The Spirit as Gift:

The Influence of the Gift of the Spirit on the Community Life as Described by the Summary Statements in Acts

by

John D. Griffiths

Thesis
Submitted to Flinders University
for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences
21/05/2020

I certify that this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any university; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text.

Signed:

_____ 21/05/2020

Abstract

In this thesis, I elucidate the description of the Spirit as gift in Acts (Acts 2:38, 8:20, 10:45, 11:17). I establish that gifts have an inherent sociability, or ability to initiate or sustain personal relations, developing this insight from sociological literature and the primary sources of the Greco-Roman world. This insight into the sociability of gifts leads to consider the sociability implicit in the description of the Spirit as gift in Acts. In this thesis, I argue that the sociability implicit in the description of the Spirit as gift is manifested in the Spirit influence on the community life described in the three summary statements (Acts 2:42-47, 4:32-35, 5:12-16). The Spirit empowers the witness, teaching, joy, and the signs and wonders of the early believers. Moreover, the early Jesus community receives the gift of the Spirit with gratitude, expressed through prayer and praise. The community share meals with Spirit-empowered great joy, while the communal sharing of the early Jesus community imitates the gift of the Spirit. The gift of the Spirit can be understood as a pre-emptive eschatological reward for generous gift-giving, which is promised by the Lukan Jesus. Finally, Luke portrays the gift of the Spirit as the status transcending attribute that enables a remarkable unity and the "sharing of all things." Luke then describes the Spirit as gift to describe the Spirit initiating and sustaining the early Jesus community.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

When reflecting on this thesis, I realise the immense debt of gratitude I have to all who have helped me. Above all, God, who called me to start this PhD, and who sustained, comforted and encouraged me during the writing process, and whose community of believers I hope is edified by this research.

My primary supervisor, the Reverend Doctor Vicky Balabanski, who has shown care and warmth throughout the ups and downs of this research, and whose wealth of knowledge and diligence in feedback has honed and clarified my work. She has gone above and beyond, especially in her insight during editing. I am also indebted to Reverend Doctor Michael Trainor, whose pointed questions particularly refined my thesis statement, and challenged my understanding of Luke-Acts. His questions brought clarity and focus. Finally, the Reverend Doctor Adam White was one of my inspirations for becoming a teacher, and pursuing a PhD; while also offering thoughtful encouragements and cautions as I started the process. He broadened the literature I was exposed to, provided valuable networking opportunities and the final edits that he gave were particularly insightful.

I am also tremendously thankful for those that supported me academically in different ways. First, I would like to acknowledge the contribution of an "Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship," which helped to ease the financial burden of a PhD. Flinders University for the scholarship for the final year of my PhD, which enabled me to finish this PhD to the best of my abilities. The staff at Adelaide College of Divinity for their encouragement and willingness to help at a moment's notice. In particular, Doctor Tanya Wittwer, who was the post-graduate coordinator during the formative years of this research, and who especially supported me in the exploration and articulation of this thesis topic in my first year. Likewise, Doctor Mauro Meruzzi, who was the post-graduate coordinator during the final year of this thesis, and who guided me in composing my conclusion. The librarians Ana Grieve, Anna Witty and Ian Trenwith at Adelaide Theological Library, who were ever helpful and a constant encouragement, especially in the final year of my thesis.

I am also grateful to those who have supported me outside of my academic endeavours. The love, care and fellowship that I have found in the churches Generocity Temora, Influencers Clare Valley and Enjoy Church Adelaide, which I have attended during the last four years. All the staff and students at Alphacrucis Adelaide Campus, especially Matt Potts, Dean O'Keefe and Joshua

Introduction

The Spirit as Gift in the Acts of the Apostles is a topic very close to my heart.[1] I have grown up in the Pentecostal church, with both of my parents being ordained Pentecostal pastors in the Australian Christian Churches (ACC) in South Australia. Integral to the life of a Pentecostal is the work of the Holy Spirit, which permeates every area of life. Pentecostals focus on the Holy Spirit, and in particular "speaking in tongues," and see this validated by Luke's portrayal of the Holy Spirit in Acts. To study the Holy Spirit in Acts is then to study a foundational basis of my Christian life.

During my honours year in 2015, I embarked on two projects that became significant in this project: an honours thesis on John 8:1-11 using social-scientific criticism, and an essay on the timing of the Spirit in Acts, elucidating the positions of James D. G. Dunn, Robert P. Menzies and Max Turner. In exploring possible PhD thesis topics six months later, I began reading the Gospels and Acts, coming across the Lukan Peter's response to the Pentecost crowd to repent and be baptised, from which they will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38). The description of the Spirit as gift immediately stood out, as I was acquainted with the social-scientific approach and the gift-giving models they had developed. Upon reading more widely in the Lukan scholarship on the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts, I decided to build upon this previous scholarship on the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts by focussing on the description of the Spirit as gift.

In this thesis, I elucidate the Spirit as gift in Acts.[2] The Spirit is described as gift (δωρεά) four times in Acts (Acts 2:38, 8:20, 10:45, 11:17); once at the end of Peter's sermon at Pentecost (Acts 2:38), once in connection with the reception of the Spirit during the Samaritan episode (Acts 8:20) and twice during the Cornelius episode (Acts 10:45, 11:17). Luke directly links the description of gift with *receiving* the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38 ("receiving" also occurs in Acts 1:8, 2:33, 8:15, 8:17, 8:19, 10:47, 19:2). Similarly, the description of "*giving* the Spirit" is prominent in Acts (Acts 5:32, 8:18, 15:8, see also Luke 11:13). The descriptions of giving and receiving the Spirit are linked with the direct characterisation of the Spirit as gift, and I argue

---

[1] All abbreviations in this thesis follow *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL, 2014).
[2] For my position on the unity of Luke-Acts see 4.3.

that these three descriptors together constitute a major interpretive framework of the Spirit in Acts.

The Outline of this Thesis

While Luke's portrayal of the Spirit in Luke-Acts is multifaceted, the facet that this thesis will focus on is the Lukan portrayal of the Spirit as gift. In order to do so, the study draws upon Greek and Latin sources, as well as sociological perspectives on gifts. As I demonstrate in Chapters Two and Three, gifts have an inherent sociability. By the term "sociability" I mean the ability to or effect of initiating and sustaining personal relations. Gifts then bind people together, with gift-giving being a "socially creative activity."[3] For the gift of the Spirit in Acts, I argue that Luke uses the gift-giving language to indicate that the Spirit initiates and sustains the early Jesus community, and therefore this community is "the community of the Holy Spirit."[4] My thesis statement is as follows:

> Luke's description of the Spirit as gift in Acts (Acts 2:38, 8:20, 10:45, 11:17), when understood against the background of Greco-Roman gift-giving, implies an inherent sociability. This sociability is manifested in the Spirit's empowerment of the community life described in the three major summary statements (Acts 2:42-47, 4:32-35, 5:12-16).

Establishing these two points leads to the conclusion that Luke's description of the Spirit as gift indicates that the Spirit initiates and sustains the early Jesus community.

In this thesis, I argue that the gift of the Spirit is directly influential on the teaching of the apostles (Acts 2:42), the signs and wonders (Acts 2:43, 5:12-16), the great joy in the community (Acts 2:46) and the witnessing of the apostles (Acts 4:33). While the signs and wonders, witnessing and great joy are all understood to be empowered by the Spirit by

---

[3] The term "socially creative activity" is taken from Miriam T. Griffin, *Seneca on Society: A Guide to De Beneficiis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 17.

[4] Throughout this thesis, I use the name "Luke" to refer to the implied author of Luke-Acts, while not claiming whether this implied author is Luke the physician or another author. No argument in this thesis is based on a specific author of Luke-Acts. For a recent overview on the authorship of Luke-Acts see Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary (Introduction and 1:1-2:47)*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 402-422.

numerous scholars, in Chapter Six I argue that the teaching of the apostles, according to Luke, is a similar action to preaching and proclaiming, and as such, is a Spirit-empowered activity.

Moreover, I connect the gift of the Spirit with the prayers and praise of the early Jesus community. As gratitude was the expected response to gifts, I argue that the early Jesus community shows its gratitude for the divine benefactions that God gives through prayer (Acts 2:42), and praise (Acts 2:47). These divine benefactions that God gives would have included not only, the healings and wonders done in the life of the community, but foundationally, the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus and the gift of the Spirit. As I argue in Chapter Seven, the concept of gratitude connects the gift of the Spirit to the prayer and praise of the early believers.

I also argue that the communal sharing of the early believers (Acts 2:44-45, 4:32, 4:34-5) is founded on and motivated by the gift of the Spirit. The Lukan Jesus teaches his disciples to imitate God in gift-giving (Luke 6:35-38),[5] and so, as God gives the gift of the Spirit freely (implied in the use of δωρεά), the benefactors to the early Jesus community also give their gifts freely.[6] Moreover, the early believers distribute (διεμέριζον in Acts 2:45) their gifts in the same way God distributes the gift of the Spirit (διαμεριζόμεναι in Acts 2:3).[7] I also argue that the Spirit as δωρεά (gift/reward) functions as a pre-emptive eschatological reward for generous gift-giving that the Lukan Jesus promises in his teaching (Luke 6:35, 12:33, 14:14, 18:22).[8] The major expression of this communal sharing would have been the sharing of meals (Acts 2:42, 2:46), which Luke connects with the influence of the gift of the Spirit in the mention of the sharing meals with great joy (Acts 2:46).[9] In this way, I explain the profound empowerment of the gift of the Spirit on both the communal sharing and the sharing of meals.

Finally, I argue that Luke describes the unity of the early community as based upon the equal endowment of the gift of the Spirit. Luke indicates in his use of Joel 2:28-32 in Acts 2:17-21 that the gift of the Spirit is given to all, no matter the gender, class or age of the believer.[10] Likewise, concerning regional and ethnic identities, Luke portrays the gift of the Spirit as

---

[5] See section 8.1.
[6] For this argument, see section 10.4.
[7] See section 9.1.2.
[8] For the promise of reward in Jesus' teaching see 8.1, for the Spirit as δωρεά (gift/reward) as a pre-emptive eschatological reward, see 10.3.
[9] See section 10.5.
[10] See section 11.1.1.

transcending yet affirming these different aspects of identity.[11] The gift of the Spirit is then the status-transcending attribute that creates equality among the members of the early Jesus community, enabling a profound unity. I argue that understanding the gift of the Spirit as the status-transcending attribute of the early Jesus community leads to this community having "all things in common" (ἅπαντα κοινά) across the usual status divisions of gender, class, age, regional identities and ethnicities.[12] The gift of the Spirit is then both directly and indirectly influential on every element the community life, as described by the summary statements.

The Structure of this Thesis

I have structured this thesis into three parts. In Part One, consisting of Chapters One to Four, establishes the interpretive context for the Spirit as gift in Acts. Chapter One establishes the methodology of this thesis, which is social-scientific criticism. This method involves establishing an insight from the sociological literature, which is then tested in the extrabiblical material for applicability for the Greco-Roman world, and then finally this sociological insight is used as a heuristic tool on the biblical text. Chapter Two elucidates the various sociological positions on gifts, arguing that a gift is inherently a socially creative activity or a force leading to sociability. Chapter Three examines the Greek and Latin literature for the sociability of gifts, focussing specifically on the sociability implied in the use of the Greek noun δωρεά and Latin noun *beneficiis*. Chapter Four is a literature review of the previous treatments of Spirit as gift, which highlights the need for further scholarly analysis of the role of the Spirit as gift. These four chapters then set the interpretive context for the remaining seven chapters of this thesis.

In Part Two, Chapters Five, Six and Seven, I turn to the summary statements in Acts and establish six initial connections between the gift of the Spirit and the community life. In Chapter Five, I provide my translation of the three summary statements, arguing for the validity of a thematic approach in connecting the gift of the Spirit to the various elements found in the summary statements. Chapter Six examines the direct influence of the Spirit on the life of the community, arguing that the Spirit empowers the teaching, witnessing, signs and wonders, and the joy in the early Jesus community. Chapter Seven addresses the praise and prayer of the early believers, arguing that they are forms of gratitude for the gift of the Spirit. Part Two then

---

[11] See section 11.1.2 and 11.1.3.
[12] See section 11.3.

establishes the Spirit's influence, either directly or indirectly, on these six attributes of the early Jesus community.

In Part Three, Chapters Eight, Nine, Ten and Eleven, I address the relationship between the sharing of possessions/meals and the gift of the Spirit, arguing that communal sharing of the early believers was founded on and motivated by the gift of the Spirit. First, in Chapter Eight, I address three key aspects of the ideal Lukan gift – imitation, divine reward and sociability – by addressing the topic of wealth in the Gospel of Luke. In Chapter Nine, I examine the descriptions of communal sharing and communal meals, arguing that this communal sharing was a voluntary sharing which manifested itself most clearly in their sharing of meals. In Chapter Ten, I elucidate the connection between the gift of the Spirit and the gifts to the early Jesus community, through these themes of imitation, divine reward and sociability. Finally, in Chapter Eleven, I argue that the equal endowment of the gift of the Spirit was the basis for the unity of the early believers, which manifested itself in the practice of having "all things in common." In these final two sections, I show that every element of the community life that Luke mentions in the summary statements is influenced, either directly or indirectly, by the gift of the Spirit, and concluding that the early Jesus community can be legitimately described in Lukan theology as "the community of the Holy Spirit."

I end this thesis with a reflection and synthesis of the findings of this thesis, before reflecting on the implications this thesis has for Pentecostal pneumatology. Interacting with the work of Frank Macchia's *Baptized in the Spirit* (2006), I situate my findings within the larger framework of Pentecostal pneumatology.[13] Moreover, I also offer some thoughts on how this thesis can contribute to the ongoing discussions on the relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology in Pentecostal theology.

---

[13] Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 155-256.

PART ONE

In Part One of this thesis, Chapters One, Two and Three, I seek to establish the first sentence of my thesis statement, which is:

> Luke's description of the Spirit as gift in Acts (Acts 2:38, 8:20, 10:45, 11:17), when understood against the background of Greco-Roman gift-giving, implies an inherent sociability.

Establishing an interpretive framework for the Spirit as gift in Acts is important for two main reasons. First, as the majority of scholars who address the description of the Spirit as gift use the LXX as their interpretive framework (see 4.1), in Part One of this thesis, I will add a new perspective on the Spirit as gift by drawing upon the wider Greco-Roman world as an interpretive context. Second, I will establish that a key aspect of gift-giving is the sociability between the gift-giving participants, which is an insight that has not been applied to the Spirit as gift in Acts before. Therefore, Part One is important for establishing a new interpretive context for the Spirit as gift in Acts.

In order to establish this interpretive context, this thesis will employ the social-scientific approach to gift-giving, which I outline in Chapter One. In Chapter One, I emphasise two key aspects of the social-scientific approach: the need for a thorough reading of the sociological literature, and the need to "test" the insight developed from the sociological literature in the extrabiblical material. These two aspects form the framework for the next two chapters. In Chapter Two, I examine the history of sociological thought on gift-giving starting with Marcel Mauss, establishing that gifts have an inherent sociability, or ability to initiate and sustain relationships. This sociological insight is then tested in Chapter Three, where I examine the context of δωρεά in the Greek literature and *beneficiis* in the Latin literature, arguing that there is an awareness of the sociability of gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world. This sociological insight, that gifts have an inherent sociability, leads to the literature review in Chapter Four, which shows that there is further research needed on the Spirit as gift in Acts. In all, Part One establishes the interpretive framework for the Spirit as gift in Acts, providing the basis for Part's Two and Three of this thesis.

Chapter 1: Methodology

In this thesis, I employ primarily a social-scientific approach in order to explore the Spirit as gift. Sociological approaches to biblical texts find their place in the historical-critical processes, complementing other types of criticisms. As biblical texts have numerous dimensions that can be explored by posing various questions to the text, sociological approaches seek to ask the biblical text social questions to uncover the social dimensions of the text.

In this chapter, I outline the social-scientific approach adopted in this thesis, comparing it to the similar approach of socio-historical criticism, while also addressing the critiques of these sociological approaches (1.1). A comparison with the socio-historical approach is important, as the most challenging critique of the social-scientific method comes from those that employ socio-historical criticism. Once the method and critiques of the social-scientific approach have been addressed, I engage with the most widely-used gift-giving models by those that employ the social-scientific method (1.2). Examining these previous gift-giving models serves three purposes. First, it sets the context for Chapters Two and Three, where I develop my gift-giving model. I am not the first to develop a gift-giving model from sociology, and so to situate my model properly, it is important to elucidate other gift-giving models that I have built upon. Second, in this second section, I show the limitations of the social-scientific approach when the proper method is not followed, as there does seem to be a lack of "testing" of gift-giving models in the extrabiblical literature. Third, in this section I show that there is a need to return to the sociological literature on gift-giving and incorporate new insights from the sociological literature on gift-giving, as most scholars that employ social-scientific gift-giving models rely on Marshall Sahlins' *Stone Age Economics*, which was published in 1972.

1.1 Sociological Approaches to the New Testament

As the social-scientific approach is a relatively new approach to the New Testament, and as this methodology is still developing, I outline my particular social-scientific approach in this section. First, I outline the methodology of this thesis as a social-scientific approach (1.1.1). Second, I compare the social-scientific approach with socio-historical criticism (1.1.2), noting the ongoing discussion between scholars who use both methods. Third, I evaluate the critiques of sociological approaches to the New Testament (1.1.3). These three subsections then set the methodological bedrock for the rest of the thesis.

1.1.1 An Outline of the Social-Scientific Approach

In the last 40 years, sociological approaches have become an essential tool for New Testament scholarship.[1] Sociological approaches to the New Testament aim to elucidate the social setting, social forces and social implications at work within a particular biblical text and consider the ramifications that these social factors have for the meaning of the text. As John H. Elliott states:

> Social scientific criticism of the Bible is that phase of exegetical task which analyzes the social and cultural dimensions of the text and its environmental context through the utilization of the perspectives, theory, models and research of the social sciences. As a component of the historical-critical method of exegesis, social-scientific criticism investigates biblical texts as meaningful configurations of language intended to communicate between composers and audiences.[2]

With a growing awareness that the social world of the New Testament is significantly different from those of modern Western societies, sociological approaches to biblical passages seek to elucidate the social dimensions of a passage. Elliott further explains the function of sociological approaches as follows:

> Social-scientific criticism … studies the text as both a reflection of and response to the social and cultural settings in which the text was produced. Its aim is the determination of the meaning(s) explicit and implicit in the text, meanings made possible and shaped by the social and cultural systems inhabited by both authors and intended audiences.[3]

The various sociological approaches to the New Testament all seek to understand the social conventions of the biblical world in order to understand the socially embedded meaning of biblical texts. Broadly, there are two different sociological approaches to New Testament passages: social-scientific criticism and socio-historical criticism.[4]

---

[1] Some see modern sociological approaches as a development of the earlier discussion on the social life-settings (*Sitz im Leben*), for this discussion see the overviews of Bengt Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 1-3; Dale B. Martin, "Social-Scientific Criticism," in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*, ed. Stephen R. Haynes and Steven J. McKenzie, (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1993), 103-107; David G. Horrell, "Social Sciences Studying Formative Christian Phenomena: A Creative Movement," in *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches*, ed. Anthony J. Blasi, Jean Duhaime, and Paul-André Turcotte, (Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2002), 4-7.

[2] John H. Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, Guides to Biblical Scholarship: New Testament Series, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 7. Also see John H. Elliott, "On Wooing Crocodiles for Fun and Profit: Confessions of an Intact Admirer," in *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina*, ed. John J. Pilch, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 10.

[3] Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 8.

[4] There is a third approach that is sometimes connected to sociological approaches to biblical texts, which is socio-political criticism. This criticism takes many forms including liberation hermeneutics, cultural criticism, feminist and

This thesis employs the social-scientific approach, developed by the "Context Group" of SBL. Bruce J. Malina in particular set the foundation for this approach. In *The New Testament World* (1981) Malina develops various models from cultural anthropology, explaining the difference between the New Testament world and the modern-day USA in the areas of family, status, personality and purity.[5] While there are critiques of this method (discussed below), the strength of the social-scientific approach is in the explicit statement of – and reflection upon – the social models used to interpret biblical texts. The results of this approach have illuminated the various social dynamics implicitly at work in the various biblical texts, highlighting the difference between the social world of the New Testament and the social dynamics of the contemporary Western world.

The social-scientific approach has three stages.[6] First, the exegete establishes an insight from the sociological, anthropological and ethnographic research performed in similar cultures to the New Testament.[7] This consultation of the sociological and related literature should be thorough, including consulting the critiques from other sociologists. This thoroughness is pivotal, as Andrew D. Clarke and J. Brian Tucker note that:

> [An] area of caution frequently – perhaps inevitably – arises in interdisciplinary studies, in which a given scholar lacks full proficiency in the secondary discipline. This occurs, for example, where biblical scholars are making extensive use of early iterations of theoretical models, without fully engaging with subsequent nuances, critiques and developments of the initially over-ambitious theories, as they are tested and honed in the light of further, contemporary, empirical research and sometimes harsh criticism.[8]

As biblical scholars are generally not trained in the fields of sociology or anthropology, we must be very cautious and thorough in the development of sociological insights. This is an especially important step for this thesis, as I argue in the next section, the predominate gift-giving model

---

queer criticism and various ethnic criticisms (i.e. Asian/African criticism). Whether these are inherently sociological is debatable, see Carolyn Osiek, *What are They Saying About the Social Setting of the New Testament?* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1992), 90-91, 112; Horrell, "Social Sciences Studying Formative Christian Phenomena," 14-15, 21-22.

[5] Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, 3rd ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001). For the use of the term "model" in this thesis, I follow Esler (4), when he says that models "are heuristic tools, not ontological statements." See Philip F. Esler, "Introduction: Models, Context and Kerygma in New Testament Interpretation," in *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*, ed. Philip F. Esler, (London: Routledge, 1995), 4; Robin Scroggs, "Sociology and the New Testament," *Journal of Religion and Culture* 21 (1986): 142; Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament*, 14.

[6] Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 60.

[7] Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 60-61.

[8] Andrew D. Clarke and J. Brian Tucker, "Social History and Social Theory in the Study of Social Identity," in *T&T Clark Handbook to Social Identity in the New Testament*, ed. J. Brian Tucker and C. A. Baker, (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014), 45.

developed from Marshall Sahlins needs to be revisited, as the sociological understanding of gifts has progressed since Sahlins' research was first published in 1972.[9]

The second stage involves testing this sociological insight in the extrabiblical primary sources, to assess its plausibility in the context of the Greco-Roman world.[10] As the sociological insight developed in the first stage is based on sociological research on contemporary societies, societies that are possibly very different to the 1st century CE Greco-Roman world, there is a need to "test" the applicability of the sociological insight for the Greco-Roman world. While some scholars that follow the social-scientific approach do not incorporate a testing of their sociological models in the extrabiblical literature, I see the concern for applicability of sociological models developed from the modern world as a valid one, and so, I plan to test my sociological insight in the extrabiblical literature.[11]

This stage can be complex or relatively simple depending on the type of sociological insight that is being assessed. As Clark and Tucker offer the following warning with regard to testing Social Identity Theory in the primary sources:

> [A] challenge occurs when the comparative lack of data or inaccessibility of evidence challenges the ability to apply social theory in standard or sustainable ways. The concern becomes more acute with those approaches that are most reliable when applied to a large body of data, or those methods that normally require empirical research, including, for example, the ability to interrogate the subject. The difficulties inherent in a study in which the target group can no longer be subject of empirical research are not, therefore, insignificant. It is important to be aware of both the implications and significance of this when interpreting the evidence reflected in the New Testament and other ancient sources.[12]

Similarly, in reviewing the use of the cognitive dissonance theory as a heuristic tool, Cyril Rodd notes that:

> There is a world of difference between sociology applied to contemporary society, where the researcher can test his theories against evidence which he collects, and historical

---

[9] See section 1.2.1.
[10] Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 61.
[11] See section 1.2.1 for examples of not testing gift-giving models in the extrabiblical sources.
[12] Clarke and Tucker, "Social History and Social Theory," 45.

sociology where he has only fossilized evidence that has been preserved by chance or for purposes very different from that of the sociologist.[13]

Rodd argues that the evidence that is available for the exegete to validate a social theory or model is fragmentary and significantly limited in scope. The legitimacy of this limitation depends on the type of sociological insight that an exegete applies to the biblical text.[14] For this thesis, there are extensive sources on gift-giving in the Greco-Roman, providing ample evidence to engage with a position developed from sociological research.[15]

The third stage uses the insight developed in the first two stages as "a heuristic tool, allowing comparisons to be made with the texts for the purpose of posing new questions to them."[16] At this point, a question is posed to the biblical text, which then can be answered using a wide range of tools, including tools from historical or literary criticisms, to answer this sociologically informed question. As Clark and Tucker state: "It would seem that one of the primary contributions of social theory is that it provides a series of questions that may be asked of a text that might otherwise go unasked because of the interpreter's social location."[17] It is important to emphasize that this social-scientific approach does not replace historical or literary criticism, but works in tandem with them.[18] As Esler states, "The social sciences are best seen as a necessary adjunct to established forms of criticism. In dealing with the past they must inevitably collaborate with history."[19] In this thesis, I consult sociological insights (Chapters 2), which I test in the extrabiblical literature (Chapter 3), in order to open up new pathways for understanding the Holy Spirit as gift in Acts (Chapters 5-11).

1.1.2   Comparison with Socio-Historical Criticism

The social-scientific approach is similar to socio-historical criticism, which is also known as social history or historical sociology.[20] Socio-historical criticism seeks to develop a deeper understanding

---

[13] Cyril S. Rodd, "On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies," *JSOT* 6, no. 19 (1981): 105. This critique is noted by Osiek, *What are They Saying*, 5.

[14] The use of social psychological models on biblical texts, for example, is contested, as it is difficult to see how an exegete could establish the psychology of ancient persons. Another example is the application cognitive dissonance theory being applied to the early Christian community by John G. Gager, *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity* (Harlow: Longman, 1975). Rodd offers a cogent critique of Gager's work in Rodd, "On Applying a Sociological Theory," 95-99.

[15] See Chapter Three for an overview of the primary sources on the sociability of gift-giving.

[16] Philip F. Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds* (London: Routledge, 1994), 13.

[17] Clarke and Tucker, "Social History and Social Theory," 57-58.

[18] Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 7; Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds*, 2.

[19] Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds*, 2.

[20] For the difference between social history and historical sociology see Paul Veyne, *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*, trans. Brian Pearce (Allen Lane: The Penguin Press, 1990), 1-3. Although Veyne sees this as a "pedantic distinction."

of history through the use of sociology and related fields in what David G. Horrell describes as "a more eclectic and piecemeal way."[21] Socio-historical criticism involves the exegete immersing him or herself in the culture and social world of the biblical text, and then applying sociological insights where the scholar sees fit to do so.[22] One of the first to employ this method is Gerd Theissen, who has eclectically and experimentally used sociological and psychological theories in his historical studies on Christian origins.[23] The strength of socio-historical criticism is that it takes the peculiarity of human behaviour and unpredictability of history seriously.

There is an ongoing discussion between scholars that employ social-scientific models and those that use socio-historical criticism, as there is a distinct difference in their approach. Those that employ social-scientific models critique the inconsistent methodological foundation of socio-historical criticism, whereas social historians critique those that employ social-scientific models for their almost prescriptive generalisations.[24] As Horrell summarises:

> Despite a common acceptance of the value of using the social sciences, there remain significant differences of approach between those who follow the method pioneered by Malina and those who follow the kind adopted by Theissen and Meeks. Members of the Context Group adopt a model-based approach that draws primarily upon anthropology and stresses the cultural gap between the early Christian world and the present one, whereas those sometimes labelled "social historians" have tended to draw their theoretical resources more from sociology… and to use their social scientific resources more as a way of constructing a framework for understanding and of sensitizing the researcher to previously ignored questions and issues.[25]

There is a tension here between the use of social-scientific and socio-historical criticism, which revolves around how to apply the insights from sociology (and related fields) to biblical texts. Carolyn

---

[21] Horrell, "Social Sciences Studying Formative Christian Phenomena," 12.

[22] David G. Horrell, "Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament: Retrospect and Prospect," in *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*, ed. David G. Horrell, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 15-17.

[23] For example, see Gerd Theissen, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978); Gerd Theissen, *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics and the World of the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992). The other major works include E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century: Some Prolegomena to the Study of the New Testament Ideas of Social Obligation* (London: Tyndale Press, 1960); Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).

[24] See the summaries of Osiek, *What are They Saying*, 108; Horrell, "Social Sciences Studying Formative Christian Phenomena," 13-14.

[25] Horrell, "Social Sciences Studying Formative Christian Phenomena," 13-14. See also Osiek, *What are They Saying*, 108.

Osiek suggests the preference of either social-science or social history could come down to the personality of the exegete, as she states:

> Sometimes, humorously enough, it seems to come down to differences in personality types: those who opt for the use of social science models tend to be those who like the big picture and are bored with details; those who opt for social description tend to be those who must have documented evidence in order to trust wider theories.[26]

Both social-scientific and socio-historical criticisms are valid methods of bringing sociological insights to bear on biblical texts. The former positions itself more closely with shared and articulated heuristic models, while the latter positions itself more closely with the particularity of historical enquiry. Nevertheless, perhaps the supposed dichotomy between them is overstated. For the purposes of this study, I give preference to the methodological consistency of the social-scientific approach, while at times drawing on insights noted by social historians.

1.1.3   Critiques of Sociological Approaches

As sociological approaches to the New Testament are still developing as methods of interpretation, it is necessary to address the critiques of them. The most substantive critiques of the sociological approaches consider if and how exegetes should use sociological insights developed from the modern world on biblical texts. In this section, I address the two main critiques that must be considered when using social-scientific models.

First, some scholars have rejected sociological approaches as an alien framework imposed on ancient texts.[27] As there are certain aspects of the human experience that are remarkably different between the ancient world and the modern Western world, there is an unease that some scholars have with using social-scientific models developed from modern societies on biblical texts. A key exponent of this position is E. A. Judge, who states that before an exegete can impose social-scientific models on the ancient evidence, the exegete must ascertain the "social facts of life characteristic of the world to which the New Testament belongs."[28] This critique argues that before an exegete can apply modern

---

[26] Osiek, *What are They Saying*, 108.

[27] Rodd, "On Applying A Sociological Theory," 95-106; E. A. Judge, "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History," *JRH* 11, no. 2 (1980): 201-217. Noted by Susan R. Garrett, "Sociology (Early Christianity)," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman, (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 90; Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 94-95; Esler, "Introduction," 4; Stephen C. Barton, "Historical Criticism and Social-Scientific Perspectives in New Testament Study," in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. Joel B. Green, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 47.

[28] Judge, "The Social Identity of the First Christians," 210.

sociological insights to biblical texts, the Greco-Roman world must first be understood. In response to Judge's critique, Horrell notes that Judge's "empiricist presuppositions" should be questioned as Judge assumes that "one can simply search for social facts, for uninterpreted data, innocent of the need for theoretical discussion or reflection on the presuppositions of particular approaches to history."[29] Judge speaks about "social facts" as if the exegete is capable of what Elliott labels an "immaculate perception."[30] Every exegete comes to the biblical text with certain assumptions, frameworks, even perhaps implicit "models" about the social world of the New Testament; the key difference is that those who use sociological approaches explicitly state their assumptions.

To probe this critique further, just because an exegete explicitly states their model does not mean that it is suitable for the Greco-Roman world.[31] Transparency does not equal validity. Therefore, there is an underlying problem that cannot be dismissed quite so easily. That is, how do we know that a particular social-scientific model is suitable for the ancient world in which we find the biblical text? Ideally, the validity and applicability of the model should be established in the testing of the sociological insight in the extrabiblical primary sources.

The second critique involves the various effects that social-scientific models have on biblical texts. Some scholars are concerned that the use social-scientific models results in determinism (there being no possibility for free will or random events), in reductionistic interpretations or in the exegete generalizing historical events.[32] In addressing the concern of determinism, using social-scientific models as a heuristic tool should actually help the interpreter in identifying what is a random event or an action of free will. For how else do we discern what is unexpected? An unexpected action to modern Western ears might be completely expected for those at home in the Greco-Roman world. A seemingly random sequence of events could have a plausible explanation for a 1st-century Jewish person. To determine what events, actions or words are normal or abnormal in a particular social context, we must establish a baseline of normality for that context.

Beyond deterministic readings, other scholars see social-scientific models generalizing historical situations.[33] This critique seems to be the tension point between social-scientific criticism and socio-historical criticism. Those that use social-scientific criticism argue that the models that they develop should be applied consistently, whereas, those of the socio-historical criticism use models in a more

---

[29] Horrell, "Social Sciences Studying Formative Christian Phenomena," 16. All biblical exegetes start with some information, which can include insights from sociological literature, see Jerome H. Neyrey, "Preface," in *The Social World of the New Testament*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey and Eric C. Stewart, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008), xxii.
[30] Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 90.
[31] Covered by Clarke and Tucker, "Social History and Social Theory," 41-45.
[32] Noted by Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 88-91; Barton, "Historical Criticism and Social-Scientific Perspectives," 48.
[33] Noted by Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 91.

immersive interpretation of biblical texts.[34] This concern is evident within the social sciences more generally, and so it is predictable that we might see a similar tension in the study of social perspectives of biblical texts.[35]

Finally, there is also the concern that the use of social-scientific models will result in reductionistic interpretations.[36] This critique argues that if an exegete applies social-scientific models to biblical texts, then the legitimacy of theology will be taken out of the equation. For example, John Milbank has argued that sociology has antitheological foundations, with theology and sociology offering different narratives.[37] To use sociology is to accept its antitheological foundations and to then reject the Christian narrative.[38]

This critique has at its core a generalization that all social-scientific models are moulded in a Durkheimian fashion, seeking to explain away all religious phenomena.[39] We should note that this critique could be levelled at most methods of criticism. As Scroggs notes,

> No "scientific" approach need be reductionistic. Every "scientific" approach – including the historical – *can* be reductionistic. That is, reductionism does not lie in the methodology itself, but in the theological presuppositions which one brings to sociological or any other methodology. Statements informed by social pressures can be apprehended as revelation. That is as legitimate a faith as the contrary.[40]

Reductionistic interpretations are not so much a product of a particular methodology but rather the theological or philosophical presuppositions that an exegete brings to the text. Elliott notes another source of reductionism is the prioritization of one form of criticism above all others, by stating that reductionism can come from seeing, "all phenomena as exclusively historical (singular or related events) or literary (aesthetic text) or social (social product) or theological (doctrinal) phenomena."[41] To understand the biblical text all dimensions (historical, literary, social, theological, etc.) must be considered.

---

[34] See the discussion between David G. Horrell, "Models and Methods in Social-Scientific Interpretation: A Response to Philip Esler," *JSNT* 22, no. 78 (2000): 83-105; Philip F. Esler, "Models in New Testament Interpretation," *JSNT* 22, no. 78 (2000): 107-113.

[35] For social scientists that advocate for models see J. H. Turner, "Analytical Theorizing," in *Social Theory Today*, ed. A. Giddens and J. H. Turner, (Cambridge: Polity, 1987). And for the more immersive approach see A. Giddens, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration* (Cambridge: Polity, 1984), 1-40.

[36] Noted by Osiek, *What are They Saying*, 5-6; Barton, "Historical Criticism and Social-Scientific Perspectives," 48-49.

[37] John Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 380.

[38] Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory*, 4.

[39] As noted by Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 88-90.

[40] Scroggs, "Sociology and the New Testament," 140.

[41] Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 90.

Although sociological approaches are no more reductionistic towards religious phenomena than any other criticism in the historical-critical process, it is reductionistic in a different sense. Sociological approaches do assume that a text is rooted in its social environment.[42] That is, social-scientific criticism focuses on the social aspects of the text, and so, it reduces/concentrates the biblical text on the social world (just as literary criticism reduces/concentrates on the literary forms of the text). Social-scientific criticism is no more reductionistic than any other criticism in the historical-critical process, as social-scientific criticism concentrates on the social dimensions of the text to further inform the interpretation of the text.

1.1.4   The Outline of the Methodology of this Thesis

For this thesis, my approach to Spirit as gift in Acts is a social-scientific approach, as I see this approach as employing a more consistent methodology than socio-historical criticism. The social-scientific approach that I am employing follows the following methodology:

1. The sociological literature is widely consulted, with the critiques of the various positions noted and weighed. A sociological insight is then developed.
2. This insight is "tested" in the extrabiblical literature to ensure its applicability for the Greco-Roman world.
3. This "model" is then used as a heuristic tool on the selected New Testament passage to develop a social question for the selected text.

Following this methodology, the outline of this thesis as follows:

1. I consult the sociological literature on gift-giving, arguing that gifts have an inherent sociability that binds people together, and giving a gift is a socially creative activity (Chapter Two).
2. I test this insight in the Greek and Latin authors, arguing that the sociability inherent in a gift is a common understanding in the 1st century CE Greco-Roman world (Chapter Three).
3. This insight, that gifts enable a sociability, is then used as a heuristic tool on the Lukan description of the Spirit as gift, to develop the question; What are the relationship(s) that are initiated or sustained by the giving of the Spirit as gift? In Chapters Five to Eleven, I argue

---

[42] Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 90.

that the Spirit as gift influences, either directly or indirectly, each element of the community life in the three summary statements (Acts 2:42-47, 4:32-35, 5:12-16).

This third stage of my methodology will involve three different type of arguments. First, Luke explicitly indicates throughout Luke-Acts that the Spirit empowers the signs and wonders, witness and joy of the early Jesus community, which is well accepted by Lukan scholars (6.3, 6.1 & 6.4 respectively). Second, focussing on the description of the Spirit as gift, I draw connections between the Spirit and the prayer and praise of the early believers through the concept of gratitude (7.1 & 7.2 respectively). Likewise, I argue that the communal sharing and the sharing of meals are a response to the Spirit being given as gift. Through focussing on the description of the Spirit as gift, we can establish the Spirit's influence on the prayer, praise, communal sharing and the sharing of meals. Third, I argue in section 5.2 that the summary statements have a circular relationship with the surrounding narratives, as Luke has drawn from the surrounding narratives to compose the summary statements, and in return, the summary statements highlight important themes to come in the following narratives. From this literary observation, I argue that the gift of the Spirit empowers the teaching of the apostles, drawing upon the wider narrative to establish this point (6.2). With these three types of arguments, I establish that the Spirit as gift influences, either directly or indirectly, each element of the community life in the three summary statements.

On this basis, I am able to conclude that the early Jesus community legitimately be understood in Lukan theology as the community of the Spirit. Consulting the sociological literature and the Greco-Roman primary sources on gifts leads to a new pathway for research on the Lukan portrayal of the Holy Spirit, highlighting the sociability inherent in the description of the Spirit as gift.

1.2   Sociological Approaches to Gift-Giving in the New Testament

In the second section of this chapter, I engage with the gift-giving models developed from sociology by those that employ social-scientific criticism in the New Testament. In surveying the current models used for gift-giving in New Testament passages, the vast majority of scholars base their definition of gift on the concept of reciprocity, often categorising gifts with other exchanges (1.2.1). From here, I elucidate the work of John M. G. Barclay in *Paul and the Gift*, as Barclay has made a significant contribution to developing a gift-giving model for New Testament scholars (1.2.2).

1.2.1 The Context Group and the Taxonomy of Reciprocity

When approaching gift-giving in the New Testament, those that employ the social-scientific method usually rely on Marshall Sahlins' taxonomy of reciprocity to define and categorise gift-giving.[43] Marshall Sahlins, in *Stone Age Economics* (1972), argues that there are three types of reciprocity in ancient societies: generalised, balanced and negative reciprocity.[44] First, Sahlins notes that generalised reciprocity is at the "solidarity extreme" of social interaction, displayed in its purest form in altruism and more commonly kinship duties.[45] Second, balanced reciprocity "refers to direct exchange," where there is an immediate reciprocal action, which is usually typified by trade or business contracts.[46] Finally, the "unsociable extreme," which Sahlins calls negative reciprocity, refers to exchanges that include haggling, barter, gambling and in the extreme, stealing and theft.[47] Sahlins then argues that these three categories of exchange are then dependent on and proportionate to kinship distance. He states that "reciprocity is inclined toward the generalised pole by close kinship, toward the negative extreme in proportion to kinship distance."[48] The socially intimate gravitate towards generalised reciprocity, whereas the socially distant tend to practice negative reciprocity.

---

[43] Bruce J. Malina, *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology*, 2nd ed. (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010), 101-106; Halvor Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*, Overtures To Biblical Theology, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 34; Douglas E. Oakman, "The Countryside in Luke-Acts," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 156; Jerome H. Neyrey, "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table-Fellowship," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 371-372; John H. Elliott, "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 232-233; Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 132-133; Ekkehard W. Stegemann and Wolfgang Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of Its First Century*, trans. O. C. Dean Jr. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 34-35; Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 406; Alan Kirk, "'Love Your Enemies,' the Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity (Luke 6:27-35)," *JBL* 122, no. 4 (2003): 667-686; Zeba A. Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion: Patronage, Loyalty, and Conversion in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*, BZNW, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 53-59; Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Gospel of John*, The New Cambridge Bible Commentary, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 22; Zeba A. Crook, "Reflections on Culture and Social-Scientific Models," *JBL* 124, no. 3 (2005): 515-520; Alan Kirk, "Karl Polanyi, Marshall Sahlins, and the Study of Ancient Social Relations," *JBL* 126, no. 1 (2007): 182-191; Bruce J. Malina and John J. Pilch, *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), 227; K. C. Hanson and Douglas E. Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), 186; Eric C. Stewart, "Social Stratification and Patronage in Ancient Mediterranean Societies," in *Understanding the Social World of the New Testament*, ed. Dietmar Neufeld and Richard E. DeMaris, (London: Routledge, 2010); Jonathan Marshall, *Jesus, Patrons, and Benefactors: Roman Palestine and the Gospel of Luke*, WUNT II/259, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 270-271; Zeba A. Crook, "Fictive Giftship and Fictive Friendship in Greco-Roman Society," in *Gift in Antiquity*, ed. Michael Satlow, Ancient World: Comparative Histories (New York: Wiley & Sons, 2013), 61-76. This model has become commonplace in biblical scholarship as others outside of the Context Group also use this model, e.g. Reta Halteman Finger, *Of Widows and Meals* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 128-129.

[44] Marshall Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics* (New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 1972), 185-230.

[45] Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics*, 193-194.

[46] Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics*, 194-195.

[47] Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics*, 194-195.

[48] Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics*, 196.

Sahlins' taxonomy has been widely used by those that use the social-scientific approach. There are however two different ways in which these scholars have applied this taxonomy to the New Testament. The first group of scholars apply Sahlins' model directly, without any modification, to the Greco-Roman world.[49] Bruce J. Malina, in *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology* (1986), is one of the first to use Sahlins' taxonomy when considering gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world.[50] Malina sets out Sahlins' taxonomy as follows: "Reciprocity interchanges can run from (A) disinterested concern for the other party through (B) mutuality in a balanced and symmetrical way to (C) pure self-interest to the disadvantage of the other party."[51] Following Sahlins, Malina labels A as generalized reciprocity involving altruistic transactions, (including gifts among kin and friends), B as balanced reciprocity which involves symmetrical exchange (like trade, the market or the payment for services) and finally C as negative reciprocity involves asymmetrical exchange (like lying, overcharging and theft).[52] For Malina, gifts are a form of generalised reciprocity, characterised by altruistic motives and the lack of any definite return.

Likewise, in the glossary of *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?* (1993), John H. Elliott outlines Sahlins' model as:

> Economic and social exchanges between two parties with varying interests. Exchanges of this type vary from (1) **generalized reciprocity** characterized by altruistic transactions where the "cost" is not counted, as in exchanges among kin; the ideal pure gift; to (2) **balanced reciprocity**, which seeks an equivalence of exchange in goods and services between kin and non-kin groups; to (3) **negative reciprocity** among strangers where maximization of gain and minimization of cost is sought, with force if necessary.[53]

Elliott, following Malina, sees gifts as solely falling under the category of generalised reciprocity, which is defined by altruistic motives, and ideally, no return being demanded or considered.

By contrast, a second group of scholars, following Ekkehard W. Stegemann and Wolfgang Stegemann, have suggested further refinements to Sahlins' model, which would make it more

---

[49] Malina, *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology*, 101-106; Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom*, 34; Oakman, "The Countryside in Luke-Acts," 156; Neyrey, "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts," 371-372; Elliott, "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts," 232-233; Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 132-133; Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*, 406; Neyrey, *The Gospel of John*, 22; Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 128-129; Malina and Pilch, *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Acts*, 227; Hanson and Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus*, 186; Stewart, "Social Stratification and Patronage." Classists often take this path as well, see Walter Donlan, "Reciprocities in Homer," *CW* 75, no. 3 (1982): 137-175.
[50] Malina, *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology*, 101-106.
[51] Malina, *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology*, 101.
[52] Malina, *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology*, 101-104.
[53] Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 132-133. Emphasis original. Others who use very similar taxonomy include Hanson and Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus*, 186.

sensitive to the Greco-Roman world.[54] The Stegemanns combine Sahlins' model with Karl Polanyi's three forms of exchange – redistribution, reciprocity and trade – into one model.[55] The Stegemanns' model starts broadly with three categories – the market, redistribution and reciprocity, and then further divide reciprocity into four subcategories; familial, balanced, generalised and negative.[56]

In this taxonomy of reciprocity, the Stegemanns have proposed that there were four different types of reciprocity in the Greco-Roman world.[57] First, familial reciprocity, which covers exchanges within households or kinship networks.[58] Second, balanced reciprocity, which is the exchange of goods and services between non-kin, which were proportional or equal.[59] The Stegemanns also suggest that we can discern balanced reciprocity by the relative equal status of the two participants of the gift-giving exchange.[60] Third, generalised reciprocity is an asymmetrical exchange between non-kin.[61] Contrasted with balanced reciprocity, the Stegemanns suggest that generalised reciprocity occurs between participants of unequal status.[62] Finally, there is negative reciprocity, which is a completely self-interested exchange between strangers or enemies.[63] According to the Stegemanns, these four categories then constitute the majority of non-commercial exchanges in the Greco-Roman world, with gifts possibly being found in each of the four categories of reciprocity.

The Stegemanns' model is adapted further by Zeba Crook, who emphasizes two points.[64] First, Crook emphasizes the reintroduction of economic exchanges into the taxonomy of reciprocity.[65] In particular, Crook suggests that balanced reciprocity also includes market exchange, trade and peacemaking as well as gifts.[66] Second, Crook argues that there is a strong correlation between the statuses of the gift-giving participants and their gifts.[67] Crook notes that Sahlins' use of kinship

---

[54] Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 34-35; Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 53-59; Crook, "Reflections on Culture and Social-Scientific Models," 515-520; Marshall, *Jesus, Patrons, and Benefactors*, 270-271; Crook, "Fictive Giftship and Fictive Friendship," 61-76; David E. Briones, *Paul's Financial Policy: A Socio-Theological Approach*, LNTS, (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 33-34.

[55] Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 34-35; Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (Boston: Beacon, 1944), 45-58.

[56] Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 34-35.

[57] Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 34-35.

[58] Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 34.

[59] Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 34.

[60] Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 36.

[61] Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 34-35.

[62] Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 36.

[63] Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 34-35.

[64] Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 53-59; Crook, "Reflections on Culture and Social-Scientific Models," 515-520; Crook, "Fictive Giftship and Fictive Friendship," 61-76.

[65] Crook, "Reflections on Culture and Social-Scientific Models," 517; Crook, "Fictive Giftship and Fictive Friendship," 66.

[66] Crook, "Reflections on Culture and Social-Scientific Models," 517; Crook, "Fictive Giftship and Fictive Friendship," 66.

[67] Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 56-57; Crook, "Reflections on Culture and Social-Scientific Models," 516-518; Crook, "Fictive Giftship and Fictive Friendship," 65-67.

distance is insufficient for the status-conscious people of the Greco-Roman world, and as such, we should replace kinship distance with status distance.[68] Crook's model is then considerably different from those that follow Malina's direct adaptation, as Crook sees gifts possibly falling into the three different categories (familial, balanced and generalised), while Malina sees gifts as solely within generalised reciprocity (which includes exchanges among kin).

All these various uses of Sahlins' model create quite a diverse array of approaches to gifts in biblical texts. The majority of scholars that employ the social-scientific criticism to gifts in the New Testament see gifts as solely falling under the category of generalised reciprocity, given with altruistic motives and with no expectation of return. The Stegemanns see gifts as encompassing familial, generalised, balanced and negative reciprocity. Crook incorporates economic exchanges within his model, seeing gifts as having similar qualities to commodities. As the majority of scholars who use social-scientific criticism use these models, it is worth evaluating these models against the first two steps of social-scientific criticism.

When critiquing sociological model building, Horrell states that, "there seems to be an over-dependence on the basic set of models outlined in Malina's work of 1981, which in any case lack the reference to extra-biblical ancient sources necessary to demonstrate the models' validity as a representation of ancient Mediterranean culture."[69] This critique is especially pertinent for gift-giving models developed by those that use social-scientific criticism outlined above, as shown in an interesting discussion between Crook and Alan Kirk.[70] Kirk chooses to use Sahlins' model directly, when considering the dynamics of reciprocity at play in the Golden Rule in Luke 6:31.[71] Kirk sees all gift-giving as falling under the banner of generalised reciprocity, which Kirk typifies as "open-ended, generous sharing, [and is] typically construed in the language of unconditional giving."[72] Contrasted with generalised reciprocity, Kirk describes balanced reciprocity as having an "overt concern for equivalence of exchange, with obligations spelled out and fulfilled within set time frames."[73] Kirk does not consider the status of the givers, nor the symmetry of the gift and counter-gift as important, but rather sees gifts as unilateral expressions of altruistic motives.

Crook has critiqued Kirk (and by extension those that follow Malina's direct application of Sahlins' model) for applying Sahlins' model developed in archaic societies directly onto the biblical text

---

[68] Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 56-57; Crook, "Reflections on Culture and Social-Scientific Models," 516-518; Crook, "Fictive Giftship and Fictive Friendship," 65-67.
[69] Horrell, "Social Sciences Studying Formative Christian Phenomena," 19.
[70] Kirk, "'Love Your Enemies,' the Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity," 667-686; Crook, "Reflections on Culture and Social-Scientific Models," 515-520; Kirk, "The Study of Ancient Social Relations," 182-191.
[71] Kirk, "'Love Your Enemies,' the Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity," 667-686.
[72] Kirk, "'Love Your Enemies,' the Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity," 675.
[73] Kirk, "'Love Your Enemies,' the Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity," 677.

without considering if this model needs adaptation.[74] Kirk indeed applies Sahlins' model to Luke 6, with minimal testing in the primary sources of the Greco-Roman world.[75] However, a similar critique could be made of Crook's model, as he does not "test" his adaptation of Sahlins' model on the extrabiblical primary sources.[76] Both Crook and Kirk do not give adequate space to the testing of their respective gift-giving models in the extrabiblical material. Furthermore, neither Crook nor Kirk consider the important subsequent sociological works to come after Sahlins in the area of gift-giving by Pierre Bourdieu, Jacques Derrida, Alain Caillé and Jacques T. Godbout.[77]

The discussion between Kirk and Crook exemplifies the critique of Horrell, as both Kirk or Crook use Sahlins' sociological model without considering the critiques of this model. Neither of them consult the major sociological works on gift-giving after Sahlins, nor do they adequately test their model on the extrabiblical literature to establish the suitability of the model. It seems that since Malina first applied Sahlins' model of gift-giving and exchange onto the Greco-Roman world in 1983, there have been very few scholars that have returned to consult the critiques of Sahlins' model by other sociologists; few have consulted other important works on gift-giving in sociology or have tested their models in the extrabiblical material.

1.2.2   John M. G. Barclay's Reconfigured Gift Theory

One of the few scholars to return to the sociological literature is John M. G. Barclay in *Paul and the Gift* (2015).[78] Barclay covers the work of not only Sahlins but the influential founders of gift theory in Marcel Mauss and Claude Levi-Strauss, as well as the more recent work of Pierre Bourdieu and Jacques Derrida.[79] In dealing with these scholars, Barclay considers the critiques by other theorists and develops a nuanced and contemporary gift theory. This thesis will build upon Barclay's work by

---

[74] Crook, "Reflections on Culture and Social-Scientific Models," 515-520.

[75] Kirk does consult some primary sources, relying mainly on Seneca's *De Beneficiis* and Aristotle's *The Nicomachean Ethics* to support his model. Moreover, Kirk does not consult the major works of Pierre Bourdeiu, Jacques Derrida, Alain Caillé and Jacques T. Godbout in his formulation of his model on gift-giving.

[76] Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 54-59. On top of this, Crook does not consider any of the critiques of Sahlins' model nor consider the major works of Pierre Bourdieu, Jacques Derrida, Alain Caillé and Jacques T. Godbout.

[77] Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Polity, 1990); Jacques Derrida, *Given Time: 1. Counterfeit Money*, trans. Peggy Kamuf (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992); Alain Caillé, *Anthropologie du don: Le tiers paradigme* (Paris: Desclée, 2000); Jacques T. Godbout and Alain Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, trans. Donald Winkler (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992).

[78] John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015).

[79] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 12-23, 51-63.

considering the perspective of Alain Caillé and Jacques T. Godbout, who have emphasised the social aspects of gift-giving (see section 2.5).[80]

In *Paul and the Gift*, Barclay also considers a considerable range of primary sources in the discussion on gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world.[81] Barclay, in a section titled "Gift and Reciprocity in the Greco-Roman World," outlines the relationship between gift-giving and reciprocity in the ancient literature. Barclay covers some of the major expressions of gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world, including civic euergetism, Roman patronage, Jewish gift-giving as well as Seneca's perspective on gift-giving found in *De Beneficiis*. Barclay's treatment of the primary sources is sensitive and extensive, drawing widely from philosophical literature as well as the papyri and the inscriptions to test his understanding of gift-giving.[82]

This leads to Barclay's gift-giving insight, that gifts are multivalent, comprising of six different aspects.[83] These six aspects of a gift are: superabundance, motivation, timing, incongruity, efficacy, and non-circularity.[84] For Barclay, focussing solely on the reciprocity (or circularity), as those that follow Sahlins' model do, reduces a gift down to only one of six aspects that contribute to a polyvalent understanding of gifts.

Barclay's work emphasises the value of a sociological approach to the New Testament when the social-scientific method is followed.[85] Barclay develops his insights on gift-giving from a wide and careful reading of the sociological literature, as well as testing in the primary sources, which leads to a useful and fruitful re-examination of Paul's understanding of χάρις. That is, Barclay's methodological rigour produces a useful "contextual" and "anthropological" approach to gift-giving.[86] I seek to imitate this methodological rigour in the next two chapters as I build upon Barclay's understanding of gifts with further sociological insights.

---

[80] Barclay (54, fn 114) does reference both Alain Caillé and Jacques T. Godbout once, from which I will seek to give a fuller treatment of Caillé and Godbout's scholarship.

[81] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 24-51.

[82] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 24-51. The other significant work on gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world is James R. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in its Graeco-Roman Context*, WUNT II/172, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003). However, I have not addressed Harrison in this section as he does not build a gift-giving model, and does not significantly draw upon any sociological literature.

[83] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 66-78.

[84] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 70-75.

[85] Barclay describes his approach as "anthropological," see Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 4.

[86] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 3, 4.

1.2.3   Summary

This overview of the current gift-giving scholarship shows that there is a need to return to the sociological literature on gift-giving and update our understanding of gift-giving. Many scholars, following Malina's work in 1986, have not returned to consult the sociological literature published after Sahlins' research in 1972. The substantial research of Barclay has shown the way forward, which I will build upon with further sociological insights from Caillé and Godbout in Chapter Two. Moreover, Barclay tests his understanding of gifts in the extrabiblical primary sources, a practice that I will imitate in Chapter Three.

1.3   Conclusion

In this chapter, I have outlined the social-scientific approach, which involves three stages. First, an insight is developed from a thorough and wide reading of the sociological material, which is the focus of Chapter Two. Second, the sociological insight developed from the sociological literature is then tested and possibly adapted in dialogue with the extrabiblical material, which I offer Chapter Three. The combination of these two chapters set the interpretive context for understanding the Spirit as gift in Acts. Once these first two stages are complete, the third step involves using these sociological insights as a heuristic tool on selected biblical texts, opening up new questions for historical criticism to answer.

Chapter 2: Sociological Approaches to Gift-Giving

In this chapter, I complete the first stage of my methodology, which is examining the different sociological approaches to gift-giving, in which I argue that focusing on the sociability that a gift brings offers the most fruitful approach. The different sociological approaches to gift-giving can be divided into two main streams. The first of these emphasizes the reciprocity of gift and counter-gift. While this first stream garnered much support in earlier sociological studies, more recent research has raised major criticisms of a focus on reciprocity. The critics of this approach argue that defining gift-giving by its reciprocity leads to many difficulties, as reciprocity lends itself to economistic interpretations of gift-giving, which treat gifts as redundant transactions.[1] A focus on reciprocity in gift-giving can also lead to a general mistrust of selfless motives in gift-giving, as Pierre Bourdieu has argued that selfless motives create an *illusio* which hides the underlying exchange at play in gift-giving.[2] Moreover, focusing on the reciprocal elements of gift-giving at the expense of the sociability of gift-giving can lead to gifts being, as Jacques Derrida notes, "the impossible," as any counter-gift annuls the initial gift.[3] These significant limitations then lead to a gift either being redundant, an *illusio*, or the impossible.

The second significant stream of sociological research into gift-giving emphasizes the sociability that ensues between the giver and receiver through the gift. In contrast to the emphasis on reciprocity, gifts are responded to with counter-gifts in order to create, nourish and continue social relationships. Behind the concern for reciprocity in gift-giving is not the desire for economic equivalence, but rather the desire for a continuation of the social relationship. While there have been many forebears of this position,[4] the work of Alain Caillé and Jacques T. Godbout on gift-giving has shifted the focus on gift-giving to the social aspects at work in gifts.[5]

---

[1] David Cheal, *The Gift Economy* (London: Routledge, 1988), 12.

[2] Bourdieu, *The Logic Of Practice*, 98-110.

[3] Derrida, *Given Time*, 12-16, 24.

[4] For an emphasis on the social aspects of gift-giving to various degrees, see C. A. Gregory, *Gifts and Commoditites* (Chicago: Hau Books, 1982), 9-19; Jonathan Parry, "The Gift, the Indian Gift and the 'Indian Gift'," *Man* 21, no. 3 (1986): 453-469; Cheal, *The Gift Economy*, 1-22. Some scholars take a mediating approach between reciprocity and sociability, i.e. Aafke Komter, "Gifts and Social Relations: The Mechanisms of Reciprocity," *International Sociology* 22, no. 1 (2007): 93-107; Marcel Hénaff, "Ceremonial Gift-Giving: The Lessons of Anthropology from Mauss and Beyond," in *Gift in Antiquity*, ed. Michael Satlow, (New York: Wiley & Sons, 2013).

[5] Alain Caillé, *Critique de la raison utilitaire: Manifeste du MAUSS* (Paris: Éditions la Découverte, 1989); Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*; Alain Caillé, *Don, intérêt et désintéressement* (Paris: La Découverte, 1994); Jacques T. Godbout, *Le don la dette et l'identité: Homo donator vs homo œconomicus* (Montréal: Éditions la Découverte, 2000); Caillé, *Anthropologie du don*. For the related work of the "Third Paradigm" see the French Journal *Revue du M.A.U.S.S.* (especially volumes 8, 27 and 52).

In this chapter, I argue that while reciprocity is important in gift-giving, it is secondary and subordinate to the sociability of the gift. Since the research of Marcel Mauss (2.1), the sociability and reciprocity found in gift-giving has been explored, with scholars developing four main approaches.[6] First is the exchangist-structuralist approach initiated by Claude Lévi-Strauss, who defined a gift as a subset of exchange governed by the principle of reciprocity (2.2).[7] Next, and following on from Lévi-Strauss, the economistic approach to the gift sees gift-giving as a veiled economic transaction (2.3).[8] As a reaction to the economistic approach to gift-giving, there are a group of scholars that see gift-giving as either conceptually impossible or practically rare (2.4).[9] Finally, a new group of scholars starting in the 1990s have argued that what is primary in gift-giving is the sociability produced, as gifts create or sustain personal relationships (2.5).[10]

2.1   Marcel Mauss and Gift-Giving

Marcel Mauss' enigmatic *The Gift* (1925) is the most influential monograph on the subject of gifts and has set the bedrock for all future discussions on gift-giving.[11] Of the following four approaches set out below (sections 2.2, 2.3, 2.5), three claim to be the successors of Mauss' work, while the fourth, the impossible gift (section 2.4), has set itself in contrast to Mauss. In *The Gift*, two things concern Mauss, which are: "What rule of legality and self-interest, in societies of a backward or archaic type, compels the gift that has been received to be obligatorily reciprocated? What power resides in the object given that causes its recipient to pay it back?"[12] For Mauss it is the spirit of the thing, its *hau*, that compels the gift to be returned.

---

[6] I take these four different approaches to gift-giving from Alain Caillé, "'Ce qu'on appelle si mal le don…' Que le don est de l'ordre du don malgré tout," *Revue du MAUSS* 2, no. 30: 396-397.

[7] See Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, trans. J. Bell, J. von Strumer, and R. Needham, 2nd ed. (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1969); Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss*, trans. Felicity Baker (London: Routledge, 1987). Other scholars use similar methods include Georges Bataille, *The Accursed Share: An Essay on General Economy: Consumption*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Zone Books, 1988); René Girard, *The Scapegoat*, trans. Yvonne Freccero (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Universtiy Press, 1982); Maurice Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*, trans. Nora Scott (Cambridge: Polity, 1996).

[8] Most notably Bataille, *The Accursed Share*; Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*; Bourdieu, *The Logic Of Practice*.

[9] For the impossible gift see Derrida, *Given Time*; John Frow, *Time and Commodity Culture: Essays in Cultural Theory and Postmodernity* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997); Jean-Luc Nancy, *Die undarstellbare Gemeinschaft* (Stuttgart: Patricia Schwartz, 1988). For gifts as rare see Alain Testart, "Uncertainties of the 'Obligation to Reciprocate': A Critique of Mauss," in *Marcel Mauss: A Centenary Tribute*, ed. Wendy James and N. J. Allen, (1998); Alain Testart, "Échange marchand, échange non marchand," *Revue française de sociologie* 42, no. 4 (2001); Alain Testart, "What is Gift?," *HAU* 3, no. 1 (2013).

[10] Caillé, *Critique de la raison utilitaire*; Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*; Caillé, *Don, intérêt et désintéressement*; Godbout, *Le don la dette et l'identité*; Caillé, *Anthropologie du don*.

[11] Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. W. D. Halls (New York: Norton, 1990).

[12] Mauss, *The Gift*, 3.

Mauss starts his discussions on gift-giving in the first chapter of *The Gift*, describing the gift-giving practices in Polynesia.[13] In addressing the gift-giving practices in Polynesian tribes, Mauss notes a report of "capital importance" on the *hau* (spirit) of the object given, which compels the possessor of an object to return it to its original owner.[14] For Mauss it is the *hau* of the gift that, "even when it has been abandoned by the giver, it [the gift] still possesses something of him [the giver]," and that, "to accept something from somebody is to accept some part of his [the giver's] spiritual essence, of his soul."[15] Interpretations of the meaning of *hau* are varied, with scholars widely critiquing Mauss' interpretation of the *hau*.[16] At the most basic level, we can say that something of the giver of a gift goes with the gift to the receiver, and Mauss argues that it is this essence of the giver that compels the receiver to respond with a counter-gift.

After arguing that it is the *hau* that compels the counter-gift, Mauss addresses the other two of the three interlocking obligations found in the Polynesian tribes, the obligation to give and the obligation to receive. On giving and receiving in the Polynesian tribes, Mauss notes that, "to refuse to give, to fail to invite, just as to refuse to accept, is tantamount to declaring war; it is to reject the bond of alliance and commonality."[17] To refuse to give or to refuse to receive is to refuse a social and personal bond. The concept of the *hau* of a gift, and the constant movement of gifts leads to a situation where Mauss states: "everything passes to and fro as if there were a constant exchange of a spiritual matter, including things and men, between clans and individuals, distributed between social ranks, the sexes and the generations."[18] Gifts in the Polynesian tribes are the very material that help the social cohesion within tribes and between tribes.

Chapter two of *The Gift* covers the gift-giving in the Melanesian tribes and the *potlatch* (a gift-giving feast) of the North American tribes.[19] Of the Melanesian tribes, Mauss notes the trade of the *kula* (translated by Mauss as "circle"), which are objects traded amongst the chiefs of the various tribes in a "disinterested and modest way."[20] The *kula* is given at the "decisive moments" in the relationships between the chiefs, to cement the relationship.[21] Of the *potlatch* of the North American tribes, Mauss notes that the same underlying logic of gift-giving applies, with the addition of "violence,

---

[13] Mauss, *The Gift*, 8-18. Mauss also briefly addresses gifts to the gods and alms in this chapter, but subsequent sociologists rarely reference these sections when formulating an approach to the gift. For a further discussion on gifts to the gods see Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*.

[14] Mauss, *The Gift*, 10-13.

[15] Mauss, *The Gift*, 12.

[16] Lévi-Strauss, *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss*, 47-59; Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics*, 149-183; Annette B. Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 49-65.

[17] Mauss, *The Gift*, 13.

[18] Mauss, *The Gift*, 14.

[19] Mauss, *The Gift*, 19-46.

[20] Mauss, *The Gift*, 22. The *kula* "trade" is contrasted by Mauss (22) with the more mercantile *gimwali* trade.

[21] Mauss, *The Gift*, 22.

exaggeration, and antagonisms" in the gift-giving process.[22] In the *potlatch* the hosting chief would host neighbouring chiefs, performing numerous feasts and shows in order to gain standing among the visiting chiefs.[23] Moreover, the hosting chief would often destroy a great number of valuable objects, in order to show his supremacy, while also "humiliating others by placing them 'in the shadow of his name'."[24] The *potlatch* then represents, according to Mauss, an agonistic form of gift-giving, which acts as a replacement for war.

The final chapter of *The Gift* follows the three obligations (giving, receiving, returning) into various Indo-European law systems.[25] Mauss spends most of his time in the Roman and Hindu legal systems, while also briefly covering the Germanic, Celtic and Chinese law. In ancient Roman law, Mauss focuses on *nexum* (debt slavery), suggesting that the loss of status in the *potlatch* is "comparable in nature and function to the Roman *nexum*."[26] The *nexum* is the evolution of the social dynamics of gift-giving into legal contracts, with *nexum* having "residues of former obligatory gifts."[27] In this chapter, Mauss argues that we can see the transition from archaic forms of gift-giving to our law and economy through Indo-European law.

It is hard to draw definitive conclusions from Mauss' work, as by Mauss' own admission, *The Gift* is an incomplete work.[28] While Mauss does give space to some prominent examples of the three obligations, Mauss does not spend any time in other equally important sources such as Seneca's *De Beneficiis*. The incompleteness of *The Gift* leads to Mauss sketching a proto-model of gift-giving, leaving room for subsequent scholarship to finish Mauss' work in different directions. An example of this is the claim that Mauss established the principle of reciprocity,[29] but as Lygia Sigaud notes, "the word reciprocity is not itself part of the lexicon of the *Année Sociologique* article [*The Gift*]: there is only reference to reciprocal gifts, which does not correspond to the concept of reciprocity."[30] Mauss' three interlocking obligations – to give, to receive and to return – are a proto-model, which has enabled subsequent scholars to guide Mauss' model in their own directions.[31] The first scholar to

---

[22] Mauss, *The Gift*, 35.
[23] Mauss, *The Gift*, 39.
[24] Mauss, *The Gift*, 39.
[25] Mauss, *The Gift*, 47-64.
[26] Mauss, *The Gift*, 42.
[27] Mauss, *The Gift*, 48.
[28] Mauss, *The Gift*, 78-80. Also noted by Lygia Sigaud, "The Vicissitudes of *The Gift*," *Social Anthropology* 10, no. 3 (2002): 341.
[29] For example, Lévi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, 52. For this reading of Mauss' economic language see Olli Pyyhtinen, *The Gift and its Paradoxes*, ed. Stjepan Mestrovic, Classical and Contemporary Social Theory, (Surrey: Ashgate, 2014), 15-43.
[30] Sigaud, "The Vicissitudes of *The Gift*," 343.
[31] Hence three of the four approaches to gift-giving all claim to be Mauss' heir, see sections 2.2, 2.3, 2.5.

offer a compelling completed model for Mauss' incomplete interlocking obligations was Claude Lévi-Strauss.

2.2   The Exchangist-Structuralist Gift

Claude Lévi-Strauss initiated the first major stream of interpretation of Mauss' *The Gift* when he gave Mauss' three interlocking obligations a structure, the principle of reciprocity, and classified gift-giving as a subset of exchange.[32] Lévi-Strauss' interpretation of *The Gift* has been widely influential, as it takes the definition of a gift in two directions. First, Lévi-Strauss argues that a gift is the penultimate aspect of sociability, what Lévi-Strauss calls a "signifier" for the deeper "unconscious mental structures" of the human mind.[33] Second, Lévi-Strauss emphasizes that the underlying mechanism of gift-giving is the principle of reciprocity, which leads Lévi-Strauss to classify gift-giving as a subset of exchange.[34] These two directions established the "Exchangist-Structuralist" interpretation of the gift, and also laid the foundations for the more economistic interpretations of gift-giving set out in the next subsection (2.3).[35]

Lévi-Strauss addresses Mauss' *The Gift* in a chapter called "The Principle of Reciprocity" in *The Elementary Structure of Kinship* (1949).[36] According to Lévi-Strauss, *The Gift* is a "classic", which

> … sought to show that exchange in primitive societies consists not so much in economic transactions as in reciprocal gifts, that these reciprocal gifts have a far more important function in these societies than in our own, and that this primitive form of exchange is not merely nor essentially of an economic nature but is what he [Mauss] aptly calls 'a total social fact'.[37]

Here Lévi-Strauss takes the findings of *The Gift* and the study of gift-giving in an influential direction. In this passage, Lévi-Strauss implies that reciprocal gifts are the primitive form of economic transactions, and similarly, that gifts have in part an underlying economic nature. Moreover, Lévi-Strauss classifies gift-giving as a subset of exchange, a classification that Mauss was cautious to avoid.[38] These comments show a movement towards understanding gift-giving in terms of exchange

---

[32] Lévi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*; Lévi-Strauss, *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss*.
[33] Lévi-Strauss, *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss*, 55, 49.
[34] Lévi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, 52.
[35] I take the label from Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, 122-127.
[36] Lévi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, 52-68.
[37] Lévi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, 52.
[38] Mauss speaks predominately about interlocking obligations, while showing caution surrounding the language of exchange see Sigaud, "The Vicissitudes of *The Gift*," 335-341.

and understanding gifts as having in part an economic nature. Lévi-Strauss then elevates the concept of reciprocity to a principle governing all archaic forms of gift-giving, emphasizing the economic aspects of gift-giving.[39]

Lévi-Strauss' also addresses the sociability of gift-giving by arguing that gifts are the penultimate aspect of human sociability in the *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss* (1950).[40] Lévi-Strauss notes that "what happened in that essay [*The Gift*], for the first time in the history of ethnological thinking, was that an effort was made to transcend empirical observation and to reach deeper realities."[41] For Lévi-Strauss, this deeper reality is the "unconscious mental structures" of the human mind, of which gifts are a "signifier."[42] That is, gifts are an expression of the unconscious, with the unconscious mental structures being the actual basis for human sociability.[43]

Subsequent scholars have widely embraced Levi-Strauss' two movements in approaching gift-giving.[44] Numerous scholars have built on the concept of gifts as the penultimate expression of sociability, arguing for different ultimate expressions of sociability expressed through gift-giving.[45] Although not seeing himself as an heir to Lévi-Strauss, René Girard argues that the notion of sacrifice is the basis for human society, of which gift-giving is the penultimate expression.[46] More recently, Maurice Godelier argues that the twin pillars of the given (gifts) and objects that cannot be given (sacred objects) are the basis of our society.[47] The second movement, to define gift-giving as a subset of exchange, has also been widely influential, sowing the seeds for the second stream of interpreting Mauss, the economistic gift.

2.3   The Economistic Gift

One of the most common approaches to gift-giving is to view gift-giving through an economistic lens.[48] This definition of a gift is the most amenable to the modern mind, as the modern mind often

---

[39] Sigaud, "The Vicissitudes of *The Gift*," 334-345; Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*, 19-20.
[40] Lévi-Strauss, *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss*.
[41] Lévi-Strauss, *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss*, 38.
[42] Lévi-Strauss, *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss*, 49, 55.
[43] As Lévi-Strauss states, "*Hau* is not the ultimate explanation for exchange; it is the conscious form whereby men of a given society, in which the problem had particular importance, apprehended an unconscious necessity." Lévi-Strauss, *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss*, 48.
[44] For a critique of this position see the section 2.5.
[45] For example, Bataille, *The Accursed Share*, 63-77; Girard, *The Scapegoat*; Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*.
[46] Girard, *The Scapegoat*.
[47] Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*.
[48] Besides the work of Bourdieu discussed below, see Bataille, *The Accursed Share*, 63-77; Colin Camerer, "Gifts as Economic Signals and Social Symbols," *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (1988): S180-S214; Joel Waldfogel, "The Deadweight Loss of Christmas," *The American Economic Review* 83, no. 5 (1993): 1328-1336; Jonathan P. Thomas and Timothy Worrall, "Gift-Giving, Quasi-Credit and Reciprocity," *Rationality and Society* 14, no. 3 (2002): 308-352;

accepts certain presumptions about human nature due to the influence of modern economic theories.[49] This approach takes many different forms, including: applying economic theories to the practice of gift-giving,[50] categorizing gifts and commodities together,[51] or by pointing out the misdirections in gift-giving that hide the reality of exchange.[52] The economistic approach to gifts then represents one of the most common approaches to gift-giving.

This approach to the gift combines both of Lévi-Strauss' movements into one, that is, gift-giving is the penultimate expression of the (archaic) economy. Georges Bataille's research is an example of this approach, as he argues that the *potlatches* of the North American tribes had an underlying economic logic.[53] Bataille argues that gifts in the *potlatch* "constituted the archaic organization of exchange."[54] The destruction of wealth in the *potlatch* converts into rank, which Bataille sees as a sort of intangible savings, as those with higher rank can then convert this rank back into material possessions in the future. For Bataille: "*Rank* will be reduced to a commodity of exploitation, a shameless source of profits."[55] Following on from Bataille, Colin Camerer argues that the North American *potlatches* are really a "complex institution of ceremonial wealth accumulation," which acts as "insurance or credit" for the gift-givers at the potlatches.[56] This economistic understanding of the *potlatch* is contrary to Mauss' position, who argued the *potlatch* was a substitute for war.[57]

Yet this approach to gift-giving has significant limitations, as it reduces a gift to an inefficient exchange. As David Cheal has argued, scholars who approach gifts from this economistic perspective reduce gifts to "redundant transactions," that is, they do not make economic sense.[58] There are many aspects of gift-giving that make a gift economically redundant. For example, gifts are rarely the optimal use of money or time from the perspective of the receiver, as economists have long noted

---

Christian Papilloud, "Marcel Mauss, the Gift and Relational Sociology," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Relational Sociology*, ed. Francois Dépelteau, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 670-672. To a degree other scholars privilege the exchange over the social relationships created or maintained in gift-giving, for example, see Yunxiang Yan, "The Gift and Gift Economy," in *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*, ed. James G. Carrier, (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2005), 250-251.

[49] Jacques T. Godbout, "Homo Donator versus Homo Oeconomicus," in *Gifts and Interests*, ed. Antoon Vandevelde, (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 23-28.

[50] For example, Martin A. Nowak and Karl Sigmund, "Oscillations in the Evoution of Reciprocity," *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 137 (1989): 21-26; Martin A. Nowak and Karl Sigmund, "The Dynamics of Indirect Reciprocity," *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 194 (1998): 561-574.

[51] In biblical studies, see Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 34-35; Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 53-59; Crook, "Fictive Giftship and Fictive Friendship," 61-76.

[52] Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 171-183; Bourdieu, *The Logic Of Practice*, 98-110.

[53] Bataille, *The Accursed Share*, 63-77.

[54] Bataille, *The Accursed Share*, 67.

[55] Bataille, *The Accursed Share*, 75. Emphasis original.

[56] Camerer, "Gift as Economic Signals," S180, S181.

[57] Mauss, *The Gift*, 37.

[58] Cheal, *The Gift Economy*, 12.

that the best gift is the gift of cash, enabling the receiver to choose how to spend the money.[59] Gifts are also economically redundant as gifts are usually followed by counter-gifts of similar value, and so there is no net benefit to either party.[60] Gifts then rarely bring any economic advantage to the gift-giving parties and are therefore redundant transactions.

Pierre Bourdieu presents a more nuanced view of the economistic gift in *The Logic of Practice* (1980), where he argues that the delay of time between gift and counter-gift creates an *illusio* that hides the underlying exchange at play.[61] Bourdieu distinguishes the perspectives of the participants and the observers of the gift-giving, which Bourdieu labels the "subjectivist view" and the "objectivist view" respectively.[62] Bourdieu notes that these two perspectives view the gift-giving cycle in very different ways. The observer, viewing from the "objectivist" perspective, can see the general cycle of gifts and as Bourdieu states can, "develop the theory of the logic of practice."[63] The observer can map out the series of gifts given and can develop a model of the gift exchange from the observer's perspective.

This perspective is contrasted with the participants, viewing from the "subjectivist" perspective, who generally emphasize, as Bourdieu notes, "the experiential succession of gifts."[64] While the observer can see the gift exchange over a period of time, the participants, according to Bourdieu, are more focused on the immediate possibilities of the gift and are therefore either tricked by or implicitly accept the "*illusio*" of time.[65] As Bourdieu notes: "the lapse in time that separates the gift from the counter-gift is what allows the deliberate oversight, the collectively maintained and approved self-deception, without which the exchange could not function."[66] The period of time between gift and counter-gift enables the participants to believe that they are giving unprompted unilateral gifts to one another, while the observer can see behind the *illusio* of time to the exchange taking place.

Bourdieu does wrestle with the contrast between the objectivist and the subjectivist perspective, as they emphasize different aspects of the gift-giving process. Bourdieu does see some value in the participants' perspective, as they recognise the unpredictability and danger involved in gift-giving, as ingratitude, injury, misrecognition and rejection are all possible responses to a gift.[67] Yet, it is clear

---

[59] For example, see Waldfogel, "The Deadweight Loss of Christmas," 1328-1336. A point also noted by Cheal, *The Gift Economy*, 12.

[60] Cheal, *The Gift Economy*, 13. This critique does assume that the society in question does use money. Many archaic societies, like the North American tribes, did not have money.

[61] Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 98-110. The French version was first published in 1980. An earlier version of this argument is found in Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 171-183.

[62] Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 104.

[63] Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 104.

[64] Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 104.

[65] Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 104-106.

[66] Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 105.

[67] Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 105.

that Bourdieu privileges the observer's perspective over the perspective of the participant's, as he states:

> Gift exchange is one of the social games that cannot be played unless the players refuse to acknowledge the objective truth of the game, the very truth that objective analysis brings to light, and unless they are predisposed to contribute, with their efforts, their marks of care and attention, and their time, to the production of collective misrecognition.[68]

Bourdieu privileges the observer's perspective, as it avoids the collective misrecognition of the underlying economic exchange at play in gift and counter-gift.

While Bourdieu helpfully notes the different perspectives of the observer and the participants in gift-giving, numerous scholars have critiqued his understanding of gift-giving as overly economistic.[69] Bourdieu's labelling of the observer's viewpoint as the "objectivist" perspective is problematic, as observers from modern capitalistic countries can superimpose modern economic theories onto ancient gift-giving practices. Godbout highlights the difference between modern and archaic societies when he states that: "archaic societies were not obsessed by material scarcity and … material accretion was not their primary concern. Besides, the obligation to give runs counter to what accumulation demands. Economic interpretations of the gift necessarily imply either a lack of awareness or hypocrisy on the part of primitive people."[70] Bourdieu's privileging of the observer's perspective over the participants perspective leads to a focus on material scarcity and economic interest while also leading to a distrust of non-economic motivations for giving a gift.

It is important to note that while purely disinterested gifts are quite rare, the presence of (self-) interest does not imply an underlying economic exchange. Many modern-day observers will assume the rational choice theory, which simply states that each person acts in their own economic self-interest. This assumption then paints gifts given without an expectation of a return as being "irrational" and a part of the *illusio* of gift-giving. Put simply, modern observers can easily dismiss selfless gift-giving

---

[68] Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 105-106.

[69] For example, see the critiques from Cheal, *The Gift Economy*, 20-22; Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, 120-121; William H. Sewell, "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation," *American Journal of Sociology* 98, no. 1 (1992): 15-21; Jeffrey C. Alexander, *Fin de Siécle Social Theory: Relativism, Reduction, and the Problem of Reason* (London: Verso, 1995), 129-202; T. M. S. Evens, "Bourdieu and the Logic of Practice: Is All Giving Indian-Giving or is 'Generalized Materialism' Not Enough?," *Sociological Theory* 17, no. 1 (1999): 22-25; Alain Caillé, "The Double Inconceivability of the Pure Gift," *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities* 6, no. 2 (2001): 24-28; Philip Smith, "Marcel Proust as Successor and Precursor to Pierre Bourdieu: A Fragment," *Thesis Eleven* 79 (2004): 106; Ilana F. Silber, "Bourdieu's Gift to Gift Theory: An Unacknowledged Trajectory," *Sociological Theory* 27, no. 2 (2009): 176; Philippe Chanial, "Bourdieu, a Paradoxal "Inheritor"?," *Revue du MAUSS* 2, no. 36 (2010): 484-490; Camil Ungureanu, "Bourdieu and Derrida on Gift: Beyond 'Double Truth' and Paradox," *Human Studies* 36, no. 3 (2013): 395-398.

[70] Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, 121.

because of the modern economic theories they accept, theories reliant on the universality of economic self-interest. Yet as Beate Wagner-Hasel states, gift-giving is "not invariably directed toward attaining economic advantage and thus was not always [economically] self-interested."[71] Not all interest in gift-giving is economic, as the interest in gift-giving can be social, i.e. wanting the social connection to continue and grow.

Other scholars have questioned Bourdieu's claim that the delay of time between gift and counter-gift is present to mask the objective truth of gift-giving being a form of exchange.[72] Cheal notes that there are many situations where people give gifts simultaneously (e.g. Christmas), which directly counters Bourdieu's arguments on the delay of time.[73] In other gift-giving scenarios, returning a gift immediately does not, as Bourdieu claims, expose the mechanism of exchange behind gift-giving,[74] but rather returning a gift immediately equates to a refusal of the relationship.[75]

These critiques then show the limitations to the Bourdieu's approach to gift-giving. Bourdieu minimizes the social implications of gift-giving, reducing gifts to their economic function, while also ignoring or downplaying the social bonds that are created or maintained in the gift-giving cycle. Moreover, Bourdieu's approach also enables the observer to dismiss any claims to disinterestedness as part of the collective misrecognition of gift-giving. This economistic approach to gift-giving has led to an initial critique by scholars who, accepting the underlying premise of the economistic approach, note the endpoint of this premise, which is that gifts are then impossible.

2.4   The Impossible Gift

The third approach to gift-giving encompasses those who claim that true gift-giving is either impossible or very rare.[76] This position could be understood as an initial critique of the overly economistic understanding of gift-giving, an approach that Cheal notes ends up treating gifts like

---

[71] Beate Wagner-Hasel, "Egoistic Exchange and Altruistic Gift: On the Roots of Marcel Mauss's Theory of the Gift," in *Negotiating the Gift: Pre-Modern Figuration of Exchange*, ed. Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner, and Bernhard Jussen, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 148. See also Antoon Vandevelde, "Towards a Conceptual Map of Gift Practices," in *Gifts and Interests*, ed. Antoon Vandevelde, (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 2-3; Caillé, "Ce qu'on appelle si mal le don…," 400.

[72] Cheal, *The Gift Economy*, 20-22; Vandevelde, "Towards a Conceptual Map of Gift Practices," 2; Chanial, "Bourdieu, a Paradoxal "Inheritor"?," 487-489.

[73] Cheal, *The Gift Economy*, 20-22.

[74] Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 105.

[75] Vandevelde, "Towards a Conceptual Map of Gift Practices," 2-3.

[76] Derrida, *Given Time*, 12-16; Frow, *Time and Commodity Culture*, 102-109; Nancy, *Die undarstellbare Gemeinschaft*. Others argue that gifts are not impossible, but very rare, see Testart, "Uncertainties of the 'Obligation to Reciprocate'," 97-110; Testart, "Échange marchand, échange non marchand," 719-748; Testart, "What is Gift?," 249-261.

redundant transactions.[77] Indeed if gift-giving is simply an archaic type of economic exchange, then there is no difference between a gift and a commodity. If a gift is simply a disguised commodity, then it is possible to argue that a counter-gift cancels out the initial gift. A gift is then annulled by the counter-gift, leaving the gift not just as a redundant transaction, but rather a conceptual impossibility.

This position is best illustrated by Jacques Derrida who in *Given Time* (1992) argues that as soon as a gift appears or is conceived of as a gift by the giver or the receiver, the gift becomes "the impossible."[78] Derrida accepts the basic premise of the economistic approach to the gift, that gifts are disguised commodities, and takes this premise to its logical conclusion. As Derrida states: "the gift is annulled in the economic odyssey of the circle as soon as it appears *as* gift or as soon as it signifies *itself as* gift."[79] This leads Derrida to comment on Mauss by saying that: "*The Gift* speaks of everything but the gift: It deals with economy, exchange, contract (*do ut des*), it speaks of raising the stakes, sacrifice, gift *and* counter-gift – in short, everything that in the thing itself impels the gift *and* the annulment of the gift."[80] As Mauss, according to Derrida, did not address the concept of gift, Derrida chooses to depart from the work of sociologists, rather, choosing to approach gift-giving from a linguistic perspective.[81] The linguistic approach to gift-giving does support the economistic perspective on gift-giving, as giving can refer both to giving gifts or giving commodities.

Yet Derrida goes further than other critiques of the economistic approach, arguing that the rituals that people perform in the process of gift-giving "produce the annulment, the annihilation, the destruction of the gift."[82] Derrida bases his conclusions on four arguments, with the first being that the gift must be given first, not in return for a previous gift, and that givers must give with no return expected.[83] That is, if a receiver gives a counter-gift, then the initial gift is annulled. Second, Derrida argues that the recipient of a gift can "not *recognize* the gift as a gift," which would lead the recipient to acknowledge the debt they have accepted in accepting a gift.[84] As Derrida notes, "The simple identification of the gift seems to destroy it."[85] Third, Derrida applies this same logic to the giver of the gift, who cannot understand the gift as a gift, which could lead to self-congratulation.[86] Fourth,

---

[77] Cheal, *The Gift Economy*, 12.

[78] Derrida, *Given Time*, 5, 10, 29.

[79] Derrida, *Given Time*, 24. Emphasis original.

[80] Derrida, *Given Time*, 24. Emphasis original.

[81] Derrida, *Given Time*, 11-12.

[82] Derrida, *Given Time*, 12.

[83] Derrida, *Given Time*, 12-13.

[84] Derrida, *Given Time*, 14. Emphasis original.

[85] Derrida, *Given Time*, 14.

[86] Derrida, *Given Time*, 13-14. Derrida states, "If he recognizes it as gift, if the gift appears to him as such, if the present is present to him as present, this simple recognition suffices to annul the gift. Why? Because it gives back, in the place, let us say, of the thing itself, a symbolic equivalent." For a practical example of a truly unilateral gift not being recognized as a gift see Parry, "The Gift, the Indian Gift and the 'Indian Gift'," 462; James Laidlaw, "A Free Gift Makes No Friends," *Royal Anthropological Institute* 6, no. 4 (2000): 618-619.

and building on the previous statements, as soon as the giver or receiver perceive a gift as a gift, the gift no longer can be a gift, as this recognition annuls the gift.[87] Derrida then summarizes his argument by saying that "for there to be gift, it is necessary that the gift not even appear, that it not be perceived or received as a gift."[88] A gift is paradoxical to the point of impossibility as soon as it is acknowledged as a gift by giver or receiver.

Derrida's argument helpfully shows the endpoint of the economistic approach to gift-giving, yet Derrida's position is also subject to critique.[89] First, scholars have noted that Derrida always equates interest with economic motives.[90] Camil Ungureanu argues that in equating interest (or conditionality or intent) with economic interest "Derrida stretches the borders of the economic so widely that it becomes a catch-all concept."[91] As with Bourdieu, Derrida equates all interest with economic motives, not considering that other non-economic factors could motivate interest in the gift-giving process.

Second, scholars have critiqued Derrida for abandoning the sociological work on gift-giving in favour of a linguistic approach.[92] Derrida shows suspicion in the sociological research on gift-giving, and yet does not apply this same suspicion to a linguistic approach, but rather states "let us still entrust ourselves to this semantic precomprehension of the word 'gift' in our language or in a few familiar languages."[93] Derrida shows scepticism towards sociological research, and yet does not apply this same suspicion to the linguistic approach. As Alain Caillé has pointedly countered: "Following his [Derrida's] exaggerated suspicion, such a trust in language is indeed surprising. Why would language, our language, not lie? Is it because it would be assured of a direct access to Being? We would be so lucky to lay claim to this language!"[94] Caillé notes that Derrida's acceptance of the linguistic over

---

[87] Derrida, *Given Time*, 14-15.
[88] Derrida, *Given Time*, 16. Derrida notes that the only way to ensure a true unilateral gift would be to suspend time!
[89] There are a multitude of critiques on Derrida's position, the following critique will be based upon the work of Jean-Louis Cherlonneix, "Lettre ouverte a Marcel Mauss touchant le désintéressement, Jacques Derrida et l'esprit de Dieu," *Revue du MAUSS* 2, no. 2 (1993): 127-142; Caillé, "The Double Inconceivability of the Pure Gift," 23-39; Stephen A. Tyler, "'Even Steven,' or 'No Strings Attached'," in *The Enigma of Gift and Sacrifice*, ed. Edith Wyschogrod, Jean-Joseph Goux, and Eric Boynton, (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002), 77-80; Marcel Hénaff, "The Aporia of Pure Giving and the Aim of Reciprocity On Derrida's *Given Time*," in *Derrida and the Time of the Political*, ed. Pheng Cheah and Suzanne Guerlac, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009), 215-234; Ungureanu, "Bourdieu and Derrida on Gift," 403-407; Jason W. Alvis, *Marion and Derrida on The Gift and Desire: Debating the Generosity of Things*, ed. Nicolas de Warren and Dermot Moran, Contributions To Phenomenology, (Cham: Springer 2016), 155-177, 179-197.
[90] Caillé, "The Double Inconceivability of the Pure Gift," 32, 34-36; Frank Adloff and Steffen Mau, "Giving Social Ties, Reciprocity in Modern Society," *European Journal of Sociology* 47, no. 1 (2006): 108; Ungureanu, "Bourdieu and Derrida on Gift," 403-404.
[91] Ungureanu, "Bourdieu and Derrida on Gift," 403-404. Also noted by Laidlaw, "A Free Gift Makes No Friends," 622.
[92] Caillé, "The Double Inconceivability of the Pure Gift," 29-30; Tyler, "'Even Steven,' or 'No Strings Attached'," 77-80.
[93] Derrida, *Given Time*, 12.
[94] Caillé, "The Double Inconceivability of the Pure Gift," 30.

sociological then removes Derrida's research from the sociological research on real-life gift-giving practices.

Derrida's arguments show the ultimate end of the economistic approach to the gift, as the economistic gift becomes "the impossible." However, this leaves us in a bind, as we know people still give gifts (and are therefore not practically impossible), and that people usually give counter-gifts in response to gifts (seemingly confirming the economistic approach). Godbout summarises this bind as: "If the gift and the counter-gift are unequal, then there's a winner and a loser, and possibly exploitation and trickery. If, on the other hand, they are the same, then there's apparently no difference between the gift and a rational, self-interested mercantile exchange."[95] Is there a way out of this double bind? The fourth approach to gift-giving, focusing on the sociability of gifts, seeks to escape this bind by moving the primary focus from the reciprocity involved in gift-giving to the sociability that ensues from gift-giving.

2.5   The Sociability of Gift-Giving

The final approach to gift-giving stands in contrast to the three previous interpretations, by arguing that reciprocity in gift-giving is a secondary matter; rather, the sociability that ensues from a gift is primary. This approach to gift-giving has had many forebears,[96] but has become a prominent approach to gift-giving through the material published in the journal the *Revue du MAUSS (the Movement for Anti-Utilitarianism in the Social-Sciences)* and, most notably, the work of Alain Caillé and Jacques T. Godbout.[97] These scholars seek to counter, from their perspective, an overly utilitarian approach to the social sciences, choosing gift-giving as their primary subject from which to critique utilitarianism.[98]

Concerning the structuralism of Lévi-Strauss, these scholars argue that rather than being the penultimate aspect of sociability, gifts are the ultimate aspect of sociability.[99] That is, gifts are

---

[95] Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, 5.

[96] For an emphasis on the social aspects of gift-giving to various degrees, see Gregory, *Gifts and Commoditites*, 9-19; Parry, "The Gift, the Indian Gift and the 'Indian Gift'," 453-469; Cheal, *The Gift Economy*, 1-22. Some scholars take a mediating approach between reciprocity and sociability, e.g. Komter, "Gifts and Social Relations," 93-107.

[97] See volumes 8, 27, and 52 of *Revue du MAUSS* for their ongoing discussions on gift-giving. The major monographs published by Caillé and Godbout on gift-giving are, Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*; Caillé, *Don, intérêt et désintéressement*; Caillé, *Anthropologie du don*; Godbout, *Le don la dette et l'identité*.

[98] It is worth noting the dual meanings of utilitarianism at play, as utilitarianism has a different meaning at a popular level compared to its use in an academic environment. For the Caillé and Godbout's use of the term "utilitarianism" see Myriam D. Maayan, "Political Ambiguity of Contemporary French Anti-Utilitarianism: The Example of MAUSS," *French Politics and Society* 13, no. 4 (1995): 51-53.

[99] Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, 9, 18-20; Alain Caillé, "Gift and Association," in *Gifts and Interests*, ed. Antoon Vandevelde, (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 47-50.

symbolic objects for the social connection between the giver and the receiver. As Godbout states: "the gift is a symbol for, and in some sense a manifestation of, personal relationships – that it is a catalyst and an outward sign of elective affinities," and perhaps more broadly, "the gift is nothing less than the embodiment of the system of interpersonal social relations."[100] Caillé offers a similar definition of a gift as: "every allowance of goods or services made without a guarantee of return, with a view to creating, maintaining or regenerating the social bond. In the relationship of gift, the bond is more important than the [material] good."[101] Gifts are then the symbolic embodiment and the physical manifestation of personal relationships.

Some take this further, arguing that gifts not only make social ties between people, but gifts also are the basis for all societies.[102] For example, Godbout understands the universality of gifts in two ways: "First, the gift concerns all societies and, second, it concerns each society in its entirety."[103] Gift-giving is seen not only as the action that binds people together but also as the action that creates and nourishes society.[104] This extension of the sociability of gift-giving has been critiqued, as some scholars argue the opposite, that society makes gifts.[105] It is beyond the scope of this thesis to seek to resolve the question of the extent to which gift-giving serves to form and maintain a society in general. Instead, the key insight of this approach for the purposes of this thesis is that gifts have an inherent sociability and have an important role to play in the binding of communities together.

Arguing that gifts are symbolic of the personal tie between the giver and receiver does create some difficulties in the modern context, as not all gifts in modern societies establish social ties. For example, numerous gifts – modern philanthropy, donations of blood and organ donations – do not create a social tie between the giver and the receiver. Godbout has explored the literature concerning organ donations and the unpayable debt that some recipients of organ donations feel.[106] Moreover, Richard Titmuss has contrasted the difference between the USA and UK systems of collecting blood,

---

[100] Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, 9, 18. Elsewhere Godbout states (20), "Any exchange of goods or services with no [legal] guarantee of recompense in order to create, nourish, or recreate social bonds between people is a gift. … the gift, as a form of circulation of goods that promotes social bonding, represents a key element in any society."
[101] Caillé, "Gift and Association," 47.
[102] Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, 11.
[103] Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, 11.
[104] Interestingly, Cicero and Seneca have a similar perspective on gift-giving, see sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3.
[105] There seems to be an ongoing discussion between the relationship between society and relations, of which Godbout sees relations (through gifts) making society, which is also supported by Osmo Kivinen and Tero Piiroinen, "Toward Pragmatist Methodological Relationalism: From Philosophizing Sociology to Sociologizing Philosophy," *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 36, no. 2 (2006): 303-329; François Dépelteau, "What is the Direction of the Relational Turn?," in *Conceptualizing Relational Sociology: Ontological and Theoretical Issues*, ed. Christopher Powell and François Dépelteau, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 163-186. For those that argue that society makes relations, see Pierpaolo Donati, *Relational Sociology: A New Paradigm for the Social Sciences* (London: Routledge, 2011); Papilloud, "Marcel Mauss, the Gift and Relational Sociology," 670.
[106] Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, 87-91; Godbout, *Le don la dette et l'identité*, 81-85; Jacques T. Godbout, "Le don au-delà de la dette," *Revue du MAUSS* 1, no. 27 (2006): 93-103.

noting that treating blood donations as gifts works better than treating them as commodities.[107] While these explanations do show some aspects of sociability that come from these modern gifts to strangers, there is some difficulty with the insistence that all gift-giving practices in the modern world are motivated by sociability. Yet, as gifts to strangers (who remain strangers) is a modern phenomenon and is not present in the Greco-Roman world, this critique is not directly relevant to the present study.

Second, and against the economistic approach to gift-giving, these scholars argue that reciprocity is a secondary issue, subordinate to the sociability of the gift.[108] As Godbout notes: "Reciprocity is important, but it is not what is essential about the gift, and it inevitably leads back to the dominant [economistic] paradigm. It is only by the presence of the gift principle [or a focus on sociability] that the norm of reciprocity is not absorbed by the principle of equivalence."[109] Basing a gift on the conception of reciprocity leads to the economistic understanding of reciprocity, and as such, moving the conception of gift-giving to its sociability moderates the economistic approach to gift-giving. If the main purpose of gift-giving is to establish social-ties, then reciprocity is important for the continuation of the social connection, not for reasons of economic equivalence.

This observation is the main critique that Caillé has of Bourdieu and Derrida, as both Bourdieu and Derrida consider all interest or intent in gift-giving to be indicative of economic interest.[110] Yet this assumption of interest equating to economic interest is clearly influenced by our modern economic theories, as historian Gadi Algazi states:

> The rise of market exchange… has modified all social relations and, more specifically, deeply shaped our understanding of reciprocity. On the one hand, it imposed its categories on the way we think about reciprocity (a calculus of benefits underlying exchange between independent and sovereign subjects), thus smuggling through the backdoor notions of *homo oeconomicus*. … An alternative account would take as its point of departure not reciprocity but *interdependence* as a deep structure of social life, challenging directly the notion that society consists of self-sufficient and autonomous subjects.[111]

---

[107] Richard M. Titmuss, *The Gift Relationship: From Human Blood to Social Policy* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1970).
[108] Godbout, "Homo Donator versus Homo Oeconomicus," 40-42.
[109] Godbout, "Homo Donator versus Homo Oeconomicus," 40.
[110] Caillé, "The Double Inconceivability of the Pure Gift," 34-36.
[111] Gadi Algazi, "Some Problems with Reciprocity," *ÉNDOXA* 15 (2002): 48-49. Emphasis original. For similar statements see Alan D. Schrift, "Introduction: Why Gift?," in *The Logic of the Gift: Toward an Ethic of Generosity*, ed. Alan D. Schrift, (London: Routledge, 1997), 19-21.

Rather than seeing reciprocity as the primary factor in gift-giving, these scholars see the continuation of social ties as the motivation behind considerations of reciprocity.

Taking the focus away from the term reciprocity is helpful, as there does seem to be a dual meaning in the term reciprocity used in discussions on gift-giving. On the one hand, reciprocity is used by economists used to describe any form of exchange, or it can be used exclusively in the realm of gift-giving by anthropologists. As Stephen Gudeman notes:

> For economists, reciprocity refers to two-directional exchanges; a market trade is reciprocal. Anthropologists use reciprocity for a more restricted set of practices. They reserve it for noncash, nonmarket exchanges and set it in opposition to the trade of commodities for cash. Often anthropologists equate reciprocity with the gift on the argument that a gift obligates the recipient to offer a return setting in motion a temporal, lasting cycle of obligations, which is reciprocity. … Sometimes anthropologists avoid the term *gift*, however, because in a market economy gift has the connotation 'without obligation' … [In summary] For economists, there are no free lunches; for anthropologists there are no free gifts.[112]

It is important to stress here that although the scholars that focus on the sociability of gift-giving define gifts by their non-reciprocity, they are referencing the economist's understanding of reciprocity.[113] That is, there is no *legal* obligation to reciprocate gifts, however, there may be a *moral* obligation to reciprocate.

Numerous authors who focus on the sociability of gift-giving have noted the harmful effects of unilateral gifts.[114] Antoon Vandevelde notes that unilateral gifts can easily be "paternalistic," involving overtones of "instrumentalism," and that unilateral gifts can often "create dependence and passivity of its beneficiaries."[115] Likewise, Caillé notes that unilateral gifts are "sacrificial [*sacrificiel*]" and they ultimately deny the existence of the other person.[116] As Mary Douglas, commenting on *The Gift*, states:

> It is not merely that there are no free gifts in a particular place… it is that the whole idea of a free gift is based on a misunderstanding. There should not be any free gift. What is wrong with the so-called free gift is the donor's intention to be exempt from return gifts coming

---

[112] Stephen Gudeman, "Postmodern Gifts," in *Postmodernism, Economics and Knowledge*, ed. Stephen Cullenberg, Jack Amariglio, and David F. Ruccio, (London: Routledge, 2001), 460.

[113] For the dual understandings of reciprocity at play, see Gudeman, "Postmodern Gifts," 460.

[114] For example, Vandevelde, "Towards a Conceptual Map of Gift Practices," 7, 19; Caillé, "Ce qu'on appelle si mal le don…," 395; Mary Douglas, "Foreword," in *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Scoieties*, ed. Marcel Mauss, (New York: Norton, 1990), vii; Laidlaw, "A Free Gift Makes No Friends," 618.

[115] Vandevelde, "Towards a Conceptual Map of Gift Practices," 7, 7, 19.

[116] Caillé, "Ce qu'on appelle si mal le don…," 395.

from the recipient. Refusing requital puts the act of giving outside any mutual ties. The public is not deceived by free gift vouchers. For all the ongoing commitment the free-gift gesture has created, it might just as well never happened. … A gift that does nothing to enhance solidarity is a contradiction.[117]

Douglas notes that a gift's purpose is to produce and sustain solidarity and mutual ties, and so, non-reciprocity is undesirable because it harms the social relation. Unilateral gifts are harmful and not ideal precisely because they harm the social connection. Although reciprocity is present in gift-giving, its importance lies in the creation or continuation of the social connection.

Third, and against the position of Bourdieu, these scholars value the perspective of the participants over the perspective of the observer.[118] This approach has been labelled the "embedded" approach, as it seeks to value the words of the participants, and indeed argues gifts are incomprehensible without the perspective of the participants. This approach does not mean that the perspective of the observer is not of worth, as the observer can make valuable observations. Instead, the privileging of the observer's perspective over that of the participants' perspective can lead to conclusions that directly contradict the testimony of the gift-giving participants. This position does have its limitations, as it may lead to an excessively positive portrayal of gift-giving while remaining oblivious to underlying exploitation or manipulation at play in gift-giving.[119] There remains a tension here between accepting the actions and words of the gift-giving parties and detecting unsaid exploitation or manipulation at play within the gift-giving.

In summary, since Mauss' *The Gift*, defining a gift has gravitated towards one of two concepts: reciprocity and sociability. First, Lévi-Strauss' interpretation of Mauss created the exchangist-structuralist approach, while also providing the framework for the economistic approach to gift-giving. Yet, as Derrida has shown, approaching gift-giving from the assumption that any interest indicates economic interest leaves the gift as a veiled commodity and ultimately a conceptual impossibility. Second, and seeking to escape the bind that the economistic approach creates, Caillé and Godbout argue that gifts create or sustain social relationships, with reciprocity being secondary and subordinate to the sociability of a gift. Focusing on the sociability of gifts then offers a way out of the economistic bind, as moving the emphasis from reciprocity to sociability leads the conceptualization of gift-giving away from economistic conclusions. A gift is then the symbolic

---

[117] Douglas, "Foreword," vii.
[118] Godbout and Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, 121-122.
[119] Harrison argues that the benefaction inscriptions can be overly positive, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 170.

expression and material manifestation of social relations, with gift-giving creating or sustaining these relationships.

2.6   Conclusion

In the light of the recent work by Caillé and Godbout, we should question the validity of defining gift-giving within a taxonomy of reciprocity, as there are numerous limitations with this approach.[120] Situating gift-giving within a taxonomy of reciprocity easily leads to an economistic understanding of gift-giving, where gifts are reduced to redundant transactions. Moreover, the dual uses of the term "reciprocity", used in significantly different ways by economists and anthropologists, means that even when the anthropological version of reciprocity is used, there is still a risk of misunderstanding from those presuming an economistic understanding of reciprocity.[121] For the purposes of this study, the sociability of gift-giving is crucial. Reciprocity is a secondary issue in gift-giving, with a focus on reciprocity often leading away from the primary function of gift-giving, that is, the sociability of gift-giving.

Moving forward, I see the focus on the sociability of gifts as the most appropriate for this thesis. Focusing on the sociability of gifts ensures the modern economic assumptions are not super-imposed onto gifts in the Greco-Roman world. This focus, while not denying the existence of voluntary (or anthropological) reciprocity, sees reciprocity as a secondary matter. Reciprocity is a secondary issue, dependent on the sociability of gifts. Moreover, I see this emphasis on the sociability of the gift as reflecting the emphasis of Greek and Latin writers' perspective on gifts, to which I turn in Chapter Three. Gifts to strangers (who remain strangers) is a modern phenomenon, as the Greco-Roman world did not practice gift-giving to strangers who were intended to remain strangers.[122]

Moreover, the "embedded" approach, which values the perspective of the participants over the observer's perspective, ensures that unmerited suspicion is not cast onto the testimony of the

---

[120] See section 1.2.1 for the biblical scholars that use Sahlins' taxonomy of reciprocity.

[121] This point is especially important for the discussion surrounding χάρις and reciprocity in Pauline studies. Harrison does not define reciprocity, and so we must question what version of reciprocity Harrison uses (economistic or anthropological?), see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*. Barclay (575) is clearer in his definition of reciprocity, following the anthropological understanding, however, I am concerned with how Barclay's language could be misinterpreted by those presuming an economistic understanding of reciprocity (and unaware of its difference to the anthropological understanding), see Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 575.

[122] There are gifts in the Greco-Roman where the participants are initially strangers, e.g. ξένοι is the gift of hospitality to a stranger, but this gift of hospitality is given in order to establish a relationship. This gift-giving is contrasted with the blood donations in our modern world, where the gift of blood does not establish a relationship between the giver and receiver. Gifts to strangers who remain strangers was very rare in the Greco-Roman world, possibly only found in alms, for example, see Anneliese Parkin, "'You do him no service': An Exploration of Pagan Almsgiving," in *Poverty in the Roman World*, ed. Margaret Atkins and Robin Osborne, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 60-82.

participants. Historians have used the embedded approach, and it is becoming more popular when exploring gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world.[123] One of the first to take this approach is Paul Veyne, who in *Bread and Circuses* (1976) shows considerable nuance in addressing the difference between Romans and Greeks which manifested itself in the difference between Roman patronage and civic benefaction.[124] More recently, Gadi Algazi emphasizes the central importance of cultural embeddedness in addressing gift-giving in history, and states that: "gifts are not given, fixed entities, but contested constructions of social transactions."[125] Likewise, in the introductory chapter of the collaborative book *Gift Giving and the "Embedded" Economy in the Ancient World* (2014), Filippo Calà and Maja Gori note that the embedded approach "seems indeed to be at least the most useful from a historical perspective, since it does not postulate necessary mechanisms and allows analyzing gift in its social, economic and cultural 'embeddedness'."[126] The embedded approach is then the most fruitful approach to gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world. In the next chapter, I turn to the Greek and Latin sources on the topic of gift-giving, in order to test the hypothesis that the sociability of gift-giving is more important than reciprocity.

---

[123] For the embedded approach to gift-giving, see in varying degrees, Veyne, *Bread and Circuses*; Algazi, "Some Problems with Reciprocity," 43-50; Gadi Algazi, "Doing Things with Gifts," in *Negotiating the Gift: Pre-Modern Figuration of Exchange*, ed. Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner, and Bernhard Jussen, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 10-18; *Gift Giving and the "Embedded" Economy in the Ancient World*, ed. Filippo Carlà and Maja Gori (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2014), passim.

[124] Veyne, *Bread and Circuses*. The French version was first published in 1976.

[125] Algazi, "Doing Things with Gifts," 10. Algazi (13, 18) also clearly distinguishes between gifts and the market, and elsewhere Algazi (14) states, "In all of them [eras], gift exchange was neither the sole nor necessarily the dominant transaction mode; they were all stratified societies, familiar with both political authority and market exchange. In none of them [eras], however, has monetary market exchange become the dominant mode of conveying objects and services and of conceiving social relationships."

[126] Filippo Carlà and Maja Gori, "Introduction," in *Gift Giving and the "Embedded" Economy in the Ancient World*, ed. Filippo Carlà and Maja Gori, (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2014), 14.

Chapter 3: Gifts in the Greco-Roman World

In this chapter, I "test" the sociological insight developed in the previous chapter, that sociability rather than reciprocity is the fundamental basis for gift-giving, for applicability in the Greco-Roman world. In order to do this, I examine a selection of Greek and Latin authors on the topic of gifts, seeking to understand the emphases these authors place on the concepts of reciprocity and sociability in relation to gift-giving.[1] Previous scholars commenting on gift-giving in the primary sources have, to various degrees, noted the importance of the sociability of gift-giving.[2] G. W. Peterman, when covering the language of giving and receiving (δόσις καὶ λῆμψις) in the Greco-Roman world, notes that "social reciprocity played an integral part in the conventions that dominated inter-personal relationships."[3] Likewise, when John M. G. Barclay examines gift-giving in the ancient Mediterranean world, he concludes that the "unanimous ancient assumption [is] that the point of gifts is to create social ties."[4] In agreement with these findings, in this chapter I build upon these conclusions seeking further proof that sociability rather than reciprocity is the fundamental basis of gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world.

This chapter has two sections. In the first section, I give a brief overview of the use of δωρεά in the Greek literature, noting the implicit sociability conveyed by the use of this term, which is the specific noun used for the Spirit as gift in Acts (3.1). In the second section, I focus on the sociability of *beneficiis* in Latin literature (3.2). While this chapter is not an exhaustive study of the sociability of gifts in the Greek and Latin literature, it will be sufficiently representative to demonstrate that sociability was a major concern in the giving of gifts in the Greco-Roman world, and to provide a platform for evaluating the relative importance of sociability and reciprocity.

In this chapter, I focus on the use of δωρεά and *beneficiis* in the literary works from predominately the 1st century CE. In excluding the inscriptions and the papyri from this study, I recognise that

---

[1] For other scholars that address the gift-giving in the primary sources, see Frederick W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis: Clayton, 1982); G. W. Peterman, *Paul's Gift from Philippi: Conventions of Gift Exchange and Christian Giving*, SNTSMS, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 51-89; Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, passim; Briones, *Paul's Financial Policy*, 25-53; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 24-51. While other address more specifically patronage, for example, Stephan Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor: Reciprocity, Strategy and Theological Reflection in Paul's Collection* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2000).

[2] Peterman, *Paul's Gift from Philippi*, 51-89; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 24-51. Harrison (345) focusses on "the first-century benefaction context of grace," drawing significantly on the inscriptions for civic euergetism, which I will admit does not display the sociability of a gift very well, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 345.

[3] Peterman, *Paul's Gift from Philippi*, 88. Peterman's use of "social reciprocity" seems to combine the two bases of gift-giving (reciprocity and sociability) into one.

[4] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 51.

inscriptions in particular can be useful, as they are public in nature and so provide the common usage of language.[5] Nevertheless, when inquiring about the philosophical underpinnings of gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world, I see literary sources as more readily revealing the mechanics of gift-giving compared to the often formulaic inscriptions.[6] The literary work of historians and philosophers provides a greater context and therefore a more nuanced view of gift-giving when compared with the inscriptional evidence. Likewise, while the papyri do give useful insights to the gift-giving of the non-elite, they are geographically confined to Judea and Egypt.[7] Therefore, I have chosen to rely on the literature of historians and philosophers to examine the awareness of the sociability inherent in gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world.

3.1   Gifts and Sociability in the Greek Literature

The Greek literature shows an awareness of the sociability of gift-giving. As early as Hesiod (7th-8th century BCE), the sociability of gifts is alluded to, as Hesiod states: "Be friendly to your friend, and go visit those who visit you. And give to him who gives and do not give to him who does not give."[8] In this maxim, Hesiod connects friendship, social intercourse and gift-giving. For Hesiod, one of the distinguishing features of friendship is gift-giving. It is proper to give to your friends, but not appropriate to give to those who do not give to you. On the surface, this could imply that reciprocity is the basis for gift-giving, but the context of friendship and visitation indicates the relationship implicit in the gift-giving is primary. Greek philosophers, starting with Aristotle, often emphasised the sociability of gifts and their effect on society.[9]

The two main groups of Greek nouns for a gift are the χαρ- root group and the various nouns related to δίδωμι. The χαρ- root is a pivotal word in the Apostle Paul's lexicon, and so the major monographs

---

[5] For example, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 26. As Harrison (26) states, "the inscriptions provide us with a rich semantic domain that was accessible to the wider Graeco-Roman public," and so Harrison prefers the inscriptional over the literary evidence when determining the common usage of Koine Greek.

[6] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 170. Harrison (170), when discussing the honorific inscriptions regarding χάρις, notes "the important corrective provided by the literary evidence (especially the popular philosophers) to the excessively positive tone of the honorific inscriptions." While there are a wide variety of inscriptions, which reveal all type of internal rivalries and dissensions (i.e. the dynamics of sociability), I have chosen to focus on literary sources for two reasons. First, this thesis is focussed on Acts 2 and not on Greco-Roman gift-giving practices, and so for reason of space constraints, I could not address both the literary and inscriptional evidence. Second, I have favoured the literary over the inscriptional, as I see the literary sources more directly addressing the dynamics of gift-giving. For recent research into the connectivity implied in inscriptions, see John S. Kloppenborg, "Occupational Guilds and Cultic Associations in Ostia Antica: Patronage, Mobility, Connectivity", in *Roman Imperial Cities in the East and in Central-Southern Italy*, Ancient Cities 1, ed. N. Andrade et al (Rome: L'Erma Di Bretschneider, 2019), 411-414.

[7] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 28.

[8] Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 342-360 (Most, LCL)

[9] For Aristotle on the sociability of gifts, see Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 8.1.1-2, 8.2.3-4, 8.8.7; *Politics*, 1.1.1252b16-31, 3.5.1280. For an overview of the sociability of gifts in early philosophical thought, see Griffin, *Seneca on Society*, 15-29, 43-45.

of James R. Harrison and John M. G. Barclay have given significant attention to the χαρ- root in Greek literature. [10] However, less attention has been directed towards the group of nouns related to δίδωμι by New Testament scholars, and so, to offer some new and complementary evidence to the work of Harrison and Barclay, I have chosen to focus on the use of δωρεά in the Greek literature.[11] Moreover, it seemed appropriate to examine the use of δωρεά in the Greek literature, as this is the noun used by Luke in relation to the Spirit in Acts. In this section, I give a brief overview of the place of δωρεά in the relationship between a general and his soldiers (3.1.1), as this is the most common context for δωρεά. After this, I examine the use of δωρεά in the works of Plutarch (3.1.1), Josephus (3.1.2) and Appian (3.1.3).

3.1.1   Δωρεά in the General-Soldier Relationship

The most common usage of δωρεά in the Greek literary tradition is as a reward, bounty or spoils of war given by a general to his soldier, as shown in the writings of Polybius (200-118 BCE),[12] Diodorus Siculus (90-30 BCE),[13] Josephus (37-100 CE),[14] Plutarch (46-120 CE)[15] and Appian (95-165 CE),[16] among others.[17] As the general-soldier relationship was the most common context for the giving of δωρεά in the extrabiblical material, it is worth noting the function that δωρεά had within the relationship.

---

[10] Harrison and Barclay both focus predominately on the use of χάρις in the Greek literature, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 174-199; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 24-51.

[11] Δωρεά falls under a group of nouns related to δίδωμι, which also includes; δόσις, δόμα, δώρημα, and δῶρον.

[12] Polybius, *The Histories*, 1.43.3, 1.43.6, 1.45.4, 2.61.8, 3.67.4, 3.71.10, 3.99.4, 5.60.3, 6.39.9, 8.37.5, 10.11.7.

[13] Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, 1.55.12, 1.64.9, 1.67.1, 1.73.6, 2.6.9, 2.25.3, 2.28.1, 11.8.1, 11.25.1, 11.27.3, 13.34.6, 13.92.5, 13.93.4, 14.9.9, 14.21.6, 14.38.7, 14.81.6, 15.91.4, 15.92.4, 16.3.3, 16.3.4, 16.3.5, 16.13.1, 16.43.3, 16.51.3, 16.53.3, 16.75.4, 16.79.1, 17.6.1, 17.25.3, 17.40.2, 17.68.6, 17.74.4, 17.78.1, 17.83.8, 17.85.6, 17.86.1, 18.33.5, 29.46.1, 19.48.8, 19.64.8, 19.81.6, 19.86.2, 20.27.3, 20.100.1, 25.19.1, 31.14.1, 33.18.1, 33.21.1, 37.38.2.

[14] Josephus, *The Jewish* War, 1.231; *Jewish Antiquities*, 5.126, 6.324, 7.115, 8.151, 12.25, 14.299, 16.53, 19.247.

[15] Plutarch, *Agesilaus*, 35.2; *Agis and Cleomenes*, 13.5; *Alexander*, 42.3; *Antony*, 56.5; *Aratus*, 42.3, 44.4; *Aristides*, 1.5; *Artaxerxes*, 14.3; *Brutus*, 45.4, 46.1; *Caesar*, 40.2; *Caius Marcius Coriolanus*, 11.1; *Caius Marius*, 21.2, 3; *Camillus*, 26.2; *Cicero*, 45.4-5; *Comparison of Demetrius and Antony*, 2.3; *Crassus*, 6.7; *Eumenes*, 4.3, 8.7; *Galba*, 2.2, 18.2, 22.1, 2, 23.3, 27.4, 5; *Lucullus*, 19.7; *Lysander*, 16.1; *Philopoemen*, 15.4, 5; *Pompey*, 31.1, 39.1, 2; *Nicias*, 3.6; *Titus Flaminius*, 13.4; *Moralia. Bravery of Women*, 5, 14, 26; *On the Malice of Herodotus*, 12, 15; *Sayings of Romans: Gaius Fabricius*, 5; *Sayings of Romans: Titus Quintius*, 2; *Sayings of Romans: Gnaeus Pompey*, 5; *Sayings of Romans: Caesar Augustus*, 1; *Sayings of Kings and Commanders: Antigonus the Second*, 4.

[16] Appian, *Sicily and the Other Islands*, 2.3; *The Wars in Spain*, 1.4, 2.8; *The Hannibalic Book*, 2.4; *The Syrian Wars*, 9.56; *The Mithridatic Wars*, 15.101; *The Civil Wars*, 1.12.104, 2.7.47, 2.11.73, 2.13.93, 3.6.42; 3.7.44, 3.7.48; 3.8.53, 3.12.86-87, 4.1.3, 4.2.8, 4.6.42, 4.12.89, 4.12.94, 4.12.96, 4.12.98, 4.12.100-101, 4.16.118, 5.2.16, 5.2.17.

[17] Augustus, *Res Gestae*, 1.3.5, 8.15.15; Chariton, *Callirhoe*, 1.6.4, 2.6.3, 4.5.8; Dio Chrysostom, *The Euboean Discourse*, 27, 60; *On Envy*, 32; Onasander, *The General*, 10.15, 10.24, 34.2; Xenophon of Ephesus, *The Story of Anthia and Habrocomes*, 5.

A soldier in the Roman army did receive a wage (usually a μισθός), from which living expenses were subtracted, with this wage being less than a day labourer would have earnt.[18] Fighting wars for less money than a day labourer was not attractive, and so an additional gift or rewards, bounties or spoils of war (usually termed δωρεά) were promised by a general in addition to the regular wage. For example, before the battle of Philippi, Cassius is recorded as saying to his soldiers "The pay (μισθοί) and the rewards (δωρεαί) given were not Caesar's, but the republic's."[19] Here, Cassius is at pains to emphasize that the Roman Republic was funding the pay and rewards of the army, and so the army's loyalty should be to the Roman Republic. It was then these extra gifts, rewards or bounties that were the motivating factor for people to conscript to the Roman army and serve a particular general.[20] Through a promise of δωρεά, among other things, a general could secure the loyalty of his army, with the general/soldier relationship becoming patronal, and providing a possible pathway for ambitious Roman generals to possibly turn their armies against the Roman state.[21]

Understanding the δωρεά as a pivotal aspect of the sociability between a general and his soldiers then sheds light on the other uses of δωρεά in the extrabiblical material. A δωρεά is theoretically similar to the *donativum* which the Principates periodically gave the Praetorian Guard and Roman army to secure their position of power.[22] The Principates gave whole regions to a client-king, who would consider them a δωρεά, which secured the loyalty of the native people and was the main method that the Principates administrated the Roman Empire.[23] A δωρεά could also secure a military

---

[18] Brian Campbell, *The Emperor and the Roman Army 31 B.C.-A.D. 235* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 161-198; Peter Herz, "Finances and Costs of the Roman Army," in *A Companion to the Roman Army*, ed. Paul Erdkamp, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 306-322. For examples of a clear distinction between a μισθός and a δωρεά in the primary sources see Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 4.12.98; Plutarch, *Alexander*, 42.3; *Moralia. Sayings of Kings and Commanders: Antigonus the Second*, 4; Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, 20.34.1, 20.113.4, 25.19.1. See also Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 31-32.

[19] Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 4.12.98 (White, LCL).

[20] For the economic, social, and political pressures that lead to the Marian reforms of 107 BCE and this reliance on a δωρεά as a motivating factor, see Micheal C. Gambino, "The Military Reforms of Gaius Marius in their Social, Economic, and Political Context" (MTh diss., East Carolina University, 2015).

[21] For the classic treatment of this point see Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939), 15. More recent treatments include Arthur Keavenery, *The Army in the Roman Revolution* (London: Routledge, 2007), 30-33; Lukas de Blois, "Army and General in the Late Roman Republic," in *A Companion to the Roman Army*, ed. Paul Erdkamp, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 164-176. Although there are some scholars that are sceptical to the extent that the relationship was quite so voluntary, see Peter A. Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1988), 435-438.

[22] Historia Augusta, *Hadrian*, 23.13; *Antoninus Pius*, 8.1, 10.3; *Pertinax*, 4.7; *Septimius Severus*, 17.5; *Elagabalus*, 26.5; *Severus Alexander*, 26.2; *Tacitus*, 9.1; Tacitus, *Annals*, 41, 11; *Histories*, 1.5, 1.30, 2.82, 2.94, 4.19, 4.36; Ammianus Marcellinus, *History*, 17.6, 24.3, 28.19; Suetonius, *Lives of Caesars: Nero*, 7.2; *Lives of Caesars: Galba*, 16.1, 20.1; *Lives of Caesars: Domitian*, 2.3; Pliny the Younger, *Panegyricus*, 41.1; Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 29.

[23] Polybius, *The Histories*, 21.46.5, 21.46.11, 22.5.5, 22.5.8, 25.4.5, 25.5.1, 30.3.4; Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, 1.67.1, 1.79.3, 19.25.3, 19.75.2; Josephus, *The Jewish War*, 1.97, 1.361-3, 1.646, 2.98-101, 2.214-7; *Jewish Antiquities*, 17.322; *The Life of Josephus*, 38; Plutarch, *Agis and Cleomenes*, 19.4; *Alexander*, 31.2; *Antony*, 36.2, 47.2; *Aratus*, 45.1, 6; *Comparison or Lysander and Sulla*, 3.4; *Eumenes*, 10.3; *Marcellus*, 20.7; *Pompey*, 31.5, 39.1, 2; *Sulla*, 33.2; *Moralia. On the Fortune of Alexander*, 5; Appian, *Numidian Affairs*, 4; *The Syrian Wars*, 10.60; *The Punic Wars*, 16.106.

treaty,[24] or tempt soldiers to defect or be a reward for an assassination.[25] This predominately militaristic background is the context for understanding δωρεά as a reward, which was outside of purely legal payments, and was given to secure the loyalty and service of an army, king or nation.

This usage of δωρεά could easily lead to a purely economistic understanding of gifts, particularly given the difference in the status between the giver and the recipients. However, it is important to emphasise the type of sociability implied in this predominately militaristic context, as the sociability is more one of loyalty or allegiance than friendship. The underlying motivation for a general to give or promise the δωρεά was to establish and maintain the trust of the soldiers, as these rewards flowed to the loyal client/soldier. Sociability in this context is not the friendship of equals, but the relationship of trust, loyalty and allegiance between those of unequal status.

3.1.2   Plutarch and Gift-Giving

Plutarch, a devout priest of Apollo at Delphi and author, gives numerous examples of the sociability of δωρεά in his writings on historical figures.[26] There are three examples from Plutarch concerning the sociability of δωρεά that I address in this subsection. First, Plutarch notes the actions of Octavian after the Battle of Philippi (42 BCE), when addressing the Roman soldiers that fought for Cassius:

> He himself [Octavian], however, assembled the soldiers of Cassius and comforted them; and seeing that they were deprived of all the necessaries of life, he promised them two thousand drachmas the man, to make good what they had lost. They were encouraged by his words and amazed at the largeness of his gift (δωρεᾶς); and they sent him on his way with shouts,

---

exalting him as the only one of the four commanders who had not been defeated in the battle.[27]

Octavian sought to win over the army of Cassius, the very army that he had fought against in the Battle of Philippi, with kind words and large gifts. Octavian skilfully ensures the loyalty from a possibly disgruntled army through the giving of a δωρεά. Moreover, it is also important to note the response of praise from these soldiers, as I argue in Chapter Seven that praise is a common response to a gift.

Second, Plutarch recounts the Roman Senate as trying to wrestle power away from this powerful young ruler after the Battle of Actium (31 BCE), through the use of δωρεά:

> But after Antony had been defeated, and, both consuls having died after the battle, the forces had united under Caesar, the senate became afraid of a young man who had enjoyed such brilliant good fortune, and endeavoured by honours and gifts (δωρεαῖς) to call his troops away from him and to circumscribe his power, on the ground that there was no need of defensive armies now that Antony had taken to flight.[28]

After the battle of Actium, the Roman Senate feared the power of Octavian and his army, and so, the Senate tried to sway portions of Octavian's army through giving δωρεά and honours. While this may seem very close to an economic transaction, there is an underlying sociability to this passage. In this case, the δωρεά offered by the Senate did not persuade the army to remain faithful to the Roman Republic, that is, the promise of δωρεά was not able to break down the allegiance between Octavian and his forces. Here Plutarch notes that the Roman Senate tied to weaken the allegiance of Octavian's army to Octavian through the use of a competing δωρεά, which implies that the giving of δωρεά was central to the loyalty of an army, a key aspect of the relationship between a general and his soldiers.

Third, Plutarch notes that during the seven month reign of Galba (3 BCE-69 CE) as Roman Emperor in 69 CE, the Roman army quickly became hostile towards him.[29] Galba had made a promise of a considerable largesse to the Roman army for their help in overthrowing Nero, a promise which Galba did not keep when he ascended to the Principate. In response, Plutarch notes that, "The soldiers also were secretly disloyal (ὕπουλα) and sullen (σκυθρωπὰ), since not even then was their largesse (δωρεᾶς) given to them."[30] This tension between Galba and the army, while involving a substantial

---

[27] Plutarch, *Brutus*, 44.43-45 (Perrin, LCL).
[28] Plutarch, *Cicero*, 45.44-45 (Perrin, LCL).
[29] Plutarch, *Galba*, 23.1-4.
[30] Plutarch, *Galba*, 23.23 (Perrin, LCL).

sum of money, foundationally revolved around the symbolic devaluing of the relationship. Plutarch describes the army as sullen (σκυθρωπός), which Frederick W. Danker states could mean, "having a look suggestive of gloom or sadness, sad, gloomy, sullen, dark."[31] This emotional state of the soldiers indicates that on top of the unfulfilled monetary gain, there was also a sadness and resentment indicating a breakdown in the good relations or sociability between Galba and the army.

In summary, these three examples show the power that a δωρεά had in the context of the Roman army. The sociability of these gifts was clearly important in each instance; Octavian used a δωρεά to secure the loyalty of a possibly hostile or disgruntled army, the Roman Senate unsuccessfully tried to wrest the loyalty of Octavian's army through the promise of δωρεά, while the unfulfilled promise of a δωρεά leads to the Roman army becoming secretly disloyal to Galba. Without downplaying the economic aspects of these interactions, the fundamental significance of δωρεά was to establish or maintain allegiance and loyalty between two parties, symbolizing that both parties shared common interests and could trust each other. When the trust was broken, or when the allegiance between a leader and an army was too strong to be swayed, the use of δωρεά was more than simply economic – it reflected relationship. In this sense, the giving of δωρεά sought to establish sociability, understood in the case of parties of unequal status as loyalty or allegiance.

3.1.3   Josephus and Gift-Giving

There are two significant examples from Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* (93-94 CE) that speak of the sociability of δωρεά. First, in retelling of the reunion of Jacob and Esau (Gen 33), Josephus notes the inducing nature of Jacob's gifts to Esau.[32] As Jacob approached Esau, Josephus states:

> These emissaries marched with intervals between, in order to appear more numerous by arriving continuously. It was hoped that Esau would be induced by the presents (δωρεῶν) to relax his wrath, were he still indignant; moreover the messengers had instructions to address him affably.[33]

Josephus notes that Jacob sought to induce his estranged brother Esau with gifts into a peaceable relationship. This passage shows that Jacob, according to Josephus, was using gifts (δωρεά) not as

---

[31] BAGD, 932.
[32] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 1.325-336.
[33] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 1.330 (Thackeray, LCL).

commodities to repay Esau's stolen birth right, but rather to repair the social relationship that had been fractured by the previous events.

The second example of the sociability of a gift in the *Jewish Antiquities* comes in Josephus' retelling of the ascension of Claudius to the imperial throne.[34] After calming the anxieties of the Senate, Josephus notes that "Claudius assembled and addressed the army, binding them by oath that they would remain loyal (πίστει) to him. He presented (δωρεῖται) the praetorian guard with five thousand drachmas apiece and their officers with a proportionate sum and promised similar amounts to the armies wherever they were."[35] As the loyalty of the Roman army was paramount for any Roman Emperor, Claudius ensured the loyalty of the Roman army through and oath and through bestowing gifts (δωρέομαι). This example, paralleling the example of Galba in Plutarch, shows the pivotal role that the practice of granting δωρεά plays in securing the loyalty of the Roman army during the era of the Roman Empire. While these soldiers would have received their pay (μισθός) for their duties, this extra δωρεά symbolised Claudius' valuing of the officers, guards and soldiers, establishing a relationship of loyalty, and hence a type of sociability.

3.1.4 Appian and Gift-Giving

The histories of Appian give numerous examples of the implicit sociability of a gift. Appian was a Greek historian of Alexandria, who eventually made his way to Rome in order to write a history on the rise of Rome, focussing predominately on the wars that Rome fought.[36] Appian gives examples of the binding nature of δωρεά, as it often held the tense relationship between general and soldier together. For example, Appian speaks of the Carthaginian Hamilcar (275-228 BC) as securing "the favour of the army by plunder (ἁρπαγαῖς) and largesses (δωρεαῖς)."[37] Similarly, Appian notes of Octavian before the battle of Philippi that "by means of lavish gifts (δωρεῶν), did Octavian bind these mercenaries to himself."[38] Likewise, Appian describes Brutus and Cassius before the battle of Philippi as giving gifts (δωρεάς) to the entire army "in order to propitiate (οἰκειούμενοι) them [the army] with gifts (δωρεάς)."[39] Through δωρεά, which was supplementary to the soldiers' wages, a general was able to solidify his relationship with the armies that he was leading. In all three of these cases, the gifts were given prior to the battle; this was not a payment for services rendered, but a kind

---

[34] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 19.236-273.
[35] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 19.247 (Feldman, LCL).
[36] Kai Brodersen, "Appian," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 126.
[37] Appian, *The Hannibalic Book*, 2.4 (McGing, LCL).
[38] Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 3.7.48.
[39] Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 4.12.89.

of investment in the loyalty and allegiance of the soldiers, that they would give of their best in the coming battle. Again, this has both economic and social implications, with the social or relational implications being foundational. In a battle, there was no guarantee that the soldier would emerge with full capacity or even his life. The δωρεά bound soldier and leader together. In a sense it was the down payment of ongoing mutual loyalty and indicated that the leader would continue to provide for the soldier.

Indeed, it is common for the general to give a δωρεά *pre-emptively*.[40] For example, in the lead-up to the battle of Philippi, Cassius and Brutus give a δωρεά to the soldiers before *even marching* to Philippi. Appian records that after Cassius' final address to his soldiers before the march in this way:

> Having put his army in good spirits by deed and word and gifts (δωρεαῖς), he dissolved the assembly. The soldiers remained a long time heaping praises on Cassius and Brutus and promising to do their duty. The generals immediately counted out the money (δωρεάν) to them, and to the bravest awarded an additional sum on various pretexts.[41]

As the upcoming battle of Philippi was going to be Roman against Roman, limiting defections by a pre-emptive δωρεά was paramount. This sort of pre-emptive giving of a δωρεά was quite rare as the loyalty of Roman soldiers was only this fragile during the civil wars.[42] Giving a δωρεά to the soldier before marching to the battlefield is rare; however, more common is giving a pre-emptive δωρεά while at the battlefield, before the battle.[43]

The role that δωρεά played in the sociability between general and their soldiers is also shown in the inverse situations, when a general does not give a δωρεά. For example, Appian recounts a story of the reactions of the soldiers to a delayed δωρεά from Julius Caesar (100-44 BCE) during his conquest of Gaul (55-52 BCE).[44] Caesar's war against the Gauls was prolonged, creating unrest among the soldiers, who ask for Caesar to discharge them in order to get their promised δωρεά. Appian describes it in this way:

> When he [Julius Caesar] bade them tell what they wanted they were so surprised that they did not even venture to speak openly of the donative (δωρεῶν) in his presence, but they

---

[40] Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, 16.55.2, 19.81.6; Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 3.6.42, 3.7.44, 4.12.89, 4,12,100-101; Plutarch, *Lives. Antony*, 42.5; *Brutus*, 44.4; *Caius Marcius Coriolanus*, 11.1.
[41] Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 4.12.101.
[42] The other instance of this type of pre-emptive δωρεά is Octavian giving a δωρεά to veterans loyal to Antony when he had declared war on Antony, see Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 3.6.42. For other instances see Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, 16.55.2, 19.81.6.
[43] Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 3.6.42, 3.7.44, 4.12.89, 4,12,100-101; Plutarch, *Lives. Antony*, 42.5; *Brutus*, 44.4; *Caius Marcius Coriolanus*, 11.1.
[44] Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 2.13.93.

adopted the more moderate course of demanding their discharge from service, hoping that, since he needed soldiers for the unfinished wars, he would speak about the donative (δωρεῶν) himself.[45]

The soldiers of Caesar's army tried to force Caesar to give a δωρεά by asking for an end to the relationship, that is, a discharge. If a δωρεά were delayed or not given, it could even result in violence, as Appian recounts with regard to the fate of Nonius:

> They [the soldiers] grew angry because Octavian delayed his coming. Nonius, a centurion, chided them with considerable freedom, urging decent treatment of the commander by the commanded, and saying that the cause of the delay was Octavian's illness, not any disregard of them. They first jeered at him as a sycophant; then, as the excitement waxed hot on both sides, they reviled him, threw stones at him, and pursued him when he fled. Finally he plunged into the river and they pulled him out and killed him and threw his body into the road where Octavian was about to pass along … when he [Octavian] saw the body of Nonius he turned aside. Then, assuming that the crime had been committed by a few, he chided them and advised them to exercise forbearance toward each other hereafter, and proceeded to divide the land. He allowed the meritorious ones to ask for rewards (δωρεάς), and he gave to some who were not meritorious, contrary to their expectation. Finally the crowd were confounded; they repented and were ashamed of their importunity; they condemned themselves and asked him to search out and punish the slayers of Nonius. He replied that he knew them and would punish them only with their own guilty consciences and the condemnation of their comrades. The soldiers, thus honoured with pardon, rewards, and gifts (δωρεῶν), changed at once to joyful acclamations.[46]

This passage shows the relationship between a general and their soldiers was often tense and sometimes led to violence if the general did not keep the promise of δωρεά. While these soldiers were receiving a wage during this time, it was the δωρεά, the promise of reward, that functioned as the foundational aspect of the sociability between general and soldier.

It is explicitly stated by Appian in his summary of the Roman army during the civil wars that a δωρεά was the central binding force of the Roman armies:

> The generals, for the most part, as is usually the case in civil wars, were not regularly chosen; that their armies were not drawn from the enrolment according to the custom of the fathers,

---

[45] Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 2.13.93.
[46] Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 5.2.16.

nor for the benefit of their country; that they did not serve the public so much as they did the individuals who brought them together; and that they served these not by the force of law, but by reason of private promises; not against the common enemy, but against private foes … soldiers thought that they were not so much serving in the army as lending assistance, by their own favour (χάριτι) and judgment (γνώμῃ), to leaders who needed them for their own personal ends. Desertion, which had formerly been unpardonable, was now actually rewarded with gifts (δωρεῶν), and whole armies resorted to it … Understanding these facts the generals tolerated this behaviour, for they knew that their authority over their armies depended on donatives (δωρεαῖς) rather than on law.[47]

In this passage, Appian contrasts the role that a δωρεά played in the Roman army during and after the civil wars compared to before the civil wars. Previously soldiers would enlist in the Roman army because of various loyalties, like kinship (the custom of the fathers), or for the benefit of country or the service of the public. Appian notes that this primary motivation is replaced by the promise of δωρεά, which secured the loyalty of the soldier not to the country or the public, but to the general. During and after the Roman civil wars the binding force of the Roman army was the promise of a δωρεά. Standing outside of the legal realm, a δωρεά was the key aspect of the sociability between a general and his soldiers. Therefore, for Appian a δωρεά when given from a general and his soldiers functioned to solidify the trust and loyalty of his soldiers.

3.1.5   Summary

In summary, the most common context for a δωρεά was a reward given from a general to his soldiers and functioned as a key aspect of the sociability between general and soldier. Armies could be won over, wooed or bound to a general through a δωρεά or the promise of a δωρεά. Conversely when a δωρεά was not given or was delayed, the relationship between general and soldier became strained or even violent. This context shows that a δωρεά, meaning gift or reward, had an inherent sociability, initiating or sustaining social relations.

---

[47] Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 5.2.17.

3.3   Gifts and Sociability in Latin Literature

The sociability of gift-giving is also widely attested in Latin literature.[48] Some Latin authors allude to the sociability of a gift indirectly, by speaking of a gift's ability to "bind" two people together.[49] For example, Cicero (106-43 BCE) states, "Service such as this [the profession of law], then, finds many to appreciate it and is calculated to bind (*obstringendos*) people closely to us by our good services (*beneficiis*)."[50] Similarly, Seneca (4 BCE-65 CE) states, "a benefit (*beneficium*) is a common bond (*commune*) and binds two persons together."[51] The language of a gift binding two people then indicates a social bond formed between these two people through the giving of a gift.

In this section, I examine the sociability of *beneficiis* from the writings of Livy and Valerius Maximus (3.2.1), as well as the philosophical reflections of Cicero (3.2.2) and Seneca (3.2.3).[52] I have chosen to limit this section primarily to *beneficiis* for two reasons. First, there are four main Latin words for a gift – *donum*, *donatio*, *munus*, *beneficiis* – of which *donatio* and *beneficiis* are the closest in meaning to the Greek δωρεά.[53] Second, in choosing between *donatio* and *beneficiis*, I have chosen the latter, as *beneficiis* is the most common noun used by philosophers when explicitly discussing the dynamics of gift-giving. While the writings of Livy, like the examples from the Greek literature, show somewhat indirectly the sociability of a gift, it is the work of Valerius Maximus, Cicero and Seneca – who each explicitly reflect upon the sociability of gift-giving – that is our strongest evidence for the sociability of gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world.

---

[48] Plautus, *Three-Dollar Day*, 1051-54; Terence, *The Eunuch*, 146-49; Cornelius Nepos, *Datames*, 10.3; Cicero, *De Officiis*, 1.22, 1.56, 2.6.22; *De Amicitia*, 9.29, 9.31; *Handbook on Electioneering*, 16; *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*, 2.35.117; *Pro Plancio*, 33.81-82; *Letters to Atticus*, 367B.1-2; Sallust, *The War with Catiline*, 6.5; *The War with Jugurtha*, 9.3; Livy, *History of Rome*, 1.34.10-12, 1.39.5-6, 9.3.10, 39.48.11; Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 5.2 .ext. 3, 5.2 ext. 4, 5.3 ext. 3f, 5.5 praef.; Seneca, *De Ira*, 1.5.3; *De Vita Beata*, 24.3; *Epistles*, 19.11-12; *De Beneficiis*, 1.4.2, 2.18.5, 2.21.1, 4.18.1-4, 7.27.3; Pliny, *Letters*, 13.10, 26.1, 33.6; *Panegyricus*, 91.5-6; Tacitus, *Annals*, 12.8, 13.37.
[49] Cicero, *De Officiis*, 2.65; *De Procinciis Consularibus*, 41-42; *In Catilinam* 1-4, 22; *Letters to Atticus*, 3012, 407B2; *Letters to Friends*, 118.2, 278.3; *Pro Balbo*, 12.29; *Pro Plancio*, 1.2; *Handbook on Electioneering*, 14; Sallust, *The War with Jugurtha*, 14.14; Livy, *History of Rome*, 26.49.8-9; Seneca the Elder, *Suasoriae*, 6.11; Frontinus, *Stratagems*, 2.11.3, 2.11.6.
[50] Cicero, *On Duties*, 2.65 (Miller, LCL).
[51] Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, 6.41.42 (Basore, LCL).
[52] Harrison has addressed the use of *gratia* in Valerius Maximus, Cicero and Seneca, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 199-209.
[53] This thesis is focussed on the Spirit as gift in Acts, and not a complete account of gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world, and as such, space constraints dictate that not all four Latin words can be explored. Moreover, there is not much difference in the basic meaning of all four of these Latin nouns, see Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 581.

Beyond the language of binding, numerous Latin authors speak directly of the sociability of a gift. Livy (59 BCE-12 CE) is a Roman historian who composed 142 books on the history of Rome and the Mediterranean.[54] In his histories, Livy tells three stories in which the socially creative power of a gift is shown. First, Livy tells the story of a Corinthian called Lucumo, who in the 7th century BCE, moved to Rome and sought to build his reputation.[55] Of Lucumo, Livy notes:

> The Romans regarded him [Lucumo] with special interest as a stranger and a man of wealth, and he steadily pushed his fortune by his own exertions, making friends wherever possible, by kind words, courteous hospitality, and benefactions (*beneficiisque*), until his reputation extended even to the palace. He had not long been known in this way to the king before the liberality and adroitness of his services procured him the footing of an intimate friend.[56]

Here Livy notes that Lucumo, desiring to integrate himself in Rome, made friends through kind words, hospitality and other gifts. This gift-giving, through words, hospitality and other gifts, is successful, as Lucumo becomes an intimate friend of the king of Rome.

Second, Livy recalls the beginnings of Servius Tullius (fl. 7th Cen. BCE), who eventually married into the royal Roman family.[57] Some of Livy's contemporaries argued that Servius Tullius was born to a slave, when his father (also named Servius Tullius) had been killed and Corniculum captured, which Livy counters in saying:

> I am rather of the opinion of those who say, that on the capture of Corniculum, when Servius Tullius, the chief man of the city, had been slain, his wife, who was great with child, had been recognized amongst the other captive women, and on the score of her unique nobility had been rescued from slavery by the Roman queen, and had brought forth her child at Rome in the house of Priscus Tarquinius; in the sequel this act of generosity (*beneficio*) led to a growing intimacy (*familiaritatem*) between the women…[58]

The *beneficio* of saving the unborn Servius Tullius and his mother from slavery, led to a growing intimacy between the Roman queen Tarquinius and Servius Tullius' mother. Again, we see that a

---

[54] John Briscoe, "Livy," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 852.
[55] Livy, *History of Rome, Volume 1*, 1.34.31-12 (Foster, LCL).
[56] Livy, *History of Rome, Volume 1*, 1.34.10-12.
[57] Livy, *History of Rome, Volume 1*, 1.39.35.
[58] Livy, *History of Rome, Volume 1*, 1.39.35-36.

gift, in this case saving a noblewoman from slavery, is the socially creative force that initiates a relationship.

Third, Livy retells the deliberations of the Samnite Gaius Pontius during the Second Samnite War (326-304 BCE).[59] After a series of battles in central Italy, the commander of the Samnites, Gaius Pontius, trapped the Roman army in the Caudine Forks (321 BCE). Having the Roman army in the vulnerable position, Gaius requested advice from his father, Herennius, who gave two options: either free the Romans or kill them all. Herennius' logic is recorded as follows:

> If, he said, they adopted his first proposal – which he held to be the best – they would establish lasting peace and friendship (*amicitiamque*) with a very powerful people by conferring an enormous benefit (*beneficium*) upon them; by adopting the other plan they would postpone the war for many generations, in which time the Roman State, having lost two armies, would not easily regain its strength.[60]

Herennius notes that freeing the Roman army would be a gift (*beneficium*), which would establish a lasting relationship between the Samnites and the Romans. In these three examples, Livy shows the implicit the sociability of a gift in the ancient Mediterranean world.

In a similar way, Valerius Maximus (fl. 14-37 CE) highlights in *Memorable Doings and Sayings* (31 CE) many of the social implications of gift-giving.[61] Maximus was an author who travelled with Sextus Pompeius to his governorship of Asia (14 CE), and upon returning to Rome, Maximus composed a handbook of moral and philosophical teachings, which he dedicated to the Emperor Tiberius.[62] There are three sayings from his handbook that illustrate the sociability of gift-giving. First, Maximus states that: "great benefits (*beneficia*) [are] … rightly considered to be the first bond of love."[63] Maximus, seemingly echoing a broad understanding, notes that the first bond of love between friends is a gift. Second, Maximus, agreeing with the Athenian practice of prosecuting the ungrateful, states that: "whoever neglects to make equal return to a benefactor abolishes the interplay of giving and receiving benefits (*beneficia*) without which life would be hardly liveable."[64] Here, Maximus highlights the social implications of a gift, as gift-giving is fundamental to a life worth

---

[59] Livy, *History of Rome, Volume 4*, 9.3.1-10 (Foster, LCL).
[60] Livy, *History of Rome, Volume 4*, 9.3.10.
[61] Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings, Volume 1: Books 1-5*, trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, LCL 492, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000). For the dating of *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, see George Clement Whittick and Barbara Levick, "Valerius Maximus," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1534. Harrison has addressed *gratia* in Maximus' writings, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 2.
[62] Whittick and Levick, "Valerius Maximus," 1534.
[63] Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings, Volume 1*, 5.5 praef.
[64] Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings, Volume 1*, 5.3 ext. 3f.

living. Third, Maximus notes in his recent history the great gifts that rulers have given one another. Reflecting upon these examples, Maximus states: "By these and similar examples the beneficence (*beneficentia*) of the human race is nourished and increased. These are its torches, its spurs, by reason of which it burns with desire to help and win favour. And assuredly the most ample and splendid wealth is the power to be widely registered with benefactions (*beneficiis*) happily disbursed."[65] For Maximus, it is gifts that binds two people together, and therefore neglecting the proper gift-giving conventions is a detriment to society and to life.

3.3.3   Cicero and Gift-Giving

Cicero also shows that he is aware of the sociability of a gift and the societal implications for proper giving and receiving.[66] Cicero was a famous orator and Senator of the 1st century BCE Roman Republic, who also wrote poetry, philosophy, letters and instructions on rhetoric.[67] There are three examples of Cicero's understanding of the sociability of gift-giving that I address here. First, Cicero engages with the Stoic, Epicurean, and students of Antiochus on the topic of the *summum bonum* (the Chief Good), showing a tendency towards the position of the Stoics, in *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum* (45 BCE).[68] In Book II, when reflecting upon the life of the revered Calatinus, Cicero critiques Torquatus, who represents an Epicurean view of the Chief Good, and argues that Hedonism "does away with generosity (*beneficium*) and with gratitude (*gratia*), the bond of mutual harmony (*concordiae*)."[69] If the highest good is pleasure, then argues Cicero, there will be no gifts or gratitude, which then will have detrimental effects to society. From this line of reasoning, we can see that Cicero sees generosity and gratitude as exemplified in gift-giving, which is a pivotal aspect of human bonding and societal harmony.

Second, Cicero addresses the sociability of gift-giving while defending Gnaeus Plancius in *Pro Plancio* (54 BCE). In 58 BCE Cicero went into exile in Thessalonica, where he met the quaestor Plancius, who faithfully cared for Cicero during his exile.[70] In 55 BCE Plancius ran for and won an

---

[65] Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings, Volume 1*, 5.2 ext. 4.

[66] Cicero, *De Officiis*, 1.22, 1.56, 2.6.22; *De Amicitia*, 9.29, 9.31; *Handbook on Electioneering*, 16; *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*, 2.35.117; *Pro Plancio*, 33.81-82; *Letters to Atticus*, 367B.1-2. Harrison has addressed *gratia* in Cicero's writings, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 199-200, 202-203, 206, 208-209.

[67] See the overview given by John Hedley Simon and Dirk Obbink, "Marcus Tullius Cicero," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1514-1519.

[68] Simon and Obbink, "Marcus Tullius Cicero," 1518.

[69] Cicero, *On Ends*, trans. H. Rackham, LCL 40, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914), 2.35.117.

[70] See the introduction in Cicero, *Pro Plancio*, 402-405 (Watts, LCL).

aedileship, but was accused of winning the election by illegal methods.[71] In defending Plancius in the ensuing trial, Cicero rebuffs the allegation of partiality in this way:

> For my part, I consider no faculty to be so essentially human as the power of recognizing the obligation, not merely of a kindly act (*beneficio*), but even of anything which betrays a kindly thought (*benevolentiae*); and there is nothing which so violates our humanity, or so much lowers us to the level of the brute beasts, as to allow ourselves to give the impression of being, I will not say unworthy of, but overcome by, a favour (*beneficio*).[72]

As Plancius had become a close friend of Cicero during Cicero's exile, Cicero sees his obligation to Plancius as a part of his humanity. According to Cicero, if he did not defend Plancius he would be equivalent with the "brute beasts," unable to recognise a gift and fulfil the obligations that come from a *beneficiis*, and so, not fully human. For Cicero, to not give, receive or return gifts is to violate our humanity, in part because gifts have a social function of binding humanity together.

Third, in *De Officiis* (44 BCE), Cicero builds upon his comments in *Pro Plancio*, concerning the sociability of gift-giving.[73] *De Officiis* is Cicero's final work before his assassination, written to his son Marcus Tullius Cicero on proper conduct, basing his advice on Stoic philosophy.[74] Cicero addresses the sociability of gift-giving in Book I, in the context of a discussion of the four cardinal virtues – wisdom, justice, fortitude and temperance – and places gift-giving in realm of justice.[75] Cicero sees gift-giving as involving the natural order of all things, including human relationships, as he states:

> But since, as Plato has admirably expressed it, we are not born for ourselves alone, but our country claims a share of our being, and our friends a share; and since, as the Stoics hold, everything that the earth produces is created for man's use; and as men, too, are born for the sake of men, that they may be able mutually to help one another; in this direction we ought to follow Nature as our guide, to contribute to the general good by an interchange of acts of kindness (*mutatione officiorum*), by giving and receiving, and thus by our skill, our industry, and our talents to cement human society more closely together, man to man.[76]

---

[71] Again, see the introduction in Cicero, *Pro Plancio*, 402-405.
[72] Cicero, *Pro Plancio*, 33.81-82.
[73] Cicero, *On Duties*.
[74] Simon and Obbink, "Marcus Tullius Cicero," 1518-1519.
[75] Cicero, *On Duties*, 1.15, 11.22.
[76] Cicero, *On Duties*, 1.22. Cicero's use of *officiorum* does generally refer to gifts, however it can sometimes be found in legal contexts, see Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 581.

Cicero here argues that humans are dependent upon one another and our purpose is to mutually help each other, and so the interchange of gifts is foundational to societal cohesion. Therefore, for Cicero, gifts are not simply disguised commodities, but rather have a socially creative force that helps cement human society together.

Later in Book I, Cicero reflects on the motivations for giving a gift, arguing that his son should consider the four motivations of goodwill, requital, self-interest and finally social implications of a gift.[77] In explaining the importance of the societal implications for gift-giving, Cicero states: "The interests of society, however, and its common bonds will be best conserved, if kindness (*benignitatis*) be shown to each individual in proportion to the closeness of his relationship."[78] Cicero then traces the formation of human society, which began with a shared language and ability to reason, through to the expression of citizenship, kinship and friendship.[79] On friendship, Cicero states: "Another strong bond of fellowship (*communitas*) is effected by mutual interchange of kind services (*beneficiis*); and as long as these kindnesses are mutual and acceptable, those between whom they are interchanged are united by the ties of an enduring intimacy (*societate*)."[80] The mutual exchange of gifts creates an enduring intimacy between the participants, a strong bond of community. In summary, Cicero describes the social implications of gift-giving, as gifts create ties of enduring intimacy and sociability. Gifts enhance the bond of mutual harmony between people, while also cementing human society more closely together.

3.3.4   *Seneca and Gift-Giving*

In this final section, I examine Seneca's perspective on the sociability of a gift in his writings.[81] Seneca was the tutor to the teenage Nero, and upon Nero ascending to the imperial throne, Seneca became a prominent political adviser of Nero. Seneca was a Stoic philosopher, who gave considerable attention to the topic of gift-giving and its inherent sociability. There are five passages that I address from Seneca's writings on the sociability of gift-giving.

---

[77] Cicero, *On Duties*, 1.47-50.
[78] Cicero, *On Duties*, 1.50.
[79] Cicero, *On Duties*, 1.50-56.
[80] Cicero, *On Duties*, 1.56.
[81] Seneca, *Epistles*, 19.12, 90.36-37; *De Ira*, 1.5.3; *De Beneficiis*, 1.4.2, 2.18.5, 2.21.1, 4.18.1-4, 7.27.3. Harrison has addressed *gratia* in Seneca's writings, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 200-202, 205-208. Likewise, Barclay addresses Seneca in Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 45-51.

First, Seneca addresses the sociability of a gift in his *Epistles* (56-64 CE).[82] The nineteenth of Seneca's letters recorded in this collection is directed towards an unknown friend who is contemplating retiring from public life and becoming a recluse.[83] Seneca reminds his friend that,

> The most serious misfortune for a busy man who is overwhelmed by his possessions is, that he believes men to be his friends when he himself is not a friend to them, and that he deems his favours to be effective in winning friends, although, in the case of certain men, the more they owe, the more they hate. A trifling debt makes a man your debtor; a large one makes him an enemy. "What," you say, "do not kindnesses (*beneficia*) establish friendships (*amicitias*)?" They do, if one has had the privilege of choosing those who are to receive them, and if they are placed judiciously, instead of being scattered broadcast.[84]

Seneca's friend seems to be giving gifts indiscriminately, like a scattered broadcast, and so creates no goodwill with the recipients of the gifts. This lack of goodwill is further exacerbated by the size of these gifts, creating what feels like a debt for the recipients. Seneca's friend had been distributing gifts without goodwill, turning them into something closer to a loan, and this leads to his friends turning into debtors and eventually enemies. In response to this practice, Seneca advises his friend to be socially conscious of the effects of gifts, and advocates not only choosing the recipients of his gifts wisely, but also being judicious in the size of them.

Second, in *De Ira* (45 CE), Seneca uses the sociability of gift-giving to illustrate the harm that anger has on human life. Seneca contrasts the social utility of gift-giving and the social destructiveness of anger, when he states,

> Anger, as I have said, is bent on punishment, and that such a desire should find a harbour in man's most peaceful breast accords least of all with his nature. For human life is founded on kindness (*beneficiis*) and concord (*concordia*), and is bound into an alliance for common help, not by terror, but by mutual love.[85]

Contrasted with socially destructive anger, gift-giving expresses itself in common help and mutual love, which are key aspects of human life.

The final three passages on the sociability of gift-giving come from Seneca's *De Beneficiis* (56-64 CE).[86] *De Beneficiis* is clearly the most important primary source on gift-giving in the Greco-Roman

---

[82] Seneca, *Epistles*, 19.12, 90.36-37.
[83] Seneca, *Epistles*, 19.1-7.
[84] Seneca, *Epistles, Volume 1: Epistles 1-65*, 19.11-12 (Gummere, LCL).
[85] Seneca, *De Ira*, 1.5.3 (Basore, LCL).
[86] Seneca, *De Beneficiis*.

world, and arguably all of antiquity, as it is the only book that explicitly addresses the philosophical underpinnings of giving, receiving and returning gifts.[87] However, the tremendous insight that *De Beneficiis* offers also needs to come with caution, as Seneca establishes numerous philosophical positions that cannot be corroborated with another primary sources.[88] This has led some scholars to critique Pauline scholars of reading Seneca into Paul.[89] Moreover, Seneca's style of teaching in *De Beneficiis* often includes, as Miriam T. Griffin notes, "high minded" thinking and "hyperbole," which read literally by modern interpreters, can present an unrealistic portrayal of Greco-Roman gift-giving practices.[90] In spite of these cautions, *De Beneficiis* offers further evidence for the sociability of gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world, and I will address three key passages on the sociability of gift-giving in *De Beneficiis*.

The first passage, in the opening discussion on the purpose of *De Beneficiis*, shows the societal purpose for addressing gift-giving. In framing *De Beneficiis*, Seneca states: "What we need is a discussion of benefits (*beneficiis*) and the rules for a practice that constitutes the chief bond of human society."[91] In language similar to Cicero (see 3.2.2), Seneca sees gift-giving as a key component to a functional human society. This purpose is manifest throughout *De Beneficiis* as Griffin states: "Seneca is concerned to stress that, whereas the exchange of benefits generally helps society to cohere, the giving of benefits, in particular, actually helps to create social bonds. … Receiving a benefit creates a relationship of friendship which is then consolidated by further interchanges of benefit."[92] From Seneca's perspective, the giving of a gift is a socially creative action, while receiving and returning of gifts are important for the cohesion of human society. The acts of receiving and returning help foster social cohesion, whereas unprompted giving is the socially creative act that forms relationships.

This conclusion is shown inversely in the second passage, where Seneca discusses his hatred of ingratitude. Gratitude is widely seen as the proper initial response to the giving of a gift, as it acknowledges the intention behind the gift.[93] When discussing the importance of gratitude in the gift-

---

[87] For the importance of *De Beneficiis* see Griffin, *Seneca on Society*, passim; Briones, *Paul's Financial Policy*, 41; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 45.

[88] So Griffin, *Seneca on Society*, 30-87.

[89] For example, see the critiques made by Julien M. Ogereau, *Paul's Koinonia with the Philippians: A Socio-Historical Investigation of a Pauline Economic Partnership*, WUNT II/377, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 38, 41-42.

[90] For an overview of this discussion, see Griffin, *Seneca on Society*, 46-49.

[91] Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, 1.4.2, see also 7.27.23.

[92] Griffin, *Seneca on Society*, 27-28.

[93] For example, Xenophon, *Agesilaus*, 11.3; *Anabasis*, 2.5.14, 7.7.23; *Cyropaedia*, 3.2.16, 5.3.20, 6.1.47, 6.4.7, 8.7.3; *Hellenica*, 3.6.13; *Memorabilia*, 3.12.4, 4.4.17; Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica*, 2.530, 3.144, 3.990, 3.1005; Aristophanes, *Assemblywomen*, 1045-8; Euripides, *Alcestis*, 299; *Children of Heracles*, 438, 870; *Andromeda*, 129; *Heracles*, 1222-8, 1352; *Suppliant Woman*, 1169, 1175-9; Isocrates, *Panathenaicus*, 202, 216; *Plataicus*, 1; *Against Callimachus*, 62, 67; *Aegineticus*, 12, 34; Heraclitus, *Testimonia, Part 3: Reception*, R115; Herodotus, *The Persian Wars*, 9.107; Hesiod, *Theogony*, 503; Homer, *Odyssey*, 4.695, 22.319; Pindar, *Pythian Odes*, 2.17; Plato, *Epistles*,

giving process, Seneca uses the destructive effects of ingratitude to emphasise the value of gratitude.[94] As Seneca states:

> Ingratitude is something to be avoided in itself because there is nothing that so effectually disrupts and destroys the harmony (*concordiam*) of the human race as this vice. For how else do we live in security if it is not that we help each other by an exchange of good offices (*officiis*)? It is only through the interchange of benefits (*beneficiorum*) that life becomes in some measure equipped and fortified against sudden disasters. … [Our] safety lies in fellowship (*societas*). … Take away this fellowship (*societatem*), and you will sever the unity of the human race on which its very existence depends.[95]

In Seneca's view, ingratitude disrupts and destroys the harmony of human relations, as the ingrate refuses to acknowledge the intention of the gift. This leads to a disruption of harmony among the human race. While this may seem hyperbolic, Valerius Maximus (3.2.1) and Cicero (3.2.2) make similar statements, indicating Seneca's position here is not purely hyperbolic, but rather reflects a common understanding of the sociability of gift-giving.[96]

The final passage, found in Book II of *De Beneficiis*, addresses how the sociability of a gift also shapes Seneca's conduct. In choosing the recipient of a gift, Seneca emphasises the social implications of gift-giving, by comparing a gift to a loan, as Seneca states:

> And so it is necessary for me to choose the person from whom I wish to receive a benefit; and, in truth, I must be far more careful in selecting my creditor for a benefit than a creditor for a loan. For to the latter I shall have to return the same amount that I have received, and when I have returned it, I have paid all my debt and am free; but to the other I must make an additional payment, and, even after I have paid my debt of gratitude, the bond between us still holds; for just when I have finished paying it, I am obliged to begin again, and friendship endures; and I would not admit an unworthy man to my friendship, so neither would I admit one who is unworthy to the most sacred privilege of benefits, from which friendship springs.[97]

8.353C; *Hippias Minor*, 372C; *Menexenus*, 249E; Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, 230; *Philoctetes*, 1370; Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 1.32.1, 1.33.1-2, 1.128.4, 1.129.3, 3.56.7, 4.20.3.
[94] Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, 4.18.11-14.
[95] Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, 4.18.11-14.
[96] See section 2.5 for sociologists who argue a similar point about the societal aspects of gift-giving.
[97] Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, 2.18.15, see also 12.21.11.

Repaying a loan ends the interaction, whereas giving a counter-gift sustains and continues the relationship, and therefore Seneca sees choosing a gift recipient as more important than choosing a creditor. The difference between a loan and a gift is not so much the legality as the relationship.

In summary, we see that Seneca, like Valerius Maximus and Cicero before him, see gifts as having an important societal function, helping human communities cohere. Moreover, Seneca, like all the other Latin authors examined, sees giving a gift as a social creative force, initiating or sustaining a relationship. As Barclay notes that, "Seneca does not advocate the one-way, unilateral gift: since humans are social animals … and society is constituted by the interchange of benefits."[98] Seneca then shows an awareness of the inherent sociability in gift-giving, while also noting the societal implications of this sociability.

3.3.5   Summary

The Latin sources then show that gifts were defined by their sociability. Both Livy and Valerius Maximus understand gifts as binding giver and receiver together and functions as the first bonds of love. Cicero sees gifts as one of the sources of societal harmony, as gifts create ties of enduring intimacy between humans. Likewise, Seneca sees gifts as the chief bond of society, with ingratitude having detrimental effects for societal cohesion. Moreover, Seneca gives advice to choose the recipients of gifts more carefully than loans, as gifts possess a socially creative force that loans do not. Gifts then possess a sociability, which binds people together, creating communities, and more broadly, societies.

3.4   Conclusion

In this chapter, I have shown that key Greek and Latin literary sources understood gift-giving as a socially creative act, which created or sustained social relations. The overview of the use of δωρεά in the Greek literature shows the pivotal role that the δωρεά played in the relationship between a general and his soldiers. Plutarch, Josephus and Appian all give examples of the social aspects at play in the generals giving δωρεά to their soldiers, as the promise and fulfilment of δωρεά fostered loyalty and allegiance. The significance of this practice was also shown when a general did not give a promised δωρεά or when the loyalty of the army was tested through the promise of competing

---

[98] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 48.

donatives. In all, the use of δωρεά in the Greek literature shows that it is connected to the fostering of loyalty between a general and his soldiers, and so had an ability to initiate and sustain the general/soldier relationship.

I have also given an overview of *beneficiis* in the Latin literature, elucidating the sociability of *beneficiis* in the writings of Livy, Valerius Maximus, Cicero and Seneca. It is in the works of Cicero and Seneca – the two that explicitly reflect upon the philosophical underpinnings of gift-giving – that we have the best evidence for the sociability of a gift. For Cicero, gifts are the bond of mutual harmony and can create ties of enduring intimacy; while for Seneca, gifts are the chief bond of human society that bind people together.

This chapter rounds out a definition of "gift" which is foundational for this thesis, that gifts are the symbolic embodiment and physical manifestation of personal relations, or more simply, gifts create and sustain social ties. Both a significant stream sociological literature and key sources of the Greco-Roman world support this definition. This definition then leads us to the question: What is the sociability implied in the description of the Spirit as gift in Acts? In the following chapters, I seek to elucidate one aspect of the sociability of the Spirit as gift, arguing that this sociability of the Spirit as gift is manifested in the Spirit's empowerment of the community life described in the summary statements (Acts 2:42-47, 4:32-35, 5:12-16). In the next chapter, I engage with the previous literature on the Spirit as gift in Acts, showing that further research can be done in the area of the Spirit as gift in Acts working from this understanding of gift-giving as a socially creative act.

Chapter 4: Literature Review

In this chapter, I engage with the previous research on the Spirit in Acts that has focussed on the description of the Spirit as gift. This literature review examines the work of Gonzalo Haya-Prats, William H. Shepherd, Max Turner, and Craig Keener, who have all given significant attention to the Spirit as gift in Acts, each offering valuable foundations for this thesis (4.1).[1] I show that while these four scholars have addressed the Spirit as gift, none has considered the ramifications of the sociability inherent within the description of a gift.[2] After this, I note the scholars that have used the Greco-Roman world and the social-scientific approach to the Holy Spirit in Acts, showing that this is not a completely new approach (4.2). Finally, I address the unity of Luke-Acts and the audience of Luke-Acts, as both these issues affect my exegesis (4.3).

While this thesis focuses on the Spirit as gift, an overview of the other metaphors used in Acts is required. The phraseology of the Spirit in Acts is as follows:[3]

1. To be filled with (πίμπλημι) the Spirit (Acts 2:4, 4:8, 31, 9:17, 13:9, 52) or to be full of (πλήρης) the Spirit (Acts 6:3, 5, 7:55, 11:24) are two of the most frequently used descriptions used in Acts.

2. Luke describes the Spirit as falling on (πίπτω) or coming upon (ἐπέρχομαι) believers (Acts 1:8, 8:16, 10:44, 11:15, 19:6).

3. To be baptized in (βαπτίζω) the Spirit is also found twice (Acts 1:5, 11:16), which is related to the Spirit being poured out (ἐκχέω) upon them (Acts 2:17, 2:18, 2:33, 10:45).

---

[1] Gonzalo Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers: The Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts*, trans. Scott A. Ellington (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2011), 48-60; William H. Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts*, SBLDS, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 142; Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series, (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2000), 47; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 986.

[2] Major works in the last 50 years on the Spirit in Acts that do not address the description of the Spirit as gift include James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*, 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 2010); Roger Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke: Trajectories from the Old Testament to Luke-Acts*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012); James B. Shelton, *Mighty In Word And Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1991); Odette Mainville, *The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, trans. Suzanne Spolarich (Woodstock, GA: The Foundation for Pentecostal Scholarship, 2016); Robert P. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2004); Matthias Wenk, *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2004); Youngmo Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul: An Attempt to Reconcile these Concepts*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs, (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005); John R. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); William P. Atkinson, *Baptism in the Spirit: Luke-Acts and the Dunn Debate* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011); Aaron J. Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other': Social Identity, Ethnicity and Intergroup Reconciliation in Luke-Acts*, LNTS, (London: T&T Clark, 2011); David J. McCollough, *Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit: An Analysis of the Timing, Mechanism, and Manifestation of Spirit-Reception in Luke-Acts*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs, (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2017).

[3] Max Turner, "Spirit Endowment in Luke/Acts: Some Linguistic Considerations," *VE* 12 (1981): 45.

4. The Spirit is said to have worked through (διά) believers (Acts 1:2, 11:28, 21:4).

5. Lastly, the Spirit is given (δίδωμι) by God (Acts 5:32, 8:18, 15:8), and received (λαμβάνω) by believers (Acts 1:8, 2:33, 38, 8:15, 17, 19, 10:47, 19:2). These two descriptors are related to the Spirit as gift (Acts 2:38, 8:20, 10:45, 11:17), which points to Luke describing the Spirit with gift-giving language.

This literature review will focus on the final group of descriptions, the gift-giving language used in relation to the Spirit, seeking to build upon the previous research by incorporating the insights developed on the sociability of gift-giving in Chapters Two and Three.

4.1   The Spirit as Gift in the Previous Research

In this section, I show that while some have considered the Spirit as a gift, none to date have considered the ramifications of the sociability inherent within the description of a gift. The scholars that do consider the Spirit as gift do not consult the sociological literature or the wider Greco-Roman world to inform their understanding of the Spirit as gift. Rather, they usually draw upon the Hebrew Bible or the literature of the Intertestamental Judaism (ITJ) to inform their understanding of the Spirit as gift. This section will address the work of Gonzalo Haya-Prats (4.1.1), William H. Shepherd (4.1.2), Max Turner (4.1.3), and Craig Keener (4.1.4).

4.1.1   Gonzalo Haya-Prats

One of the first to give attention to the understanding of the Spirit as gift is Gonzalo Haya-Prats, who addresses the gift-giving language in the third chapter of *Empowered Believers* (1970).[4] In *Empowered Believers,* Haya-Prats clarifies the activity of the Holy Spirit in Acts, arguing that the Spirit is an eschatological gift.[5] Haya-Prats focuses on grammatical issues surrounding the language of the Spirit in Acts, and as such, does not significantly draw on any external sources to inform his understanding of the Spirit in Acts. Haya-Prats covers two grammatical issues related to the gift-giving language found in Acts.[6] First, Haya-Prats addresses whether τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος is a subjective genitive or an epexegetical genitive.[7] Second, Haya-Prats addresses whether Luke's preference for the aorist in describing the coming of the Spirit indicates that the early

---

[4] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 48-71.
[5] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 235.
[6] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 48-60.
[7] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 48-54.

believers had a transitory experience of the Spirit, rather than a permanent possession of the Spirit.[8] For Haya-Prats, the gift of the Spirit is an objective genitive, the gift of God, which is a permanent endowment for the early believers in Acts.

First, Haya-Prats addresses the use of δωρεά (gift, reward) in relation to the Spirit in Acts.[9] Luke uses δωρεά four times in Acts in relation to the Spirit of God:

Passage	Greek Phrase	Translation
Acts 2:38	τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος	*the gift of the Holy Spirit*
Acts 8:20	τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ	*the gift of God*
Acts 10:45	ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος	*the gift of the Holy Spirit*
Acts 11:17	τὴν ἴσην δωρεάν	*the same gift*

Four times in Acts δωρεά is connected to the Spirit (Acts 2:38, 8:20, 10:45, 11:17), twice indirectly (Acts 8:20, 11:17) and twice directly with the following genitive construction of τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (Acts 2:38, 10:45). Haya-Prats notes that the genitive construction τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος can be translated as a subjective genitive (the giftedness of the Holy Spirit),[10] or an epexegetical genitive (the gift of God is the Holy Spirit).[11] Haya-Prats argues that taking τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος as a subjective genitive leads to a confusion between the "exterior sign of the presence of the Spirit" and the actual indwelling of the Spirit.[12] Haya-Prats parallels the Holy Spirit coming upon the early believers in Acts with the Spirit of God coming upon the 70 elders in Numbers 11:16-30, as in both cases the exterior sign indicates a more continual indwelling of Spirit of God.[13] Luke's use of δωρεά then indicates that the gift of the Spirit does not refer to the giftedness that comes from the Spirit, but rather, the gift of God, which is the Holy Spirit.

---

[8] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 54-60.
[9] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 48-54.
[10] For example, see the argument of Turner, *Power from on High*, 39-48.
[11] This seems to be the majority position, for example, see F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, NICNT, Rev ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 71; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, SP, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 57; C. K. Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, ICC, (London: T&T Clark, 1994), 155; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Yale Bible, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 266; Mikeal C. Parsons and Martin M. Culy, *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2003), 44; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, BECNT, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 144; Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Acts*, Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 165.
[12] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 54.
[13] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 53.

Second, Haya-Prats examines the verbs used in relation to the coming of the Holy Spirit in order to discern if the gift of the Spirit is a permanent indwelling or a transitory empowering.[14] The common tense for the verbs that describe the movement of the Holy Spirit is aorist, which could indicate a transitory empowerment of the Spirit.[15] Haya-Prats argues, against this inference, that the gift of the Spirit is a permanent indwelling with three arguments. First, Haya-Prats notes that in the LXX and New Testament the passive and active perfect forms of πίμπλημι (to fill), χρίω (to anoint), and λαμβάνω (to receive) "have an almost absorbent tendency towards the aorist."[16] Second, Haya-Prats suggests that Luke is following the LXX, as the perfect tense is used only once in the LXX for the spirit of God (Hag 2:5, see also Wis 1:7).[17] Third, the aorist could be used to emphasise the moment of receiving the gift of the Spirit, which at the same time does not exclude a permanent endowment of the Spirit.[18] In all, Haya-Prats concludes that the gift of the Spirit is a permanent endowment for those that believe in Jesus.

Haya-Prats' contribution to the study of the Spirit as gift is significant. Haya-Prats has persuasively argued that the use of τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in Acts 2:38 and 10:45 is an epexegetical genitive, which establishes the gift-giving language as a distinct description. Likewise, by making a substantial case that the receiving and giving of the Spirit refers to a permanent endowment, Haya-Prats has demonstrated that the gift of the Spirit is more than the prophetic manifestations. Haya-Prats has thus provided subsequent scholars with a foundation for further studies on the Spirit as gift in Acts.

4.1.2   William H. Shepherd

A second scholar to consider the Spirit as gift is William H. Shepherd Jr. in *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts* (1994).[19] In his monograph, Shepherd seeks to elucidate Luke's portrayal of the Holy Spirit as a character in Luke-Acts, through examining the various direct and indirect characterisations that Luke uses in relation to the Spirit. Shepherd defines these two characterisations as:

---

[14] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 54-60.

[15] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 55-56.

[16] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 58. Although, as Haya-Prats (58) notes, this does not explain why Luke did not use the prefect forms ἐλήλυθα (Luke 5:17, 5:32, 7:33-34; Acts 8:27, 9:21, 18:2, 21:22), πέπτωκα (Rev 2:5, 8:3, 9:1) or δέδωκα (Luke 10:9, 19:15; Acts 4:12).

[17] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 58-59.

[18] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 59.

[19] Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*. See also Ju Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 146-147.

Direct Definition. Most explicit, with varying degrees of reliability. Narrators most frequently define characters directly. Characters can also directly define themselves and other characters, and must be evaluated in light of their trustworthiness and consistency.

Indirect Presentation. Less explicit than direct definition, and therefore inherently less reliable. But reliability may further vary depending on the trustworthiness and consistency of the presentation, just as with direct definition.[20]

In Luke-Acts, Shepherd notes, Luke usually characterises the Spirit indirectly, with Shepherd stating that "Luke uses direct characterization of the Spirit sparingly, but tellingly."[21] The contrast between direct and indirect characterisations then leads into Shepherd giving attention to the various direct characterisations of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts.[22] Shepherd notes that there are three direct characterisations of the Spirit of God in Luke-Acts; the Spirit as gift (Luke 11:13; Acts 10:45, 11:17), the Spirit as witness (Acts 5:32), and the Spirit as the promise of the Father (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4, 2:33).[23]

Specifically on the Spirit as gift, Shepherd argues that the direct characterisation of the Spirit as gift is "along traditional lines" deriving from the LXX and ITJ.[24] Shepherd lists six passages from the LXX and the literature of the ITJ to support this interpretive context for the direct characterisation of the Spirit as gift:[25]

1. Numbers 11:24-30, which describes the anointing of the 70 elders to help Moses lead the people of Israel. In this passage, the spirit of God is described as being "put on" (LXX: ἐπέθηκεν) and having "rested on" (LXX: ἐπανεπαύσατο) 68 of the chosen elders (Numbers 11:25). Likewise, in the next verse, the spirit of God also "rested on" (LXX: ἐπανεπαύσατο) the final two elders who were still in the camp (Num 11:26). Finally, in this passage, Moses wishes that God would "give" (LXX: δῷ) the spirit of God to all the people of Israel (Num 11:29). This passage then has four indirect characterisations of the spirit of God, with one of these indirect characterisations being gift-giving language (δῷ in the LXX version of Num 11:29).

---

[20] Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 88.
[21] Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 248.
[22] Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 142-143, 150, 161, 174, 202, 205, 247-148.
[23] Summarised in Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 247-248.
[24] Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 142.
[25] Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 142. I have chosen to rely on the LXX versions here, as Shepherd uses the LXX as the main interpretive context for the Spirit in Luke-Acts, see Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 97. All the Greek examples are taken from *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, ed. Alfred Rahlfs (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979).

2. Numbers 24:2, which describes how the spirit of God "came upon" (LXX: ἐγένετο … ἐν) Balaam before his third prophetic message for Israel.

3. Psalms 51:11, in which David asks God not to "take" (LXX: ἀντανέλῃς) the holy spirit from David in the wake of his adultery with Bathsheba.

4. Isaiah 63:10, which describes how the people of Israel "rebelled" (LXX: ἠπείθησαν) and "grieved" (LXX: παρώξυναν) the holy spirit.

5. Sirach 48:12 (Codex A), which describes Elisha being "filled" (LXX: ἐνεπλήσθη) with the spirit of Elijah after Elijah's whirlwind ascension.

6. Susanna 45 (Theodotion), which describes how God "awakened" (LXX: ἐξήγειρεν) the holy spirit within Daniel to save Susanna's life.

In these six passages, the spirit of God is directly characterised in two ways: the spirit as coming from God (Num 11:29, 24:2) and the spirit as holy (Ps 51:11, Isa 63:10, Sus 45). Of the indirect characterisations of the spirit of God in these passages, only one uses gift-giving language, that is Moses' wish that God would give (LXX: δῷ) the spirit to the whole Israelite nation in Numbers 11:29.

While these passages do give numerous characterisations of the spirit of God, only one, the indirect characterisation in Numbers 11:29 (LXX: δῷ), uses gift-giving language. Of the passages that Shepherd uses to understand the Spirit as gift in Acts, only one uses gift-giving language and none of these passages use the direct characterisation of the Spirit as gift. Shepherd draws these six passages from Kirsopp Lake's "The Holy Spirit" in *The Beginnings of Christianity* (1933) and Haya-Prats' *Empowered Believers* addressed in the previous section (4.1.1).[26] However, both Haya-Prats and Lake focus on the characterisation of the Spirit as holy and not as gift, and it does seem that Shepherd has misread Lake and Haya-Prats on this point.[27] Shepherd's work on the Spirit as gift is important, as he notes the importance that Luke places on the gift-giving language, directly characterising the Spirit as gift. However, the passages that Shepherd uses to understand the Spirit as gift do not contain gift-giving language, except for the indirect characterisation in Numbers 11:29, and as such, there remains a need for the Spirit as gift to be elucidated.

---

[26] Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 142; Kirsopp Lake, "The Holy Spirit," in *BegC*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1933), 98; Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 22-23.
[27] Lake, "The Holy Spirit," 98; Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 22-23.

Max Turner addresses the Spirit as gift in *Power from on High* (1996).[28] *Power from on High* is a continuation of the recent research on the themes of the restoration of Israel (or the return from exile) in the life and ministry of the historical Jesus.[29] If the historical Jesus sought to restore Israel, then Turner argues that this "messianic cleansing, restoration and transformation of Israel [is accomplished in Acts] through the gift of the Spirit which is now the messiah's executive power."[30] Concerning the Spirit as gift, Turner (like Shepherd) has chosen the LXX to inform his understanding of the Spirit as gift.[31]

Turner first addresses the subjective/epexegetical genitive discussion addressed in the previous subsection on Haya-Prats (4.1.1). Turner connects the epexegetical genitive understanding of τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in Acts 2:38, 10:45 to the understanding of the Spirit as the third person of the Trinity.[32] Turner contrasts himself against the position of N. Adler, who suggests the gift-giving language indicates the personhood of the Spirit as the third person of the Trinity.[33] This discussion between Adler and Turner could also be influenced by recent theological discussions on the Spirit as gift within a trinitarian framework.[34] Therefore, as the personhood of the Spirit of God cannot be established in Luke-Acts, Turner prefers understanding τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in Acts 2:38, 10:45 as a subjective genitive, that is, the giftedness of the Spirit.

Turner then argues that in Luke's depiction of Paul receiving of the Holy Spirit (Acts 9:17-19), Luke is "intentionally referring" to King Saul's reception of the Spirit (1 Sam 10:6), both of which lead to an empowerment for a specific calling or mission.[35] For Turner, Luke's use of the gift-giving language in relation to the Spirit refers to "the inception of a specific new activity, or coherent set of activities" for the recipient of the Spirit.[36] Turner then argues that the gift-giving language used in relation to the Holy Spirit possibly indicates a giftedness that comes from the Holy Spirit, as the gift-giving language refers to a vocational or missional calling for certain figures in the book of Acts.[37] Turner supports this conclusion with the two Lukan depictions of Jesus' interactions with the Spirit (Luke 3:22; Acts 2:33), as both of these interactions with the Spirit are shown to empower Jesus for "a distinct nexus

---

[28] Turner, *Power from on High*.

[29] Turner, *Power from on High*, 133-136.

[30] Turner, *Power from on High*, 268.

[31] Turner, *Power from on High*, 46-48.

[32] Turner, *Power from on High*, 39-46.

[33] Turner, *Power from on High*, 39-45. For Adler's position, see N. Adler, *Das erste christliche Pfingstfest: Sinn und Bedeutung des Pfingstberichtes Apg 2:1-13* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1938), 74, 91.

[34] For example, see John Milbank, "The Gift and the Given," *Theory, Culture & Society* 23, no. 2-3 (2006): 444-447.

[35] Turner, *Power from on High*, 47.

[36] Turner, *Power from on High*, 47.

[37] Turner, *Power from on High*, 47.

of activities."[38] Turner concludes that the gift-giving language that is applied to the Spirit in Acts refers to the giftedness that the Spirit brings upon the believer by drawing upon the LXX.

There are three observations concerning Turner's approach to the Spirit as gift. First, I agree with Turner that the Spirit of God in Acts cannot be established as the third person of the Trinity, and that we should not project back onto Acts a trinitarian understanding of the Spirit. However, the epexegetical genitive understanding of τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in Acts 2:38, 10:45 does not inevitably lead back to the divine personhood of the Spirit. Seeing the Spirit as gift does not imply that this Spirit is the third person of the Trinity. This connection between the epexegetical genitive understanding of τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in Acts 2:38, 10:45 and the divine personhood of the Spirit seems to be based on a theological understanding of "gift" rather than exegetical arguments.

Second, while there are similarities in the outcomes of the Spirit endowments of King Saul, which is linked to his royal calling, and Paul's Damascus road experience and subsequent reception of the Holy Spirit, linked with his subsequent preaching, these parallels are limited. There are not any clear literary links between the two narratives, and gift-giving language is not used in King's Saul's Spirit endowment narrative. While Turner is correct that Jesus has two distinct interactions with the Spirit of God (Luke 3:22; Acts 2:33), it should be noted that the specific use of gift-giving language is only used in one of these interactions (Acts 2:33). The Spirit "descends upon" (καταβῆναι) Jesus at his baptism (Luke 3:22), while Jesus "receives" (λαβών) the Spirit of God at his ascension (Acts 2:33).[39] This indicates that the gift-giving language used in relation to the Spirit in Acts involves more than a giftedness for mission.

Third, understanding the gift of the Holy Spirit as a pneumatic giftedness for vocation does create tension with Turner's wider thesis. Turner sees the Spirit's role to empower witness and mission as a secondary effect of the Spirit, while the primary purpose of the Spirit is to restore and cleanse Israel. As Turner notes that "with the exception of Paul (Acts 9) there is barely any evidence for the view that Luke thinks the Spirit is given to converts [primarily] as empowering for mission."[40] Turner sees the gift-giving language used in relation to the Spirit as indicating the empowerment for certain apostles and leaders, while the Spirit has the more universal effect of empowering rest of the church for life in the church.[41] However, this point is not convincing, as in Acts 2:38-39 Luke directly links the gift-giving language of the Spirit to a universal effect in stating that *God gives the gift of the Spirit*

---

[38] Turner, *Power from on High*, 47.

[39] *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece with Dictionary*, ed. Barbara Aland et al., 28th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012), 190, 384.

[40] Turner, *Power from on High*, 348. Turner argues that the gift of the Spirit is given as the empowerment for mission to the apostles only, while the gift of the Spirit's primary role is in the life of the church.

[41] Turner, *Power from on High*, 398-399.

to all. That is, the statement that God gives "the gift of the Spirit" to all contradicts Turner's conclusion that the language of gift-giving used in relation to the Spirit refers to the empowerment of mission for only certain leaders. While Turner's wider work is rightly held as one of the significant works on the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts in the last 30 years,[42] his treatment of the gift-giving language in relation to the Spirit is limited and leaves room for further research to explore the Spirit as gift in Acts.

4.1.5   Craig Keener

Craig Keener, in the first volume of his commentary *Acts* (2012), notes how the gift-giving language used in Acts is distinctively Lukan.[43] Keener makes three observations concerning the giving language in Acts used in relation to the Spirit:

1. On Luke's use of δωρεά, Keener notes that Luke's specific use of δωρεά in reference to the Spirit is exclusively Lukan (depending on if we take the two phrases of Hebrews 6:4 as antithetical).[44] This point indicates that Luke has specifically described the Spirit using the term δωρεά.

2. On the use of δίδωμι (to give), Keener notes that the Spirit is not "given" in the LXX or the wider New Testament.[45] God does give other attributes, e.g. the wisdom of God (Wis 8:21, 9:17; Sir 1:10), while God is also described elsewhere in the literature of the ITJ as giving spirit, life and favour (Sib. Or. 4:46, 4:189-190).[46] Moreover, in Numbers 11:29 Moses wishes that God would give the spirit of God to the whole Israelite community, although this is a desire of Moses, not an actual giving of the spirit of God.[47] To speak of God giving the Spirit is then quite distinctive to Luke.

3. On Luke's use of λαμβάνω (to receive), Keener notes that this language is common in both Paul (Rom 8:15, 1 Cor 2:12, Gal 3:2, 14) and John (John 7:39, 14:17, 20:22), however, Luke uses λαμβάνω in a distinctive manner.[48] For Luke to receive (λαμβάνω) the Spirit is used in the context of empowerment for mission, while in Paul and John use it the context of salvation.

---

[42] See François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950-2005)*, 2nd ed. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 538.
[43] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 986.
[44] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 986.
[45] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 986.
[46] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 986.
[47] As noted in 4.1.2.
[48] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 986.

Keener's insights then show the rarity with which δίδωμι and δωρεά are used in relation to the Spirit in the pre-Lukan tradition. This rarity indicates that Luke has placed a distinctive emphasis on the Spirit being given as gift rather than simply following a pre-Lukan tradition. The Spirit of God being given as gift is a distinctively Lukan description. Moreover, Keener also highlights the distinctive theological perspective that Luke has, compared to Paul and John, in the use of λαμβάνω and the Holy Spirit. Rather than in the context of salvation, Luke's language of receiving the Spirit is used in the context of empowerment for mission. These points indicate a distinctively Lukan perspective on the Spirit as gift.

4.1.6   Summary

We see a common thread throughout all this scholarship, with scholars using the LXX and literature of the ITJ as an interpretive context for the Spirit as gift. Haya-Prats has persuasively argued that the gift of the Spirit is an epexegetical genitive, that is the Holy Spirit is a gift from God, which is a permanent endowment. Shepherd has highlighted the rarity that Luke uses direct characterisations of the Spirit of God in Luke-Acts, which further highlights the importance for understanding the Spirit as gift in Acts. Turner sees the labelling of the Spirit as "gift" as indicating the giftedness or vocation that the Spirit brings, yet Turner's approach shows the limitations of approaching this gift-giving language solely from the LXX. Finally, Keener has highlighted the rarity of the gift-giving language in the pre-Lukan tradition, indicating that Luke's usage of this description of the Spirit as gift indicates that he attaches a specific significance to it.

4.2   A Fresh Approach to the Spirit as Gift

The previous scholarship has focussed on the description of the Spirit as gift purely from the LXX and ITJ perspective. Drawing upon the insights developed from the sociological literature on gifts (Chapter Two) and the primary sources of the Greco-Roman world on gifts (Chapter Three), in the following chapters I elucidate the implications of the sociability inherent in the description of the Spirit as gift in Acts. I show this by drawing connections between the gift of the Spirit and the community life described in the summary statements (Acts 2:42-47, 4:32-35, 5:12-16). In this section, I note the scholars that have used the Greco-Roman world to inform their understanding of the Spirit in Acts (4.2.1), and the scholars who have used various social-scientific approaches to the Spirit in Acts (4.2.2).

4.2.1   *The Spirit and the Greco-Roman World*

In this thesis, I use the Greco-Roman world to inform the description of the Spirit as gift in Acts (Chapter Three). While the vast majority of 20th and 21st century Lukan pneumatologists draw upon the Jewish tradition to inform their understanding of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts, there is a growing number of scholars that are beginning to turn to the Greco-Roman world as an interpretive source.[49] There has also been a reaction among scholars against the Greco-Roman world as an interpretive source for the Spirit in Luke-Acts.[50] In this contested space, it is important to address why the Greco-Roman world is an important interpretive context for the Spirit in Luke-Acts.

The collaborative book edited by Jörg Frey and John R. Levison, titled *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity* (2017), explores the various interpretive contexts for πνεῦμα in the literature of antiquity, concentrating mainly on the New Testament. Two chapters in particular focus on the possibility of Greco-Roman influences on the Lukan portrayal of the Holy Spirit. First, Levison co-authors a chapter with Heidrun Gunkel and Rainer Hirsch-Luipold titled "Plutarch and Pentecost."[51] In this chapter, they explore the inadequacy of biblical motifs to completely explain the imagery of Acts 2:1-13, and the "rich resonance" between Plutarch and Pentecost in the imagery of fire, prophetic tongues and intoxication.[52] Second, Soham Al-Suadi examines Luke 1:15 in the light of Greco-Roman medical discourses, in a chapter titled "'Even before his birth he was filled with the Holy Spirit.'"[53] In this chapter, Al-Suadi shows the parallels between ancient medical texts and the description of filling with πνεῦμα in relation to pregnancy.[54] These two chapters show the increasing

---

[49] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*; Jörg Frey and John R. Levison, ed., *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, Ekstasis, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017). A Stoic approach to πνεῦμα is also becoming more common in Pauline and Johannine scholarship, for example see Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Gitte Buch-Hansen, *'It is the Spirit that Gives Life': A Stoic Understanding of Pneuma in John's Gospel*, BZNW, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010).

[50] For the reaction against Levison's work, see James B. Shelton, "Delphi and Jerusalem: Two Spirits or Holy Spirit? A Review of John R. Levison's *Filled with the Spirit*," *Pneuma* 33, no. 1 (2011): 47-58; Blaine Charette, "'And Now for Something Completely Different': A 'Pythonic' Reading of Pentecost?," *Pneuma* 33, no. 1 (2011): 59-62; Roger Stronstad, "Review of John R. Levison's, *Filled with the Spirit* Part III, Early Christian Literature Chapter 3, 'Filled with the Spirit and the Book of Acts.'," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 20, no. 2 (2011): 201-206. And for Levison's responses, see John R. Levison, "Recommendations for the Future of Pneumatology," *Pneuma* 33, no. 1 (2011): 79-93; John R. Levison, "Filled with the Spirit: A Conversation with Pentecostal and Charismatic Scholars," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 20, no. 2 (2011): 213-231.

[51] Heidrun Gunkel, Rainer Hirsch-Luipold, and John R. Levison, "Plutarch and Pentecost: An Exploration in Interdisciplinary Collaboration," in *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity*, ed. Jörg Frey and John R. Levison, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 63-94.

[52] Gunkel, Hirsch-Luipold, and Levison, "Plutarch and Pentecost," 90.

[53] Soham Al-Suadi, "'Even before his birth he will be filled with the Holy Spirit': Luke 1:15 in the Spectrum of Theological and Medical Discourses of Early Christianity," in *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity*, ed. Jörg Frey and John R. Levison, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 95-118.

[54] Al-Suadi, "Even before his birth," 115-116.

interest that scholars are displaying in the possibility of the Greco-Roman world as an interpretive context for the Spirit in Luke-Acts.

Levison's interest in the Greco-Roman world as a source for the Spirit in Acts in *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity* comes from the arguments in an earlier book *Filled with the Spirit* (2009).[55] *Filled with the Spirit* addresses the use of spirit language throughout the biblical literature (including the ITJ), with Levison utilizing Greco-Roman sources at various points throughout his monograph.[56] Specifically on Acts, Levison notes the rich interpretive context of the Greco-Roman world for the mention of ecstasy, fire, filling, intoxication and the role the Spirit plays in the reinterpretation of scripture and inspired proclamation.[57] Levison's work provides some interesting pathways, but he never considers the Spirit as gift when applying the insights from the Greco-Roman world to the Spirit in Acts.

Levison's work in *Filled with the Spirit* has reopened the Greco-Roman world as an interpretive context for the Spirit in Acts, but this has also been met with some strong criticism.[58] To give a potent example, Roger Stronstad argues that "Levison's 'history of religions' approach *paganizes* those experiences which Acts of the Apostles portrays to be uniquely *Judeo-Christian*."[59] Stronstad sees Levison "paganising" the text, in part, through his reliance on the wider Greco-Roman world used, which he describes as a history of religions approach. However, we should question this sharp divide between Judaism and Hellenism, as Hellenism had integrated with Judaism by the 1st century CE (although this varied region to region).[60] Moreover, as it is likely that a significant portion, if not the majority of Luke's initial audience was Gentile,[61] it is conceivable that these Gentiles would have had particular understandings of πνεῦμα that differed from the Jewish understanding(s) of πνεῦμα.[62] While I do agree that the main interpretive context of the Spirit in Luke-Acts is Judeo-Christian, we should be cautious about neatly dividing the pagan and Judeo-Christian worlds. Moreover, I see the wider Greco-Roman world as a more fruitful interpretive context for the specific description of the Spirit as gift.

---

[55] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*.
[56] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*.
[57] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 317-365.
[58] For example, Shelton, "Delphi and Jerusalem," 47-58; Charette, "And Now for Something Completely Different," 59-62; Stronstad, "Review of John R. Levison's, *Filled with the Spirit*," 201-206.
[59] Stronstad, "Review of John R. Levison's, Filled with the Spirit," 201-206. Emphasis original
[60] This has been well accepted since the work of Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, trans. John Bowden, vol. 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974).
[61] For example, see Joseph B. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 35-36; Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 63-65; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 426-428; Youngmo Cho and Hyung Dae Park, *Acts, Part One: Introduction and Chapters 1-12*, New Covenant Commentary Series, (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019), 13-14.
[62] Wenk has made this point in the conclusion of his monograph, see Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 314-315.

4.2.2   *The Spirit and Sociological Models*

Using insights from sociological literature is not foreign to understanding Lukan pneumatology, as sociological models have already been used by Lukan scholars addressing the Spirit. For example, Matthias Wenk uses "Speech Act Theory" to argue that the empowerment of witness includes not only the empowerment of words but also the effects of those prophetic words.[63] Aaron J. Kuecker uses "Social Identity Theory" to argue that it is the Spirit that empowers and guides the early Jesus movement to incorporate "the Other" into their movement.[64] Nevertheless, as yet no Lukan scholar studying the Spirit in Luke-Acts has applied a sociological understanding of gift-giving to the Spirit as gift.

However, this does not mean that sociological approaches to the gift-giving language in the New Testament are foreign. For example, Zeba Crook has applied a sociological understanding of gift to Paul's language of conversion.[65] Likewise, John M. G. Barclay addresses Paul's language of χάρις (gift, favour, grace) from a sociological perspective, while James R. Harrison has taken a more socio-historical approach to Paul's use of χάρις.[66] Sociological approaches to the gift-giving language in the Pauline literature have then become well-known, yet no-one to date has applied these sociological approaches to the Spirit as gift in Acts.

There have been two scholars that have suggested the Spirit as gift as a possible topic of research. In a chapter of the collaborative *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (1991), Halvor Moxnes provides a social-scientific model for interpreting patronage systems in the gospel of Luke, and suggests in the final paragraph that there is further research needed on the "gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts."[67] Jerome Neyrey has also touched on the Spirit as gift in *Render to God* (2004), by noting that Jesus acts as a broker in giving the Spirit to the disciples, and in fact, scholars could apply the lens of patronage to the reception of the Spirit.[68] Yet, no scholar has taken up these suggestions for further research. The insights developed in Chapters Two and Three, then provide the basis for a new examination of the sociability of the Spirit in Acts, implied in the description of the Spirit as gift. As this thesis will focus on the Spirit as gift *in Acts*, while at times drawing on insights from the Gospel, in the next section, I address the unity of Luke-Acts and the implied audience of Acts.

---

[63] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*.
[64] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*.
[65] Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*.
[66] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*; Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*.
[67] Halvor Moxnes, "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 268.
[68] Jerome H. Neyrey, *Render to God: New Testament Understandings of the Divine* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004), 87-89.

4.2.3   Summary

While using the Greco-Roman world or the social-scientific approach are not common in elucidating the Spirit in Acts, my approach is not without antecedents. The work of Levison, while controversial for some, has reopened the Greco-Roman world as an interpretive context for the Spirit in Acts. Moreover, the work of Wenk and Kuecker, in approaching the Spirit in Acts through a social-scientific approach has shown the fruitfulness of a sociological perspective on the Spirit in Acts.

4.3   Reading Acts

When approaching Acts, there are two foundational questions that are of significance for this research: the unity of Luke-Acts and the audience of Acts.[69] The unity of Luke-Acts is important for this thesis, as I use the Lukan Jesus' teaching on wealth in Gospel of Luke to inform the communal sharing of the early Jesus community in the summary statements.[70] There is a consensus that the Gospel of Luke and Acts have the same author, although there is an ongoing discussion as to whether Luke-Acts are two volumes of the one work or two separate (but loosely related) works by the same author. Michael F. Bird suggests that what is "at stake is whether we link Luke and Acts with a dash (Luke-Acts = a close connection) or with a forward slash (Luke/Acts = a loose connection)."[71] The question of the unity of Luke-Acts is a question of degree, between a close and a loose connection.

While it is not possible within the scope of this thesis to explore fully the degree to which Luke and Acts are unified, the unity of Luke-Acts is important to this thesis in two respects: the theme of wealth in Luke-Acts and the gift-giving language used in relation to the Spirit in Luke-Acts. In this thesis, I argue that there is a close connection between the Gospel of Luke and Acts on the topic of wealth and gift-giving. Through the process of researching and writing this thesis, I have become convinced that there is a close connection between the Gospel of Luke and Acts on the topic of wealth and gift-giving, and I argue that the Lukan Jesus' teaching on wealth in Luke 6:27-38 is illustrated in the communal sharing of the early Jesus community (Acts 2:44-45, 4:34-35).[72] While some scholars see discrepancies between Luke and Acts on the topic of wealth, I will argue that if the description of the

---

[69] The arguments presented in this thesis are not based on a specific genre, dating, authorship, or purpose of Acts. For an overview of these discussions, see Keener, *Acts*, 1, 51-89, 383-401, 402-416, 435-458 respectively. I address the genre of "summary" and the insights from literary critics on the summary statements in 5.2.

[70] See Chapter Eight for the Lukan Jesus' teaching on wealth, see Chapter Ten for the impact this teaching has on the communal sharing.

[71] Michael F. Bird, "The Unity of Luke-Acts in Recent Discussion," *JSNT* 29, no. 4 (2007): 426. For the ongoing discussion since Bird, see Keener, *Acts*, 1, 550-574. I use the hyphen instead of the dash to follow *The SBL Handbook of Style* (45) guidelines.

[72] For the Lukan Jesus' teaching on wealth see Chapter 8, and for the illustration of this teaching see Chapter 10.

Spirit as gift is considered in the evaluation of the communal sharing in Acts 2, then these discrepancies ease.[73] That is, I see a close connection between the Gospel of Luke and Acts on the topic of wealth. However, it is also worth noting that there is a significant discrepancy between the Gospel of Luke and Acts in the language used in relation to the Holy Spirit. Luke uses the gift-giving language (giving, receiving and gift) in relation to the Spirit only once in the Gospel of Luke (Luke 11:13) and fifteen times in Acts (Acts 1:8, 2:33, 2:38 (x2), 5:32, 8:15, 8:17, 8:18, 8:19, 8:20, 10:45, 10:47, 11:17, 15:8, 19:2). While there could be many explanations for this descriptive discrepancy, there seems to be a loose connection between the Gospel of Luke and Acts in relation to the Spirit as gift.

Concerning the audience of Acts, scholars have suggested numerous geographical locations for the first audience of Luke-Acts.[74] Cho and Park note that "Irenaeus and Eusebius suggest it to be Rome… [while] Anti-Marcionite Prologues and Jerome… put it in Achaia."[75] Others have suggested Corinth, Ephesus, or Philippi.[76] Despite the variance in the geographical location of the first audience of Acts, there is wide agreement that Acts is written to an urban educated audience, which included wealthy members.[77] Keener summaries the consensus concerning Luke's implied audience, by stating,

> Luke's ideal audience was probably, on average, of higher education than many others, with a wide knowledge of the northern Aegean Greek culture and a familiarity with the LXX. This observation probably also supports the likelihood that it was more economically stable than say, rural peasants in Galilee or Egypt, and some were probably better off than the average artisan (Theophilus perhaps much better).[78]

Luke's ideal audience being educated, urban and (relatively) wealthy is based upon four observations. First, the mention of "most excellent" Theophilus in Acts 1:1 probably refers to the literary patron of Acts (and so wealthy), as well as someone of high standing in society.[79] Second, Luke emphasises the status of many of the believers in the early Jesus movement, as well as portraying Paul as having a relatively elevated status.[80] Third, Luke employs popular rhetorical conventions and philosophical aphorisms, which implies an educated (or at least an urban) audience.[81] Fourth, Keener notes that, like the author of Sirach, Luke's teaching on wealth and gift-giving might "suggest an audience that

---

[73] See in particular, sections 10.3, and 10.4.
[74] For a comprehensive overview, see Keener, *Acts*, 1, 423-434.
[75] Cho and Park, *Acts, Part One*, 6.
[76] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 429-432.
[77] See the overview of Keener, *Acts*, 1, 423-428.
[78] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 423.
[79] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 423-424.
[80] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 424.
[81] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 425.

can afford to be challenged in the area of generosity."[82] While these points do not indicate that all of the implied Lukan community were elite or near to the elite, it does indicate that this gospel addresses those whose life is lived above the subsistence lifestyle of peasants and the poor.

4.4   Conclusion

As I have shown in this literature review, there is still more to be said concerning the Spirit as gift. Previous scholars examining the Spirit as "gift" have relied on purely Jewish sources to understand the description of the Spirit as gift. This thesis seeks to broaden the approach to the Spirit as gift by incorporating the perspectives developed from sociology and from the primary sources of the Greco-Roman. Chapters Two and Three have argued that gifts have an inherent socially creative force, or sociability, that binds people together. Incorporating this insight into the current scholarship on the Spirit as gift, leads us to the question: What is the sociability that is implied in the description of the Spirit as gift?

The following seven chapters seek to answer this question by establishing the Spirit's influence on the community life as depicted in the three main summary statements (Acts 2:42-47, 4:32-35, 5:12-16). I argue that the description of the Spirit as gift implies the Spirit initiates and sustains the early Jesus community, as evidenced by the Spirit's empowerment of every aspect of the community life as described in the summary statements. The next chapter begins to answer this question by giving a translation of the summary statements, addressing the literary, source and narrative insights on the summary statements and exploring the various ways scholars have connected the Spirit to the community.

---

[82] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 424.

PART TWO

As I have now established that gifts have an inherent sociability, Part Two and Part Three of this thesis will then move to apply this insight to the description of the Spirit as gift in Acts. Part Two and Three then seeks to establish that this sociability is manifested in the Spirit's empowerment of the community life as described in the three major summary statements (Acts 2:42-47, 4:32-35, 5:12-16). In Part Two, I will connect the witnessing, teaching, signs and wonders, great joy, prayer and praise to the gift of the Spirit, while in Part Three, I will focus on the gift of the Spirit influence on the communal sharing, sharing of meals and the unity of the early Jesus community.

Part Two comprises of three chapters, Chapters Five, Six and Seven, which seeks to establish six initial connections between the Spirit and the community life described in the three summary statements. Chapter Five gives my translation of the three summary statements, examines the literary, source and narrative perspectives on the summary statements, and addresses the previous arguments that connect the Spirit with the community life in Acts. Spending time translating the summary statements is important, as I address the interpretive issues that arise in translating the summary statements. Moreover, examining the literary source and narrative perspectives on the summary statements establishes the circular relationship between the summary statements and the surrounding narratives. This insight then means we can use the surrounding narrative to inform the various elements found in the summary statements.

In Chapter Six, I examine the Spirit's empowerment of four aspects of the community life: their witnessing, their teaching, their signs and wonders, and their great joy. In this chapter, I note that other scholars have persuasively established the Spirit's empowerment of the witnessing, signs and great joy. However, I add new arguments for placing teaching under the banner of Spirit inspired speech, as the apostles teach in the same social space that they preach and proclaim, while the Spirit as empowers the reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible, which would have pivotal to their teaching. In Chapter Seven, I connect the gift of the Spirit to the prayer and praise of the early Jesus community through the concept of gratitude, as gratitude was the expected response to gifts, including divine benefactions. Chapters Six and Seven in particular then establish the sociability of the Spirit as a gift through examining the Spirit's empowerment of these six aspects of the community life mentioned in the three summary statements.

Chapter 5: An Overview of the Summary Statements

In this chapter, I give my translation of the three main summary statements (Acts 2:42-47, 4:32-35, 5:12-16), address the insights from the literary, source and narrative critics concerning Luke's use of the summary statements, and outline my approach in connecting the Spirit to the summary statements.[1] Giving my translation and addressing interpretive issues related to the summary statements is important, as I argue, among other things, that Luke's use of κοινωνία in Acts 2:42 should be understood as referring to the communal sharing of the early Jesus community. Likewise, addressing the insights from the literary, source and narrative critics leads to the insight that there is a circular relationship between the summary statements and the surrounding narratives, and so we can use these surrounding narratives to inform the various elements found in the summary statements. Moreover, addressing the previous arguments for connecting the Spirit to the summary statements situates my approach within the wider scholarship, and displays the strength of an element by element approach to the Spirit's relationship with the Lukan portrayal of the community life in the summary statements.

This chapter will have three sections, with the first giving a translation and commenting on some of the difficult phrases in these summary statements (5.1). After this, in the second section I address the various insights of literary, source and narrative criticism on the summary statements (5.2). In the final section, I set out the three main approaches to connecting the Spirit to the summary statements (5.3).

5.1   The Translation and Difficult Phrases

In this section I give my translation and address the contested areas of interpretation for the three summary statements in Acts. In this section, I offer a translation of Acts 2:42-47, Acts 4:32-35 and Acts 5:12-16 (5.1.1), and address the translation of τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό and ἀφελότητι (5.1.2).

---

[1] This thesis will differentiate between summary statements (Acts 2:42-47, 4:32-35, 5:12-16) and summary sentences (i.e. Acts 6:7, 9:31, 12:24, 16:5, 19:20) as they serve difference literary functions in Acts, see Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 157-159.

The Greek text and my translation of the first summary statement, Acts 2:42-47, is as follows:[2]

2[42] Ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων[3] καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ [4] τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς.

[43] ἐγίνετο δὲ πάσῃ ψυχῇ φόβος, πολλά τε τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο.[5]

[44] πάντες δὲ οἱ πιστεύοντες[6] ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό καὶ[7] εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινὰ

[45] καὶ τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις ἐπίπρασκον καὶ διεμέριζον αὐτὰ πᾶσιν καθότι ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχεν·

[46] καθ᾽ ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, κλῶντές τε κατ᾽ οἶκον ἄρτον,[8] μετελάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας

[47] αἰνοῦντες τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἔχοντες χάριν πρὸς ὅλον τὸν λαόν. ὁ δὲ κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σῳζομένους καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ.

2[42] *They were continually devoting themselves to the teachings of the apostles and to the communal sharing, to the breaking of bread and to the prayers.*

[43] *Awe came upon every soul as many wonders and signs were performed through the apostles.*

[44] *All the believers were together and had everything in common,*

[45] *and they were selling their possessions and property and distributing [the proceeds] to all, as anyone who had a need.*

[46] *Every day they met together in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they shared food in great joy and simplicity of heart,*

---

[2] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 385.

[3] Some manuscripts add ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ after ἀποστόλων. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), 302; Reuben J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: The Acts of the Apostles* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 34; Richard I. Pervo, *Acts*, Hermeneia, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2010), 92.

[4] Some manuscripts add a καὶ after κοινωνίᾳ to separate more clearly the communal sharing from the breaking of bread. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, 34; Pervo, *Acts*, 92.

[5] There are numerous variants at this point. First, some manuscripts add εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ at the end of verse 43. Others add the τῶν χειρῶν to τῶν ἀποστόλων, which is probably due to the wording of Acts 5:12. While other manuscripts repeat φόβος τε ἦν μέγας ἐπὶ πάντας [αὐτούς] after διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 302; Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, 34-35; Pervo, *Acts*, 93.

[6] Οἱ πιστεύοντες is sometimes found as πιστεύειν or πιστεύσαντες. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 302-303; Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, 35.

[7] Some manuscripts omit ἦσαν and καὶ rendering the line ... πιστεύοντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶχον.... Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 303; Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, 35.

[8] There are numerous minor variants from verse 45 up until this point, none of which has any impact on the meaning of the text. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 303-304; Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, 35-36; Pervo, *Acts*, 94.

[47]praising God and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to the community daily those who were being saved.

This first summary statement describes the first community in the aftermath of Pentecost (Acts 2:1-41), describing the private and public life of this Jesus-centred community. I will address the translation of τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό and ἀφελότητι in 5.1.2; here I set out the four significant differences between my translation and those of the NIV, NLT and NRSV.[9]

First, I have added the adverb "continually" to the present participle "devoting," in order to emphasise the imperfect nature of the Ἦσαν at the start of Acts 2:42. Second, I have chosen a more literal translation of Acts 2:43. The NIV speaks of "Everyone was filled with awe," as they translate ἐγίνετο here as "filling." My translation is closer to the NRSV, only differing on the translation of πάσῃ ψυχῇ, as the NRSV translates this as "everyone," whereas I have chosen the more literal translation "every soul," in order to emphasise that this is all of Jerusalem, not just everyone in the early Jesus community that had awe. Third, both the NRSV and NIV translate ἀγαλλιάσει as "glad," rather than great joy, which dampens the exuberance of ἀγαλλιάσει (see 6.4 for more detail). Fourth, my translation of Acts 2:47 differs from the NRSV and NLT, as both of these translations translate χάριν as "goodwill" (rather than "favour").[10] I also differ from the NIV and NLT translations of this verse, as both the NIV and NLT translate ἔχοντες as "enjoying" (rather than "having"). Apart from the translation of τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό and ἀφελότητι which I discuss in 5.1.2, these are the four significant differences that my translation of Acts 2:42-47 has with the NIV, NLT and NRSV.

The Greek text and my translation of the second summary statement, found in Acts 4:32-35, is as follows:[11]

4[32] Τοῦ δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων ἦν καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία, καὶ οὐδὲ εἷς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι[12] ἀλλ᾽ ἦν αὐτοῖς ἅπαντα κοινά.

[33] καὶ δυνάμει μεγάλῃ ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ,[13] χάρις τε μεγάλη ἦν ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς

[34] οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής τις ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὅσοι γὰρ κτήτορες χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ὑπῆρχον, πωλοῦντες ἔφερον τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πιπρασκομένων

---

[9] All references to the NIV, NLT and NRSV are taken from *Holy Bible: New International Version*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011); *Holy Bible: New Living Translation*, (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House, 2015); *New Revised Standard Version Bible*, (National Council of the Churches of Christ, 1989).

[10] See section 10.2 for the discussion on the semantic range of χάρις

[11] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 391.

[12] Codex D adds καὶ οὐκ ἦν διάκρισις ἐν αὐτῖς οὐδεμία while Codex E substitutes διάκρισις for χωρισμός, see *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 391.

[13] Some manuscripts change the order of the phrasing ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, while others add Χριστοῦ into the phrase. See *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 391.

³⁵ καὶ ἐτίθουν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων, διεδίδετο δὲ ἑκάστῳ καθότι ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχεν.

4³² Now the community of believers had one heart and soul, and no one claimed that any possessions were their own, but they had all things in common.

³³ With great power the apostles gave their testimony to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus and great favour was upon all of them,

³⁴ for there was not a needy person among them because all the owners of fields or houses sold them

³⁵ and brought the proceeds to the feet of the apostles, and this money was distributed to each according to their need.

The context of this second summary statement is the conflict between the Sanhedrin and the representatives of the early Jesus community, Peter and John (Acts 4:1-22). This conflict leads to the first recorded prayer after Pentecost (Acts 4:23-30), which ends with the community being filled again with the Holy Spirit and preaching with boldness (Acts 4:31). Scholars have focussed on the wording of Acts 4:33b-4:34a, which I address in 10.2; otherwise there are three significant differences that my translation has with the NIV, NLT and NRSV.

The first point of difference is in the translation of πλήθους, which the NIV and NLT translate as "all," while the NRSV has the more literal translation of "whole group." There are many suggestions for the translation of πλήθους,[14] but I have decided to translate πλήθους with the sense of "community."[15] Fitzmyer notes of the term πλήθους that it is most probably "a reflection of various Hebrew terms used to describe the assembly of the Essene community," and, as in this specific case it is linked with the believers (τῶν πιστευσάντων), I have translated πλήθους as community.[16] However, in Acts 5:12 (translated below), πλήθους is used in a more general sense of "crowds".

Second, my translation differs from the NIV on Acts 4:34a in that the NIV adds the descriptor of where the χάρις comes from, God, and translates μεγάλη as "powerfully." The NLT translates χάρις as "blessing", while also indicating that this blessing comes from God. As I discuss in further detail in 10.2, I see χάρις of Acts 4:34a as referring to the favour upon the community, with the most likely

---

[14] For the translation "company" see Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel, Hermeneia, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 36; I. Howard Marshall, *Acts: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC, (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), 155; Gerhard A. Krodel, *Acts*, ACNT, (Minneapolis: Augsburg University Press, 1986), 166; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 252; Bock, *Acts*, 213. Or "assembly" see Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 86; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 206.

[15] Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles*, New Testament Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1990), 173; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 313.

[16] Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 313.

source of this favour being God, although it is possible that this favour could be from the wider Jerusalem population (see e.g. Acts 2:47).

Third, there are differences in the translation of the second and third phrases of Acts 4:32, as all three translations differ significantly from a literal translation. My translation differs slightly from the NIV and NLT, as both choose to translate κοινά as "sharing" rather than "in common." The NRSV departs from the literal translation of the original Greek, by making explicit the understanding of the community of goods as the denunciation of private property, by stating: "no one claimed private ownership of any possessions."[17] I address the ongoing discussion around the type of communal sharing that the early Jesus community practiced in 9.1, where I see the weight of evidence supporting a shared access to property and possessions, rather than the denunciation of private property. For now, I have chosen to keep my translation of the Greek text close to a literal translation.

Finally, the Greek text and my translation of the third summary statement, found in Acts 5:12-16, is as follows:[18]

> 5[12] Διὰ δὲ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα πολλὰ ἐν τῷ λαῷ. καὶ ἦσαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅπαντες ἐν τῇ στοᾷ Σολομῶντος,[19]
>
> [13] τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδεὶς[20] ἐτόλμα κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ᾽ ἐμεγάλυνεν αὐτοὺς ὁ λαός.
>
> [14] μᾶλλον δὲ προσετίθεντο πιστεύοντες τῷ κυρίῳ, πλήθη ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν,
>
> [15] ὥστε καὶ εἰς τὰς πλατείας ἐκφέρειν τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς καὶ τιθέναι ἐπὶ κλιναρίων καὶ κραβάττων, ἵνα ἐρχομένου Πέτρου κἂν ἡ σκιὰ ἐπισκιάσῃ τινὶ αὐτῶν.
>
> [16] συνήρχετο δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πέριξ πόλεων[21] Ἰερουσαλὴμ φέροντες ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ὀχλουμένους ὑπὸ[22] πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, οἵτινες ἐθεραπεύοντο ἅπαντες.[23]
>
> *5[12] Through the hands of the apostles many signs and wonders were performed among the people, and they were all together in the Colonnade of Solomon,*
>
> *[13] none of the rest dared to join them, but the people held them in high esteem.*

---

[17] I will address the discussion surrounding whether the community of goods in Acts is shared ownership of shared possession in section 9.1.

[18] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 392-393.

[19] Codices A, B and E read ἅπαντες with πάντες, while ἐν τῇ στοᾷ Σολομῶντος is replaced with ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ in Codex D, see *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 393.

[20] Codex D rearranges τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδεὶς to καὶ οὐδεὶς τῶν λοιπῶν, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 393.

[21] Some manuscripts (including Codices D, E and Ψ) insert εἰς after πόλεων indicating that the crowds come into Jerusalem, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 393.

[22] Codex D uses ἀπό instead of ὑπό, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 393.

[23] Some manuscripts, including Codex D, read οἵτινες ἐθεραπεύοντο ἅπαντες with καὶ ἰῶντο πάντες, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 393.

[14] *Nevertheless, more people were added to those believing in the Lord, multitudes of both men and women,*

[15] *so that they would bring out the sick into the streets and put them on couches and mats, so that when Peter came by at least his shadow might envelop some of them.*

[16] *Now the crowds were coming together from the cities surrounding Jerusalem, bringing the sick and those being tormented by unclean spirits, of whom all were healed.*

The third summary statement comes shortly after the second summary statement, with the examples of Barnabas, Ananias and Sapphira separating these two summaries.

There are three significant differences that my translation has with the NIV, NLT and NRSV. First, the NIV, NLT and NRSV choose not to include τῶν χειρῶν (the hands) in their translations of Acts 5:12. While I have included this description, as it stays true to the Greek text. Second, the NIV and NLT elaborate on the implied object of ἦσαν, by adding "the believers used to meet", in the second phrase of Acts 5:12. This interpretive move seeks to emphasise the change in perspective from the population of Jerusalem (τῷ λαῷ) in Acts 5:12a to the community in Acts 5:12b. Third, the NLT adds the phrase "of the apostles' work" to the ὥστε at the start of Acts 5:15, which again emphasises the place the apostles had in the early Jesus community's public ministry.

5.1.2   Issues with Translation

There are three phrases from the first summary statement that are particularly contested by scholars, and I examine them in this subsection. The first of these is the translation of τῇ κοινωνίᾳ (Acts 2:42) in the early Jesus community, which I have rendered as "to the communal sharing". Acts 2:42 is the only time Luke uses κοινωνία in his two volumes, while he uses the related adjective κοινά in Acts 2:44 and 4:32. Given that in Acts 2:42 κοινωνία is simply stated, with no adjective or descriptive phrase, the translation and meaning of this κοινωνία is difficult to ascertain. The base definition of κοινωνία seems to be well accepted, as Friedrich Hauck, in the influential *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (1964), notes that κοινωνία in its broadest meaning is the "sharing with someone or in something."[24] This broad definition seems to be the accepted definition among Lukan commentators for the usage of κοινωνία in the Greco-Roman world.[25]

---

[24] Friedrich Hauck, "κοινωνία," in *TDNT*, 3, 797.
[25] Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 23; Barclay M. Newman and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles* (London: United Bible Societies, 1972), 63; Marshall, *Acts*, 89; Krodel, *Acts*, 92-93; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 110-111; David J. Williams, *Acts*, New International Biblical Commentary, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1990), 59; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 58; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 164; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the*

The difficulty arises when we ponder what type of sharing the κοινωνία in Acts 2:42 denotes. There seem to be two main positions: κοινωνία as a spiritual union or fellowship, and κοινωνία as an economic partnership or communal sharing. Some scholars argue that Luke's use of κοινωνία in Acts 2:42 is mainly, if not solely, alluding to the spiritual fellowship of the first believers.[26] For example, Hauck argues for this position:

> κοινωνία does not denote the concrete community or society of Christians which, while it had not yet separated itself legally and cultically from the Jewish community, already represented a circle of the closest fellowship. Nor can it signify the community of goods. ... It is rather an abstract and spiritual term for the fellowship of brotherly concord established and expressed in the life of the community.[27]

The κοινωνία in Acts 2:42, according to Hauck, is the sharing of a spiritual bond, signifying a profound spiritual unity that bound the early Jesus community together. Yet, Hauck's study predates the rise of social scientific methods, and its sharp distinction between spiritual and actual bonding is now problematic.

While noting the fellowship of the first believers, other scholars argue that κοινωνία refers to a communal sharing of possessions.[28] There are two arguments for this. First, as Reta Halteman Finger argues, the κοινά in Acts 2:44 and 4:32, which refers to a communal lifestyle, should inform the translation of κοινωνία in Acts 2:42.[29] Second, Julien M. Ogereau's recent research into the inscriptional and papyrological use of κοινωνία indicates that:

Apostles, 270; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 160; Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, ANTC, (Nashville: Abingdon, 2003), 81; Bock, *Acts*, 150; J. Bradley Chance, *Acts*, SHBC, (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2007), 59; Mikeal C. Parsons, *Acts*, Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 48; Pervo, *Acts*, 92; David G. Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 160-161; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1002-1003.

[26] Hauck, "κοινωνία," 808-809; Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 170-172; James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 145, 183; Marshall, *Acts*, 89; French L. Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction and Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), 33-34; James D. G. Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Epworth Commentaries, (London: Epworth, 1996), 35; Turner, *Power from on High*, 413; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 268; Bock, *Acts*, 150.

[27] Hauck, "κοινωνία," 809.

[28] Ajith Fernando, *Acts*, The NIV Application Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 120; Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 23; Newman and Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles*, 63; Krodel, *Acts*, 92-93; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 110-111; Williams, *Acts*, 59; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 58; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 164; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 270; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 160; Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 81; Chance, *Acts*, 59; Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 228-230; Parsons, *Acts*, 48; Roger Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology* (Cleveland: CPT, 2010), 73-74; Cho and Park, *Acts, Part One*, 69.

[29] Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 228. Finger (228) also notes that the use of κοινός in the letters of Paul most commonly connotes material sharing (Rom. 15:26, 2 Cor. 8:4, 9:13). Moreover, Miguel Manzanera has shown that in the *Didache* κοινωνία meant the communal sharing, see Miguel Manzanera, "Koinonia en Hch 2,42. Notas sobre su interpretacion y origen histórico-doctrinal," *Estudios Eclesiasticos* 52, no. 202 (1977): 321-324.

in a majority of cases, these cognates [κοινωνέω, κοινωνός, κοινωνία] essentially expressed the idea of partnership, be it economic, political, marital, or otherwise, and not that of religious association and/or spiritual communion, as the expression would later come to signify in Christian theology and liturgy.[30]

In the common usage in the Greco-Roman world, κοινωνία refers to a partnership, and frequently economic partnerships, with the understanding of a spiritual κοινωνία developing in later liturgy. These two points lead to an alternative translation of κοινωνία as communal sharing.

Although it is possible for the κοινωνία of Acts 2:42 to refer to a spiritual union or fellowship, the lack of an adjective or descriptive phrase indicates a more common usage. However, this should not discount the spiritual fellowship that this community experienced. Communal sharing was often the basis of sociability, and so it is probable that the sharing of possessions is a major influence on the unity of the early believers. As Ben Witherington states, "fellowship is the result of κοινωνία, of sharing in common; it is not the κοινωνία itself. κοινωνία is an activity which can result in fellowship."[31] The sharing of the first believers in the early Jesus community *leads* to profound sociability, their fellowship. As κοινωνία in Acts 2:42 primarily indicates the communal sharing of possessions and meals, I have chosen to translate κοινωνία as communal sharing while noting that this communal sharing led to a profound sociability, their fellowship and unity.

The next challenging phrase from the summary statements is the phrase ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (Acts 2:44, 47), which I argue has dual meanings of "in the same place" or "together."[32] Charles C. Torrey started the discussion on Luke's use of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, noting that its use in Acts 2:47 is especially awkward,[33] which leads Torrey to argue that this is a "serious mistranslation" from the Aramaic source to the Greek.[34] Torrey argues that Luke mistranslates ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in Acts 2:47 from the Aramaic *lahda*, which means "greatly."[35] Therefore, according to Torrey, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό should be translated as greatly.

---

[30] Ogereau, *Paul's Koinonia with the Philippians*, 216.

[31] Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 160.

[32] Barrett (167) has noted that some manuscripts drop the ἦσαν and the καὶ which are either side of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, which Barrett argues was the original text. This suggestion would render the Acts 2:44: πάντες δὲ οἱ πιστεύοντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινά. Barrett (158) then translates Acts 2:44 as, "All the members of the believing community held all their belongings in common." This variation is found in the important early manuscript of Codex Vaticanus (4th century CE), and also in Origen (254 CE) and Salvian (480 CE), see *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 385. However, Barrett (167) notes that this is a more "difficult reading." Moreover, Barrett's position does not answer what the proper translation of Acts 2:47 should be. See Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 158, 167.

[33] As shown by the numerous different variants at the end of Acts 2:47. See the variants noted by Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 304-305; Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, 37; Pervo, *Acts*, 95.

[34] Charles C. Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916), 10. Supported by J. de Zwaan, "The Use of The Greek Language in Acts," in *BegC*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977), 2, 30-65.

[35] Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts*, 14.

Torrey's position has been engaged with by many scholars, who note that Torrey's position calls into question the translation of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in Acts 2:44.[36] H. F. Sparks notes that ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό occurs five times in Acts (Acts 1:15, 2:1, 2:44, 2:47, 4:26), with Torrey's argument making sense only for Acts 2:47.[37] More recently, Noble has noted that "ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό has a sizable Septuagintal and Lukan pedigree," and that in the LXX, "ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό can mean 'at the same time,' 'at the same place,' or 'together' in the sense of being a unified body."[38] According to these scholars, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό can have a spatial or non-spatial meaning of together.

Other scholars go further, arguing that ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό can have a unitive sense.[39] A. A. Vazakas supports this point when he examines the use of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in the early Christian literature, arguing that it has a "technical meaning" which "signifies the union of the Christian body."[40] Likewise, Bruce M. Metzger states,

> The phrase ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, which is common enough in classical Greek and the Septuagint, acquired a quasi-technical meaning in the early church. This meaning, which is required in [Acts] 1.15; 2.1, 47; 1 Cor 11.20; 14.23, signifies the union of the Christian body, and perhaps could be rendered "in church fellowship."[41]

These scholars agree that ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό has technical meaning for the fellowship or gathering of believers.

Brian Capper has argued for a connection between ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό and the Hebrew phrase *hayahad*, which was used by the Qumran community to indicate "the community."[42] This argument has led Capper to argue that the ἅπαντα κοινά of Acts 2:44 is "an epexegesis to explain a phrase (ἦσαν ἐπὶ

---

[36] F. C. Burkitt, "Professor Torrey on 'Acts'," *JTS* 20, no. 80 (1919): 321-324; A. A. Vazakas, "Is Acts 1-15.35 a Literal Translation from an Aramaic Original?," *JBL* 37, no. 1/2 (1918): 106-108; H. F. D. Sparks, "The Semitisms of Acts," *JTS* 1, no. 1 (1950): 17-19; Max E. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 93-100; Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* 1st ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 9-10.

[37] Sparks, "The Semitisms of Acts," 18.

[38] Joshua Noble, "Common Property, the Golden Age, and Empire in Acts 2:42-47 and 4:32-35" (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2018), 222-223.

[39] Vazakas, "Is Acts 1-15.35 a Literal Translation," 107; Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 305; Newman and Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles*, 65; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 58; Bradley Blue, "Acts and the House Church," in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting: Graeco-Roman Setting*, ed. David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf, BAFCS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 130-131; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 160; Bock, *Acts*, 152; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 132; Noble, "Common Property," 222-223.

[40] Vazakas, "Is Acts 1-15.35 a Literal Translation," 107.

[41] Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 305.

[42] Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, 93-100; Brian J. Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context of the Earliest Christian Community of Goods," in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting: Palestinian Setting*, ed. Richard Bauckham, BAFCS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 336-337; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 161; Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 231; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1027.

τὸ αὐτό) which could not carry in Greek the technical significance."[43] By that Capper means that Luke intends ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό and ἅπαντα κοινά to indicate the same thing, so that ἅπαντα κοινά is equivalent to ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in Luke's usage.[44] However, it is hard to establish Capper's position, as we have no clear examples of an ancient author translating *hayahad* as ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.

In summary, I see Luke using ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in three ways: the spatial understanding of "in the same place" or the more general "together," the non-spatial meaning of "at the same time," or the more formal unitive sense of "community." Joshua Noble notes that in Acts 2:47 ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό has the formal unitive sense, and so argues that the ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό of Acts 2:44 should also have this same unitive sense.[45] While I agree with Noble that the ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in Acts 2:47 has the formal unitive sense of "community," I do not see this as determining the phrase in Acts 2:44. With a phrase such as ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό of Acts 2:44, if the phrase in question does not clearly have a technical sense, nuances apparent in the later usage (Acts 2:47) do not necessarily determine the nuances of the earlier usage. Rather, the most plausible meaning of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in Acts 2:44 is the general spatial sense of "together." Therefore, I have used the formal unitive sense of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in Acts 2:47 and the general spatial sense in Acts 2:44.

The third difficult phrase in the summary statements is the translation of ἀφελότητι, as this word is not found anywhere else in the New Testament or the LXX and is rare in the broader Greco-Roman literature.[46] Moreover, Noble notes that Luke is the first known author in Greek literature to use ἀφελότητι.[47] Some scholars suggest that ἀφελότητι has connotations of generosity, as it appears in the context of shared meals.[48] More likely is the suggestion by those who note that ἀφελότης shares the same root as ἀφελεια (simplicity), and in the case of Acts 2:46, is used instead of ἀφλότης (simplicity, sincerity, uprightness).[49] Therefore, I have chosen to translate ἀφελότητι as "simplicity."

---

[43] Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context," 336; Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 232.
[44] For a critique of this position see Richard J. Bauckham, "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001*, ed. James R. Davila, (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 85-89.
[45] Noble, "Common Property," 223.
[46] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1029.
[47] Noble, "Common Property," 224.
[48] Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, 74; Bock, *Acts*, 154; Schnabel, *Acts*, 184.
[49] James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929), 95-96; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 171; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 59; Noble, "Common Property," 224.

5.1.3   Summary

In this section, I have given my translation of the three summary statements, noting the differences with the NIV, NLT and NRSV, and addressed the three most contested phrases from these summaries. The next section will address the various approaches to these three summary statements.

5.2   Approaching the Summary Statements

In this section, I examine the insights from literary, source and narrative perspectives on the summary statements. Discussions on the historicity of the summary statements, while important for the study of Christian origins, is not relevant for this thesis, as I am solely elucidating the Lukan portrayal of the early Jesus movement.[50] Likewise, there are scholars who focus on the function of the summary statements within the implied Lukan community, seeing the summary statements fulfilling various functions like an apologetic function,[51] or a didactic function.[52] The presence of the summary statements and the function attributed to them may influence our understanding of Lukan narrative practice, however determining their function falls outside the scope of this thesis. None of the arguments set out in the following chapters is dependent upon ascribing a specific function to the summary statements. Instead, I build a case for the Spirit's empowerment of the community life as described in the three major summary statements. This can have both an apologetic function and a didactic function as well as a hortatory one. Therefore, while these various functions might influence

---

[50] While scholars accept most aspects of the summary statements as historically accurate (for example see, Brian J. Capper, "Community of Goods in Early Jerusalem Church," in *Religion: Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Neues Testament*, ed. Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 1730-1774; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1026-1028), the historicity of the community of goods, in particular, has been questioned, see Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, trans. R. McL. Wilson (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 233-235; Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 24; Gerd Theissen, "Urchristlicher Liebeskommunismus: Zum 'Sitz im Leben' des Topos in Apg 2,44 und 4,32," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*, ed. Tord Fornberg and David Hellbolm, (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 689-710; Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, "Die Gütergemeinschaft der Urgemeinde," *EvT* 58, no. 5 (1998): 370-383. Capper has countered these arguments convincingly in Brian J. Capper, "Community of Goods in Early Jerusalem Church," 1730-1774. Others argue that Luke is nostalgically reflecting on the golden age of the early church, for example, Andreas Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem According to the Summaries in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 2:42-47; 4:32-37; 5:12-16)," in *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder*, ed. Julian V. Hills, (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 209-212; Paul W. Walaskay, *Acts*, Westminster Bible Companion, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 47-48, 61.

[51] For the summary statements as apologia, see Stephen E. Pattison, "A Study of the Apologetic Function of the Summaries of Acts" (PhD diss., Emory University, 1990); Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 158. Or similarly, for a propaganda function, see Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 156-157.

[52] For a didactic function to the summary statements, see Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 160; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 991; H. Alan Brehm, "The Significance of the Summaries for Interpreting Acts," *SwJT* 33, no. 1 (1990): 30; William Andy Chambers, "An Evaluation of Characteristic Activity in a Model Church as set forth by the Summary Narratives of Acts" (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1994).

how we apply the summary statements to our modern context, these considerations fall outside the scope of this thesis.

From the beginning of critical scholarship to the mid-1920s, scholars focused on the historical accuracy of the summary statements, while not recognizing these summaries as distinct literary units.[53] The focus shifted from the historical accuracy of the summaries to their literary function with the work of Martin Dibelius.[54] Dibelius noted the genre of a "summary," arguing that these summaries "provide links and elaborations" for the surrounding narratives, and are "generalized descriptions of typical circumstances."[55] These summaries, according to Dibelius, "can only be explained as Luke's assimilation of certain accounts he had collected together from the communities."[56] Dibelius' work then initiated modern scholarship's interest in the summary statements as distinct literary units within Acts.

The literary function of these summaries was then further clarified by the work of Henry Cadbury, who noted the use of summaries in Kings, Chronicles, Matthew and Mark, and argued that these summaries are used to "divide and connect" the surrounding narratives.[57] Cadbury began by noting that the "great freedom" by which Matthew and Luke use Mark's summaries, while also noting Luke's tendency to interchange, rearrange, repeat, and expand Mark's material.[58] Luke then has great editorial control over the composition of his summaries in the Gospel of Luke. This composition is not an unusual editorial choice, Cadbury argues, as the Chronicler uses the summaries found in 1 and 2 Kings in a similar way.[59] Ancient authors had great editorial freedom when composing summaries, an insight which Cadbury then applies to the summaries in Acts.

On the summaries in Acts, Cadbury makes five arguments. First, the summaries "are later than the intervening panels [narratives]," that is, the surrounding narratives are older than the summary statements.[60] Second, the content in these summaries are generalisations from the surrounding narratives.[61] Third, Luke had great editorial freedom in composing these summaries.[62] As Cadbury

---

[53] As noted by Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 193.

[54] Martin Dibelius, *The Book of Acts: Form, Style, and Theology*, trans. Mary Ling and Paul Schubert (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004).

[55] Dibelius, *The Book of Acts*, 37. Although Dibelius does not distinguish between summary statements and summary sentences.

[56] Dibelius, *The Book of Acts*, 38.

[57] Henry J. Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," in *BegC*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1933), 5, 401.

[58] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 393-394.

[59] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 394.

[60] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 396. This does seem to mean that the surrounding narratives are from older sources, although Cadbury's wording of this point can also be read in the opposite way.

[61] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 396.

[62] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 396. See also, Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 195; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 268, 312.

states, "at whatever stage they arose they are undoubtedly pieces of editorial workmanship, devised by the author or his predecessor for the creation of a continuous narrative out of raw materials."[63] Fourth, the similarities between the summaries are due to Luke's tendency to emphasise a point through repetition of threes, as shown by Luke's repetition of Mark's summaries in the Gospel of Luke.[64] Fifth, in these summaries Luke shows a tendency to paraphrase.[65] On this point, Cadbury suggests that "there is some probability… that the second occurrence [of similar material] represents the original position of the summary in the source."[66] The summaries are then Lukan editorial creations from the surrounding narratives.

In concluding his treatment of the summary statements, Cadbury notes the placement of the summaries at the "interstices of the narrative."[67] Therefore, Luke not only has great editorial freedom in creating the summaries, but Luke also gives these summaries another literary function, to "divide and connect" the surrounding narratives.[68] In placing the summaries between narratives, Luke can indicate a passage of time between narratives.[69] In summarising his argument, Cadbury states that the summaries "indicate that the material is typical, that the action was continued, that the effect was general."[70] Cadbury then makes two influential observations: first, that the surrounding narratives are the source for the content of the summary statements, and second, that these summaries divide and connect the surrounding narratives. With these observations concerning summaries in Acts, Cadbury is widely influential in the continuing discussions of the literary function of the summary statements.

The first of Cadbury's conclusions – that Luke used the surrounding narratives to compose these summaries – led numerous scholars using source criticism as a tool, to discover Luke's method of creating these summaries and identifying Luke's sources.[71] Source critics agree on two of Luke's editorial moves: Acts 2:43 is derived from the third summary statement (Acts 5:12-16), and Acts 2:44-45 derives from the second summary (Acts 4:32-35).[72] Yet, beyond these two observations, there is much disagreement concerning Luke's editorial moves. For example, Joachim Jeremias argued that

---

[63] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 401.
[64] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 396.
[65] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 396.
[66] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 396.
[67] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 401.
[68] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 401.
[69] Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 160.
[70] Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," 5, 402.
[71] L. Cerfaux, "La Composition de la Premiere Partie du Livre des Acts," *ETL* 13 (1936): 667-691; Joachim Jeremias, "Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte," *ZNW* 36, no. 2 (1937): 205-221; Pierre Benoit, "Remarques sur les 'Sommaires' de Actes 2.42 à 5," in *Aus Sources de la Tradition Chéretienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*, ed. J. J. von Allmen, (Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1950), 1-10.
[72] Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 268. This is presuming that Cadbury is correct when he says that the second occurrence is probably the original position of the material.

Acts 2:41-42 is derived from older material, whereas Acts 2:43-46 is a later expansion, which contradicts Lucien Cerfaux's conclusion, who argues that Acts 2:41-42 is a Lukan redaction, whereas Acts 2:46-47a is the older material.[73] Pierre Benoit saw two layers of material in the summary statements, the primitive layer composed by Luke (Acts 2:42, 2:46-47, 4:32, 4:34-5, 5:12a, 5:15-16), and a second layer composed of an editor after Luke (2:43-45, 4:33, 5:12b-14).[74] This later editor negatively affects the summaries in two ways: the editor "breaks the logical sequence of the text" (*de briser… la suite logique du texte*) with their additions, and the editor creates contradictions between the summaries with these additions.[75]

The conclusions of the source critics are mixed. On the one hand, the source critics, and in particular Cerfaux, have conclusively shown that Luke has drawn the content of the summary statements from the surrounding narratives.[76] This conclusion has laid the foundation for narrative critics to establish that the elements listed in the summary statements foreshadow important themes to come in the following narratives.[77] That is, when focussing on the relationship between the surrounding narratives and the summary statements, the conclusions of source criticism are helpful. On the other hand, when focussing on Luke's editorial moves within the summaries, from the early 1960's onwards, scholars began to realise that the diverging conclusions of the source critics showed the significant limitations of the source-critical approach when only focussing on Luke's editorial moves within the summary statements.[78] As M. A. Co states: "The divergent and contradictory results of their investigations manifest the weakness of their approach."[79] Likewise, William A. Chambers states of the source critics that "they consistently assumed that an editorial seam implied a redaction of the source by an editor. They neglected the possible stylistic contributions of the author himself in trying to achieve his own goals with his summary narratives."[80] Discerning Luke's step by step editorial move is difficult, so that it is safer to conclude simply that Luke composed these summaries from the material in the surrounding narratives.

---

[73] Cerfaux, "La Composition de la Premiere Partie," 673-680; Jeremias, "Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem," 206.
[74] Benoit, "Remarques sur les "Sommaires"," 3-5.
[75] Benoit, "Remarques sur les "Sommaires"," 7-10, quote from 17. My own translation.
[76] Cerfaux, "La Composition de la Premiere Partie," 667-691.
[77] Discussed below, see Chambers, "An Evaluation of Characteristic Activity in a Model Church," 217.
[78] Heinrich Zimmermann, "Die Sammelberichte der Apostelgeschichte," *BZ* 5, no. 1 (1961): 71-82; Maria Anicia Co, "The Major Summaries in Acts: Acts 2:42-47; 4:32-35; 5:12-16: Linguistic and Literary Relationships," *ETL* 68, no. 1 (1992): 49; Chambers, "An Evaluation of Characteristic Activity in a Model Church," 12; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 268.
[79] Co, "The Major Summaries in Acts," 49. See also Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 268.
[80] Chambers, "An Evaluation of Characteristic Activity in a Model Church," 12.

In reaction to source criticism, there has been a push to examine the summary statements within the narrative context of Acts 2-6.[81] One of the first to argue this is S. J. Noorda, who has argued that a focus on source criticism leads to exegetes ignoring the narrative flow of Acts 2-5.[82] Noorda notes that the genre of summary is applied too rigidly to the summaries in Acts, creating unnecessary problems.[83] Noorda makes the distinction between the author communicating to the audience through "showing" or through "telling," of which showing corresponds to "scene" and telling to "summary."[84] For Noorda, scene and summary are not polar opposites, but rather two ends of a spectrum, with the possibility of "scenic or summarylike" narratives found between the genres of scene and summary.[85] Noorda notes that summaries are then general, broader and address topics from a distance, whereas a scene "represents the more natural way of dramatic presentation, its point of view is much closer, its perspective narrower."[86] Therefore, removing the summaries completely from the surrounding narratives is detrimental to understanding the summary statements.

For the summaries in Acts, Noorda focuses on the relationship between the second and third summaries (Acts 4:32-35, 5:12-16) and the two narratives that separate these two summaries (Acts 4:36-37, 5:1-11).[87] Noorda notes that Acts 4:32-5:16 represents "a coherent unit," much like Acts 1, 2, 3:1-4:31 and 5:17-42 are "coherent compositional units."[88] There are many narratival and thematic links within Acts 4:32-5:16, as this passage starts with a summary mainly focussed on the communal sharing, then moves onto two scenes of this communal sharing. The scene of fear in the community after the deaths of Ananias and Sapphira then leads into the third summary (Acts 5:12-16), whose main focus is the miraculous deeds of the apostles.[89] Therefore Noorda concludes that we should not divide Acts 4:32-5:16 into rigid divisions (i.e. 4:32-37, 5:1-11, 12-16), but rather Acts should be read narratively while noting the shifts between scene and summary.[90] Noorda helpfully emphasises that we should read the summary statements in the context of the surrounding narratives, and Noorda is convincing in his treatment of second and third summary statements. Yet Noorda does not address the first summary statement (Acts 2:42-47), and this is a limitation to his argument.

---

[81] This move towards the narrative perspective began with Zimmermann, "Die Sammelberichte der Apostelgeschichte," 71-82; S. J. Noorda, "Scene and Summary: A Proposal for Reading Acts 4,32-5,16," in *Les Acts Des Apôtres: Traditions, Rédaction, Théologie*, ed. J. Kremer, (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), 475-483.
[82] Noorda, "Scene and Summary," 475-483.
[83] Noorda, "Scene and Summary," 475-483.
[84] Noorda, "Scene and Summary," 475.
[85] Noorda, "Scene and Summary," 476.
[86] Noorda, "Scene and Summary," 478-479.
[87] Noorda, "Scene and Summary," 479-483.
[88] Noorda, "Scene and Summary," 480.
[89] Noorda, "Scene and Summary," 480-483.
[90] Noorda, "Scene and Summary," 482-483.

After Noorda, Chambers has also addressed the understanding of the narrative technique of summarization and the effects that summarization has on the wider narrative.[91] Important for this thesis is Chambers' observation that the themes in the summaries foreshadow themes to come in the wider narrative. Chambers states that a theme's

> … first appearance in the summary narratives prepares the reader for important aspects of upcoming episodes. Then important activities that should characterize the internal life of a model church are reiterated. For example, the legitimizing effect of signs and wonders for the apostolic message (Acts 2:42, 43; 5:12) is seen in the caution of the Jewish leaders (Acts 4:16; 5:35) and in the subsequent conversion of many priests (Acts 6:7).[92]

There are many examples of this foreshadowing in the summary statements. For example, the mention of the teaching of the apostles in Acts 2:42 is quite vague; however, as the narrative progresses this teaching is elucidated in the following narratives (e.g. Acts 4:2, 18, 5:21, 25, 28, 42). Likewise, the mention of signs and wonders in Acts 2:43 foreshadows the healing of the disabled man and the Temple Gates (Acts 3:1-10) and later signs and wonders in the early Jesus community (e.g. Acts 5:1-11, 12, 15-16). Luke highlights the various aspects of the community life in the mind of the reader, foreshadowing their appearance in the following narratives.

To summarise the insights of literary, source and narrative critics on the summary statements, there are three main points, which inform the rest of this thesis:

1. On a narrative level, the summaries divide and connect the surrounding narratives. They divide the narratives by implying a period of time between narratives, while they connect the narratives thematically.
2. From a literary perspective, the summary statements are generalisations of the community life. Luke has generalised the community life from the surrounding narratives, as they are his sources for the various aspects of the community life.
3. Inversely, the various aspects of the community life in the summary statements are mentioned by Luke, in order to foreshadow these important themes in the coming narratives. Therefore, there is a circular relationship between the content of the summary statements and the more detailed narratives in Acts 2-6.

This circular relationship means that we can infer the various aspects of community life mentioned in the summary statements can be elucidated from the surrounding narratives. The teaching found in

---

[91] Chambers, "An Evaluation of Characteristic Activity in a Model Church," 217.
[92] Chambers, "An Evaluation of Characteristic Activity in a Model Church," 217.

Acts 4 and 5 should inform "the teaching of the apostles" in Acts 2:42. The prayer of the early community in Acts 4:24-30 can be used to inform "the prayers" of Acts 2:42. Using the surrounding narratives to inform the various elements in the summary statements then provides us with a fuller and narratively sensitive understanding of the early Jesus community.

5.3   The Spirit and the Summary Statements

In this final section, I elucidate the three main approaches that scholars take when connecting the gift of the Spirit with the community life depicted in the summary statements. The three main approaches are: arguments based on the narrative flow of Acts 2 and 4, arguments drawing thematic links between the summary statements and broader biblical themes, and arguments for the Spirit's direct influence on specific elements mentioned in the summary statements. While the first two approaches show that there is a relationship between the Spirit and the summary statements, I situate this research within the third approach – developing the Spirit's direct influence on each of the specific elements mentioned in the summary statements – as the one most pertinent to the thesis question.

The first and the most common argument is implication of the narrative flow of Acts 2 and 4.[93] Typical of this position is the work of James D. G. Dunn, who states that "Luke evidently intends us to understand 2.41-47 as the direct and immediate result of the Spirit's coming [at Pentecost], just as 4.32-37 is the immediate and direct consequence of 4.31."[94] For Dunn, the placement of the summary statements after Pentecost indicates that Luke sees the community life as being the "direct and immediate result" of the gift of the Spirit.

This argument has been developed by Max Turner, who notes the immediate context of both summary statements is the outpouring of the gift of the Spirit.[95] The gift of the Spirit's influence on the community is to be presumed in Acts 2:42-47 as it follows directly on from the Pentecostal outpouring and subsequent speech in Acts 2:1-41, and Acts 4:32-35 directly follows on from the activity of the Holy Spirit in Acts 4:31. This point is strengthened by the fact that there is not a change of subject between Acts 4:31 and Acts 4:32, or between Acts 2:41 and 2:42, indicating that Luke saw the

---

[93] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 51; Turner, *Power from on High*, 414; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 262; Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*; Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 50; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1003; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 159; Steve Walton, "Primitive Communism in Acts? Does Acts Present the Community of Goods (2:44-45; 4:32-35) as Mistaken?," *EQ* 80, no. 2 (2008): 105; Douglas A. Hume, *The Early Christian Community: A Narrative Analysis of Acts 2:41-47 and 4:32-35*, WUNT II/298, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 90-91.
[94] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 51.
[95] Turner, *Power from on High*, 414.

outpouring of the Spirit as influencing the community life as described in the summary statements.[96] Turner notes that this is contrasted with the change in subject from Acts 2:47 to 3:1.[97] Likewise, Matthias Wenk notes that "Acts 3:1 also marks a temporal break and explicitly represents a different setting."[98] Therefore the narrative flow of chapters 2 and 4 indicate that the activity of the Spirit and the summary statements should not be separated.[99]

The final scholar that uses this first type of argument is Hume, who argues that Acts 2 has a chiastic structure, where Acts 2:1-4 mirrors Acts 2:41-47. This chiastic structure implies that the outpouring of the Spirit on the community in Acts 2:1-4 is parallel to description of the Spirit-filled community in Acts 2:41-47.[100] However, this argument is unpersuasive, as the only connection that can be established between Acts 2:1-4 and Acts 2:41-47 is the use of the phrase ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in Acts 2:1 and Acts 2:44. Hume's chiastic structure, while supportive for the argument of this thesis, lacks evidence for definitive parallel between Acts 2:1-4 and the first summary statement in Acts 2:42-47.

While these arguments do indicate that there is some connection between the gift of the Spirit and the early Jesus community, this connection remains a general and unspecified connection. The narrative flow does not indicate what type of connection (direct or indirect) exists between the gift of the Spirit and the community. Moreover, arguments solely from narrative flow do not explain how the Spirit interacts and influences with each of the different elements, or whether the Spirit influences each of these elements (e.g. the teaching, the sharing of meals, the joy) in the same way. The narrative flow is helpful, as it points us in the right direction – the Spirit as empowering the community life – but an argument from narrative flow alone is insufficient to address the complexity and nuance that exists between the gift of the Spirit and community life as described in the summary statements.

The second type of argument that establishes the relationship between the Spirit and the summary statements is an argument based on thematic links.[101] Three examples of this type of argument will suffice. First, Turner has argued that Luke depicts the community life in the summary statements as a result of the Messiah's cleansing of Israel.[102] Turner sees parallels between Acts 4:29-30 and Luke 1:71-76, where Luke portrays God as protecting the followers of Jesus, which is a sign that the Spirit's cleansing is at work in the summary statements.[103] Similarly, Wenk argues that the early Jesus

---

[96] Turner, *Power from on High*, 414.
[97] Turner, *Power from on High*, 414.
[98] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 262.
[99] Likewise, Kuecker (126) notes that the summary statements are in "conspicuous proximity to the first three major Spirit-events in Acts." Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 126.
[100] Hume, *The Early Christian Community*, 90-91.
[101] For example, Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 62-63; Turner, *Power from on High*, 413-414; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 265-268, 271-272; Walton, "Primitive Communism in Acts?," 105.
[102] Turner, *Power from on High*, 413-414.
[103] Turner, *Power from on High*, 413-414.

community represents the renewed community that the reader anticipates in the quotations in Luke 4:18-9 (Isa 61:1-2, 58:6) and Acts 2:17-21 (Joel 2:28-32). In both these quotations, salvation is offered, which Luke further elaborates as a time of restoration in Acts 15:15-19.[104] As Wenk concludes,

> The Spirit-outpouring at Pentecost was part of the community's experience of the messiah's liberation with the aim of restoring Israel. This suggests that if the restoration was a pneumatic experience, the subsequent expression of the reality of this restoration has a pneumatic origin; thus the Spirit lies at the heart of the renewed community's life. The renewed prophetic community of Acts did not express the renewal in 'intra-personal' categories but in terms of a renewed society as anticipated in Joel.[105]

The renewed Israel that Jesus taught about and promised finds its ultimate fulfilment in the post-Pentecost community as described by the summary statements. While Wenk acknowledges the Spirit inspires prophetic speech in Acts, he has broadened the understanding of prophetic speech to include the effect that it has on the community, namely the restoration of Israel.

Second, on the topic of the communal sharing of the early Jesus community, Steve Walton has argued that the Spirit helps the believers in their attitude towards wealth.[106] As Walton states:

> Luke is clear, of course, that this community life flows from the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit, for 2:44-45 follows hot on the heels of the promise of the Spirit to those who believe (2:38), and 4:32-35 follows on the description of a fresh filling with the Spirit in response to prayer (4:31). It is notable that Jeremiah 32 and Ezekiel 11 are both passages which hint at God's intervention to bring about the radical change to human attitudes and actions which they cannot accomplish unaided. Thus divine power is behind the early believers' ability to hold their possessions lightly, and this background suggests that a broader biblical theology of stewardship may underlie our two passages in Acts 2:44-45; 4:32-35.[107]

Walton notes the rich prophetic tradition of the Hebrew Bible on the godly use of wealth, which is linked with the work of the spirit of God in Jeremiah 32 and Ezekiel 11. There is a line of reasoning from the Hebrew Bible that sees the eschatological spirit as empowering the godly use of wealth, and Luke portrays the early Jesus community, being filled with the gift of the Spirit, as fulfilling this

---

[104] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 271.
[105] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 272.
[106] Walton, "Primitive Communism in Acts?," 105.
[107] Walton, "Primitive Communism in Acts?," 105.

expectation. For Walton, the communal sharing is motivated by the power of the Spirit, which enables a godly attitude to the use of possessions.

Third, Wenk argues that the summary statements describe a community similar to the Qumran community, which understood itself to be a congregation of the Holy Spirit.[108] The Qumran community had a community of goods, teaching and ritual meals, which are all elements to the summary statements in Acts.[109] These parallels lead Wenk to suggest that early Jesus community and the Qumran community have a similar self-understanding, and since the Qumran community was a congregation of the Holy Spirit, so the early Jesus community "understood the presence of the Holy Spirit among them as a mark of their identity."[110] However, this thematic link between the Qumran community and the early Jesus community is limited, as sharing meals and teaching were common attributes of most Jewish sects and many Greco-Roman philosophical schools. Moreover, as I address in 9.1, there are significant differences between the Qumran community and the early Jesus community in their practice of communal sharing. While there are some similarities between the Qumran community and the early Jesus community, I do not think that these arguments alone are strong enough to conclude that these communities have a similar self-understanding.

These thematic links help situate the summary statements within the wider narrative of Luke-Acts (e.g. Turner, Wenk) and even more broadly, the biblical narrative (e.g. Walton). Much like the argument from the narrative flow of Acts 2 and 4, these do indicate that the Spirit is active and influential in the early Jesus community. However, I see a more direct and nuanced argument available in the third type of argument, which connects the influence of the Spirit to each of the particular elements mentioned in the summary statements.

The third type of argument develops links between the gift of the Spirit and specific elements in the summary statements. Some of these links are well established. For example, Luke clearly states that the witnessing is a Spirit-empowered action, which means that the Spirit empowers the witness of the apostles in Acts 4:33.[111] Likewise, scholars often note that joy is empowered by the Spirit in Luke-

---

[108] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 265-268.
[109] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 266-267.
[110] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 268.
[111] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 232; Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 99; Marshall, *Acts*, 115; Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, 58-59; Krodel, *Acts*, 117; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 54; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 174; Williams, *Acts*, 93; Shelton, *Mighty In Word And Deed*, 82-83; Mainville, *The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 99; Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 171; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 269; Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 186, 275; Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom*, 130; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 205; Schnabel, *Acts*, 271; Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary (3:1-14:28)*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 1177.

Acts, which means we can infer that the joy of Acts 2:46 is empowered by the Spirit.[112] This argument is the most persuasive, as it develops the gift of the Spirit's unique relationship with each element of the community life, and so offers a more nuanced understanding of the Spirit's relationship to the community life as a whole.

While the some of these connections have been well established by previous scholarship, there has not been to date, a thorough consideration of how the Spirit as gift empowers each element of the community life as described by the summary statements in Acts. In the following chapters I engage with these various arguments that connect each element of the community life (e.g. the teaching of the apostles, the unity of the community, the communal sharing), in cases offering additional evidence to establish the Spirit's empowerment of the community life, in order to establish that the Spirit as gift in Acts implies a sociability that is manifested in the Spirit's empowerment of the community life as described in the three major summary statements.

5.4   Conclusion

In conclusion, in this chapter, I presented my translation of the three summary statements and addressed the various interpretive issues surrounding my translation. I also addressed the literary, source and narrative perspectives of the summary statements. These perspectives have shown that Luke composed these summaries, drawing his material from the surrounding narratives, and placing them between at important points between narratives. Moreover, there is a circular relationship between the surrounding narratives and the summary statements, as the content of the summary statements are drawn from the surrounding narratives, while these summary statements also highlight important themes to come in the following narratives. From this, we can utilize the surrounding narratives to inform the various elements mentioned in the summary statements.

There have been three different types of arguments connecting the Spirit to the community life in Acts: arguments from the narrative flow of Acts 2 and 4, thematic arguments, and arguments concerning particular elements in the summary statements. The arguments from narrative flow do indicate that the Spirit is active in the summary statements, however this argument is general, and does not indicate *how* the Spirit influences the community. The thematic arguments are helpful, as they situate the community life in the broader biblical narrative, and are complementary to the third

---

[112] Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 117; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 188; Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, 59; Shelton, *Mighty In Word And Deed*, 125; Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 214; Turner, *Power from on High*, 411, 441; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 153; Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 277; Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 120; Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 159.

type of argument, which enquires about the Spirit's empowerment of specific elements in the summary statement. This third type of argument is the strongest, as it establishes the Spirit's unique relationship with each element of the community life, and so offers a nuanced understanding of the Spirit's relationship with the community.

In the next chapter, I begin this element by element elucidation of the gift of the Spirit's influence on the summary statements. I elucidate the gift of the Spirit's direct influence on the community life, in the Spirit-empowered witnessing, signs and wonder, teaching and joy. These four elements present the clearest evidence for the gift of the Spirit's influence on the community life.

Chapter 6: *The Gift of the Spirit and Witnessing, Teaching, Wonders and Joy*

In this chapter, I argue that the gift of the Spirit directly empowers four elements of the early Jesus community, which are derived from the three summary statements (Acts 2:42-47, 4:32-35, 5:12-16). These elements are the testimony of the apostles (Acts 4:33), the teaching of the apostles (2:42), the signs and wonders (2:43, 5:12a, 15-16) and the great joy amongst the community (2:46). While scholars commonly attribute the testimony, signs and wonders, and the joy present in the community to the Spirit's work,[1] scholars give less attention to the possibility of the gift of the Spirit empowering the teaching of the apostles.[2] In addition to establishing the Spirit's direct involvement in the life of the community, this chapter will also offer a contribution to Lukan pneumatology by developing an argument for the Spirit's direct empowerment of the teaching of the apostles.

It is necessary to outline the aspects of the early Jesus community that were directly empowered by the gift of the Spirit, as some scholars downplay the Spirit's involvement in the life of the early community.[3] The first to hold this position was Hermann Gunkel who noted of Acts 2:42-47 that "there is not one syllable to indicate that the ideal state of community described derives from the Spirit."[4] Gunkel's assessment of the Spirit's relationship to the summary statements has been influential, with Eduard Schweizer, Gonzalo Haya-Prats and Robert Menzies all agreeing with Gunkel's assessment.[5] Gunkel's position could also be seen as influencing numerous Lukan commentators who do not mention the gift of the Spirit's influence in their comments on the summary statements.[6]

This chapter seeks to counter Gunkel's position, as many already have,[7] in establishing Luke's presentation of the Spirit's direct influence on the life of the community. This chapter will start with

---

[1] See sections 6.1, 6.3 and 6.4 respectively.

[2] The most comprehensive argument has come from Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1245.

[3] Hermann Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit: The Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul*, trans. Roy A. Harrisville and Philip A. Quanbeck II (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008 [Original German Edition:1888]), 16; Eduard Schweizer, "The Spirit of Power: The Uniformity and Diversity of the Concept of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament," *Int* 6, no. 3 (1952), 264-268; Eduard Schweizer, "πνευμα," in *TDNT*, 6, 389-455; Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 175-177; Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 258.

[4] Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 16.

[5] Schweizer, "The Spirit of Power."; Schweizer, "πνευμα."; Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 175-177; Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*.

[6] Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*; Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995); Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*; Chance, *Acts*; Bock, *Acts*; Malina and Pilch, *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Acts*; Pervo, *Acts*.

[7] Turner, *Power from on High*, 412-415; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 260; Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 127.

the Spirit's influence on the testimony of the apostles (6.1) and the related teaching of the apostles (6.2). After that, this chapter will address the gift of the Spirit's influence on the signs and wonders (6.3) and the joy in the community (6.4). Therefore, this chapter is the first of six that seeks to show how the gift of the Spirit, directly and indirectly, influences the various elements of the early Jesus community as described by the summary statements.

6.1   The Testimony of the Apostles

The testimony of the apostles, mentioned in Acts 4:33, represents the clearest example of the gift of the Spirit's direct influence on the community life as depicted in the summary statements. Every scholar that addresses the Spirit in Luke-Acts understands one of the central functions of the Holy Spirit is the empowerment for witness.[8] Some scholars go further and argue that it is, in Luke's conception, the only purpose of the gift of the Spirit in Acts.[9] Conversely, Dunn has argued that the empowerment for witnessing is a secondary purpose of the gift of the Spirit, subordinate to the identity that the Spirit provides.[10] Turner generally sees the empowerment for witnessing as limited to the apostles and other key leaders, with the broader purpose of the Holy Spirit being given to cleanse and restore Israel.[11] Yet to date, as far as I am aware, no scholar has rejected the gift of the Spirit's direct empowerment of the witnessing of the early Jesus movement.[12]

The mention of testimony in the early Jesus community comes in the second summary statement, where it states in Acts 4:33 that: "With great power the apostles gave their testimony to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus." There are three elements to this sentence, the prefix "with great power," the action "the apostles' testimony," and the content of this testimony, "the resurrection of the Lord Jesus." Important for this section is the mention of power, which is often linked by Luke with the work of the Spirit, and the mention of testimony (μαρτύριον), which derives from the same root word as a witness (μάρτυς).

First, throughout Luke-Acts the mention of great power by which the apostles testified is connected with and derives from the Spirit.[13] That is, the gift of the Spirit is the source of divine power. This is

---

[8] For an overview, see Keener, *Acts*, 1, 519-524.
[9] Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 44-45.
[10] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 4.
[11] Turner, *Power from on High*, 398-399.
[12] Gunkel and Schweizer do not address the presence of witnessing in the summary statements. Haya-Prats and Menzies acknowledge the witnessing of the apostles in the summary statements, but this does not change their position that the gift of the Spirit does not influence the life of the community.
[13] The Spirit as the source of divine power has been persuasively argue by Max Turner, "The Spirit and the Power of Jesus' Miracles in the Lucan Conception," *NovT* 33, no. 2 (1991): 124-152.

shown in Luke 1:17 and Acts 10:38, which contain the complementary couplet of power and Spirit. Elsewhere, "the power of the Spirit" is mentioned in Luke 4:14 and Acts 1:8. Moreover, in Luke 1:35, Luke uses parallelism between the Holy Spirit and the power of the Most High. Again, a similar parallelism is found in Luke 24:49, when the promise of the Father, which Luke will soon reveal to be the gift of the Spirit in Acts 2, is paralleled to being "clothed with power from on high." Luke links the power of God and Spirit of God intimately throughout Luke-Acts, either through complementary couplets or through parallelisms. These points then lead us to see the influence of the gift of the Spirit in the great power of Acts 4:33.

Second, Luke clearly states that the Spirit empowers witness.[14] In Acts 4:33, Luke uses μαρτύριον, the same word for witness that Luke uses when describing the apostles' role as Spirit-empowered witnesses (μάρτυρες) in Luke 24:48-49 and Acts 1:8, 5:32. This is most clearly demonstrated in Acts 1:8, where Jesus promises that the disciples will receive power when the gift of the Spirit is given to them, from which the disciples will be Jesus' witnesses to the ends of the earth. Commenting on Acts 1:8, Keener states: "Most scholars recognize that the primary activity of the Spirit emphasized in Acts is the empowerment of witness for their mission."[15] Luke directly states that the activity of witnessing in the early Jesus community was empowered by the Spirit.

Throughout Luke-Acts, Luke attributes the ability of the apostles to witness as deriving from the empowerment of the Spirit. The connection between the power of God and the activity of the Spirit and the direct empowerment of witnesses mentioned throughout Luke-Acts then establishes the testimony of apostles in Acts 4:33 as empowered by the Spirit, a point which is well accepted by the overwhelming majority of scholars.[16] The testimony of the apostles is then the clearest indicator that the gift of the Spirit is directly influential on the life of the community.

---

[14] Luke 24:48-49; Acts 1:8, 5:32, 10:39.

[15] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 689. Keener notes that those that do not see it as a primary activity (e.g. Turner) do see it as a secondary activity. That is, no Lukan scholar denies the Spirit's empowerment for witness, with the vast majority seeing it as the Spirit's primary activity.

[16] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 232; Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 99; Marshall, *Acts*, 115; Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, 58-59; Krodel, *Acts*, 117; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 54; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 174; Williams, *Acts*, 93; Shelton, *Mighty In Word And Deed*, 82-83; Mainville, *The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 99; Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 171; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 269; Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 186, 275; Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom*, 130; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 205; Schnabel, *Acts*, 271; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1177.

6.3   The Teaching of the Apostles

Linked with the Spirit-empowered testimony of the first believers is the Spirit-empowered teaching of the apostles (Acts 2:42). The genitive construction of the "teaching of the apostles" found in Acts 2:42 (τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων) is a subjective genitive, that is the teaching as the apostles' activity. This is echoed in the broader context of Acts 2-6, which speaks of teaching as the apostles' activity in Jerusalem (Acts 4:2, 18, 5:21, 25, 28, 42, 6:2, 4).

In this section, I argue that Luke gives three lines of evidence that the Spirit empowers the teaching of the apostles in Acts. First, teaching occurs in the same social space as proclaiming and preaching (6.2.1). Second, Luke places teaching in complementary couplets with the other Spirit-empowered actions of proclaiming and preaching (6.2.2). Third, teaching would have involved the reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible, which Luke indicates is a Spirit-empowered action (6.2.3).

6.3.1   Teaching and Social Space

The first indication that teaching in the early Jesus movement was considered a Spirit-empowered action is that it occurs in the same social space as proclaiming (εὐαγγελίζω) and preaching (κηρύσσω).[17] The ancient world divided their social environment into two separate spaces, the public sphere and the private sphere, or as Acts describes, the temple and the household (most notably Acts 5:42).[18] In Acts, the Spirit-empowered preaching and proclaiming both function predominately in the public sphere. For preaching, κηρύσσω mostly takes place in the public sphere (Acts 8:5, 9:20, 10:37, 10:42, 15:21, 19:13, 28:31). Likewise, Craig Keener states of proclaiming that εὐαγγελίζω is "by definition 'evangelistic'… though even here a partial function of encouraging the church with the 'good news' cannot be ruled out."[19] Both preaching and proclaiming occur primarily in the public sphere, where the speech aims to convince those outside the early Jesus community to become believers, while it is also possible that this proclaiming could also occur within the early Jesus community.

Yet, in the opening seven chapters of Acts, κηρύσσω is not used by Luke, while Luke uses εὐαγγελίζω and the related καταγγέλλω three times (Acts 3:24, 4:2, 5:42). In two of these three

---

[17] Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 110; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 163; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 813-814; Pervo, *Acts*, 92; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 228; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1002. Contrary to Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 269.

[18] Elliott, "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts," 211-240.

[19] Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1245; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 228.

uses (Acts 4:2, 5:42), the mention of preaching is linked in a complementary couplet with teaching.[20] What stands in the place of these verbs for Spirit-empowered speech is the teaching (διδάσκω) of the apostles, as seen most clearly in Acts 4:2, 18, 5:21, 25, 28 and 42. While the private sphere is the most common context for διδάσκω in Acts (Acts 1:1, 5:42, 11:26, 15:1, 35, 18:11, 25, 20:20, 21:21) and some of the contexts for διδάσκω are unclear (i.e. Acts 21:28, 28:31), there is a significant number of passages that portray διδάσκω as a public discourse directed towards those *outside* of the early Jesus movement (Acts 4:2, 18, 5:21, 25, 28, 42, 13:12, 17:19). This point is particularly evident in Acts 4 and 5, as numerous people come into the early Jesus community through the apostles' teaching (Acts 4:4), the teaching of the apostles fills Jerusalem (Acts 5:28), and the apostles teach in both public and private spaces (Acts 5:42). The teaching of the apostles in Acts functions in both the private and the public sphere, being directed at both the believers and the wider Jerusalem audience.

Luke predominately uses teaching in the public sphere in the opening chapters of Acts, while the emphasis on preaching and proclaiming replaces teaching from Acts 8 onwards. These differing emphases indicate that for Luke, teaching can have a similar function to preaching and proclaiming. A similar conclusion is reached by Keener, who notes that: "Their [διδάσκω and κηρύσσω] semantic ranges overlap, but like familiar OT merisms (coupling of opposites) to indicate a whole (though these are closer to synonyms than opposites), their appearance together (Luke 20:1; Acts 5:42, 28:31) probably implies a full range of activities."[21] In this way, Keener brings the meaning and function of these key verbs into close association with each other. He also notes the coupling of teaching with preaching and proclaiming, which the next subsection will address.

6.3.2   Teaching in Complementary Couplets

The second connection between the gift of the Spirit and teaching is in the complementary couplets, where Luke connects the action of teaching with to the action of proclaiming and preaching. Luke frequently uses complementary couplets in Luke-Acts, e.g. of heaven and earth (Luke 10:21, 16:17, 21:33; Acts 4:24, 14:15, 17:24),[22] or signs and wonders,[23] with the two nouns or verbs being in

---

[20] For more on the complementary couplets, see 6.2.2.

[21] Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1245. For similar conclusions see also, Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 110; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 163; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 813-814; Pervo, *Acts*, 92; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 228, 722; Fernando, *Acts*, 631; William J. Larkin Jr., *Acts*, The IVP New Testament Commentary Series, (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995), 61, 392.

[22] Charles Anderson, "Lukan Cosmology and the Ascension," in *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts: New Explorations of Luke's Narrative Hinge*, ed. David K. Bryan and David W. Pao, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), 205-207. Anderson (205) notes that, "Luke does not use heaven and earth in a contrastive sense," but rather Luke places heaven and Earth, "together to point to the union, rather than the opposition, between these parts of the universe."

[23] See subsection 6.3.

apposition. Acts contains four complementary couplets, which place teaching in direct apposition with either proclaiming (Acts 4:2, 5:42, 15:35) or preaching (Acts 28:31).

There are four places where Luke uses teaching in a complementary couplet with either preaching or proclaiming in Acts. First, in Acts 4:2 the priests and Sadducees are disturbed by Peter and John "because they were teaching and proclaiming to the people that in Jesus there was the resurrection from the dead" (διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς τὸν λαὸν καὶ καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν). Mikeal C. Parsons and Martin M. Culy state that both διδάσκειν and καταγγέλλειν are causal infinitives, as they explain why the priests and Sadducees (Acts 4:1) were disturbed.[24] Of the relationship between the two infinitives, Barrett states that: "There is no ground for drawing a sharp distinction between διδάσκειν and καταγγέλλειν," and that the translation of the passage could be, "teaching the people and in their teaching proclaiming… ."[25] While αὐτοὺς τὸν λαόν does separate the two infinitives, Pervo notes that both διδάσκειν and καταγγέλλειν "are infinitive objects of the preposition διά... [and are] connected by the one article [τό]".[26] That is, the absence of an article or preposition before καταγγέλλειν indicates that Luke sees teaching and proclaiming as relatively synonymous actions in the context of this passage.

The second complementary couplet is found in Acts 5:42, where Luke states that "they [the apostles] did not cease teaching and proclaiming that the Messiah was Jesus" (οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν χριστόν Ἰησοῦν).[27] Of this verse, Daniel Wallace notes that διδάσκοντες and εὐαγγελιζόμενοι are both complementary participles, as both participles complete the thought of ἐπαύοντο.[28] While the teaching may have involved an exposition from the Hebrew Bible, while the proclaiming may have been more evangelistic, the content was the same, that the Messiah was Jesus. That is, while teaching and proclaiming are not completely synonymous actions, the difference between teaching and proclaiming was probably the method by which the apostles conveyed the message that Jesus was the Messiah.

In the third complementary couplet, in Acts 15:35, there is a similar construction, which states that Paul and Barnabas stayed in Antioch, "teaching and proclaiming with many others the word of the Lord" (διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι μετὰ καὶ ἑτέρων πολλῶν τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου).

---

[24] Parsons and Culy, *Acts*, 64.

[25] Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 219.

[26] Pervo, *Acts*, 111. Pervo (103) translated the verse as, "These people were fed up with the apostles for teaching in public, specifically for arguing the case of Jesus as proof of the resurrection of the dead."

[27] Pervo (149) notes that "it is preferable not to link 'teaching' to one place (temple, house) and 'preaching' with another." See, Pervo, *Acts*, 149; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 240. Contrary to Williams, *Acts*; Fernando, *Acts*, 214.

[28] Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 646. Wallace also lists five other places where Luke uses a complementary participle, which are, Luke 5:4; Acts 6:13, 13:10, 20:31, 21:32.

Similar to Acts 5:42, here teaching and proclaiming are complementary ideas, both of which seek to convey the same material, the word of the Lord.

The final couplet is in Acts 28:31, which states that Paul was "preaching the reign of God and teaching concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness" (κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας). Peterson notes that: "No distinction should be made here between preaching… and teaching…, since *the kingdom of God* and the Messiahship of Jesus are not two separate agendas but one."[29] Moreover, Luke indicates that Paul taught and proclaimed his message *with boldness*, which indicates that this posture comes from the Spirit's empowerment (Acts 4:31).

These four complementary couplets all indicate that teaching is considered by Luke to be a complementary concept to the Spirit-empowered proclaiming or preaching. A similar understanding is found in the synoptic tradition, there are some similar complementary couplets (Matt 4:23, 9:35, 11:1; Luke 20:1).[30]

	1st Item of Couplet	2nd Item of Couplet
Acts 4:2	διδάσκειν	καταγγέλλειν
Acts 5:42	διδάσκοντες	εὐαγγελιζόμενοι
Acts 15:35	διδάσκοντες	εὐαγγελιζόμενοι
Acts 28:31	κηρύσσων	διδάσκων

Luke's use of these couplets is not incidental, as three of the four complementary couplets used in Acts occur at pivotal points in the narrative of Acts. Acts 5:42 is a summary of the activity of the apostles after a conflict with the Sanhedrin.[31] Acts 15:35 concludes the significant resolution of the Jerusalem council and is before Paul and Barnabas part ways.[32] Moreover, the complementary couplet at Acts 28:31 is crucial as it is the final verse of the book of Acts.[33] Luke links διδάσκω with the Spirit-empowered κηρύσσω and εὐαγγελίζω in complementary couplets at important narrative

---

[29] Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 722. Emphasis original. See also, Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 967.

[30] For complementarity of teaching and preaching in the gospel of Matthew see Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Crouch, Hermeneia, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 168.

[31] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 258; Krodel, *Acts*, 130; Williams, *Acts*, 113; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 101; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 299; Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 73-74; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 240; Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 110; Bock, *Acts*, 252; Parsons, *Acts*, 79; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 229; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1244. Barrett (299) states that this verse, "brings to an end the first stage of his [Luke's] work."

[32] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 455; Krodel, *Acts*, 291; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 567-568; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 470; Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 226-227; Bock, *Acts*, 514-515; Pervo, *Acts*, 383; Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary (15:1-23:35)*, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 2296.

[33] All scholars agree that Acts 28:31 is a pivotal verse, as it is the final verse, and it leaves the story somewhat open-ended.

junctions throughout Acts. In summary, Luke connects the concepts of teaching with the Spirit-empowered preaching and proclaiming in complementary couplets at critical points throughout Acts.

6.3.3   Teaching and the Reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible

While these two points all indicate that teaching has a close relationship to the gift of the Spirit, in this subsection, I establish a clear connection between the gift of the Spirit and teaching. I establish this through arguing that teaching should come under the banner of Spirit-empowered speech. When scholars ponder the content of the teaching of the apostles in Acts 2:42, they either see this teaching as a reiteration of Jesus' teaching,[34] or a reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible.[35] There is a link between the reiteration of Jesus' teaching and the Spirit, as Luke describes Jesus teaching with the enabling of the Holy Spirit in Luke's gospel (e.g. Luke 4:18-19). However, just because the Spirit enabled the initial teaching by Jesus, this does not mean that we can presume the reiteration of this teaching is also Spirit-empowered.

More promising is the teaching of the apostles involving the reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible, which John R. Levison has argued is a Spirit-empowered activity.[36] Scholars agree that the Spirit empowers witness in Acts (see section 6.1), finding its precedent in the Spirit of prophecy in ITJ.[37] Turner has queried this, arguing that the Spirit of prophecy in the ITJ was primarily an *impartation* of revelation, wisdom or knowledge, which often, but not always, manifests itself in invasive or non-invasive speech.[38] The differentiation between impartation of revelation/wisdom/knowledge and speech has been taken further by Levison, who persuasively argues that one of the primary functions of the Spirit in Acts is to give "inspired interpretation of scripture."[39] As Levison states, "Filling with the spirit in the book of Acts is the sort of inspiration that amazes, that startles, because it catalyzes

---

[34] Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 23; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 185-186; Marshall, *Acts*, 88; Krodel, *Acts*, 92; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 110; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 58; Fernando, *Acts*, 120; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 269; Bock, *Acts*, 150; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1002; N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 659; Larkin Jr., *Acts*, 61.

[35] Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 185-186; Krodel, *Acts*, 92; Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 35; Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 659; Chance, *Acts*, 59; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1002; Larkin Jr., *Acts*, 61.

[36] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 347-354.

[37] Max Turner, "The Spirit of Prophecy and the Power of Authoritative Preaching in Luke-Acts: A Question of Origins," *NTS* 38, no. 1 (1992): 330. There are a few scholars that remain silent on the issue of the Spirit of prophecy as an essential motif for Luke, see Shelton, *Mighty In Word And Deed*; Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*. While Kuecker is the only one who explicitly rejects this motif, see Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 3.

[38] Turner, *Power from on High*, 92-97.

[39] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 347. See also recently Cho and Park, *Acts, Part One*, 68.

impressive and entirely unexpected abilities of scriptural interpreters."[40] Levison has persuasively argued that one of the primary actions of the Spirit in Acts is the inspired interpretation of scripture.

The most definitive example that Levison gives of the Spirit empowering the reinterpretation of scripture is Acts 13:4-12, which is the first description of Paul and Barnabas' missionary work.[41] This passage is seen by some as the programmatic passage for the ministry of Paul, as it is the first description of his ministry, and has allusions to Jesus' programmatic passage in Luke 4.[42] In this passage, Paul and Barnabas are set apart by the Holy Spirit (Acts 13:2) and start their travels by sailing to Cyprus and preaching the word of the Lord throughout all of Cyrus (Acts 13:5-6). They end up in the town of Paphos, where Paul brings the gospel to the proconsul Sergius Paulus (Acts 13:7). Elymas, the magician, opposes Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:8), which Paul responds to in Acts 13:9-12, which is as follows:

13⁹ Σαῦλος δέ, ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, πλησθεὶς πνεύματος ἁγίου ἀτενίσας εἰς αὐτὸν
¹⁰ εἶπεν· ὦ πλήρης παντὸς δόλου καὶ πάσης ῥᾳδιουργίας, υἱὲ διαβόλου, ἐχθρὲ πάσης δικαιοσύνης, οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς [τοῦ] κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας;
¹¹ καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ χεὶρ κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ ἔσῃ τυφλὸς μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον ἄχρι καιροῦ. παραχρῆμά τε ἔπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀχλὺς καὶ σκότος καὶ περιάγων ἐζήτει χειραγωγούς.
¹² τότε ἰδὼν ὁ ἀνθύπατος τὸ γεγονὸς ἐπίστευσεν ἐκπλησσόμενος ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ κυρίου.

13⁹ Now Saul, also called Paul, filled with the Holy Spirit, stared directly at him and said,
¹⁰ "Are you full of all deceit and all wickedness? Are you a son of the devil, an enemy of all righteousness? Will you stop making crooked the straight path of the Lord?
¹¹ Now behold, the hand of the Lord is against you, and you will be blind and not see the sun for a time." At once, mist and darkness fell over him [Elymas the magician], and he went about seeking someone to lead him by the hand.
¹² The proconsul, seeing this take place, believed, amazed at the teaching of the Lord.

With reference to this passage, Levison argues that the first five phrases of Paul's speech are very similar to phrases from the LXX.[43] First, Paul describes Elymas as "full of all deceit and all

---

[40] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 349.
[41] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 352-354. Levison (349-351) also notes that much of the Spirit-empowered speech in Acts 2-5 revolves around the inspired interpretation of scripture, however, he does not connect this with their διδάσκω.
[42] For the significance of this passage see Gerd Lüdemann, *The Acts of the Apostles: What Really Happened in the Earliest Days of the Church* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2005), 165. Gaventa (194) also notes the change in name from Saul to Paul, "reflects a changed context for Saul/Paul's work and his emergence as the central figure through whom Luke narrates his story of God's activity." See, Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 194.
[43] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 353. Although Levison does not reference any other scholars here, numerous scholars have noted the allusions to various passages from the Hebrew Bible, including Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 400;

wickedness" (ᾧ πλήρης παντὸς δόλου καὶ πάσης ῥᾳδιουργίας), with Levison noting that being "full of deceit" (πλήρης δόλου) is found in Sir 1:30, 19:26; Jer. 5:27.[44] Second, Paul calls Elymas "son of the devil" (υἱὲ διαβόλου) which could allude to 1 Chronicles 21:1 and Job 1:6. Although in the original Hebrew neither of these passages refers to the devil, the LXX does use διάβολος (the accuser). Both these phrases could also be Lukan wordplay, as Paul is filled with the Spirit, whereas Elymas is full of wickedness, and Elymas is not the son of Jesus (Acts 13:6) but rather a son of the devil.[45]

These two rebukes are then followed by three judgements, which are likewise reinterpretations of passages from the LXX. The third reinterpretation is when Paul claims that Elymas is "an enemy of all righteousness" (ἐχθρὲ πάσης δικαιοσύνης) alluding to Genesis 32:11 (ἀπὸ πάσης δικαιοσύνης) and 1 Samuel 12:7 (τὴν πᾶσαν δικαισούνην). Fourth, Paul states that Elymas should, "stop making crooked the straight path of the Lord" (οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς [τοῦ] κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας). Levison argues that this is a combination of Hosea 14:10, which speaks of "the ways of the Lord are straight" (εὐθεῖαι αἱ ὁδοὶ τοῦ κυρίου), and Proverbs 10:9, which speaks of "perverting the way" (διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς). Finally, Paul pronounces upon Elymas that "the hand of the Lord is against you" (χεὶρ κυρίου ἐπὶ σέ), which is similar to 1 Samuel 7:13 to the pronouncement of "the hand of the Lord being against" (ἐγενήθη χεὶρ κυρίου ἐπί) Israel all of Samuel's days. On top of these five scriptural allusions, blindness was also a common punishment for wickedness in the Hebrew Bible (Gen 19:11, Deut 28:28-29).[46] According to Levison, one of the primary actions of the Spirit in Acts is the inspired interpretation of scripture.

Paul's Spirit-empowered speech in this passage is then a reinterpretation of the LXX to Paul's situation. Levison explains the Lukan Paul's use of the LXX in this way:

> What appears at first to be an extemporaneous string of invectives then, is actually yet another instance of the inspired application of scripture to the situation of the early church. The question Saul [Paul] puts to Bar-Jesus [Elymas the magician] is a direct application of two otherwise separate scriptures that Saul, under the inspiration of the holy spirit [*sic*], has combined into a forceful and extremely effective indictment of this false prophet.[47]

Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 100; Chance, *Acts*, 211-212; Parsons, *Acts*, 189; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 2024. All the following quotations from the LXX are taken from *Septuaginta*.

[44] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 353. Although it should be noted here that none of these passages mentions "wickedness" or uses the adjective "all."

[45] Keener, *Acts*, 2, 2022-2023.

[46] Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 128; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 503; Parsons, *Acts*, 189; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 2023.

[47] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 353-354.

Luke demonstrates how Paul, being filled with the Holy Spirit, reinterprets these passages from the Hebrew Bible, which is followed by the divine sign of the physical blindness. Levison helpfully notes that Paul's Spirit-empowered speech in this passage is an inspired reinterpretation of scripture.

Building upon this insight, I understand the teaching of the Lord (τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ κυρίου) mentioned in in the final verse, Acts 13:12, as encompassing Paul's speech and the subsequent divine sign.[48] The final phrase of Acts 13:12 is difficult to understand as it is not clear whether τοῦ κυρίου (teaching of the Lord) is an objective or subjective genitive. If τοῦ κυρίου is an objective genitive, then it would be translated as the teaching about the Lord and would be a separate teaching not recorded in the text.[49] Whereas, if τοῦ κυρίου is a subjective genitive, then this phrase could be translated as the Lord's teaching, which could include the words of Paul and the miracle of blindness would be considered a part of the Lord's teaching.[50]

Three indications show that the teaching of the Lord in Acts 13:12 should be considered a subjective genitive. First, Richard R. Pervo notes that "if [κυρίου is] taken as a subjective genitive, this could be understood as saying that the 'teaching' (διδαχή) took place in the miracle, that is, that from it the governor learned of the power of God. This would reduce the [grammatical] tension."[51] Grammatically, understanding τοῦ κυρίου as a subjective genitive would give greater coherence to Acts 13:12 and more broadly the passage. Second, from the wider Lukan narrative we can see that Luke portrays signs and wonders as a validation of teaching in Acts (see 6.3), and so, there is an implicit connection between the divine sign of blindness and the teaching in this passage. Third, teaching involves the reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible, which then gives an implicit link between the teaching of the Lord with the Spirit-empowered words of Paul. In this passage, Luke attributes the Spirit-inspired reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible and the divine sign of blindness to the teaching of the Lord.[52]

If the Spirit empowers the reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible of the first followers of Jesus, then we should expect to see the Spirit as being active not only in the proclaiming and preaching but also in the teaching of the apostles. As Turner states, the "'apostolic teaching' of Acts 2:43 (*sic*) would too almost certainly be imagined to be charismatic in character and to have considerable spiritual

---

[48] Levison chooses to translate the teaching of the Lord as an objective genitive, distancing the teaching from the Spirit-empowered words and sign of blindness, see Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 354.

[49] Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 618-619; Parsons and Culy, *Acts*, 249; Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 354.

[50] Marshall, *Acts*, 233; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 505; Pervo, *Acts*, 327; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 2026.

[51] Pervo, *Acts*, 327. For the difficulty translating Acts 13:12 see, Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 618-619.

[52] There is also a parallel here with Luke 4:32, where the crowds are amazed at Jesus' teaching because of the signs and wonders that Jesus performed. See Keener, *Acts*, 2, 2026.

impact on the community after the stunning success of Peter's preaching."[53] As Levison notes, "In the heady world of inspiration evoked by the book of Acts, the holy spirit inspires more than a short outburst of inspired proclamation or prophetic speech. The focus of the holy spirit's inspiration is the interpretation of Israel's scriptures."[54] The Holy Spirit empowers the reinterpretation of scripture, which was a critical component in the teaching of the apostles.

6.3.4   Summary

The gift of the Spirit not only empowers speech but also empowers the reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible, enabling the early Jesus followers to preach, proclaim and teach the message of the risen Jesus. This conclusion is shown by the overlap between the audiences of teaching, preaching and proclaiming, indicating that Luke sees them as similar actions. Moreover, Luke's use of complementary couplets, connecting teaching with preaching and proclaiming, indicates that these are similar actions. Finally, Luke portrays the Spirit as empowering the reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible, which was a vital component of the teaching of the apostles. In all, Acts portrays the teaching of the apostles as not only reiterating the Spirit-empowered teachings of Jesus, but also themselves being empowered by the Spirit to reinterpret the Hebrew Bible in the light of Pentecost.

6.4   Signs and Wonders

The third element of the community life that the gift of the Spirit directly empowers is the signs and wonders, with these signs and wonders evoking awe from the wider community. The mention of awe with signs and wonders is found in the first summary statement (Acts 2:43) and is the central theme of the third summary statement (Acts 5:12-16).[55] Acts 2:43 and 5:12-16 share close similarities, as Acts 2:43 is almost exactly the same as Acts 5:12a, with Acts 5:15-16 expanding upon Acts 2:43 and 5:12a. As I have addressed in 5.2, this has led scholars to suggest that Acts 2:43 is derived from the third summary statement.[56]

---

[53] Turner, *Power from on High*, 414. See also, Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 159; Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, 73; Shelton, *Mighty In Word And Deed*, 147; Parsons, *Acts*, 366; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 723; Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 72-73.

[54] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 354.

[55] The other elements of the third summary statement are the believers meeting in Solomon's Colonnade and a comment about the early Jesus community's interaction with the broader society.

[56] This claim is one of the insights of source critics, see Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 268.

There are three reasons why the majority of scholars see the signs and wonders performed by the apostles as being directly empowered by the gift of the Spirit.[57] First, scholars widely agree that signs and wonders function in Luke/Acts as a method of validating the teaching and preaching of the early Jesus followers (most clearly in Acts 14:3).[58] Signs and wonders are then performed through the guidance of the Holy Spirit to validate the Spirit-empowered teaching and preaching of the followers of Jesus. Second, the quotation of Joel in Peter's Pentecost sermon, which is programmatic for Luke's view of the Spirit, mentions signs and wonders (Acts 2:19) as an expression of the Spirit's work.[59] Third, Luke consistently attributes the source of the signs and wonders throughout Luke-Acts to the power of God (see Acts 2:22, 6:8, 10:38, 15:12), and Luke links this power from God with the work of the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:17, 35, 4:14, 24:49; Acts 1:8, 10:38). The gift of the Spirit is then the source of the power of God to perform signs and wonders.[60]

These signs and wonders inspire awe (φόβος in Acts 2:43, 5:5, 5:11) upon the whole region. There are two relevant points concerning this awe. First, although the syntax of this verse does not link them, the cause of the awe throughout Acts is often signs and wonders (Acts 3:10, 5:5, 5:11, 5:13, 13:12, 19:17).[61] Second, this awe seems to be a societal response, as Acts 2:43 notes the audience as "every soul" (πάσῃ ψυχῇ) and Acts 5:12 states that the signs and wonders where preformed "among the people" (ἐν τῷ λαῷ). Luke here is showing that the wider population was not indifferent to the activity of the Spirit, but rather responded with awe.

In summary, we can see that the gift of the Spirit empowered the signs and wonders amongst the community. The connection Luke develops between the power of God and the gift of the Spirit and the role that signs and wonders performed in affirming the witnessing and teaching of the apostles, leads to the conclusion that the signs and wonders performed by the apostles were empowered by the Spirit. Moreover, Luke does not portray the wider population as indifferent, but instead, the population responds to the activity of the Spirit with awe. These points create an intricate web, as the

---

[57] Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, 63; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 35, 61; Shelton, *Mighty In Word And Deed*, 147; Mainville, *The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 222-223; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 58; Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 164; Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 50; Turner, *Power from on High*, 253-259; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 270; Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 228-229, 236-237; Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom*, 132, 188; Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 8-9, 78, 85, 103, 114; Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 122.

[58] Larkin Jr., *Acts*, 88; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 61; Shelton, *Mighty In Word And Deed*, 147; Mainville, *The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 222-223; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 255, 271; Turner, *Power from on High*, 441; Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 52; Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 93; Chance, *Acts*, 59; Parsons, *Acts*, 48; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 162; Schnabel, *Acts*, 180; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 538.

[59] Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 50.

[60] Some scholars argue against this conclusion, see Schweizer, "The Spirit of Power," 263-268; Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 175-176; Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 112-116. However, these positions have been convincingly critiqued by Turner, "The Spirit and the Power of Jesus' Miracles," 124-152.

[61] Krodel, *Acts*, 93, 124; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 110; Williams, *Acts*, 60; Schnabel, *Acts*, 180-181; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1011; Cho and Park, *Acts, Part One*, 68.

Spirit empowers the teaching, preaching and witness of the believers, giving them boldness in their speech, while the Holy Spirit also validates the message of the believers with signs and wonders.

6.5   The Great Joy

There is one last element I address in this chapter which Luke portrays as influenced by the gift of the Spirit, namely the great joy (ἀγαλλιάσει) that the early believers experienced during their meals (Acts 2:46). Louw and Nida note that ἀγαλλιάσις indicates, "A state of intensive joy and gladness, often implying verbal expression and body movement."[62] The great joy of the early believers overflowed into physical form as leaping, jumping or dancing could be expressions of this joy. This all creates an enticing picture of the early Jesus community sharing meals while dancing, leaping and singing.

Luke uses ἀγαλλιάσις three times in the Gospel of Luke (Luke 1:14, 1:44, 10:21), with two of these uses indicating that this great joy is empowered by the Spirit in the Gospel of Luke (Luke 1:44, 10:21). First, when an angel appears to Zechariah in Luke 1:5-25, the angel promises Zechariah that his son "will be joy (χαρά) and exultation (ἀγαλλίασις) to you… ." This connection between Zechariah's son, John the Baptist, and ἀγαλλιάσις then sets the scene for the second use of ἀγαλλιάσις in Luke 1:44. As the narrative progresses, the pregnant Mary visits the pregnant Elizabeth (Luke 1:39-45). Upon Mary greeting Elizabeth, Luke 1:41 states that Elizabeth's "baby leapt in her womb, and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit" (ἐσκίρτησεν τὸ Βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς; καὶ ἐπλήσθη Πνεύματος Ἁγίου ἡ Ἐλισάβετ). Explaining this experience in Luke 1:44, Elizabeth says to Mary that, "the baby leapt in exultation in my womb" (ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει τὸ Βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ μου). Elizabeth's filling with the Spirit is then paralleled with John's leaping in the womb with exultation, indicating that this great joy is a result of the filling of the Spirit. The third use of ἀγαλλιάσις in the Gospel of Luke occurs in Luke 10:21, where Luke describes Jesus as "rejoicing in the Holy Spirit" (ἠγαλλιάσατο [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ). Similar to the use of ἀγαλλιάσις in Luke 1:44, Luke here indicates that Jesus' great joy derives from the Spirit. These three verses then indicate that Luke sees exultation (ἀγαλλιάσις) as a Spirit-empowered activity.

---

[62] Johannes P. Louw and Eugene Albert Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1996), 25.132. Likewise, Rudolf Bultmann notes that this word has "the character of demonstration rather than impartation," see Rudolf Bultmann, "ἀγαλλιάομαι," in *TDNT*, 1, 19.

From the broader use of ἀγαλλίασις and the related ἀγαλλιάω in Luke-Acts, we see that this exultation was a Spirit-empowered activity. As I. Howard Marshall states of Acts 2:46 that, "The joy that characterizes these gatherings was no doubt inspired by the Spirit."[63] This conclusion is also widely accepted amongst Lukan pneumatologists.[64] Therefore, the fourth connection between the gift of the Spirit and the life of the community is the great joy.

6.6   Conclusion

In conclusion, I have argued in this chapter that the gift of the Spirit directly impacts the life of the community as described by the summary statements through four activities: the witnessing of the apostles, the teaching of the apostles, the signs and wonders and the great joy experienced during the communal meals. While previous scholarship has established the witnessing, signs and wonders, and joy as directly influenced by the gift of the Spirit, this chapter has argued that there should be a fourth Spirit-empowered element, the teaching of the apostles. In all, this provides us with sufficient evidence to move beyond Gunkel and those that support his conclusions and see the Spirit as having a direct influence on the life of the community.

In the following chapters, I offer further connections between the gift of the Spirit and the various elements of the community life by elucidating how the gift of the Spirit is received with gratitude in the prayer and praise of the early Jesus community. Is it possible to see the benefactions to the community as a counter-gift from these believers back to God for the gift of the Spirit? These connections will be explored by considering how the early Jesus believers received the gift of the Spirit. In Chapter Seven, I argue prayer and praise are common expressions of receiving divine gifts from deities. In Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten, I consider the connection between the gift of the Spirit and the gifts given to the community by human benefactors. Finally, in Chapter Eleven, I will demonstrate the connection between the unity of the early Jesus community and the work of the gift of the Spirit.

---

[63] Marshall, *Acts*, 91.

[64] This seems to be a well-accepted point among scholars, see Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 117; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 188; Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, 59; Shelton, *Mighty In Word And Deed*, 125; Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 214; Turner, *Power from on High*, 411, 441; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 153; Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 277; Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 120; Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 159. Even Menzies (259) notes that joy is linked to the Spirit in Act 13:52 is "remarkable," although he does not see the great joy of Acts 2:46 as influenced by the Spirit. See Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 259.

Chapter 7: The Gift of the Spirit and Prayer, Praise and Gratitude

In this chapter, I connect the prayer (Acts 2:42) and praise (Acts 2:47) of the early Jesus community with the gift of the Spirit through the concept of gratitude. In the Greco-Roman world, one of the key moments of the gift-giving process was the reception of a gift, as there was a strong cultural emphasis on expressing gratitude for gifts that were received.[1] In receiving a gift, the receiver recognises the giver and the intention of the gift. As such, in the Greco-Roman world, gratitude is universally praised, while ingratitude is unanimously despised.[2] Prayer and praise were common ways in which followers of a deity could express gratitude for a divine benefaction, and so through gratitude we can connect the prayer and praise of the early Jesus community to the gift of the Spirit.

There are a few scholars that have sought to draw a connection between the gift of the Spirit, and the prayer or praise of the early Jesus community. Max Turner has argued that the praise of the early Jesus community was charismatic in nature as the Spirit of prophecy did inspire praise in the literature of ITJ.[3] Robert Menzies argues that the praise of the early Jesus movement was missiological, and therefore connected to the work of the Holy Spirit.[4] More common is the connection between prayer and the gift of the Spirit, as some scholars see the prayer as the action that brings the gift of the Spirit; others argue that prayer creates the right environment to receive the gift of the Spirit, while the actual impartation occurs through the laying on of hands.[5]

In this chapter, I bring a new perspective to the study of the connection between the gift of the Spirit and prayer and praise. In the Greco-Roman world prayer and praise functioned as a method of expressing gratitude for divine benefactions, and on this basis I will make the case that the prayer and praise of the early Jesus community is linked to the gift of the Spirit through gratitude. This chapter

---

[1] For example, for gratitude as the proper initial response to a gift see, Xenophon, *Agesilaus*, 11.3; *Anabasis*, 2.5.14, 7.7.23; *Cyropaedia*, 3.2.16, 5.3.20, 6.1.47, 6.4.7, 8.7.3; *Hellenica*, 3.6.13; *Memorabilia*, 3.12.4, 4.4.17; Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica*, 2.530, 3.144, 3.990, 3.1005; Aristophanes, *Assemblywomen*, 1045-8; Euripides, *Alcestis*, 299; *Children of Heracles*, 438, 870; *Andromeda*, 129; *Heracles*, 1222-8, 1352; *Suppliant Woman*, 1169, 1175-9; Isocrates, *Panathenaicus*, 202, 216; *Plataicus*, 1; *Against Callimachus*, 62, 67; *Aegineticus*, 12, 34; Heraclitus, *Testimonia, Part 3: Reception*, R115; Herodotus, *The Persian Wars*, 9.107; Hesiod, *Theogony*, 503; Homer, *Odyssey*, 4.695, 22.319; Pindar, *Pythian Odes*, 2.17; Plato, *Epistles*, 8.353C; *Hippias Minor*, 372C; *Menexenus*, 249E; Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, 230; *Philoctetes*, 1370; Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 1.32.1, 1.33.1-2, 1.128.4, 1.129.3, 3.56.7, 4.20.3.

[2] For example, for ingratitude as a horrible vice see, Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 2.1.32, 2.2.2-3; Theognis, *Elegiac Poems*, 853-4, 955-6, 1263-6; Euripides, *Rhesus*, 411; Isocrates, *Evagoras*, 20; *Plataicus*, 27; Lysias, *Against Alcibiades 2*, 10; Praxilla, *Fragments*, 749; Sophocles, *Fragments Not Assignable to Any Play*, 920; *Oedipus at Colonus*, 234; Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 6.12.1; Theophrastus, *Characters*, 26.5.

[3] Turner, *Power from on High*, 414-415.

[4] Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 177.

[5] For example, see Kyu Sam Han, "Theology of Prayer in the Gospel of Luke," *JETS* 43, no. 4 (2000): 679, 690-691; E. Glenn Hinson, "Persistence in Prayer in Luke-Acts," *RevExp* 104, no. 4 (2007): 721-722.

has two sections, the first addressing the prayers of the early believers (7.1) and the second addressing their praise (7.2).

7.1   *Prayer*

The prayers mentioned in Acts 2:42 are related to the gift of the Spirit in two ways. First, gratitude (sometimes called thanksgiving) was an integral aspect of gift-giving in the Greco-Roman world. As addressed in 3.2.2, Cicero sees ingratitude as destroying the mutual bond of harmony between humans, with ingratitude violating our humanity and reducing humans to the level of brute beasts. Likewise, as I have shown in 3.2.3, Seneca sees ingratitude as most effective at disrupting and abolishing the concord of humanity, with gratitude central to the gift-giving cycle. Both Cicero and Seneca see ingratitude as a horrible vice that should be avoided, with there being a strong moral obligation to express gratitude in receiving a gift. As I argue in 7.1.2, prayer was a primary expression of gratitude in the Greco-Roman world, as so the prayers of the early Jesus community would have consisted of expressions of gratitude for the divine benefactions.

Second, the Lukan Jesus' teaching in the gospel of Luke indicates that prayer can include a request for the gift of the Spirit (Luke 11:13), and in fact, the gift of the Spirit is the ultimate gift of God. Although we cannot be sure of the content of the prayers of Acts 2:42, we can note from the broader Greco-Roman world that prayer was involved in the ongoing relationship between humans and the divine. In this section I address the various suggestions as to the content of the prayer in Acts 2:42 (7.1.1), the relationship between prayer and gratitude (7.1.2), and the relationship between prayer and requesting the gift of the Spirit found in the Gospel of Luke (7.1.3).

7.1.1   *Prayer in the Summary Statements*

There are many different suggestions as to what Luke is referring to in the mention of the prayers in Acts 2:42. Some scholars have suggested that the prayers of Acts 2:42 could be the Psalms,[6] or a form of the Lord's Prayer.[7] Luke's use of the plural with the definite article (ταῖς προσευχαῖς) could indicate that he is referencing specific prayers.[8] Moreover, scholars note the Temple was the most

---

[6] Krodel, *Acts*, 93.
[7] Krodel, *Acts*, 93; Bock, *Acts*, 151.
[8] Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 166; Bock, *Acts*, 151; Chance, *Acts*, 59.

common location for these prayers,[9] which could indicate that the believers prayed traditional Jewish prayers.

However, there is a reason to doubt whether these prayers are *only* Jewish prayers for two reasons. First, the other elements in this verse highlight how the early Jesus followers were different from the broader Jewish society, and so this prayer must have been distinctive in some way from the broader Jewish society.[10] Second, the plural form could tie into the imperfect (ἦσαν), indicating continued adherence to prayer, and not the prayers. Barrett has suggested that the plural προσευχαῖς could be an intensive plural, indicating that the believers prayed more than usual.[11] These points would mean that the prayers are not only Jewish prayers, but also included a continuation and application of Jesus' teaching on prayer.

Instead of referencing only traditional Jewish prayers, I see the prayer mentioned in Acts 2:42 as a combination of traditional Jewish prayers and the Lukan Jesus' teaching on prayer. There are two strengths to this position. First, it considers the wider context of Luke-Acts, as prayer is a major theme in the Gospel of Luke.[12] Second, Acts 2:42 notes that the believers *continually devoted* themselves to prayer, which is a direct outworking of the Lukan Jesus' teaching of persisting in prayer (Luke 11:5-8, 18:1-8).[13] These points lead to the conclusion that these prayers probably consisted of both Jewish prayers and an outworking of the Lukan Jesus' teaching on prayer.

7.1.2   *Prayer and Gratitude*

While noting these arguments, I would like to take a broader approach to the prayers of Acts 2:42, by considering the sociological function of prayer in the Greco-Roman world. Prayer in the Greco-Roman world was the primary form of communication from a human client and to their divine patron.[14] As Bruce Malina defines it, "Prayer is a socially meaningful symbolic act of communication

---

[9] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 191; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 269; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 35; Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, 73; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 111; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 271; Bock, *Acts*, 151; Chance, *Acts*, 59; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 162; Daniel K. Falk, "Jewish Prayer Literature and the Jerusalem Church in Acts," in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting: Palestinian Setting*, ed. Richard Bauckham, BAFCS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 267-302.

[10] Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 166.

[11] Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 166.

[12] Luke 3:21, 5:16, 6:12, 6:27-28, 9:18, 9:29, 10:2, 10:21-24, 11:1-13, 18:1-8, 21:36, 22:32, 22:39-46, 23:46.

[13] Han, "Theology of Prayer in the Gospel of Luke," 679, 690-691; Hinson, "Persistence in Prayer," 721-722.

[14] Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 108-112; Martin P. Charlesworth, "Some Observations on Ruler-Cult Especially in Rome," *HTR* 28, no. 1 (1935): 8-20; H. S. Versnel, "Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer," in *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, ed. H. S. Versnel, (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 4-64; Bruce J. Malina, "What Is Prayer?," *TBT* 18 (1980): 214-220; Jerome H. Neyrey, *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 154-155; John J. Pilch, *The Cultural Dictionary of the Bible* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 123-128; Jerome H. Neyrey, "Prayer, in Other Words: New Testament

directed to persons perceived as somehow supporting, maintaining, and controlling the order of existence of the one praying."[15] Prayer in the Greco-Roman world was both a form of communication between a human client and a divine patron and also the recognition of a patron's honour and power. Crook divides prayer into two different types, prayers of gratitude and prayers of supplication, which ultimately served the same function, honouring a divine patron.[16] Prayers of supplication usually revolved around requesting a divine benefaction, while prayers of gratitude, much like praise (see section 7.2), express gratitude. Prayer was then a way for clients to communicate with their divine patrons in order to express gratitude or to request a benefaction.

As prayer was a way of communicating with a divine patron, to either request a benefaction or to express gratitude for the benefactions given, it is logical to argue that prayer was perceived as being involved with divine gifts either to intercede for them or as a response to them.[17] As David E. Aune notes, prayer is often considered "magical," however, "what we have here [with prayer] is simply the informal principle of reciprocity in human social interaction applied to the analogous sphere of divine-human relationships."[18] Just as clients would approach human patrons and request benefactions or express gratitude, so prayer was the method by which human clients approached their divine patrons for requests and gratitude. Gratitude for divine benefactions was then a central consideration of the purpose and content of prayer in the Greco-Roman world.[19]

The understanding of prayer as an expression of gratitude is found in both the Jewish and non-Jewish understanding of prayer. There is a wealth of literature that demonstrates prayer as an expression of gratitude.[20] For our purposes, I will offer two examples, one from a Jewish source and the other from a non-Jewish source. Gratitude was a central aspect of and underlying motivation for traditional

---

Prayers in Social Science Perspective," in *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina*, ed. John J. Pilch, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 349-351; Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*, 392; Jerome H. Neyrey, *Give God the Glory: Ancient Prayer and Worship in Cultural Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 46-52.

[15] Malina, "What Is Prayer?," 215.

[16] Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 109. See also Versnel, "Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer," 4-17, 42-63.

[17] Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 109; Simon Pulleyn, *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 16-38; David E. Aune, "Prayer in the Greco-Roman World," in *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 25-28.

[18] Aune, "Prayer in the Greco-Roman World," 26.

[19] Aune, "Prayer in the Greco-Roman World," 26-28; Pulleyn, *Prayer in Greek Religion*, 4; Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 108-112; Neyrey, *Give God the Glory*, 46-52; Versnel, "Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer," 46-50.

[20] For further references to gratitude in prayer see Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 108-112; Charlesworth, "Some Observations on Ruler-Cult," 8-20; Versnel, "Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer," 4-64; Malina, "What Is Prayer?," 214-220; Neyrey, *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew*, 154-155; Pilch, *The Cultural Dictionary of the Bible*, 123-128; Neyrey, "Prayer, in Other Words," 349-351; Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*, 392; Neyrey, *Give God the Glory*, 46-52; Pulleyn, *Prayer in Greek Religion*, 16-38; Aune, "Prayer in the Greco-Roman World," 25-28.

Jewish prayers. To give a representative example of the Jewish understanding of prayer, Josephus notes the centrality of gratitude in prayer when he states:

> Twice each day, at the dawn thereof and when the hour comes for turning to repose, let all acknowledge (μαρτυρεῖν) before God the bounties (δωρεάς) which He has bestowed on them through their deliverance from the land of Egypt: Thanksgiving is a natural duty and is rendered (ἀμοιβῇ) alike in gratitude (εὐχαριστίας) for past mercies and to incline the giver to others yet to come.[21]

Josephus notes that in prayer, Jews were to acknowledge the gifts (δωρεάς) that God gives to them, and Josephus specifically points to the remembrance of the Exodus as a source of gratitude. Josephus notes that gratitude, or thanksgiving, is the "natural duty" for those that have received gifts, which also "inclines" God to give further gifts in the future. It is also worth noting that Josephus does not seem to be arguing a specific point here, rather he is articulating a widely held attitude concerning the Jewish practice of prayer.

For a representative position of prayer from the non-Jewish world, Seneca in *De Beneficiis* states:

> But he who says this [that the gods don't give benefits] does not hearken to the voices of those who pray and of those who all around him, lifting their hands to heaven, offer vows for blessings public and private. Assuredly this would not be the case, assuredly all mortals would have agreed upon this madness of addressing divinities that were deaf and gods that were ineffectual, unless we were conscious of their benefits that sometimes are presented unasked, sometimes are granted in answer to prayer.[22]

Seneca, following along a similar line to Josephus, notes the connection of prayer and benefits, for the gods hear the vows and blessings offered in both public and private. People are to pray to the gods because, according to Seneca, they hear prayers. Seneca also notes the second function of prayer, requesting gifts, as unrequested gifts can sometimes be given by the gods, but gifts can also be granted as an answer to prayer (see 7.1.3).

In the Greco-Roman context, it was expected that prayer, benefits and gratitude were part of the social script of religious life. The early Jesus community shared the cultural expectation that gifts and gratitude are integral, and so gift of the Spirit evokes gratitude in the community of believers. This gratitude is expressed in prayer and further intercession.

---

[21] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 4.8.13.
[22] Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, 4.4.2-3.

7.1.3   Prayer, Gift-Giving and the Spirit

Beyond the presence of gratitude in prayer, Luke also connects prayer with a request for the gift of the Spirit in Luke 11:13.[23] In Luke 11:11-13, the Lukan Jesus teaches that the ultimate answer to prayer is the gift of the Spirit, which is then exemplified in Acts 4:24-31. The Lukan Jesus' teaching on prayer in Luke 11:1-13 has three sections: the Lord's prayer (Luke 11:2-4),[24] a parable (Luke 11:5-8), and then a final section of teaching (Luke 11:9-13). Perseverance in prayer is the central theme of the parable in Luke 11:5-8,[25] from which the topic shifts to emphasise the goodness and trustworthiness of God in answering prayer (Luke 11:9-10). This teaching on prayer then finishes with Luke 11:11-13, which states:[26]

> 11^{11} τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσει ὁ υἱὸς ἰχθύν, καὶ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσει;
> ^{12} ἢ καὶ αἰτήσει ᾠόν, ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκορπίον;[27]
> ^{13} εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ [ὁ] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον[28] τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν.

> *11^{11} What parent among you, when their child asks for a fish, would instead of fish give a serpent?*
> *^{12} Or when they ask for an egg, would give them a scorpion?*
> *^{13}If then you who are evil know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him.*

In Luke 11:11-13, Luke uses a Midrashic principle of light to heavy (*qal wehomer*) where if the light is correct then so is the heavy.[29] Therefore, if the light is true (evil parents giving good gifts), then the heavy is also true (God will give the best gift, the gift of the Spirit). Moreover, Luke's redaction of

---

[23] There are two groups of passages on prayer in the gospel of Luke; descriptions of Jesus praying (Luke 3:21, 5:16, 6:12, 9:18, 9:29, 22:32, 22:39-46, 23:46) and the Lukan Jesus' teaching on prayer (Luke 6:27-28, 10:2, 10:21-24, 11:1-13, 18:1-8, 21:36).

[24] For the various discussions surrounding the Lukan and Matthean versions of the Lord's prayer, see James R. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Luke*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 329-331.

[25] For example, see Edwards, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 336-338.

[26] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 231.

[27] Some manuscripts add a third question, contrasting bread and stone, copying Matthew 7:9, see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 132.

[28] There are various variants at this point, including; πνεῦμα ἀγαθόν (good spirit), ἀγαθόν δόμα (good gift), and δόματα ἀγαθά (good gifts). All these can be explained as a confusion between the Lukan and Matthean versions, see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 133.

[29] Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, SP, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 178.

the Matthean original, replacing good things (ἀγαθά) with the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα ἅγιον) indicates that Luke sees the gift of the Spirit as the highest good God can give.[30]

This *qal wehomer* has led numerous scholars to conclude that the gift of the Spirit the ultimate answer to prayer.[31] For example, on this passage, Odette Mainville states that "the answer par excellence of prayer is the gift of the Holy Spirit."[32] John T. Carroll states of this passage that, "Ask (continually), and what will be given (by God) is not necessarily what is requested but what is needed: God's own Spirit."[33] Likewise, Roger Stronstad states that the gift of the Spirit is "the ultimate good gift."[34] Finally, Ju Hur states of Luke 11:13 that it,

> shows that Jesus, while teaching his disciples how to pray, refers to the specific good gift, namely the Holy Spirit. … In other words, the Lukan implied author sees 'receiving the Spirit' as the highest gift from God… and closely associates it with prayer as seen throughout the narrative of Luke-Acts.[35]

Jesus' teaching in Luke 11:13 indicates that the gift of the Spirit is the highest good that God can give to those that ask.

At this point in the Gospel of Luke, we should note that the Lukan Jesus has, as Joel B. Green labels it, created "a new narrative need."[36] That is, the audience of Luke now realises that they need the gift of the Spirit, as it is the ultimate good gift from God. This need is carried forward in Acts, with the outpouring of the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost fulfilling this narrative need. It is in the context of communal prayer (Acts 1:14) that the early believers receive the gift of the Spirit. This connection

---

[30] For the argument that this phrase is a Lukan redaction of the Matthean version, see I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC, (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), 470; Sharon H. Ringe, *Luke*, Westminster Bible Companion, (Louisvillle: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 167; François Bovon, *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51-19:27*, trans. Donald S. Deer, vol. 2, Hermeneia, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 107; Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm: Part II Commentary: Luke 9.51-24.53*, vol. 2, JSNTSup, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989), 499-500.

[31] See Mainville, *The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 221; Shelton, *Mighty In Word And Deed*, 86, 95-96; Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 217; David E. Garland, *Luke*, Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 471, 474; Leon Morris, *Luke*, TNTC, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 196; Ringe, *Luke*, 167; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*, The Anchor Bible, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979), 914; Frederick W. Danker, *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 231; Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 54; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 450.

[32] Mainville, *The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 221.

[33] John T. Carroll, *Luke: A Commentary*, The New Testament Library, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 253.

[34] Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 54.

[35] Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 217.

[36] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 450.

between prayer and a request for the gift of the Spirit is further reinforced with one of the first recorded prayers in Acts (Acts 4:24-31).[37]

This prayer in Acts 4:24-31 sits at a pivotal place in the overall narrative of the opening chapters of Acts, as it occurs at the end of the period of tension between the Sanhedrin and the apostles, and acts as an interpretation of this conflict. Moreover, it leads into the second summary statement in Acts 4:32-35. The prayer of the believers in Acts 4:24-30 has two sections, the first being Acts 4:24-28 which grapples with the conflict that the community is having with the Jewish authorities. The second section of this prayer starts at Acts 4:29; as Parsons and Culy note of the καὶ τὰ νῦν at the start of Acts 4:29 that: "Within a speech, this expression seems to indicate that the speaker is about to make his or her main point."[38] The prayer starts with the believer's use of scripture to interpret the conflict, which then transitions to a request for the gift of the Spirit.

Five things indicate that Acts 4:29-30 is an implicit request for the Spirit. First, the request for boldness in speech, is synonymous with a request for the gift of the Spirit, as boldness is a sign of Spirit-empowered speech.[39] Second, Keener notes that the use of δούλοις in Acts 4:29 alludes back to Acts 2:18, where God promises to pour out the gift of the Spirit even upon slaves.[40] Third, the phrase "speak the word" (λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον) is what Haenchen calls, "a technical term of the primitive mission and designates missionary preaching."[41] Luke consistently links mission and preaching with the empowering work of the Spirit in Acts. Fourth, the prayer also includes a request for signs and wonders, which is another work of the Holy Spirit.[42] Fifth, the immediate aftermath of the prayer is the early believers being filled with the Spirit and speaking the word of God with boldness. These five points all indicate that the request the believers make here is synonymous with a request for the gift of the Spirit.

In summary, we can find significant evidence that Luke depicts prayer as requesting the gift of the Spirit. As Amy-Jill Levine and Ben Witherington state, "Prayer is the medium by which the disciples make their requests to God."[43] When read in the light of Luke 11:13, the prayer of Acts 4:24-30

---

[37] The other recorded words of a prayer that occurs in the opening chapters of Act is in Acts 1:24.
[38] Parsons and Culy, *Acts*, 78.
[39] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 228; Marshall, *Acts*, 114; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 50; Williams, *Acts*, 89-90; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 203. Contrary to Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 202.
[40] Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1172.
[41] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 227; Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 35; Newman and Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles*, 108; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 49.
[42] Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 85. Contrary to Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 58. For a fuller discussion on the Spirit's relation to signs and wonders, see section 6.3.
[43] Amy-Jill Levine and Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Luke*, New Cambridge Bible Commentary, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 317.

indicates that prayer for God's presence and intervention is prayer for the gift of the Spirit. The gift of the Holy Spirit is shown to be the ultimate good gift from God.

7.1.4 Summary

In summary, I have argued that prayer in the Greco-Roman world functioned as the primary method of communication from a client to their divine patron. This communication involved gratitude for past divine gifts and requests for further divine gifts. Prayer as an expression of gratitude and as a pathway for requesting a divine gift gives two pathways for the prayers of Acts 2:42 to be connected to the gift of the Spirit. First, gratitude was the culturally expected response to a divine gift, which was often expressed through prayer, and so we can see that Luke depicts the early Jesus community expressing their gratitude for the gift of the Spirit through their prayer. Second, prayer functioned as an avenue of communication for a human to request a divine gift from a deity. This function connects the gift of the Spirit to prayer, as Lukan Jesus' teaching in Luke 11:13 indicates that the ultimate good gift from God is the gift of the Spirit. Furthermore, the first recorded prayer after Pentecost (Acts 4:24-30) exemplifies the teaching of Luke 11:13, as this prayer in Acts 4:24-30 can be understood as an implicit request for the gift of the Holy Spirit. The prayers of the early Jesus community are then connected to the gift of the Spirit in both the concepts of gratitude and intercession.

7.2 Praising God

Praise (Acts 2:47) is a second term that Luke uses to describe the early Jesus community expressing gratitude to God, including for the gift of the Spirit. Scholars have a variety of thoughts on the believers praising God.[44] Ernst Haenchen notes that this praise is "associated with the experience of God's loving-kindness and saving grace."[45] Gerhard A. Krodel argues that the Spirit manifested itself in the worship of the believers, including the praise of the believers.[46] Pervo notes that this praise is "the appropriate response to grace and a characteristic of all that the believers did."[47] David G. Peterson characterises the praising God as an expression of gladness and devotion to God.[48] These

---

[44] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 193; Marshall, *Acts*, 91; Krodel, *Acts*, 94; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 272; Pervo, *Acts*, 94; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 164; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1035-1037.
[45] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 193.
[46] Krodel, *Acts*, 94.
[47] Pervo, *Acts*, 94.
[48] Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 164.

scholars see the praise of the believers as a response to the grace given by God or an expression of devotion, worship and gladness.

Lukan pneumatologists have connected the Spirit with praise, as for example, Menzies argues that the praise of the believers was missiological.[49] When examining the praise of Acts 2:11, where the disciples speak in various languages of the mighty works of God, Menzies notes that the Spirit primarily enables the believers to communicate with the people. As Menzies states: "The product of this divine gift should not be understood simply as praise directed to God. It is, above all, proclamation."[50] Menzies then sees the praise of the early believers as deeply rooted in their mission to proclaim the gospel through the enabling of the Spirit, however Menzies does not comment on the praise mentioned in Acts 2:47.

Turner has offered a different interpretation on how the Holy Spirit could influence the praise of the first believers in Acts 2:47.[51] Turner notes that "The verb αἰνεῖν ('to praise [God]') itself tells us nothing about whether the action concerned is performed as an unaided human response, as an influenced human response, or as invasive charismatic speech."[52] That is, there is no explicit evidence to suggest that expressions of praise to God were Spirit influenced or unaided human responses. However, the link between praise and tongues in Acts 2:11 and 10:46 does indicate the Spirit's involvement in the praise of the first believers. As Turner concludes: "The reader will anticipate that at least some of the exultation and praise of [Acts] 2:46-47 resulted from a variety of levels of inspiration by the Spirit, from praise articulating joyous charismatic faith to occasions of full-blooded invasive charismatic speech."[53] Turner here notes that the Spirit could interact with the praise of the believers in a variety of ways while highlighting the tension between human agency and charismatic influence. While noting these positions, I would like to add a sociological perspective, first by discussing the connection between praise and gratitude (7.2.1), and then by focussing on the praise of the early Jesus believers in Acts (7.2.2).

---

[49] Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 117. See also Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 163.
[50] Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 117.
[51] Turner, *Power from on High*, 415. See also Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, 61; Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 207-208.
[52] Turner, *Power from on High*, 415.
[53] Turner, *Power from on High*, 415.

7.2.1   Praise and Gratitude

Praise is widely understood in the Greco-Roman world as a common form of gratitude, as it ascribed honour to a client's patron.[54] As Keener notes, "Given the emphasis on honor in the ancient Mediterranean world, 'praise' was very important in worshipping deities."[55] Although the ancient Israelite society did not have patronage or benefaction, they were still a society built around honour and shame, and so they too expressed gratitude to God for his benefactions through praise.[56] Praise, similar to prayer, is a form of communication from a client to a divine patron, mainly to express gratitude for benefactions given and to attribute honour to the divine patron.[57]

This definition of praise rings true throughout the Gospel of Luke, as Luke consistently notes the praise of those that receive divine gifts.[58] As healing can be considered a gift from God, examining a representative healing story from the Gospel of Luke, and the role that praise plays in this story, can help show the how gratitude is expressed through praise for a divine gift.[59] In Luke 5:17-26 Jesus forgives and heals a paralysed person, which leads to the expression of gratitude through praise. The paralysed person is brought to Jesus (Luke 5:18), lowered through the roof (Luke 5:19), from which Jesus states that the paralysed persons' sins are forgiven (Luke 5:20). The Pharisees and teachers of the law begin questioning Jesus' authority to forgive sins in their thoughts (Luke 5:21), which Jesus explicitly confronts by healing the paralysed person (Luke 5:22-24). The response of the paralysed person and the crowd are recorded in Luke 5:25-26, which states:[60]

> 5[25] καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν, ἄρας ἐφ᾽ ὃ κατέκειτο, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ δοξάζων τὸν θεόν.
> [26] καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου λέγοντες ὅτι εἴδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον.

> 5[25] *And immediately he rose up before them, he picked up that which he lay upon, and he went to his home praising God.*

---

[54] Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 111; Versnel, "Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer," 50-56; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1036; Neyrey, *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew*, 70-89; Pieter W. van der Horst, "Hellenistic Parallels to the Acts of the Apostles (2:1-47)," *JSNT* 8, no. 25 (1985): 60.

[55] Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1035.

[56] See the numerous examples given by Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1035-1037.

[57] For an extended discussion on praise and its relationship to honour, Neyrey, *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew*, 70-89.

[58] Luke 5:25-26, 7:16, 17:15-9; 18:43; 19:37

[59] For healing as a divine benefaction see for example Carroll, *Luke*, 131.

[60] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 199.

> [26] *And astonishment seized them all, and they praised God and were filled with fear saying, "We saw remarkable things today."*

The initial response of the healed person was to praise God, which then is mirrored by the response of the crowd, who also praise God.[61] As Danker notes of the responses to the divine gift of healing: "Glorification or praise of God… is one of Luke's favourite themes in description of responses to divine action."[62] The healed person and the crowd praise God for the healing of the paralysed person, as the healing is understood as a divine gift which should be responded to with gratitude.

This response of praise and awe is found in other healing narratives in the Gospel of Luke. After Jesus raised the widow's son from the dead (Luke 7:14-15), Luke 7:16 records that the crowd, "were all taken with awe and praised God" (ἔλαβεν δὲ φόβος πάντας καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν). In the story of the ten lepers (Luke 17:11-19), Luke describes in Luke 17:15 how one leper, seeing that he was healed, returned to Jesus "praising God with a loud voice" (μετὰ φωνῆς μεγάλης δοξάζων τὸν θεόν). Likewise, when the blind beggar receives his sight in Luke 18:43, Luke states that the healed beggar "followed him [Jesus], praising God" (ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ δοξάζων τὸν θεόν). This praise is then echoed by the all people (πᾶς ὁ λαός), who also "gave praise to God" (ἔδωκεν αἶνον τῷ θεῷ). Finally, in Jesus' entry into Jerusalem in Luke 19:28-44, Luke 19:37 records that all of disciples began "to joyfully praise God in loud voices for all the mighty works they had seen" (χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων). These examples from the Gospel of Luke shows that praise was a frequent reaction to receiving divine benefactions.

7.2.2   Praise and the Spirit in Acts

Luke uses this same pattern – praise as an expression of gratitude for divine gifts – in Acts, where praise is one of the first responses from the recipients of the gift of the Spirit. In the two central Spirit-reception narratives, Pentecost (Acts 2:1-13) and Cornelius' household (Acts 10:1-48), praise is the initial response of the recipients of the gift of the Spirit. First, Pentecost describes the coming of the Spirit with the imagery of wind and fire (Acts 2:2-3), and this outpouring of the gift of the Spirit enables the believers to speak in other tongues (Acts 2:4). Luke, after describing the crowd (Acts 2:5-11a), reveals the content of this speaking in other tongues as:[63]

---

[61] This sign and wonder of healing also evokes astonishment and fear from the crowd, a societal reaction that we see in the opening chapters of Acts as well (see 6.3).

[62] Danker, *Jesus and the New Age*, 61.

[63] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 382.

2^{11b} ἀκούομεν λαλούντων αὐτῶν ταῖς ἡμετέραις γλώσσαις τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ.

2^{11b} We hear them telling in our tongues the mighty works of God.

The initial response of the first believers in receiving the gift of the Spirit was to tell others around the event the mighty works of God. Numerous scholars note that μεγαλεῖα (mighty works) occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, while it is used frequently in the LXX to refer to the salvific works of God.[64] French L. Arrington goes further when commenting on this praise when he states that the praise was "for God's mighty saving acts in Christ and for their enduement with spiritual power."[65] David G. Peterson states of the praise of Acts 2:11 that:

> From Peter's sermon in vv. 16-36 we may judge that this [praise] included affirmations about Jesus and his exaltation, as well as *thanksgiving for the gift of the Spirit*, but such speech cannot simply be identified as missiological proclamation. There was a missiological implication of their praise, but this was not its primary function and purpose.[66]

While the praise of the believers at Pentecost could have missional aspects, I agree with Peterson that there is another purpose in their praise, namely, to express gratitude for the giving of the gift of the Spirit.

In the second central Spirit-reception narrative, Acts 10:1-48, which focusses on Cornelius' household, praise is again the initial response to receiving the gift of the Spirit. In this passage, the Spirit orchestrates the meeting between Peter and Cornelius (Acts 10:19-20), from which Peter addresses Cornelius' household (Acts 10:27-43).[67] While Peter is still speaking, the gift of the Spirit is poured out on Cornelius and his household (Acts 10:44), Luke relates the reaction to this gift in Acts 10:45-46:[68]

> 10^{45} καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοὶ ὅσοι συνῆλθαν τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκκέχυται.
> 46 ἤκουον γὰρ αὐτῶν λαλούντων γλώσσαις καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν θεόν.

> *10^{45} The circumcised believers who accompanied Peter were amazed that the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out even upon Gentiles.*

---

[64] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 171; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 84; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 124; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 243; Bock, *Acts*, 104; Schnabel, *Acts*, 120.
[65] Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 24.
[66] Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 137-138. Emphasis my own.
[67] For the Spirit as orchestrator of this meeting see section 11.1.3.
[68] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 415.

⁴⁶ For they heard them speaking in tongues and praising the greatness of God.

Upon receiving the gift of the Spirit, Cornelius' household praise the greatness of God. Luke here is undoubtedly seeking to parallel the gift of the Spirit to Cornelius' household with the gift of the Spirit to believers at Pentecost, as both groups spoke in tongues and the content of their tongues was the praising of God. Therefore, in the two main Spirit-reception narratives in Acts, the believers express gratitude for the gift of the Spirit through their praise.

However, this praise is not just a momentary expression of gratitude for those who had received the gift of the Spirit, but also by the believing community, as upon reflection of both Pentecost and the Cornelius episode the believers are noted as praising God. When summoned to Jerusalem to explain his actions to the leaders of the Jesus movement, Peter states in Acts 11:17-18:[69]

11¹⁷ εἰ οὖν τὴν ἴσην δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν πιστεύσασιν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐγὼ τίς ἤμην δυνατὸς κωλῦσαι τὸν θεόν;
¹⁸ Ἀκούσαντες δὲ ταῦτα ἡσύχασαν καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες· ἄρα καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁ θεὸς τὴν μετάνοιαν εἰς ζωὴν ἔδωκεν.

11¹⁷ "So if God gave them the same gift to them as to us, who have believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who am I to hinder God?"
¹⁸ When they heard this, they had no more objections and praised God, saying, "So then, God has given repentance unto life to the Gentiles."

Here we see praise as the response to the testimony of Peter that the gift of the Spirit had been poured out on the Gentiles. For Pentecost, praise is the initial response (Acts 2:11b) and the response upon the reflection of the outpouring of the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2:47). Similarly, in the Cornelius episode, praise is the initial response (Acts 10:46) and the response upon reflection (Acts 11:18).

Praise also features at other times in Acts as a response to receiving other divine gifts. For instance, in Acts 3:8-9 a healed man praises God for the benefaction of his healing, which in Acts 4:21 leads to the broader audience praising God for the divine gift. In both these verses, Luke attributes the source of praise specifically to the gift of God, which is the healing of the paralysed beggar. Finally, as with Acts 11:18, Luke depicts the Jerusalem church in Acts 21:20 as praising God for what God had done in the Gentile communities. Praise then functions as a common response of gratitude for gifts given by God. In summary, we see that praise in Luke-Acts is often the response to a divine gift

---

[69] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 417.

from God, and as the gift of the Spirit was a significant gift from God in Acts, it would have had a central place in the praise of Acts 2:47.

7.2.3   Summary

In summary, we see praise in Acts as a form of gratitude to God for the benefactions given. Luke depicts praise as a response of gratitude for healing (Luke 5:25-26, Acts 3:8-9, 4:21), but more importantly for this thesis, the believers also offer praise as an expression of gratitude for the gift of the Spirit. In two of the central Spirit reception narratives, Pentecost and Cornelius' household, praise is described as the initial reaction to receiving the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2:11, 10:46), while the believers also praise God upon reflection of these events (Acts 2:47, 11:18). The praise of the early Jesus community is then intimately linked by Luke to the giving of the gift of the Spirit, as it expresses gratitude for this divine gift.

7.3   Conclusion

This chapter has elucidated the response from the early Jesus community to receiving the gift of the Spirit, with a particular focus on prayer and praise. The cultural environment expected expressions of gratitude for divine benefactions. The early believers expressed this gratitude in their praise and their prayer, particularly for the gift of the Spirit. In the next four chapters, I examine the connection between the gift of the Spirit and the gifts to the early Jesus community, starting with the Lukan Jesus' teaching on wealth.

PART THREE

This third and final part of my thesis focusses on the relationship between the gift of the Spirit and the communal sharing, the sharing of meals and the unity of the early Jesus community. Part Three, collectively with Part Two, seeks to establish the sociability inherent in the description of the Spirit as a gift manifests itself in the Spirit's influence on the community life as described in the three summary statements. Part Three then establishes the Spirit's influence on the community's sharing of meals and possessions, and their unity.

Part Three consists of Chapters Eight, Nine, Ten and Eleven. Chapter Eight examines the Lukan Jesus' teaching on wealth and gift-giving in the Gospel of Luke, establishing that the ideal Lukan gift consists of imitation, reward and sociability. These three aspects of the ideal Lukan gift are important, as they are put into practice in the communal sharing of the early Jesus community in the opening chapters of Acts. Chapter Nine addresses the descriptions of the communal sharing and the sharing of meals, as there is a significant about of scholarship on this particular aspect of the Lukan portrayal of the early Jesus community. Addressing the scholarship on the communal sharing enables us to see that this sharing was not mandatory or coerced, which will help me argue that the benefactors to the early Jesus community imitate the gift of the Spirit in giving their gifts freely to the early Jesus community in Chapter Ten. In Chapter Nine, I also argue that the

In Chapter Ten, I argue that the communal sharing of the believers was founded on and motivated by the Spirit as gift. I argue that the Spirit as δωρεά can be understood as a pre-emptive eschatological reward for generous gift-giving, something that the Lukan Jesus promises will happen in his teaching in the Gospel of Luke. Moreover, I argue that the communal sharing is an imitation of the Spirit as δωρεά as both gifts are given freely. Additionally, Luke uses the same word to describe the distribution of the Spirit and the distribution for the poor, indicating that the early Jesus community imitate the gift of the Spirit in their distribution as well as in their giving. Finally, in Chapter Eleven, I argue that Luke portrays the gift of the Spirit as the status-transcending attribute, transcending considerations of gender, age, class, regional identities and ethnicities. The gift of the Spirit as the status-transcending attribute of the early Jesus community is then the basis for the remarkable unity of this community, and also enables this community to "have all things in common." Part Three then involves establishing the gift of the Spirit's connection to the communal sharing, the sharing of meals and the unity of the early Jesus community.

Chapter 8: Gift-Giving and the Lukan Jesus

There is an implicit connection between wealth and gift-giving in Lukan theology which is particularly evident in the Gospel of Luke. In the Gospel, the rich are faced with an ethical decision; they could store up their wealth (e.g. Luke 12:16-21), or the rich could give their excess as gifts to the poor (e.g. Luke 18:18-23).[1] The rich have an implicit choice in the Gospel of Luke between generously giving gifts to the poor and selfishly storing up wealth (which includes giving gifts for self-serving ends, e.g. Luke 6:32-34). In this chapter, I seek to establish the Lukan ideals of imitation, reward, and sociability in gift-giving, by giving particular attention to the teaching of the Lukan Jesus.[2] The concepts of imitation, reward, and sociability will then help us in Chapter Ten, where I connect the gift of the Spirit with the communal sharing of the early Jesus community through these three concepts.

Luke portrays God as involved in the disciples' use of wealth, as God sees the way wealth is used and promises to administer justice both to the poor and the rich (Luke 1:53, 6:20-26, 6:32-35).[3] Luke establishes human benefactors should *imitate* God's gift-giving (Luke 6:35-38), which is a common refrain in the wider Greco-Roman world.[4] Moreover, God promises to *reward* the practice of giving a gift without expecting a return (Luke 6:35, 6:38, 14:14, 18:22). Finally, giving without expecting a return *creates sociability* between the giver and God, as, according to Luke, generous givers will be "children of God" (Luke 6:35).

This chapter will not be a comprehensive treatment of wealth and gift-giving in the Gospel of Luke, rather, it will seek to establish the Lukan ideals of reward, imitation and sociability in gift-giving. I see Luke establishing these three critical aspects of an ideal Lukan gift in Luke 6:27-38 (8.1), which Luke further addresses in the following parables and teachings of Jesus (i.e. Luke 12:13-21, 16:1-15, 16:19-31, 18:18-30). Luke establishes the promise of divine rewards for generous giving in Luke 6:35 and 6:38, which Luke then again mentions in Luke 12:33, 14:14, 18:22. Luke establishes a sociability between the generous giver and God (Luke 6:32-35), which Luke further refers to throughout the

---

[1] This understanding derives from the view of wealth as a limited good, see Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom*, 76-79; Michael Trainor, *About Earth's Child: An Ecological Listening to the Gospel of Luke*, The Earth Bible Commentary Series, (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2012), 187. For an recent examination of wealth and poverty in the ancient world and the implications for us today, see Steve Walton and Hannah Swithinbank, eds., *Poverty in the Early Church and Today: A Conversation*, (London: T&T Clark, 2019).
[2] All references to Jesus in this chapter will refer to the Lukan portrayal of Jesus, as the understanding of the historical Jesus falls outside the scope of this thesis.
[3] For example, see Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 39-45.
[4] For example, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 188.

gospel (Luke 12:21, 16:9). The Lukan understanding of gifts, although addressed elsewhere, is encapsulated in Jesus' teaching in Luke 6:27-38. The second section of this chapter will also cover the teaching of the Lukan Jesus on sharing meals, found in Luke 14:12-14 (8.2), as I see the meal sharing as a significant expression of gift-giving in Luke-Acts.

8.1   The Sermon on the Plain

In the sermon on the plain (Luke 6:20-49), the Lukan Jesus sets out the ideal Lukan gift, which involves the concepts of imitation, reward, and sociability.[5] The sermon on the plain has three main sections, the blessings and woes to the poor and rich (Luke 6:20b-26), the ethical teaching on gift-giving in different forms (Luke 6:27-38) and then a parable with a final teaching (Luke 6:39-49). This section will focus on the central passage, Luke 6:27-38, on Jesus' teaching on gift-giving. This section will cover the golden rule (8.1.1), credit and reward (8.1.2), and finally divine repayment (8.1.3).

8.1.1   The Golden Rule

In the first paragraph of Jesus' teaching on gift-giving, Luke 6:27-31, Jesus instructs his disciples to use gifts to turn enemies into friends.[6] While the Golden Rule and the instruction to love your enemies do have a varied meaning in the ancient world, the use of active imperatives and the context of power imbalance leads to implied instruction to turn enemies into friends. In this context, the instruction to give to all and not ask back what has been taken indicates that Luke emphasises the sociability of a gift, as gifts are to be used to turn enemies into friends. The teaching on the Golden Rule, in Luke 6:27-31, states:[7]

> 6²⁷ Ἀλλ' ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς,
> ²⁸ εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.
> ²⁹ τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσῃς.

---

[5] Scholars have applied gift-giving paradigms to this passage, for example, see Kirk, "'Love Your Enemies,' the Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity," 667-686.
[6] I recognise here that the lens in which you choose to approach Luke 6:27-38 may affect the meaning of this passage. That is, if viewed through the lens of the historical Jesus, this teaching may have even more radical implications. For recent research into this passage in the context of the historical Jesus see James R. Harrison, "The Historical Jesus as 'Social Critic': An Investigation of Luke 6:27-36," *Journal for the Gospels and Acts Research* 2 (2018): 53-74.
[7] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 204.

³⁰ Παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει.

³¹ Καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ποιεῖτε⁸ αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.

6²⁷ But I say to you (all) that hear, love your enemies, do good to those hating you,

²⁸ bless those that curse you, pray for those that are threatening you.

²⁹ To the one who slaps you upon the cheek, present the other (cheek) also. From the one who takes away your coat, do not even withhold (your) shirt.

³⁰ Continue to give to everyone who asks of you, and do not demand your things back from the one taking/stealing them.

³¹ Just as you want people to treat you, likewise continue to do to them.

In this passage, Luke creates quite an antagonistic picture, where the followers of Jesus are to love enemies, turn the other cheek, give the shirt as well as the coat, and to pray and bless those that are hostile towards the disciples of Jesus.[9] It is in this antagonistic context that Jesus instructs his followers to give repeatedly (δίδου) to all (παντί) who ask, and not to demand back (ἀπαίτει) the things stolen or taken by force (αἴροντος). Understanding the surrounding instructions, in particular the love of enemies and the Golden Rule, will elucidate the motivations for giving to all.

In order to understand why the followers of Jesus are to give to all who ask, we must consider two of the most striking commands of this paragraph, to love your enemies and the Golden Rule. Luise Schottroff has argued that in the ancient world, the command to love your enemies and the Golden Rule can have broadly three meanings.[10] First, these commands could be used in the context of passivity of an inferior to an antagonistic superior.[11] This instruction is commonly given to slaves in the Roman Empire, as they commonly had to put up with horrific injustice without any recourse for action.[12] Second, ancient authors can use this instruction to love your enemies in the context of honourable moral conduct from a superior to an inferior.[13] Ancient authors direct this advice to the *paterfamilias* of the typical Roman household or the proper conduct of a conquering Roman general

---

[8] Some manuscripts (including א, A and D), following Matt 7:12, add καὶ ὑμεῖς, see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 118.

[9] The Matthean version seems to have more of a militaristic emphasis, with the instruction to walk the extra mile, which is absent in the Lukan version. For the differences between the Lukan and Matthean versions see, Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm: Part I Commentary: Luke 1:1-9.50*, vol. 1, JSNTSup, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989), 360-363.

[10] Luise Schottroff, "Non-Violence and the Love of One's Enemies," in *Essays on the Love Commandment*, ed. Reginald H. Fuller, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 9-39. See also John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, WBC, (Dallas, TX: Word, 1989), 294-295.

[11] Schottroff, "Non-Violence and the Love of One's Enemies," 17-18. Schottroff (33) lists Plato, *Gorgias*, 483B; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 4.11; Theophrastus, *Characters*, 1; Seneca, *De Ira*, 2.33.2-4, 3.14, as evidence for this position.

[12] Schottroff, "Non-Violence and the Love of One's Enemies," 17-18.

[13] Schottroff, "Non-Violence and the Love of One's Enemies," 18-20. Schottroff (33-34) gives as supporting evidence the examples of Seneca, *De Ira*, 2.32.1; Seneca, *De Clementia*, 1.5.1.

towards a defeated army and people.[14] Third, these commands can be given a the context, which Schottroff calls, "The Protest of the Powerless," where the powerless use acts of love as a protest in the face of injustice.[15] Schottroff gives the examples of the death of Socrates and the beatings of Cynics as protests against the corrupt nature of society.[16] The love of enemies and the Golden Rule can then have quite a varied meaning, with its meaning dependant on context.

So which of these three meanings best suits this passage? First, there is a clear power imbalance in this paragraph, with the follower of Jesus being in the inferior position. The power imbalance is shown in the instruction to the follower of Jesus to accept another slap and to surrender their shirt as well as their coat. Moreover, Luke reinforces this antagonistic context in the use of ἀπαιτέω (to demand something back). Fredrick W. Danker notes that ἀπαιτέω can mean "to demand something back or as due, [to] ask for, [to] demand or a loan … or stolen property."[17] In the wider antagonistic context, we could translate ἀπαίτει as "demanding back something stolen." These points indicate that Jesus here is instructing those in the inferior position, indicating that the second context, instruction for the powerful towards the weak, is unlikely. As Schottroff states, "the desire of the powerless for the salvation of their enemies is the precise opposite of the desire of the ruling classes to integrate their enemies or rebellious subjects into their dominion after they have defeated them."[18] Jesus directs his instruction in Luke 6:27-31 toward those that are in the inferior position.

To further refine our understanding of the instruction to love your enemies, we need to evaluate whether Luke portrays Jesus as teaching passivity or proactivity in the face of an antagonistic superior. Instructive is the use of imperatives in Luke 6:27-28 (ἀγαπᾶτε, ποιεῖτε, εὐλογεῖτε, προσεύχεσθε), which could imply that the Lukan Jesus encourages the disciples to have agency in case of antagonistic superior. These imperatives indicate that Jesus' use of the Golden Rule and the teaching to love your enemies points towards a proactive goodness towards others.[19] It is worth noting that Jesus' instruction in the love of your enemies and the Golden Rule do differ slightly from a

---

[14] Schottroff, "Non-Violence and the Love of One's Enemies," 19-20.
[15] Schottroff, "Non-Violence and the Love of One's Enemies," 20-22. Schottroff (35) lists Plato, *Crito*, 51C; Seneca, *De Ira*, 3.11.2, 3.38.1; Plutarch, *De Cohibenda Ira*, 14.
[16] Schottroff, "Non-Violence and the Love of One's Enemies," 21-22.
[17] BAGD, 96.
[18] Schottroff, "Non-Violence and the Love of One's Enemies," 24.
[19] Schottroff, "Non-Violence and the Love of One's Enemies," 24; Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke*, ANTC, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 118; Garland, *Luke*. Topel (477) argues that "The Golden Rule … is not a response to an action, but the consideration of an appropriate *first* action." John Topel, "The Tarnished Golden Rule (Luke 6:31): The Inescapable Radicalness of Christian Ethics," *TS* 59, no. 3 (1998): 475-485. Against Topel's view, the broader context seems to place the love of enemies as a reaction to an antagonistic superior.

protest of the powerless, as Schottroff states, in Jesus' teaching "the enemy must be won over."[20] The goal of the love of enemies is not simply a protest, but to turn your enemy into your friend.

Jesus' teaching to give to all who ask, in the context of loving your enemies and the Golden Rule, is then an instruction to use gifts to turn your enemy into your friend. Robert C. Tannehill argues that Jesus here "turns reciprocity into a guide to proactive goodness, free of calculations concerning our past treatment by others."[21] Tannehill argues that instead of abandoning reciprocity, Jesus is moving the calculation of reciprocity into the future, where Jesus' followers are to forget past injuries, and they are to give an initial positive gift. Indeed, using gifts to win friends is similar to the instruction found in the parable of the shrewd manager (Luke 16:1-13), where, in Luke 16:9, Jesus commends the shrewd manager because he made friends with unrighteous wealth (τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας). Therefore, as with Luke 16:9, Jesus is advocating in this paragraph to use the sociability of gifts to turn an enemy into a friend. That is, the love of enemies is meant to turn them into our friends. This instruction from Jesus is something like: If your enemy asks for your coat, give them your shirt as well, in order that they will be positively indebted to you and this may initiate a friendship. From this, we see that Jesus expects his disciples to unleash the socially creative force of gifts in order to turn enemies into friends.[22]

In summary, the expectation of giving without demanding a return in this antagonistic context leads to the expectation that the disciples of Jesus are to turn their enemies into their friends. This conclusion is shown by the antagonistic context and the use of active imperatives, indicating a proactive use of one's possessions to turn enemies into friends. A similar connection, concerning the sociability of a gift, is again addressed in the next paragraph, Luke 6:32-35, as Jesus speaks of the generous as having the χάρις of God and being children of God.

8.1.2   Credit and Reward

In the next paragraph, Luke 6:32-35, Jesus connects gift-giving with the concepts of sociability and imitation. In this paragraph, Jesus notes the redundancy of self-serving gift-giving, arguing that givers should prioritise sociability over reciprocity. Moreover, in this paragraph, Jesus introduces one of the

---

[20] Schottroff, "Non-Violence and the Love of One's Enemies," 24.

[21] Tannehill, *Luke*, 118.

[22] Indeed, this teaching is played out in the Cornelius pericope, as a Roman general (the enemy of the Jewish people) was accepted into the Jesus community by the pouring out of the gift of the Spirit.

core motivations for giving without expecting a return, which is an imitation of God. Luke expands the Golden Rule in the following paragraph, Luke 6:32-35, which is as follows:[23]

6³² καὶ εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσιν.

³³ καὶ [γὰρ] ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῆτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιοῦντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.

³⁴ καὶ ἐὰν δανίσητε παρ᾽ ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις [ἐστίν]; καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανίζουσιν ἵνα ἀπολάβωσιν τὰ ἴσα.

³⁵ πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δανίζετε μηδὲν[24] ἀπελπίζοντες· καὶ ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολύς, καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ ὑψίστου, ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηρούς.

6³² And if you love those who love you, what favour is that to you? For even sinners love those who love them.

³³ And if you do good to those who do good to you, what favour is that to you? Even sinners do the same.

³⁴ And if you lend to those whom you expect to receive a return, what favour is that to you? Even sinners lend to sinners, so that they may receive back an equal amount.

³⁵ But love your enemies, and do good and lend, expecting nothing back, and your reward will be great, and you will be children of the Most High, because he is benevolent to the ungrateful and wicked.

In this passage, Jesus responds to loving, doing good and lending to those who can return a similar action, with the question: "What favour is that to you?" (ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν;). Of these three parallel verses, the first appears in Matthew 5:46, with the second and third, concerning doing good and lending, only found in Luke.[25] From these three parallel verses, the sequence breaks, with Jesus explaining the motivation for generous living, namely the imitation of God. Again, in this passage, we find the instruction to lend without expecting anything in return, but instead of enemies, Jesus here is addressing those that can make a return. On the topic of the ideal Lukan gift, I see three layers of meaning in this paragraph.

---

[23] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 204-205.
[24] Some manuscripts, including ℵ, W and Ξ, have μηδένα instead of μηδέν, which seems to be a copyist error, see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 118.
[25] Tannehill, *Luke*, 119.

In the first layer, Jesus notes the redundancy of self-interested gift-giving. As discussed in Chapter Two, when gift-givers focus on reciprocity, gift-giving becomes a redundant transaction that produces more waste than gain.[26] That is if we receive back an equal amount for the gifts we give, is there any economic gain? Scholars generally do not think that Jesus here is referring to lending with interest, as the use of τὰ ἴσα (the same amount) indicates strict equality.[27] Those that lend receive the exact same amount back. The Lukan Jesus is therefore critiquing those that choose their friends based on the ability to reciprocate. At this foundational level, Jesus is highlighting the ultimate futility of using wealth in self-centred ways, as self-interested giving only leads to receiving back an equal amount.

In the second layer of meaning, Jesus shifts the focus of gift-giving from reciprocity to sociability. Claiming not to seek a return, while not denying the opportunity of reciprocity, shifts the focus to the relationships created or sustained through gift-giving. In seeking no return, the focus moves from reciprocity to sociability. This shift to the sociability produced by a gift is manifest in this paragraph, as those that give without expecting a return will be children of God (Luke 6:35). While some scholars have suggested that being children of God is the reward,[28] this suggestion seems to imply that generous giving qualifies you or makes you a child of God.[29] What is more likely is the common connection between identity and imitation. As Green notes, "To be the progeny of something or someone is to share its character by nature."[30] Jesus then seems to be saying "If you are children of God, you will imitate the way God gives gifts."[31]

The third and final layer of meaning in this passage is the implicit link between giving without expecting a return and the χάρις of God, which indicates an intermingling of the divine and human realms of gift-giving. This implicit link goes beyond the indirect connection of the imitation of God to the direct involvement of God in the gift-giving practices of the followers of Jesus. Those that give gifts without expecting a return will gain χάρις from God, as God is intimately involved in the gift-giving practices of the followers of Jesus. As Christopher M. Hays states:

> Luke endorses giving in order to gain χάρις *from God*. Whether or not his love of enemies issues in their friendship, it gains one the χάρις, gratia, gratitude, and corresponding

---

[26] Cheal, *The Gift Economy*, 12.

[27] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 273.

[28] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 112.

[29] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 274.

[30] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 274.

[31] This interplay between sociability, identity and provision for the poor derives from a distinctively Jewish tradition, as alms was quite rare in the wider Greco-Roman, but practised regularly in Jewish society and functioned as a distinctive marker within the Jewish identity. For example, see Gary A. Anderson, *Charity: The Place of the Poor in the Biblical Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).

repayment of the Lord. ... Luke subverts reciprocity ethics with Jewish eschatological expectations of divine recompense.[32]

Jesus' teaching indicates that God sees the giving to others without expecting a return, and it garners the χάρις (favour/credit) of God. Likewise, David E. Garland notes the relationship between imitation and reward when he states:

> If there is to be any reciprocity in one's relationships, it is to be reciprocity with God. Relationships with others are not to be understood as bipolar but as always involving God. They are triangular. Jesus applies the principle that one who receives a benefit must return it in some form and the one who gives a benefit rightfully expects some return [from God]. ... Giving to others and treating them graciously is praiseworthy behaviour that imitates God, and God will reward it.[33]

As God is involved in the use of wealth and the gift-giving practices of the followers of Jesus, it is God that will reward the generous giver. Similarly, François Bovon says:

> Neither Q nor Luke ultimately overcomes the principle of reciprocity, shifting it as they do from inter-human reciprocity to the relationship between God and humans. For this reason, ποία ("what, what type") is quite apt here: what type of reward are you receiving? Usually, only a small limited, and temporary one. The rupture with calculating reciprocity in the love of enemies opens, on the other hand a promising response and return from God.[34]

Instead of the contrast between reciprocity and unilateral gifts, Jesus here is contrasting between receiving χάρις from your friends and receiving χάρις from God. This promise of reward is found elsewhere in the Gospel of Luke (Luke 6:38), with Luke describing these rewards in eschatological terms (Luke 12:33, 14:14, 18:22). The disciples are not to expect χάρις from one another, but rather are to expect to receive a μισθὸς (reward/payment) from God.[35]

To summarise, this second paragraph has three layers of meaning, with the first noting the futility of gift-giving based on reciprocity. Those that give gifts based on self-interest ultimately receive an equal amount back, rendering the transaction redundant. In the second layer of meaning, Jesus moves the focus on gift-giving from reciprocity to sociability, through the instruction to seek no return. In

---

[32] Christopher M. Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics: A Study in Their Coherence and Character*, WUNT II/275, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 114.

[33] Garland, *Luke*, 282.

[34] François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*, trans. Christine M. Thomas, vol. 1, Hermeneia, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 237.

[35] This connection is more explicit in the Matthean version of this passage, as Matthew replaces χάρις with μισθὸς in Matthew 5:46. The rhetorical question in Matt 5:46 is: τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; (what reward will you get?)

the third layer of meaning, giving without expecting a return will garner the χάρις of God, and will be rewarded by God. Moreover, this giving without expecting a return will also develop not only a relationship with the receiver but also with God, as those that give gifts like God will show that they are children of God. As we move to the final paragraph of this section of the sermon on the plain, Luke 6:36-38, we see Jesus further developing the concept of divine rewards from and imitation of God in gift-giving.

8.1.3   Divine Repayment

In the third paragraph of this section, Jesus expands on the concept of imitation in gift-giving, noting that imitating God in the area of gift-giving will be rewarded by God. In the final paragraph of this passage, we find the concept of imitation in gift-giving, Luke 6:36-38, which states:[36]

> 6[36] Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.
> [37] Καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε· καὶ μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε. ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε·
> [38] δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· μέτρον καλὸν πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον ὑπερεκχυννόμενον δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν· ᾧ γὰρ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

> 6[36] *Be merciful just as your Father is merciful;*
> [37] *Do not judge, and you will not be judged;*
> *Do not condemn, and you will not be condemned;*
> *Pardon, and you will be pardoned;*
> [38] *Give, and it will be given to you;*
> *Good measure, pressed down, shaken, overflowing, poured out into the fold your garment.*
> *For the measure that you apportion, (the same) measure will be given in return to you.*

Jesus then gives five statements concerning mercy, judging, condemning, pardoning, and giving, which are then followed by an image an employer measuring out a wage out generously.

---

[36] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 205. There are no significant variants mentioned by Metzger, see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 118.

This mention of imitation in gift-giving is similar to the common indirect connection between divine and human gift-giving in Greco-Roman literature.[37] For example, when discussing how repaying good with good binds people together, Aristotle uses the three Graces as an example for imitation:

> This is why we set up a shrine of the Graces (Χαρίτων) in a public place, to remind men to return a kindness (ἀνταπόδοσις); for that is a special characteristic of grace (χάριτος), since it is a duty not only to repay a service done (χαρισαμένῳ), but another time to take the initiative in doing a service oneself (χαριζόμενον).[38]

Aristotle argues that the shine of the three Graces is placed in a public place to remind citizens to return gifts and services. James R. Harrison notes that Aristotle's connection between χάρις and Χαρίτες "functions more by mnemonic association than any notion of divine grace impelling human beneficence, as is the case with the early Christians."[39] That is, the connection between Χαρίτες and χάρις is indirect. Similarly, Seneca implores his reader to "follow these [immortal gods] as our guides in so far as human weakness permits," and that "he who gives benefits imitates the gods."[40] In this way, the gods were set up as a model for human benefactors to imitate.

However, the imitation that the Lukan Jesus speaks of goes further than the imitation of Aristotle or Seneca. Luke is not establishing the imitation of a god that is distant and uninvolved in human benefaction. Rather, this imitation springs forth from the generosity that God has already shown. As we have already seen in the previous subsection (8.1.2), the divine and human gift-giving realms are intermingled, as God is involved in the disciples' use of wealth. Luke further reinforces this intermingling by the picture of the day labourer's wages being measured out (Luke 6:38).

This paragraph then progresses to a picture of an employer paying a day labourer's wages, as employers often paid wages in grain.[41] Often a measuring cup would be used, which this verse envisions is filled with grain, then the grain is pressed down to fit more grain. Then the measuring cup is shaken to make more room, filled again until overflowing and then poured out into the worker's garment.[42] The point of this picture is clear. God promises to repay the generous giver, as Garland states, "Those who imitate God's benevolence will receive even greater benevolence from God."[43]

---

[37] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 5.5.7; Dio Chrysostom, *Oracles*, 31.37; Plutarch, *Moralia*, 141F, 778C-D; Cornutus, *Summary of Greek Theology*, 8, 15; Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, 1.1.9, 3.15.4, 4.25.1-3, 4.28.1-6, 7.31.3-5; *De Clementia*, 1.5.7, 1.19.9.

[38] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 5.5.7 (Rackham, LCL).

[39] Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 188.

[40] Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, 1.1.9, 3.15.14, respectively.

[41] Danker, *Jesus and the New Age*, 151; Morris, *Luke*, 132; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 266-267.

[42] Tannehill notes that in Greek, the words are progressively longer, which builds the anticipation of this reward. See Tannehill, *Luke*, 121.

[43] Garland, *Luke*, 283.

Jesus' teaching here does not idealise unilateral gifts, as these can have harmful effects on the recipients; rather, Jesus teaches that God will reward the generous giver.

Luke further reinforces this point in the final phrase of this paragraph, which equates the generosity from a disciple of Jesus with generosity from God. As I. H. Marshall states of the final phrase in Luke 6:38, "human generosity is rewarded with divine generosity, [but] not with a precisely equivalent gift from God."[44] Likewise, Fitzmyer states: "Human generosity will be rewarded with divine superabundance."[45] The disciple of Jesus is to imitate God's generosity, and in this imitation, God will reward the generous gift-giver.

8.1.4   Summary

To summarise, this passage of teaching from Jesus lays the foundations for the ideal Lukan gift. Jesus teaches in this passage that God is involved in the gift-giving of the disciples of Jesus. Jesus implicitly connects the χάρις of God with giving gifts without the consideration of return, with God promising to reward generous gift-giving. Moreover, the sociability of gift-giving is also addressed, as those that give to those that cannot pay back will be children of God, indicating that Luke connects the gift-giving practices to our relationship with God. Moreover, Jesus also uses the imagery of imitation, imagery that is common in Greco-Roman philosophy, to connect divine and human gift-giving indirectly.

8.2   Gift-Giving and the Sharing of Meals

In this second section, I address the Lukan Jesus' teaching on the sharing of meals in Luke 14:12-14, arguing that the sharing of meals has the same motivational base as gift-giving for Luke. Luke 14:12-14 is the third of four discussions at the house of a prominent Pharisee (Luke 14:1). Luke 14 starts with Jesus healing a man with dropsy (Luke 14:2-6), followed by a discussion about seating at a meal (Luke 14:7-11), from which Jesus' attention moves to the host (Luke 14:12-14), before finishing with the parable of the great banquet (Luke 14:15-23). Directed towards the host of the dinner, Luke 14:12-14, states:[46]

---

[44] Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 267.
[45] Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*, 641.
[46] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 246.

14¹² Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ τῷ κεκληκότι αὐτόν· ὅταν ποιῇς ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον, μὴ φώνει τοὺς φίλους σου μηδὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου μηδὲ τοὺς συγγενεῖς σου μηδὲ⁴⁷ γείτονας πλουσίους, μήποτε καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀντικαλέσωσίν σε καὶ γένηται ἀνταπόδομά σοι.

¹³ ἀλλ᾽ ὅταν δοχὴν ποιῇς, κάλει πτωχούς, ἀναπείρους, χωλούς, τυφλούς·

¹⁴ καὶ μακάριος ἔσῃ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναί σοι, ἀνταποδοθήσεται γάρ⁴⁸ σοι ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων.

14¹² He also said to the one who had invited him, "When you give a meal or dinner, do not invite your friends nor your siblings nor your relatives nor your wealthy neighbours, lest they invite you in return, and may that be your recompense.

¹³ But when you give a feast, invite the poor, crippled, lame and blind.

¹⁴ And you will be blessed, for they cannot repay you, for your repayment will be in the resurrection of the righteous.

Jesus instructs the host to invite the poor, the crippled, the lame and the blind instead of those who can repay, and in inviting the marginalised God will reward the host at the resurrection of the righteous. There are two things I would like to emphasise from this passage.

First, this teaching by Jesus on sharing meals has similar instructions to Jesus' teaching on the use of wealth and gift-giving.[49] Jesus teaches to invite those that cannot repay (Luke 14:13), which is similar to Jesus' instruction to give without expecting a return (e.g. Luke 6:35). Moreover, Jesus promises that those that give to recipients who cannot repay the gift will receive a repayment at the resurrection of the righteous (Luke 14:14), and this is similar to the promise of divine reward for generous giving found elsewhere in the Gospel (Luke 6:35, 12:33, 18:22). As Sharon H. Ringe notes of Luke 14:12-14, "These teachings thus echo those found earlier…. Where reciprocal relationships between friends and enemies alike are transformed by new standards of generosity."[50] For Luke, the ideal gift and the sharing of meals has a similar motivational base.

Second, while there are similarities between Luke's ideal gift and sharing meals, this sharing of meals has an additional social cost attached.[51] The work of Louise A. Gosbell has highlighted that in the Greco-Roman world, the poor, crippled, blind and lame were often invited to banquets (in particular

---

[47] Some manuscripts, including Codex D, split up γείτονας and πλουσίους into two separate groups, rendering the passage μηδὲ τοὺς γείτονας [σου] μηδὲ τοὺς πλουσίους (nor [your] wealthy people, nor the neighbours). See *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 246.

[48] Some manuscripts, including Sinaiticus and Codex N, have δε instead of γάρ, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 246.

[49] Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 583; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*, 1045; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 225; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 553-554; Ringe, *Luke*, 196; Edwards, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 419.

[50] Ringe, *Luke*, 196.

[51] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 553; Carroll, *Luke*, 299.

the drinking party or symposium) of the wealthy as objects of ridicule and amusement.[52] In this context, inviting the marginalised and disabled as equal members of a shared meal, and not as objects of ridicule and amusement, would have been striking and confronting. Moreover, while giving a gift could happen anywhere, inviting someone into one's own home in antiquity was a symbolic representation of acceptance and inclusion.[53] Jesus' instruction to share meals with those that cannot repay, would have, according to Joel Green, been,

> the death knell for the ethics of patronage and, more generally, for the regulation of social affiliations according to the demands of reciprocity. … Insofar as Jesus' host and table companions are comprised of the social elite, his message to them would entail a form of unpremeditated generosity involving redistribution on behalf of "the poor.[54]

Green sees the Lukan Jesus' teaching on meal sharing in Luke 14:12-14 as eliminating the regulation of social affiliations according to reciprocity. While I agree with Green that Jesus is addressing the place of reciprocity in the regulation of personal relationships, I see Jesus, much like in Luke 6:27-38, moving the focus from reciprocity to sociability. The care for the poor is an important command in the Hebrew Bible (e.g. Deut 15:1-11), and so Jesus is seeking to move the focus away from self-interest reciprocity towards a care for the poor and marginalised that builds the sociability of a community, village or town. While reciprocity is not abandoned, as God promises rewards, he moves the focus from reciprocity to the sociability of gift-giving.

This instruction in Luke 14:14 not only involves a redistribution but calls into question the segregation of society based upon strict calculations of reciprocity. Likewise, Luke Timothy Johnson states, "This challenge to conventional patterns of reciprocity is made obvious in Jesus' rebuke to their habit of inviting to banquets those who could respond in kind," and that, "they will be rewarded by God rather than by other humans."[55] Jesus' teaching here is clear; the sharing of meals cannot be used as a tool of exclusion, but rather should express the generosity and acceptance of God.

In summary, the Lukan Jesus in this passage teaches his disciples to share meals in the same way that they are to give gifts; to give/share without expecting a return. This sharing of meals with those that

---

[52] Louise A. Gosbell, *"The Poor, the Crippled, the Blind, and the Lame": Physical and Sensory Disability in the Gospel of the New Testament*, WUNT II/369 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 204-228.
[53] For example, Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 169-182.
[54] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 553.
[55] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 227. Likewise, Garland notes, "Jesus eliminates the issues of power and status that the giving of gifts generated by introducing God into the equation. The assumption is that the bond between people – in the case, the haves and the have-nots – is triangular. Repayment would come from God at the resurrection, not from the recipients of any benevolence." See Garland, *Luke*, 579.

cannot repay is promised to be repaid at the resurrection of the righteous, echoing the previous promises of reward for giving gifts freely.

8.3 *Conclusion*

In conclusion, this chapter has shown that Luke establishes his understanding of gift-giving around four points. First, Luke uses the imagery of imitation in gift-giving, known in the wider Greco-Roman world, as the motivation for giving gifts without expecting a return. However, Luke goes further than this common Greco-Roman world understanding as, second, Luke sees God as involved in the way that the disciples use wealth. This involvement is shown in the promise of rewards from God, and the connection between the χάρις of God and giving to those that cannot repay in Luke 6:32-35. Third, giving gifts to those that cannot repay creates sociability between God and the giver, as the giver will be a child of God. Fourth, a significant expression of gift-giving is the sharing meals, which has an additional social cost. Therefore, the Lukan ideal gift involves the concepts of imitation, reward and sociability, which Luke indicates can be expressed through the sharing of meals.

These conclusions have implications for this thesis. In the next chapter, I argue that the main expression of communal sharing was the sharing of meals, drawing upon the similarities noted in section 8.2. Subsequently, in Chapter Ten, I will argue that Luke connects the gift of the Spirit to the communal sharing of the early Jesus community through the concepts of imitation and reward. In the next chapter, I address the descriptions of the communal sharing of the early Jesus community and develop the connection between the communal sharing and the sharing of meals in Acts.

Chapter 9: The Communal Sharing and Sharing of Meals

In this chapter, I explore the communal sharing of the early Jesus community, and the connection this sharing has to communal meals. While I do not directly establish a connection between the gift of the Spirit and the communal sharing in this chapter, as I do in Chapter Ten, this chapter is important for three reasons. First, exploring the type of communal sharing the early Jesus community practiced helps establish the *freedom* with which the wealthy gave to the early Jesus community, which I will argue in Chapter Ten is an imitation of the δωρεά of the Spirit. Second, addressing the various allusions and parallels that Luke invokes gives greater context for his depiction of the communal sharing of the early Jesus community. Third, in this chapter, I argue that the sharing of meals would have been the main expression of communal sharing in the early Jesus community. This argument will be utilized in Chapter Ten, where I argue that the gift of the Spirit empowers this communal sharing, and so by extension the Spirit empowers the sharing of meals as well. Therefore, this chapter is important for this thesis as it gives context to the communal sharing that Luke describes in his summary statements, context which will be relied upon in Chapter Ten.

This chapter will have three sections, with the first addressing the type of sharing that the summary statements are describing (9.1). Next, I address the various allusions, parallels and influences this description of communal sharing has with sources outside of New Testament (9.2). Finally, I elucidate the connection between the sharing possessions and the sharing meals (9.3).

9.1   The Descriptions of the Communal Sharing

Luke's description of the communal sharing is easily the most addressed aspect of the summary statements. Earlier discussions concerning the historicity of the communal sharing have given way to a more recent reflection on the type of sharing described in the summary statements; are the summaries describing shared property or shared access?[1] In the first subsection, I address whether the summary statements are describing shared property or shared access (9.1.1). In the second subsection,

---

[1] For examples of the questioning of the historicity of the communal sharing, see H. J. Holtzmann, "Die Gütergemeinschaft der Apostelgeschichte," in *Strassburger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie. Eduard Zeller zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag*, (Tübingen: Akad. Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1884), 27-60; Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 24; Theissen, "Urchristlicher Liebeskommunismus," 690-691; Horn, "Die Gütergemeinschaft der Urgemeinde," 370-383.

I investigate the descriptions of the distributing of wealth that Luke uses in these summary statements (9.1.2), and in the final subsection, I discuss the references to wealth in Acts 3-5 (9.1.3).

9.1.1   Shared Property or Shared Access

Some scholars suggest that the selling of property and giving it to the community describes a practice similar to the Essene community's communal ownership of property.[2] The parallels between the Essenes and the early Jesus community have grown from a critique of an earlier position, which argued that the communal sharing described in Acts never existed.[3] However, as Brian Capper – among others – has argued, the presence of the Essene community with their communal ownership, suggests that these depictions of communal lifestyles are not purely utopian or unhistorical, but rather, communal lifestyles were possible in 1st century Palestine.[4]

The question then arises as to whether and in what way the early Jesus community was similar to the Essene community? Capper has argued that the communal lifestyles of the early Jesus community and the Essene community were indistinguishable.[5] Capper supports this case with five arguments:

1. Jesus and the disciples lived out of a communal purse, as commented on in John 12:4-6 and 13:29.[6] Finger has suggested that Luke 8:3, which describes Jesus' female financial supporters, could be further evidence for a communal purse.[7]

2. The Essenes were a large number of the early believers in the Jesus community, basing this upon the close vicinity between the Essenes and the early Jesus followers in Jerusalem, which could indicate that many of the first believers to enter the community after Pentecost were previously Essenes.[8]

---

[2] Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 168-169; Capper, "Community of Goods," 1730-1774; Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context," 327-335; Justin Taylor, "The Community of Goods Among the First Christians and Among the Essenes," in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokba in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. D. Gooblatt, (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 147-161; Brian J. Capper, "Holy Community of Life and Property Amongst the Poor: A Response to Steve Walton," *EQ* 80, no. 2 (2008): 113-127.
[3] Holtzmann, "Die Gütergemeinschaft," 27-60; Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 24; Theissen, "Urchristlicher Liebeskommunismus," 690-691; Horn, "Die Gütergemeinschaft der Urgemeinde," 370-383.
[4] Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context," 327-335; Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 232.
[5] Capper, "Community of Goods," 1730-1774; Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context," 327-335; Capper, "Holy Community of Life and Property," 113-127.
[6] Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context," 326; Capper, "Holy Community of Life and Property," 113-114.
[7] Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 233.
[8] Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context," 341-350; Capper, "Community of Goods," 1752-1759.

3. The influence of the Hellenistic converts strained and eventually collapsed the communal ownership model.[9] Capper argues that the Hellenistic Jews did not commit to the communal ownership of property, leading to the complaints arising in Acts 6:1-6.[10]

4. The phrases ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό and ἅπαντα κοινά are the Greek equivalents of the Hebrew *hayahad*, which was self-designation of the Qumran community.[11]

5. It is possible that the early believers met in Essene houses and guest facilities.[12]

These five arguments lead Capper to conclude that the communal lifestyle of the early Jesus community was indistinguishable from the communal ownership practised by the Essenes.

While noting the value of the Essenes as evidence of communal lifestyles in 1st century CE Palestine, other scholars make a distinction between shared ownership and shared access.[13] Capper's arguments have received critical scrutiny, with Christopher M. Hays' critique being the most conclusive.[14] First, it is questionable whether Luke presents Jesus and his disciples as living out of a common purse, as Luke 9:1-6, 10:1-11 and 22:35-38 suggests otherwise.[15] Second, Hays notes that it is hard to engage with the suggestion that Essenes comprised of most of the early believers.[16] I would add that Luke describes the first audience of Peter's Pentecost sermon as consisting of diaspora Jews (Acts 2:9-11), with no mention of Essenes. Third, there is no clear evidence that it was the Hellenistic influence that saw the communal ownership end, or if in fact this communal sharing did end at Acts 6.[17] Fourth, Capper's suggestion that ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ and ἅπαντα κοινά refer to the *hayahad* is speculative and does not work for the translation of Acts 1:15 and 2:1 (for a further discussion see section 5.1.2).[18] Fifth, it is again hard to engage with the suggestion that the early believers met in Essene homes, as

---

[9] Capper, "Holy Community of Life and Property," 121.

[10] Capper, "Holy Community of Life and Property," 121.

[11] Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context," 336; Capper, "Community of Goods," 1738-1741. See also, Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, 93-100; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 161; Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 231; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1027.

[12] Capper, "Holy Community of Life and Property," 121-122.

[13] John G. Greehy, "Community of Goods - Qumran and Acts," *ITQ* 32, no. 3 (1965): 239; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 163; Donald B. Kraybill and Dennis M. Sweetland, "Possessions in Luke-Acts: A Sociological Perspective," *PRSt* 10, no. 3 (1983): 234; Krodel, *Acts*, 94; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 54; Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, 100-101; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 173-174; Williams, *Acts*, 92-93; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 86; Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 36; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Jewish Christianity in Acts in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls," in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, ed. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, (London: Chapman, 1997), 286; Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life," 216; Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 100; Bock, *Acts*, 153; Walton, "Primitive Communism in Acts?," 99-111; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 163; Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 200-201; Cho and Park, *Acts, Part One*, 69.

[14] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 196-201.

[15] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 198.

[16] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 200.

[17] Interestingly others argue the complete opposite, namely that the Hellenists introduced the idea of having "all things in common," which the pre-Acts 6 community did not practice. See Theissen, "Urchristlicher Liebeskommunismus," 707-710.

[18] Bauckham, "The Early Jerusalem Church," 84-89; Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 199.

there is no evidence for this in Acts.[19] Moreover, Acts 12:12 speaks of Mary's house, which seems to imply that some people did keep their homes.[20]

Moreover, Capper's theory does not adequately address two further aspects of the communal lifestyle of the early Jesus community. First, the continual use of the imperfect verb in the summary statements indicates a continual selling of property and goods when a need arose.[21] Hays suggests that if Luke sought to portray the complete divestiture of possessions and goods, he probably would have used the aorist, rather than the imperfect.[22] Capper has countered this point by arguing that these imperfect verbs could be an iterative imperfect.[23] Second, Acts 2:45 and 4:35 describes the communal sharing only benefitting the needy, not the whole community.[24] If the early Jesus community did practice shared ownership, then the whole community, not just the poor would have needed assistance.

While noting Capper's helpful work on the historicity of communal lifestyles in 1st century CE Palestine, I see the weight of evidence supporting the early Jesus community as practising shared access, not shared ownership. As Steve Walton concludes,

> In sum… the life of the earliest believers in Jerusalem was marked by a remarkable level of economic sharing which fell short, however, of the common ownership found at Qumran. … The Essenes provide a partial parallel to the life of this community, as do the aspirations of Graeco-Roman writers such as Plato, Aristotle and Seneca.[25]

While there are some similarities between the early Jesus community and the Qumran community in their use of wealth, the differences are significant, and there is sufficient evidence in Acts to conclude that the early Jesus community did not practice shared ownership.

9.1.2   Communal Sharing as Distribution

Rather than the divestiture practised by the Essene community, Acts 2:45 and Acts 4:34b-35 describes a system of distribution, where the wealthier members of the early Jesus community support those

---

[19] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 199-200.
[20] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 199-200.
[21] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 198.
[22] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 199.
[23] Brian J. Capper, "Reciprocity and the Ethic of Acts," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David G. Peterson, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 502. See also Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 169. Indeed Wallace notes that the imperfect προσετίθει in Acts 2:47 is an iterative imperfect which could add further weight to Capper's argument, see Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 547.
[24] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 199.
[25] Walton, "Primitive Communism in Acts?," 109.

that are needy. Central to this understanding of the communal sharing of the early believers as a form of distribution is Luke's use of ὅσοι in Acts 4:34b, διεμέριζον in Acts 2:45, and διεδίδετο in Acts 4:34.[26]

First, many commentators note that a literal understanding of Luke's use of ὅσοι in Acts 4:34b is difficult, because if all the houses where sold, where did the early believers reside and share their meals (Acts 2:46)?[27] Pervo sees Luke's use of ὅσοι here as "hyperbole."[28] Codex D tries to ease this tension in Acts 2:45 by adding ὅσοι and εἶχον, rendering the passage ὅσοι κτήματα εἶχον ἢ ὑπάρξεις (as many as had possessions).[29] This variant emphasises that not all of the early believers had properties to be sold, indicating that is was only excess properties sold. The "all" used at the start of Acts 4:34b probably refers to two separate groups of people; those with excess properties and those that relocated from Galilee or the diaspora. Barnabas is an example of a diaspora Jew selling his properties in Cyprus, as his properties in Cyprus would not have been of much use for the Jerusalem community.[30]

Second, Luke's use of διεμέριζον in Acts 2:45 and διεδίδετο in Acts 4:35 both provide an indication of distribution not divestiture. The verb διεμέριζον, used in Acts 2:45, has the broad meaning of distribution, as in the wider Greco-Roman literature διαμερίζω (the present form of διεμέριζον) is found in the context of distributing stress,[31] distributing a message,[32] distributing land as the spoils of war,[33] or God distributing the nations.[34] The imperfect form διεμέριζον is found only found once (Acts 2:45) in the whole New Testament, while the present form διαμερίζω occurs twice in Luke-Acts. One of those occurrences is in Luke 23:34, where Jesus' clothes are divided as he is crucified

---

[26] The one main suggestion concerning the translation of Acts 2:45 unaddressed below has come from Lake and Cadbury, who argue that, "they sold the land [κτήματα] and divided up their other possessions [ὑπάρξεις]." See Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, *The Acts of the Apostles: English Translation and Commentary*, vol. 4, BegC, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965), 29. However, Finger notes that, "the text does not say this, and it seems more likely that they sold whatever real estate or other possessions they had that would not be of use to the community" Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 234.

[27] Krodel, *Acts*, 90; Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 233; Pervo, *Acts*, 128.

[28] Pervo, *Acts*, 128.

[29] Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 303.

[30] For a fuller discussion see Luise Schottroff, *Lydia's Impatient Sisters: A Feminist Social History of Early Christianity*, trans. Barbara Rumscheidt and Martin Rumscheidt (London: SCM, 1995), 97; Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 233-234.

[31] Aristotle, *Problems*, 885a19.

[32] Plato, *Philebus*, 15E.

[33] Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, 5.81.6; Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 1.1.10, 1.11.96.

[34] Philo, *On the Posterity of Cain and His Exile*, 242.89; *On Mating with the Preliminary Studies*, 12.58; *Concerning Noah's Work as a Planter*, 14.59.

(διαμεριζόμενοι),[35] and the other is in Acts 2:3 where the tongues of fire are distributed (διαμεριζόμεναι) at Pentecost.[36]

Likewise, the verb διαδίδωμι, found in Acts 4:35, is often found in the context of distributing the spoils of war.[37] Other contexts include distributing food,[38] distributing gifts,[39] talk being distributed,[40] or soldiers dispersing/fleeing from a battle or attack.[41] In the papyri, the present form διαδίδωμι is found in the contexts of distributing a message,[42] money,[43] a certain make of ships,[44] and distributing property in a will.[45] Hays notes that Luke's use of πωλοῦντες (sold) and διεδίδετο (distributed) in Acts 4:34-35 evokes Luke 18:22, where the rich young ruler is told to sell (πώλησον) all his possessions and distribute (διάδος) it to the poor.[46] As Hays notes: "This allusion suggests some attempt at ethical continuity between the two books [Luke and Acts]."[47] Lindemann notes that διεδίδετο in Acts 4:34 is in the passive voice, and so the subject who is distributing is unnamed.[48] Nevertheless, Lindemann notes that the context probably implies that it is the apostles that are the ones distributing.[49] In summary, Luke's description of the communal sharing in Acts 2:45 and 4:34-35 indicates that not all the properties were sold, but rather this communal sharing was a shared access, where the wealthier members financially care for the needy in the early Jesus community.[50]

---

[35] In the parallel passage in Mark 15:24, the present indicative διαμερίζονται is used.

[36] In section 10.4, I will connect the gift of the Spirit to this use of διαμεριζόμεναι in Acts 2:3, through the concept of imitation.

[37] Xenophon of Athens, *Cyropaedia*, 3.7, 7.35; Polybius, *The Histories*, 8.6.3; Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, 16.33.2; 19.21.3; Appian, *The Mithridatic Wars*, 12.17.114; *The Punic Wars*, 8.4.23; *The Wars in Spain*, 6.1.5, 6.10.60.

[38] Xenophon of Athens, *Cyropaedia*, 1.7, 8.3; *Anabasis*, 4.5.8; Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 4.128D.

[39] Xenophon of Athens, *Anabasis*, 1.9.23; Polybius, *The Histories*, 16.21.8.

[40] Polybius, *The Histories*, 22.4.2; Plutarch, *Lives. Sulla*, 6.9; *Lives. Sertorius*, 25.2; Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, 13.92.2, 31.32a.

[41] Xenophon of Athens, *Cyropaedia*, 1.3; Strabo, *Geography*, 4.2; Plutarch, *Lives. Brutus*, 30.7; Lucian, *The Dance*, 8; Josephus, *The Jewish War*, 2.6.538, 4.7.52; Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 1.9.78; 4.5.30; *The Punic Wars*, 8.4.21, 8.8.90; *The Wars in Spain*, 6.9.47.

[42] Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis SB 26 16761.

[43] Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis P.Cair Masp. 3 67320

[44] Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis P.Cair Masp. 3 67295

[45] Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis P.Cair Masp. 3 67312

[46] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 193-194. See also Philip F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge Universtiy Press, 1987), 186.

[47] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 194.

[48] Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life," 212.

[49] Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life," 212.

[50] This literary link between Luke 18:22 and Acts 4:34 creates an implicit link to the gift of the Spirit, as the Lukan Jesus in 18:22 promises "treasure in the heavens" (θησαυρὸν ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς) for the distribution (διάδος) of wealth. As I argue in the next chapter, this promise of eschatological reward is fulfilled by the Spirit as δωρεά (see section 10.3).

9.1.3   Wealth in Acts 3-5

As I have argued that the surrounding narratives inform the summary statements, and these summaries inform the surrounding narratives, it is important to examine the mention of wealth in Acts 3-5.[51] There are three main instances of wealth in Acts 3-5 outside of the summary statements. First, Acts 3:1-10 describes the healing of paralysed man (ἀνὴρ χωλός) at the Beautiful Gate by Peter and John. The paralysed man asks Peter and John for alms (ἐλεημοσύνην in Acts 3:3) from which Luke records Peter in Acts 3:6 as saying:[52]

> 36 εἶπεν δὲ Πέτρος· ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον οὐχ ὑπάρχει μοι, ὃ δὲ ἔχω τοῦτό σοι δίδωμι· ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου [ἔγειρε καὶ] περιπάτει

> 36 *And Peter said, "I do not have silver nor gold, but what I have I give to you. In the name of Jesus of Nazareth [get up and] walk."*

Peter then lifts the paralysed man up, healing the man, at which the paralysed man begins leaping (ἀλλόμενος) in praise to God. Some have questioned why Peter and John do not have any money, which could be explained by the apostles taking control of the distribution of the gifts to the community in the period between the first and second summary statements.[53] More significant to the current study is the connection between wealth and the gift of the Spirit in this passage. The paralysed man asks for a monetary gift, to which Peter and John respond with a divine gift. As the signs and wonders of the early community were Spirit-empowered, this divine gift of healing is then influenced by the gift of the Spirit.

The second and third mentions of wealth in Acts 3-5 are the positive example of Barnabas in Acts 4:36-37, and the negative examples of Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5:1-11. These two examples directly follow the second summary statement (Acts 4:32-35) and lead into the third summary (Acts 5:12-16). Barnabas is the exemplar of the wealthy selling their fields and laying the proceeds at the feet of the apostles. There could also be allusions of a return to the biblical ideals set out in Deuteronomy, as Levites were not permitted to own land (Deut 12:12, 14:29; Josh 14:3, 14:4, 18:7).[54] Therefore, I see the example of Barnabas selling his land as an allusion to the return to the biblical

---

[51] Acts 6:1-6 will be addressed in section 10.5.
[52] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 386.
[53] For example, see Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 65; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 175.
[54] Although by the time of the NT there were exceptions to these laws, see the overview of Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, 101; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 260; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 209; Bock, *Acts*, 216; Schnabel, *Acts*, 273; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1181-1182.

instruction concerning Levites, which shows a community that seeks to live out the proper use of wealth as described in the Torah.

The mention of Barnabas then leads to the confronting story of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11). Ananias and Sapphira also sell a field (Acts 5:1), and conspire to keep part of the proceeds to themselves (Acts 5:2).[55] Upon being confronted by Peter, both Ananias and Sapphira die (Acts 5:6, 5:10), because they lie to the Holy Spirit (Acts 5:3), falsify God (Acts 5:4), and test the Spirit of the Lord (Acts 5:9). This story then connects the use of wealth with action towards the Holy Spirit.

Important for this thesis is identifying the link between the use of wealth and the gift of the Spirit in this passage, as Ananias and Sapphira "lie to" and "test" the Holy Spirit in their withholding part of their proceeds. A common interpretation of this incident is that this is a sin of deception, as Ananias and Sapphira lie (ψεύδομαι in Acts 5:3) to the apostles, the community and the Holy Spirit.[56] Other scholars see this lie as specifically involving Ananias and Sapphira portraying themselves as giving all the proceeds of sale in order to gain more honour for the gift to the early Jesus community.[57] As S. Scott Bartchy states, they lied "in order to achieve an honour they had not earned."[58] Yet, this interpretation is limited, because, as I argue in the next chapter, no honour was attributed to the benefactors of the early Jesus community – "no one claimed any possessions as their own" – and benefactions did not increase your standing within the early Jesus community.[59]

However, the use of ψεύδομαι in Acts 5:3 could be taken another way. If ψεύδομαι is intended to mean "falsify" rather than "lie to," then Ananias and Sapphira could, as Kuecker states, through their actions, have "'falsified' the work of the Spirit in the community."[60] Ananias and Sapphira misuse their possessions, and in their misuse, make false the gift of the Spirit.[61] Numerous scholars note that Luke's use of νοσφίσασθαι (Acts 5:3) has a direct parallel with ἐνοσφίσατο used the LXX version of Joshua 7:1 to describe Achan's financial deceit.[62] Therefore, Ananias and Sapphira commit a

---

[55] Barrett (267) states, "It is impossible to evade the conclusion that (at least as far as this verse [Acts 5:4] is concerned) the sale of the property and the distribution of the proceeds was voluntary." Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 267. See also Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 322; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1186-1188.

[56] Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 267; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 323; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 216; Schnabel, *Acts*, 283.

[57] S. Scott Bartchy, "Community of Goods in Acts: Idealization or Social Reality?," in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, ed. Birger A. Pearson, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 316; Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 142.

[58] Bartchy, "Community of Goods in Acts," 316.

[59] See section 10.4.

[60] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 145.

[61] Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 88; Bock, *Acts*, 221-222; Marshall, *Acts*, 118; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 322; Larkin Jr., *Acts*, 84; Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom*, 131-132; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1188.

[62] Marshall, *Acts*, 118; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 88-92; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 322; Larkin Jr., *Acts*, 84.

similar sin to Achan. Moreover, Luke T. Johnson notes that this verb is also used in 2 Maccabees 4:32 to describe "financial fraud."[63] Johnson summarises this financial deceit as:

> It was the Spirit that led them [the community] to call nothing their own and share all their possessions. But this couple [Ananias and Sapphira] "falsified the Spirit" in the first place by breaking the unanimity of intention; they "colluded" in their action. They were hoping that by counterfeiting the gesture, they could both partake of the community life and "hold back something of their own."[64]

Ananias and Sapphira make false the gift of the Spirit through the misappropriation of possessions and through lying to Peter, the community and the Spirit. The story of Ananias and Sapphira then show the misappropriation of possessions in relation to the early Jesus community is a transgression against the Holy Spirit, which points to a connection between the gift of the Spirit and the gifts to the community, which I address further in Chapters Ten and Eleven.

9.1.4   Summary

In summary, Luke portrays the communal sharing of the early believers as a sharing of access rather than a shared property. The presence of the Qumran community in the period of the early Jesus community shows that communal lifestyles were possible in Palestine prior to the first Jewish War. However, the communal sharing of the early Jesus community is significantly different from the divestiture of the Qumran community, with the early Jesus community practicing the distribution rather than the divestiture of wealth through gift-giving. This is shown in Luke's use of διεμέριζον in Acts 2:45 and διεδίδετο in Acts 4:34.

Moreover, the mention of wealth in Acts 3-5 further develops this picture of the communal sharing as redistribution, with added connections to the gift of the Spirit. In response to the request for a monetary gift, Peter and John give a divine gift, a healing through the power of the Spirit, to the paralysed man at the beautiful gate. Barnabas is mentioned as a positive example of this communal sharing, as he returns to the biblical instruction for Levites, by selling his land and giving the proceeds to the community. Ananias and Sapphira provide a negative example, by withholding part of the proceeds, in which they falsify the gift of the Spirit, through the improper use of wealth. In these

---

[63] Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 88. For a couple of secular parallels see Larkin Jr., *Acts*, 84.
[64] Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 92.

descriptions of the communal sharing of the early Jesus community, Luke alludes to numerous sources outside of the New Testament, which I address in the next section.

<center>

9.2   The Various Allusions in the Communal Sharing

</center>

There are various allusions, parallels and influences that scholars note in these descriptions of communal sharing. In this description of the communal sharing, Luke creates a multifaceted picture of the early Jesus community, not relying exclusively on one particular allusion. In this section, I see the two strongest allusions being to the Hebrew Bible (9.2.1) and to the friendship tradition (9.2.2) in Luke's description of the communal sharing of the early Jesus community. There are also parallels between this communal sharing and the ancient associations (9.2.3), kinship sharing (9.2.4) and utopian ideals (also addressed in 9.2.2). I address the friendship tradition and the utopian ideals more extensively in Chapter Eleven, only giving a brief overview of these traditions in this section.

<center>

9.2.1   The Hebrew Bible

</center>

Luke clearly invokes the Hebrew Bible extensively in his description of the early Jesus community. The Hebrew Bible is also invoked in the descriptions of the community in the combination of καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ in Acts 4:32 (see section 11.2), and the mention of signs and wonders in Acts 2:43, 5:12 (see section 6.3).[65] An allusion to the Hebrew Bible in the descriptions of the communal sharing of the early Jesus community is found in the mention of "no needy being among them" in Acts 4:34a.[66] This phrase invokes Deuteronomy 15:4, as Acts 4:33a has parallels with the LXX version of Deuteronomy 15:4, which states:[67]

> 15⁴ ὅτι οὐκ ἔσται ἐν σοὶ ἐνδεής, ὅτι εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσει σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἐν τῇ γῇ, ᾗ κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι ἐν κλήρῳ κατακληρονομῆσαι αὐτήν

---

[65] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 231; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 53; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 173; Williams, *Acts*, 92; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 313; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 206; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 206; Schnabel, *Acts*, 269; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 2:1176-1177; A. Friedl, "The Reception of the Deuteronomic Social Law in the Primitive Church of Jerusalem According to the Book of Acts," *AcT* 23 (2016): 176-200.

[66] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 231; Greehy, "Community of Goods," 238; Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 36; Marshall, *Acts*, 115; Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life," 211; Schnabel, *Acts*, 271.

[67] *Septuaginta*, 314.

15⁴ However, no needy will be among you, because in the land the Lord your God will richly bless you, the Lord your God is giving you [this land] to possess as your inheritance.

And Acts 4:34a states:[68]

4³⁴ᵃ οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής τις ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς

4³⁴ᵃ for there was not a needy person among them

The allusion to Deuteronomy 15:4 in Acts 4:34 is found most clearly in the use of ἐνδεής. The noun ἐνδεής is quite a rare word, only being found once in the New Testament, in Acts 4:34.[69] Lena V. Toews notes that the LXX does use ἐνδεής several times, with it seeming "plausible that Luke had the Deuteronomy passage [15:4] in mind when describing the events of Acts 4."[70] When looking for a comparable context of Acts 4:34a, Deuteronomy 15:4 is the most likely context.

Deuteronomy 15:4 is found in the wider context of the Jubilee instructions (Deut 15:1-11). This passage covers the laws surrounding the cancelling of debts (Deut 15:1-3) and the care for the poor (Deut 15:7-11), while emphasising that it is God who will give the land to the Israelites (Deut 15:4, 15:7), which is the basis for Israel's generous care for the needy, while God will also bless the generous giver (Deut 15:4, 15:6, 15:10). Luke portrays the early Jesus community as fulfilling the intention of these Jubilee instructions, that there would be no needy among the Israelite nation, in their communal sharing.[71]

9.2.2   The Friendship Tradition and Utopian Ideals

Beyond allusions to the Hebrew Bible, other scholars have developed connections between Luke's depiction of the communal sharing, the friendship tradition and utopian ideals.[72] First, Luke's depiction of communal sharing has clear allusions to the friendship ideals in the wider Greco-Roman world.[73] The refrain καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία (one heart and soul), and the having ἅπαντα κοινά (all

---

[68] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 391.
[69] Lena V. Toews, "Motivation for the Sharing of Material Possessions in Acts, Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa* and the *Didache*: A Comparative Study" (PhD diss., Andrews University, 2019), 104.
[70] Toews, "Motivation for the Sharing," 104.
[71] Luke does elsewhere connect the Spirit to Jubilee language, e.g. Luke 4:19. Contra to Turner, *Power from on High*, 266.
[72] See sections 11.2 and 11.3 for a full treatment of these allusions.
[73] Krodel, *Acts*, 117; Alan C. Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship in Acts 2:44-47 and 4:32-37," *JBL* 111, no. 2 (1992): 255-272; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 59; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 168; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 313; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 162; Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 278; Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 81; Bock, *Acts*, 153; Parsons, *Acts*, 48; Hume, *The Early Christian Community*.

things in common) in Acts 4:32 both allude to the unity and sharing that was common between friends in the Greco-Roman world.[74] The allusions to the friendship tradition are extensively addressed in sections 11.2 and 11.3.

Second, and closely linked with the friendship tradition, is the depiction of communal sharing in utopian societies.[75] Drawing connections between Plato's *Republic* (c. 375 B.C.E.) and the depiction of the communal sharing in Acts, these scholars see Luke as idealizing the communal sharing of the early Jesus community.[76] Two things should be noted about the utopian depictions of communal sharing and the possible parallels with Acts. First, rather than these utopian ideals being exclusive of the friendship tradition, the utopian ideals find their philosophical basis in the friendship tradition.[77] Second, while there is an aspect of idealizing that does occur in the summary statements, this can be attributed to the generalising nature of summarization. The presence of the stories about Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11) and the complaint of the Hellenistic widows (Acts 6:1-6) indicates that Luke chooses to emphasise the positive aspects of the community in the summary statements, but is not creating an unhistorical or utopian depiction of the early Jesus community. In the description of the communal sharing of the early Jesus community, Luke twice alludes to the friendship tradition in the Greco-Roman world (see sections 11.2 and 11.3) and draws a parallel to the utopian ideals.

9.2.3   Ancient Associations

Markus Öhler has argued that the early Jesus community has conceptual parallels with ancient associations.[78] Öhler offers four interesting lines of evidence for the parallels between the ancient associations and the early Jesus community:

1. The relative equality among all the members of an association is similar to the equality found in the early Jesus community.[79] While he notes that there were varying degrees of equality in

---

[74] See sections 11.2 and 11.3 respectively

[75] Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 24; David L. Mealand, "Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts 2-4," *JTS* 28, no. 1 (1977): 97; Gregory E. Sterling, "'Athletes of Virtue': An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41-47; 4:32-35; 5:12-16)," *JBL* 113, no. 4 (1994): 679-696; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 162; Rebén R. Dupertuis, "The Summaries of Acts 2, 4, and 5 and Plato's Republic," in *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christianity and Jewish Narrative*, ed. J. A. A. Brant, C. W. Hedrick, and C. Shea, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 275-295; Parsons, *Acts*, 72; Pervo, *Acts*, 90-91; Noble, "Common Property."

[76] See in particular Dupertuis, "The Summaries of Acts," 275-295; Noble, "Common Property."

[77] For example see Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 210. As far as I have read only Noble explicitly denies any relationship between the communal sharing and the friendship tradition, see Noble, "Common Property."

[78] Markus Öhler, "Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde im Spiegel des antiken Vereinswesens," *NTS* 51, no. 3 (2005), 393-415.

[79] Öhler, "Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde," 397, 411-313.

different associations, Öhler states that the lesser the standing of the association within the wider society, the sooner all the members were equal.[80]

2. Öhler claims that one of the common expressions of the friendship tradition among the non-elite was the associations, which became the more regulated expression of the friendship ideals.[81] Therefore, as the early believers were not a part of the elite of Jerusalem, this use of the friendship tradition among the non-elite points to an ancient association.

3. On the concept of the communal sharing, Öhler notes that ancient associations did have many different ownership styles, including joint ownerships, associations for mutual support, and associations based on benefactions from wealthy members.[82] Öhler suggests that the communal sharing of the early believers is closest to this last style of association, associations based upon benefactions from wealthy members.[83]

4. Both the associations and the early Jesus community share meals and could meet in homes.[84]

Öhler then argues that the structure and sharing of the early Jesus community was very similar to those of ancient associations in their equality, unity, communal sharing and meal sharing.

However, Öhler does note some significant differences between the associations and the early Jesus community. One of these differences is that believers in the early Jesus community gained social standing through proclamation of the gospel and not through benefactions. A second one is that, contrary to the associations, there are no entrance fees or mandatory membership fees in the early Jesus community. Finally, unlike associations, the believers met daily.[85] In concluding his treatment of the relationship between ancient associations and the early Jesus community, Öhler does not see the early Jesus community as the ideal association, rather these are simply parallels, as Öhler concludes that Luke seeks to describe a new type of community.[86]

9.2.4   Kinship Sharing

The fourth and final parallel between the practice of sharing communally to be discussed in this subsection concerns sharing among kin, which some scholars identify as a significant background to

---

[80] Öhler, "Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde," 412.
[81] Öhler, "Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde," 403.
[82] Öhler, "Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde," 404-408.
[83] Öhler, "Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde," 407-408.
[84] Öhler, "Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde," 408-410.
[85] Öhler, "Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde," 413-415.
[86] Öhler, "Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde," 415.

these practices.[87] The sharing across usual status divisions and the unity of the early Jesus community do seem to be similar to the communal sharing found in a kinship networks. As Finger states:

> At one level, the story of the beginning of the church in Jerusalem is the story of disparate people being melded into one family, one kin group. From an economic perspective, most of them would have had no more material resources to share with each other than members in a typical lower-class extended family with meagre possessions living at a subsistence level.[88]

As it is likely that the majority of people that joined the early Jesus community were living at subsistence level, their sharing parallels the sharing within a kinship unit. In noting this context, there are no clear literary allusions to the sharing amongst kin in the Lukan depictions of the communal sharing, and so this context remains a more of a parallel than an intertextual allusion.[89]

9.2.5   Summary

In summary, Luke alludes to numerous traditions in his description of the communal sharing of the early Jesus community. Most clearly, Luke alludes to the Hebrew Bible and the friendship tradition, while also possibly drawing parallels between the depiction of the early Jesus community and the utopian ideals, ancient associations and the sharing within kin.

9.3   Shared Meals

In this final section, I explore the descriptions of the shared meals of the early Jesus community, considering how these shared meals are connected to the communal sharing. In Acts 2:42, one of the four key aspects to the community life is the breaking of bread (τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου). Joachim Jeremias argues that the breaking of bread was not a Jewish euphemism for a meal, but rather alludes to the Eucharist (otherwise known as the Lord's Supper).[90] Jeremias sees the κοινωνία of Acts 2:42 as the Agape meals of the early Jesus community, and thus translates κοινωνία as "table

---

[87] Bartchy, "Community of Goods in Acts," 313-318; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 205; Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 132-136, 230; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 204.

[88] Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 132.

[89] There may a parallel in Luke 11:11-13, where the Lukan Jesus uses kinship relationships (fathers/Father) to address the concepts of prayer, gift-giving and the Holy Spirit.

[90] Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. Norman Perrin (London: SCM, 1966), 118-121.

fellowship."[91] The phrase "the breaking of bread" according to Jeremias, "consisted of the ritual which began the meal, united with that which ended it."[92] This interpretation, seeing the breaking of the bread as the Eucharist, has been influential for many commentators.[93]

However, other scholars critique Jeremias' conclusion for two reasons.[94] First, the breaking of bread in Acts 2:42 does seem to have a clear connection to κλῶντές τε κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον (breaking bread from home to home) in Acts 2:46.[95] Second, τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου cannot mean solely the Eucharist, as Paul breaks bread with pagan sailors in Acts 27:35. In the middle of Paul's troubles at sea (Acts 27:14-44), Paul requests that the whole ship eat a meal, which would be their first meal in 14 days, before throwing their wheat supplies over board (Acts 27:33-34). Acts 27:35 then states:[96]

> 27[35] εἴπας δὲ ταῦτα καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαρίστησεν τῷ θεῷ ἐνώπιον πάντων καὶ κλάσας ἤρξατο ἐσθίειν.

> 27[35] *And when he [Paul] said this, he took the bread, and gave thanks to God in the presence of everyone and broke [the bread] and began to eat.*

Paul, in the presence of other pagan prisoners and soldiers, breaks bread (both ἄρτον and κλάσας are used in this verse), indicating that for Luke this bread breaking cannot mean solely the Eucharist.

In the light of these objections, some scholars have suggested that τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου alludes to shared meals or otherwise known as Agape meals.[97] Seeing the breaking of bread as shared meals is supported by Acts 2:46, which further elaborates that the breaking of bread was the sharing meals. The main critique of this position is that the other three elements in this verse are spiritual, hence the need for a spiritual interpretation of the breaking of bread. However, there is a third option, which argues that the breaking of bread signifies both the Eucharist and the Agape meals.[98] As Finger notes,

> To make such a marked separation [between the Agape meals and the Eucharist], however, is to misunderstand the symbolism of meals in Palestinian culture, where *every* meal eaten with

---

[91] Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 120.

[92] Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 121.

[93] Fernando, *Acts*, 121; Marshall, *Acts*, 88-89; Krodel, *Acts*, 93; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 34; Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, 73; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 111; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 58; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 269; Parsons, *Acts*, 49.

[94] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 191; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 185; Pervo, *Acts*, 93; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 161.

[95] Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 230.

[96] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 476.

[97] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 191; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 185; Pervo, *Acts*, 93; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 161; Cho and Park, *Acts, Part One*, 69.

[98] Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 23; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 165; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 35; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 161; Bock, *Acts*, 150-151; Chance, *Acts*, 59; Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 230; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1003-1004.

others has religious and social significance…. The bread-breaking ritual at the beginning signifies the unity and community of those who lay aside status for the sake of equal access to sustenance and a sense of belonging.[99]

The breaking of bread had a profound spiritual, as well as communal significance, uniting all the members together. I find this option, the breaking of the bread as referring to both the Eucharist and the Agape meal, to be the most convincing. As I argue in 10.5, the connection between the Spirit-empowered great joy (ἀγαλλιάσει) and the sharing of meals indicates that these meals do have a "spiritual" aspect to them, and therefore are both spiritual and literal meals.

These shared meals are an expression of communal sharing, with two arguments supporting this conclusion. First, the Lukan Jesus' instruction concerning sharing meals (Luke 14:12-14) is similar to the Lukan Jesus' instruction on gift-giving.[100] Jesus instructs his disciples to invite those that cannot repay to dinner, and in doing this, the disciples of Jesus will receive an eschatological reward (Luke 14:14). This teaching is similar to Jesus' teaching on gift-giving, as Jesus encourages his disciples to give without expecting a return (Luke 6:35), and in giving this way, the disciples of Jesus will receive an eschatological reward (6:35, 6:38, 12:33, 18:22). Jesus' teaching on sharing meals and sharing possessions have a similar framework.

Beyond having the same theoretical underpinnings, there is a second, more practical connection. The most common and basic need among the early Jesus community would have been housing, clothing and food, with food being the most immediate among these three needs. Therefore, practically, these communal meals would have been the most common and daily expression of the communal sharing of possessions. As Luise Schottroff notes, "The common meal is the expression of their economic sharing, their communion in the faith, and their emotional bondedness."[101] The sharing of meals is not only theoretically similar to the giving of gifts in the teaching of Jesus, but this meal sharing would have been the most common and daily expression of the communal sharing of the early Jesus community. In summary, I have argued that the breaking of bread in Acts 2:42 is both the Agape meal and the Eucharist, being the major expression of the communal sharing.

---

[99] Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 230.

[100] Again, all mentions of Jesus are of the Lukan Jesus. See Chapter Eight for this point.

[101] Schottroff, *Lydia's Impatient Sisters*, 217.

9.5   Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the descriptions of the communal sharing of the early believers, arguing that this sharing was a shared access rather than shared property. The wealthy in the early Jesus community were willing sell their properties and the proceeds were distributed to those that were needy. Barnabas is an example of a diaspora believer selling his property and relocating to Jerusalem, which suggests returning to the biblical ideals surrounding the Levites and the ownership of land. The story of Ananias and Sapphira is centred around their financial fraud, in which, through the misuse of wealth, they falsify the gift of the Spirit.

Luke gives a multi-faced picture of this communal sharing, clearly invoking the Hebrew Bible and the friendship tradition. The provision for the needy, noted in Acts 4:34a, invokes Deuteronomy 15:4 and the cancelation of the debts in the Jubilee year, while Luke's use of καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία and ἄπαντα κοινά invokes the Greco-Roman tradition of unity and sharing between friends. Moreover, there are parallels that Luke's picture of the communal sharing has with utopian ideals, ancient associations and the sharing within families.

The major expression of this communal sharing was the sharing of meals, which I have argued is described in the "breaking of bread." Practically, food would have been the most common and daily need for the marginalised within the early Jesus community, and so this sharing of meals would have been a common and daily expression of the communal sharing. Moreover, the connection between the communal sharing and the sharing of meals is further indicated in that the Lukan Jesus teaches that God expects giving a gift and sharing a meal to be based on a similar motivation. Moving forward, in the next chapter, I build upon these ideas, by taking this work on the communal sharing of the early believers and elucidating the effect the gift of the Spirit has on it.

Chapter 10:   The Gift of the Spirit and Communal Sharing

In this chapter, I argue that the communal sharing of the early Jesus community was founded on and motivated by the gift of the Spirit. There are five ways that Luke indicates the gift of the Spirit is the basis for communal sharing. First, the close narrative proximity between the first time the Spirit is called gift (Acts 2:38) to the first description of the gifts to the community (2:44-45), suggests a link between the two gifts (10.1). Second, Luke connects the favour of God with the community's provision for the needy in Acts 4:33b-34a, which indicates that God is involved in the believers' use of wealth (10.2). This favour indicates the interconnectedness of the divine and human gift-giving realms. Third, the mention of the favour of God with generous gift-giving brings up the promise of an eschatological reward, which I will argue is fulfilled in the gift of the Spirit (10.3). Fourth, the communal sharing of the early Jesus community imitates the semantic range of a δωρεά of the Spirit, a gift or reward freely given (10.4). Fifth, the major expression of communal sharing, the sharing of meals, is also influenced by the Spirit through the presence of great joy in Acts 2:46 (10.5). These five points then lead to the conclusion that the communal sharing of the early Jesus community is founded on and motivated by the gift of the Spirit.

Some scholars have already sought to connect the work of the Spirit to the communal sharing of the early Jesus community in the following ways. First, some argue that Luke's use of κοινωνία should be understood through a Pauline lens, as Paul connects the Holy Spirit with the κοινωνία in 2 Cor. 13:13.[1] However, this argument is limited as it does not seek to address the Lukan corpus within its own parameters. Other scholars seek to make an indirect connection, through the increased expectation of the Parousia (or related eschatological hopes) brought about by the Spirit, which meant that the early believers held onto their possessions loosely.[2] Others connect the communal sharing to the gift of the Spirit through the power of the Spirit,[3] the unity of the Spirit,[4] or the general presence of the Spirit.[5] These connections between the Spirit and the communal sharing are valid, but they differ from the current study in that they remain generalized observations of this association, whereas

---

[1] Williams, *Acts*, 59; Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 35.

[2] Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 161; William H. Willimon, *Acts*, Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, (Atlanta: John Knox, 1988), 40.

[3] Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 50, 63; Schnabel, *Acts*, 179, 270. Schnabel (270) states, "The willingness to regard one's own possessions as being at the disposal of the community if needy members needed help is the result of the transforming power of the Holy Spirit."

[4] Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, 74, 100; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 62; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 158. Bruce (100) states, "The Spirit-filled community exhibited a remarkable unanimity which expressed itself even in the attitude to private property."

[5] Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 33; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 112; Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 82; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1003.

this study deepens and extends this connection by the analysis of gift-giving and the Spirit as gift. Rather than developing an indirect connection, this chapter seeks to offer new arguments that will directly connect the gift of the Spirit with the communal sharing of the early Jesus community.

10.1   The Gift of the Spirit and the Communal Sharing

The first connection between the gift of the Spirit and the communal sharing is in the closeness of the language narratively. That is, the Spirit is described as 'the gift' in Acts 2:38, which is then followed by the communal sharing in Acts 2:44-45. This connection between the gift-giving in the communal sharing and the specific description of the Spirit as gift has not been clearly made by scholars. Two scholars have begun to establish the gift-giving language found in Acts 2, Halvor Moxnes and Frederick W. Danker. Building upon their foundation, I contribute a new observation concerning the gift-giving language found in Acts 2.

The first scholar, Halvor Moxnes, argues that God should be understood as the divine benefactor in Luke-Acts, with this understanding influencing our interpretation of the practice of communal sharing in Acts.[6] Moxnes notes of Luke's overall motif of wealth that:

> Luke envisages a reversal that implied a central, forced *redistribution* of goods and possessions, prophetically forewarned in the Magnificat (1:51-53). This reversal was an act of God, and the divine redistribution was manifested through the acts and speeches of Jesus, the benefactor of humanity. This divine act served as the foundation for a new interaction among individuals and groups, likewise based on generalized reciprocity and redistribution.[7]

For Moxnes, Luke establishes the motif of God as the divine redistributor, which is shown in the acts and speeches of Jesus as well as the Magnificat. Specifically, on the Lukan Jesus' teaching on wealth, Moxnes notes that:

> The emphasis upon the non-expectance of a return is balanced, however, by a promise of return and generous rewards from God. Many exhortations to give without expecting a return conclude with a promise of reward, for instance, in the form of repayment at the resurrection or of a reward in heaven (6:35; 12:33; 14:14). So in this model of exchange, there are three parties involved. First, there is a human patron or benefactor. He or she is supposed to give to

---

[6] Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom*, 155-160.
[7] Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom*, 155.

the second party, one of the needy, without expecting a return. The human benefactor is repaid, however, by a third party, God, who is the great benefactor.[8]

Moxnes notes the promise of reward for generous gift-giving established in the Lukan Jesus' teaching, which implies that God is the third party in the gift-giving practices of the followers of Jesus. For the communal sharing in Acts, the relationship between benefactors and the needy in the early Jesus community is not dyadic, but rather triadic, including God as the great benefactor. These observations then come to the fore in the summary statements' depiction of the communal sharing which Moxnes describes "as an ideal community, one of whose main characteristics is redistribution of resources to members in need ([Acts] 2:43-47, 4:32-37, 5:1-11)."[9] Moxnes helpfully establishes the interconnectedness of the divine and human gift-giving realms, as God is the great benefactor who rewards generous gift-giving.

The second scholar, Fredrick Danker, has commented on communal sharing in Acts, stating that "in typical Hellenistic fashion it is understood that the generosity of a benefactor is to be contagious," and that the communal sharing is an action "in response to the wonder of Pentecost."[10] Danker sees the wonder of Pentecost as initiating a contagious generosity among the early Jesus followers. Moreover, Danker further explains his position by noting that "the generosity of the divine benefactor is subsequently echoed in the sharing of material goods by the new believers (Acts 2:44-47). Graeco-Roman auditors of Acts would readily recognize the motif of the benefactor as a model for imitation."[11] Here Danker notes the concept of imitation in gift-giving, as the generosity of God is echoed in the generosity displayed in the communal sharing of the early Jesus community. Importantly, Danker here connects the communal sharing with the "wonder" of Pentecost and identifies God as a divine benefactor in Pentecost.

Both authors have made helpful observations. Moxnes' observations concerning the interconnectedness of the gift-giving realms (explored further in 10.2) lead us to ponder whether the gift of the Spirit effects the communal sharing of the early Jesus community. Likewise, Danker's argument that the generosity of the communal sharing derives from a contagious generosity of God helps establish links between the gift of the Spirit and the communal sharing through the concept of imitation (explored further in 10.4).

---

[8] Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom*, 156.
[9] Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom*, 160.
[10] Danker, *Benefactor*, 414.
[11] Danker, *Benefactor*, 411. See also Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 127.

Building upon these observations, I would like to highlight that Luke draws a clear connection between God as the great benefactor and the communal sharing in the specific description of the Spirit as gift (Acts 2:38). The wonder of Pentecost is the outpouring of the Spirit as gift, with this contagious generosity motivating the communal sharing of the early Jesus community. Likewise, seeing the divine and human realms of gift-giving as interconnected highlights the causality of God giving the Spirit as gift (Acts 2:38) followed by the community giving gifts to one another (Acts 2:44-45). Therefore, the close narrative proximity of the gift of the Spirit and the gifts to the community should indicate to us an interconnectedness, which I address further in the next subsection.

10.2 The Great Grace Upon the Community

This interconnectedness of the gift-giving realms is then further developed in the second summary statement, where Luke connects the χάρις of God with the provision for the needy, which is a direct outworking of Luke 6:32-35. This connection between the χάρις of God and the provision for the needy indicates that God is involved in the gift-giving practices of the early believers.[12] That is, the divine and human realms of gift-giving are interconnected. Acts 4:33-34 states:

> 4³³ καὶ δυνάμει μεγάλῃ ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ,[13] χάρις τε μεγάλη ἦν ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς
>
> ³⁴ οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής τις ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς ὅσοι γὰρ κτήτορες χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ὑπῆρχον, πωλοῦντες
>
> *4³³ With great power the apostles gave their testimony of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus and great favour was upon all of them*
>
> *³⁴ for there was not a needy person among them because as many as were owners of fields or houses, sold them,*

The central focus of this subsection will be on the χάρις upon them all. Broadly, χάρις means favour, which Greco-Roman authors apply in four different ways.[14] First, an object that has χάρις can be an attractive or favourable object. Second, if a person acts towards you with χάρις, they have a favourable disposition towards you. Third, if something concrete is done towards you, which is favourable, e.g. a gift is given, or if someone saves your life, then it can be called a χάρις. That is

---

[12] There is also an allusion to Deuteronomy 15:1-11 in the provision for the needy, addressed in 9.2, see also, Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 231; Greehy, "Community of Goods," 238; Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 36; Marshall, *Acts*, 115; Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life," 211; Schnabel, *Acts*, 271.

[13] Some manuscripts change the order of the phrasing ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, while others add Χριστοῦ into the phrase. See *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 391.

[14] Following Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 132-136; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 576-579.

χάρις can be a material gift, not just an appearance or a disposition. Fourth, as gratitude is considered the initial return for the intention of the gift, χάρις can also mean gratitude or thanks. The preposition ἐπί in Acts 4:33b indicates that this is probably not the first or third meanings, an attractive appearance or a gift, leaving the second and fourth meanings as viable meanings for χάρις.

The χάρις in Acts 4:33b could have a multi-valent meaning, as it could refer to the favourable disposition towards the believers from either the broader population or from God, or the gratitude that the early believers felt for the divine benefactions.[15] All three of these meanings could make sense in the context of the surrounding narrative. Seeing the χάρις as gratitude could allude to the prayer and praise of the early Jesus community, as these are the common expressions of gratitude in the Greco-Roman world.[16] This χάρις could be a favourable disposition from the broader population to the believers, as Luke makes a similar statement in Acts 2:47a.[17] However, the repetition of μεγάλη in Acts 4:33 (great power and great favour), with the first use of μεγάλη connected to the power of God, indicates that the great favour upon the community is God's favourable disposition towards the believers.[18]

Why did the early believers have the χάρις of God? Some scholars see the χάρις of God as deriving exclusively from the witnessing of the apostles.[19] As Youngmo Cho states: "The state of χάρις of the community results from the salvific message through the witness of the apostles."[20] The great grace was upon the believers because they responded to the gospel, which was preached by the apostles. While there are connections between the witnessing of the apostles and the χάρις of God, as evidenced by the connective τε of verse 33 and the repetition of μεγάλη, there is also a connection in the text between the χάρις of God and the provision for the needy.[21]

There are two main arguments for connecting the χάρις of God to the provision for the needy. First, the great favour was upon *them all*, not just on the apostles, indicating that the favour is not because of the apostles' testimony but rather reflects the communal sharing.[22] Second, the conjunction γάρ

---

[15] Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, 101.
[16] See chapter 7.
[17] Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 174; Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 100.
[18] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 231; Newman and Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles*, 111; Marshall, *Acts*, 115; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 55; Williams, *Acts*, 93; Bartchy, "Community of Goods in Acts," 317; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 254; Larkin Jr., *Acts*, 82; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 207; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 314; Lüdemann, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 75; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 205; Pervo, *Acts*, 127; Schnabel, *Acts*, 271.
[19] Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 54; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 269; Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom*, 130; Bock, *Acts*, 214; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 205.
[20] Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom*, 130.
[21] Marshall, *Acts*, 115; Krodel, *Acts*, 116; Bartchy, "Community of Goods in Acts," 317; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 86; Capper, "Reciprocity and the Ethic of Acts," 502; Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life," 211; Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 100.
[22] Marshall, *Acts*, 115; Krodel, *Acts*, 116.

connects the χάρις of God and the believers.[23] If we are to associate the provision of the needy with the sale of fields and houses through the explanatory γάρ in Acts 4:34b, then explanatory γάρ at the start of Acts 4:34a should associate the provision of the needy with the χάρις of God. Acts 4:33-34 then associate the χάρις of God with the provision for the needy among the community, indicating that God is involved in the early believers' use of wealth.

In summary, the χάρις of God upon the early believers was due, at least in part, to their communal sharing. This use of χάρις in Acts 4:34 indicates that the divine and human realms of gift-giving cannot be separated, as Luke portrays God as involved in the gift-giving practices of the early Jesus community. This conclusion sets the foundation establishing the connection between the gift of the Spirit and the communal sharing in the opening chapters of Acts. This use of χάρις in Acts 4:33 then brings to the fore the concept of an eschatological reward for generous giving established in Luke 6:35, 12:33, 14:14, 18:22, which the next section will address.

10.3 The Gift of the Spirit and the Promise of Reward

The favour of God, which was upon the community because of their care for the needy within the community, evokes the promise of reward. Acts 4:33b-34a is a direct result of Jesus' teaching in Luke 6:32-35, where it states that those who give generously will be rewarded by God (Luke 6:35).[24] As noted in section 8.1.2, the third layer of meaning for the rhetorical questions found in Luke 6:32-34, "what favour is that to you?" (ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν;), indicates that giving without expecting a return gains χάρις from God, which is then expanded upon in Luke 6:35, where God promises a reward for generous gift-giving.

This connection between generous giving and the promise of reward is developed again in Acts 4:35, where Luke's διεδίδετο creates a direct literary link with Luke 18:22. As I have noted in section 9.1.2, Hays draws a connection between Luke's use of πωλέω (to sell) and διαδίδωμι (to distribute) in Acts 4:34-35 and the instruction to the rich young ruler, who is told to sell (πώλησον) all his possessions and distribute (διάδος) it to the poor in Luke 18:22.[25] This indicates a close connection between the Gospel of Luke and Acts on the topic of wealth.[26] Yet, the second half of Luke 18:22

---

[23] Krodel, *Acts*, 116; Bartchy, "Community of Goods in Acts," 317; Capper, "Reciprocity and the Ethic of Acts," 502; Lindemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Life," 211; Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 100.
[24] Some scholars connect this use of χάρις in Acts 4:33 with Luke 2:40, see Marshall, *Acts*, 115; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 314; Larkin Jr., *Acts*, 82; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 254; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1177; Williams, *Acts*, 93. However, I see a stronger connection with Luke's use of χάρις in Luke 6:32-35.
[25] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 193-194. See also Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 186.
[26] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 194.

includes the promise "you will have treasure in the heavens" (ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς) for generous gift-giving. In Acts 4:33-35, we see two direct links between generous gift-giving and the promise of reward.

Numerous scholars note that this connection between generous gift-giving and the promise of reward presents a problem, as, according to these scholars, Luke does not mention a reward in Acts.[27] As David J. Downs notes that in Acts:

> There is not necessarily a clear connection between giving and reward, particularly since notes of eschatological reward for generous giving are mute in Acts in comparison with the Gospel of Luke. That is not to say that the story of Acts is unconcerned with the economic practices of the earliest followers of Jesus after the resurrection.[28]

According to Downs, Jesus' teachings in the Gospel of Luke establish that God will reward generous giving, yet this reward is not stated in any of the summary statements in Acts, *even though* the use of wealth is a significant theme in the opening chapters of Acts.

However, I see this promise of an eschatological reward for generous gift-giving as being fulfilled in the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2:38), as these scholars do not consider the role Spirit as gift plays in the gift-giving practices of the early Jesus community. As I have argued in the previous sections (10.1-10.2), Luke indicates that the divine and human realms of gift-giving are interrelated, with, for example, the favour of God associated with the care for the needy. There are two indications that the Spirit as gift can be the eschatological reward for generous gift-giving.

First, Luke describes the gift of the Spirit as having an eschatological dimension. Lukan scholars addressing the Spirit in Acts widely agree that the gift of the Spirit is eschatological.[29] This is most clearly evidenced by the addition of "in those last days" (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις) to the Joel quotation in the Pentecost sermon (Acts 2:17). Luke has added an eschatological dimension to the Lukan Peter's Joel quotation, indicating that Luke sees the gift of the Spirit as an eschatological gift. The gift of the Spirit is then an eschatological gift that is given by the same God who promises eschatological rewards for generous gift-giving.

---

[27] Leander E. Keck, "The Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament," *ZNW* 56, no. 1-2 (1964): 103-106; Helmut Flender, *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1967), 75-78; Schuyler Brown, *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 100-105; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 10, 129; David J. Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement in Early Christianity* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press), 133.
[28] Downs, *Alms*, 133.
[29] This point seems well accepted, see the overview in Keener, *Acts*, 1, 877-881.

Second, as I have already covered in section 3.1, within the literature of the wider Greco-Roman world, δωρεά does have the meaning of a reward. The majority of historians of the Greco-Roman world that use δωρεά, including Plutarch, Josephus, and Appian, all use δωρεά to refer to a soldier's share of the spoils of war or an extra reward for acts of bravery.[30] The giving of δωρεά was then a binding force between a general and his soldiers, understood as a reward for service or bravery in battle, with this connotation of reward is also found in the use of δωρεά as a reward for other military services rendered.[31] In this context, a δωρεά could have many different functions, like securing the loyalty of the army, calming the rage of soldiers, or rewarding acts of bravery.

From the wider Greco-Roman world, we can see that δωρεά can describe a reward given, which has implications for Luke's use of δωρεά in the Pentecost narrative. While Luke places the giving of the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2:38) narratively before the depiction of the communal sharing (Acts 2:44-45), this pre-emptiveness is not unheard of in the usage of δωρεά in the wider Greco-Roman literature.[32] This pre-emptiveness of the δωρεά of the Spirit does avoid the implication that the gift of the Spirit could be bought, and that implication seems to be the meaning of Acts 8:18-25.[33] Likewise, the pre-emptiveness of the δωρεά of the Spirit does avoid the implication that communal sharing was a pre-requisite for the gift of the Spirit, as for Luke, the pre-requisite for the gift of the Spirit is faith in Jesus. Therefore, the gift of the Spirit can be understood as eschatological and as a reward, with this eschatological reward being pre-emptive of the communal sharing of the early Jesus community.

While some scholars do argue for a disconnection between the Gospel of Luke and Acts on the topic of wealth, if we acknowledge that God does give an eschatological reward that is pre-emptive of the communal sharing, the gift of the Spirit, this disconnection is resolved. The Spirit as δωρεά then fulfils the Lukan Jesus' promise of eschatological reward for generous gift-giving in the Gospel of Luke. Simply put, the gift of the Spirit is the eschatological reward, pre-emptively given, for the generous gift-giving in the early Jesus community.

---

[30] See 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4 respectively.

[31] See 3.1.1.

[32] For a δωρεά given pre-emptively see Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, 16.55.2, 19.81.6; Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 3.6.42, 3.7.44, 4.12.89, 4,12,100-101; Plutarch, *Lives. Antony*, 42.5; *Brutus*, 44.4; *Caius Marcius Coriolanus*, 11.1.

[33] An examination of this pericope falls outside the scope of this thesis, so an overview of this pericope see Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1529-1533.

There is a further connection between the gift of the Spirit and the communal sharing, in the concept of imitation, as the early Jesus community imitates the δωρεά of the Spirit in their communal sharing.[34] Luke uses δωρεά four times throughout his second volume (Acts 2:38, 8:20, 10:45, 11:17), and given the large amount of gift-giving language found in the Greco-Roman world, we can discern specific nuances to this word.[35] Danker notes that one of the widely accepted nuances of δωρεά is "that which is given or transferred freely by one person to another, gift, bounty," while the adjectival form (δωρεάν) can mean, "being freely given, as a gift, without payment."[36] The δωρεά is then a gift or reward that is freely given, without any consideration of return.

This nuance of giving gifts freely, with no expectation of return, not only corresponds with the Lukan ideal of a gift described in the Gospel of Luke (Luke 6:35, 14:14),[37] but also presents a model for imitation for the benefactors of the early Jesus community. There are three descriptions concerning the gifts to the early Jesus community that indicate that the benefactors to the community give their gifts freely. The first is in the second phrase of Acts 4:32 states that "no one claimed that any possessions were their own" (καὶ οὐδὲ εἷς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι). Not having any possessions as one's own could allude to friendship/utopian ideals, the Qumran community or benefaction ideals. This phrase could refer to friendship ideals or utopian allusions, as it occurs in the middle of two other friendship aphorisms, καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία and ἅπαντα κοινά. The closest parallels are with Plato who in *Critias* (360 B.C.E.) describes the Guardians of his utopian society as not having any private property (using both οὐδὲ and ἴδιον), but rather these Guardians, "regarded all they had as the common property of all (ἅπαντα δὲ πάντων κοινά)."[38] Nevertheless, this parallel between Acts and *Critias* is faint, as in *Critias* only select a few, not the whole community, abnegate the ownership of property.[39]

Other scholars argue that this could refer to the Qumran community and their community of goods.[40] However, the use of ἔλεγεν (were claiming) does weaken this position, as ἔλεγεν seems to indicate that the believers still retained ownership of the property, but freely shared their property and

---

[34] For imitation elsewhere in Acts, see the theme of imitation in Paul's Miletus speech in Steve Walton, *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians*, SNTSMS, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 85, 155, 158-159, 169.

[35] BAGD, 266; Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 224; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 578-579.

[36] BAGD, 266. See also F. Büchsel, "δωρεά," in *TDNT*, 2, 166-167; Gerhard Schneider, "δωρεά," in *EDNT*, 1, 363-364; Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 224; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 578-579.

[37] See section 8.1.2 for further discussion on this Lukan ideal.

[38] Plato, *Critias*, 110CD (Bury, LCL).

[39] Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship," 260; Capper, "Reciprocity and the Ethic of Acts," 507.

[40] Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context," 335-337; Taylor, "The Community of Goods," 152-153.

possessions as needed, as discussed in Chapter 9.[41] This phrase alone does not indicate a Qumran-like communal ownership, but rather a willingness to sell excess goods to meet the needs of the needy in the community.

The most likely context that Luke's use of this phrase would have evoked is the benefaction conventions attested to in the vast number of inscriptions.[42] This allusion is particularly evident in the use of ἴδιον in the civic benefaction inscriptions, which Aaron J. Kuecker notes would have been an everyday and public context for ἴδιον in the Greco-Roman world.[43] The Packard Humanities Institute lists 1907 inscriptions containing the phrase ἐκ τῶν ἰδιῶν, including 75 inscriptions in Greater Syria and 971 inscriptions in Asia Minor.[44] Of these inscriptions, Kuecker notes that ἐκ τῶν ἰδιῶν "usually indicates that the object commemorated by the inscription was provided by a named donor," and that, "[t]he inscription functioned to ensure that the donor received the honor due from benefaction."[45] A benefactor's primary motivation for giving a benefaction was to receive honour in return, and so the recipients needed to identify the benefactor.[46] In this common and public context of benefaction inscriptions, ἴδιον indicates who should receive the return of honour for the gift. However, the usage in Acts 4:32 is antithetical to the common inscriptional usage, as *no one* claimed any possessions as their own. This practice surely would have been a remarkable and peculiar statement in light of the social conventions surrounding benefaction in the Greco-Roman world.[47] The benefactors of the early Jesus community were not to seek any recognition or honour for the gifts they give to the community.

The second indication that benefactors give their gifts freely is that Luke reinforces the lack of public recognition for benefactions with the later description of the benefactors laying the proceeds at the feet of the apostles in Acts 4:35-37. Luke Timothy Johnson notes that laying at the feet in the Hebrew Bible was a sign of submission, and so the benefactors in the early Jesus community are submitting to the apostles.[48] The benefactors in the early Jesus community do not increase their standing in the community through benefactions, but instead, use their benefactions to signal their submission to the

---

[41] The similarities and dissimilarities between the sharing of the Qumran community and the sharing of the early Jesus community, see 9.1.1.

[42] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 136.

[43] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 136.

[44] This result is from searching ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων in https://inscriptions.packhum.org/ accessed 8/11/2018. Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 136. Kuecker notes that there are 1,766 in 2010.

[45] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 136. See also Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*, trans. John H. Schütz (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982), 148-150; Francesco Camia, "The Financing of Public Honours in Greece during the Roman Imperial Period: The Case of Honorary Statues in the Cities of the Greek Mainland," in *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, ed. Anna Heller and Onno M. van Nijf, (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 125, 137, 140-141; John S. Kloppenborg, "Paul's Collection for Jerusalem and the Financial Practices in Greek Cities," in *Paul and Economics: A Handbook*, ed. Thomas R. Blanton IV, and Raymond Pickett, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017), 317.

[46] For honour as a return in the benefaction system, see Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*, 27-28.

[47] Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship," 270.

[48] Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 87.

apostles.[49] Third, God receives the praise of the community, with no mention of human benefactors receiving praise for their benefactions. As Finger states, "within the community of Jesus' fictive kin group, God is the real benefactor, and the rich are asked to forego expectations of a reward of gratitude, honor, or increased status from their poor clients."[50] The benefactors of the early Jesus community give their gifts freely, not seeking honour, praise or an increase in social standing. In this way, the benefactors to the early Jesus community imitate the way God gives gifts in their gifts to the community.

Likewise, this imitation of God is also shown in Luke's use of διεμέριζον in Acts 2:45, which has a literary connection to the gift of the Spirit in Acts 2:3. Acts 2:3 describes the tongues of fire being διαμεριζόμεναι (distributed) among the believers, which then is echoed in the use of διεμέριζον in the description of the distribution of wealth in the community in Acts 2:45. Luke here could be echoing the distribution of the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2:3) in the distribution of gifts to the community (Acts 2:45). As imitation of God in gift-giving is something that the Lukan Jesus established in Luke 6:35-38, the early Jesus community seems to be distributing their gifts in the same way that God distributes the gift of the Spirit.

The benefactors of the early Jesus community give their gifts freely, not seeking the bare minimum expected return, namely gratitude, in the form of praise. Moreover, these Jesus following benefactors do not claim the common counter-gift of honour for the benefactions they give to the community. The benefactors to the community give their gifts freely, free of the typical responses of praise, honour or gratitude, and in this way, the communal sharing of the early Jesus community imitates the semantic range of the δωρεά of the Spirit, a gift or reward freely given. The Lukan Jesus has established divine gift-giving as a model for imitation (Luke 6:35-38), and so in Acts we see the followers of Jesus imitating the δωρεά of the Spirit in their communal sharing. Moreover, the early Jesus community imitates the distributing the gift of the Spirit (διαμεριζόμεναι in Acts 2:3) in their distributing of gifts to the needy (διεμέριζον in Acts 2:45). In summary, the early Jesus community then imitates in their communal sharing the way God gives gifts.

---

[49] Alan C. Mitchell, "'Greet the Friends by Name': New Testament Evidence for the Greco-Roman *Topos* on Friendship," in *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 253-254.
[50] Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 131.

In this final section, I establish the gift of the Spirit's influence on the early Jesus community's practice of meal sharing. There are scholars that connect the sharing of the meals with the gift of the Spirit.[51] For example, Dunn states of the early Jesus community's meetings, which included these shared meals, that "were not simply social get-togethers marked by cheerful camaraderie. They were conscious of the eschatological Spirit, the power of God in their midst."[52] Likewise, Schnabel states that, "The communal meals of the believers in Jerusalem were marked by exuberant joy, surely prompted by God's presence through his Spirit, by the assurance of salvation, and by the experience of new friendships and the privilege of giving and receiving."[53] These scholars see the presence of the Spirit of God in the community as affecting the meal sharing of the early Jesus community. Building upon the insights of these scholars, I will offer three arguments that further establish a connection between the sharing of meals and the gift of the Spirit.

First, as I have argued in 9.3, the sharing of meals was the primary and daily expression of the communal sharing, as food would have been a daily need for the poor in the early Jesus community. In the previous four sections (10.1-10.4), I have established that this communal sharing is founded on and motivated by the gift of the Spirit, and so by extension, we can imply that the major expression of the communal sharing, the sharing of meals, is also influenced by the gift of the Spirit As the early Jesus community

Second, Acts 6:1-6 provides an insight into the sharing of meals in the early Jesus community and the influence that the gift of the Spirit has on these meals. Much of the recent discussion has centred around whether Luke's use of διακονία in Acts 6:1 and 6:2 indicates a complaint by the Hellenists over a lack of an opportunity to serve or a lack of provision.[54] Important for this thesis are the four key attributes of those organising the διακονία mentioned in Acts 6:3; being full of the Spirit (πλήρεις πνεύματος), wisdom (σοφίας), good repute (μαρτυρουμένους) and that they are men (ἄνδρας). Important for this thesis, is the fact that one of the key attributes for organising and overseeing these shared meals is being full of the Spirit. Luke states that being full of the Spirit is a key attribute for those organising these sharing of meals, indicating that the gift of the Spirit is associated with the sharing of meals. The gift of the Spirit as a requirement for service does fit within

---

[51] E.g. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 188; Schnabel, *Acts*, 184.

[52] Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 188.

[53] Schnabel, *Acts*, 184.

[54] For a lack of opportunity to serve, see Finger, *Of Widows and Meals*, 255-257. For a lack of provision, see Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, 120-121. A third nuanced option is given by Fiona J. R. Gregson, *Everything in Common?: The Theology and Practice of the Sharing of Possessions in Community in the New Testament* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2017), 60-65.

Luke's the overall understanding of the Spirit as the empowerment for service, as a service required in the early Jesus community would have been the administration of these meals.[55]

Third, Acts 2:46 describes these meals as being shared with great joy (ἀγαλλιάσει), which I have already argued (section 6.4) is a Spirit-empowered activity. While joy is commonly linked with the work of the Spirit (e.g. Acts 13:52), the great joy (ἀγαλλιάσις) is directly linked to the work of the Spirit, in Luke 1:44 where the baby John the Baptist leaps in the Spirit-filled womb of Elizabeth, and in Luke 10:21 where Jesus rejoices in the Spirit.[56] Great joy is then a Spirit-empowered action in the wider narrative of Luke-Acts, which leads to seeing these shared meals as being shared in an atmosphere of Spirit-empowered great joy.

These shared meals are influenced by the gift of the Spirit, as they are the major expression of the communal sharing, which was founded on and motivated by the gift of the Spirit. Moreover, the gift of the Spirit is required to administer the meals of the early Jesus community, again creating a connection between the gift of the Spirit and the sharing of meals. Finally, the presence of Spirit-empowered great joy, shows that the atmosphere of the shared meals was deeply affected by the presence of the gift of the Spirit. With these three arguments taken together, we see that the gift of the Spirit influences the motivation, the administration and the atmosphere of these shared meals.

10.6 Conclusion

In this section, I have established five connections between the gift of the Spirit and the communal sharing of the early believers. First, the close association narratively between the gift of the Spirit and the communal sharing in Acts 2 indicates that there is a connection between the two gifts. Second, the early Jesus community receives the χάρις of God for providing for the needy, indicating that Luke does not differentiate between divine and human gift-giving realms. Third, the mention of the χάρις of God brings to the fore the promise of an eschatological reward for generous gift-giving, which I have argued the δωρεά of the Spirit fulfils. Fourth, I have argued that the communal sharing of the early Jesus community is an imitation of the δωρεά of the Spirit, and likewise, the distribution of the gifts to the needy imitates the distribution of the gift of the Spirit. Fifth, the shared meals, which

---

[55] For the Spirit's empowerment for service in Acts, see for example, Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, 71-82. For an overview of the theme, see Keener, *Acts*, 1, 520-524.

[56] For those that see joy as Spirit-empowered, see Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers*, 117; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 188; Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, 60-61; Shelton, *Mighty In Word And Deed*, 125; Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit*, 214; Turner, *Power from on High*, 411, 441; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 153; Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 277; Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 120; Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 159.

were the major expression of the communal sharing, were administrated by men full of the Spirit, while Spirit-empowered great joy affected the atmosphere of these shared meals. These five arguments then lead to the conclusion that the communal sharing of the early Jesus community was founded on and motivated by the gift of the Spirit. In the following chapter, I examine the descriptions of the unity of the early Jesus community, arguing that this unity comes from the gift of the Spirit, which is the basis for the having "all things in common" (ἅπαντα κοινά) in Acts 2:44 and 4:32.

Chapter 11:   The Unity of the Community

In this chapter, I elucidate the status-transcending function of the gift of the Spirit that Luke portrays in the opening chapters of Acts, and then consider the implications for the early Jesus community. First, I discuss the status-transcending function of the gift of the Spirit (11.1). Next, I address the descriptions of the unity of the early Jesus community in the summary statements, arguing that this unity comes from the understanding of the gift of the Spirit as the status transcending attribute of the early community (11.2). Finally, I connect this unity that derives from the gift of the Spirit to the phrase "all things in common" (ἄπαντα κοινά) in Acts 2:44 and 4:32 (11.3).

11.1 The Gift of the Spirit as Transcending Status

Luke presents the gift of the Spirit as the status-transcending attribute that ensures a certain equality among all the members of the community. The Greco-Roman world was a highly segregated society, with the main segregating factor being status.[1] Status was constructed around unalterable characteristics (e.g. gender, age, regional and ethnic identities, class) and alterable characteristics (e.g. wealth, honour).[2] When describing the beginnings of the early Jesus community, Luke notes the remarkable unity and harmony of the early believers, with this unity and harmony appearing to transcend the societal status divisions.

Some scholars argue that the belief (πιστεύοντες in Acts 2:44 and πιστευσάντων in Acts 4:32) of the early followers of Jesus was the basis for this unity.[3] While Luke does describe the followers of Jesus as believers twice in the summary statements (Acts 2:44, 4:32), this could simply be the designation Luke chooses for the early followers of Jesus.[4] While noting these positions, I propose that Luke invokes a different status-transcending attribute of the early Jesus community, namely the gift of the Spirit, as in the opening chapters of Acts it is the gift of the Spirit does not differentiate

---

[1] For a recent treatment of status in the Greco-Roman world see the collective work Annika Kuhn, ed., *Social Status and Prestige in the Graeco-Roman World* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2015).
[2] For the unalterable aspects of status, see John H. Elliott, "Jesus Was Not an Egalitarian: A Critique of an Anachronistic and Idealist Theory," *BTB* 32, no. 2 (2002): 77.
[3] Co, "The Major Summaries in Acts," 70; Paul S. Jeon, "Collectivism and/or Christianity: An Exegetical Study of Acts 2:42-47 and 4:32-5:11," *Institute for Faith, Work & Economics* (2013): 5; Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship," 268; Gregson, *Everything in Common?*, 56.
[4] Fitzmyer, "Jewish Christianity," 271.

based on gender, class, age, regional identities nor national identities.[5] I see Luke's use of Joel 2:28-30 in the Pentecost sermon as indicating that the gift of the Spirit transcends considerations of gender, class and age (11.1.1). The work of Aaron J. Kuecker in *The Spirit and the 'Other'* (2011) has already established that Luke sees the gift of the Spirit as transcending yet affirming different regional (11.1.2) and ethnic identities (11.1.3); in this chapter, I extend the argument to include other societal boundary markers of gender, class and age.

11.1.1 The Joel Quotation in relation to Gender, Class and Age

In Peter's quotation of Joel 2:28-30 (MT, the LXX is 3:1-5) at Pentecost (Acts 2:17-21), Luke indicates that the early Jesus community after Pentecost transcends considerations of gender, class and age because of the presence of the gift of the Spirit. Twice in the quotation from Joel, no distinction is made between male and female, and scholars point to this passage as indicating Luke's egalitarian tendencies.[6] Moreover, the mention of old ones (πρεσβύτεροι), young men (νεανίσκοι), children (υἱοὶ, θυγατέρες) and slaves (δούλους, δούλας) indicates that Luke sees the gift of the Spirit as being available to every human, no matter the class or age. The usual divisions that existed between the genders, classes and age groups are no longer relevant to those that have the gift of the Spirit.

In this subsection, I focus on the first half of the quotation from Joel in the Pentecost sermon, Acts 2:17-18. The Greek text and my translation is as follows:[7]

2[17] ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός,
ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα,
καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν
καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται
καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται·
[18] καί γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις
ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν.

---

[5] While a person's status in the Greco-Roman world would have involved more than these five categories, these five were core to the status considerations, as these five categories address the more unalterable aspects of a person's status, that being the physical (gender and age), social (class), and ethnic (regional and national identity) dimensions of status.
[6] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*, 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 1994), 185; Schottroff, *Lydia's Impatient Sisters*, 144; Turid Karlsen Seim, "The Virgin Mother: Mary and Ascetic Discipleship in Luke," in *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine and Marianne Blickenstaff, (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 101-103.
[7] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 382.

2[17] In those last days, God says,

I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh

Your sons and daughters will prophesy

Your young men will see visions

Your elders will dream dreams

[18] And even upon my male slaves and female slaves, in those days, I will pour out my Spirit,

and they will prophesy.

Starting with gender, we see twice in this first half of the quotation from Joel 2:28-30, the Spirit is said to be poured out on both men and women. The Joel quote states that "your sons *and daughters* will prophesy," and that the Spirit will be poured out, "even upon my male slaves *and female slaves*." Although these statements may be unremarkable to modern ears, to claim that a divine benefaction did not differentiate between men and women would have evoked egalitarian tendencies already developing in 1st century CE Judaism and the wider Greco-Roman society.[8]

Lukan scholarship has often noted the implications for gender in the use of Joel 2:28-30 in the Pentecost sermon.[9] Feminist scholarship on Christian origins has particularly focussed on what the equality implied in the equal possession of the gift of the Spirit described in Joel quotation in Acts 2:17-21.[10] As both male and female receive the same gift of the Spirit, and as both male and female prophesy, there is an equality between genders based on the equal possession of the gift of the Spirit. As Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza states: "This 'equality' in the Spirit is summed up by the early Christian movement in the words of the prophet Joel (Acts 2:17f)."[11] The gift of the Spirit is poured out upon both male and female, indicating that there is an equality between the genders because of a shared pneumatic experience and indwelling.[12]

A caution has been made by some critics, as there is a tendency to present Judaism as an exaggeratedly misogynistic or restrictive movement for women, from which Jesus liberates women into an

---

[8] For the egalitarian elements in Judaism, see for example Bernadette J. Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Bakcground Issues* (Chicago: Scholars Press, 1982); Amy-Jill Levine, "Second Temple Judaism, Jesus, and Women," *BibInt* 2, no. 1 (1994): 8-33; Mary Ann Beavis, "Christian Origins, Egalitarianism, and Utopia," *JFSR* 23, no. 2 (2007): 32. For the wider Greco-Roman, see for example Carolyn Osiek and David Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 57-60; Carolyn Osiek and Margaret Y. MacDonald, *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 2-3.

[9] Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 44; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 28; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 140; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 49; Parsons, *Acts*, 42; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 89; Bock, *Acts*, 113; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 137; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 253; Larkin Jr., *Acts*, 54; Schnabel, *Acts*, 136; Cho and Park, *Acts, Part One*, 56.

[10] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 185; Schottroff, *Lydia's Impatient Sisters*, 144; Seim, "The Virgin Mother," 101-103.

[11] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 185.

[12] Other feminist scholars argue that we should hold this passage in tension with the fact that Luke does not record the words of a female prophet in Acts, see Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 77.

egalitarian community.[13] Scholars note that various streams of Judaism by the 1st century CE were quite progressive as there is evidence that women led synagogue services,[14] could and did become disciples of teachers,[15] and were quite active in the public sphere.[16] Jesus seems to have embraced these egalitarian elements already residing within 1st century CE Judaism, and fostered them in his "discipleship of equals."[17] Feminist scholarship has widely embraced these critiques, and as Mary Ann Beavis notes, identified the anti-Jewish tendencies of the study of Christian origins long before male scholarship.[18]

Likewise, in the wider Greco-Roman world, there was a movement towards greater gender egalitarianism by the 1st century CE. Carolyn Osiek and Margaret Y. Macdonald note that by the 1st century CE there are many indicators of a movement towards greater freedom for females, including,

> the virtual disappearance of marriage by *manus* (transfer of the bride from the family and authority of her father to that of her husband); Augustus' incentive of freedom from *tutela* (legal guardianship) to women who bore a certain number of children (three for a freeborn woman, four for a freedwoman); evidence mentioned by several authors that respectable women were beginning to recline at public banquets alongside their husbands; evidence of women administering their property, conducting business, and owning businesses.[19]

As with Judaism in the 1st century CE, we can see a movement towards gender freedom for females in the wider Greco-Roman society. Within this environment of growing gender freedom for females, claims of no distinction between male and female, although probably striking, were not inconceivable.

As with the considerations of gender, the quotation from Joel also addresses different classes, indicating that it is the gift of the Spirit that transcends class. This Joel quotation lists the different groups that the Spirit comes upon with prophetic activity, with the gift of the Spirit being available

---

[13] This critique initially came from Jewish scholars Bernadette J. Brooten, "Jewish Women's History in Roman Period: A Task for Christian Theology," *HTR* 79, no. 1 (1986): 22-30; Judith Plaskow, "Anti-Judaism in Feminist Christian Interpretation," in *Judith Plaskow: Feminism, Theology, and Justice*, ed. Hava Tirosh-Samuelson and Aaron W. Hughes, (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 83-96. Subsequent Christian scholars have noted and expanded on this critique Mary Rose D'Angelo, "Theology in Mark and Q: Abba and 'Father' in Context," *HTR* 85, no. 2 (1992): 149-174; Levine, "Second Temple Judaism, Jesus, and Women," 8-33; Amy-Jill Levine, "Gender, Judaism, and Literature: Unwelcome Guests in Household Configurations," *BibInt* 11, no. 2 (2003): 239-249. In fairness, Fiorenza does address this point in Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 105-118.
[14] Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue*.
[15] Levine, "Second Temple Judaism, Jesus, and Women," 18.
[16] Levine, "Second Temple Judaism, Jesus, and Women," 21.
[17] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 105-118.
[18] Beavis, "Christian Origins," 32. See also Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Jesus and the Politics of Interpretation* (New York: Continuum, 2000), 39.
[19] Osiek and MacDonald, *A Woman's Place*, 2-3. See also Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 57-60.

to every group of a household. The Spirit is given to slaves (δούλους/δούλας), children (υἱοὶ/ θυγατέρες), servants/workers (νεανίσκοι), and elders (πρεσβύτεροι). However, the flow of this passage, moving from children to young men to elders, then emphasises God giving the gift of the Spirit to the final group, slaves, which is further supported by the emphatic particle γε (Acts 2:18). Slaves are placed at the final place in this quotation to emphasise that God gives the gift of the Spirit to even the lowest of the low.

The possible identity of these male and female slaves is multifaceted. The mention of slaves could refer to Israel, as the nation of Israel had been "slaves" to foreign rulers for many centuries. Some scholars emphasise the Lukan addition of μου to the slaves (δούλους/δούλας), indicating that these slaves are God's own representatives.[20] In addition to these perspectives, the mention of slaves can also refer to a real socio-economic group made up of those who were in servitude to the head of the household (possibly one of the πρεσβύτεροι of the household).[21] Seeing the δούλους/δούλας as actual slaves is plausible when we consider this passage in the light of Luke's wider concern for the marginalised and the effect that the gospel has on them.[22] To emphasise this further, the slaves are the only group given the addition of μου, further emphasising that God gives the gift of the Spirit to even slaves. While I do not deny this mention of slaves could also include a reference to God's representatives or Israel, the starting point of the mention of δούλους/δούλας should be actual slaves. This emphatic mention of slaves makes it clear to the early Jesus community that every class, even slaves, are given the gift of the Spirit, as Schnabel states: "the coming of the Holy Spirit on all people will remove all distinctions of class and caste."[23]

Moreover, we can reach similar conclusions concerning the divisions between different age groups. The God gives the gift of the Spirit to "old ones" (πρεσβύτεροι), as well as "sons and daughters" (υἱοὶ ... θυγατέρες). These points then imply that the gift of the Spirit is the status-transcending attribute that is the basis for the unity of the early Jesus community.[24]

In the Lukan Peter's use of Joel 2:28-30, Luke portrays the gift of the Spirit as transcending three of the most common and distinctive status indicators: gender, class and age. Therefore, it is the gift of the Spirit that enables the early Jesus followers to unite across divisions of class, age and gender. While Luke does indicate this status-transcending attribute of the gift of the Spirit through the Joel

---

[20] Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 49; Turner, *Power from on High*, 270; Bock, *Acts*, 115; Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 121.

[21] Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 253; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 142; Bock, *Acts*, 113; Schnabel, *Acts*, 137.

[22] Most clearly seen in Luke 4:18-19.

[23] Schnabel, *Acts*, 137.

[24] Luke further reinforces this point by the second line of the Joel quotation, "I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh (σάρκα)."

quotation in the Pentecost sermon, he does not explicitly reinforce this further throughout Acts.[25] Luke's attention is on the gift of the Spirit as the commonality that transcends yet affirms regional and ethnic identities, which I address in the next two subsections.[26]

11.1.2 The Gift of the Spirit and Regional Identities

While Luke does indicate that the gift of the Spirit transcends gender, class and age, the majority of his attention is devoted to the gift of the Spirit as transcending, yet affirming, the regional and ethnic identities of the early Jesus believers. Helpfully, Kuecker has already addressed the gift of the Spirit's relationship to regional and ethnic identities in *The Spirit and the 'Other'*. Kuecker uses Social Identity Theory (SIT) to highlight the role that the Spirit plays in transcending yet affirming regional and ethnic identities in the early Jesus movement.[27]

In *The Spirit and the 'Other'* Kuecker argues that it is the gift of the Spirit in the opening two chapters of Acts that transcends yet affirms different regional identities.[28] Kuecker gives two supporting arguments for this conclusion. First, Luke emphasizes the regional identities of the disciples in the opening two chapters of Acts, which is then contrasted to the disciples' calling to witness to the other regional identities. The disciples are described as Galileans in Acts 1:11 and 2:7, emphasizing their regional identity.[29] Luke contrasts this emphasis with the regions mentioned in Jesus' commission in Acts 1:8, where the Spirit-empowered disciples will be Jesus' witnesses "in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the Earth" (ἔν τε Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ [ἐν] πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς). Jesus' commission to the disciples is for the disciples to transcend regional identity through the empowerment and direction of the gift of the Spirit.[30] As Kuecker notes, "Jesus' commission moves the disciples away from an identity centered primarily on their ethnic (sub-)group [Galileans] and towards a new identity centered on Jesus and empowered by the Spirit."[31] It is the gift of the Spirit that empowers and directs these Galileans to be witnesses to Jerusalemites, and then to Judeans, and so on.

---

[25] Scholars continue to discuss the degree to which Luke is an "egalitarian"; see the overview by Keener, *Acts*, 1, 597-638. Keener (637) concludes that "The closest Luke comes to offering a statement of ideology about gender is his programmatic quotation of Joel about sons and daughters prophesying." Luke's attention seems to lie with the gift of the Spirit as transcending yet affirming regional and ethnic identities, as section 10.1.2 and 10.1.3 will address.

[26] Most clearly argued by Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 97-124, 181-215.

[27] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 97-124, 181-215.

[28] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 97-124.

[29] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 100-101.

[30] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 101-103.

[31] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 104.

Second, Kuecker convincingly argues that the miracle of language in Acts 2:4-11 is a "miracle of universal particularity."[32] As Kuecker notes: "Rather than eliminating the cultural particularity marked by language, the Spirit explicitly *affirmed* ethno-linguistic diversity by allowing the crowd to hear Peter's address in the diverse languages of their respective births."[33] As the crowd would have known either Aramaic or Greek,[34] the language miracle is unnecessary, which Kuecker argues shows that the early Jesus community did not base their identity around an ethno-linguistic identity.[35] As Kuecker concludes, "The Spirit, therefore, not only creates common identity, but the Spirit also powerfully affirms the validity of ethno-linguistic particularity."[36] The miracle of language at Pentecost indicates that the commonality of a particular ethnic (sub-)group is not the basis of this new community, but rather Peter's Pentecost sermon indicates that the commonality is instead the gift of the Spirit.[37]

With these two arguments, Kuecker helpfully shows that Luke does not erase regional identities, but rather it is the gift of the Spirit that provides a basis for the early Jesus community. As Kuecker notes concerning the gift of the Spirit's role in transcending regional identities:

> [T]he Spirit typically appears in the narrative precisely at the moment that human identity is in question. Yet the work of the Spirit in both facilitating, marking and empowering this identity comes in a way that does not eliminate, but rather affirms (through an "unnecessary miracle"), the particularity of ethno-linguistic identities present at Pentecost. *This is an initial indication that ethnic identity, while it must be chastened, is not inherently incompatible with the emerging allocentric identity formed by the Spirit*.[38]

The gift of the Spirit transcends but does not eliminate the different regional identities, instead brings these various regional identities under an overarching attribute, the gift of the Spirit. Put a different way, the gift of the Spirit is the status-transcending attribute of the early Jesus community, but this does not mean that this attribute of the Spirit makes all the believers uniform.[39]

---

[32] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 117.
[33] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 117. Emphasis original.
[34] For this point Kuecker notes A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Traditions and Redactions in Acts 2:1-13," *JSNT* 17, no. 55 (1995): 49; Bob Zerhusen, "An Overlooked Judean Diglossa in Acts 2," *BTB* 25, no. 3 (1995): 118-130.
[35] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 118.
[36] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 118.
[37] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 119-122.
[38] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 123. Emphasis original.
[39] This conclusion does not deny that the early Jesus community did not always live up to this ideal, e.g. Acts 6:1-6 could be seen as evidence of the early Jesus community falling short of this ideal.

11.1.3 The Gift of the Spirit and Ethnic Identities

As with regional identities, Luke also portrays the gift of the Spirit as the commonality that transcends ethnic identities in the Cornelius episode covered in Acts 10, 11 and 15. The Cornelius episode is widely seen as influential in the wider scope of Acts, as this episode is considered a mini-Pentecost,[40] with its two retellings emphasising this importance for Luke.[41] In the Cornelius episode, the gift of the Spirit is poured out upon non-Israelites, which is repeatedly interpreted by the Lukan Peter and the Jerusalem council as evidence that the gift of the Spirit has transcended the ethnic barrier between Jew and Gentile.

Following Kuecker, there are three main points which indicate that the gift of the Spirit is the commonality that transcends ethnic identities. First, the Spirit orchestrates the encounter between Peter and Cornelius through a series of Spirit-empowered visions and direct speech (Acts 10:19-20).[42] Visions are a manifestation of the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2:17), implying that Peter's vision of the clean and unclean animals is Spirit inspired.[43] Moreover, while Peter is initially puzzled by the vision, it is the direct voice of the Spirit (Acts 10:19-20) that directs Peter to accompany these Gentiles "without discriminating" (μηδὲν διακρινόμενος).[44] This direct voice of the Spirit is emphatic, as it is one of only three times the Spirit directly speaks in Acts.[45] The Spirit's direct speech to Peter also states that Cornelius' angelic vision and instruction is orchestrated by the Spirit (Acts 10:20). Kuecker concludes that: "The Spirit's orchestration of the interethnic encounter between Peter and Cornelius is evidence that boundary maintenance for the in-group is being commandeered by the Holy Spirit."[46] As will be explicitly accredited by the Lukan James (Acts 15:28), it is the Spirit that coordinates the meeting of Peter and Cornelius.

Second, in the meeting between Peter and Cornelius, it is the gift of the Spirit given to Cornelius' household that creates a status-transcending attribute between Peter and the Cornelius household.[47] This role that the gift of the Spirit plays is made explicitly clear in the gift of the Spirit being poured out upon the Cornelius household (Acts 10:44-48).[48] This pouring out "amazes" (ἐξέστησαν) the

---

[40] Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, 216; Bock, *Acts*, 400.

[41] Schnabel, *Acts*, 471.

[42] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 188-192.

[43] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 188.

[44] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 189, 191-192. Kuecker (191) notes that "Luke uses the word [διακρίνειν] with the stronger meaning in Acts 11:2, 12; 15:9, texts that solidify the claim that διακρίνειν refers not to hesitation but to distinctions between peoples." See also Schnabel, *Acts*, 493.

[45] The other times are Acts 8:29, 13:2. The Spirit does speak through people, e.g. Acts 1:16, 4:8, 4:25, 21:4, 21:11, 28:25.

[46] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 189.

[47] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 192-197.

[48] For Peter's cognitive recognition see Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 192-194.

circumcised believers, as Kuecker notes: "nobody in Luke's narrative frame expected the Spirit to be given to non-Israelites *as non-Israelites*."[49] Moreover, Luke's language of the Spirit being poured out (ἐκχέω) creates a direct literary link to Pentecost, as ἐκχέω is only used elsewhere in the Pentecost narrative (Acts 2:17, 2:18, 2:33).[50] The outpouring of the gift of the Spirit prompts the Lukan Peter to baptise the Cornelius household, signalling that the early Jesus community is integrating these Gentiles into their community.[51] As Kuecker concludes, the gift of the Spirit "obliterates ethnicity as a basis for intergroup comparison" as "Acts 10-11 gives Luke's clearest evidence that the Spirit functions as the definitive identity marker for those who are rightly identified with Jesus."[52] It is the possession of the gift of the Spirit that transcends yet affirms ethnic identities.

Third, in the aftermath of the gift of the Spirit being poured out on Cornelius' household, it is the equal possession of the Spirit that serves as a justification for the incorporation of Gentiles into the early Jesus community in Acts 11 and 15.[53] In the first retelling in Acts 11:4-17, the Lukan Peter repeatedly uses the gift of the Spirit as evidence for a shared status between Jew and Gentile.[54] The Lukan Peter recalls the instruction by the Spirit to not discriminate (Acts 11:12), the Spirit's interruption of the sermon (Acts 11:15), the similarities to Pentecost (Acts 11:15), and Peter identifies the gift of the Spirit given to Cornelius' household as the "same gift" (Acts 11:17).[55] This common status found in the gift of the Spirit is further developed to a common identity in the second retelling in Acts 15:7-11.[56] Again, the Lukan Peter establishes that it is the gift of the Spirit that is the commonality that transcends ethnic identities. Kuecker summarises the role of the Spirit in the retelling of Acts 15:7-11, noting that God "testified to the hearts of the non-Israelites by giving them the Spirit just as he had to the Israelites (Acts 15:7: ἡμῖν)" and that "God has not made a distinction (διακρίνω) between them (αὐτῶν) and us (ἡμῶν) … (Acts 15:9)."[57] Luke emphatically and repeatedly points to the gift of the Spirit as the status-transcending attribute that transcends ethnic identities.

In summary, in the Cornelius episode, Luke portrays the gift of the Spirit as the status-transcending attribute that transcends ethnic boundaries. The Spirit orchestrates the meeting between Peter and Cornelius, bringing together different ethnic identities. Moreover, God's giving of the gift of the Spirit to the Cornelius household is used to signify the equality between the Jewish and Gentile

---

[49] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 195. Emphasis original
[50] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 196.
[51] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 196.
[52] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 195 and 192 respectively.
[53] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 197-215.
[54] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 198.
[55] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 198.
[56] For the difference between common status and common identity see Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 199.
[57] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 201.

believers in Jesus. Finally, in the retelling of the Cornelius episode, the Spirit is again emphasised, as it is the reception of the gift of the Spirit that leads the Lukan Peter to baptize Cornelius' household.

11.1.4 Summary

The gift of the Spirit then functions as the status-transcending attribute of the early Jesus community. In the use of the Joel quotation, Luke indicates that God gives the gift of the Spirit to all flesh, no matter what class, age or gender. Luke also indicates, as Kuecker has argued, that the gift of the Spirit transcends yet affirms the different regional and ethnic identities that come into the early Jesus community. As we move to the next two sections of this chapter, this understanding of the gift of the Spirit as the status-transcending attribute of the early Jesus community enables us to elucidate the Spirit's influence on the unity of the community (11.2) and the "sharing of all things" (11.3).

11.2 The Unity of the Early Jesus Community

In this section, I address the two explicit statements concerning the unity of the early Jesus community, arguing that the equal endowment of the gift of the Spirit is the basis for this unity. The immersive description of the community life in the summary statements portrays the believers as living a life of unity, which the believers express in their teaching, communal sharing, meals, and their worship together. These believers are called a πλήθους (community) in Acts 4:32, and are ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (in the same place, together, a community) in Acts 2:44, 2:47.[58]

In this context, the first explicit description of the unity of the early Jesus community is Luke's use of ὁμοθυμαδόν in Acts 2:46. Danker describes ὁμοθυμαδόν as "with one mind/purpose/impulse."[59] Lena V. Toews surveys the use of ὁμοθυμαδόν in Luke-Acts and notes that "it is clear that every time the word is used, some sort of inner unity among a group is indicated."[60] The early believers direct this one-mindedness towards Temple attendance – probably referring to the community's worship and adherence to teaching – and sharing meals from home to home. Therefore, the early Jesus community are unified in all four elements mentioned in Acts 2:42, which is further reinforced by the repetition of προσκαρτεροῦντες in Acts 2:46. The unity of the early Jesus

---

[58] For a discussion on these two phrases, see sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 respectively.
[59] Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 706.
[60] Toews, "Motivation for the Sharing," 83.

community, in every aspect of their praxis and worship, is then evident in Luke's use of ὁμοθυμαδόν.

The second description, the refrain καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία (one heart and soul), also refers to the unity of the early believers, combining both Deuteronomic and friendship ideals. The start of the second summary statement begins with a comment on the unity of the early believers. Acts 4:32a then states:[61]

4[32a] Τοῦ δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων ἦν καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία

4[32a] Now the community of believers had one heart and soul

The combination of καρδία καὶ ψυχή, heart and soul, evokes biblical ideals of devotion to the God of Israel.[62] Deuteronomy repeatedly commands the Israelites to love God with "all your heart and all your soul."[63] The Shema, found in Deuteronomy 6:4-9, uses the combination of heart and soul in verse 5, which states, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your might."[64] As the Shema was a prevalent recital in the Jewish tradition, the combination of καρδία καὶ ψυχή in Acts 4:32 would have invoked the Shema for the Jewish believers in Luke's audience. This allusion has lead Alfred Friedl to argue that Deuteronomy is a significant influence on the early Jesus community.[65] Deuteronomy is one of the most quoted books of the Hebrew Bible in the New Testament, along with Isaiah and the Psalms.[66] Moreover, some of the language of the summary statements in Acts is drawn directly from Deuteronomy, like the complementary couplet of "signs and wonders" in Acts 2:43, or "heart and soul" in Acts 4:32.[67] The combination of καρδία καὶ ψυχή is then a Deuteronomic phrase that evokes the notion of devotion to God.

---

[61] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 391.

[62] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 231; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 53; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 173; Williams, *Acts*, 92; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 313; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 206; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 206; Schnabel, *Acts*, 269; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1176-1177; Friedl, "The Reception of the Deuteronomic Social Law," 176-200.

[63] Deut 6:5, 10:12, 11:13, 13:3, 26:16, 30:2, 30:6, 30:10. For singleness of mind or heart see 1 Chron. 12:39, 2 Chron. 30:12, Jer. 32:39. Likewise, Ezekiel 36:26 speaks of a new heart and a new spirit.

[64] Deut 6:5 NRSV.

[65] Friedl, "The Reception of the Deuteronomic Social Law," 176-200. Friedl's claim that exegetes do not consider the Deuteronomic influences of Acts 4:32 is suspect. For scholars that consider Deuteronomic influences see Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 231; Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 53; Kistemaker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 173; Williams, *Acts*, 92; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 313; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 206; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 206; Schnabel, *Acts*, 269; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1176-1177.

[66] Friedl, "The Reception of the Deuteronomic Social Law," 178. For the Isaianic influences on the early Jesus community, see Brandt Van Roekel, "Evidences of Isaianic Social Justice Restoration in the Early Community of Luke-Acts" (MTh diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016).

[67] Friedl, "The Reception of the Deuteronomic Social Law," 185, 187.

Luke then fuses this allusion to the Deuteronomic ideal with Greek friendship ideals.[68] Although the combination of καρδία καὶ ψυχή is not used together often in the friendship literature, the claim to have one heart (or one soul or one mind or even one body) was common in the context of friendship.[69] For example, Euripides (480-406 B.C.E.) in *Orestes* (408 B.C.E.) shows Electra and Orestes as being, "one in soul" (ψυχὴ μία).[70] Likewise, Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E.) states that a friend is, "A single soul (μία ψυχή) dwelling in two bodies."[71] Keener notes that oneness of heart or soul is found sparingly in other contexts, like marriage, the army, the city or the state, although this ideal is most common in the context of friendship.[72] The phrase καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία is a combination of the Deuteronomic couplet of "heart and soul" with the friendship ideal of "one heart."[73]

In this opening phrase of the second summary statement, Luke introduces Jewish and Greek ideals that will be alluded to later in the passage, while also commenting on the unity of the early Jesus community. The variants at the end of this phrase further reinforce the unity of the early Jesus community. Bruce M. Metzger notes that Codex D adds "and there was no quarrel among them at all" (καὶ οὐκ ἦν διάκιρισις ἐν αὐτῖς οὐδεμία) while Codex E substitutes quarrel (διάκιρισις) for division (χωρισμός).[74] In summary, the community of believers having one heart and soul introduces both Deuteronomic and friendship ideals, fusing them in the phrase καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία, to indicate the unity of the early Jesus community.

There are three indications that this unity derives from the status-transcending attribute of the gift of the Spirit. First, as noted in the previous section (11.1), the usual divisions between people were not present because of the equal endowment of the gift of the Spirit. There was no division, but rather there was unity because God gave the same gift of the Spirit to all. Second, if all the actions to which the community devoted themselves continually with ὁμοθυμαδόν (one mind) were Spirit-empowered, then by extension, this devotion and one-mindedness is influenced by the gift of the Spirit. Third, the influence of the gift of the Spirit is clearest in Acts 4:32, as the refrain καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία (one heart and soul) is found in the context of the description of the communal sharing, which I have already argued is founded on and motivated by the gift of the Spirit (Chapter Ten). The

---

[68] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 231; Marshall, *Acts*, 115; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 86; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 253; Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 63; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 206; Bock, *Acts*, 213; Chance, *Acts*, 80; Pervo, *Acts*, 127; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 204; Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1176.

[69] Euripides, *Orestes*, 1046; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1168B; *Eudemian Ethics*, 1240B; Cicero, *De Amicitia*, 21.81; 25.92; *De Officiis*, 1.17.56 (citing Pythagoras); Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love*, 21.9; *Moralia*, 967E; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 5.1.20 (citing Aristotle).

[70] Euripides, *Orestes*, 1046 (Kovacs, LCL).

[71] "μία ψυχὴ δύο σώμασιν ἐνοικοῦσα," Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Volume 1*, 5.1.20 (Hicks, LCL).

[72] Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1176.

[73] Kraybill and Sweetland, "Possessions in Luke-Acts," 234; Pervo, *Acts*, 127.

[74] Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 325.

use of καί at the end of Acts 4:32a (after μία) indicates a connection between having one heart and soul to the sharing of possessions. In summary, this unity of the early Jesus community, evidenced by Luke's use of ὁμοθυμαδόν and καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία, is empowered by the gift of the Spirit.

11.3 Sharing All Things

In this final section, I examine Luke's use of "all things in common" (ἅπαντα κοινά) in Acts 2:44, 4:32, arguing that it evokes an equality-making attribute, which for Luke is the gift of the Spirit. The use of the specific phrase ἅπαντα κοινά and the inverse order κοινὰ πάντα is quite rare in the Greek literature.[75] Noting this point, scholars argue that Luke's use of ἅπαντα κοινά in both Acts 2:44 and Acts 4:32 is comparable with the aphorism κοινὰ τὰ φίλων (friends have all things in common).[76] The aphorism κοινὰ τὰ φίλων is used widely in the Greco-Roman world, and by the 1st century CE would have been a common aphorism.[77]

This connection has led scholars to see Luke referring to two different ideals in his use of ἅπαντα κοινά, which are: friendship ideals,[78] and utopian ideals.[79] These ideals should not be seen as antithetical, as Hays notes that, "friendship maxims and ideology *undergird* philosophical ethics and social utopianism. It is not an either/or question, but rather an issue of *in what way* Luke's appeals to friendship relate to his rosy depiction of Christian sharing."[80] Friendship and utopian ideals are not

---

[75] For ἅπαντα κοινά see Galen, *Hygiene*, 131, 326; Alciphron, *Letters*, 1.7. For κοινὰ πάντα see Plato, *Sophist*, 264E; Aristotle, *Politics*, 1264A15; Strabo, *Geography*, 7.3.9; Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 2.5.34.

[76] Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 231, 233; Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 23, 36; Krodel, *Acts*, 95; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 59; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 168-169, 253-154; Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 63-64; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 313; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 162-163; Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 81; Bock, *Acts*, 153; Parsons, *Acts*, 48; Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 162; Pervo, *Acts*, 90-91; Schnabel, *Acts*, 181-182; Kari-Shane David Zimmerman, "Neither Social Revolution nor Utopian Ideal: A Fresh Look at Luke's Community of Goods Practice for Christian Economic Reflection in Acts 4:32-35," *The Heythrop Journal* 53 (2012): 777; Keener, *Acts*, 1, 1017-1019.

[77] Pythagoras, *Testimonia: Institution*, T2; Euripides, *Andromache*, 376-377; *Orestes*, 735; *Phoenician Women*, 243; Plato, *Critias*, 110CD; *Laws*, 5.739BC; *Lysis*, 207C; *Phaedrus*, 279C; *Republic*, 4.424A; 5.449C; Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics*, 1237B34, 1238A17; *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1159B31, 1168B6-7; *Politics*, 1263A31; Philo, *Moses 1 and 2*, 156; *On Abraham*, 235; Martial, *Epigrams*, 2.43.1, 2.43.16; Plutarch, *Moralia*, 65A, 490E, 664D, 743E, 767E, 1102F; Dio Chrysostom, *On Kingship*, 110; *The Corinthian Discourse*, 7; Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 8A; Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortation to the Greeks*, 9.94; Alciphron, *Letters*, 2.12; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 4.7.53, 6.2.37, 6.2.72, 8.1.10, 10.1.11; Julian, *To Sallust*, 245A. For the Latin equivalent, see Terence, *The Brothers*, 804; Cicero, *De Officiis*, 1.16.51; Cornelius Nepos, *Epaminondas*, 15.3.4-5; Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, 7.12.1, *Epistles*, 48.3.

[78] Krodel, *Acts*, 117; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 59; Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, 168; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 313; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 162; Stegemann and Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, 278; Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 81; Bock, *Acts*, 153; Parsons, *Acts*, 48; Hume, *The Early Christian Community*; Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship."

[79] Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 24; Mealand, "Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions," 97; Sterling, "Athletes of Virtue," 679-696; Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 162; Dupertuis, "The Summaries of Acts," 275-295; Parsons, *Acts*, 72; Pervo, *Acts*, 90-91; Noble, "Common Property."

[80] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 210. Emphasis original. See also Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 162-162; Parsons, *Acts*, 72; Pervo, *Acts*, 90-91.

antithetical, but rather ancient authors built utopian visions upon the desire for a society of friends. In this section, I elucidate what I see broadly as two different uses of κοινὰ τὰ φίλων, both of which revolve around a distinctive attribute (11.3.1). Second, I will connect Luke's use of ἅπαντα κοινά with the gift of the Spirit, arguing that it is the gift of the Spirit that is the basis of ἅπαντα κοινά (11.3.2).

11.3.1 κοινὰ τὰ φίλων in the Primary Sources

In examining the use of κοινὰ τὰ φίλων in the primary sources, I see primary sources using this aphorism in two different ways. The first is the default position, which authors use in discussions concerning friendship, where the status of the friends is relatively equal.[81] I note that this is the *default position*, as status was the normal way to judge people in the Greco-Roman world.[82] The equality of status is the determining factor as to who can ἅπαντα κοινά. Typical of this position is Pythagoras (570-495 B.C.E.) who is the credited as being the creator of the maxim κοινὰ τὰ φίλων as well as a second maxim, φιλίαν ἰσότητα (friendship is equality).[83] The combination of these two maxims indicates that equality (ἰσότητα) of status is the basis for communal sharing.

This use of κοινὰ τὰ φίλων reflects the typical conventions of both Greek and Roman friendship, which evoked considerations of communal sharing within and not across status divisions. The Greek and Roman conceptions of friendship had at their core an equality of status.[84] Greco-Roman writers connect the equality of status to the cultivation of virtue and the ability to return gifts, with relationships of unequal partners easily sliding into relationships of exploitation and dependence.[85] In

---

[81] Pythagoras, *Testimonia: Institution*, T2; Euripides, *Andromache*, 376-377; *Orestes*, 735; *Phoenician Women*, 243; Plato, *Lysis*, 207C; *Phaedrus*, 279C; Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics*, 1237B34, 1238A17; Martial, *Epigrams*, 2.43.1, 2.43.16; Plutarch, *Moralia*, 65A, 490E, 644D, 743E; Dio Chrysostom, *On Kingship*, 110; *The Corinthian Discourse*, 7; Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 8A; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 4.7.53; 8.1.10, 10.1.11; Julian, *To Sallust*, 245A; Alciphron, *Letters*, 1.7.

[82] Malina, *The New Testament World*, passim; Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, 20-22, 53-55.

[83] Pythagoras, *Testimonia: Institution*, T2; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 8.1.10; 10.1.11.

[84] Both Greek and Roman friendship had five key characteristics; ἰσότης (equality), χάρις (gratitude/gifts), κοινωνία (unity), εὔνοια (goodwill) and παρρησία (frankness), see Crook, "Fictive Giftship and Fictive Friendship," 69. For the five Roman equivalent characteristics see David Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 122-123; Peter A. Brunt, "'Amicitia' in the Late Roman Republic," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 11 (1965): 3. The equality of status was paramount for friendship because the ability for a person to acquire material goods or services is connected to status, and so status was an indicator of a person's ability to reciprocate. The equal ability of friends to acquire goods and/or services leads to a lack of indebtedness, control or power of one friend over the other. This equality then leads to frankness, which is not possible in other asymmetrical relationships. Likewise, the sociability of exchanging gifts, without a growing indebtedness leads to unity between the friends. Finally, because honour was not necessarily the counter-gift for giving in friendship, the exchange was not agonistic but instead based on goodwill. From the combination of equality and reciprocity flows the other characteristics of friendship.

[85] Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 53.

this context of equality of status, the use of κοινὰ τὰ φίλων reflects a sharing of the material and immaterial within and not across status divisions.

The second way that ancient authors use κοινὰ τὰ φίλων, often in conjunction with utopian depictions or primitivism, is with an attribute other than status.[86] In this use of κοινὰ τὰ φίλων, there is an invocation of a higher attribute that transcends the social considerations of status. For example, in the *Republic* (380 B.C.E.), Plato (428-348 B.C.E.) argues that a shared education and a shared upbringing could create a generation of decent human beings that could κοινὰ τὰ φίλων.[87] Likewise, Aristotle in *Nicomachean Ethics* (340 B.C.E.) notes the following,

> For in every partnership (κοινωνία) we find mutual rights of some sort, and also a friendly feeling: one notes that shipmates and fellow-soldiers speak of each other as 'my friend,' and so in fact do the partners in any joint undertaking (κοινωνίαις). But their friendship is limited to the extent of their association in their common business (κοινωνοῦσιν). Again, the proverb says 'Friends' goods are common property,' and this is correct, since community (κοινωνία) is the essence of friendship.[88]

A shared enterprise or shared mission helps soldiers or business partners have everything in common, and as such, these partners transcend usual conventions of status. Similarly, in a fictional letter attributed to Alciphron,[89] a farmer requests an exchange of wine jars for baskets and quite slyly adds, "The old saying, 'Friends have all things in common,' ought to be at home in the country, if anywhere."[90] The implication of this use of κοινὰ τὰ φίλων is that shared geography should encourage the sharing of materials. These examples show that when an author invokes an attribute that transcends status, the friendship aphorism κοινὰ τὰ φίλων abandons the usual status considerations and enables sharing across status divisions.

Invoking an attribute higher than status can be taken to the extreme when authors discuss friendship with the gods.[91] For example, the attribute of wisdom can lead to all things belonging to the wise, as

---

[86] Plato, *Critias*, 110CD; *Laws*, 5.739BC; *Republic*, 4.424A; 5.449C; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1159B31; 1168B6-7; *Politics*, 1263A31; Philo, *Moses 1 and 2*, 156; *On Abraham*, 235; Plutarch, *Moralia*, 767E, 1102F; Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortation to the Greeks*, 9.94; Alciphron, *Letters*, 2.12; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 6.2.37, 6.2.72.

[87] Plato, *Republic*, 424A.

[88] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1159B1131.

[89] Dated in the 2nd to 3rd century CE by M. B. Trapp, "Alciphron," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 53.

[90] Alciphron, *The Letters*, 2.12 (Benner & Fobes, LCL).. Similarly, Strabo notes of the Scythians that their savagery and primitive nature was the foundation of their frugal living of which they held all things in common (κοινὰ πάντα) see Strabo, *Geography*, 7.3.9.

[91] Philo, *Moses 1 and 2*, 156; *On Abraham*, 235; Plutarch, *Moralia*, 1102F; Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortation to the Greeks*, 9.94; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 6.2.37, 6.2.72.

Diogenes (412-323 B.C.E.) says, "All things belong to the gods. The wise are friends of the gods, and friends hold things in common. Therefore all things belong to the wise."[92] Although humans are not equals with the gods in status, the shared attribute of wisdom between the gods and wise humans leads to wise humans having all things.

In summary, the aphorism κοινὰ τὰ φίλων is used broadly in two different contexts. First, κοινὰ τὰ φίλων is used in the context of friendship, where possessions are held in common only within and not across status divisions. Second, the primary sources use this aphorism in the context of a different attribute, where another attribute transcends the usual status considerations. These commonalities vary as Plato speaks of a shared education and upbringing, Aristotle of a shared mission or enterprise, and Alciphron of a shared locality.

Returning to Luke's use of ἅπαντα κοινά in the summary statements, I see Luke using the friendship aphorism in this second way, invoking a higher attribute which transcends the consideration of status. The effect of this invocation is quite clear, as Mitchell states, "Luke's appeal to friendship challenges the reciprocity ethic. He does this by suggesting how Lucan Christians can become friends across status divisions, thereby suspending the normal conventions of friendship in their day."[93] Mitchell, along with other scholars, helpfully notes that Luke uses this friendship aphorism to indicate that the more affluent members of the early Jesus community should share with their material possessions with those that are needy within the community.[94]

11.3.2 The Gift of the Spirit and ἅπαντα κοινά

In light of the previous two sections, the status-transcending attribute that enables the ἅπαντα κοινά across status divisions for Luke the gift of the Spirit. As feminist scholarship on the Joel quotation in Acts 2:17-21 has argued, Luke portrays the Spirit as the commonality that transcends gender, laying the foundations for an egalitarian community. However, as far as I have read, no feminist scholar has connected this "common Spirit" with ἅπαντα κοινά in Acts 2:44 and 4:32. That is, this "common Spirit" leads to male and female believers having "all things in common" in the early Jesus community. Likewise, Kuecker's research is very helpful in seeing the gift of the Spirit as transcending yet affirming the various regional identities noted in Acts 2:8-11, however he does not connect this with Luke's use of ἅπαντα κοινά. In the opening chapters of Acts, Luke portrays the

---

[92] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Volume 2*, 6.2.37 (Hicks, LCL).
[93] Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship," 259.
[94] Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship," 259; Zimmerman, "Neither Social Revolution nor Utopian Ideal," 777.

gift of the Spirit as the status-transcending attribute of the early Jesus community, which enables the communal sharing across the status division of gender, class, age and regional identities.

While narratively removed from the uses of ἅπαντα κοινά in Acts 2:44 and 4:32, Luke does create a literary link between the ἅπαντα κοινά and the Cornelius episode through the use of ἴσην (same/equal) in Acts 11:17. In justifying his decision to baptise the Cornelius household, the Lukan Peter recounts the coming of the Spirit, and says in Acts 11:17a, "then if God gave the same gift to them as [was given to] us..." (εἰ οὖν τὴν ἴσην δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν). In this first half of the Acts 11:17, Luke connects the gift of God with the adjectival form of ἴσος. Ἴσος is used only once elsewhere in Luke/Acts in Luke 6:34, where sinners lend to sinners and expect an equal (ἴσα) return. In the wider New Testament, the use of ἴσος is rare (Matt 20:12, Mark 14:56, 14:59, John 5:18, Phil 2:6, Rev 21:16), with John 5:18 and Phil 2:6 describing Jesus' equality with God.[95] The related ἰσότης is used twice by Paul (2 Cor 8:13; Col 4:1) and ἰσότιμος being found in 2 Peter 1:1. Scholars have noted the rare use of ἴσος and cognates in the New Testament, which makes Luke's use of ἴσος in Acts 11:17 striking.[96]

I see Luke here as making an implicit connection to the aphorism ἅπαντα κοινά in his use of ἴσος. While Greek writers use ἴσος in a broad range of contexts, it does have a distinctive use within the friendship tradition, and therefore a strong connection to κοινὰ τὰ φίλων.[97] As noted in section 11.3.1, Pythagoras famously had two sayings concerning friendship: κοινὰ τὰ φίλων (friends have all things in common) and φιλίαν ἰσότητα (friendship is equality).[98] Within the friendship tradition, Greek writers connect κοινὰ τὰ φίλων with ἴσος.

There is evidence that Luke is alluding to the friendship tradition in his use of ἴσος in Acts 11:17. When speaking of sameness in other contexts, Luke most commonly uses the intensive pronoun αὐτός as an identifying adjective (Luke 2:8, 6:33, 10:7, 10:21, 23:40, 24:33; Acts 15:27),[99] yet when

---

[95] Matt 20:12 describes the equal (ἴσους) payment of the workers in the parable of the vineyard, Mark 14:56 and 14:59 describes the witnesses at Jesus' trial not being the same, and Rev 21:16 uses ἴσος in the context of measurements of the New Jerusalem.

[96] Elliott, "Jesus Was Not an Egalitarian," 78; Beavis, "Christian Origins," 35. Seccombe notes the absence of ἰσότης in the three summary statements could indicate that Luke is not concerned with equality among the early Jerusalem church, see David Peter Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*, ed. Albert Fuchs, SNTSU, (Linz: A. Fuchs, 1982), 209. Yet, as Mitchell notes, the allusions to the friendship tradition and the language of unity gets the concept of equality across without the need for the use of ἰσότης Mitchell, "Greet the Friends by Name," 250. Neither note the use of ἴσος in Acts 11:17.

[97] For ἴσος in the friendship tradition, see Crook, "Fictive Giftship and Fictive Friendship," 69. And for the Latin equivalent in the Roman friendship tradition see Brunt, "'Amicitia' in the Late Roman Republic," 3; Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World*, 122-123.

[98] Pythagoras, *Testimonia: Institution*, T2; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 8.1.10; 10.1.11. Interestingly, the LXX version of Deuteronomy 13:6 uses a similar phrase, as it warns against letting ὁ φίλος ὁ ἴσος (closest friends) lead you to worship idols. Noted by Mitchell, "Greet the Friends by Name," 252.

[99] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 348-350. Elsewhere, Luke uses the demonstrative adverb οὗτος in Acts 1:11 and the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος in Acts 16:33.

speaking of the "same gift" in Acts 11:17, Luke prefers the adjectival form of ἴσος. As Luke has described the early community as reaching the ideals of friendship (ἅπαντα κοινὰ, μία καρδία), when arguing that Gentiles should be able to join this community of friends, the Lukan Peter uses ἴσος, which has a distinctive use in the friendship tradition. When commenting on Acts 11:17 Keener notes that "The use [of ἴσην] in friendship texts might be significant for Luke's larger vision of an international, multicultural movement under Jesus' lordship."[100] I see Luke in Acts 11:17 implicitly connecting the equality (sameness) that derives from the equal endowment of the gift of the Spirit with membership in the early Jesus community, and therefore with ἅπαντα κοινά.[101]

11.3.3 Summary

In this section, I have argued that the use of ἅπαντα κοινά alludes to the friendship aphorism κοινὰ τὰ φίλων, which, in some contexts, invokes the concept of a status-transcending attribute. This attribute is the gift of the Spirit, and so, it is the equal endowment of the gift of the Spirit that enables the sharing of all things across gender, age, class, and regional identities. Moreover, in the retelling of the Cornelius episode, the Lukan Peter invokes this friendship aphorism in his use of ἴσος in Acts 11:17. It is the gift of the Spirit, according to Luke, that creates this community that can share all things across common status divisions.[102]

11.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that the gift of the Spirit influences the unity of the early Jesus community, and one of the major expressions of this unity, the sharing of all things. In the opening chapters of Acts, Luke indicates that the gift of the Spirit is given to all, no matter the gender, class, age or regional identity. Moreover, the Cornelius episode establishes that the Gentiles are incorporated into the early Jesus community, as God has given them the same Spirit as was given to the believers at Pentecost. This equal endowment of the Spirit produces a remarkable unity, displayed

---

[100] Keener, *Acts*, 2, 1826. Keener does connect this use of ἴσος with the Acts 2:44-45.
[101] Interestingly, Gustav Stählin, "ἴσος," in *TDNT*, 348, connects ἴσος with Acts 2:44, 4:36.
[102] It is worth highlighting at this point that the early Jesus community did not always live up to this ideal, as shown by the complaints from the Hellenist widows in Acts 6:1-6. There are two things to note about Acts 6:1-6. First, the complaint is heard, and a solution reached, which indicates that the community realized they were not living up to the ideal that Luke describes and sought to rectify it. Second, we should distinguish between the Lukan ideal, that there be communal sharing across regional/ethnic divisions, and the historical reality that this ideal was not always met by the early Jesus community. The ideal is sharing all things across regional and ethnic divisions, although this ideal was not attained.

in the praxis and praise of the early Jesus community, and sets the foundation for the "sharing of all things" across the usual status divisions.

This chapter then finishes the argument connecting the gift of the Spirit with the community life depicted in the summary statements. In the following conclusion, I summarise the findings of this thesis, note the contribution of this thesis, suggest areas of further research and comment on the implications this thesis has for Pentecostal pneumatology.

Conclusion

In this thesis, I have elucidated the Spirit as gift in Acts, arguing that this description of gift implies the establishment and maintenance of relationships, epitomized in the concept of sociability. This sociability is shown in Luke's portrayal of the Spirit empowering the community life as described by the three summary statements. This empowering leads us to see the Spirit as establishing and sustaining the early Jesus community. By designating the Spirit as gift, Luke indicates that the early Jesus community was initiated and sustained by the Holy Spirit. The gift of the Spirit is not just an individual empowerment, but also a collective experience and a significant influence in community cohesion.

I have reached this conclusion by understanding the Spirit as gift in Acts against the backdrop of the Greco-Roman world's understanding of gift-giving, which implies an inherent sociability. Previous gift-giving models used by biblical scholars tend to categorise gift-giving by its reciprocity, while John M. G. Barclay has re-examined these gift-giving models emphasising the reciprocity and sociability of gift-giving. In this thesis, I have returned to the sociological literature on gift-giving, examining the works of Mauss, Levi-Strauss, Bourdieu, Derrida, Caillé and Godbout. Examining the work of these scholars on gift-giving has shown that when the focus of gift-giving is reciprocity, gifts become redundant transactions (Levi-Strauss), an *illusio* (Bourdieu) or the impossible (Derrida). Caillé and Godbout argue that rather than reciprocity, it is sociability that should be our focus when examining gift-giving, as gifts create or sustain social relationships. Gifts are the physical manifestation and symbolic representation of personal relationships.

From this work in the sociological literature, I have tested this insight in the Greco-Roman world, focussing on the use of δωρεά in the Greek literature and *beneficiis* in Latin literature. For δωρεά, I have noted that this gift or reward most commonly given from a general to his soldier to secure the soldiers allegiance or loyalty. Likewise, for *beneficiis* in Latin literature, I showed that gifts were understood as the bond of mutual harmony, the chief bond of society and that gifts bind people together. Therefore, I concluded that a "gift" was the symbolic embodiment and physical manifestation of personal relations, or more simply, gifts create and sustain social ties.

This understanding on the sociability of gift-giving then leads to a question: What type of personal relationship does Luke portray as being initiated and sustained by God giving the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost? I have argued that this sociability inherent in the description of the Spirit as gift is manifested in the Spirit's empowerment of the community life described in the three major summary

statements. Therefore, Luke's description of the Spirit as gift leads us to consider the Spirit empowerment of the early Jesus community.

I have notes that previous scholarship has established that the witnessing (Acts 4:33), signs and wonders (Acts 2:43, 5:12-16), and great joy (Acts 2:46) of the early Jesus community was directly empowered by the gift of the Spirit. With these three, I have argued that we should include a third, the teaching of the apostles (Acts 2:42). In the opening chapters of Acts, Luke portrays the apostles as teaching in public spaces and Luke connects teaching with the Spirit-empowered preaching and proclaiming in complementary couplets. Moreover, Luke portrays the Spirit as inspiring the reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible, which occurs during the teaching of Paul (Acts 13:12). I have then argued that there are four areas of the community life of the early Jesus community that is directly empowered by the Spirit: their witnessing, their teaching, their signs and wonders, and their great joy.

A pivotal moment in the gift-giving cycle is the expression of gratitude for a gift received, and so we should expect to see the early Jesus community express gratitude for the gift of the Spirit. I have argued that in their prayer and their praise, the early Jesus community express gratitude for receiving the gift of the Spirit. Moreover, in the wider Greco-Roman world, prayer could function as a method of requesting divine benefactions, and so following the implications of Luke 11:13, I have argued that the prayer of the early Jesus community also functioned as a method for requesting the empowerment of the gift of the Spirit.

I have also connected the communal sharing, sharing of meals and the unity of the early Jesus community to the influence of the gift of the Spirit. I have argued that the communal sharing of the early Jesus community imitates the way that God gives and distributes the Spirit as gift. Likewise, as the Lukan Jesus promises eschatological rewards for generosity, so Luke portrays the Spirit as the pre-emptive eschatological reward for the generous communal sharing of the early Jesus community. The sharing of meals, as a practical expression of the communal sharing, is also influenced by the gift of the Spirit, as those that administer the shared meals are required to be full of the Spirit and these meals are shared with a Spirit-empowered great joy. Finally, the gift of the Spirit functions as a status-transcending attribute that is the basis for the remarkable unity of the early Jesus community and the sharing of all things in common. The gift of the Spirit affects every area of life for the early Jesus community, in both their praxis and their worship.

Other scholars have come to similar conclusions, including the work of Matthias Wenk and Aaron J. Kuecker.[1] Wenk examines the theme of the restoration of Israel and the Spirit role in this restoration in Luke-Acts, noting of the summary statements that "the Spirit lies at the heart of the renewed community's life."[2] For Wenk, the Spirit is the "community-forming power" of the early Jesus community, which was promised in the Hebrew Bible and initiated by the proclamation of the gospel.[3] Likewise, Kuecker addresses the Spirit's role in identity formation in Luke-Acts, noting that the summary statements portray the early Jesus community as "both the logical extension and the corporate expression of the Spirit-empowered allocentric [outward focussed] identity."[4] This thesis stands in agreement with their conclusions, while offering new arguments to support this conclusion.

Perhaps another apt description for Luke's portrayal of the early Jesus community, is that this whole community, not just individuals, are baptised in the Holy Spirit. That is, the Spirit is so intimately and thoroughly present within this community, affecting every aspect that Luke lists in the summary statements, that this community is immersed, saturated, baptised in the gift of the Spirit. Put another way, the Spirit as gift is the socially creative power of the early Jesus community, binding the believers to one another, and to God. It is the gift of the Spirit that initiates and sustains the early Jesus community, empowering a deep sociability between believers and between the community and God.

The Contribution of this Thesis

In this thesis, I have made six contributions to the understanding of the Spirit in Acts through focussing on the description of the Spirit as gift.

1. I have argued that the Holy Spirit is the basis for the sociability of the early Jesus community, which Luke indicates in the description of the Spirit as gift. This description indicates that the gift of the Spirit is the way the early Jesus community is initiated and sustained.
2. I have incorporated the perspectives of Caillé and Godbout on gifts, further building upon the work of Barclay, in order to emphasise the sociability of gift-giving.
3. I have argued that the teaching of the apostles is a Spirit-empowered activity. Specifically drawing upon Levison's arguments surrounding Acts 13:1-12, I have connected the Spirit-

---

[1] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*. See also Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*.
[2] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 313.
[3] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*.
[4] Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other'*, 218.

empowered words of Paul in this passage to the "teaching of the Lord" (Acts 13:1-12).[5] This offers a new argument for the Spirit's empowerment of the teaching of the apostles in Acts.

4. Offering a new perspective on the prayer and praise of the early Jesus community, I have argued that prayer and praise was an expression of gratitude in response to divine benefactions, which included the gift of the Spirit.

5. I have added four new arguments for connecting the gift of the Spirit with the communal sharing of the early followers of Jesus:

   a. Luke designates the Spirit as gift (Acts 2:38), and this designation shapes our understanding of the communal sharing of 'gifts' (property and possessions) among the early Jesus community described six verses later (Acts 2:44-45). Moreover, Luke describes great grace being upon the community because of their care for the needy. This indicates the divine and human realms are interconnected.

   b. The early followers of Jesus imitate the gift of the Spirit in the communal sharing, while also imitating the distribution of the Spirit in their distribution of gifts.

   c. The gift of the Spirit fulfils the promise of reward found in the Lukan Jesus' teachings on the proper use of wealth, as the Spirit can be understood as a pre-emptive eschatological reward for generous gift-giving.

   d. The having of "all things in common" is enabled by the status transcending function of the equal endowment of the gift of the Spirit.

6. I have also brought new insights to the teaching of the Lukan Jesus in Luke 6:27-38. I have argued that the Lukan Jesus moves the focus on gift-giving from reciprocity to sociability, as those that give generously imitate God and are known as children of God.

These six contributions show the fruitfulness of a social-scientific approach to the Spirit as gift, and open up new areas of research, which I will now address.

Areas of Further Research

In this thesis, I have incorporated insights from three different areas of scholarship, which are: the Spirit in Acts, gift-giving in the New Testament, and Lukan depiction of the community life in the summary statements. This thesis is an intersection of these three areas of scholarship, which have rarely crossed paths, but do offer fruitful areas for further research. First, this thesis is primarily focussed on the Spirit in Acts, seeking to elucidate the Spirit as gift. There is still further research that

---

[5] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 353-354.

could be explored in the metaphor of the Spirit as gift. I have focussed on one aspect of the Spirit as gift, its sociability. To take three of Barclay's six main aspects of a gift, further research could be done on the singularity, superabundance, and efficacy of the Spirit as gift.

Moreover, this thesis has drawn significantly on the wider Greco-Roman world to inform this elucidation of the Spirit as gift. This does seem to be a growing trend in Lukan pneumatology (as well as Pauline and Johannine pneumatology) and could offer some interesting research pathways (see section 4.2.1 for fuller discussion). For example, one possible application of the wider Greco-Roman world to the Spirit in Acts is in the area of speech. Rhetoric was a powerful and formidable tool in the Greco-Roman world, and a great deal of biblical scholarship is now focussing on the various conventions and beliefs surrounding rhetoric. What is the significance of the Spirit empowering the speech and the rhetoric of the early believers? How would a Gentile audience perceive God's empowering the early believers' speech and rhetoric? Most scholarship on this question has focussed solely on "inspired speech" but a broader approach, informed by both the Hebrew Bible and the role of rhetoric in the broader Greco-Roman world, could be fruitful.

The Greco-Roman world as an interpretive context, and in particular the Stoic understanding of πνεῦμα, does offer an interesting further area of research for the Spirit in Acts. The Stoic understanding of πνεῦμα has been explored by New Testament pneumatologists (see section 4.2.1), and these insights could be applied to the Spirit in Acts to see if there are any parallels between the two understandings of πνεῦμα. These are many of the interesting research pathways that could be explored, using the Greco-Roman world as an interpretive context.

There is still another interesting research pathway in the topic of the Spirit in Luke-Acts that this thesis has uncovered. I have argued that one of the most common contexts for δωρεά in the broader Greco-Roman world is militaristic, that is, a reward or the spoils of war from a general to his soldiers. It seems quite unusual for Luke to use such a militaristic term to describe God empowering of the believers at Pentecost. There are many interesting questions here. Does this use of δωρεά have any significance for Luke's conception of the coming of the kingdom of God (another concept with militaristic aspects in Luke-Acts) at Pentecost? Is Luke portraying the Spirit as the reward of the exalted Christ after his victory and plunder of hell in Acts 2:38? What is the significance of the δωρεά of the Spirit being given to a Roman centurion in Acts 10:45? Would Cornelius' acceptance of the δωρεά of God be scandalous, betraying an implied previous δωρεά of Rome and Caesar? These are fascinating research pathways that could be explored.

The second area of scholarship that this thesis has engaged with the scholarship on gift-giving in the New Testament. The vast majority of biblical scholarship focussing on gift-giving in the New

Testament has gravitated towards Pauline literature, with a few significant monographs on gift-giving in the Gospel of Luke and James.[6] In this thesis, I have noted that more attention should be given to the social aspects of gift-giving, as defining a gift by its reciprocity leads to an economistic understanding of gift-giving and treating gifts like veiled commodities. This insight on the inherent sociability of gift-giving developed from the work of Caillé and Godbout could open up fruitful re-examinations of gift-giving in the New Testament, with a focus not on reciprocity but sociability. The modified gift theory that I developed in this thesis could be used to further highlight the social implications of gift-giving or refusing to give. For example, does the Corinthians' hesitancy towards giving to the Jerusalem collection equate to *a refusal of a relationship* with the church in Jerusalem? There is still further research to be done in the area of gift-giving in the New Testament with a focus on the sociability inherent within a gift.

The third area of scholarship that this thesis has addressed in some detail is Luke's depiction of the community life as described in the opening chapters of Acts. I have shown that if we are to speak of the content of the summary statements, then we must consider the influence that the gift of the Spirit has on the community life. For example, I gave considerable attention to considering the effect that the gift of the Spirit had on the early Jesus communities communal sharing. I have shown that some of the disconnect that scholars note between the Gospel of Luke and Acts on the topic of wealth can be resolved by considering the role of the Spirit as gift. The gift of the Spirit can be considered a pre-emptive eschatological reward for the generous gift-giving of the early Jesus community, fulfilling the teaching of the Lukan Jesus. To date, no scholar approaching the topic of wealth in the Luke-Acts has significantly engaged with the Spirit as gift, and the effect that this description has on the theme of wealth in Luke-Acts. There are still further research pathways in considering the role that Luke's depiction of the Spirit as gift has upon the discussions on wealth in Luke/Acts.

Implications for Pentecostal Pneumatology

As the opening chapters of Acts are central to a Pentecostal's self-understanding and as I am a Pentecostal, it is also worth situating my findings within the theological reflection of Pentecostal pneumatology. One clear theological implication of this thesis that I will explore here is the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Church. I would like to highlight the theological

---

[6] For gift-giving in Pauline literature see section 4.2.2, in the Gospel of Luke see for example Marshall, *Jesus, Patrons, and Benefactors*. For gift-giving in James see for example Alicia Batten, "God in the Letter of James: Patron or Benefactor?," in *The Social World of the New Testament*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey and Eric C. Stewart, (Peabody, MA: Baker Academic, 2008).

implications of this research by drawing upon the influential monograph by Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit* (2006), in which Macchia argues that "the church exists in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit."[7] For Macchia: "Spirit baptism gave rise to the global church and remains the very substance of the church's life in the Spirit, including its charismatic life and mission."[8] Macchia understands the giving of the Spirit at Pentecost as the birthing of the early community centred around Jesus, which became the church.

Macchia sees the connection between the gift of the Spirit and the church as implicit in the trinitarian origins of the gift of the Spirit. Macchia draws upon the understanding of the *perichoresis* of the Trinity, which Macchia describes as:

> … the Father shares the divine reign with the Son in order to discover it anew in him. Likewise, the Spirit as the bond of love between the Father and the Son is poured out from the Father through the Son in order that the Son's giving of the kingdom back to the Father may involve the redeemed creation as the dwelling place of God.[9]

The relational implications of the *perichoresis* between the three persons of the Trinity, is then manifested in Spirit baptism. As Macchia states: "Spirit baptism implies a triune life that is motivated by love, not only as an internal dynamic but externally toward the other."[10] As each person of the Trinity is motivated by love to the "other," so Spirit baptism leads to the believer to be outwardly focussed to love the "other." Therefore, the trinitarian origins of Spirit baptism, links this baptism with the formation and empowerment of the church.

This thesis adds to Macchia's understanding of Spirit baptism in two ways. First, while Macchia develops the connection between the Spirit and the church through a theological understanding – the *perichoresis* of the Trinity that is imitated in Spirit baptism – this thesis offers an additional exegetical basis for Macchia's argument. As the gift of the Spirit enables the very sociability of the early Jesus community, empowering each and every action of this community, so the trinitarian origins of the gift of the Spirit lead to the Spirit empowering every action within the community. My research offers a complementary exegetical evidence for the Spirit's role in the formation and empowerment of the

---

[7] Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 155. Quoting Ralph Del Colle, "The Outpouring of the Holy Spirit: Implications for the Church and Ecumenism," in *The Holy Spirit, the Church, and Christian Unity: Proceedings of the Consultation Held at the Monastery of Bose, Italy, 14-20 October, 2002*, ed. D. Donnelly, A. Denaux, and J. Famerée, (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 249.

[8] Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 155. I see Macchia's label of "Spirit baptism" as analogous with my label of "the gift of the Spirit."

[9] Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 159. Macchia (163) does note the critiques of this understanding of the Trinity.

[10] Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 161.

community in Acts 2-5, to Macchia's theological understanding of the connection between the Spirit and the church.

Second, I see my research as showing the gift of the Spirit having a similar function within the early Jesus community that Macchia notes the Spirit has within the Trinity. Within Pentecostalism, the gift of the Spirit is often individualised, as the empowerment for individuals to fulfil their unique God-given mission, which then contributes to the overall plan of God. Macchia has encouraged Pentecostals to see communal aspects of Spirit baptism when he states: "The relational dynamic of Spirit baptism is not merely between us as individuals and God, it is also a shared reality among us in God."[11] Macchia qualifies this point with the statement that: "Spirit baptism does not cause individuals when initiated into the church to become dissolved into a corporate *Geist* or spirit."[12] Macchia argues that Spirit baptism is both an individual empowerment and a communal experience.

With these two functions, I see a third, that the gift of the Spirit is the very binding force between believers. Macchia notes that the Spirit is the "bond of love between the Father and the Son," and in a similar way, I see my research showing the Spirit as gift within the early Jesus community as functioning as the "bond of love" between believers.[13] The gift of the Spirit is not only the empowerment of individuals or only a communal experience, but the gift of the Spirit is also the basis for the sociability between believers. The gift of the Spirit is the binding force between believers, the social creative power of the community, the bond of love between the followers of Jesus. The Spirit functions within the Trinity as the bond of love, and when understood as gift in Acts, we can see that the Spirit functions as the bond of love between believers. These are two initial implications that I see the findings of this research as having in the area of Pentecostal Pneumatology.

---

[11] Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 160.
[12] Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 166.
[13] Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 159.

Bibliography

Adler, N. *Das erste christliche Pfingstfest: Sinn und Bedeutung des Pfingstberichtes Apg 2:1-13*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1938.

Adloff, Frank, and Steffen Mau. "Giving Social Ties, Reciprocity in Modern Society." *European Journal of Sociology* 47, no. 1 (2006): 93-123.

Al-Suadi, Soham. "'Even before his birth he will be filled with the Holy Spirit': Luke 1:15 in the Spectrum of Theological and Medical Discourses of Early Christianity." In *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity*, edited by Jörg Frey and John R. Levison, 95-118. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017.

Alciphron. *The Letters*. Translated by A. R. Benner and F. H. Fobes. LCL 383. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. *Fin de Siécle Social Theory: Relativism, Reduction, and the Problem of Reason*. London: Verso, 1995.

Algazi, Gadi. "Some Problems with Reciprocity." *ÉNDOXA* 15 (2002): 43-50.

———. "Doing Things with Gifts." In *Negotiating the Gift: Pre-Modern Figuration of Exchange*, edited by Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner and Bernhard Jussen, 9-28. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.

Alvis, Jason W. *Marion and Derrida on The Gift and Desire: Debating the Generosity of Things*. Contributions To Phenomenology. Edited by Nicolas de Warren and Dermot Moran. Cham: Springer 2016.

Anderson, Charles. "Lukan Cosmology and the Ascension." In *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts: New Explorations of Luke's Narrative Hinge*, edited by David K. Bryan and David W. Pao, 175-212. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016.

Anderson, Gary A. *Charity: The Place of the Poor in the Biblical Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Appian. *The Civil Wars, Books 3.27-5*. Translated by Horace White. LCL 5. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913.

———. *The Hannibalic Book*. Translated by Brian McGing. LCL 2. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2019.

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL 73. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Arrington, French L. *The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction and Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.

Atkinson, William P. *Baptism in the Spirit: Luke-Acts and the Dunn Debate*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011.

Aune, David E. "Prayer in the Greco-Roman World." In *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Barclay, John M. G. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

Barrett, C. K. *Acts 1-14*. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 1994.

Bartchy, S. Scott. "Community of Goods in Acts: Idealization or Social Reality?". In *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, edited by Birger A. Pearson, 309-318. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Barton, Stephen C. "Historical Criticism and Social-Scientific Perspectives in New Testament Study." In *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, edited by Joel B. Green, 34-64. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Bataille, Georges. *The Accursed Share: An Essay on General Economy: Consumption*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Zone Books, 1988.

Batten, Alicia. "God in the Letter of James: Patron or Benefactor?". In *The Social World of the New Testament*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey and Eric C. Stewart, 47-61. Peabody, MA: Baker Academic, 2008.

Bauckham, Richard J. "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001*, edited by James R. Davila, 63-89. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Beavis, Mary Ann. "Christian Origins, Egalitarianism, and Utopia." *JFSR* 23, no. 2 (2007): 27-49.

Benoit, Pierre. "Remarques sur les 'Sommaires' de Actes 2.42 à 5." In *Aus Sources de la Tradition Chéretienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*, edited by J. J. von Allmen, 1-10. Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1950.

Bird, Michael F. "The Unity of Luke-Acts in Recent Discussion." *JSNT* 29, no. 4 (2007): 425-448.

Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 1st ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

Blois, Lukas de. "Army and General in the Late Roman Republic." In *A Companion to the Roman Army*, edited by Paul Erdkamp. 1st ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.

Blue, Bradley. "Acts and the House Church." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting: Graeco-Roman Setting*, edited by David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf. BAFCS, 119-222. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Bock, Darrell L. *Acts*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

———. *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Polity, 1990.

Bovon, François. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Translated by Christine M. Thomas. Hermeneia. Vol. 1, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.

———. *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51-19:27*. Translated by Donald S. Deer. Hermeneia. Vol. 2, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.

———. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950-2005)*. 2nd ed. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Brehm, H. Alan. "The Significance of the Summaries for Interpreting Acts." *SwJT* 33, no. 1 (1990): 29-40.

Briones, David E. *Paul's Financial Policy: A Socio-Theological Approach*. LNTS. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Briscoe, John. "Livy." In *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 852-853. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Brodersen, Kai. "Appian." In *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 126. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Brooten, Bernadette J. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Bakcground Issues*. Chicago: Scholars Press, 1982.

———. "Jewish Women's History in Roman Period: A Task for Christian Theology." *HTR* 79, no. 1 (1986): 22-30.

Brown, Schuyler. *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.

Bruce, F. F. *The Book of the Acts*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Brunt, Peter A. "'Amicitia' in the Late Roman Republic." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 11 (1965): 1-20.

———. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.

Buch-Hansen, Gitte. *'It is the Spirit that Gives Life': A Stoic Understanding of Pneuma in John's Gospel*. BZNW. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.

Büchsel, F. "δωρεά." In *TDNT*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, 2:166-173. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "ἀγαλλιάομαι." In *TDNT*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, 1:19-21. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Burkitt, F. C. "Professor Torrey on 'Acts'." *JTS* 20, no. 80 (1919): 320-329.

Cadbury, Henry J. "The Summaries in Acts." In *BegC*, 3, 392-402. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1933.

Caillé, Alain. *Critique de la raison utilitaire: Manifeste du MAUSS*. Paris: Éditions la Découverte, 1989.

———. *Don, intérêt et désintéressement*. Paris: La Découverte, 1994.

———. *Anthropologie du don: Le tiers paradigme*. Paris: Desclée, 2000.

———. "Gift and Association." In *Gifts and Interests*, edited by Antoon Vandevelde, 47-55. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

———. "The Double Inconceivability of the Pure Gift." *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities* 6, no. 2 (2001): 23-39.

———. "'Ce qu'on appelle si mal le don…' Que le don est de l'ordre du don malgré tout." *Revue du MAUSS* 2, no. 30 (2007): 393-404.

Camerer, Colin. "Gifts as Economic Signals and Social Symbols." *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (1988): S180-S214.

Camia, Francesco. "The Financing of Public Honours in Greece during the Roman Imperial Period: The Case of Honorary Statues in the Cities of the Greek Mainland." In *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, edited by Anna Heller and Onno M. van Nijf, 109-146. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Campbell, Brian. *The Emperor and the Roman Army 31 B.C.-A.D. 235*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.

Capper, Brian J. "Community of Goods in Early Jerusalem Church." *ANRW* 26.2:1730-1774. Part 2, *Religion*, 26.2. Edited by Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.

———. "The Palestinian Cultural Context of the Earliest Christian Community of Goods." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting: Palestinian Setting*, edited by Richard Bauckham. BAFCS, 323-356. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

———. "Reciprocity and the Ethic of Acts." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, edited by I. Howard Marshall and David G. Peterson, 499-518. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. "Holy Community of Life and Property Amongst the Poor: A Response to Steve Walton." *EQ* 80, no. 2 (2008): 113-127.

Carlà, Filippo, and Maja Gori. "Introduction." In *Gift Giving and the "Embedded" Economy in the Ancient World*, edited by Filippo Carlà and Maja Gori, 7-47. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2014.

Carroll, John T. *Luke: A Commentary*. The New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012.

Cerfaux, L. "La Composition de la Premiere Partie du Livre des Acts." *ETL* 13 (1936): 667-691.

Chambers, William Andy. "An Evaluation of Characteristic Activity in a Model Church as set forth by the Summary Narratives of Acts." PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1994.

Chance, J. Bradley. *Acts*. SHBC. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2007.

Chanial, Philippe. "Bourdieu, a Paradoxal "Inheritor"?". *Revue du MAUSS* 2, no. 36 (2010): 483-492.

Charette, Blaine. "'And Now for Something Completely Different': A 'Pythonic' Reading of Pentecost?". *Pneuma* 33, no. 1 (2011): 59-62.

Charlesworth, Martin P. "Some Observations on Ruler-Cult Especially in Rome." *HTR* 28, no. 1 (1935): 5-44.

Cheal, David. *The Gift Economy*. London: Routledge, 1988.

Cherlonneix, Jean-Louis. "Lettre ouverte a Marcel Mauss touchant le désintéressement, Jacques Derrida et l'esprit de Dieu." *Revue du MAUSS* 2, no. 2 (1993): 127-142.

Cho, Youngmo. *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul: An Attempt to Reconcile these Concepts*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005.

Cho, Youngmo, and Hyung Dae Park. *Acts, Part One: Introduction and Chapters 1-12*. New Covenant Commentary Series. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019.

Cicero. *On Duties*. Translated by Walter Miller. LCL 30. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913.

———. *On Ends*. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL 40. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914.

———. *Pro Plancio*. Translated by N. H. Watts. LCL 158. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1923.

Clarke, Andrew D., and J. Brian Tucker. "Social History and Social Theory in the Study of Social Identity." In *T&T Clark Handbook to Social Identity in the New Testament*, edited by J. Brian Tucker and C. A. Baker, 41-58. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.

Co, Maria Anicia. "The Major Summaries in Acts: Acts 2:42-47; 4:32-35; 5:12-16: Linguistic and Literary Relationships." *ETL* 68, no. 1 (1992): 49-85.

Colle, Ralph Del. "The Outpouring of the Holy Spirit: Implications for the Church and Ecumenism." In *The Holy Spirit, the Church, and Christian Unity: Proceedings of the Consultation Held at the Monastery of Bose, Italy, 14-20 October, 2002*, edited by D. Donnelly, A. Denaux and J. Famerée. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.

Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Crook, Zeba A. *Reconceptualising Conversion: Patronage, Loyalty, and Conversion in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*. BZNW. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.

———. "Reflections on Culture and Social-Scientific Models." *JBL* 124, no. 3 (2005): 515-520.

———. "Fictive Giftship and Fictive Friendship in Greco-Roman Society." In *Gift in Antiquity*, edited by Michael Satlow. Ancient World: Comparative Histories. New York: Wiley & Sons, 2013.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. "Theology in Mark and Q: Abba and 'Father' in Context." *HTR* 85, no. 2 (1992): 149-174.

Danker, Frederick W. *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*. St. Louis: Clayton, 1982.

———. *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

Dépelteau, François. "What is the Direction of the Relational Turn?". In *Conceptualizing Relational Sociology: Ontological and Theoretical Issues*, edited by Christopher Powell and François Dépelteau, 163-186. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Derrida, Jacques. *Given Time: 1. Counterfeit Money*. Translated by Peggy Kamuf. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Dibelius, Martin. *The Book of Acts: Form, Style, and Theology*. Translated by Mary Ling and Paul Schubert. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004.

Donati, Pierpaolo. *Relational Sociology: A New Paradigm for the Social Sciences*. London: Routledge, 2011.

Donlan, Walter. "Reciprocities in Homer." *CW* 75, no. 3 (1982): 137-175.

Douglas, Mary. "Foreword." In *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Scoieties*, edited by Marcel Mauss. New York: Norton, 1990.

Downs, David J. *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement in Early Christianity*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016.

Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

———. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Epworth Commentaries. London: Epworth, 1996.

———. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 2010.

Dupertuis, Rebén R. "The Summaries of Acts 2, 4, and 5 and Plato's Republic." In *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christianity and Jewish Narrative*, edited by J. A. A. Brant, C. W. Hedrick and C. Shea. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Edwards, James R. *The Gospel According to Luke*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

Elliott, John H. "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 211-240. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

———. *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?* Guides to Biblical Scholarship: New Testament Series. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

———. "On Wooing Crocodiles for Fun and Profit: Confessions of an Intact Admirer." In *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina*, edited by John J. Pilch. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

———. "Jesus Was Not an Egalitarian: A Critique of an Anachronistic and Idealist Theory." *BTB* 32, no. 2 (2002): 75-91.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Esler, Philip F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. SNTSMS. Cambridge: Cambridge Universtiy Press, 1987.

———. *The First Christians in their Social Worlds*. London: Routledge, 1994.

———. "Introduction: Models, Context and Kerygma in New Testament Interpretation." In *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*, edited by Philip F. Esler, 1-20. London: Routledge, 1995.

———. "Models in New Testament Interpretation." *JSNT* 22, no. 78 (2000): 107-113.

Euripides. *Orestes*. Translated by David Kovacs. LCL 11. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Evens, T. M. S. "Bourdieu and the Logic of Practice: Is All Giving Indian-Giving or is 'Generalized Materialism' Not Enough?". *Sociological Theory* 17, no. 1 (1999): 3-31.

Falk, Daniel K. "Jewish Prayer Literature and the Jerusalem Church in Acts." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting: Palestinain Setting*, edited by Richard Bauckham. BAFCS, 267-301. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Fernando, Ajith. *Acts*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.

Finger, Reta Halteman. *Of Widows and Meals*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1994.

———. *Jesus and the Politics of Interpretation*. New York: Continuum, 2000.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979.

———. "Jewish Christianity in Acts in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls." In *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, edited by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, 271-303. London: Chapman, 1997.

———. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Flender, Helmut. *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1967.

Frey, Jörg, and John R. Levison. *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Ekstasis. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017.

Friedl, A. "The Reception of the Deuteronomic Social Law in the Primitive Church of Jerusalem According to the Book of Acts." *AcT* 23 (2016): 176-200.

Frow, John. *Time and Commodity Culture: Essays in Cultural Theory and Postmodernity*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

Gager, John G. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*. Harlow: Longman, 1975.

Gambino, Micheal C. "The Military Reforms of Gaius Marius in their Social, Economic, and Political Context." MTh diss., East Carolina University, 2015.

Garland, David E. *Luke*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.

Garrett, Susan R. "Sociology (Early Christianity)." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman, 6:89-99. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. *The Acts of the Apostles*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 2003.

Giddens, A. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity, 1984.

Gift Giving and the "Embedded" Economy in the Ancient World. Edited by Filippo Carlà and Maja Gori. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2014.

Girard, René. *The Scapegoat*. Translated by Yvonne Freccero. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Universtiy Press, 1982.

Godbout, Jacques T. "Homo Donator versus Homo Oeconomicus." In *Gifts and Interests*, edited by Antoon Vandevelde, 23-46. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

―――. *Le don la dette et l'identité: Homo donator vs homo œconomicus*. Montréal: Éditions la Découverte, 2000.

―――. "Le don au-delà de la dette." *Revue du MAUSS* 1, no. 27 (2006): 91-104.

Godbout, Jacques T., and Alain Caillé. *The World of the Gift*. Translated by Donald Winkler. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992.

Godelier, Maurice. *The Enigma of the Gift*. Translated by Nora Scott. Cambridge: Polity, 1996.

Gosbell, Louise A. *"The Poor, the Crippled, the Blind, and the Lame": Physical and Sensory Disability in the Gospel of the New Testament*. WUNT II/369. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Goulder, Michael D. *Luke: A New Paradigm: Part I Commentary: Luke 1:1-9.50*. JSNTSup. Vol. 1, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989.

―――. *Luke: A New Paradigm: Part II Commentary: Luke 9.51-24.53*. JSNTSup. Vol. 2, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989.

Greehy, John G. "Community of Goods - Qumran and Acts." *ITQ* 32, no. 3 (1965): 230-240.

Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Gregory, C. A. *Gifts and Commoditites*. Chicago: Hau Books, 1982.

Gregson, Fiona J. R. *Everything in Common?: The Theology and Practice of the Sharing of Possessions in Community in the New Testament*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2017.

Griffin, Miriam T. *Seneca on Society: A Guide to De Beneficiis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Gudeman, Stephen. "Postmodern Gifts." In *Postmodernism, Economics and Knowledge*, edited by Stephen Cullenberg, Jack Amariglio and David F. Ruccio, 459-474. London: Routledge, 2001.

Gunkel, Heidrun, Rainer Hirsch-Luipold, and John R. Levison. "Plutarch and Pentecost: An Exploration in Interdisciplinary Collaboration." In *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity*, edited by Jörg Frey and John R. Levison, 63-94. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017.

Gunkel, Hermann. *The Influence of the Holy Spirit: The Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul*. Translated by Roy A. Harrisville and Philip A. Quanbeck II. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.

Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by R. McL. Wilson. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

Han, Kyu Sam. "Theology of Prayer in the Gospel of Luke." *JETS* 43, no. 4 (2000): 675-693.

Hanson, K. C., and Douglas E. Oakman. *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.

Harrison, James R. *Paul's Language of Grace in its Graeco-Roman Context*. WUNT II/172. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

―――. "The Historical Jesus as 'Social Critic': An Investigation of Luke 6:27-36." *Journal for the Gospels and Acts Research* 2 (2018): 53-74.

Hauck, Friedrich. "κοινωνία." In *TDNT*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, 3:789-809. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Haya-Prats, Gonzalo. *Empowered Believers: The Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts*. Translated by Scott A. Ellington. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2011.

Hays, Christopher M. *Luke's Wealth Ethics: A Study in Their Coherence and Character*. WUNT II/275. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Hénaff, Marcel. "The Aporia of Pure Giving and the Aim of Reciprocity On Derrida's *Given Time*." Translated by Jean-Louis Morhange. In *Derrida and the Time of the Political*, edited by Pheng Cheah and Suzanne Guerlac, 215-234. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009.

———. "Ceremonial Gift-Giving: The Lessons of Anthropology from Mauss and Beyond." In *Gift in Antiquity*, edited by Michael Satlow, 12-24. New York: Wiley & Sons, 2013.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated by John Bowden. Vol. 2, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.

Herz, Peter. "Finances and Costs of the Roman Army." In *A Companion to the Roman Army*, edited by Paul Erdkamp, 306-322. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.

Hesiod. *Works and Days*. Translated by Glenn W. Most. LCL 57. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018.

Hinson, E. Glenn. "Persistence in Prayer in Luke-Acts." *RevExp* 104, no. 4 (2007): 721-736.

Holmberg, Bengt. *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Holtzmann, H. J. "Die Gütergemeinschaft der Apostelgeschichte." In *Strassburger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie. Eduard Zeller zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Akad. Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1884.

Holy Bible: New International Version. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.

Holy Bible: New Living Translation. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House, 2015.

Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm. "Die Gütergemeinschaft der Urgemeinde." *EvT* 58, no. 5 (1998): 370-383.

Horrell, David G. "Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament: Retrospect and Prospect." In *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*, edited by David G. Horrell, 3-27. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.

———. "Models and Methods in Social-Scientific Interpretation: A Response to Philip Esler." *JSNT* 22, no. 78 (2000): 83-105.

———. "Social Sciences Studying Formative Christian Phenomena: A Creative Movement." In *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches*, edited by Anthony J. Blasi, Jean Duhaime and Paul-André Turcotte, 3-28. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2002.

Hume, Douglas A. *The Early Christian Community: A Narrative Analysis of Acts 2:41-47 and 4:32-35*. WUNT II/298. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Hur, Ju. *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. T &T Academic Paperbacks. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Jeon, Paul S. "Collectivism and/or Christianity: An Exegetical Study of Acts 2:42-47 and 4:32-5:11." *Institute for Faith, Work & Economics* (2013): 1-15.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte." *ZNW* 36, no. 2 (1937): 205-221.

———. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Translated by Norman Perrin. London: SCM, 1966.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. SBLDS 39. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

———. *The Gospel of Luke*. SP. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.

———. *The Acts of the Apostles*. SP. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.

Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume 2: Books 4-6*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus. LCL 490. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

———. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume 8: Books 18-19*. Translated by Louis H. Feldman. LCL 433. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Joubert, Stephan. *Paul as Benefactor: Reciprocity, Strategy and Theological Reflection in Paul's Collection*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2000.

Judge, E. A. *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century: Some Prolegomena to the Study of the New Testament Ideas of Social Obligation*. London: Tyndale Press, 1960.

———. "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History." *JRH* 11, no. 2 (1980): 201-217.

Keavenery, Arthur. *The Army in the Roman Revolution*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Keck, Leander E. "The Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament." *ZNW* 56, no. 1-2 (1964): 100-129.

Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary (Introduction and 1:1-2:47)*. Vol. 1, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

———. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary (3:1-14:28)*. Vol. 2, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.

———. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary (15:1-23:35)*. Vol. 3, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.

Kirk, Alan. "'Love Your Enemies,' the Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity (Luke 6:27-35)." *JBL* 122, no. 4 (2003): 667-686.

———. "Karl Polanyi, Marshall Sahlins, and the Study of Ancient Social Relations." *JBL* 126, no. 1 (2007).

Kistemaker, Simon J. *Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles*. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1990.

Kivinen, Osmo, and Tero Piiroinen. "Toward Pragmatist Methodological Relationalism: From Philosophizing Sociology to Sociologizing Philosophy." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 36, no. 2 (2006): 303-329.

Kloppenborg, John S. "Paul's Collection for Jerusalem and the Financial Practices in Greek Cities." In *Paul and Economics: A Handbook*, edited by Thomas R. Blanton IV, and Raymond Pickett, 307-332. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017.

——— "Occupational Guilds and Cultic Associations in Ostia Antica: Patronage, Mobility, Connectivity." In *Roman Imperial Cities in the East and in Central-Southern Italy*, Ancient Cities 1, edited by N. Andrade et al, 401-424. Rome: L'Erma Di Bretschneider, 2019.

Komter, Aafke. "Gifts and Social Relations: The Mechanisms of Reciprocity." *International Sociology* 22, no. 1 (2007): 93-107.

Konstan, David. *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Kraybill, Donald B., and Dennis M. Sweetland. "Possessions in Luke-Acts: A Sociological Perspective." *PRSt* 10, no. 3 (1983): 215-239.

Krodel, Gerhard A. *Acts*. ACNT. Minneapolis: Augsburg University Press, 1986.

Kuecker, Aaron J. *The Spirit and the 'Other': Social Identity, Ethnicity and Intergroup Reconciliation in Luke-Acts*. LNTS. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

Kuhn, Annika. *Social Status and Prestige in the Graeco-Roman World*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2015.

Laertius, Diogenes. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Volume 1: Books 1-5*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. LCL 184. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925.

———. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Volume 2: Books 6-10*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. LCL 185. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Laidlaw, James. "A Free Gift Makes No Friends." *Royal Anthropological Institute* 6, no. 4 (2000): 617-634.

Lake, Kirsopp. "The Holy Spirit." In *BegC*, 96-111. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977.

Lake, Kirsopp, and Henry J. Cadbury. *The Acts of the Apostles: English Translation and Commentary*. BegC. Vol. 4, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965.

Larkin Jr., William J. *Acts*. The IVP New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Translated by J. Bell, J. von Strumer and R. Needham. 2nd ed. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1969.

———. *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss*. Translated by Felicity Baker. London: Routledge, 1987.

Levine, Amy-Jill. "Second Temple Judaism, Jesus, and Women." *BibInt* 2, no. 1 (1994): 8-33.

———. "Gender, Judaism, and Literature: Unwelcome Guests in Household Configurations." *BibInt* 11, no. 2 (2003): 239-249.

Levine, Amy-Jill, and Ben Witherington III. *The Gospel of Luke*. New Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Levison, John R. *Filled with the Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

———. "Filled with the Spirit: A Conversation with Pentecostal and Charismatic Scholars." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 20, no. 2 (2011): 213-231.

———. "Recommendations for the Future of Pneumatology." *Pneuma* 33, no. 1 (2011): 79-93.

Lindemann, Andreas. "The Beginnings of Christian Life in Jerusalem According to the Summaries in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 2:42-47; 4:32-37; 5:12-16)." In *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder*, edited by Julian V. Hills, 202-217. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998.

Livy. *History of Rome, Volume 1: Books 1-2*. Translated by B. O. Foster. LCL 114. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919.

———. *History of Rome, Volume 4: Books 8-10*. Translated by B. O. Foster. LCL 191. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene Albert Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1996.

Lüdemann, Gerd. *The Acts of the Apostles: What Really Happened in the Earliest Days of the Church*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2005.

Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*. Translated by James E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

Maayan, Myriam D. "Political Ambiguity of Contemporary French Anti-Utilitarianism: The Example of MAUSS." *French Politics and Society* 13, no. 4 (1995): 51-62.

Macchia, Frank D. *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006.

Mainville, Odette. *The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Translated by Suzanne Spolarich. Woodstock, GA: The Foundation for Pentecostal Scholarship, 2016.

Malina, Bruce J. "What Is Prayer?". *TBT* 18 (1980): 214-220.

———. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. 3rd ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

———. *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology*. 2nd ed. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.

Malina, Bruce J., and John J. Pilch. *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.

Malina, Bruce J., and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

Manzanera, Miguel. "Koinonia en Hch 2,42. Notas sobre su interpretacion y origen histórico-doctrinal." *Estudios Eclesiasticos* 52, no. 202 (1977): 307-329.

Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.

———. *Acts: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980.

Marshall, Jonathan. *Jesus, Patrons, and Benefactors: Roman Palestine and the Gospel of Luke*. WUNT II/259. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Martin, Dale B. "Social-Scientific Criticism." In *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*, edited by Stephen R. Haynes and Steven J. McKenzie, 103-119. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1993.

Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Translated by W. D. Halls. New York: Norton, 1990.

Maximus, Valerius. *Memorable Doings and Sayings, Volume 1: Books 1-5*. Translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. LCL 492. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

McCollough, David J. *Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit: An Analysis of the Timing, Mechanism, and Manifestation of Spirit-Reception in Luke-Acts*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2017.

Mealand, David L. "Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts 2-4." *JTS* 28, no. 1 (1977): 96-99.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

Menzies, Robert P. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. T &T Academic Paperbacks. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Milbank, John. *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

———. "The Gift and the Given." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23, no. 2-3 (2006): 444-447.

Mitchell, Alan C. "The Social Function of Friendship in Acts 2:44-47 and 4:32-37." *JBL* 111, no. 2 (1992): 255-272.

———. "'Greet the Friends by Name': New Testament Evidence for the Greco-Roman *Topos* on Friendship." In *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, edited by John T. Fitzgerald, 225-262. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Morris, Leon. *Luke*. TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Moulton, James Hope, and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929.

Moxnes, Halvor. *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*. Overtures To Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

———. "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 241-268. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Die undarstellbare Gemeinschaft*. Stuttgart: Patricia Schwartz, 1988.

Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece with Dictionary. Edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini and Bruce M. Metzger. 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

New Revised Standard Version Bible. National Council of the Churches of Christ, 1989.

Newman, Barclay M., and Eugene A. Nida. *A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles*. London: United Bible Societies, 1972.

Neyrey, Jerome H. "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table-Fellowship." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 361-387. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

———. *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.

———. "Prayer, in Other Words: New Testament Prayers in Social Science Perspective." In *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina*, edited by John J. Pilch, 349-380. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

———. *Render to God: New Testament Understandings of the Divine*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004.

———. *Give God the Glory: Ancient Prayer and Worship in Cultural Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

———. *The Gospel of John*. The New Cambridge Bible Commentary. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

———. "Preface." In *The Social World of the New Testament*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey and Eric C. Stewart, xxi-xxiv. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008.

Noble, Joshua. "Common Property, the Golden Age, and Empire in Acts 2:42-47 and 4:32-35." PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2018.

Nolland, John. *Luke 1-9:20*. WBC. Dallas, TX: Word, 1989.

Noorda, S. J. "Scene and Summary: A Proposal for Reading Acts 4,32-5,16." In *Les Acts Des Apôtres: Traditions, Rédaction, Théologie*, edited by J. Kremer, 475-483. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum loveaniensium 48. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982.

Nowak, Martin A., and Karl Sigmund. "Oscillations in the Evoution of Reciprocity." *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 137 (1989): 21-26.

———. "The Dynamics of Indirect Reciprocity." *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 194 (1998): 561-574.

Oakman, Douglas E. "The Countryside in Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 151-179. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

Ogereau, Julien M. *Paul's Koinonia with the Philippians: A Socio-Historical Investigation of a Pauline Economic Partnership*. WUNT II/377. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Öhler, Markus. "Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde im Spiegel des antiken Vereinswesens." *NTS* 51, no. 3 (2005): 393-415.

Osiek, Carolyn. *What are They Saying About the Social Setting of the New Testament?* Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1992.

Osiek, Carolyn, and David Balch. *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Osiek, Carolyn, and Margaret Y. MacDonald. *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.

Papilloud, Christian. "Marcel Mauss, the Gift and Relational Sociology." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Relational Sociology*, edited by Francois Dépelteau, 663-675. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

Parkin, Anneliese. "'You do him no service': An Exploration of Pagan Almsgiving." In *Poverty in the Roman World*, edited by Margaret Atkins and Robin Osborne, 60-82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Parry, Jonathan. "The Gift, the Indian Gift and the 'Indian Gift'." *Man* 21, no. 3 (1986): 453-473.

Parsons, Mikeal C. *Acts*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Parsons, Mikeal C., and Martin M. Culy. *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2003.

Pattison, Stephen E. "A Study of the Apologetic Function of the Summaries of Acts." PhD diss., Emory University, 1990.

Pervo, Richard I. *Acts*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 2010.

Peterman, G. W. *Paul's Gift from Philippi: Conventions of Gift Exchange and Christian Giving*. SNTSMS. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Peterson, David G. *The Acts of the Apostles*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Pilch, John J. *The Cultural Dictionary of the Bible*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.

Plaskow, Judith. "Anti-Judaism in Feminist Christian Interpretation." In *Judith Plaskow: Feminism, Theology, and Justice*, edited by Hava Tirosh-Samuelson and Aaron W. Hughes, 83-96. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Plato. *Critias*. Translated by R. G. Bury. LCL 234. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Plutarch. *Brutus*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. LCL 98. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918.

———. *Cicero*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. LCL 99. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919.

———. *Galba*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. LCL 103. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Polanyi, Karl. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon, 1944.

Pulleyn, Simon. *Prayer in Greek Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

Pyyhtinen, Olli. *The Gift and its Paradoxes*. Classical and Contemporary Social Theory. Edited by Stjepan Mestrovic. Surrey: Ashgate, 2014.

Ringe, Sharon H. *Luke*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisvillle: Westminster John Knox, 1995.

Rodd, Cyril S. "On Applying A Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies." *JSOT* 6, no. 19 (1981): 95-106.

Roekel, Brandt Van. "Evidences of Isaianic Social Justice Restoration in the Early Community of Luke-Acts." MTh diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016.

Russell, Donald. "Plutarch." In *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 1165-1166. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Sahlins, Marshall. *Stone Age Economics*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 1972.

Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Acts*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Schneider, Gerhard. "δωρεά." In *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider, 1:363-364. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Schottroff, Luise. "Non-Violence and the Love of One's Enemies." In *Essays on the Love Commandment*, edited by Reginald H. Fuller, 9-39. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

———. *Lydia's Impatient Sisters: A Feminist Social History of Early Christianity*. Translated by Barbara Rumscheidt and Martin Rumscheidt. London: SCM, 1995.

Schrift, Alan D. "Introduction: Why Gift?". In *The Logic of the Gift: Toward an Ethic of Generosity*, edited by Alan D. Schrift, 1-22. London: Routledge, 1997.

Schweizer, Eduard. "The Spirit of Power: The Uniformity and Diversity of the Concept of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament." *Int* 6, no. 3 (1952): 259-278.

———. "πνευμα." Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. In *TDNT*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, 6:389-455. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Scroggs, Robin. "Sociology and the New Testament." *Journal of Religion and Culture* 21 (1986): 138-147.

Seccombe, David Peter. *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*. SNTSU. Edited by Albert Fuchs. Linz: Linz, 1982.

Seim, Turid Karlsen. "The Virgin Mother: Mary and Ascetic Discipleship in Luke." In *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, edited by Amy-Jill Levine and Marianne Blickenstaff, 80-105. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002.

Seneca. *Epistles, Volume 1: Epistles 1-65*. Translated by Richard M. Gummere. LCL 75. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917.

———. *De Ira*. Translated by John W. Basore. LCL 214. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.

———. *De Beneficiis*. Translated by John W. Basore. LCL 310. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.

Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.

Sewell, William H. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98, no. 1 (1992): 1-29.

Shelton, James B. *Mighty In Word And Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1991.

———. "Delphi and Jerusalem: Two Spirits or Holy Spirit? A Review of John R. Levison's *Filled with the Spirit*." *Pneuma* 33, no. 1 (2011): 47-58.

Shepherd, William H. *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts*. SBLDS. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.

Sigaud, Lygia. "The Vicissitudes of *The Gift*." *Social Anthropology* 10, no. 3 (2002): 335-358.

Silber, Ilana F. "Bourdieu's Gift to Gift Theory: An Unacknowledged Trajectory." *Sociological Theory* 27, no. 2 (2009): 173-190.

Simon, John Hedley, and Dirk Obbink. "Marcus Tullius Cicero." In *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 1514-1519. 4th ed.Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Smith, Philip. "Marcel Proust as Successor and Precursor to Pierre Bourdieu: A Fragment." *Thesis Eleven* 79 (2004): 105-111.

Sparks, H. F. D. "The Semitisms of Acts." *JTS* 1, no. 1 (1950): 16-28.

Stählin, Gustav. "ἴσος." In *TDNT*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, 3:343-355. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1964.

Stegemann, Ekkehard W., and Wolfgang Stegemann. *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of Its First Century*. Translated by O. C. Dean Jr. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.

Sterling, Gregory E. "'Athletes of Virtue': An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41-47; 4:32-35; 5:12-16)." *JBL* 113, no. 4 (1994).

Stewart, Eric C. "Social Stratification and Patronage in Ancient Mediterranean Societies." In *Understanding the Social World of the New Testament*, edited by Dietmar Neufeld and Richard E. DeMaris, 156-166. London: Routledge, 2010.

Stronstad, Roger. *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology*. Cleveland: CPT, 2010.

———. "Review of John R. Levison's, *Filled with the Spirit* Part III, Early Christian Literature Chapter 3, 'Filled with the Spirit and the Book of Acts.'." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 20, no. 2 (2011): 201-206.

———. *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke: Trajectories from the Old Testament to Luke-Acts*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

Swanson, Reuben J. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: The Acts of the Apostles*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

Syme, Ronald. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Talbert, Charles H. *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on The Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Crossroad, 1997.

Tannehill, Robert C. *Luke*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.

Taylor, Justin. "The Community of Goods Among the First Christians and Among the Essenes." In *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokba in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by D. Gooblatt, 147-161. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Testart, Alain. "Uncertainties of the 'Obligation to Reciprocate': A Critique of Mauss." In *Marcel Mauss: A Centenary Tribute*, edited by Wendy James and N. J. Allen, 97-110. New York: Berghahn Books, 1998.

———. "Échange marchand, échange non marchand." *Revue française de sociologie* 42, no. 4 (2001): 719-748.

———. "What is Gift?". *HAU* 3, no. 1 (2013): 249-261.

Theissen, Gerd. *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

———. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Translated by John H. Schütz. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982.

———. *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics and the World of the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

———. "Urchristlicher Liebeskommunismus: Zum 'Sitz im Leben' des Topos in Apg 2,44 und 4,32." In *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*, edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellbolm, 689-712. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.

Thomas, Jonathan P., and Timothy Worrall. "Gift-Giving, Quasi-Credit and Reciprocity." *Rationality and Society* 14, no. 3 (2002): 308-352.

Titmuss, Richard M. *The Gift Relationship: From Human Blood to Social Policy*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1970.

Toews, Lena V. "Motivation for the Sharing of Material Possessions in Acts, Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa* and the *Didache*: A Comparative Study." PhD diss., Andrews University, 2019.

Topel, John. "The Tarnished Golden Rule (Luke 6:31): The Inescapable Radicalness of Christian Ethics." *TS* 59, no. 3 (1998): 475-485.

Torrey, Charles C. *The Composition and Date of Acts*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916.

Trainor, Michael. *About Earth's Child: An Ecological Listening to the Gospel of Luke*. The Earth Bible Commentary Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2012.

Trapp, M. B. "Alciphron." In *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 53. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Turner, J. H. "Analytical Theorizing." In *Social Theory Today*, edited by A. Giddens and J. H. Turner, 156-194. Cambridge: Polity, 1987.

Turner, Max. "Spirit Endowment in Luke/Acts: Some Linguistic Considerations." *VE* 12 (1981): 45-63.

———. "The Spirit and the Power of Jesus' Miracles in the Lucan Conception." *NovT* 33, no. 2 (1991): 124-152.

———. "The Spirit of Prophecy and the Power of Authoritative Preaching in Luke-Acts: A Question of Origins." *NTS* 38, no. 1 (1992): 66-88.

———. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2000.

Tyler, Stephen A. "'Even Steven,' or 'No Strings Attached'." In *The Enigma of Gift and Sacrifice*, edited by Edith Wyschogrod, Jean-Joseph Goux and Eric Boynton, 77-90. New York: Fordham University Press, 2002.

Tyson, Joseph B. *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991.

Ungureanu, Camil. "Bourdieu and Derrida on Gift: Beyond 'Double Truth' and Paradox." *Human Studies* 36, no. 3 (2013): 393-409.

van der Horst, Pieter W. "Hellenistic Parallels to the Acts of the Apostles (2:1-47)." *JSNT* 8, no. 25 (1985): 49-60.

Vandevelde, Antoon. "Towards a Conceptual Map of Gift Practices." In *Gifts and Interests*, edited by Antoon Vandevelde, 1-20. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

Vazakas, A. A. "Is Acts 1-15.35 a Literal Translation from an Aramaic Original?". *JBL* 37, no. 1/2 (1918): 105-110.

Versnel, H. S. "Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer." In *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, edited by H. S. Versnel, 1-64. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

Veyne, Paul. *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*. Translated by Brian Pearce. Allen Lane: The Penguin Press, 1990.

Wagner-Hasel, Beate. "Egoistic Exchange and Altruistic Gift: On the Roots of Marcel Mauss's Theory of the Gift." In *Negotiating the Gift: Pre-Modern Figuration of Exchange*, edited by Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner and Bernhard Jussen, 141-171. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.

Walaskay, Paul W. *Acts*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.

Waldfogel, Joel. "The Deadweight Loss of Christmas." *The American Economic Review* 83, no. 5 (1993): 1328-1336.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Walton, Steve. *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians*. SNTSMS. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

———. "Primitive Communism in Acts? Does Acts Present the Community of Goods (2:44-45; 4:32-35) as Mistaken?". *EQ* 80, no. 2 (2008): 99-111.

Walton, Steve, and Hannah Swithinbank. *Poverty in the Early Church and Today: A Conversation*. London: T&T Clark, 2019.

Wedderburn, A. J. M. "Traditions and Redactions in Acts 2:1-13." *JSNT* 17, no. 55 (1995): 27-54.

Weiner, Annette B. *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Wenk, Matthias. *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*. T &T Academic Paperbacks. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Whittick, George Clement, and Barbara Levick. "Valerius Maximus." In *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 1534. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Wilcox, Max E. *The Semitisms of Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

Williams, David J. *Acts*. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1990.

Willimon, William H. *Acts*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Atlanta: John Knox, 1988.

Witherington III, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

———. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Wright, N. T. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

Yan, Yunxiang. "The Gift and Gift Economy." In *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*, edited by James G. Carrier, 246-261. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2005.

Zerhusen, Bob. "An Overlooked Judean Diglossa in Acts 2." *BTB* 25, no. 3 (1995): 118-130.

Zimmerman, Kari-Shane David. "Neither Social Revolution nor Utopian Ideal: A Fresh Look at Luke's Community of Goods Practice for Christian Economic Reflection in Acts 4:32-35." *The Heythrop Journal* 53 (2012): 777-786.

Zimmermann, Heinrich. "Die Sammelberichte der Apostelgeschichte." *BZ* 5, no. 1 (1961): 71-82.

Zwaan, J. de. "The Use of The Greek Language in Acts." In *BegC*, 30-65. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977.