

Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13

The Denouement of the South Galatian Hypothesis*

Clare K. Rothschild
Romeoville, IL

Abstract

According to Acts 13, after Barnabas and Paul confront the Jewish magician Bar-Jesus on Cyprus and successfully win the allegiance of Roman proconsul, Sergius Paulus, the fellow travelers visit Pisidian Antioch. On the Sabbath in Pisidian Antioch, Paul gives his first and only speech to Jews in Acts (13:16b-41). William M. Ramsay, subscribing to the “province” or “Southern Galatian” hypothesis, understands the addressees of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians to be those converted in response to this speech. Ramsay goes so far as to draw connections between the speech and Paul’s Letter to the Galatians. In contrast, H.D. Betz argues that Galatians was written to Gentiles in Northern Galatia. Betz sees no proof of the historicity of the Acts account and finds no compelling reason, therefore, to associate it with Paul’s Letter to the Galatians. A prolegomenon for both Ramsay and Betz is the purpose of Acts. Kirsopp Lake once asked whether it was “an accident that he [“Luke”] describes Paul’s first dealings with the Romans, the Corinthians, the Ephesians, and the Thessalonians,” noting that “Galatia was the remaining church which Paul founded and wrote to.” This essay argues that both Ramsay and Betz are in a sense correct. Paul’s visit to Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13 provides grounds for Paul’s foundation of the Galatic churches, irrespective of the historicity of its presentation in Acts. Further, it argues that such a stopover has a distinct narrative advantage; namely, it affords an attractively Romanesque stopover early in Paul’s travels for this Roman-born, Roman-named, Rome-bound missionary.

*) I would like to thank Carl Holladay of Emory University for the opportunity to tour Turkey with a group of Emory faculty and students for three weeks in January 2009 and for the assignment to explore Pisidian Antioch for that trip. That assignment gave rise to the present study. This essay narrowly confines its topic to the purpose of Pisidian Antioch in Acts. It does not take up either the Northern vs. Southern Galatia Hypotheses or the addressees of Galatians *per se*. It will, however, in its conclusion resolve the Northern *versus* Southern Galatian debate by canceling the historical viability of the Southern Hypothesis. The Greek text of the New Testament is cited according to NA²⁷. The essay refers to the author of Acts as ‘Luke’ for the sake of convenience and without prejudice as to the identity of the author. I also wish to thank the anonymous reviewers at *Novum Testamentum* and Trevor W. Thompson for helpful corrections and critique.

Keywords

Acts of the Apostles; Epistle to the Galatians; North/South Galatian hypothesis; Pisidian Antioch

So any historiography is an act of optimism, assuming that the past can be tamed into some sort of order.¹

I. Introduction

According to Acts 13, immediately after Barnabas and Paul confront the Jewish magician Bar-Jesus or Elymas in Paphos on Cyprus and successfully win the allegiance of the Roman proconsul Sergius Paulus (an event which follows their commissioning in *Syrian* Antioch), the fellow travelers visit *Pisidian* Antioch.² On the Sabbath day in Pisidian Antioch, the two men

¹ Christopher Pelling, "Epilogue," in *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (ed. Christina S. Kraus; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 351.

² Commentaries consulted for this study include: C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994); F. Bovon, *Luke 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002); F.F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rev. ed., 1988); A.C. Clark, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes on Selected Passages* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1933); H. Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. J. Limburg, A.T. Kraabel, and D.H. Juel; ed. E.J. Epp with C.A. Matthews; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), German: *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1972); J.A. Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998); *The Beginnings of Christianity* (5 vols.; ed. F.J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake; London: Macmillan, 1920-1933; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979); E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1st ed. [= 10th ed.] 1956; 5th ed. [= 14th ed.] 1965; idem, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (trans. B. Noble and G. Shinn under supervision of H. Anderson, with trans. rev. by R. McL. Wilson from the 14th German ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971); J. Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998); K. Lake and H.J. Cadbury, *The Acts of the Apostles: English Translation and Commentary and Additional Notes to the Commentary*, in *Beginnings*, vols. 4-5 (London: Macmillan, 1933; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979); A. Loisy, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1920; Paris: F. Rieder, 1925; Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1973); G. Lüdemann, *Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary* (trans. John Bowden; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989); German: *Das frühe Christentum nach den Traditionen der Apostelgeschichte: Ein Kommentar* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987]); R. Pervo, *Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009); R. Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (EKKNT V/1, V/2; Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1986); R.B. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London: Methuen & Co., 1901).

enter a synagogue. Following the reading of the law and the prophets, they are invited to exhort the crowd—both Jews and “god-fearers” (v. 16b). At this time, Paul gives his first and only speech to Jews in Acts (13:16b-41). William Ramsay, subscribing to the “province” or “South Galatian” hypothesis, understands the addressees of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians to be those who converted in response to this speech (and the other un-narrated speeches to God-fearers and Gentiles noted in v. 48). Ramsay even sees connections between this speech and the letter to the Galatians.³ Hans Dieter Betz, however, argues that Galatians was written to Gentiles in Northern Galatia.⁴ Although he acknowledges that no evidence supports the existence of such Anatolian churches, Betz sees no proof of the historicity of Acts (for Galatia or elsewhere). He finds, therefore, no compelling reason to associate Galatians with Acts 13-14.⁵ For Betz, the recipients of Paul’s rhetorical missive are *unknown*.

³ *The Cities of St. Paul: Their Influence on His Life and Thought* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1979 [1907]) 299-314.

⁴ See n. 5 below. Udo Schnelle summarizes the *status quaestionis*: “On the whole the arguments for the north Galatian hypothesis are stronger. In particular, the absence of the addressees in Gal. 1.21, the Lucan statement about Paul’s work in ‘the region of . . . Galatia’ and the address in Gal. 3.1, along with the well thought out arrangement of the letter as a whole, speak against the south Galatian theory” (*The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings* [trans. E.M. Boring; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998] 97; German Original: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994]). In a helpful footnote, further endorsing the Northern Hypothesis, Schnelle adds: “The positions of individual exegetes on the north vs. south Galatian theories are listed by Rohde, *Galaterbrief* 6-7. Cf. for the north Galatian theory see Betz, *Galatians* 3-5; further Ulrich Wickert, “Kleinasien,” *TRE* 19 (1990) 244-265, here 251: ‘The north Galatian theory is to be decisively preferred.’ He says nothing about the theological reason at work in those who prefer the south Galatian theory (U. Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings* [trans. M.E. Boring; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998] 97 n. 266; Wickert as cited by Schnelle).

⁵ Betz writes, “The letter is addressed to ‘the churches in Galatia’ (1:2; cf. 3:1). The location of this area called Galatia has been discussed extensively but without definitive result. Most likely the location is central Anatolia, where wandering Celtic tribes settled after 278/277 B.C.E. (the ‘North Galatian’ or ‘territory hypothesis’). Less likely is the ‘South Galatian’ or ‘province hypothesis,’ which assumes that Paul meant the Roman *provincia Galatia*, established in 25 B.C.E. Yet the information contained in Galatians and Acts cannot be harmonized. Acts 13-14 does not mention Galatia as [*sic*] all. In 16:8 and 18:23, a ‘Galatian country’ is mentioned, but no mission is described. Also, the inhabitants of Pisidia and Lycaonia were not called ‘Galatians.’ Whether the itineraries of Acts are historically reliable in that they report all of Paul’s campaigns accurately is another unsolved problem. Although no archaeological traces seem to be left, central Anatolia is the most

One important prolegomenon for both Ramsay and Betz is the purpose of Acts. Why was Acts written? To accurately inform, playfully entertain, deviously mislead, strenuously attack, or vigorously defend? With respect to the purpose of Acts, Kirsopp Lake asks the following question:

Is it an accident that he [“Luke”] describes Paul’s first dealings with the Romans, the Corinthians, the Ephesians, and the Thessalonians? If it be not, it is possibly justifiable to go a step further, and emphasize the fact that *Galatia is the remaining church which Paul founded and wrote to*. If Luke knew this and *had any interest in the foundation of the Pauline churches*, he may have noted that the narrative, as it was in his sources, gave no place after xvi.6 for the foundation of the Galatian churches. Possibly he thought that it belonged to the period just before Paul went to Europe, for which his two main sources gave him no information. Moreover it is not impossible that he was right.⁶

This statement raises the questions of, not only whether the so-called first journey—Paul’s visits to Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe—was constructed as the foundation narrative behind the letter to the Galatians,⁷ but whether Acts’ overall purpose was to narrate the foundation

likely location of the churches of Galatia (see Betz, *Galatians* [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979] 1-5)” (“Galatians, Epistle to the,” *ABD* 2:872). However, in the *ABD* article immediately prior to Betz’s entitled, “Galatia,” Stephen Mitchell argues: “The most authoritative champion of the South Galatian Theory was the great explorer of Asia Minor, W.M. Ramsay, and although the North Galatian Theory still finds many supporters, his work should long ago have put the matter beyond dispute” (*ABD* 2:870-872 at 2:871). Also, in response to Betz, Mitchell argues: “The book of Acts relates that he [Paul] passed through a region called Phrygia and the Galatic country after leaving Derbe and Lystra, as a stage in a journey that led through Mysia to Troas (Acts 16:6). This cannot have been Galatia, which lay some 200 km NE of any natural route between Lystra and Mysia in NW Asia Minor. The phrase is naturally understood as denoting the country of Phrygia Paroreius which lay on either side of Sultan Dag, the mountain range that divided Pisidian Antioch from Iconium, an area that was ethnically Phrygian but which was divided between the Roman provinces of Asia and Galatia” (*ABD* 2:871). With regard Acts 18:22-23, Mitchell writes: “Again, this route can only have intersected the first one in the region of Phrygia Paroreius, not conceivably in N Galatia, which would have involved a huge detour for any traveller between Syrian Antioch and Ephesus” (*ABD* 2:871). Furthermore, “the region of Galatia” in Acts 16:8 and 18:23 is likely to refer back to the churches founded in Acts 13-14. See also G. Walter Hansen, “Galatia,” in *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting* (ed. D. Gill, C. Gempf; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1994) 377-396.

⁶ Kirsopp Lake, “XVIII: Paul’s Route to Asia Minor,” 5.224-246 in *Beginnings of Christianity*; here 5:239.

⁷ Lake’s statement begs the question of why “Luke” would cause Paul to found churches in Galatia at all without knowledge of the letter to this region. The evidence for such a

of churches addressed by Paul's extant letters,⁸ irrespective of the content of these letters⁹—perhaps in light of *competing claims*.¹⁰ Although Richard Pervo argues that the author of Acts knows and relies on a select early second-century corpus of Paul's letters (disputed and undisputed), he remains guarded on this point.¹¹ Pervo acknowledges “a strong correlation between places either addressed or spoken about in surviving Pauline letters and the sites that receive detailed and specific discussion in Acts,”¹² but allows that “these data will fit more than one explanation and offer no proof of Luke's use of Paul's letters.”¹³ He adds only that: “Luke shows more interest in (and knowledge about) the places to which Paul addressed (extant) letters than does the Apostle himself.”¹⁴ Pervo, then, argues on other grounds

mission comes of course from the extant letters, but is not prolific, confined to the letter to the Galatians and the reference in 1 Cor 16:1. See Richard Pervo, *Dating Acts between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2006) 98-99. There are more references in Paul's letters to a mission to Galatia than Rome (never mentioned) and Colossae (or Laodicea). Paul never mentions a mission to Corinth (apart from addresses: 1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:2), although a mission to Achaëa occurs three times (Rom 15:26; 1 Cor 16:15; and 2 Cor 9:2).

⁸⁾ <i>Letter Addresses</i>	<i>Acts</i>
Rome	28:16-31
Corinth	18:1-18
Ephesus	18:19-21; 19:1-40
Philippi	16:12-40
Thessalonica	17:1-9

⁹⁾ Lake, “Paul's Route to Asia Minor,” 5:239. On Luke's knowledge of Paul's letters, see Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 51-147. Every address of the undisputed letters of Paul makes an appearance in Acts: Rome (Acts 28:14), Corinth (Acts 18:1), Galatia (Acts 16:6; 18:23), Philippi (Acts 16:12; 20:6), and Thessalonica (Acts 17:1). Some of the addresses of the deuterio-Pauline letters also occur in Acts (e.g., Ephesus [Acts 18:19; 19:1]). Although the Lukan Paul meets Jews in every city he visits in Acts, the historical Paul, as far as we know, sends no letter to Jews specifically. Presumably this is because he views himself as apostle to the Gentiles (Gal 2:9). The discrepancy, however, would have been sharp to an ancient reader seeking to assimilate Paul's letter corpus with Acts.

¹⁰⁾ Does First Peter wish to assert foundation of these churches by Jerusalem? (1 Pet 1:1)

¹¹⁾ Pervo in fact finds “risible” the thesis that an early second century Paulinist such as “Luke” did *not* know some collection of Paul's letters (*Dating Acts*, 52). Pervo's thoughtful reflections on his thesis and method: 136-137, 146-147. Rather than ignorance, the thesis tends to explain contradictions between Acts and the letters of Paul that “Luke” knew as deliberate modifications.

¹²⁾ *Dating Acts*, 98.

¹³⁾ *Dating Acts*, 98.

¹⁴⁾ *Dating Acts*, 99; see also “Itinerary Parallels,” 142.

that the author of Acts knows Paul's letters, in particular, the Letter to the Galatians.¹⁵

However, viewed not as a proof itself, but in light of Pervo's *other* proofs for Acts' reliance on an early second-century Pauline corpus, knowledge of the letter *addresses* becomes collateral information.¹⁶ That is, if Luke's knowledge of Paul's letters can be demonstrated, then Luke knows their addresses, explaining his notable interest in these places. This point is an assumption of the present thesis. It is not, however, necessary to it. For the argument of this essay, Luke must only know *that* Paul wrote to Galatia—information available to him through a variety of different sources.

In view of Luke's knowledge of the addresses of some of Paul's letters, this essay proposes that *both* Ramsay and Betz are to a certain extent correct. Ramsay is correct that "Luke" depicts Paul in Pisidian Antioch and other cities such as Perge, Iconium, Derbe, Lystra, and Attalia in order to show him evangelizing those to whom Galatians was written; and, at the same time, Betz is correct that Acts is not historically accurate. That is, irrespective of the historicity of Acts' view that Paul visits *Southern* Galatia, the destination of Galatia is, nevertheless, a desideratum based on Luke's awareness of a letter to the Galatians.¹⁷ Moreover, this essay attempts to

¹⁵ See comparative totals in *Dating Acts*, 139-143.

¹⁶ Although it cannot be stated with certainty, there is no serious reason to doubt that by the time "Luke" wrote the Gospel of Luke and Acts (115 C.E.) addresses of letters by Paul to at least Thessalonika, Corinth, Galatia, Rome, and Philippi were known.

¹⁷ This thesis likewise endorses the arguments, if not the conclusions of Cilliers Breytenbach (*Paulus und Barnabas in der Provinz Galatien: Studien zu Apostelgeschichte 13f.; 16,6; 18,23 und den Adressaten des Galaterbriefes* [Leiden/New York: Brill, 1996]). Breytenbach's careful study of Acts 13-14, featuring comparisons with epigraphic and other archaeological evidence, demonstrates the plausibility/historical accuracy of its local color. With W.M. Ramsay and other British scholars, Breytenbach connects Acts 13-14 with Paul's letter to the Galatians, endorsing the Southern Galatian Hypothesis. My thesis only parts ways with Breytenbach's insofar as he links historical accuracy of "local color" in Acts 13-14 to the historical Paul's situation. My thesis prefers the explanation that "local color" in Acts 13-14 reflects the compositional hand of "Luke"—stemming from knowledge of a *corpus Paulinum* and a desire (in Acts) to offer the church foundation narratives for all letter addresses. The position taken by Mark Wilson in the new article, "The Route of Paul's First Journey to Pisidian Antioch," *NTS* 55 (2009) 471-483 is similar to Breytenbach's. Neither the details of his investigation into possible routes between Perge and Pisidian Antioch nor his proposed solution of a western route inbound (to Pisidian Antioch) and central route back (to Perge) are in question. Wilson's demonstration of discrepancies among Bible atlases (480-481) is, furthermore, helpful. Yet, his thesis presumes historicity of the Acts account, whereas my own questions it.

demonstrate that Luke uses this desideratum to his advantage. The argument that follows defends the thesis in two parts: (A) Galatia as desideratum; and (B) desideratum as literary advantage. A brief conclusion summarizes findings.

II. Analysis

A. *Galatia as Desideratum*

Five related features of Acts 13 commend the thesis that a visit by Paul to Galatia constitutes a desideratum of the Lukan narrative: (1) stereotypes; (2) lack of detail; (3) historical inaccuracies; (4) brisk narrative pace; and (5) link between Cyprus and Antioch.

Stereotypes replace historical information in Acts 13-14, suggesting that the author knows little more about Paul in the region of Galatia than the duty to place him there. If, for the sake of argument, the “three missionary journeys” model for Acts is adopted, the second journey—with its references to Jerusalem—poses by far the most historical questions.¹⁸ Challenges posed by the first journey seem minor in contrast. With some exceptions,¹⁹ traveling from Paphos to Perge, Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and Attalia comprises the expected Galatian tour. Pisidian Antioch made a natural choice as hub. Established in the third century B.C.E., some time after the death of Alexander,²⁰ its name reflects Seleucid founders,

¹⁸ K. Lake, “XVIII: Paul’s Route to Asia Minor,” 5.224-246 in: *Beginnings of Christianity*, here 5.226-239.

¹⁹ E.g., that Timothy evidently comes from Lystra may lend a historical (non-stereotypical) impetus to Acts’ inclusion of (14:8) and return to (14:21, 16:1) that city (i.e., to collect Timothy before Paul begins his European ministry: 1 Thess 1:1; 1 Cor 4:17, 16:10; 2 Cor 1:1; Phil 1:1; and Phlm 1). According to Acts, Paul does not, however, found the church in Lystra (Acts 16:1-2, see n. 73 below). If this datum is historically reliable, then the historical Paul’s apparent commitment to establishing churches where others have not already founded them (i.e. Rom 15:20) may account for his missionary activity in northern Galatia (as implied by the Letter to the Galatians, see nn. 4, 5 above). The historical Paul does not divulge where he met Timothy, but may suggest through the language of sonship (e.g., 1 Cor 4:17; Phil 2:22; cf. 1 Tim 1:2, 18; 2 Tim 1:2; re. Onesimus: Phlm 10) that he bears responsibility for Timothy’s conversion. Also, Derbe is also not wholly stereotypical insofar as it was not located on the *via Sebaste*.

²⁰ In this section, I follow closely the work of Stephen Mitchell in *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor* and Stephen Mitchell and Marc Waelkens, *Pisidian Antioch: The Site and Its Monuments* (London: Duckworth with The Classical Press of Wales, 1998).

perhaps Antiochus I or II. Like several others, it may have been one of a string of cities in Anatolia that the Seleucids set up during this period. In 25 B.C.E., when the client king of the country of Galatia, Amyntas died, central Asia Minor was transferred to direct governance by the Roman Empire. The province of Galatia was thereby established and new roads connecting interior regions with the coast were built. The most famous of these roads was the *via Sebaste*.²¹ Antioch was *caput viae* of this road system, running east through Iconium and Lystra in Lycaonia and southwest through Apollonia and Comama across the Taurus Mountains to Perge in Pamphylia.²²

In terms of Luke's narrative, the *via Sebaste* would have taken Paul on his so-called first journey. In fact, the cities of Paul's journey beginning in Pisidian Antioch adhere so closely to the route of the *via Sebaste* as to appear stereotypical. A writer in possession of a map or even just a list of the cities on this road might easily have selected them as an itinerant missionary's (or other traveler's) choices *in lieu of* sources.²³ Furthermore, no evidence (other than Acts) supports Christianity in Pisidian Antioch until the third century;²⁴ no non-literary evidence suggests even that Jews resided there in this period, although literary witnesses give us reason to believe they did.²⁵ The best explanation of stereotypes in Acts 13 is, therefore, that,

²¹ On the road's name "Sebaste," see Lake, "XVIII: Paul's Route to Asia Minor," 5.224-246 in *Beginnings of Christianity*; here 5.226.

²² Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 4. About the *via Sebaste*, he writes, "This was a major highway, suitable for carriages and wheeled traffic as well as pack animals, whose course may still be traced on the ground today. The accessibility of Antioch, through this long-distance network of communications, was one of the vital factors which enabled the city to become the impressive centre revealed by its buildings" (Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 4).

²³ The (barebones) itinerary theory of Paul's travels would have been moot (or identical to) a list (or simply knowledge of) the cities along the *via Sebaste*.

²⁴ Mitchell writes: "There is no evidence that Christianity took root at Antioch before the widespread conversion of Anatolian communities in the later third and fourth centuries" (12). Cf. Stephen Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor* (2 vols.; Vol. 1 = "The Celts and the Impact of Roman Rule"; Vol. 2 = "The Rise of the Church"; Oxford: Clarendon, repr. 2003 [1993]) 2:38. Third century is the earliest possible date of the so-called Central Church. See Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 205-206; cf. also data for "central church," 209-210. The "large basilica (church of St. Paul)" is later—fourth century (217). Some deduce that the absence of first- and second-century evidence indicates the mission's failure.

²⁵ See Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor*, 2:35-36. Pervo, *Acts*, 331 n. 3: "There is no definite evidence for the presence of Jews in first-century Pisidian Antioch," although Josephus, Philo, Strabo, Pliny and *First Peter* suggest they did inhabit,

as Pervo writes: “Luke had—or wished to utilize—only very sketchy data about these places.”²⁶

The second observation that Galatia constitutes a desideratum of Luke’s narrative irrespective of access to specific information about Paul’s visit there (either to the North or South) is that, different from other cities, (e.g., καθ’ ἡμέραν διαλεγόμενος ἐν τῇ σχολῇ Τυράννου, 19:9), Acts’ account of Paul’s visit with Barnabas to this city lacks detail. The account comprises, almost entirely, a speech to Jews and others who “fear God.” As such, the report is a construct of the Lukan imagination. Whereas the episodes about Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe (14:1-20) feature local color in lieu of historical detail,²⁷ the report about Pisidian Antioch lacks both.²⁸ Pervo comments on this section of the text as follows:

and certainly many Jews dwelled in, Asia Minor. See Josephus, *Ant.* 12.147-153. Evidence for the presence of the Jewish community is provided by an inscription in Apollonia; see Conzelmann, “Excursus: Antioch” in *Acts of the Apostles*, 103. Archaeological excavations for Pisidian Antioch currently grant no proof. “There is not reason to doubt the evidence of this passage in Acts that there was a substantial Jewish population” (Barrett, *Acts*, 1:627-628).

²⁶ *Dating Acts*, 98.

²⁷ See Breytenbach, *Paulus und Barnabas in der Provinz Galatien*, esp. 29-52.

²⁸ With an emphasis on Pisidian Antioch as Paul’s initial stop, the *spate* of stopovers including Perge, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and Attalia simply implies Paul’s address to a *region* rather than a city. That Luke’s reports about other cities in Galatia feature local color further detracts from the historicity of Paul’s Galatian itinerary in Acts. Perhaps, Pisidian Antioch deliberately mirrors the eastern hub of Syrian Antioch. When Paul returns to this region, the text twice reports “Galatia” (16:6 and 18:23), rather than the names of individual cities, emphasizing Paul’s letter address. Derbe was not on the *via Sebaste*, but was not far off. Derbe may have been part of the local assize tour; see Stephen Mitchell, “Geography, Politics, and Imperialism in the Asian Customs Law,” in *The Customs Laws of Asia* (ed. M. Cottier, M.H. Crawford, C.V. Crowther, J.-L. Ferrary, B.M. Levick, O. Salomies, M. Wörrle; Oxford Studies in Ancient Documents; Oxford University, 2008) 165-201. In addition, if “Luke” knew Paul’s letters, he knew Paul’s interest in evangelizing Roman colonies. “Paul attached great importance to the evangelization of Roman colonies, which were planted at strategic points along the imperial roads to safeguard the interests of Rome. . . . There was a Jewish colony in this city, and therefore a synagogue, too, and on the first Sabbath day after their arrival the two missionaries went to the synagogue and took their places among the congregation” (Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of the Acts*, 266-267). Cilliers Breytenbach argues that, although the text conforms to the author’s pattern of missionary activity, at the same time the text betrays rich regional knowledge. Breytenbach primarily focuses on Acts 14 (not Acts 13), however. See *Paulus und Barnabas in der Provinz Galatien*, esp. 29-52. Moreover, Breytenbach values perceived accuracy of “Lokalkolorit” as

About Antioch in Pisidia (which was a Roman colony), the reader learns no more than that there was a synagogue in a city populated with the normal complement of “jealous Jews,” as well as “leading citizens,” a commodity one might safely infer to be present in any city (13:14, 45, 50).²⁹

With stereotypes and lack of detail, the speech occupying Acts 13:16-47 suggests that the author had no information about Paul’s visit to this city.

Third, what little the narrative offers about Paul in Galatia is not always accurate. Although 13:13 mentions that the missionaries arrive from Paphos at Perge—Perge was not on the coast and the nearest tributary (i.e., the Cestrus River) was still eight kilometers from this city.³⁰ Pisidian Antioch was not in Pisidia (it was, rather, “toward” or “facing” Pisidia as opposed to Antioch on the Maeander), and the adjective “Pisidian” (Πισίδιος, 13:14) has no prior attestation.³¹ The episode in Pisidian

historical plausibility—a conclusion the present author is disinclined to accept (see n. 17 above).

²⁹) *Dating Acts*, 98. Barrett writes: “The paragraph [13:13-52] as a whole, then, is mostly Luke’s work. On this most commentators agree” (*Acts* 1:625). Cf. also Acts 13:44 “almost the whole city” and “throughout the entire region” are hyperbolic and, as such, characteristically Lukan.

³⁰) “According to *Stadiasmus* 219, Perge could be reached by ship on the Cestrus River; in reality, however, it was situated eight kilometers away from the river” (Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 103).

³¹) “It has been even thought possible to place Theophilus in Italy, since when Luke’s story carries him that far west he gives up such explanations as “a city of Galilee named Nazareth,” “Capernaum a city of Galilee,” “a village named Emmaus, which was three-score furlongs from Jerusalem,” “Perge of Pamphylia,” “Antioch of Pisidia,” “the cities of Lycaonia, Lystra and Macedonia, a colony” “Tarsus of Cilicia,” “Myra of Lycia,” “a certain place called Fair Havens, to which the city Lasea was near,” “Phoenix, a harbor of Crete facing north-east and south-east,” and the like, but names without locating them—Syracuse, Rhegium, Puteoli, and even such little places (without apology for the Latin) as Appii Forum and Tres Tabernae. But the explanations of names are not really distributed along geographical lines and may be due to the influence of sources or to other causes. It is not easy to ascertain whether the author, when he speaks in this manner, does so from familiarity with a place or from unfamiliarity. What may seem to be an explanation due to ignorance may be really local color due to knowledge” (H.J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* [Peabody, MA: Hendrikson, 1999 (1927)] 241-242). Cf.: “They continued their journey from Perge and came to Pisidian Antioch.” MSS P⁴⁵, P⁷⁴, a, A, B, C, 453, and 1175 read *Antiocheian ten Pisidian*, using the otherwise unattested proper adj. *Pisidios*, but the WT (MSS D, E, Y, 33, 1739) and the Koiné text-tradition read *Antiocheian tes Pisidias*, “Antioch of Pisidia.” BDAG, s.v. Πισίδιος (p. 816) suggests the variant reading: “Antioch of Pisidia.”

Antioch is at once significant *and* hollow,³² suggesting some kind of empty imperative.

Fourth, the Pisidian Antioch episode is driven by a sense of urgency.³³ No sooner do Paul and Barnabas arrive in Antioch than they enter the synagogue to deliver a speech: αὐτοὶ δὲ διελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Πέρρης παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν τὴν Πισιδίαν, καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων ἐκάθισαν (13:14). Ernst Haenchen comments to this effect:

The spareness of Luke's narration gives the impression that Paul and Barnabas walk into the synagogue as soon as they arrive.³⁴

This Antioch was called more properly *Antiocheia he pros Pisidian*, "Antioch facing Pisidia," and was actually in the district of Phrygia (see Strabo, *Geog.* 12.6.4; 12.8.14; *OGIS* § 536) of the Roman province of Asia. Because it lay close to the border of Pisidia, it was called "Pisidian" to distinguish it from Phrygian Antioch on the Meander River. Pliny wrongly assigned it to Pisidia (*Nat. Hist.* 5.24.94). The text of Acts may reflect the same confusion. This became part of the Roman Empire in 25 BCE and, in time, a Roman colony (*Pisidiarum Colonia Caesarea Antiochia*). See Barbara Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967) 12-41. "In traveling from Perge to Antioch, Paul and Barnabas would have traveled along the old paved highway, the *via Sebaste*, which led through Colonia Comama to Colonia Antiochia. See D.H. French, *Roman Roads and Milestones in Asia Minor* (2 fascicles; Oxford: BAR, 1981, 1988) 2.183" (Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, 509). Acts is unclear from whom Timothy's mother first heard the gospel in Galatia (16:1). If she converted prior to visits by Paul and Barnabas there (14:6, 20), then Paul was not first to bring the gospel to Galatia, begging the question of Paul's establishment of churches in Southern Galatia at all (and, perhaps, Galatians' destination as the South). Acts 14:20-21; 15:37 may claim that Barnabas and Paul founded the church there. Why then does Paul require character testimony from the local brothers about Timothy before he accepts him as his traveling colleague (14:6, 8, 21)? Why also, if Paul circumcises believers, was Timothy not circumcised when he first became a disciple under Paul? Does this also suggest that Timothy and his mother were "converted" by someone other than Paul? Someone who preceded Paul in a gospel mission to Lystra and Derbe? Or is Paul circumcising only those disciples who will serve with him in ministry? To Jews (cf. Acts 16:9)? Cf. Gal 5:11.

³² It may also be that Pisidian Antioch is a bivalent link in Acts connecting Luke's Antiochene source with information concerning Rome.

³³ After the speech, a week passes before Paul and Barnabas address "almost the entire city" (13:44), including God-fearers and Gentiles, and are driven away.

³⁴ Haenchen, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, 407.

Pervo's perspective is similar:

The narrator is in a great hurry to get to Antioch, a remote but important Roman colony. . . . Within two verses after converting Sergius Paulus, Paul and Barnabas are seated in a synagogue on the Sabbath.³⁵

The brisk pace of the narrative at this stage suggests that the author has no tradition to develop beyond the city itself. The author seems eager to get the missionaries to a city about which his sources are silent, ambiguous, or ignored.³⁶

Related to this urgency, the fifth and final observation supporting the claim that Galatia constitutes a desideratum of Luke's narrative is that the Cyprus and Pisidian Antioch incidents are, in at least one important respect, linked. The Bar-Jesus episode (nine verses) constitutes the miraculous component of a two-part—miracle + teaching—segment, a common feature of the Lukan narrative.³⁷ The apostles' dash to the synagogue emphasizes the connection, unifying Cyprus and Pisidian Antioch.³⁸

These five narrative features suggest that the author of Acts knew little more about Pisidian Antioch than a mandate—likely based upon familiarity with Paul's Letter to the Galatians—to get Paul to Galatia.

³⁵) *Acts*, 331.

³⁶) Pervo comments on the lengthy portrayal of Pisidian Antioch in Acts: "Only one site receives a third as much space [as Ephesus in 'Luke's' narrative], and about that site the reader learns no more than that it contained a synagogue" (*Acts*, 6).

³⁷) Numerous episodes in Acts comprise both a miraculous and an intellectual (i.e., preaching) component, as if to address the concerns of these two primary constituencies: the common people persuaded by displays of natural power and the intellectuals persuaded by reasoned arguments, respectively. See e.g., 2:1-42; 3:1-26; 8:4-8; 14:3, 8-18; 16:25-34; 19:8-20). See A.D. Nock, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo* (Oxford University, 1933) 254-271.

³⁸) Luke presents Paul as heading for Pisidian Antioch after his brief visit to Cyprus. An inscription bearing the name "Sergius Paullus" unearthed in Pisidian Antioch is on view today in the Yalvaç Museum. See Barrett, *Acts*, 1:613-614. For information on this museum, see website: <http://www.padfield.com/turkey/yalvac/> (14 March 2010). This archaeological evidence may suggest that, whereas Sergius Paulus was stationed as proconsul (ἀνθύπατος [13:7]) on Cyprus, his home city was Pisidian Antioch. If this interpretation is correct, then after Paul converts Sergius to Christianity, perhaps Sergius commissioned him to visit his home city. See Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 10, 12.

B. *Desideratum as Literary Advantage*

Although it begins as a desideratum based on Galatians, Paul's visit to Pisidian Antioch creates an *inclusio* between chapters 13 and 28 that gives the second half of Acts a few important literary advantages. The *inclusio* is explained first, after which its specific narrative advantages are discussed.

1. *Pisidian Antioch as a Narrative Inclusio*

Acts 13 reports that Paul and his companions (v. 13) went to Antioch of Pisidia just after their confrontation in Paphos on Cyprus with the Jewish *magus*, Bar-Jesus.³⁹ The absence of any other evidence for a mission by Paul and Barnabas to Cyprus suggests that this episode is not historical.⁴⁰ The ahistorical character of 13:4-12 may further detract from the integrity of vv. 13-41 (discussed above). Although the text depicts a magician "*with*" Sergius Paulus in 13:4-12, it likewise refers to Sergius Paulus as *συνετός* ("intelligent") or, as Pervo translates, "discerning" (v. 7).⁴¹ The formula, "discerning" yet consorts with magician (vv. 6-7), is unexpected given Acts' negative disposition toward magicians (e.g., 8:9-24). It is possible that Bar-Jesus is not a historical figure at all, but merely serves as a literary foil for Paul (i.e., Paul was *not* a magician, charlatan, religious prankster).⁴² At this point, the narrative permanently switches to the Roman form of Paul's name: *Σαῦλος* δὲ, ὁ καὶ Παῦλος (13:9).⁴³ Some interpreters understand Paul's name change to be a response to the positive reaction (v. 12) by the intelligent "Sergius Paul-us" to Paul, even arguing that Paul may have received his cognomen from Sergius Paulus.⁴⁴ At a minimum, the name change probably suggests that Paul is headed for Rome.

³⁹ Not only is Saul first called Paul in this episode, but Luke places Paul's name first here (v. 13) for the first time (cf. 13:43, 46, 50; 14:12, 15; 15:12) in contrast to prior pattern of "Barnabas and Saul" (11:30; 12:25; 13:2).

⁴⁰ "If it is conceded that there is no visible traditional basis for a mission of Paul and Barnabas to Cyprus, it follows that the entire episode is, as it stands, unhistorical" (Pervo, *Acts*, 323).

⁴¹ *Acts*, 324.

⁴² E.g., Pervo, *Acts*, 323-324; Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 100.

⁴³ Paul's citizenship is first noted (i.e., invoked) in Acts 16:37-38; cf. 22:25-29; 23:27; compare 25:10-12, 25-26.

⁴⁴ Often cited: G.A. Harrer, "Saul who also is called Paul," *HTR* 33 (1940) 19-34. Haenchen, however, disagrees: "The indeclinable *Σαούλ*, then, was the *signum* and 'Paul' the *cognomen*" (*Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, 399 n. 1).

As noted above, from Cyprus, Paul and his companions rush off to deliver a speech in Pisidian Antioch. Although Luke divulges little about it, other ancient witnesses, together with modern archaeological excavations, provide a significant amount of information about the city. When Rome created the province of Galatia in 25 B.C.E., Pisidian Antioch became a colony.⁴⁵ New settlements of Roman veterans were posted to the city such that, by the mid-first century, a larger proportion of the city's inhabitants had Roman family names.⁴⁶ The city was modeled after the capital, divided into *vici*, the names of which reflect Rome itself.⁴⁷ A regular influx of illustrious visitors from Rome added to the city's imperial affect.⁴⁸ During Augustus' reign, eight colonies were established in Pisidia,

⁴⁵ "In 25 BC, at the same time that Rome annexed most of central Asia Minor to create the province of Galatia, Antioch was refounded as a Roman colony, *Colonia Caesarea Antiochia*, and it received a new settlement of Roman veterans, drawn from legions V and VII" (Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 8).

⁴⁶ "A high proportion of the inhabitants of Antioch possessed Roman family names, which show that they could trace their origins, by descent or manumission, back to the original Augustan group of veteran settlers" (Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 9).

⁴⁷ "The city itself was divided physically into wards, *vici*, whose names show not simply generalized Roman influence but direct inspiration from the city of Rome itself. The *vici* known as Venerius, Velabrus, Tuscus, Cermalus, and Salutaris all took their names from landmarks in Roman topography, while the Aedilicius and Patricius are not less obviously Roman in origin" (Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 8). Latin was the formal language until the end of the 3rd century C.E. (Levick, *Roman Colonies*, 136).

⁴⁸ Mitchell writes, "The effort and imagination which had gone into its foundation, its remoteness from the rest of the Latin-speaking world, and its strategic and political significance in Augustus' schemes for the security of the new province of Galatia, are all evidence that Antioch was a place of considerable importance. In the early Julio-Claudian period, several members of the family of the ruling dynasty and of the Roman military elite were elected to honorary magistracies in the colony: Drusus, Augustus' stepson and brother of the future emperor Tiberius, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, husband of the younger Agrippina and father of the emperor Nero, L. Cornelius Sulla Felix, the son-in-law of Germanicus, P. Sulpicius Quirinius and M. Servilius, the last two both leading Augustan generals. . . . The concentration of talent and power can be matched by no other eastern colony and by few cities elsewhere in the Roman Empire. . . . There is clear evidence from elsewhere that the holding of honorary local offices by emperors or their associates was the occasion of them to make specific benefactions to the cities of the empire, as it would have been if a wealthy local man held an important magistracy. We may reasonably suppose that this happened at Antioch, where the new building is on an unparalleled scale for this part of Asia Minor during the Augustan period. It is entirely apt that the colony should have been adorned with splendid and extravagant monuments to the imperial cult at precisely the period when members of the imperial family were associated with its administration"

but only Antioch was given the title *Caesarea* and awarded the *ius italicum*; that is, its land was legally viewed as Italian soil.⁴⁹ It was governed by Rome, everyone born in the city automatically had Roman citizenship (and the rights thereof), and the land was exempt from certain taxes. The city eventually rose to the position of capital of the name *Colonia Caesarea*.⁵⁰ One of the three surviving copies of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* was discovered in Pisidian Antioch. This stone copy of the text in Latin offers another sign of the importance of the city as a military and cultural base of Rome in Asia.⁵¹ According to Stephen Mitchell, “Julio-Claudian Antioch, in the fullest sense of the adjective, was an imperial city.”⁵² Referring to the thesis of Barbara Levick, Mitchell sums up: “Antioch was designed to be a *new Rome* on the borders of Phrygia and Pisidia.”⁵³

More than any other city in Galatia in the 30s and 40s C.E., Antioch of Pisidia offered the ideal Galatic headquarters for a mission proceeding to Rome.⁵⁴ A city of the reputation, “Rome in Galatia”—the *most* Roman city in the region—together with Sergius Paulus, the Roman proconsul, and Paul’s Roman cognomen together imbue Acts 13 with a distinctly Roman flavor.⁵⁵ This Roman affect of chapter 13 creates a noticeable literary *inclusio* with Paul’s arrival in Rome in Acts 28:14. Such an *inclusio*, not uncommon in ancient literature, lends coherence to Acts’ overall presentation of Paul’s ministry. Pisidian Antioch affords Luke an attractively Romanesque departure point for his Roman-born, Roman-named, Rome-bound missionary.⁵⁶

(Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 9-10). The Roman colony, its Roman settlers, visitors and its organization on the model of Rome created “symbolic links between the colony and the city of Rome” (9).

⁴⁹ Levick, *Roman Colonies*, 137; 84 n. 7 (citing *Dig. L.* 15.8.10).

⁵⁰ Levick, *Roman Colonies*, 137; Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 10-11.

⁵¹ Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 28-30, 146, 149, 164.

⁵² Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 9-10, emphasis added.

⁵³ Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 9, following Levick, *Roman Colonies*, 78.

⁵⁴ Mitchell, *Pisidian Antioch*, 12.

⁵⁵ Luke highlights Antioch’s Roman traits. Contrast his comment on Philippi, a more important Roman colony than Antioch, in Acts 16:12: “and from there to Philippi, which is a leading city of the district of Macedonia and a Roman colony.”

⁵⁶ When Paul speaks about Galatia (1:21) he does not mean province but territory. “Luke” either misses or ignores/overrides any distinction in order to claim a narrative advantage offered by Pisidian Antioch. Haenchen’s position is that “Luke” speaks about Galatia as Roman province (i.e., on political not geographical terms) (*The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, 483 n. 2).

This *inclusio* from “Little Rome” in chapter 13 to “Big Rome” in chapter 28 is emphasized in a number of different ways in Acts. Perhaps Luke denotes the motif of Paul’s journey to Rome as early as chapter 1 when, in v. 8, Jesus predicts that the apostles will act as his witnesses: ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς.⁵⁷ In chapter 19, the Lukan Paul explicitly announces his intention to go to Rome: μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι με ἐκεῖ δεῖ με καὶ Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν (19:21).⁵⁸ The Lukan Paul may also anticipate this intention in Pisidian Antioch

⁵⁷) The meaning of “end of the earth” (ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς) is not self-evident. For Rome, see especially *Ps. Sol.* 18:15 and Ignatius, *Rom.* 2:2; cf. Acts 23:11. Among important questions, it is unclear now to interpret the singular (ἑσχάτου). The reference could be geographical, metaphorical, or some combination. E. Earle Ellis surveys all possibilities, arguing that the reference anticipates a Pauline mission to Spain: “‘The End of the Earth’ (Acts 1:8),” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 1 (1991) 123-132. Cf. L. Curt Niccum, “One Ethiopian Eunuch is Not the End of the World: The Narrative Function of Acts 8:26-40,” in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2011) 2:883-900. Richard Pervo reads the phrase as a “programmatic statement” in which Jerusalem is regarded as the “navel” of the Israelite earth: *Acts* 43. Pervo draws on Mikeal Parsons, “The Place of Jerusalem on the Lukan Landscape: An Exercise in Symbolic Cartography,” *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (Macon, GA: Mercer University, 1998) 155-171. According to Pervo: “The literary function of 1:8b is like that of the ‘introductory oracle’ found in some ancient narratives” (Pervo, *Acts*, 43). Important for Pervo’s conclusion is repetition of the phrase in Acts 13:47 in which Paul makes ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς the culmination of his sermon in Pisidian Antioch. Quoting Isa 49:6, Paul recounts the command of the Lord: “I appointed you as a light for the nations, for you to bring salvation to the end of the earth” (οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος: τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἔθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς). The phrase resonates with the Septuagint (e.g., Deut 28:49; Tob 13:13; Ps 134:7; *Ps. Sol.* 1:4; 8:15; Isa 8:9; 45:22; 48:20; 62:11; Jer 6:22; 10:13; 16:19; 27:41; 28:16; 32:32; 38:8. Cf. τὰ πέρατα [τῆς] γῆς/οἰκουμένης—Ps 2:8; 18:5; 21:28; 45:10; 47:11; 58:14; 60:3; 64:6, 9; 66:8; 71:8; 94:4; 97:3; Dan 4:11, 21, 22; Wis 6:1; 8:1; Zeph 3:10; etc.) Paul’s own related language in Rom 15:19 and Rom 10:18 (quoting Ps 18:5). Cf. 2 Cor 10:16. One could argue that the author of Acts proposes a decentered, literary, not literal, map... a kind of Christological cartography. In describing the scene at Pentecost, the author maps the world around Jewish inhabitants assembled in Jerusalem: Parthia and Media in the east, Pontus in the north, Egypt to the south, and Rome to the west (Acts 1:9-11). The action in Acts operates within this map with Jerusalem at the center. Ironically, Rome is placed at the edge of the literary οἰκουμένη, an implausible but provocative ἕσχατος τῆς γῆς. One wonders if an emerging *corpus Paulinum*—although not explicitly mentioned, shapes the narrative cartography of Acts. Perhaps an epistolary cartography in which Paul’s itinerary functions as space in the narrative? I wish to thank Trevor W. Thompson for many of these insights.

⁵⁸) On the role of δεῖ in Lukan prediction, see C.K. Rothschild, *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History*, 185-212.

when he states that he and his companions “*are* now turning to the Gentiles” (ἰδοὺ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη; 13:46) and, in Corinth, when he reiterates that he “*will go* to the Gentiles” (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πορεύσομαι; 18:6). Gentiles in these two passages suggest a connection to Rome insofar as, when Paul arrives in Rome, Paul concludes that the mission “*has been sent* to the Gentiles” (τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπεστάλη τοῦτο τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ; 28:28). This supposition is also supported by the citation of Isa 49:6 LXX (“light for the Gentiles”) in Acts 13:47, recalling Simeon’s words in Luke 2:32 (tracing the movement’s destination in Acts to Jesus). The text cites this passage again in 26:17-18, when Paul appeals to Agrippa to be tried by the emperor in Rome.⁵⁹ Moreover, in the Lukan Paul’s address in Rome (28:26-27), Paul appeals to Isa 6:9-10 LXX, emphasizing illumination of Gentiles there.⁶⁰

Acts 28:26-28 further establishes an *inclusio* with chapter 13 by its speech to Jews. Acts 18:6 and 28:25-28 are the only places in Acts, other than chapter 13, that cite lines from Paul’s speeches to Jews. Different from chapter 13, however, both chapters 18 and 28 provide only the speech’s last line. That said, the final line in all three chapters is the same, namely Paul’s announcement of his intention to turn to the Gentiles. As noted, chapter 28 is further similar to chapter 13 in its citation of the prophet Isaiah (6:9-10 in 13:47; 49:6 in 28:26-28).

By their echoes of Paul’s speech in Acts 13, these passages in chapter 18 and 28 endorse Pisidian Antioch as the official beginning of the ministry and Rome as its certified end. As such, these passages emphasize a literary *inclusio* between chapters 13 and 28 arguable also on the grounds of the encounter with Sergius Paulus, Paul’s name change, and Pisidian Antioch’s Romanesque air. In the period before Hadrian, Corinth, too, (i.e., 18:6) was a particularly Roman city.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Acts 26:17-18: ἔξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν, εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποπέμψω σε ἀνοίξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κληρὸν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ.

⁶⁰ λέγων· Πορεύθητι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ εἰπόν· Ἀκοῆ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνήτε, καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε· ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν βαρέως ἤκουσαν, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμυσαν· μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν, καὶ ἰάσωμαι αὐτούς.

⁶¹ Greek inscriptions are in Corinth rare in this period. See Michael D. Dixon, “A New Latin and Greek Inscription from Corinth,” *Hesperia* 69 (2000) 335-342, here 338 (precise data in n. 6).

2. *Narrative Advantages of an Inclusio: Prediction-Fulfillment and Coherence*

The *inclusio* that Luke constructs by the pattern “Little Rome” to “Big Rome” gives his narrative at least two distinct advantages: (1) it organizes Paul’s ministry within a prediction-fulfillment scheme; and (2) it lends coherence to Paul’s rather unsystematic mendicant travels.

First, it is widely established that the author of Luke-Acts organizes many of his sources according to a principle of prediction-fulfillment.⁶² In his study of Abraham in Luke-Acts, Nils Dahl argues that, for no other biblical writer is the idea of the “successive fulfillment of prophecies . . . so prominent.”⁶³ Events that are predicted⁶⁴ somewhere prior in the narrative appear plausible, even likely;⁶⁵ and, prediction-fulfillment does more than just anticipate upcoming narrative and increase likelihood. As Robert Brawley persuasively argues, Luke-Acts “employs prophetic prediction as a literary device to *sanction* its fulfillment.”⁶⁶ Prediction of events in Luke-Acts

⁶² Most recently, see Allen Black, “‘Your Sons and Your Daughters Will Prophesy . . .’: Pairings of Men and Women In Luke-Acts,” in *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay* (ed. Patrick Gray, Gail R. O’Day; NovTSupp 129; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 193-206.

⁶³ “The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts,” in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert* (ed. L.E. Keck, J.L. Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1966) 139-158, here 147.

⁶⁴ Markan *parataxis* offers an example.

⁶⁵ Polybius 1.4.7-8, 38.5.1, 7-8; Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 50. Also, Charles Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley: University of California, 1983) 1-46. Cf. Mircea Eliade’s description of repetition in myth and history: “. . . an object or act becomes real only insofar as it imitates or repeats an archetype. Thus, reality is acquired solely through repetition or participation; everything which lacks an exemplary model is ‘meaningless,’ i.e., it lacks reality. Men would thus have a tendency to become archetypal and paradigmatic. This tendency may well appear paradoxical, in the sense that the man of a traditional culture sees himself as real only to the extent that he ceases to be himself (for a modern observer) and is satisfied with imitating and repeating the gestures of another. In other words, he sees himself as real, i.e., as ‘truly himself,’ only, and precisely, insofar as he ceases to be so” (*The Myth of the Eternal Return or, Cosmos and History* [trans. Willard R. Trask; Princeton University, repr. 1991] 34; orig. publ. as *Le Mythe de l’éternel retour: Archétypes et répétition* [Paris: Librairie Gallimard, 1949]). Also, “The anhistorical character of popular memory, the inability of collective memory to retain historical events and individuals except insofar as it annuls all their historical and personal peculiarities—poses a series of new problems” (46). Also cited in Rothschild, *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History*, 100 n. 5.

⁶⁶ Robert Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (SBLMS 33; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars, 1987) 49, emphasis added.

is not confined to written and oral prophecy. Events in the narrative are anticipated through more subtle means, such as structural patterning. Perhaps the most well known structural pattern with a predictive effect in Luke-Acts is the narrative oracle in 1:8: καὶ ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες ἐν τε Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρεία καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.⁶⁷ The salvation-historical pattern “first to the Jews, then to the Gentiles” from Rom 1:16-17 offers another such example.⁶⁸

The *inclusio* created by Paul’s journey from “Little Rome” to “Big Rome” in Acts 13-28 offers another example of Lukan prediction-fulfillment. On the one hand, chapter 13 *foretells* the city (i.e., Rome) to which Paul is headed in Acts.⁶⁹ On the other hand, chapter 28 *sanctions* Paul’s arrival there, perhaps against competing claims. Lastly, memory and recognition are strategies of enhancing audience engagement and understanding. This *inclusio*, thus, also facilitates Luke’s pedagogical aim of clarifying for Theophilus “the truth about the things about which he had been instructed.”⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Regarding Luke’s travel narrative, Conzelmann writes: “To sum up, we may say that the extent of the journey report is not determined by the source material employed, but by the work of arrangement carried out by the author. It is he who stamps the ‘journey’ on the existing material, for his editorial work affects each group of sources, Q, Mark and the special material. The more meager the material, the more distinct does the author’s intention become. . . . The journey is therefore a construction, the essential meaning of which has yet to be brought out” (*The Theology of St. Luke* [London: Faber and Faber, 1960] 72-73).

⁶⁸ In city after city, Paul first visits the local synagogue before preaching his gospel to local Gentiles. See, e.g., Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 104-105, 118.

⁶⁹ Paul arrives in Rome in 28:14: καὶ οὕτως εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἦλθαμεν. The predictive quality of this episode is related to prediction fulfillment and divine intervention in Luke-Acts. See Rothschild, *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History*, esp. 142-212. Elsewhere I have argued that the sanctioning effect is evidence of agonistic historiography, that is, arguing one’s own report of the events over competing versions: see *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History*, 60-98. Paul’s trip to Rome (from Galatia) in Acts also parallels Jesus’ trip to Jerusalem (from Galilee) in the Third Gospel. What is more, Paul’s trip to Jerusalem in Acts parallels Jesus’ trip to Jerusalem in the Third Gospel. In other words, the author maps pattern upon pattern as a means of stabilizing unfixed traditions in an indissoluble network of connections.

⁷⁰ Luke 1:4: ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν. Unfamiliarity with the events of Acts is conveyed as late as John Chrysostom (*Hom. in Ac.* and *Hom. 1-4 in Ac. Princ.*).

III. Conclusion

This essay argues that Paul's stopover in Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13 is a geographical desideratum, traced to the author's awareness of the address, if not the content, of Paul's Letter to the Galatians. Pausing in what archaeologists today refer to as "Little Rome," Paul's week long stay in Pisidian Antioch creates an *inclusio* between chapters 13 ("Little Rome") and 28 ("Big Rome") that lends coherence to Paul's potentially confusing itinerary in Acts.⁷¹ This *inclusio* both predicts and sanctions Paul's arrival in Rome.⁷²

If proofs of the literary character of Paul's stopover in Pisidian Antioch in Acts persuade, the thesis has two added effects. It invalidates the Southern Galatian Hypothesis by demonstrating that South Galatia is based on nothing more than a blank mandate to get Paul to Galatia and a literary advantage of placing him in the South. And, conversely, it confirms the Northern Galatian Hypothesis: for many scholars the more cogent explanation, even before this argument was made.⁷³

⁷¹ The theme of Rome and Roman is played out in a variety of episodes in Acts, including Paul's Roman name, Paul's visits to Roman cities such as Philippi (16:12) and Thessalonica (headquarters of Roman governor, 17:1), Roman law (?) (16:20-21), Paul's Roman citizenship (16:37), and Paul's exoneration by Roman tribunals.

⁷² E.g., 2:22-40, 41-51; 9:51-19:44 esp. 9:51, 53; 13:22, 33; 17:11; 18:31; 19:11, 28, 41. Paul's arrival in Philippi may suggest a gradual crescendo over the course of chapters 13-28 of appearances in colonies with Roman associations.

⁷³ See n. 4 above. The literary character of Paul's stopover in Pisidian Antioch in Acts does not rule out some level of historical veracity. While unlikely that Paul founded the churches in Southern Galatia, it is likely that "Christianity" spread to this region early, perhaps by the disciple(s) responsible for Timothy's (or Timothy's mother's, Acts 16:1) conversion. Epigraphical evidence for the early rise of Christianity in Lycaonia suggests that Luke develops Paul's stopover in Southern Galatia based on his *own* life and experience (ca. 115). In other words, five or more decades after Paul's death, Luke knows Southern not Northern Galatia to be spotted with Christian churches, deducing or inventing that Paul founded them. A final possibility is that Acts itself inspired the founding of churches in the cities Luke claims Paul visited, although attestation of the knowledge of Acts during this period is lacking.