

REVIEW–DISCUSSION

ON THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PROMISES AND PERILS OF READING *THE BOOK OF ACTS* IN LIGHT OF TRAJAN’S COLUMN

Drew W. Billings, *Acts of the Apostles and the Rhetoric of Roman Imperialism*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. xiii + 231. Hardback, £80.00/\$99.99. ISBN 978-1-107-18785-6.

What would result if we drew on the imagery from Trajan’s Column to interpret the Book of Acts? Drew Billings (henceforth B.) offers an answer to that question in his revision of his doctoral dissertation, completed at McGill University under the direction of the late Ellen Bradshaw Aitken, to whose memory he thoughtfully dedicates his study.¹ The monograph joins a growing number of studies dedicated to the study of New Testament texts informed by Roman imperial iconography.² The overall thesis of the book is that comparison with imperial ideas and images reveals that Acts is a Trajanic-era text that ‘was written in concert with the broader representational trends and standards found in provincial representations and imperial monuments dating to the first two decades of the second century, and in a way reflecting the dynamic exchange that produced an innovative narrative that hybridizes local and imperial forms’ (14). The persuasiveness of this thesis is largely dependent upon making a compelling link between Acts and what B. identifies as the idiosyncratic aspects of Trajanic iconography and ideals, which created a distinctive way of imagining the imperial world that Acts in some ways echoes and in other ways resisted. He accompanies his study with twenty-one excellently produced photographs of scenes from Trajan’s Column. Their purpose is to draw attention to the ways in which Acts reflects Trajanic values and perspectives which B., drawing on a host of art historical studies, interprets the Column as representing. It is important to note that B. does not think that the author of Acts ever saw Trajan’s Column, or even that he had visited Rome. Rather, the imperial iconography furnishes B. with a visual depiction of a distinctly Trajanic view of the world that he argues also influenced the author of Acts. B. complements those depictions and links with

¹ Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. One cannot help but detect in his study of Acts an approach analogous to that of Aitken’s use of the Arch of Titus to interpret *Hebrews* (Aitken (2005a) and (2005b)).

² Winn (2016) contains representative essays, authors, approaches, and bibliography.

Acts by referring to Pliny's *Panegyric* to the emperor and with attention to other monuments erected in the capital. He is keen to counter any suggestion that many of his insights can also be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the Hadrianic period, a result that if true would render moot his chief hermeneutical location at the foot of the Column. This is a rich and instructive study that repays attention for the ways in which B. thoughtfully takes up the positioning of Acts in its imperial world in an interesting way. That is the promise of this monograph. Its peril is that it attempts to press Acts into service in Trajan's empire by pointing to not necessarily Trajanic elements of Roman imperial discourse and that by doing so it raises questions about hermeneutical procedures.

The book presents its argument in five chapters; each of them is followed by a conclusion. Following a review of attempts to situate Acts within its imperial context (1–16), B. presents a reading of Acts as a form of rhetorical persuasion which he identifies as idiosyncratically Trajanic and which he calls 'monumental historiography' (17–52). There then follows a chapter that reads Acts with attention to Trajanic imperial virtues and their representation in Provincial elite culture (53–89). Having set the warrant for situating Acts during Trajan's reign, the rest of the study takes up Acts in more focused detail. Chapter 3 considers Paul in the light of Trajanic era public portraiture (90–131). The following chapter argues that Acts' treatment of Jews is at home in Trajan's 'anti-Jewish propaganda' (132–63). The final chapter considers the treatment of women in Acts as part of a programme of Roman imperial masculinity (164–87), also connected with Trajan's imperial discourses. It ends with a brief conclusion (189–91) and an expansive and excellent bibliography of select, largely English-language studies. There is a subject index; the absence of an author index limits the utility of the study as a research tool. Overall, the volume is handsomely and, so far as I could see, flawlessly produced.

The introduction stakes out the book's claim for a second-century composition of Acts by citing now well-rehearsed evidence of its use of Josephus and by drawing attention to studies that detect an anti-Marcionite polemic. It should be stated that nothing in these arguments would necessarily compel us to think that Acts was written by the end of Trajan's reign. Indeed, Marcion's career extends all the way through to 160 and it is as easy to place Acts in Hadrian's or even Antoninus Pius' reign on this evidence. The specific warrant for a *terminus ad quem* of 117 rests on B.'s argument that Acts evidences specifically Trajanic-era values and imagery. This results in some curious arguments. For example, he sees a link between Trajan as the first Roman emperor from the provinces and Paul as a provincial Roman citizen: 'This situation [of Trajan's Spanish origin] provoked a great opportunity for early Christian representational interests, as Acts casts its chief protagonist, Paul, as a Roman citizen from the provinces who is engaged in the kind of virtuous actions that are appearing in imperial representations of the time' (13). B.'s introduction is more successful where he challenges simplistic accounts of Acts

as either ‘for’ (Esler (1987); Walaskay (2005)) or ‘against’ (Gilbert (2003); Rowe (2011)) the Roman Empire and challenges both perspectives for treating Acts reductively as transparent windows onto the past. By contrast he reads Acts as a complex data field that can be mined for either a positive or negative treatment of the Empire. Moreover, the author nowhere expressly outlines a direct evaluation of the Empire; Acts rather reflects at differing times and in varying degrees ‘assimilation, cooperation, negotiation, cooption, and subversion’ (9). Thus in their rush to determine Acts’ pro- or anti-imperial stance, scholars neglect the poetics of the text and its careful construction of its narrative world; such accounts reduce Rome to a monolith and thereby fail to recognise that the Empire was a web of complex networks with multiple meanings and possibilities. As Acts is a negotiation rather than an opposition or endorsement of Rome, it is necessary to ‘explore how the narrative representations of the apostles relate to broader representational trends and standards of provincial leaders’ (11). In other words, before looking to see its evaluation of the Roman Empire, one must first discover the ways in which Acts *is itself* an imperial writing. This insightful treatment of Acts as an imperial text and of the way in which New Testament scholars should consider readings of New Testament texts ‘in Empire’ (to cite a way of expressing this hermeneutical focus that is particularly fashionable amongst some biblical scholars today) repays attention and would be an excellent reading to assign in a senior undergraduate or graduate seminar on the New Testament in its imperial world.

The first two chapters ‘Acts and Monumental History’ and ‘Imperial Virtues and Provincial Representations’ constitute the heart of the thesis and the three chapters dedicated to topics in Acts as evidence of a Trajanic imprint depend on the success of their argument that attention to imperial iconography and representation in the capital and in the provinces shows that Acts most probably was composed under Trajan. But iconography does more than help pinpoint a date for Acts; it enables us to recognise shared discursive formations. His hermeneutical foundation is that ‘[t]exts and images serve as two types of representational media manifesting the same conceptual world’ (25). The opening chapter articulates two reasons for bringing Acts to the representational medium of Trajan’s Column. First, it provides a useful focus for locating the writing ‘within the multimedia context of the Roman Empire, in order to consider how the text [of Acts] relates to its visual milieu ...’ (22). Secondly, as such it shares in a process in which Roman art ‘did not only reflect the historical conditions and interests at the time of its production; it also served as an agent in constructing that world’ (25). Thus what Roman art like Trajan’s Column did through iconography, Acts did in text, and since Acts was composed under Trajan it is important to read it in the context of the world-construction of the emperor’s rule through a variety of media. Recognition of this shared milieu and world-construction leads him to follow

Gregory E. Sterling's account of Acts as an instance of 'apologetic historiography' since 'it helps to bring into focus the dynamics of self-definition in the rhetorical effects of Acts' extended narrative' (22).³ To help illustrate Acts' apologetic historiography and its relation to Trajan's imperial discourse he accompanies his arguments with several beautifully reproduced photos of plasters of the Column currently on display in the Museo della Civiltà Romana. (The quality of a close-up photo of the Column *in situ* (Illustration 2, p. 30) is compromised slightly by half of it being in shadow.)

The phrase 'monumental history' in the heading of the first chapter refers to the inscription of history on the monument of Trajan's Column as well as the way written history and monuments were in mutual relation in the early Empire more generally.⁴ In the case of the Column it expresses a monumentalisation of history, the chief aim of which was to celebrate the emperor as the supreme embodiment of *Romanitas*. Following Roger David Von Dippe's iconographical treatment of the Column, B. treats it as a 'continuous narrative' in a 'plain style' that unfolds in successive discrete episodes as the imagery winds up the Column. Its chief qualities are that the Column's scenes are related to unfolding geographical markers, characterised by verisimilitude, which imitate an encomiastic rhetorical style commending moral and epideictic qualities (37–51), a set of claims offered with frequent attention to reproduced images (29–35). Acts imitates to a surprising degree in its text what one encounters on the monument: it too mostly comprises an unadorned, geographically marked, travel narrative, imitating reality, in praise of apostles and other characters, whose virtues imitates those displayed on the Column. This is an excellent example of the way monument and text participate in a shared discursive formation, one to celebrate Rome, and the other as apologetic historiography. The argument is inviting, but with consideration of only Trajan's Column and Acts, it is somewhat thin. One looks for a thicker account that will relate not only Acts and the Column to one another but also a variety of other texts. To some degree this is furnished by attention to Pliny's *Panegyricus* celebrating Trajan, to which the study often returns. But one wishes for a further reach, which is one of the chief strengths of Von Dippe's study in that he relates the Column to rhetorical conventions as well as to imperial

³ Here he builds on Sterling's (1992) 386 definition of apologetic historiography: 'Apologetic historiography is the story of a subgroup of people in an extended prose narrative written by a member of the group who follows the group's own traditions but Hellenizes them in an effort to establish the identity of the group within the setting of the larger world.'

⁴ It also (23 n. 29) bears the imprint of Elsner (1996), Woolf (1996), and Thomas (2007).

histories of the Dacian War and their communication of Trajanic ideals, thereby offering the kind of multimedia account B.'s treatment of Acts desires.⁵

Next, B. takes what he describes with respect to the Column and applies it to the provinces. In 'Imperial Virtues and Provincial Representations' he shows the ways in which elites in the provinces echoed ideals fashioned in the capital. The success of B.'s overall argument rests largely on this chapter since Acts is a text probably from Asia Minor. He divides the chapter roughly in half, the first (53–74) dedicated to the identification of ideals and virtues promoted by Trajan and communicated through imitation by provincial elites in inscriptions and benefactions, as well as through numismatic imagery; and the second (75–88) focused on the monumental culture of the capital. The latter half is instructive for Rome but fails to indicate precisely enough the way the monumental culture in the capital affected that of the provinces. The point is of course that they share a discourse which the monuments exemplify, but that case is more often assumed than it is argued. The first half of the chapter is especially critical for B.'s argument. He discusses ways in which Trajan as exemplar of beneficence, creator of provincial harbours, frequent visitor to the provinces, and celebrated expander of Roman territory could have been perceived by and influenced the type of city dwellers Acts most probably had as its target audience. The virtues of *indulgentia*, *liberalitas*, and *munificentia* are values out of host of which B. lifts up for examination (puzzlingly, he passes over a host of others that Von Dippe identifies; and missing is any discussion or reference to the seminal essay of Fears on the cult of imperial virtues, a discussion of great importance for B.'s case since it discusses the ways in which virtues were celebrated on coinage).⁶ In one of the most important sentences of the entire study B. rightly states, 'The ubiquity of the emperors' [*plural possessive*] image would have helped keep the idea of the emperor in the collective consciousness of his subjects, indelibly impacting the cultural life of the empire' (55; my insertion). It is specifically Trajan's image that is at issue here and the discussion is most compelling when it restricts itself to its presence and influence. B. contends that Trajan the benefactor was imitated by an explosion of euergetism in the provinces (68–75), a fact that, in my opinion, probably reflects more the 'tax and donate' possibilities, the social and material

⁵ Von Dippe's discussion of the Column appears at 387–425; the relation to the Column of the conventions and uses of Trajanic era historians, earlier and contemporary rhetoric, as well as Pliny's *Panegyricus* appears on 409–25.

⁶ Fears (1981b), specifically 910–24 with plates VI and VIII as well as XI–XII with reference to the Arch of Beneventum, which Billings nowhere discusses, but which is just as important for understanding the kinds of virtues Trajan was broadcasting as part of his imperial programme. It is true that Acts narrates episodically as Trajan's Column does, but the point in B.'s argument is that the Column is part of a monumental transmission of imperial ideology, and it is puzzling that the other intact monument from Trajan's reign is passed over.

glue that allowed cities to function in the period, arising from the prosperity amongst civic elites in the first half of the second century, than it does any direct desire to ape the emperor. This will translate in the case of Acts to multiple stories of beneficence that B. explores in the next chapter. More importantly, one of the most significant insights of B.'s introduction on the nature of the Roman Empire is largely forgotten in this discussion, namely that the empire was a complicated web of relations, experienced differently by various groups, and enacted variously under diverse situations. One looks in vain for a more thorough discussion of numismatic imagery (even reproductions of it), as well as examination of the inscriptions celebrating donors and officers of the eastern Mediterranean's innumerable associations, and for the presence of epigraphic language echoing virtues which Trajan's propaganda emphasised.⁷ This would have cemented B.'s case that Trajanic ideals were indeed filtering down into the broader population of urban artisans and thereby won for the emperor a place 'in the collective consciousness of his subjects'. B. tantalises with the indication that such evidence exists (73), but as he nowhere cites it, the discussion remains in the ether of elite culture, while it is on the ground of the lived material realities of Acts' urban artisans that one wants the argument to unfold.

It remains then for B. to show how Acts as a provincial text crafts its protagonists after the Trajanic image, the way anti-Jewish sentiments typical of the regime filtered their way into or were paralleled by the story of the nascent church, and the means by which Acts reflects the masculinist constructions of the empire. By such comparisons, B. wants to show that Acts is not only imperial, but also necessarily a production shaped by the imperial culture of the first two decades of the second century.

In Chapter 3, 'Paul and the Politics of Public Portraiture', the apostle as Roman citizen is on view as a Trajanic version of a provincial elite. His pre-conversion career shows him the antitype of the emperor's ideals (94–7); his mediation of divine gifts (*beneficia*, 97), and his *Romanitas* (101) reflect the influence of Trajan's ideology. An extended discussion (102–21) of Paul's career narrated in Acts 4, 19, and 27 shows Paul the stylised Trajanic euergete, a man Acts presents as having many of the characteristics of the provincial elite and who mirrors the image of the emperor as benefactor. This is important data, but as Allen Brent commented in a separate review, it ignores the multiple virtues promoted by Trajan and Pliny that Acts does *not* contain, and we may

⁷ B. cites repeatedly (for example, 68 n. 77) Noreña's (2011) study (focused on the western part of the empire!) of the presence of specific ideals and values found on coins, and their presence in honorific dedications to the emperor and the communication of the emperor's virtues in provincial media (Noreña (2001) 56 n. 21), but the focus on communication between the emperor and urban elites leaves open the question of the ways in which this was communicated to the kinds of imperial residents Acts addresses.

expand this critique by drawing attention to the much larger field listed (and illustrated on *provincial* coinage in Fears' essay cited above).⁸ One cannot help but criticise B. for forcing selective evidence to fit his thesis. In the first two instances where Paul's actions in Lystra and Ephesus are narrated, B. relies heavily on Danker's general study of benefaction and the New Testament and in particular his excellent study of Paul's miraculous performances presented as benefactions in Acts.⁹ To this he adds (113–14) that Acts has modelled Paul after Trajan: Acts presents Paul as a broker of divine patronage

binding otherwise distant areas to the ever-expanding *imperium* of God. This parallels Trajanic contributions to the concept of *imperium* of an increasingly interconnected network of different ethnic groups that pledges its loyalty to a powerful and benevolent world ruler who unifies together the empire's great diversity of geographies and ethnicities.

A similar hermeneutical application appears in the treatment of Paul's shipwreck at Malta in Acts 27. It is here (116–17) where what is creative becomes fanciful, for B. argues that just as on Trajan's Column there is the depiction of Trajan as master helmsman and a shipwreck of Dacians crossing a river and their drowning, so in this story there is another shipwreck with Paul guiding the ship; but unlike the Dacian barbarians who fight Trajan and perish, Paul saves the *barbaroi* (Acts 28.2, 24) of Malta. Thus it is that Paul the traveller and Roman citizen is depicted in Acts 'as an *optimus civis*, closely following the example set by the *optimus princeps*' (123). When B. makes these kinds of connections one detects a kind of hermeneutical sleight of hand. It is one thing to argue that Acts as a text belongs to the same discursive formation that imperial monuments helped to create, it is another to argue that a writer who had never seen Trajan's Column could have intended that his protagonist's shipwreck replicated by way of contrast the depiction of the drowning Dacians. Here we may ask a question that hangs over such close scrutiny of Trajan's Column in general: by what means would a resident of Asia Minor have learned of this event, let alone have been so familiar with the way it would come to be represented, that he would translate it into a new historical form? B. is on firmer ground where he argues that Acts has constructed Paul after the ideals of imperial *Romanitas*. The networked Mediterranean of Acts imitates that of Trajan, the one patronised via its traveller *par excellence* by the ultimate benefactor, God, the other by the travelling emperor.¹⁰ In perhaps the most important pages of B.'s book (23–8)

⁸ Allen (2018).

⁹ Danker (1982).

¹⁰ Here B.'s argument could have been reinforced by attention to Fears' (1981a) treatment of Trajan (and later Hadrian) as vice-regent of Jupiter (again he draws attention

he counters the arguments of those who have recognised the same imperial valences he does, but have located them in other imperial reigns (Domitian and Hadrian). The largest spectre that haunts his study from the start is whether we should rather seek links with the Hadrianic period than that of Trajan. Laura Nasrallah in an insightful study does just that in relating Acts' connected Mediterranean to that of Hadrian's Panhellenion.¹¹ B. comments: 'There is nothing exclusively Hadrianic about the image of Paul's movement from city to city; nor is there the same kind of relationship forged between cities in Acts, compared to the diplomatic relationships that constituted the Panhellenion' (126). It is true that Nasrallah's link with Hadrian's Panhellenion is too clever by half, but her argument only requires us to see shared between Hadrian and Acts a travelling emperor networking the eastern Mediterranean and visiting cities. B.'s argument that Acts better replicates Trajan because both were expanding the empire while Hadrian was consolidating it is unpersuasive, as surely the author could have just as easily been influenced by the record of Paul's letters, Lk 24.46–9, or Matthew's Great Commission (Mt 28.19; the presence of Matthaicisms in Luke indicates Luke's possible knowledge of Matthew). Moreover, the implied author of Acts treats Paul's journeys *retrospectively*, that is the 'Christianised' Mediterranean is an achieved result, not one underway (the 'we' passages are presented as vivid events that have happened, not on-the-site reporting), and Paul is under house arrest in Rome at the end of Acts with his mission behind him. The evidence taken together means that a Hadrianic date can neither be ruled out nor secured.

The penultimate chapter, 'Acts and Anti-Jewish Propaganda', turns to the depiction of Jews in the text and their treatment in the empire under Trajan. A close examination of Acts' treatment of Jews reveals a high degree of anti-Judaism. Most pointedly the Jews of Acts are the church's and Paul's enemies. Trajan created anti-Jewish propaganda and the construction of the barbarians on Trajan's Column as enemies is homologous with Acts' othering of Jews. The objection arises again whether there is anything expressly Trajanic in Acts' negative appraisal of Jews, and that shared anti-Judaism may be as easily located in the reign Hadrian—when there was a rebellion under Simon bar Kokhba—as the one that occurred under Trajan in 115. B. again over-reaches for direct parallels with the opposition of Jews to Paul and to Trajan: even as Trajan was expanding his empire eastward in Parthia when the Jews rebelled on his rear flank, thereby helping to thwart his campaign, so the Jews attempted to stall Paul's expansion of the movement through the

to the provincial coinage). In this case Trajan is to Jupiter what Paul/Acts' Christ is to God, the kind of homologous replication of imperial ideology the study seeks to identify, a point I have argued elsewhere with reference to Ephesians (which I consider Trajanic) and to 1 Timothy (which I consider Hadrianic), in Maier (2013) 132–3 and 157–64 respectively.

¹¹ Nasrallah (2008).

Mediterranean (157). With respect to constructions of the other, even as Trajan's Column depicts hostile barbarians as foreigners in need of Roman civilisation, Acts portrays Jews as enemies of the church in need of the Gospel—another instance of the kind of hermeneutical misadventure we identified in chapter 3's juxtaposition of the saved Maltans with the drowning Dacians. Acts thus participates in Trajan's imperial discourse. Alternatively, Acts may be replicating/echoing/distorting certain treatments of Jews by Paul or even other first-century Christian texts and therefore only coincidentally align with the ideological construction of Trajan. The issue is whether B. makes a sufficient case to make the kind of link he sees necessary.

The final chapter, 'Women, Gender, and Roman Imperial Masculinity', supplements Acts with Luke's discursive construction of women, their construction of masculinity, the representation of women on Trajan's Column, and the role of women and of the construction of gender in achieving Acts' goals. B. is unimpressed by the way women are treated in Luke and Acts. Women in Luke are little more than passive recipients; they fare worse in Acts because they are seen but not heard, hold no offices, and do not serve as leaders (187). In contrast, much more attention is given to Paul and Peter; both not only talk a great deal about masculinity, but Paul also wins his masculinity through his conversion and his agonistic struggles to expand the church territorially throughout the Mediterranean. Women serve the aims of the historiographical verisimilitude of Acts that B. describes in Chapter 1 by serving in subordinate roles to men, thus rendering the social order as natural. Inevitably, as we by now have come to expect, this too is homologous to what we see on Trajan's Column, 'a rather conspicuous and pronounced 100-foot phallic symbol standing erect in the middle of Rome' (185), where numerous depictions of Dacian women (reproduced by B.) 'serve to highlight imperial virtue and to construct Trajan as *the man*' (186, italics original). Acts engenders the church and its male apostles even as Trajan's Column engenders the empire and its emperor. Both are in the service of masculinist ideological programmes; that of Acts indicates its location in the Trajanic gender project. It is unconvincing that this should be allied particularly with Trajan; the fact that there are women in Acts and on the Column, that both are pressed into masculine service, only indicates a shared overall gender programme promoted at least from the time of the Augustan era onward, and nothing expressly Trajanic.

During the three-page conclusion (189–91) B. exaggerates the success of his arguments: 'While scholars may doubt the extent to which we can situate Acts within a particular period (or place) in the evolution of the empire, I find it extremely difficult to explain Luke's work without reference to the Trajanic context proposed in this study.' There is scope for being more imaginative on this count. History of course deals with probabilities and more-or-less compelling constructions of the past. While he has argued for a reading in reference

to Trajan, it remains more possible for this reviewer than it does for B. to explain the contents of Acts without specific reference to Trajan.¹² This is for the simple reason that much of the evidence adduced for such a limited perspective is patient of other explanations. Other readers must judge whether the cumulative evidence tips the data set to make Trajan the only possible emperor under whom Acts must have been written; this one remains agnostic. B. has successfully shown the degree to which Acts participates in, promotes, and resists in varying degrees the discursive construction of the imperial world around it, and for this he is to be commended.

Vancouver School of Theology

HARRY O. MAIER
harryomaier@gmail.com

Table of Contents

1. Acts and Monumental Historiography
 - What Kind of History?
 - The Multimedia Context of Antiquity
 - The Column of Trajan and the Rhetorical of Monumental Historiography
 - Continuous Narrative Style
 - Verisimilitude
 - Encomiastic Rhetorical Style
 - Conclusion: The Book of Acts as an Apostolic Monument
2. Imperial Virtues and Provincial Representation
 - The Emperor in the Roman World
 - Trajanic *Indulgentia*
 - Trajanic Discourses of *Imperium*
 - Trajanic Patterns of Provincial Representation
 - Monumentalizing Trajan as Patron of the People
 - Conclusion: Trajanic Standards of Representation
3. Paul and the Politics of a Public Portraiture
 - Becoming Paul (Acts 8–13)
 - Paul and the Patronage of Communities
 - Paul in Lystra (Acts 14)
 - Paul in Ephesus (Acts 19)
 - Paul in Malta (Acts 27)

¹² Similarly Backhaus (2017) (published after B.'s book appeared) who, in the light of both textual and material imperial data, considers that the most likely period of composition was sometime between 100 and 130 CE.

The Political Significance of Universalism in Acts
Representations of Provincials on the Column of Trajan
Conclusion: The Politics of Public Portraiture

4. Acts and Anti-Jewish Propaganda

Narrative Representations of Paul's Jewish Opponents

Acts 1—7, 12: Jerusalem

Acts 9: Damascus

Acts 13: Cyprus and Antioch

Acts 14: Iconium and Lystra

Acts 17: Thessalonica, Beroea, and Athens

Acts 18–19: Corinth and Ephesus

Acts 20–28: Final Voyage to Jerusalem

Anti-Jewish Misanthropy in Acts and Antiquity

Anti-Jewish Propaganda in Imperial Rhetoric

Anti-Jewish Rhetoric during the Reign of Trajan

Conclusion: Acts and Jewish Customs

5. Women, Gender and Roman Imperial Masculinity

Women and Gender in Luke–Acts

Acts and Greco-Roman Masculinity

The Column of Trajan and Roman Imperial Masculinity

Conclusion: Engendering Empire

Conclusion

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aitken, E. B. (2005a) 'Portraying the Temple in Stone and Text: The Arch of Titus and the Epistle to the Hebrews', in G. Gelardini, ed., *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods, New Insights* (Leiden) 131–48.
- (2005b) 'Reading Hebrews in Flavian Rome', *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 59: 82–5.
- Backhaus, K. (2017) 'Zur Datierung der Apostelgeschichte: ein Ordnungsversuch im chronologischen Chaos', *ZNW* 108: 212–58.
- Brent, Allen (2018) Review of Billings, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2018.03.36 (<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2018/2018-03-36.html>), last accessed 8 July 2019.
- Danker, F. W. (1982) *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis).
- Elsner, J. (1996) 'Inventing *Imperium*: Texts and Propaganda of Monuments in Augustan Rome', in J. Elsner, ed., *Arts and Texts in Roman Culture* (Cambridge) 32–53.
- Esler, P. F. (2011) *Community and Gospel in Luke–Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (Cambridge).
- Fears, J. R. (1981a) 'The Cult of Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology', *ANRW* II.17.1: 3–141.
- (1981b) 'The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology', *ANRW* II.17.2: 827–948.
- Gilbert, G. (2003) 'Roman Propaganda and Christian Identity', in T. C. Penner and C. Vander Stichele, edd., *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse* (Atlanta) 233–56.
- Maier, H. O. (2013) *Picturing Paul in Empire: Imperial Image, Text and Persuasion in Colossians, Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles* (London).
- Nasrallah, L. (2008) 'The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Cities, and Hadrian's Panhellenion', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127: 533–66.
- Noreña, C. (2001) 'The Communication of the Emperor's Virtues', *JRS* 91: 146–68.
- (2011) *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power* (Cambridge).
- Rowe, C. K. (2011) *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age* (New York).
- Sterling, G. E. (1992) *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke–Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden).
- Thomas, E. (2009) *Monumentality and the Roman Empire: Architecture in the Antonine Age* (Oxford).
- Von Dippe, R. D. (2007) *The Origin and Development of Continuous Narrative in Rome Art, 300 B.C.–A.D. 200* (diss., University of Southern California).

- Walaskay, P. W. (2005) *‘And So We Came to Rome’: The Political Perspective of St Luke* (Cambridge).
- Winn, A., ed. (2016) *An Introduction to the New Testament and Empire: Resources for Biblical Study* (Atlanta).
- Woolf, G. (1996) ‘Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire’, *JRS* 86: 22–39.