "colonizing" network.[889]

Third and finally, Luke's identification of προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι (13:1) as leaders in the Antiochene community underscores its continuity with the origins of the colonizing movement. Certain individuals such as Agabus (11:28; 21:10),[890] Judas and

---

[886] See chapter 3. In the earlier instance, Luke sandwiches his depiction of the Jerusalem community's leaders—the Twelve as reconstituted by Judas's replacement (1:21–26)—between reinforcing forms of divine sanction: the oracle (1:8) and the Holy Spirit's empowerment (2:1–4).
[887] See above my comments on Acts 11:22–26. Cf. 4:36–37; 9:27–30.
[888] Cf. Keener, *Acts,* 2:1983–90.
[889] Interestingly, the appointment of the "Hellenists" in Acts 6 foreshadows the connection between Jerusalem and Antioch. Luke lists among the seven appointed διακονεῖν τραπέζαις a certain Nicolaus, a proselyte of Antioch (6:5).
[890] In fact, Agabus played a key role in facilitating Antioch's relationship with Jerusalem through his prophecy about famine, which led to the relief visit of Paul and Barnabas on behalf of the colony. But Luke mentioned Agabus in that context as one of a number of prophets who "come down from Jerusalem to Antioch" (11:27), allowing for the possibility that some of them formed part of the leadership now

Silas (15:32) and Philip's daughters (21:9) are singled out as prophets even though the gift of prophecy was capable of wide distribution (19:9). Luke portrays Agabus as a foreteller of the future, but his depiction of prophecy throughout Acts is varied.[891] Prophets, as Ellis notes, are responsible not only for prediction but also "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."[892] The salient point is that "prophecy" was a gift of the Holy Spirit, first poured out upon believers in Jerusalem (2:17). The prophetic leadership in Antioch, therefore, underscores its connection with the mother community.

By the same token, the leadership "institutions" foster accord with the colonizing mission sanctioned in Jerusalem. Luke connects this mission to the gift of the Holy Spirit (1:8), and with it, prophecy, both of which he presents as eschatological events (2:17). The goal of the end-time mission is universal salvation (2:21; cf. 3:24).

---

overseeing the Antiochene community; this potentiality would further strengthen the community's ties with the mother community.

[891] 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.

[892] Ibid., 56.

Jesus himself was the prophet like Moses because he proffered salvation—or its corollary, destruction (3:13–26).[893] His apostles, such as Peter, perform a prophetic role when they "witness" to Jesus's status as savior (5:30–32).[894] So also with Paul: he received a commission (9:15) and went on to proclaim Jesus as savior in places such as Psidian Antioch (13:23, 26), after having served as part of the leadership team of "prophets and teachers" in Antioch (13:1). Paul's experience, like Peter's before him, suggests that the role of "prophets" and "teachers" reinforce each other. Indeed, the interpretive of Israel's traditions and scriptures from the vantage point of Jesus's messianic status constitutes part of the prophetic task.[895] The leadership "institution" of prophet-teacher, therefore, links the Antiochene community to the colonizing mission sanctioned in Jerusalem, while contributing to its position as a mother community.

---

[893] 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.

[894] Cf. Aune, "Christian Prophecy and the Messianic Status of Jesus," 421–22, on the "prophetic vision" of Jesus's exalted state qualifying him as messiah (5:31).

[895] Cf. Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome,* 56; Croatto, "Jesus, Prophet Like Elijah," 461, 462, 464. Luke associates "teaching" with 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.

4.4.3.2 Religious Institutions

What we might call "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.[896] In some "mixed" colonies, such as Rhegion, one group of settlers would come to dominate.[897] Nevertheless, the challenge thrust upon such communities was to agree on "institutions" amenable to the different groups or, at least, reflective of the colony's "mixed" character. Himera, for example, adopted Chalcidic institutions since the main body of her settlers hailed from Chalcis while a smaller contingent comprised fugitives from Syracuse.[898] But compromise was sometimes necessary. With this aim in mind, no doubt, Gela's settlers who came from Rhodes and Crete adopted "Dorian" institutions.[899] These "semi-inclusive" institutions presumably furnished a common identity, on the basis of which the different groups of community members could be integrated.[900] Something analogous occurs in the determination of religious "institutions" in Acts 15.

---

[896] See the examples listed above.
[897] See Graham, *Colony and Mother City*, 17–20.
[898] Thucydides 6.5.1.
[899] 6.4.3. See the discussion of "sub-ethnic" *nomima* in chapter 2; Malkin, *A Small Greek World,* 74–75.
[900] Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 143.

In Acts 15 the challenge centers on the practice of circumcision—namely, whether it should be made mandatory for gentiles members of the "mixed" community.[901] Certain "men who had come down from Judea"[902] insisted on the necessity of the rite for salvation (15:1).[903] It was hardly unusual for a mother city—in this case, Jerusalem—to require its colony to abide by certain practices viewed as definitive 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" Israel[904] and to eliminate the threat of

---

[901] 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.

[902] Luke stops short of saying that these men represent the view of the Jerusalem leaders (cf. 15:24; Craig C. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992], 117), for he associates the latter's authority with a more moderate judgment about Antioch's institutions excluding circumcision (15:19–21).

[903] The receipt 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.

[904] 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

contamination for Jewish members of the community sharing meals and spaces with their gentile counterparts.[905] Imposing this institutional requirement in mixed Christian communities was problematic. On a practical level, it would certainly limit converts. But more pertinent for Luke, as discussed below, is that the insistence flew against God's plan of outreach to gentiles. It is therefore not surprising that the Judeans' insistence on circumcision stirred up discord[906] with Paul and Barnabas.[907] Luke depicts the Judeans' actions as "teaching," inviting a contrast with the real prophet-teachers and formal founding figures of the Antochene community—a technique used

---

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 to 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 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.

[905] Cf. Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 91–142.

[906] 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 possess responsibility for instigating the "strife."

[907] See above for this characterization.

earlier in the portrayal of conflict between Peter and John, on the one hand, and the religious leaders in Jerusalem, on the other.[908]

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 had been formally commissioned by the Antiochene community leaders in compliance with the Holy Spirit's instructions (Acts 13:2–3). A similar sequence occurs during the Jerusalem council: Paul and Barnabas report on God's work through them, which elicits the troublesome intervention of some "believers" (15:4–5).[909] The implication is that the institutions determined for the Antioch community would also influence the identity of

---

[908] See chapter 3. The contrast is ultimately about who accurately articulates the divine will.
[909] 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).

her "colonies." The letter conveying Jerusalem's judgment makes this implication explicit by addressing not only "Antioch and Syria" but also "Cilicia" (15:23).[910]

What was at stake in the resolution? As I have argued, it is the identity of the Antiochene community and her "colonies," predicated on the full and equal inclusion of their gentile members *as* gentiles.[911] How was this to be attained? And would such "mixed" communities qualify as legitimately belonging among the people of God?

Cultic identification—via commitment to patron deities—was a critical concern in colonial contexts. Colonists in Sicily, for example, established a cult of Apollo *Archegetes* at Naxos[912] to foster community and prevent conflict among the island's various groups of Greek setters.[913] Similarly, according to Libanius the cults of Zeus and Apollo were formative for the identity of Antioch and nearby Daphne, respectively.[914]

---

[910] Paul and Barnabas traveled even farther than Cilicia. The province, in a way, is synecdoche for the expanding mission.
[911] Tiede, *Prophecy and History,* 50.
[912] Thucydides 6.3.1–2; cf. Parke and Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, 1:66–67.
[913] 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.
[914] 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' 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*.

From the perspective of the reader and "outsiders" in the narrative, the Antiochene community's foremost association is with the God of Israel. After all, it was the Lord who stood behind the receptive response of gentiles,[915] and observers had begun to identify the community members as partisans of Christ (Χριστιανούς; 11:26),[916] whom Luke consistently presents as God's appointed founder.[917] However, ironically, Judean "insiders" express qualms about the terms of gentile inclusion in this cultic community. While Barnabas's oversight (Acts 11:22–24) might have allayed most of these concerns, it was still necessary to determine the institutions formalizing their new identity. Therefore, to answer the initial question: What is at stake is nothing less than the legitimacy of the Antiochene community and its "colonies" as part of the movement sanctioned by the 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

---

[915] See, e.g., Acts 11:21; 13:48.

[916] 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]."

[917] Acts 1:6–8; 2:22–36; 3:13–26; 4:10–12, 27; 5:29–32. See chapter 3. Cf. Balch, "ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ," 139–88.

community and its colonies.[918] 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 two of Athens's famous festivals, the Great Panathenaea and Dionysia. Graham adduces further examples: Didyma was bound to Miletus by the cult of Apollo;[919] Gela submitted a dedication to Athena of Lindos;[920] Astypalaea made an offering at Epidauros.[921] He suggests as well that Argos, as mother city of both Cnossus and Tylissus, required her colonies to sacrifice to Argive deities.[922] Rome, moreover, established the Capitoline Triad of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva in some of the colonies which she planted.[923]

---

[918] 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.

[919] Graham, *Colony and Mother City,* 161.

[920] Ibid.

[921] Ibid., 163–64.

[922] Ibid., 156.

[923] Torelli, *Tota Italia,* 30, 134. Once caveat: The degree to which Rome (in the middle Republic) sought to make "little Romes" as Gellius imagined it has been overstated. See Bispham, "Coloniam Deducere," 73–160; T. C. A. de Haas, *Fields, Farms and Colonists: Intensive Field Survey and Early Roman Colonization in the Pontine Region, Central Itay* (Groningen: Barkhuis, 2011), 1:299–300.

In the case of the Antiochene community, Jerusalem had already asserted her authority by sending Barnabas (through whose efforts Paul also was brought over; 11:15–26) to put her imprimatur on the "colony's" foundation (11:22–25).[924] Barnabas and Paul themselves play a subordinate role in the determination of Antioch's institutions: they report on the σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα (15.12; cf. 15:4) and accompany the letter carrying Jerusalem's decision back to Antioch (15:22–26),[925] just as they had "carried" the issue in dispute to Jerusalem (15:2–4). Ultimately, they are accountable to Jerusalem's leadership. It is Peter and (especially) James who wield the power to determine Antioch and its colonies' institutions, and the space allotted to each one's speech is evidence of their weightier authority (15:7–11; 13–21).[926]

Together the speeches articulate God's will concerning the inclusion of gentile Christians. Peter's speech invokes the belief of gentiles at Caesarea and their reception

---

[924] See above.

[925] 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 Galatians 2:11–18.

[926] By contrast, the words of Paul and Barnabas receive short summaries (15:4, 12).

of the Holy Spirit (Acts 10:9–11:18)[927] 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 (15:15–6) and to rescue a gentile remnant (15:17–18).[928] Second, it renders a "judgment" (δὶο ἐγὼ κρίνω; 15:15–21) about the customs meant to facilitate the latter's integration. The letter, which communicates this decision, symbolizes the authority of the Jerusalem community over the Antiochene community,[929] an effect which Judas, Silas, Barnabas, and Paul's accompaniment of it likewise conveys (15:22, 32–33).[930]

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

---

927 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).

928 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.

929 Cf. ibid., 114.

930 The parallel role of Judas and Silas' is seen how both "encourage" (15:32; cf. 15:31) and elicit a warm response (15:33; cf. 15:31).

authority to secure its acceptance. Peter and James's involvement, it is true, lent gravitas to the proceedings as well as the resolution, but this by itself was hardly sufficient to win approval for the full inclusion of Gentiles "as they are" without there being a divine basis[931] for this development. The same emphasis on divine initiative, we have shown, features prominently in colonization accounts more generally.[932] Recall how in Libanius' *Antiochikos*, for example, Zeus summoned Casus—the "flower of the Cretans"—to Syria because he wanted the new settlement to be peopled with "the best stock."[933] Paul and Barnabas's reports alone play a part in establishing divine initiative since they announce how God was working through them (15:4, 12). But Luke's desire to stress the continuity of the colonizing movement from its inception to the current stage of gentile outreach beyond Jerusalem-Judea leads him to place in the mouths of Peter and James a fuller articulation of God's will concerning the gentile inclusion. The speeches are complementary: Peter's cites a precedent for God's present work among

---

[931] Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*, 50, 52. Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 120.
[932] See the examples cited in chapter 2.
[933] *Or.* 11.52–53.

Gentiles (15:7–11), while James's offers further interpretation of this precedent (15:13–18) before rendering a final judgment (15:19–21).

Peter insists that God's initiative drives the mission to the Gentiles and cites his outreach to Cornelius, using the apostle himself, as proof.[934] Above we 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 that it was indeed divine forces that dissolved the boundary markers separating gentiles from full and equal inclusion in the colonizing community.[935] Here Peter makes the same point drawing on the language of election. While acknowledging his own proclamation (δὶα τοῦ στόματος μου), he subordinates this participation 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 which reinforce divine initiative. First, God marked the authenticity of their belief by giving gentile converts the Holy

---

[934] Cf. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews,* 122.

[935] On boundary-drawing in the Second Temple period, see Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 97–98.

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.[936] Just as Peter had pointed to God's "choice" as the reason why, ultimately, the gentiles hear and believe (15:7), so too he presents the gift of the Holy Spirit as orchestrated by God, citing his knowledge of their uprightness (15:8; cf. 5:1–11) and "witnessing to" his sanction of their inclusion (15:8). Second, God's choice and gift of the Holy Spirit ensured that this inclusion was to occur on a full and equal basis. In the context of "mixed" colonies, comprising parties from two or more different points of origin, "equality of rights" was often a pivotal term of settlement since it helped protect against potential divisions among settlers.[937] 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,

---

[936] Acts 2:38, 41; 8:12–17, 36; 10:44–48; 11:21; 13:12, 48; 16:14–15, 30–34.

[937] 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 for 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" for the Sabines whom he overcame and incorporated into Rome (Plutarch, *Rom.* 16.4).

though they might have been 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. Therefore, they could be full and equal members of the community without fear of their profaning or (morally) polluting Jewish members.[938]

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, recalling the opposition in Acts 3–5.[939] 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 preventing 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) of disciples that neither our fathers nor

---

[938] Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 104–105, cf. 120.
[939] See chapter 3.

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.[940]

James also stresses God's initiative behind the outreach to and inclusion of gentiles. Indeed, James's judgment (διό; 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:[941] "God first[942] *visited to take* (ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν) from the gentiles a people for his name" (15:14).[943] This language of election recalls Peter's in 15:7. But James expounds even further than Peter on how God expressed his will at Caesarea—interpreting the event

---

[940] Cf. Wilson, "Urban Legends," 90.

[941] Cf. Apollo's founding of Cyrene (Pindar, *Pyth.* 5, 9; Callimachus, *Hymn. Apoll.*; Calame, *Myth and History*).

[942] "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).

[943] Cf. Deut 18:5; 21:5 where similar language describes the "setting apart" of Levites.

through the lens of scripture (15:15–18).[944] 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 mankind[945] may seek the Lord" (15:17). The perspective that gentile fortunes are linked to the restoration of Israel one which has marked the narrative since Acts 1–2.[946] It also serves 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 ὄνομά 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).[947]

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 ἐθνῶν ἐπιστρέφουσιν τὸν θεόν; 15:19; cf. 15:10). His

---

[944] 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.
[945] The LXX refers to a remnant of "mankind" (τῶν ἀνθρώπων) in place of the MT's more parochial "of Edom" (Amos 9:12).
[946] See Acts 1:6–8 and 2:1–41 together with my commets on these passages in chapter 3.
[947] 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).

"judgment" produces a compromise[948] which takes account of the Jewish origins of the movement as well as the "mixed" nature of the Antiochene community and its "colonies." Yet in "mixed" colonies compromise over institutions was frequently necessary, as suggested above. James's judgment excludes the rigorous of the proposed institutions, circumcision (15:1, 5), while insisting on abstention from τῶν ἀλισγημάτων κὰι τῆς πορνείας κὰι τοῦ πνικτοῦ κὰι αἵματος.[949]

It may be, as Borgen argues, that the stipulations in 15:20 (cf. Acts 15:29) in actuality originated as a catalogue of vices.[950] Nevertheless, Luke represents them as a

---

[948] Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews,* 145, argues that the compromise was struck in response to the "Antioch incident" reported in Gal 2:11–18.

[949] 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 situations 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.

[950] Borgen, "Catalogues of Vices," characterizes "new life" through the Spirit as the corresponding virtue (132).

decree adjudicated and circulated by the Jerusalem leadership,[951] reaffirming the mother community's jurisdiction over her "colony."[952] For Luke, Jerusalem's influence over the institutions of Antioch and her "colonies" helps 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 (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 together 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 that they backed their own members ἐτάραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγοις

---

[951] Cf. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 114. Antioch's acceptance of Jerusalem's terms and emissaries (15:32–33) signals a corresponding acceptance of her right as mother community to shape the colony's institutions.
[952] Cf. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 114.

ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν (15:24), and announce their intention to μηδὲν πλεὸν 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.[953]

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 not limited to) Leviticus 17–18.[954] There might not have been an established norm which governed common meal practices between Jews and Gentiles,[955] but a list of prohibitions such as Luke's—featuring idolatry and *porneia*, common in anti-Gentile Jewish invective[956]—would have helped underscore the Jewish

---

[953] Cf. Borgen, "Catalogues of Vices," 136.

[954] 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.

[955] Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews,* 115. *Contra* Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts,* 118–22.

[956] Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 97, 120. Cf. Borgen, "Catalogues of Vices," 131–32.

origins of the "mixed" Christian communities in Antioch and beyond.[957] More to the point, these intuitions would have signaled a common identity predicated on the worship of the Jewish god, similar to how Massalia, its satellite cities, and its colonies were defined by their devotion to Artemis and her cult.[958] Or how, according to Libanius, the cult of Zeus marked Antioch, and that of Apollo, Daphene. 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),[959] rendering acceptable an erstwhile

---

[957] 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."

[958] Or Sicily (Thucydides 6.3.1–2) and Cyrene (Herodotus 4.158; Pindar, *Pyth.* 4, 5, 9; Callimachus, *Hymn. Apoll.* 2.86) to Apollo; Messene to Demeter (Pausanias 4.26–27); Alexandria (along with Apollo) to Isis (Arrian 3.1.5–2.1).

[959] 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.

profane and (morally) impure people.[960] 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 they articulate represent the implications of an identity previously fashioned for them by divine initiative.[961]

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 cult transfer, has emerged as a mother city in her own right—of second generation, "mixed" colonies like herself. The community possesses her own institutions of leadership and religious identity. Even more crucial, her "colonizing" ventures are legitimized by the initiative of the Holy Spirit. Because of her dual role as colony and mother community, Antioch thus occupies a pivotal place in Acts, embodying the expansion of the colonizing movement beyond its origins in Jerusalem-Judea and eventually all the way to Rome. The Antiochene community sponsors the

---

[960] Ibid., 120; cf. 97–98, 104–5, 118.
[961] Ibid; Borgen, "Catalogues of Vices," 136.

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—the "Rome of the East."

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 to sponsor 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, 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 Syrian Antioch 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, as judged from the space which Luke allocates 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.[962] Moreover, in both this episode and the one in Lystra (14:8–20a), Paul gives speeches which involve "rewriting history"[963] in cultic contexts: "the center of Jewish cult symbolized by the meeting in the synagogue on the one hand, and the

---

[962] 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.

[963] See A. Destro and M. Pesce, "Paul's Speeches at Pisidian Antioch and Lystra: 'Mise En Histoire' and Social Memory," in *Actes Du Ier Congres International Sur Antioche de Pisidie,* ed. Thomas Drew-Bear, Mehmet Taşıalan, and Christine M. Thomas (Lyons: Université Lumière-Lyon 2, UMR 5649 du CNRS, 2002), 33–43.

Gentile cult on the other, symbolized by the sacrificial cult and the temple of Zeus" (14:11–13).[964]

Finally, the Antiochene speech for the first time reveals the content of Paul's message,[965] and as such is analogous to Jesus's inaugural sermon in Luke 4 and Peter's in Acts 2.[966] 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 "programmatic for Luke's promise-fulfillment motif."[967] At the same time, bearing in mind Paul's mandate to βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον 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 through both its institutions and architectural monuments. Luke

---

[964] Destro and Pesce, "Paul's Speeches at Pisidian Antioch and Lystra," 37.

[965] 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.

[966] G. F. Synder, "The Godfearers in Paul's Speech at Pisidian Antioch," in *Actes Du Ier Congres International Sur Antioche de Pisidie*, 45. Zhang, *Paul Among the Jews*; Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary*, 331.

[967] Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 131.

arguably places this episode in Antioch to anticipates the spread of the colonizing message to Rome (28:14–31).[968] 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 continued by the apostles as his representatives.

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 period, and thus underscore the significance of Paul and Barnabas' 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 Lucan Paul to expound the rhetoric of

---

[968] 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."

"second-generation" colonization, which, beginning in Syrian Antioch, eventually reaches all the way to the capital of the empire.

By the time Acts was written, Antioch had a well-established history as a colonized city.[969] Prior to the Romans, sometime in the 3rd century BCE, the Seleucids (probably Antiochus I or II) colonized the inland city[970]—which adjoined the Sultan Dağ Mountain and relied on the nearby Anthius River for its water[971]—populating it with settlers from Magnesia-on-the-Meander.[972] 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, grammateis*.[973] Little has been excavated of the original Seleucid colony. However, it is likely that Antioch in this early period also featured quintessential Hellenistic buildings

---

[969] 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, Wales: 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).
[970] Adrian J. Ossi and J. Matthew Harrington, "Pisidian Antioch: The Urban Infrastructure and Its Development," in *Building a New Rome*, 15.
[971] Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 42–44.
[972] Ibid., 18.
[973] Ibid., 72.

such as a theater, stadium, and temples.[974] The evidence is secure, at least, for the erection of the sanctuary of Mên Askaênos atop Kara Kuyu east of Antioch,[975] along with cult activity there,[976] 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 Antioch and Pergamum suggest this was an impressionable period.[977] 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.[978]

Augustus founded *Antiocheia Caesarea* in 25 BCE as part of the new province of Galatia; later, the city achieved the status of *colonia*.[979] Roads helped link interior cities like Antioch—along with the other Pisidian colonies founded around the same time—to the coast.[980] Antioch was well positioned with respect to many of the minor roads,[981]

---

[974] Ossi and Harrington, "Pisidian Antioch," 17.
[975] Katharine A. Raff, "The Architecture of the Sanctuary of Mên Askaênos: Exploration, Reconstruction, and Use, " in *Building a New Rome*, 151–52.
[976] Lori Khatchadourian, "The Cult of Mên at Pisidian Antioch," in *Building a New Rome,* 153–55.
[977] Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 125–27.
[978] Ibid., 28–29.
[979] Ibid., 34–37, 137.
[980] In point of fact, Antioch lay in Phrygia not Pisidia. Strabo 12.6.4; 8.14.
[981] Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 13, 18, 42.

and she stood along another road built only three decades later to secure Pisidia, the *via Sebaste.*[982] As was his modus operandi pertaining to overseas colonies, Augustus settled Antioch with veterans from his legions[983]—in this case from the V and the VII legions, whose soldiers largely hailed from northern and central Italy.[984] 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.[985] Only the richest would enter the ranks of the city's elite and become "cultural liaisons" between the native population and new Roman colonists.[986] Yet despite this denial of privileges, native residents would have participated alongside new colonists "in the processes of becoming involved in the Empire,"[987] simply by

[982] Ibid., 39.
[983] 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.
[984] 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.
[985] Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 75.
[986] Rubin, "Ruler Cult and Colonial Identity," 34.
[987] R. 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 assumed. 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 dominate for centuries by the coloni and their descendants."

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 divided up into *vici* (or "wards") corresponding to the seven hills—again like 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 her history. Like Rome initially, too, Antioch's citizens were organized into tribes, which formed the basis for their voting.[988] 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.*[989] 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."[990]

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*

---

[988] Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 76–78.
[989] Ibid., 78–90.
[990] Ibid., 91.

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,"[991] possibly named the Augusta Platea if a nearby inscription is any guide. The platea whose remains have been most thoroughly excavated, however, was positioned at the southeast of Antioch's urban space. Discovery of Hellenistic coins suggest the area was popular prior to Roman arrival, but the Roman 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."[992] 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 Tibera Platea fed into the imperial cult complex, which was positioned at the eastern side of the city.

[991] Ossi and Harrington, "Pisidian Antioch," 19.
[992] Rubin, "Ruler Cult and Colonial Identity," 41.

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.[993] The staircase itself featured an inscribed copy of the *Res Gestae,* the first-person reportage of Augustus's achievements.[994] According to Suetonius, the *princeps* instructed that the declaration be inscribed on bronze tablets and placed in front of his mausoleum,[995] but the only surviving copies belong to the Galatian cities of Ankara, Apollonia, and Antioch.[996] 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.[997] 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,[998] catering to the language of the veteran soldiers comprising the core of the colony's population. Its placement on

---

[993] Alcock, "Roman Colonies of the Eastern Empire," 316.

[994] The remains of the *Res Gestae* are preserved in the Yalvaç museum in Turkey.

[995] *Aug.* 101.4.

[996] See Suna Güven, "Displaying the Res Gestae of Augustus: A Monument of Imperial Imagery for All," *JSAH* 57 (1998): 30–45.

[997] Ibid., 40.

[998] 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."

the stairway was not incidental. Güven observes that the Romans "trained themselves to 'remember' ideas locating ideas in space."[999] 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. [1000] 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,"[1001] inviting them to recall their Augustan origins.

The *Res Gestae* covers much ground. Broadly, it addresses Augustus's honors, awarded by the senate, which he 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).[1002] The tone of the documents may be measured, but the figure that emerges from it is, by virtue of his deeds, larger-than-life by virtue of his deeds—even indispensable. Augustus brought order to geo-politics. Not only did he restore the republic,[1003] he also "placed the whole world under the sovereignty of the Roman

---

[999] Ibid., 40.
[1000] Ibid.
[1001] Ibid.
[1002] See Frederick W. Shipley, "Introduction to the *Res Gestae* of Augustus," LCL, 336.
[1003] Res Gest. Divi Aug. 1 (cf. 34).

people" (Res Gest. Divi Aug. preface [Shipley, LCL]), bringing to heel the Dacians[1004] and other newly subjected peoples.[1005] 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 the Roman order presiding over far-off places such as Pisidian Antioch.

It was not only for his empire-building that Augustus proved worthy of veneration; he was also beneficent and pious. He showcased his generosity to the general public with games and spectacles, but he was equally attentive to his soldiers, at one point awarding 10,000 sesterces to veteran colonists.[1006] Augustus demonstrated his piety to the gods by constructing and repairing temples around Rome, such as the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine hill[1007] and the Temple of Mars Ultor.[1008] In this way, Augustus claims that he patronized 82 temples in Rome. But the homeland could not

---

[1004] Ibid., 30.
[1005] Ibid., 26.
[1006] Ibid., 15.
[1007] Ibid., 19.
[1008] Ibid., 21.

contain his piety: in Asia he replaced votive objects which Antony and his supporters seized from the region's temples.[1009] Augustus's achievements, beneficence, and piety guaranteed him a mediator-like position vis-à-vis 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 consecrated "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 of the *Res Gestae*, it is apropos that the inscription's placement in Antioch coincided with an

[1009] Ibid., 24.

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."[1010] 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 practices.[1011] The sanctuary probably originated in the Hellenistic period, but it enjoyed a "renaissance . . . in the Antonine period and beyond,"[1012] underscored by statue of Cornelia Antonia that was discovered in its premises.[1013] Moreover, among the significant number of inscriptions found in the sanctuary are many dedications from

---

[1010] Rubin, "Ruler Cult and Colonial Identity," 42.
[1011] Raff, "The Architecture of the Sanctuary of Mên Askaênos," 31.
[1012] Khatchadourian, "The Cult of Mên at Pisidian Antioch," 164; cf. 172. Raff, "The Architecture of the Sanctuary of Mên Askaênos, " 151–52.
[1013] Ibid., 161–62.

Italians,[1014] including both free-standing and *naiskoi* inscriptions.[1015] Possibly, as Lane argues, the Romans patronized the cult due in part 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.[1016] Indeed, numismatic and iconographic evidence throughout Asia Minor testifies to the popularity of Mên during the Roman period.[1017] But the Romans probably also saw an "ideological benefit" in promoting this cult in Antioch,[1018] near the rough and tumble region of Pisidia. Doing so would have been a savvy means of fostering a common identity among the colony's heterogeneous—Italian and Greek-Phrygian—residents; indeed the dedicatory inscriptions belie a fixation on ethnic or geographical identity and instead focus on the devotee's familial bonds and/or membership in the *xenoi tekmoreioi*, the cult association.[1019] Common devotion to the

---

[1014] 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.
[1015] Khatchadourian, "The Cult of Mên at Pisidian Antioch," 164.
[1016] Eugene N. Lane, "The Italian Connection: An Aspect of the Cult of Men," *Numen* 22 (1975): 236–37.
[1017] 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.
[1018] Ibid., 172.
[1019] Ibid., 158, 164, 172.

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."[1020] 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 in the service of a Roman-oriented 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 proplyon "celebrated the victories of Augustus on land and sea."[1021] 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.[1022] Statues on the attic, ca. 2 meters in height, featured the *princeps* himself alongside members of the imperial family and the goddess Victoria.[1023] This heavy use of Augustan imagery was fitting given the destination of those walking through the arch—the imperial temple complex.

[1020] Ibid., 164.
[1021] Rubin, "Ruler Cult and Colonial Identity," 42.
[1022] Ibid.
[1023] Ibid.

The complex provided an arena for celebrating 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.[1024] 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.[1025] 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—,* and sister of Apollo, patron deity of Augustus.[1026] The most likely candidate for the temple's dedicatory inscription leaves little doubt about

---

[1024] Ibid., 45–47.
[1025] Ibid., 49.
[1026] Ibid., 50.

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 presents Augustus as a sort of "liminal" figure, enabling him to act "in effect, as Jupiter's chosen agent on earth."[1027] 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 her founding, the arch of Hadrian and Sabina.[1028] This arch was erected in the southwest part of Antioch's urban space and led northward into a "highly functional urban space,"[1029] 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 southern and northern façades of the

---

[1027] Ibid., 55.

[1028] 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).

[1029] Ibid., 106.

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.)[1030] 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 is likewise bustling 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.[1031] The inscription above credits Gaius Julius Asper Pansinianus with dedicating the arch. Meanwhile, vegetal imagery such as palmettes feature in a frieze running above the inscription. Taken as a whole the arch's

---

[1030] See chapter 3.

[1031] The bucrania here possibly allude to Mên. See Ossi, "The Arch of Hadrian and Sabina at Pisidian Antioch," 101–4, who even 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.

imagery proclaimed 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 does not capture 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—often of the mythical variety. As a relatively recent foundation, however, Antioch instead staked its reputation on the city's identity as a Roman colony.[1032]

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. Like its predecessor, the arch of Hadrian and Sabina is triple-bayed; and the two are of similar width. The likewise of

[1032] Ibid., 107.

imagery of the later arch to that of the former is particularly striking, however. This is 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 that winged figures with rows of garland between them—both *genii* holding grapes and victories grasping "emblems of victory such as wreaths or palm fronds."[1033] Ossi persuasively demonstrates, 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.[1034] These parallels served more than an aesthetic function: they linked Antioch's present to its defining past as a colony founded by Augustus,[1035] in the process casting Hadrian as a "second founder."[1036]

[1033] Ibid., 97.
[1034] Ibid., 98.
[1035] Ibid., 100.
[1036] Ibid., 108.

5.3 Paul's Speech: The Rhetoric of "Second Generation" Colonization

5.3.1 Introduction

The above sketch of Antioch's history and architecture is enough to convey the city's ideological orientation toward Rome.[1037] 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,[1038] he was surely cognizant of the city's pretensions to being a simulacrum of Rome. Like the city, Luke's narrative possesses 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

---

[1037] The Roman character of Antioch helps us appreciate 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 we 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 "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.

[1038] Or so the dearth of descriptive detail about the city itself seems to suggest. Ibid., 342–43. Cf. Keener, *Acts,* 2:2032. P. Pilhofer, "Luke's Knowledge of Pisidian Antioch," in *Actes Du Ier Congres International Sur Antioche de Pisidie*, 77–83. Pilhofer somewhat tempers the 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).

sermon functions in part to establish continuity between this aim and Jewish history. Yet in Luke's colonizing narrative, Rome looms large. Paul's founding acts in this Roman colony anticipates his eventual voyage to Rome itself, a successful realization of his colonizing mandate (9:15).[1039] Understanding the Roman character of Antioch helps us appreciate 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.[1040]

Luke's founding account of the Antiochene community involves many of the elements which characterize both prior and succeeding episodes: shifting locations,[1041]

[1039] 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.

[1040] In the previous chapter we 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 "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.

[1041] 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.

multiple characters,[1042] and mixed results.[1043] 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 after the reading of the law and prophets (13:15).[1044] After relating their departure from Cyprus, Luke has rushed Paul and his companions to this moment in the synagogue at Antioch,[1045] pausing only to report their intermediate stop in Perge (13:13).[1046] In having him gesture with his hand—κατασείσας τῇ χειρί (13:16)—, Luke has Paul take "the stance of a Hellenistic orator,"[1047] 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.

[1042] 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 the Jews incite against Paul and Barnabas (13:50).

[1043] See 13:43, 45, 48–49, 50.

[1044] These "officials" were likely to have been benefactors, whether Jewish or Gentile. See Keener, *Acts,* 2:2046.

[1045] Cf. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 148; Rothschild, "Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13," 345.

[1046] Keener, *Acts,* 2:2045, suggests that Paul gave his "word of exhortation" on the Sabbath following his arrival in Antioch.

[1047] 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.

There are various approaches to identifying the speech's structure.[1048] Drawing on rhetorical traditions in Classical Greece, Kennedy concludes that Paul's Antiochene speech represents an example of epideictic rhetoric, whose purpose is to sway opinion.[1049] He determines 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.[1050] 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 context. 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 which "carries the weight of a designated truth"; and verses 40–41 as logically following exhortation.[1051] Kilgallen analyzes the speech based on temporal indicators. This scheme produces a division between those verses

---

[1048] 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).
[1049] Cf. Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 66.
[1050] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 124–25. Presumably Kennedy forgot to include verses 38–39 in the epilogue.
[1051] 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).

relating events in the ancient (vv. 17–22) and recent (23–31a; 33–37) past, on the one hand, and those relating present events (vv. 31b–32; 38–41).[1052] 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."[1053] 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.[1054] Strauss divides the speech according to the "three major addresses": ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται (v. 16); Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί 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).[1055] Holladay's scheme has the advantage of isolating discrete moments in the speech, five to be exact.[1056] Section one relates

---

[1052] John J. Kilgallen, "Acts 13:38–39: Culmination of Paul's Speech in Pisidia," *Biblica* 69 (1988): 487–89.
[1053] Ibid., 488–89.
[1054] However, this does not preclude the value of the other structural proposals.
[1055] 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.
[1056] See Carl Holladay, *Acts: A Commentary,* NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2016), 275–79.

Israelite history from Abraham[1057] 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. 26–31), while section four expounds the related theme of his resurrection (vv. 32–37). Finally, section five extends the message of salvation to the Antiochenes along with a warning (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 recognizes, if only implicitly, 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

[1057] Contra Pervo, *Acts,* 335, who claims that the "historical review begins with the sojourn in Egypt (rather than with Abraham or Moses).

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 (vv. 17–22) offers a retelling of Israel's history, what we might call an ancestral prehistory.[1058] 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.[1059] Here, the survey anticipates the present work of God among the Antiochenes and so serves as a kind of prehistory. We

---

[1058] 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."

[1059] Joachim Jeska, *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), 21–22.

have also discussed a number of other pre-histories which function as examples of proto-colonization in Greek and Roman contexts. In fact, we noted above that while the colonists of Antioch preferred to stress the city's foundation under Augustus, neighboring cities distinguished themselves by claiming ancient origins long predating the 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 include: the Dorian and Ionian migrations;[1060] Croton's settlement by "Achaeans" returning from the Trojan War[1061] or else by its eponymous founder;[1062] Sicily's occupation by Cyclopes and Laestrygonians;[1063] Cyrene's colonizing by Euphemos via a gift of earth,[1064] the Trojan Antenoridai,[1065] and the eponymous nymph seized by Apollo;[1066] Rome and/or her territory's founding by "Aborigines,"[1067]

[1060] On Dorian, see Tyrtaeus, *Eunomia;* Pindar, *Pyth.* 5.75; Herodotus 9.26; Thucydides 1.12. On Ionian, see Solon Fr. 4a; Pherecydes fr. 155; Herodotus 1.145; Thucydides 1.12. Cf. chapter 2.
[1061] Strabo 6.1.12.
[1062] Ovid, *Metam.* 15.9–18; cf. chapter 2.
[1063] Thucydides 6.2.1–2; cf. chapter 2.
[1064] Pindar, *Pyth.* 4.23; cf. Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, 163.
[1065] Pindar, *Pyth.* 5.83–86.
[1066] Pindar, *Pyth.* 9.1–8; cf. chapter 2.
[1067] Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.11–15; 2.1.

Pelasgians,[1068] Arcadians,[1069] Hercules,[1070] Aeneas,[1071] and his son Ascanius;[1072] and Antioch of Syria's colonization by Triptolemus and the Argives,[1073] Casus and the Cretans,[1074] Cypriots,[1075] Heraclidae and Eleans,[1076] and eventually Alexander.[1077] In some cases, proto-colonization licensed the transfer of cult.[1078] Thus, the foundation of Cyrene involved the transfer of Apollo's cult in Pindar's accounts,[1079] and the foundations of Syrian Antioch entailed the transfer of Zeus's cult according to Libanius.[1080] These examples of proto-colonization furnished ancient reference points for later (historical) generations wishing to articulate and legitimate their settlement and residence in the land. In like manner, the prehistory in Paul's sermon is designed to

[1068] Ibid., 1.17–30.
[1069] Ibid., 1.31–33; 2.1.3–4.
[1070] Ibid., 1.34; 2.1.4.
[1071] Livy 1.1–17; Plutarch, *Rom.;* Dionysius 1.34–65.
[1072] Ibid., 1.66; cf. chapter 2.
[1073] Libanius, *Or.* 11.52.
[1074] Ibid. 11.52–53.
[1075] Ibid., 11.54.
[1076] Ibid., 11.56.
[1077] Ibid., 11.77; cf. chapter 4.
[1078] See chapters 2 and 4.
[1079] Pindar, *Pyth.* 4, 5, and 9.
[1080] Libanius, *Or.* 11.

root the Antiochene's experience of the "colonizing" message of salvation (13:26, 32–41)[1081] in ancient realities, namely, traditions about God's acts on behalf of his people.

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."[1082] 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 that which occurs in Israel's history.[1083] 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 Luke ascribes to the people, requesting a king (v. 21a), God revokes with his

[1081] For the argument that salvation in Acts functions as the means of "colonization," see chapter 2.
[1082] Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 158. Cf. Pervo, *Acts,* 335; Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 82.
[1083] 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."

removal of Saul (v. 22a).[1084] His replacement of Saul with David— ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὅ ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου (v. 22)—, therefore, restores the emphasis on divine orchestration of Israel's history.[1085] 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's[1086] "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).[1087] 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).[1088] In Stephen's speech, by

---

[1084] 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.
[1085] Cf. Zhang, *Paul Among the Jews,* 132.
[1086] Τοῦτο, which refers to David, is set in the frontal position and as such is emphatic.
[1087] Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 94.
[1088] This despite the fact that the history leading up to the judges is, according to NA[28] to have lasted "for about four hundred fifty years" (ὡ ἔτεσιν τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντήκοντα; v. 20). The D-text tradition represents an alternative reading which identifies the period of the judges as lasting four hundred fifty years. See the discussion by Holladay, *Acts,* 266.

comparison, the narrative of Israel's history requires forty-six verses to reach David.[1089] In other words, just as Luke rushes Paul and his companions to the synagogue in Antioch, he rushes the apostle to the subject of King David and his heir Jesus, which dominate the remainder of the discourse (vv. 22–39). This stands in tension with other historical surveys in the Hebrew Bible[1090] where "it is the entry into the land which is seen to be the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham."[1091] We will see that behind the reference to ἡ ἐπαγγελία which was fulfilled in Jesus's life, death, and resurrection[1092] stands God's promises to David in 2 Sam 7:11–16.[1093] 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,[1094] or at least provides its "conceptual framework."[1095] Therefore, we might

---

[1089] However, Paul "develops at greater length the point of 7:45–46 [relating to David] in 13:19–22" (Keener, *Acts,* 2:2060).

[1090] 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.

[1091] Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 82.

[1092] Cf. Morgan-Wynne, 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)."

[1093] See Dale Goldsmith, "Acts 13:33–37: A Pesher on II Samuel 7," *JBL* 87 (1968): 321–24.

[1094] J. W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen, Netherlands: Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Company, 1954), 172.

[1095] Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 150. Cf. J. W. Bowker, "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form," *NTS* 14 (1967–68): 104; Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 77–78, 84, 90.

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 of Jesus as well as 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 these individuals who are not Jews by ethnicity. Despite Kraabel's assertions,[1096] it seems evident that around Luke's time there were gentiles who, on the one hand, were attracted to certain ethical aspects of Judaism and may have attended the synagogue, but who, on the other hand, nevertheless stopped short of full

[1096] A. T. Kraabel, "The Disappearance of the 'Godfearers,'" *Numen* 28 (1981): 113–26.

conversion.[1097] The term which would come to refer to such people by the third century was θεοσεβής. Writing much earlier, however, Luke employs different terminology to refer to Gentiles who at some level revere the Jewish God: 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.[1098] 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 ensuring that the referent are Gentiles who had converted to Judaism. Based on this meaning here, Morgan-Wynne argues that "Godfearer" in 13:16 and 26, though a different phrase in the Greek (φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν), bears the same sense.[1099] But this cannot be proved

---

[1097] 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 Acts," *HTS* 79 (1986): 91–99. Cf. Synder, "The Godfearers in Paul's Speech at Pisidian Antioch," 45–52.
[1098] Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 73.
[1099] Ibid., 70.

beyond a doubt, since elsewhere Luke seems to use the phrase for Gentile sympathizers and not full converts (10:2, 22, 35). Likely he employs φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν in the sermon in the same general way, to denote 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 Ἰσραηλῖται) and Gentiles (οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν).

As I have suggested, the ancestral prehistory anticipates the encounter with Jesus the savior later in the speech. We see this preparatory function in God's benevolent actions on behalf of his people, both prior to and after 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 (παροίκιᾳ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπου; 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 quite 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.[1100]

5.3.2.2.1 Choosing a People

Several examples will illustrate this amplification. At the very beginning of the prehistory, Paul's assertion that ὁ θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου Ἰσραὴλ ἐξελέξατο τοὺς

[1100] Of course, 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 ἀνάγωσιν 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 differing purposes in turn help explain one of the chief differences in content: Stephen's speech provideσ much more detail about the ancestral traditions, particularly related to Moses (7:27–29, 35a, 39–43), in order to develop the pattern of salvation—rejection, which he then applies 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 (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)—and 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 being 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), which 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, is the fulfillment of the promises made to him (see 13:23, 33, 34, 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.

πατέρας (v. 17a)[1101] 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 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.[1102] 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 allusion to τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, "our ancestors" (13:17a). Emphatic for both is God's sovereign initiative in choosing Abraham and his offspring. For ultimately it is this which legitimates the patriarchs and the prehistory. The choice of a people in the prehistory anticipates, ironically, God's appointment of Gentiles following Paul's speech (13:48).

5.3.2.2.2 Exalting a People

Paul next alludes to the παροίκιᾳ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπου (v. 17b). This period too, as Luke depicts it, witnesses to the beneficent oversight of God. Naturally, of course, the reference to Egypt would trigger ambivalent associations: On the one hand, there is

---

[1101] See, e.g., Gen 12–35; Deut 4:37; 7:7; 10:15.

[1102] By the same token, in the entirety of the first verse (13:17) Paul references traditions which Stephen took 35 verses (7:23–36a) to enumerate.

Joseph's brothers' treachery, which brought him to Egypt, and later Pharaoh's enslavement of "Israelites," which held the people there; on other hand, there is God's protection and elevation of Joseph, his appointment of Moses, and finally his deliverance of his people (which Paul mentions next). Stephen mentions each of these events, in his own fashion, in Acts 7. Yet he places them all under the umbrella of God's providence by having God announce ahead of time to Abraham that his descendants (σπέρμα αὐτοῦ) would be πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ καὶ δουλώσουσιν but finally they ἐξελεύσονται καὶ λατρευσουσίν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ (7:6–7). The culmination of this prophecy—worship in the land—underscores that the interim history of the descendants is moving inexorably toward the fulfillment of God's promise to their "father," Abraham (7:5).[1103] 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 ὕψωσεν ("lifted up, exalted") his people[1104] (v. 17b) during the sojourn at some level probably reflects God's care for his

---

[1103] Cf. Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 82.

[1104] τὸν λαόν. D and several other witnesses read διὰ τὸν λαόν. But as Pervo, *Acts,* 328, observes, this "leaves ὕψωσιν without an object" (328).

chosen people. But the word seems to imply more than this—even thriving. In this sense, it recalls Stephen's remark that the people ηὔξησεν . . . καὶ ἐπληθύνθη ἐν Αἰγύωτῳ (7:17b), itself reminiscent of the Septuagint.[1105] I would argue, however, that it also triggers an association with the portrayal of Joseph and Moses in Stephen's speech (Acts 7).[1106]

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 Φαραώ[1107] and even made him ἡγούμενον ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον[1108] καὶ [ἐφ'] ὅλον τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ (7:10).[1109] In his depiction of Moses, Luke employs a pattern of verbs

---

[1105] See Exodus 1:7: οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ ηὐξήθησαν καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν.

[1106] The fact that Paul as compared with Stephen (7:20–44) omits subsequent mention of Moses's role in leading the people out of Egypt (7:36) or his reception of "living oracles" (7:38) does not tell against a possible allusion here. There are reasons which justify 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 figure 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.

[1107] Joseph speaks of finding χάριν when he approaches Pharaoh's household about burying his father. The text does not mention σοφία; the term, as used by Luke, is likely meant to refer 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) and the jailor (Gen 39:21). By the same token, Jacob and his sons show concern about finding grace/favor with Joseph (Gen 43:14, 25, 29).

[1108] Gen 41:43; cf. 49:26.

[1109] Gen 41:40.

characterizing his birth (ἐγεννήθη; 7:20), upbringing (ἀνετράφη/ἀνεθρέψατο; 7:21), and education (ἐπαιδεύθη; 7:22).[1110] At each stage there is something remarkable about Moses. At birth, he was ἦν ἀστεῖος 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 chosen by the God of the people of Israel 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

[1110] See Sterling, "'Opening the Scriptures,'" 210, who notes that Luke later applies the same "schema" to Paul's life (Acts 22:3).

(7:23)—entailed a rejection of Egyptian culture in favor of Israelite. For his very next declaration portrays the Egyptian-educated Moses in the same terms applied to Jesus and the apostles, founding figures in Acts: ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ (7:22b).[1111]

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. Arguably, the presentation in both instances has the effect of validating life outside the land of Israel. In the case of Paul's specifically, though, it anticipates and validates the experience of God's favor in Antioch.

5.3.2.2.1 The patriarchs as cultural benefactors. Luke was not alone in adapting in adapting Jewish traditions to fit and legitimate diaspora life. Some Hellenistic Jewish authors, for example, imagined the patriarchs as cultural benefactors or innovators.[1112] According to Josephus, Abraham was recognized as a "wise man" by Egyptians, and he

---

[1111] See chapter 3.
[1112] Cf. Ibid., 204–8.

was responsible for passing along knowledge of arithmetic and astronomy.[1113] Pseudo-Eupolemus echoes this sentiment[1114] explaining how Abraham taught his knowledge of astrology—or knowledge about the "movements of the sun and moon" (fr. 1.4 [Holladay])—to the Phoenicians after migrating to their land. (Pseudo-Eupolemus credits Enoch with discovering the science of astrology.[1115]) When he later migrated to Egypt, Abraham passed along his knowledge of astrology and other sciences to the priests of Heliopolis.[1116]

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;[1117] he also helped the Egyptians divide their land and discovering measurements.[1118] After his people migrated to Egypt and became

---

[1113] *A.J.* 1.167–68.

[1114] See Pseudo-Eupolemus fr. 1.3–4. Citations of Jewish fragments come from see Carl Holladay, *Historians,* vol. 1 of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983).

[1115] Pseudo-Eupolemus fr. 1.8–9.

[1116] Pseudo-Eupolemus fr. 1.8.

[1117] Artapanus fr. 2.4.

[1118] Ibid.

numerous, they founded temples in both Athos and Heliopolis.[1119] 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 invented an assortment of objects and occupations: boats, construction devices, (Egyptian) weaponry, tools for drawing water, and philosophy.[1120] 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.[1121] For this latter act the priests "deemed [Moses] worthy of divine honor," referring to him as Hermes (fr. 3.6 [Holladay]), while the masses of people adored him for the entirety of his contributions.[1122] Moses and his followers even founded a city at Hermopolis.[1123] The examples marshalled are designed to highlight the cultural benefactions of the patriarch, often with a claim to chronological priority implied or stated outright. Claiming patriarchal benefactions is one way Hellenistic Jews justified

[1119] Ibid.
[1120] Ibid., fr. 3.4.
[1121] Ibid., 3.4–6.
[1122] Ibid.
[1123] Ibid, fr. 3.3.

their status outside the land of Israel and among other nations. We might say that the patriarchs thus function as proto-colonizers of a cultural kind.

5.3.2.2.2.2 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 kings of Libya."[1124] Pseudo-Eupolemus links Abraham to both to "Phoenicia"— territory with which the Samaritans "had proximity . . . and ties—and Mount Gerizim.[1125] Finally, Artapanus's fragments connect Abraham, Joseph, and Moses with Egypt.[1126] 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."[1127]

[1124] Sterling, "'Opening the Scriptures,'" 203.
[1125] Ibid., 205.
[1126] Ibid., 206–8.
[1127] Ibid., 202.

5.3.2.2.2.3 The patriarchs as colonizers. Finally, Josephus and Philo adopt the language of colonization to depict the movement and settlement of Jews.[1128] 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.[1129] Moreover, Abraham sought to settle in "colonies" those sons and grandson which stemmed from his late-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" (1.239–40 [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 ἀρχηγετῶν to Egypt, and how much later Moses[1130]—the "seventh in descent" from ʾΙδουδαίων ἔθνους ἀρχηγέτης[1131]— sought to "send a colony" to Phoenicia, Coelesyria, Palestine[1132] after being appointed leader[1133] by an oracle of God. But this was not to be the permanent destination of all Jews. Elsewhere, Philo unabashedly describes how he

[1128] See chapter 3.
[1129] *A.J.* 1.120–21.
[1130] *Mos. 1.34.*
[1131] *Mos.* 1.7.
[1132] *Mos.* 1.163.
[1133] *Mos.* 1.70–71. Cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 2.268.

and many of his Jewish contemporaries dwelled outside the land of Israel. He characterizes these Jewish communities in the diaspora as “colonies” possessing 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 the same ends. I have suggested that this is what Luke does in Stephen and Paul’s speeches in Acts 7 and 13, respectively. In the latter case, he indicates that the people of “were lifted up” in order to anticipate and legitimate the Antiochenes’ experience of blessing— salvation—outside the land of Israel.

5.3.2.2.3 Raising up David

David represents the second major “moment” of God’s sovereign care for his people in the ancestral prehistory.[1134] 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

---

[1134] 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.

difference between the two figures (as judged by God) 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 which anticipates the resurrection of Jesus as described—using the same verb—in verses 30 and 37.[1135]

The supporting citation[1136] that follows reinforces the depiction of David as God's sovereignly chosen ruler, while also providing a rationale for his selection: εὗρον Δαυὶδ 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.[1137] The first of these, 1 Samuel 13:14 LXX, shares the same background as

---

[1135] Cf. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 156, 165; Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 67.

[1136] Note that the relative clause introducing the citation—ᾧ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας—casts it as a form of "witness," a favorite concept of Luke's.

[1137] 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. J. W. 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 Samuel 13:14. But in "the Targum the phrase hytw[r dyb[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 sided 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 Psalm 89.20 and 1 Samuel 13.14. Neither of

Paul's rehearsal: the remove of Saul and his replacement with David. Moreover, it too characterizes the person in view as "a man" (ἄνθρωπον instead of ἄνδρα) "after the [Lord's] heart" (κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ [instead of μου]), though one who is sought (ζητήσει) rather than found (εὗρον).[1138] Then, Psalm 89:20 LXX supplies "I found David" (εὗρον Δαυιδ), while Isaiah 44:28 provides the qualification that David "will do all my will" (πάντα τὰ θελημάτα μου ποιήσει), 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.[1139] 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, whose authority derives from their divine selection and whose

---

these conjectures is any more convincing than the possibility that Luke drew on the three texts because of how they served his theological *Tendenz.*

[1138] Cf. Stephen's similar language in Acts 7: εὗρεν χάριν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (7:46). But whereas Stephen mentions David while making an argument which relativizes the temple, Paul does so to foreground the salvific purposes of God.

[1139] Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts.*

responsibility, therefore, is to fulfill their divine mandate.[1140] In the case of colonization accounts, the latter entails planting a city, while in Acts it translates to replicating the cult community. The founding figures discussed in chapters 3 and 4 managed this through the announcement of restoration/salvation. But David, we might say, anticipated these activities insofar as he embodied the providential will of God and was the genealogical bridge to the savior, Jesus (v. 23).[1141]

5.3.3 The Colonizing Message for Antioch (13:23–41)

5.3.3.1 Introduction

We have been discussing how the ancestral prehistory functions as a precursor, a sort of proto-colonizing message, in preparation for what follows in the speech. In doing so, it legitimates the prospective community in Antioch as a replication of the (restored) 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

[1140] For this reason, they occupy a liminal state between God and men.
[1141] Cf. Rom 1:3–4.

speech moves from the distant to the recent past[1142] and thus to the colonizing message proper.

5.3.3.2 Announcing the Colonizing Message

5.3.3.2.1 Jesus the Savior—Culmination of the Prehistory

The two sections of verses 23–25 and 26–31 (per Holladay's division) 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 preceding verses (vv. 17–22). He does this relying on the connections of genealogy, on the one hand, and promise-fulfilment, on the other. Luke says that it was "from this one's[1143] offspring [ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος]" that "God has brought [ἤγαγεν] to Israel[1144] a savior, Jesus." 2 Samuel 7:12 LXX stands behind the use of σπέρμα here, as the argumentation in verses 32–37 all but

[1142] 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.
[1143] Luke fronts τοῦτο for emphasis. See the alternative reading of D: ὁ οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ. Note that in addition to replacing τοῦτο with the (more correct) pronoun αὐτοῦ and restoring God to the frontal position, this reading also implies an even stronger (inferential) connection with the preceding verse by virtue of the οὖν.
[1144] Zhang, *Paul Among Jews*, 134, observes that the use of ἤγαγεν and Ἰσραήλ 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).

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,[1145] above all his pledge to raise up a successor from his descendants.[1146] However, Morgan-Wynne is not altogether wrong in seeing a wider referent for "promise,"[1147] 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.[1148] "Promise" is the conceptual glue that unites Jesus to the prehistory.

[1145] Cf. Psalm 131:11–12 LXX. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 36, reflecting on 2 Samuel 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."

[1146] Ibid., 165.

[1147] Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 91, 118. Morgan-Wynne bases his understanding of "promise" in part on the fact that in verses 32–33 Paul announces that τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν have been fulfilled.

[1148] 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 σῴζω 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)."

The reflection on John the Baptist (13:24–25) similarly bolsters this view of Jesus,[1149] while it also introduces an all-important *topos*: responding properly to the message about Jesus. The "evocation" of Malachi 3:1–2, through such "odd language" as πρὸ προσώπου,[1150] ensures that John and his proclamation of repentance as preparation for the savior represent a seamless continuation of God's interactions with his people. He is a bridge figure, in fact: a prophet like those of old but also a proto-witness like the apostles who follow. Moreover, his demand for repentance (v. 24)[1151] and reception of Jesus (v. 25) serves to remind that the colonizing community takes root only where the message of its founder(s) is received. In this sense, John himself represents a positive exemplar of response in contrast to the religious leaders in the following verses (vv. 26–31).[1152]

[1149] It is also possible to look at these verses as proof supporting Paul's claim in verse 23 paralleling the scriptural proof in verses 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.

[1150] Pervo, *Acts*, 337.

[1151] 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; 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. Cf. Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 60–61, on the importance of "forgiveness" in Luke–Acts.

[1152] 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 in instance of Luke juxtaposing positive and negative exemplars.

5.3.3.2.2 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 φοβοὺμενοι τὸν θεόν). This direct address orients the events in Jerusalem to the present,[1153] signaling that they possess a weighty relevance for the Antiochenes,[1154] notwithstanding the fact that they are described in the past tense.[1155] 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 through the colonizing message

---

[1153] Cf. Keener, *Acts,* 2:2056.
[1154] Thus, although the following section (vv. 32–37) marks the first consistent use of the present tense, it has a resumptive quality. It routes the discussion back to Paul's overriding concern, the reception of salvation by the Antiochenes, pressed home in verses 38–41.
[1155] Cf. Kilgallen, "Acts 13:38–39," 487.

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 to inform the behavior of the Antiochenes.[1156] This function is particularly apparent when read alongside the positive example of John the Baptist's response to the coming of Israel's savior (13:24–25). The message is clear: Jews and Godfearers in Antioch should not mimic the response of their Jerusalem counterparts.

A comparison of Paul's words with that of Peter and the other apostles in Acts 2–5 helps clarify the instructional value bestowed upon 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);[1157] his salvific benefits, especially forgiveness (2:38; 3:19–26 [especially v. 19]; 4:31; 5:31); and his

---

[1156] See Keener, *Acts,* 2:2052, who observes a number of parallels between Peter and Paul's accusations in Acts 2 and 13, respectively.

[1157] 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 represented by Jesus's resurrection.

witnesses (2:32; 3:15; 5:32). Peter, moreover, emphasizes that the Jews responsible for Jesus's death acted out of ignorance (3:17), while God nevertheless ensured the outcome as the fulfillment of prophecy (3:18). What is critical to note about these rehearsals of the history concerning Jesus and his reception is their function: They are intended to furnish one more opportunity for the Jerusalem Jews to repent and receive the salvific benefits mediated by Jesus. Hence the indispensable role played by the apostles. As "witnesses" to Jesus, it is they who qualified to extend the second chance opportunity.

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,[1158] through which they unwittingly fulfilled the prophets (13:27; cf. 3:17–18); Jesus's betrayal/execution by his people with the assistance of Pilate (13:28; cf. 2:30; 3:13, 15; 4:11; 5:20); Jesus's resurrection by God (13:30; 2:24, 32; 3:15; 4:10; 5:31); and his subsequent appearance to

[1158] Cf. 2:23. Such irony relating to ignorance and fulfillment is not 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."

"witnesses" (13:31; 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 reoriented as the grounds for the appeal in both 13:26 and 13:32–33 and thus highlighted. This is a clue to the function of the rehearsal of Jesus's reception in Jerusalem in Paul's telling: It is designed to serve as a lesson for how the Antiochene Jews and Godfearers are not to respond to the message of salvation.

This leads us to the second effect of linking the direct address to the account of the Jerusalem Jews' rejection: It anticipates and justifies Paul's appeal to the experience of salvation among the Antiochenes in 13:33.[1159] It does so 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 discussed in chapter 4, the latter episode was pivotal as it precipitated the foundation

---

[1159] We might mention a corresponding 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).[1159]

of a cult community which would become the 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

5.3.3.3.1 Introduction

Having offered positive and negatives examples of response, Paul returns in the next section to the appearance of salvation among the Antiochene Jews and Godfearers.[1160] Paul's claim—in the present tense—Καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα reminds readers of his appointment by this mother city in compliance with divine will (Acts 1–4). Moreover, following 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

---

[1160] The speech's progression from rejection of the savior in Jerusalem to the (attempted) spread of his cult in Pisdian Antioch recalls a by-now familiar colonizing pattern, which has seen the message of salvation propagated in different locations—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).

the risen Lord (9:15–16; 22:14–15; 26:16–18). In this very speech Paul has shown himself suited for this role based on his ability to discern God's purposes via interpretation of Israel's history (13:17–25) and deciphering of sacred oracles (13:26, 29) in the manner of a *chresmologos*.[1161] 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 role of μάρτυς is performed by founding figures in Acts.[1162] They witness to the salvation/restoration ushered in by Jesus with the purpose of replicating the cult community.

5.3.3.3.2 The Promise Fulfilled

In his good news announcement[1163] to the Antiochenes, Paul casts the appearance of Jesus the savior as a fulfillment among the "children" of promises 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 13:17–2. This is not a new phenomenon to us. We have demonstrated how many colonization

---

[1161] See remarks about this term in respect to colonization in chapters 2 and 4.
[1162] See chapters 3 and 4.
[1163] 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.

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 life outside the land of Israel (though in a non-geographically specific sense). But he is also capable of marshalling the evidence of 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.[1164] Luke tailors the history to serve the needs of the argument. So, for example, Stephen's speech draws on the patriarchal history to contend that the religious leaders in Jerusalem repeat the pattern of rejecting salvation established by their forbearers in the wilderness.[1165]

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 presenting Jesus as the offspring of David

---

[1164] See Acts 3:13, 25; 5:30; 15:10; 22:14; 26:6.

[1165] Indeed, the highest density of references to πατέρας in Acts occur in Stephen's speech: 7:11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 32, 38, 39, 44, 45, 51, 52.

(13:23), but also portraying the Jews and Godfearers[1166] in Antioch as descendants of the patriarchs (13:26).[1167] 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 new cult community in Jerusalem and its replication in Antioch 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 would-be founding figure 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

---

[1166] 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.

[1167] Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραὰμ (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.

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 then distribution of land as their inheritance (13:19), and his provision of judges first (13:20) and kings second to rule over them (13:21–22). The inheritance of land would be one candidate for the promise that was he fulfilled. Indeed, in Acts 7 Stephen explicitly refers to the “promise” God made to Abraham 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.[1168]

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

[1168] 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.

his rule in perpetuity. Arguably, Paul's speech in Acts 13 implies a similar ideology. God chose Israel as a nation for himself, made her great, delivered her, destroyed her enemies, led her into the land, and provided her 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."

As I argued below, 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" (LXX 2 Samuel 7:12).[1169] God underscores how this rule is to have no end: "I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever" (LXX 2 Samuel 7:13b); "Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever" (LXX 2

[1169] God also announces how David οἰκοδομήσει μοι οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί μου (13:13). Yet we have seen how Luke relativizes the importance of such a temple in Stephen's speech (7:47–50). Further, he does not even mention the temple in connection with David in Paul's speech; his focus is the importance of David as Jesus's forbearer—and what this signifies about the latter's status.

Samuel 7:16).[1170] What God promises is a secure rule for David's line. But it is not just the fact of rule which matters, I suggest, but also what the rule symbolizes—namely, 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) makes clear that he adhered to God's covenantal will. So also it is implied that Jesus the savior represents the will of God. As such, he ushers in the fulfillment of the promise made to David becoming the ruler for eternity.

5.3.3.3.2.1 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 (σῶτηρ) appointed and vindicated by God (13:23; 30–31). "Paul" accomplishes this by portraying the circumstances of Jesus's ministry, death, and resurrection as a fulfillment of God's plan.[1171] In the larger scheme of Luke's colonizing

---

[1170] David echoes this promise in 2 Samuel 22:51: "He [God] shows steadfast love to his anointed [χριστῷ]; to David and his descendants [τῷ σπέρματι] forever."

[1171] Carl R. Holladay, *Acts: A Commentary,* NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016), 272. This part of Paul's speech at points 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*

narrative, this objective in turn legitimates the Christian community—including prospective members in Antioch—by linking it both to the legendary "ancestors" and the divine sanction which they enjoyed.

Paul's manner of arguing here for the fulfilment 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—namely, 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.[1172]

The citations help advance the central argument of verse 32–37, which as Holladay has argued is two-fold: that "God 'raised' Jesus in the sense of selection among

---

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.

[1172] 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 people of Israel, as God had done with earlier leaders. . . . [and] that he also raised him from the dead."[1173] 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.[1174] By "raising him" God has fulfilled his promise to the ancestors (vv. 33a).[1175] In other words, ἀνίστημι here functions much like ἐγείρω does in verse 22,[1176] to signify the act of appointment—in this case as savior.[1177] Moreover, the citation, especially the first part (ὑιός μου εἶ σύ), recalls the words spoken by the "voice from heaven" at Jesus's baptism: σὺ εἶ ὁ ὑιός μου (Luke 3:22). Given this allusion, the

---

[1173] Holladay, *Acts,* 272.

[1174] 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 verses 34–37]."

[1175] ἀναστήσας is a participle of means.

[1176] See Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 162: Luke does not "distinguish ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι."

[1177] The enthronement context of the Psalm (see Keener, *Acts,* 2:2070) provides another suggestive connection to David. The kindship language (ὑιός 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."

"'raising' of Jesus would thus encompass his life and ministry understood as a single whole."[1178] But the multivalence of ἀνίστημι in Luke-Acts[1179] creates space for Luke to further bolster and develop his argument that Jesus is God's appointed savior, which he capitalizes on in the following verses.

5.3.3.3.2.2 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 by arguing that his resurrection, too, represents fulfillment. This development in his argument 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).[1180] Luke

---

[1178] Holladay, *Acts,* 272.
[1179] Only Luke use ἀνίστημι in the simple sense of "stand up" or "arise" (though 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),[1179] Luke uses ἀνίστημι to signal resurrection (Acts 2:24, 32; 10:41; 17:3, 31).
[1180] Holladay, *Acts,* 273. Cf. Peters argumentation in 2:24–28.

introduces both concepts—resurrection and incorruptibility—with a ὅτι clause.[1181] By foregrounding this clause, he announces resurrection/incorruptibility as the subject matter *and* points forward to the scriptural citations—introduced by οὕτως εἴρηκεν ὅτι—which demonstrate it place in the purposes of God.

The aim of both citations is to substantiate the claim that Jesus's resurrection represents the fulfillment among contemporary Jews and Godfearers of God's promise to the ancestors. They accomplish this in tandem with Isaiah 55:3 introducing the "holy and sure things" (τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά) to be explicated in Psalms 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,[1182] to the experience of his contemporaries. As Holladay have observed, the plural ὑμῖν facilitates this application, since it "links with the 'you' (pl.) in Acts 13:22 and, by extension, 'their children—to us,' in verse

[1181] 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/enthronement.

[1182] Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 86.

33."[1183] David's relation to these "holy and sure things" promised to the audience is at first ambiguous. However, since on our understanding the third citation unpacks the second—notably, it is introduced by διότι καὶ ἐν ἑτέρω—it is significant that it comes from Psalm 15:10. The point seems to be that David is the one making the promise, and he is making it with "Paul" and his Jewish contemporaries in view.[1184]

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 ("your holy one") can only refer to Jesus in the handling of Luke, who is making a claim about the fulfillment of God's promise among contemporary Jews (and Godfearers). In other words, in Luke's argumentation the ancestor David was not promising that God would secure his own incorruptibility but rather the savior Jesus's, which he in fact accomplished by resurrecting him. Of course, Luke has elsewhere linked resurrection and incorruptibility. In his Pentecost speech,[1185] Peter draws on the same passage to validate his claim that "God raised

[1183] 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).
[1184] See ibid., 273.
[1185] See Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 123.

(ἀνέστησεν) him [Jesus] up, loosing the pangs of death, because it was not possible for him to be held by it" (2:24).[1186] 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 ὀσφὺος 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 done. He offers one last piece of evidence to demonstrate that the resurrection qualifies Jesus as not only an heir, but the exclusive heir of David's promises. The argument here— proceeding by contrast (μὲν . . . δέ)—again follows the same logic used by Peter in Acts 2: by virtue of his death and burial David was corruptible (Δαυὶδ μὲν γὰρ ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ ὑπηρετήσας τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλῇ ἐκοιμήθη καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶδεν διαφθοράν) and therefore 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) and therefore *is* the one spoken of in scripture.

[1186] In this earlier instance, as here, Luke sets the claims about the resurrection in the context of the larger claim that Jesus is ruler-savior (see 2:21; cf. 36–40).

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).[1187]

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 ὑμῖν[1188]—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 (13:17–25).[1189] Structurally, the formal transfer of the colonizing message features both the appeal proper (13:38–39) and a warning (13:40–41).

[1187] Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 86.

[1188] This address echoes Peter's in 2:14. Cf. Ibid., 87.

[1189] One might also say that the contemporary proclamation represents a culmination of the recent past as well based upon verse 32, which extends the announcement of the fulfillment of God's promises to the Antioch subsequent to the narration of the appearance and rejection of Jesus in Jerusalem.

5.3.3.4.1 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, recall, Paul spoke of Jesus σωτῆρα (13:23; cf. 5:31) and cast the news of his appearance as the ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρὶας (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),[1190] though he is careful to present it as a message proclaimed (καταγγέλλεται) rather than accomplished fact since it is contingent upon acceptance.[1191]

5.3.3.4.1.1 Continuity in the message. This presentation of salvation harmonizes with the earlier portrayal of John's proclamation—that is, "proclaiming a baptism of repentance" (προκηρύξαντος . . . βάπτισμα μετανοίας; 13:24) prepared the way to receive "forgiveness of sins" (ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν; 13:38). It is also the case that Paul's depiction of salvation here recalls that of Peter in his Pentecost speech. There, of

[1190] Cf. Luke 24:46–48; Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 60, 159.
[1191] See my comments above on 13:25–31.

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,[1192] for everyone to "repent and be baptized . . . in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sins" (2:38).[1193] And shortly after, Peter characterizes the proper response to his message about Jesus as the path of salvation: σώθητε ἀπὸ τῶς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς ταύτης (2:40). This suggests, therefore, that Paul's portrayal of salvation as forgiveness of sins closely resembles Peter's portrayal. This not only reinforces the connection between the two founding figures; it only also contributes to the depiction of the prospective community in Antioch as a replication of the cult community which originated in Jerusalem and was built up there, initially in response to Peter's speech.

5.3.3.4.1.2 Implications of the message. The rest of verses 38–39 expounds on the implications of this forgiveness of sins, particularly for the Antiochene audience.[1194] Paul portrays this state brought about by Jesus (ἐν τούτῳ) as one of "freedom" or

---

[1192] The Jews had inquired: τί ποιήσωμεν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί; (2:37).

[1193] See Soards, *The Speeches of Acts*, 87.

[1194] Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 127, takes the καί—omitted by some witnesses (P[74] a A C* D t x vg[st])—as epexegetical. He is quite right in remarking that verses 38–39 elaborate on the "*substance* of 'the word of salvation' sent to the congregation ('to us,' v. 26)" (128).

"release": δικαιοῦται (13:39).[1195] But characteristic of Acts this freedom is available only to he or she who embraces the message—whom Paul describes as πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων. (This description once again ensures that salvation is not restricted to Jews but is open to Gentiles as well.[1196]) We have observed this emphasis on proper response in Paul's reflections on John (13:24–25) on the one hand and the Jews and religious leaders of Jerusalem (13:27–29) on the other, and we will see it again in the quotation of scripture in 13:40–41. It is enough to note here that throughout Acts the believing response of audiences effectively seals the "colonizing" process initiated by the proclamation and miracles of founding figures pursuant to their mandate as "witnesses."

Rather than just promise freedom and forgiveness of sins, Paul pictures what this might mean for the Antiochene community's identity. 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 both insiders

[1195] The verb δικαιόω in the passive could be translated as "justified" in verses 38 and 39. Either way, it is likely that its use is meant to evoke Pauline theology. So Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 174; Pervo, *Acts,* 340.

[1196] 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."

and 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 marked it out as distinct from the broader culture while linking it to the ministry of Jesus, the 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 Jerusalem one from which it originated, as did its leadership institutions. Later the "council" convened in Jerusalem would earmark some practices deemed essential for further underscoring the "mother-child" connection between these two communities (Acts 15:19–21; 28–29).[1197] However, the other side of the coin was that one striking practice, circumcision, was set to the side in 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).[1198]

[1197] 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).

[1198] Cf. Pervo, *Acts*, 339–40.

The freedom believing Antiochenes will experience is "from all those sins [πάντων ὧν] from which you were unable to be freed by the law of Moses [οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν νώμῳ Μωϋσέως]." As it turns out, the clarification speaks to the means of salvation just as much as it does to its content, pitting the efficaciousness of Jesus's salvation against the law's perceived inefficacy.[1199] From Luke's perspective, the latter is ultimately due not to any flaw in the law itself, but rather in the Jews' inability to keep it.[1200] 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 conjured by Stephen's speech (7:38). As noted above, the ancestral prehistory builds toward the climax which is the proclamation of the colonizing message to the patriarchs' descendants, the Jews and Godfearers of Antioch, and it is tailored to fit this situation. The Antiochenes are meant to be defined first and

---

[1199] See Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 128–29, 153.

[1200] 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 etioloated 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." Yet Luke could not count on all Jews believing that the law by itself ever meant to provide justification. See E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977). Paul's claim may simply mean that that justification through Jesus was the solution for a problem which the law could not—and was not meant to—fully address.

foremost by the promises given to David—or rather, the response to their fulfilment of them in Jesus, who offers forgiveness of sins as the embodiment of God's gracious sovereign rule. What Paul's claim in verse 39 does, then, is validate the identity which he envisions for his audience by presenting its negative corollary—identity which is circumscribed by an ineffectual law.

Paul's characterization of the law also anticipates the meeting in Jerusalem over identity markers in Acts 15.[1201] 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 "*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

[1201] See chapter 4.

"colonies." The four-fold prohibition (15:29; cf. 15:29; 21:25)—with its special focus on idolatry and *porneia*—was deemed sufficient to bind gentiles in mixed communities to the Jewish, and therefore Jerusalem, origins of the cult.[1202] Paul's speech in Acts 13, of course, does not mention the prohibition since it has not yet occurred. However, his (related) negative characterization of the law anticipates the decisions made about the identity markers of Antioch of Syria and its colonies in Acts 15. As such, it contributes the impression—first signaled by the commission in 13:2–4 and later reinforced by the debriefing in 14:26–28—that Pisidea Antioch is the second generation offspring of Syrian Antioch. With this relationship in mind, the characterization of the law likewise anticipates the positive reception of Paul's message by τὰ ἔθνη (13:48–49) as compared with its reception among οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι (13:45). Like its mother community, the cult community in Antioch of Pisidia was to be defined by its mixed membership.

[1202] 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.

5.3.3.4.2 Warning: Response to the Message

But for the moment Paul's focus is 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 their potential failure to respond appropriately to the colonizing message. John the Baptist, recall, demonstrated what a proper orientation to God's work through the savior looked like (13:24–25), while the Jews in Jerusalem followed the path of rejection (13:27–9). The latter's rejection looms large in this passage: not only did it serve, by God's providence, to push the colonizing message beyond the borders of Israel and thus eventually to Antioch, but it also functions as a negative exemplar for Paul's Antiochene audience—visualizing how not to respond to the message of salvation. But true to form when it comes to articulating his caution Paul employs 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 (13:32–37).[1203]

5.3.3.4.2.1 Warning as divine foreknowledge. But the citation of Habakkuk does more than issue a warning. It also demonstrates divine foreknowledge since it anticipates the response of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι in 13:45,[1204] which is of monumental importance: It influences Paul and Barnabas's subsequent efforts and ultimately shapes the outcome of the colonizing mission in Antioch. Paul's introduction of the passage in light of its demonstration of God's foreknowledge. It is in the introduction, in fact, that the warning occurs: 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

---

[1203] Used 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).

[1204] See Quesnel, "Paul prédicateur dans les Actes des Apôtres," 472. Pervo, *Acts*, 341.

fulfilling, a prophesy refashioned by Paul to describe an unbelieving response to God's saving action through Jesus. A hefty number of witnesses[1205] have supplied ἐφ' ὑμᾶς to make clear that it is the Antiochenes who will be affected, countering the odd use of ἔρχομαι without an object.[1206] 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.

5.3.3.4.2.2 Continuity in the warning. Paul's citation, though a reconfiguration of Habakkuk 1:5, connects with several ideas in the immediate context and for this reason, 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 κατφρονηταί,

[1205] A C E L Ψ 097. 81. 323. (614). 945. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. M gig vg sy co; Bas.

[1206] See Pervo, *Acts*, 329, who describes this reading as "an obvious improvement the removal of which would be inexplicable."

καὶ θαυμάσατε καὶ ἀφανίσθητε,

ὅτι ἔργον ἐργάζομαι ἐγὼἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν,

ἔργον ὃ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆαι

ὑμῖν.

To begin with οἱ κατφρονηταί—a rare word appearing merely three times in the LXX (twice in Habakkuk[1207] 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 ἐπιβλέψατε[1208] and adverb θαυμάσια,[1209] presumably for stylistic reasons—i.e., because they are repetitive. 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,

---

[1207] Instead of ἴδετε οἱ κατφρονηταί ("Behold/look scoffers") the MT reads ראו בגוים ("Look at/among the nations"). 4QHab also provides some support for κατφρονηταί. See Barrett, "Old Testament History According to Stephen and Paul," 59. Thus, Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 129, concludes that κατφρονηταί is taken either from the LXX or a Hebrew vorlage.

[1208] MT: והביטו.

[1209] θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια renders the infinitive absolute והתמהו תמהו (MT).

"amazement" characteristically captures the immediate reaction to a divine work and does not necessarily imply lasting belief,[1210] as the current context well demonstrates.

Ἀφανίσθητε ("perish")[1211] seems much better suited to its original context as a reference to the invading Babylonian forces,[1212] but it applies here too given the looming rejection of the colonizing message by many of the Jewish auditors. Paul and Barnabas' reaction is to say to the Jews who spoke out against them, οὐκ ἀξίους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς (13:46). The command to "perish" foreshadows this withdrawal of "eternal life."[1213] 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 (13:23b), his appearance in Jerusalem (13:27–32), and finally the proclamation of him in Antioch (13:26, 32–37). Ἡμέραις recalls the appearance of

---

[1210] See Acts 2:7; 3:12; 4:13. Cf. Zhang, *Paul Among the Jews*, 150, who speaks of the "ambivalent response to salvation."

[1211] 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.

[1212] Cf. Keener, *Acts,* 2:2090.

[1213] 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."

Jesus τοῖς συναναβᾶσιν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίς εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ (13:31), but in this subsection the weight of the reference falls upon the conveyance of Jesus's salvation to the Antiochene (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, or literally "works/does." 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).[1214] It is important to note once again that this blurring of the 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.

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: ὅ 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 contradiction

[1214] Cf. 15:38.

(verb: ἀντίλεγον) a presumably similar discourse elicit from the Jews of Antioch the following Sabbath. The reference to *not believing* here, then, foreshadows the Jews' rejection of the message (13:45) that promises justification, or release from sins, for πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων (13:38).[1215] Further, insofar as this failure to believe contrasts with the belief of the gentile Sergius Paulus earlier in the colonizing mission (13:12), it also anticipates the belief of the Antiochene Gentiles,[1216] leading to their reception of the ζωὴν αἰώνιον withdrawn from their Jewish counterparts (13:48; cf. v. 46). 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.

However, the verbal and conceptual links which I have highlighted illustrates an additional function: to reveal divine foreknowledge of the rejection by many Antiochene Jews in the near future. 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

---

[1215] See Quesnel, "Paul prédicateur dans les Actes des Apôtres," 472.

[1216] Indeed, Jeska, *Die Geschichte Israels in der Sicht des Lukas,* 238, suggests that in Paul's quotation of Habakkuk 1:5 in 13:41 "Werk‹ nicht nur die Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben an Jesus zu verstehen, sondern auch die Heidenmission (vgl. Apg 13, 2; 14,26; 15,38)."

prerequisite for the forgiveness of sins.[1217] However, the oracle of "the prophets," much like an oracle of Delphi, validates the outcome belonging to 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—including 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 that grounds the Antiochenes' present encounter of the salvation message articulated by Paul and Barnabas; this function is demonstrated *inter alia* by the forms of address in verses 16, 26, and 38. Paul's narrative legitimates the prospective community because it envelops its members in a history solely directed God and typified by seminal moments that take place outside the land of Israel. God's benefaction of his people in Egypt (13:17), for

[1217] 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; 17:30; 11:18; 13:24; 19:4; 20:21; 26:20.

example, offers a precedent for the current display of salvation in Antioch, much like legends of proto-colonization provided 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; 13:23) to Jesus; further, as one committed to God's will (τὰ θελήματά; 13:22) he anticipates the founder of the new cult community. The other founding figures in the speech likewise act on behalf of a higher purpose: The apostles serve as Jesus's "witnesses" (13:31) and Paul and Barnabas "proclaim the good news" that God has brought his promises to fulfillment (13:32–33).

As elsewhere in Acts,[1218] 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 fully possible through the law (13:39). By virtue of his resurrection, Jesus the savior acts as guarantor of both. But for the message of salvation to succeed in replicating the cult

---

[1218] E.g., Acts 2, 3–5. See chapter 3.

community, it must engender a believing response. The Jerusalem Jews' rejection of the savior offers the Antiochenes a negative exemplar (vv. 27–31), while also explaining the spread of the cult through opposition, or "crisis"—a familiar colonizing motif.

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). Drawn sacred scripture, the warning implies the foreknowledge of God and thus validates this turn of events even before it occurs. Since Paul appropriates this warning from sacred scripture, it implies the foreknowledge of God thus validating the rejection 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,[1219] Paul and Barnabas again (v. 51), and finally "the disciples" (v. 52). This latter sequence of reactions—ultimately facilitating Paul and Barnabas's

transition out of the Roman colony—influences the complexion of the community planted in Antioch and with it, any judgement about the success of the entire venture. These two issues serve as foci in my remaining remarks.

5.4.1 The Foundation of a "Mixed" Community

I have identified Paul's sermon as rhetoric of second generation colonization since 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 speech interpreting it (2:1–40); Stephen's speech

[1219] 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.

(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, in Luke's reconstruction it was at Antioch where the first full-fledged community of Jews and Gentiles was formed, equipped with leadership and religious institutions reflecting its relationship to the mother community but also 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 as 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's community in multiple ways. In fact, Paul 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 (13:16) 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 (13:26). The references and their placement demonstrate that Paul considers Gentiles who attach themselves to Judaism to be

eligible for the blessings of salvation transmitted 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 efficacious than the law of Moses. 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 he and Barnabas leave the synagogue. By itself the plea for an encore—παρεκάλουν εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ λαληθῆναι αὐτοῖς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα (13:42)—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.[1220] 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

[1220] Cf. Pervo, *Acts*, 342: "The narrator's intensions [in verses 42–43] are to set the stage for the return visit [to the synagogue], yet to assure readers that some had been won over."

"following" to depict both discipleship and its costs.[1221] But he also utilizes the same word to describe the mass following Jesus acquired during his ministry.[1222] 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 represents superficial attraction rather than genuine belief. More conclusive, however, is Paul and Barnabas' response. Luke relates that προσλαλοὺντες αὐτοῖς ἔπειθον αὐτοὺς προσμένειν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ (13:43). This plea resembles exhortation that is elsewhere directed at genuine embracers of the colonizing message of salvation.[1223] 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.[1224]

A shift in target audience further influences the development of a "mixed" membership. Whereas initially gentiles became part of the community through their

---

[1221] Luke 5:11, 27–28, 9:23, 57, 59, 61; 18:22, 28, 43.
[1222] Luke 7:9; 9:11; 23:27.
[1223] See Acts 11:23; 18:27; 20:32.
[1224] Cf. Morgan-Wynne, *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*, 38, who argues that 13:43 constitutes "the founding of the Christian community in PA."

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 (13:45).[1225] One might be tempted to view Paul and Barnabas' subsequent "turning" (στεφόμεθα; v. 46) to Gentiles as reactionary or a sensible response motivated by self-preservation. However, for their part Luke's characters invest it with theological significance: the deliberate rejection of God's witnesses[1226] triggers God's plan to reach to Gentiles.

However, this "turning to Gentiles" does not abrogate the mission to Jews. Luke understands the universal mission as an extension of the restoration of Israel.[1227] Here, even, he has Paul claim ὑμῖν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ

[1225] Robert C. Tannehill, "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story," *JBL* 104 (1985): 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 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."

[1226] 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 than this—to the "Israelites" rejection of Moses (7:27, 53).

[1227] See Acts 1:6–8. Cf. James M. Scott, "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 Ådna and Hans Kvalbein (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 87–123; chapter 3.

(13:46). Keeping in mind that some Jews have 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.[1228] As is characteristic of the colonizing narrative, opposition such as this serves as a mechanism to expand the cult community—here among Gentiles.[1229] Paul henceforth does not abandon the Jews; rather, "to the Jew first, then to the Gentile" functions as an implicit blueprint of sorts 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).[1230]

[1228] 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, 168, notes that such divisions fulfill Simeon's prophecy in Luke 2:34. Strauss, 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, notes the opposition to Paul mirrors that which Jesus encountered following his inaugural synagogue sermon.

[1229] 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.

[1230] Keener, *Acts* 2:2097.

Luke's appropriation of Isaiah 49:6 to substantiate the appeal to Gentiles reinforces two points: God[1231] has orchestrated this plan and 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) which sanctioned the mission to Jerusalem and beyond, and thus outreach to Gentiles as well as Jews, in his absence prophecies from scripture which perform this role. Peter was a trailblazer in his use of scriptural interpretation to 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.[1232] Using Isaiah 49:6, Paul and Barnabas cast their mandate as a calling to extend salvation to Gentiles, with τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς

[1231] 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.

[1232] Recall that we the 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.

σωτηρίαν elaborating on τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν (13:47).[1233] The extent of the salvation bearing mission—ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς— recalls the Jesus's oracle in 1:8.[1234] We have already noted how Paul's speech expresses that the agents of Syrian Antioch were on a mission to spread the message of salvation (13:32). Yet there are two differences between the earlier and present contexts: first, the speech's target audience were Jews and Gentiles attached to Judaism; second, the speech seemingly prioritizes the witness of Jesus's disciples (13:31).[1235] But when it comes to the gentile mission, Paul and Barnabas take a back seat to no one. Scripture authorizes their witness similar to how the Lord's appearance underwrote the disciples'. Yet in this respect Paul's experience is not so different after all, since scripture merely bolsters the sanction which the apostle already possessed due to his own encounter with the resurrected and exalted Lord. His work in Antioch helps inaugurates the mission forecast back in 9:15.[1236]

[1233] 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).

[1234] 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.

[1235] See Ibid., 113.

[1236] 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 (Acts 13:2–3). Being a companion of Paul, moreover, he participates in the same divinely sanctioned mission to gentiles. However, Paul has greater importance as founding figure in the gentile

The results stemming from Paul and Barnabas' 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' declaration—Ἀκούοντα—the gentiles "rejoiced"[1237] 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 (11:48),[1238] as this underscores divine orchestration of the colonizing process. Just as the Jews who rejected the message of salvation saw "eternal life" withdrawn from them (13:46), those gentiles who believe find themselves the unexpected recipients of it.[1239] The near equivalent to salvation, "eternal life" guarantees the latter's membership in the cult community formed at Antioch, in turn further ensuring that community's "mixed" composition.

---

mission, which Luke marks beginning in 13:13 by placing him when listing him along with Barnabas or other "companions."

[1237] Luke elsewhere associates rejoicing with the inclusion of Gentile converts. See Acts 8:39; 11:23; 15:31.

[1238] Cf. Acts 18:10.

[1239] 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)."

5.4.2 The Colonization of Pisidian Antioch—A Success?

So, was the colonizing mission at Antioch of Pisidia successful? This question begs asking not only due to the active opposition by many of the Jews in verse 45, but also since it is the Jews' incitement of "women of high standing and the leading men of the city" against Paul and Barnabas along with their "persecution" which "drove them out of their district" (13:50). On Acts' own terms, the answer, quite simpy is yes. The opposition of "natives" to the "colonizing" mission has been a recurrent theme throughout the narrative and indeed often (as here) contributes to the further spread of the message. Moreover, Luke does relate the positive response of many Antiochenes along with the implicit creation of a "mixed" community: first, some Jews and Godfearers embraced Paul's message (13:43); then, many Gentiles believed (13:47). Following the conversion of gentiles, Luke even offers the summary statement διεφέρετο δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου δι' ὅλης τῆς χώρας[1240] (13:49), recalling remarks that elsewhere in Acts signal the success of the "colonizing" message. There is also the

[1240] 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.

concluding comment of Acts 13: οἵ τε μαθηταὶ ἐπληροῦντο χαρᾶς καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου (13:52). In Acts, 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.[1241] In some cases, indeed, the "filling" of the Holy Spirit is the mechanism which produces or formalizes membership in the community.[1242] 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 God has orchestrated. 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 (13:16), led to his "raising up" of David (13:22), and culminated in his sending and resurrection of the savior Jesus (13:23–37). The warning in the sermon also demonstrates divine foreknowledge that some Jews would reject Jews (13:40). Second, the oracle in 13:47 reinforces the idea that it was God's plan all along to use Paul and Barnabas to bring salvation to Gentiles—a fulfillment of Paul's mandate from 9:15 and prior to that, Jesus's in 1:8. Third, Luke's report in 13:48 clarifies

---

[1241] See, e.g.; 8:39; 11:23; 15:31. Cf. Keener, *Acts*, 2:2101.

[1242] Acts 2:1–4, 38; 8.15; 10:44–45; 11.15–17; 15:8; 19:6.

that those gentiles believing unto eternal life do so in agreement with the "appointment" of the Lord. In other words, he wields authority over the results of the "second generation" colonizing mission to gentiles just as he does over Israel's sacred history. Finally, the conclusion to the episode at Antioch of Pisidia indicates the Holy Spirit fills the disciples at Antioch (13:52). This "filling" by the one who has, from the beginning of Acts, empowered the colonizing mission at the behest of God certifies the success of the divinely orchestrated plan to replicate the cult community in Antioch.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

In this study, I have argued the benefit of reading Acts of the Apostles as a colonizing narrative. To do so I have adopted an analytic framework developed from accounts of colonization in the ancient Mediterranean world (chapter 2).[1243] Reading Acts in this way yields two major benefits. First, at the macro level, it gives intensified focus to the subject matter of the narrative—the replication of the Christian community. Just like Rhodes and Crete founded Gela, which in turn founded Acragas, and just like Alba Longa founded Rome, which in turn founded numerous other colonies, so also the Christian community replicates. Beginning in Jerusalem (chapter 3), it first expands in a significant way to Antioch of Syria (chapter 4). Then the colony becomes a mother community and engages in its own acts of colonization, planting second-generation communities in places such as Antioch of Pisidia (see chapter 5). In fact, the establishment of a colony here, I have argued, anticipates the replication of

[1243] Most of these accounts were of Greek colonization. Indeed, Greek accounts represent the closest analogue to Acts. However, Roman colonization was important to our study for at least two reasons. First, Luke's narrative is set against the backdrop of Rome's dominance—often via colonization—over the inhabited world. Second, accounts of Rome's foundation (see chapter 2), and that of colonies such as Antioch of Pisidia (see chapter 5), exploit prominent motifs typically employed in accounts of Greek colonization.

the Christian community in Rome itself (Acts 28)—once the same outcome has been achieved in eminent cities like Philippi (Acts 16), Corinth (Acts 18), and Ephesus (Acts 19).

Second, at the micro level, reading Acts as a colonizing narrative illuminates key *topoi*— such as the prominence of Jerusalem, the guidance of Jesus and the Holy Spirit, and the leadership of the apostles (especially Peter and Paul). The analytic framework helps us to see that these emphases correspond with recurrent motifs in colonization accounts designed to legitimate new communities: origins, divine sanction, and founder(s).

I have argued that Jerusalem functions like the *metropolis* of the Christian movement in general and Antioch of Syria in particular (chapters 3–4). The city's antiquity and religious importance confers legitimacy upon the newer communities. This holds true despite the *stasis* precipitating the dispersal of community members from Jerusalem. For, as I have argued, memorable origins like this actually reinforce the symbolic connection between the mother community and colony. There are other ways of underscoring the relationship. Members of the community in Syrian Antioch came to be called "Christians" (Acts 11:26), nomenclature that (whatever the intent) signaled

their link to the original founder and the mother city, Jerusalem. Moreover, the leadership institutions in Antioch—“prophets and teachers” (Acts 13:1–2)—also hint at the community’s relation to Jesus and a Jewish heritage. Finally, the visits by the Jerusalem apostles and their emissaries highlights the mother community’s oversight of her colonies.

As is often the case in colonization accounts, there is ambivalence in the *metropolis*-colony relationship, which stems mostly from the “mixed” membership in 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—which delineate a non-onerous means for incorporating gentile members and project a common identity for the community (Acts 15:19–20). In Antioch of Pisidia, the concept of Godfearer naturally facilitates the inclusion of gentile members into the community, which Paul presents as the fulfillment of God’s purposes. To further ensure the equal footing of Jews and gentiles in the new community, he links both to the legendary traditions about the ancestors. Doing so also bolsters the connection between the Antiochene community and the origins of the colonizing movement in Jerusalem.

I have argued that the legitimacy of the colonizing community portrayed in Acts above all derives from its divine sanction. Luke represents this sanction in various ways. Jesus's oracle in Acts 1:8 authorizes the replication of the Christian community, while the Holy Spirit's outpouring (Acts 2:1–4) precipitates it. But signs of divine favor continue to orchestrate the spread of the community throughout the narrative. Epiphanic signs (Acts 4:31) and the assistance of an angel (Acts 5:20–21) demonstrate support for the growth of the community within Jerusalem. A vision by Peter legitimates the inclusion of gentiles at Caesarea (Acts 10:9–11:18). The Holy Spirit leads Philip and Peter alike to proclaim the gospel in areas beyond Jerusalem (Acts 8; 10:9–-11:18). And, most pertinent to our project, he appoints Paul and Barnabas to colonize on behalf of the mother community, Syrian Antioch (Acts 13:1–4). Finally, divine sanction appears more subtly in Paul's sermon in Antioch of Pisidia. Here, as an interpreter of sacred traditions, Paul demonstrates God's plan to expand the restored community to include both Jews and Godfearers outside the land of Israel (Acts 13:16–41).

Finally, I have strived to show how the apostles, particularly Peter and Paul, function like founding figures in Acts. Jesus is *the* founder, but these individuals

nevertheless act as his representatives in their capacity as "witnesses." Their chief qualification is their (unexpected) divine mandate (Acts 1:8: 9:15). As founding figures, their primary responsibility is to contribute to the expansion of the restored community. Like the founder whom they represent, they accomplish this through words and actions announcing God's salvation. They also help shape the identity of the new communities by determining/interpreting and overseeing institutions (Acts 2:42–47; 4:32–5:11; 13:39; 15:7–29). By these means, the founding figures fulfill their divine mandate to replicate the Christian community in Jerusalem and areas beyond throughout the Mediterranean world.

I hope to have demonstrated that reading Acts as a colonizing narrative enables us to discover important nuances in the way Luke depicts the expansion of the Christian community. But there is a question which confronts us beyond the narrative: Why does Luke opt to employ colonization motifs in the first place? I would argue that though origins, divine sanction, and founding figures are important in other contexts, it is not incidental that his narrative is about the replication of a community. These were cultural concepts ready at hand to explain and validate translocations and new beginnings. Luke found them useful, I suggest, to articulate why it was that the

Jerusalem community *had* to replicate. In other words, via these motifs Luke's colonizing narrative explains not just the reality of expansion, but also its necessity.

APPENDIX: SELECTIVE 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, *Mor.* 96b; cf. *Mor.* 812b	Clazomenae?	Timesios	oracle (predicting conflict)
	Strabo 14.1.30	Teos		
	Pindar, *Paean* 2	Teos	Abderus (hero); Timesios	
Acanthus	Thucydides 4.84	Andros		
	Plutarch, *Quaest. rom.* 30, 298a–b	Chalcis and Andros		
Al Mina				
Alba Longa	Livy 1.1–17		Ascanius (son of Aeneas)	
	Diodorus 7.5.1–7		Ascanius	oracle, vision
Alexandria	Arrian 3.1.5–2.1		Alexander	oracle, *manteis*
	Plutarch, *Alexander* 26f		Alexander	vision, omen/*manteis,* oracle
	Pseudo-Callisthenes 1.30–31		Alexander	oracle, omen
Amphipolis	Thucydides 4.102–8; 5.11	Athens > Sparta	Hagnon (Athenian) Brasidas (Spartan)	
	Polyaenus, *Strat.* 6.5.3			oracle
Antioch of Pisidea		1. Seleucids; 2. Rome	Seleucus (I or II), Augustus	
Antioch of Syria	Appian, *The Syrian Wars* 57		Seleucus Nicator	
	Libanius, *Or.* 11	1. Argos 2. Crete 3. Cyprus	1. Triptoelmus 2. Casus	2. Zeus

		4. Elea (with Heraclidae)	5. Alexander 6. Seleucus Nicator	6. Omen: Eagle of Zeus
	Malalas 199–200		Seleucus Nicator	omen: eagles; priests and augurs
Apamea	Appian, *The Syrian Wars* 57		Seleucus Nicator	
	Malalas 202–4		Seleucus Nicator	omen: eagle
Aphrodisias		Rome		
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, *Anabasis* 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		
	Ovid, *Metam.* 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 4.150–61	Thera	Battos	oracle(s)

	Pindar, *Pyth.* 4	Thera	Battos	oracle, prophecy (Medea)
	Pindar, *Pyth.* 5	Trojan Antenoridai, Thera	Battos	oracle
	Pindar, *Pyth.* 9	Apollo/Cyrene, Thera	Apollo/Cyrene (Nymph)	
	Callimachus, *Hymn to Apollo* 2.86		Apollo/Cyrene (Nymph), Battos	Apollo (i.e., oracle)
Cyrnos (= Corsica)	Herodotus 1.165–67	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, Alopeconnesians)		
Gela	Thucydides 6.4.3	Rhodes and Crete	Antiphemus (Rhodes) and Entimus (Crete	
	Herodotus 7.153 (cf. 154)	Rhodes	Antiphemus	
	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 2.846–50	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, *The Syrian Wars* 57	Seleucus Nicator		
Leontini	Thucydides 6.4.1–2	Settlers from Megara (previously Chalcis)	Lamis	
Locri Epizephyrii	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 Hyblaea	Thucydides 6.4.1	Settlers originally from Megara		
Messene (refounding)	Pausanias 4.26–27 (cf. 9.14.5)	Thebes, Argos	Epaminondas (Thebes) and Epiteles (Argos)	dream-vision(s), apparition ("ancient man"), oracle (of Bacis), (mystery) cult
Mylae	Diodorus 14.87.1–3	Rhegion (settlers: fugitives from Catane and Naxos)		
Naucratis	Herodotus 2.178	*Emporion* represented by many Greeks (e.g., Aegina, Samos, Miletus)		
Naxos (Italy)	Thucydides 6.3.1–2	Chalcis	Thucles	oracle (?) [altar to Apollo *Archegetes*]
Neapolis	Strabo 5.4.5–9	(refounded) Chalcis, Pithecusa, 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, *Romulus*		Romulus	augury, founding ritual
	Plutarch, *Romulus* [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 or 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, *Life of Pythagoras* 2.3–4	Mixed group of settlers: Cephallenia, Arcadia, Thessaly; *epoikoi:* 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, *The Syrian Wars* 57		Seleucus	
Seleucia on the Mediterranean	Apian, *The Syrian Wars* 57		Seleucus	“portent of thunder”
Seleucia at Pieria	Malalas 199		Seleucus	omen: eagle, augury
Seleucia on the Tigris	Apian, *The Syrian Wars* 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 *metropolis*)		
Stratonicea	Appian, *The Syrian Wars* 57		Seleucus	
Syracuse	Thucydides 6.3.2–3	Corinth	Archias (one of Heracleidae)	
	Plutarch, *Moralia* 772d–773b		Archias (one of Heracleidae)	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	
Thera	Herodotus 4.146–150	Sparta	Theras	

Thracian Chersonese	Herodotus 6.35–37	(from Athens)	Miltiades the Elder	oracle
	Nepos, *Miltiades* 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 Manticlus	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Aeschylus. Translated by Alan H. Sommerstein. 3 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Aristotle. Translated by H. Rackham. 22 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1991.

Arrian. Translated by P. A. Brunt. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976–1983.

Artapanus. Edited and translated by Carl Holladay. *Historians.* Vol. 1 of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors.* Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

Callimachus. Translated by A. W. Mair et al. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1921–1973.

Cicero. Translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey et al. 29 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999–2010.

Cornelius Nepos. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Diodorus Siculus. Translated by C. H. Oldfather et al. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933–1967.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Translated by Earnest Carey and Stephen Usher. 9 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937–1985.

Euripides. Translated by David Kovacs et al. LCL. 6 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998–2009.

Herodotus. Translated by A. D. Godley. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920–1925.

Homeric Hymns. Translated by Martin L. West. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Iamblichus. *On the Pythagorean Way of Life.* Edited and translated by John Dillon and Jackson Hershbell. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

John Malalas. Translated by Elizabeth Jeffreys et al. Melbourne: Australian Association of Byzantine Studies, 1986.

Josephus. Translated by Henry St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.

Libanius. *Antioch as a Center of Hellenic Culture as Observed by Libanius.* Edited and translated by A. F. Norman. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.

Livy. Translated by B. O. Foster et al. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919–1959.

Ovid. Translated by Grant Showerman et al. 6 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914–1931.

Pausanias. Translated by W. H. S. Jones et al. 5 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918–1935.

Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson et al. 13 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1953.

Pindar. Translated by William H. Race. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Plato. Translated by R. G. Bury et al. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914–2013.

Pliny the Elder. Translated by H. Rackham et al. 10 vols. LCL Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938–1962.

Plutarch. *Moralia.* Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt et al. 16 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–2004.

Pseudo-Callisthenes. *The Great Alexander Romance.* Translated by Richard Stoneman. London: Penguin, 1991.

Pseudo-Eupolemus. Edited and translated by Carl Holladay. *Historians.* Vol. 1 of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors.* Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

Quintus Curtius. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.

Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Translated by Frederick W. Shipley. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924.

Strabo. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. 8 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917–1932.

Theodotus. Edited and translated by Carl Holladay. *Poets.* Vol. 2 of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors.* Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1989.

Thucydides. Translated by C. F. Smith. 4 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919–1923.

Virgil. Translated by H. Rushton Fairclough. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Xenophon. Translated by Carleton Brownson et al. 7 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914–1925.

Secondary Sources

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.* 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 Toponomy 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.* Editd 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, J. *La colonisation grecque de l'Italie Méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'Antiquité*. 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, Wales: 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 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 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, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Bowker, J. W. "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form." *NTS* 14 (1967–68): 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.* Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 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 Verlag, 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 Verlag GmbH, 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.

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, C.J. “The Alms Trader: A Note on Identifying the Beautiful Gateof Acts 3.2.” *NTS* 42 (1996): 475–6.

Croatto, J. Severino. “Jesus, Prophet Like Elijah, and Prophet-Teacher Like Moses in Luke-Acts.” *JBL* 124 (2005): 451–65.

Cumont, Franz. “La plus ancienne géographic 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, T. C. A. *Fields, Farms and Colonists: Intensive Field Survey and Early Roman Colonization in the Pontine Region, Central Itay.* Groningen: Barkhuis, 2011.

Demougin, Ségolène, and John Scheid, eds. *Colons et colonies dans le monde romain.* Rome: École française de Rome, 2012.

Descoeudres, Jean-Paul, ed. *Greek Colonists and Native Populations.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Destro, A., and M. 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 Taşıalan, 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, Netherlands: 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, T. 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.

Fontenrose, 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 A. Y. Collins and M. M. Mitchell. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

Gilbert, Gary. “The List of Nations in Acts 2: Roman Propagana and the Lukan Response.” *JBL* 121 (2002): 497–529.

Goldsmith, Dale. “Acts 13:33–37: A Pesher 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 Ὅρκιον Τῶν Οἰκιστήρων 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.

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*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Hamm, Dennis. "Acts 3:12–26: Peter's Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lame." *PRSt* 11(1984): 199–217.

Hänlein-Schäfer, Heidi. *Veneratio Augusti: Eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers* Rome: G. Bretschneider, 1985.

Hengel, Martin, and Anna Maria Schwemer. *Between Damascus and Antioch*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Herrmann, P. "Teos and Abdera im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Ein neues Fragment der Teiorum Dirae." *Chiron* 11 (1981): 1–30.

Hill, Craig C. *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Heiserman, A. *The Novel before the Novel.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Hiesinger, Ulrich W. "Three Images of the God Mên." *HSCP* 71 (1967): 303–10.

Holladay, Carl R. *Hisorians.* Vol. 1 of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

_____. *Acts: A Commentary.* NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016.

Hurst, H. 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, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

Judge, E. A. "Judaism and the Rise of Christianity: A Roman Perspective," *TynBul* 45 (1994).

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 Ertez Israel with the Hellenistic Cities Uring the Second Temple Period (332 BCE-70 CE).* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.

Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary.* 4 Volumes. 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): 665–680.

Kraabel, A. T. "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. *Grunder der Stadt: Studien zu einem politish-religiosen Phanomen der griechischen Geschichte.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GMBH, 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, PA: 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, Y, 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. Della Sc. Norm. Super. Di 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.

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, Wales: Duckworth, 1998.

Moessner, David P. “Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet Like Moses in Acts.” *SBLSP* 22 (1983): 203–12.

Morel, J.-P. “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. *ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΑΡΧΗΓΟΣ: 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, MA: 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): 529–555.

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, H. W., and D. 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, TX: 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.

_____. *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, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2004.

Pilhofer, P. “Luke’s Knowledge of Pisidian Antioch.” Pages 77–83 in *Actes Du Ier 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. “S.v. Ktistes,” *RE* 11.2.22. Cols. 1149–50.

Prinz, Friedrich. *Grundungsmythen und Sagenschonologie.* 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 Askaênos: 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. JSOTSS 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 Paeans: 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. Tubingen: 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.

Slingerland, Dixon. "'The Jews' in the Pauline Portions of Acts." *JAAR* 54 (1986): 305–21.

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

Smith, Daniel Lynwood. "Interrupted Speeches in Luke-Acts," *JBL* 134 (2015): 177–91.

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.

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.

Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Synder, G. F. "The God-Fearers in Paul's Speech at Pisidian Antioch." Pages 44–52 in *Actes Du Ier Congrès International sur Antioche de Pisidie.* Edited by Thomas Drew-Bear, Mehmet Taşıalan, and Christine M. Thomas. Lyon: Université Lumière-Lyon 2, UMR 5649 du CNRS, 2002.

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, MT: 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.

Tyson, Joseph B. “Acts 6:1–7 and Dietary Regulations in Early Christianity.” *PRSt* 10 (1983): 145–61.

Vallet, G. *Rhegion et Zancle: Histoire, commerce et civilisationde cités chalcidiennes du détroit de Messine.* Paris: de Boccard, 1958.

Van Dommelen, Peter, and N. 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, D. 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.

Weinstock, Stefan. "The Geographical Catalogue in Acts II, 9-11." *JRS* 38 (1948): 43–46.

Wedderburn, A. J. M. "Traditions and Redactions in Acts 2.1–13." *JSNT* 55 (1994): 29–39.

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.