The Liminal Spirit and Early Christian Experience

MCCOLLOUGH, DAVID,JOHN

The Liminal Spirit and Early Christian Experience

A PhD Dissertation Presented to

Durham University

The Department of Theology and Religion

By

David J. McCollough

2021

Contents

Abbreviations

AAA	Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik
AANS	American Anthropologist New Series
AE	American Ethnologist
AJPS	Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies
AJS	American Journal of Sociology
ANYAS	Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences
ARA	Annual Review of Anthropology
ARES	Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics
AS	American Scientist
AT	Anthropological Theory
ASR	American Sociological Review
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
AYB	The Anchor Yale Bible
AYBRL	The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
BBS	Behavioral and Brain Sciences
BC	Biblical Commentaries
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BES	Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BI	Biblical Interpretation
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJMP	British Journal of Medical Psychology
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BRS	The Biblical Resource Series
BTCL	Biblical and Theological Classics Library
BTS	Biblisch Theologische Studien
BW	Bible World
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CA	Current Anthropology

CB	The Church's Bible
CBC	The Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBR	Currents in Biblical Research
CCIR	Columbia Classics in Religion
CCR	Cross-Cultural Research
CNTDS	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament Deuxième Série
CFTLNS	Clark's Foreign Theological Library New Series
Ch	The Churchman
CI	Critical Inquiry
CJQHCE	Cliodynamics: The Journal of Quantitative History and Cultural Evolution
CP	Classical Philology
CSCT	Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition
EC	Early Christianity
EHB	Evolution and Human Behavior
EJIL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
EJSP	European Journal of Social Psychology
Ethos	Ethos
ETP	English Teaching Professional
EvC	Evolution and Cognition
EvT	Evangelische Theologie
Eth	Ethnos
ETL	Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EQ	The Evangelical Quarterly
ET	Expository Times
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GFC	Geschichte des frühen Christentums
GNT	Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament
GTA	Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten

HDR	Harvard Dissertations in Religion
HN	Human Nature
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HR	Hermeneia
HTA	Historisch Theologische Auslegung
HTS	HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
Int	Interpretation
IRSS	International Review for the Sociology of Sport
ISG	International Study Guide
JAH	Journal of Ancient History
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JCC	Journal of Cognition and Culture
JCR	Journal of Contemporary Religion
JCRe	Journal of Consumer Research
JETS	Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society
JGL	Journal of Greek Linguistics
JGRCJ	Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism
JPSP	Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
JPT	Journal of Pentecostal Theology
JPTS	Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series
JRAI	Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute
JRS	The Journal of Roman Studies
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSNTS	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSRNC	Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture
JRS	Journal of Ritual Studies
JTS	The Journal of Theological Studies
JYT	Journal of Youngsan Theology
KEK	Meyers Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament

LC	Language & Communication
LLL	Longman Linguistics Library
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
MES	Middle Eastern Studies
MNS	Man New Series
Nar	Narratologia
Neo	Neotestamentica
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NICNT	The New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	The New International Greek Testament Commentary
Nr	Narrative
NRT	Nouvelle Revue Théologique
NT	Novum Testamentum
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTL	The New Testament Library
NTM	New Testament Monographs
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus/Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
NTS	New Testament Studies
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology
Oc	Oceania
PBM	Paternoster Biblical Monographs
PNAS	PNAS: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
PP	Pastoral Psychology
PR	Psychological Review
RJHR	Rhetorica: A Journal for the History of Rhetoric
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
RQ	Revue de Qumrân
RRA	Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity
RRJ	The Review of Rabbinic Judaism

RRR	Review of Religious Research
RRT	Reviews in Religion and Theology
RSR	Reveu des Sciences Religieuses
RTNT	Reading the New Testament
SBL	Studies in Biblical Literature
SB	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBFLA	Studium Biblicum Franciscanum: Liber Annuus
SBJT	The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SCL	Sather Classical Lectures
Sem	Semeia
SERAPHIM	Studies in Education and Religion in Ancient and Pre-Modern History in the Mediterranean and Its Environs
SNT	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and its World
SP	Sacra Pagina
SPr	Social Problems
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
Synkrisis	Synkrisis
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
TB	Tyndale Bulletin
TCS	Trends in Cognitive Sciences
THNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
TJ	Trinity Journal
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TRENT	Traditions of the Rabbis from the Era of the New Testament
TZ	Theologische Zeitschrift

UCL2	Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis: Dissertationes ad gradum magistri in Facultate Theologica consequendum conscrptae Series II
VE	Verbum et Ecclesia
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WUNT2	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentlich Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

1. Introduction

'We can scarcely believe that every convert on emerging from the water of baptism fell into a trance and spoke in tongues….' (Wayne A. Meeks[1])

The Jesus followers, 'spontaneously became spirit-possessed and from that point on formed themselves into a missionary spirit-possession cult.' (Stevan L. Davies[2])

This dissertation consists of narratological, discourse analysis, and literary exegesis of texts in Paul and Luke-Acts relevant to the question of Holy Spirit experience and initiation in the Pauline and Lukan stream(s) of Christianity, followed by interpretation of the resultant data with social anthropological approaches. It is not a theological study. Nor is it a psychological study of 'conversion' *per se*, though implications for conversion will be addressed. It is a social anthropological analysis of the initiation rituals of a historically significant new religious movement through literature of that movement. It does not attempt to understand all sectarian variants of early Christianity but focuses exclusively upon the Pauline and Lukan version(s). All references to the 'early Christian sect' or to 'early Christianity' are in this way limited and make no claims to any unified, monolithic 'Christianity'.

Furthermore, the dissertation is fundamentally etic in its approach. That is, while being careful to understand the emic expressions of the religionists studied, that emic understanding does not provide the framework for interpretation. The dissertation adopts a non-religious, non-metaphysical approach to the beliefs, experiences, and practices of those it studies. The tension between emic belief and etic scientific methodology is resolved by understanding emic information as data to be analysed. Paul and Luke inform us about their religious beliefs and the dissertation seeks to interpret that information in terms of scientific theories of human behaviour and cognitive processes. The exegesis sections provide for us the emic data. The narrative 'camera' depicts the scenes just as 'Luke', the narrative 'movie producer', wanted his readers to view them. As we recognise the tension between emic and etic approaches, care will be taken not to damage the emic data with etic impositions: for example, assuming *a priori* that Lukan or Pauline spirit experience is identical with a modern practice, or worse, imposing a modern theory about modern practices upon ancient religious phenomena. Equally, care will be taken not to assume that the emic construction represents 'how it actually was'. Furthermore, the metaphysical question of 'how it actually is' does not pertain to this dissertation – for metaphysics please consult your preferred dogmatic theology textbook.

The salient result of the critical exegetical and social anthropological analysis is, *pace* Meeks and consonant with Davies, that the Lukan variant of early Christianity, at the time of Luke's writing, circa 70-130 CE, was a glossolalic spirit-possession cult and that the earlier Pauline churches of the 50s differed little if at all. For both Paul and Luke, God's Spirit was imparted separate from water immersion but nevertheless both water baptism and Spirit baptism were

[1] Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* Second Edition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003 [1983]), 151.
[2] Stevan L. Davies, *Spirit Possession and the Origins of Christianity* (Dublin: Bardic Press, 2014), 206.

united as integral elements of Christian initiation, both preceding admittance to the Christian sacred meal.

That is, not only was 'Spirit reception' among some early Christianities in some generic way experiential, as James Dunn and others have asserted, but that every initiate to the Lucan stream of Christianity, a sect which laid claim to the charismatic Pauline heritage, was expected, after immersion in water and via the laying-on-of-hands by powerful community representatives, to become possessed by the Holy Spirit, to psychologically dissociate, and to 'speak in tongues'. While Paul and those who imitated him were clearly pneumatic enthusiasts and could expect initiates to undergo both water immersion and spirit experience before reaching the status of 'justification' before God, Luke may have been the first to require glossolalia of initiates. Nevertheless, the differences between initiation in the early Pauline Christ groups and in the later Lukan circle are minimal. By roughly the turn of the century when Luke published his Acts, the ritual initiation process in the Lukan stream of the Jesus movement entailed a highly experiential, glossolalic, spirit-possession experience.

The Lukan initiatory experience will be viewed as a cluster of distinguishable, yet interrelated phenomena – dissociation, spirit-possession, glossolalia. Glossolalia, the utterance of language-like sounds which have no denotational content, is understood here as a natural phenomenon, a product of the human brain and socialisation. Consequently, the glossolalia of Luke's time is unlikely to be distinguishable from contemporary glossolalia. That is, it would be special pleading to suggest that the brain only recently evolved the capacity to produce free vocalisation. Luke presents his glossolalia as spontaneous and unlearned – a divine interruption in normal human affairs. A social science perspective need not reject this emic conception as merely an idealisation of what is in actuality a learned behaviour. If glossolalia is a latent human talent, shaped by social conditions but fundamentally a product of the brain, then its sudden activation need not be a cause for scepticism. Rather, the means and techniques which evoke glossolalia represent an area ripe for research (a project beyond the bounds of this dissertation).

This unlearned quality of Lukan glossolalia stands in stark contrast to the extensive field research of anthropologist Tanya Luhrmann among members of the Vineyard Church in North America. Luhrmann's subjects emphasised experiencing God as a learned behaviour involving serious play and deliberate pretending – a kind of ludic epistemology – and their church socialisation facilitated the learning process. Luhrmann's research need not mean that Luke 'got it wrong' or misrepresented the phenomena taking place in his community. In fact, Luhrmann addresses glossolalia only tangentially, focussing instead upon Vineyard prayer practices involving training cognitive focus and employing the imagination. There is no reason to expect that Lukan religionists had the same social formation as Vineyard believers. However, Luhrmann's research on the effects of training to enable the mind to experience – often vividly – a non-material presence, may provide a foil with which the invasive form of glossolalia may be contrasted.[3]

Lukan Spirit reception will be classed within the anthropological spectrum of spirit possession phenomena. However, it will be noted that spirit possession phenomena vary from culture to culture and do not always result in the host personality being completely replaced by an alter-

[3] T. M. Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back: Understanding the American Evangelical Relationship with God* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012).

agency. Thus, the glossolalia Luke integrates with spirit experience is not *necessarily* the product of a trance state, as argued by Felicitas Goodman and roundly rejected by linguists (William Samarin) and anthropologists (Nicholas Harkness) alike.[4] Experienced glossolalists can produce tongues speech at will apart from dissociation.[5] But, as documented by Christopher Dana Lynn, glossolalia can present in both dissociative and non-dissociative modes – 'excited' vs. 'calm' glossolalia – with each type fulfilling different social roles.[6] The dissertation asserts that the Lukan sect encouraged intensity in *initiatory* religious experience and moulded that intensity around a constellation of phenomena embracing glossolalia, dissociation, and spirit possession. Subsequent religious experience was to be marked by characteristics of calm, but powerful 'flow', as well as periods of renewed intensity in corporate prayer especially in response to opposition.

This Christian spirit-possession experience I interpret in social anthropological terms. In what way does it mediate between the sacred and the profane, between the devotee and her God? How is it related to sacrifice, in particular to conceptions of Jesus as a sacrifice? I suggest that it does not eliminate the concept of sacrifice but changes the subject and nature of sacrifice. In the performance of holy spirit possession, the Lukan initiate is purified to offer sacrifices of glossolalic worship to Jesus while at the same time she is conceptualised as herself a sacrifice, consumed by the divine spirit. The initiate both receives the holy spirit – a gift which cannot be reciprocated – and is herself gifted to the deity, becoming a 'devoted' object. The Lukan sectarian, purified and consumed by the fiery spirit, consecrated to God, is now transformed and enabled, by the same holy spirit, to enter the spiritual realm and encounter angels, Jesus, and God himself. That is, drawing upon Joel Robbins, Maurice Bloch, and Douglas Davies, I suggest that for Luke, the mediation of holy spirit possession does not merely establish brief contact between the sacred and the profane while concomitantly holding the two realms apart, but it transforms the profane into the sacred and grants entrée to holy space. Having become a sacred being, possessed of and possessing the holy spirit, now wholly devoted to God and accessing spiritual realms, the sectarian is embued with power and zeal to transform the – still profane – human world.[7]

This grand story of transformation begins with Christian initiation which we will analyse in terms of experience, rituals, beliefs, and texts. At initiation, holy spirit possession functions to

---

[4] Felicitas Goodman, *Speaking in Tongues: A Cross-Cultural Study in Glossolalia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), 8. William J. Samarin, Review of Felicitas Goodman, *Speaking in Tongues: A Cross-Cultural Study in Glossolalia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), *Language* Vol. 50 (1974), 207-212; 209. Nicholas Harkness, *Glossolalia and the Problem of Language* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2021), 15.

[5] Cf. Thomas J. Csordas' humorous first encounter with glossolalia: 'I was in the back seat of the car as both people in front devoutly spoke in tongues. Theories of trance and altered states of consciousness completely preoccupied my thoughts as we approached a red traffic light….' *Language, Charisma, and Creativity: The Ritual Life of a Religious Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 41. So too, Harkness, *Glossolalia*, 15-16. See also the small, but original study of Brian Grady and Kate Miriam Loewenthal, 'Features Associated with Speaking in Tongues (Glossolalia)', *BJMP* Vol. 70 Pt. 2 (1997), 185-191.

[6] Christopher Dana Lynn, '"The Wrong Holy Ghost": Discerning the Apostolic Gift of Discernment Using a Signaling and Systems Theoretical Approach', *Ethos* Vol. 41 Issue 2 (2013), 223-247.

[7] Cf. Joel Robbins, 'Keeping God's distance: Sacrifice, possession, and the problem of religious mediation', *AE* Vol. 44 Issue 3 (August 2017), 464-475. Maurice Bloch, *Prey into Hunter: The Politics of Religious Experience* (Cambridge University Press, 1992). Douglas J. Davies, 'Rebounding Vitality: Resurrection and Spirit in Luke-Acts', in M. Daniel Carroll, et al., *The Bible in Human Society: Essays in Honour of John Rogerson* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 205-224.

signal commitment to the group, to symbolize the Christian ritual/moral 'purity' system, to establish the sectarian emotional regime, i.e., the expected emotional habitus, to legitimate the sacred values of the group, and to bind the individual group members together through a process of 'identity fusion' so that sect members become willing to radically sacrifice for the group and its ideology. Christian initiatory spirit-possession, in synergistic combination with the sacred belief system, is the primary factor – even more than social networks – in the growth of the new religion.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Principles of the Literature Review

Literature on the Spirit in Luke-Acts is voluminous, and Max Turner, Robert Menzies, and myself have all produced extensive reviews.[8] This will not be repeated here. Similarly, we will not elaborate upon literature on the Spirit in Paul. Nor will we survey the standard literature of the diverse methodologies, such as narratology, discourse analysis, literary analysis, social anthropology, and cognitive science, utilised in this interdisciplinary study. Instead, we will initially review in chronological order according to each author's first publication that scholarship which, relating directly to the theme of the dissertation – spirit experience within initiation – has utilised the foregoing methods to interpret ritual initiatory practice in early Christianity. We will not review the entirety of every monograph or article but will present those aspects particularly relevant to the dissertation. We will then review authors who, though not using narrative or social anthropological approaches, have seminally argued for conclusions close to those of the dissertation.

2.2 Sociological, Anthropological, and Narratological Approaches

2.2.1 Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (1983)

Meeks, in his classic 'social history' of the early Christians, reads Paul's 2 Corinthians 1:21 mention of 'anointing' as referencing a physical anointing, not a spiritual. Meeks recognizes that the Holy Spirit 'was also associated with baptism, but there is nothing in the letters to indicate how this gift was symbolized.'[9] He recognizes that at Corinth, glossolalia was in vogue, 'the sign par excellence of possession of (or by) the Spirit' and that this view perdured to the time of Luke, as in Acts 10:44-46. Yet, he writes:

> We can scarcely believe that every convert on emerging from the water of baptism fell into a trance and spoke in tongues, however, if for no other reason than that it would then be hard to understand either the divisions over the practice at Corinth or Paul's arguments in trying to bring it under control.[10]

He notes that the Acts 10 passage does not list speaking in tongues alone, but together with 'magnifying God', a point which will be taken into account in the dissertation. From Luke he moves to Paul in Galatians 4:6 and Romans 8:15 which 'suggest that the newly baptized person

[8] Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, JPTS 9, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000 [1996]); Robert P. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004 [1991]); David J. McCollough, *Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit: An Analysis of the Timing, Mechanism, and Manifestation of Spirit Reception in Luke-Acts* PBM (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2017).

[9] Meeks, First Urban Christians,151.

[10] 151-152.

shouted out the Aramaic word *Abba* ("Father"), and that this was understood as the Spirit speaking through him'.[11]

2.2.2 Philip F. Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds: Social Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (1994)

Although Esler does not address the topic of ongoing ritual initiation practice in early Christianity, he applies anthropological research on glossolalia to the Christian practice at Corinth and, especially, to the question of the historicity of Luke's depiction of the Gentile inclusion into the church. This is a question of initiation in terms of the integration of non-Jews.

Regarding glossolalia in Luke's account of Pentecost, Esler notes that in the 1956 global survey by L. Carlyle May, glossolalia as a corporate phenomenon, rather than a characteristic of an individual, is unknown outside of Christian Pentecostal/Charismatic contexts.[12] He pairs this modern anthropological research with the historical work of Christopher Forbes, who argues that the Graeco-Roman world holds no genuine parallels to the Christian phenomenon of glossolalia.[13] Esler argues that Luke's Pentecost story must have reframed (perhaps relying upon pious re-interpretations of his sources) an original experience of glossolalia into an example of xenoglossy – speaking in a known language one has never learned.

For Esler, dissociative glossolalia occurring spontaneously among Gentiles present as observers (a possibility demonstrated by Paul's discussion of 'unbelievers' and 'outsiders' in the Corinthian assembly) at early Jewish sectarian meetings, 'would have constituted the strongest imaginable inducement' for the Jews to set aside their resistance to Gentiles and accept them into the believing community. Thus, for Esler, the great point of historical consequence is the role of glossolalia in cementing the full incorporation of Gentiles into the previously Jewish-only Christian sect.

Esler has paved the way for this dissertation to expand upon the crucial importance of glossolalia. Namely, if it was in fact so crucial a community boundary marker, then why would it not have been incorporated into the standard initiation? In fact, if it was the persuasive factor for the Jewish leadership, might it not have already been an element in Jewish ritual initiation? Esler's work opens the theoretical door.

2.2.3 Steven L. Davies *Jesus the Healer: Possession, Trance, and the Origins of Christianity* (1995)

Steven L. Davies argues that the experiences described in the New Testament as related to the Holy Spirit, e.g., 'filling', 'baptism with', 'indwelling', etc., including the historical Jesus' experience of the 'Holy Spirit', all refer to spirit possession. Davies draws upon a number of anthropological studies of spirit possession, including those of Erika Bourguignon, I. M. Lewis, Chandra Shekar and Colleen Ward, Felicitas Goodman, and Michael Lambek, among others, for his understanding of spirit possession as a globally ubiquitous social phenomenon, explaining that:

---

[11] 152.

[12] L. Carlyle May, 'A Survey of Glossolalia and Related Phenomena in Non-Christian Religions', *AANS*, Vol. 58 No. 1 (Feb. 1956), 75-96.

[13] Christopher Forbes, Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment, WUNT2 75 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, Paul Siebeck, 1995).

> Possession trance is an altered state of consciousness wherein an individual experiences a change in personal identity so that he or she feels himself or herself to be, and is socially defined to be, some other person altogether.[14]

For Davies, the key point is not merely an altered state of consciousness (ASC), but that the original persona is no longer consciously present, the alter-persona completely takes the place of the originally present individual. Davies then fits all New Testament experiences of prophecy and of the Holy Spirit into this particular understanding of 'spirit possession'. So, at Jesus' baptism, which Davies notes is accepted by critical scholarship as almost certainly historical, Jesus becomes spirit possessed. The baptism story is recounted by the gospel writers because: 'the story of Jesus for formative Christianity was the story of a spirit-possessed man whose new social role resulted from that specific status'.[15] For Davies, the historical Jesus that preaches, exorcises, and heals is thus not the persona of the man from Nazareth, but the alter-persona of the spirit of God by which Jesus the man was possessed: 'the spirit of God was an identity Jesus *became*…'.[16] The centrepiece of Jesus' message, the 'kingdom of God' is understood by Davies to be, not a doctrine, but a trance state which parables induced people into.[17]

The Jesus movement continued after his death because 'they spontaneously became spirit-possessed and from that point on formed themselves into a missionary spirit-possession cult'.[18] The 'Pentecost' story was told to reference the Jesus followers' experience of mass spirit possession which happened within weeks of Jesus' death.[19] From that point, to join the Jesus movement meant, necessarily, to become spirit possessed. Davies is undecided on whether glossolalia was a distinct experience from the possession experience, but, in any case, the two experiences belong to the same basic dissociative category.[20] As for the book of Acts accounts, Luke is a historian writing after the initial fervour has died down, after the incidences of spirit possession have significantly decreased and at a time when the Christian organization can no longer be called a 'possession-cult'.[21]

The problematic nature of Davies' radical understanding of the historical Jesus, of Paul, and of early Christianity is twofold. First, he predicates his argument upon the existence of a unitary, cross-culturally valid category termed 'spirit possession'. However, as Emma Cohen discusses at length, 'the term *possession* has been used to describe a broad spectrum of practices across time and cultures.'[22] While Cohen recognizes the contribution of Bourguingnon in distinguishing between 'possession phenomena and nonpossession altered states of consciousness', she also notes that, 'some have expressed concerns that it provides no more

---

[14] Stevan L. Davies, *Jesus the Healer: Possession, Trance, and the Origins of Christianity* (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1995), 26. Morton Smith's 1978 book, *Jesus the Magician*, while proposing the radical idea that Jesus practiced magical arts, does not argue from social anthropology as does Davies, and consequently will not be reviewed. For Davies' perspective on Smith, cf. Davies, 15. See also Stevan L. Davies, *Spirit Possession and the Origins of Christianity* (Dublin: Bardic Press, 2014).
[15] 65.
[16] 99.
[17] 131.
[18] 171.
[19] 172.
[20] 173
[21] 176.
[22] Emma Cohen, The Mind Possessed: The Cognition of Spirit Possession in an Afro-Brazilian Religious Tradition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 12.

than a heuristic model that leads to superficial analyses and misleading lines of enquiry.'[23] She cites Michael Lambek's call to recognize the diversity of phenomena that a term like 'possession trance' might encompass. She summarizes his argument as follows:

> Imposing monothetic, decontextualized categories onto the variable beliefs and practices of Mayotte and other societies… creates the danger of reifying something that is heteroglossic, continuously changing, and part of a wider context.[24]

Cohen seeks to find a balance between Bourguingnon and Lambek by approaching the 'possession-trance complex' from the perspective of cognitive science. She draws upon the work of Pascal Boyer, Justin Barrett, Jason Slone, and Harvey Whitehouse to understand ideas of spirit possession. Her 'central claim is that the emergence, communication, acquisition, and storage (e.g., remembering) of ideas about spirits and possession are both promoted and constrained by ordinary cognitive mechanisms and processes.'[25] Spirit possession is both a social and a cognitive concept. She ultimately works in the space between Bourguingnon and Lambek, stating that, 'Aspects of people's representations of possession … display striking cross-cultural regularities',[26] but nevertheless being uncomfortable with neat categorizations of trance and possession, for these can become 'fused' in human cognitive processes. Davies did not take into account the fundamental principle, highlighted by Lambek, that anthropology must be sensitive to the unique qualities of every individual culture. Spirit possession among the Mayotte in the 1980s may not be exactly like spirit possession among the Jesus people of the Second Temple Period.

The second problem with Davies' radical approach is that he imposes this etic construct of spirit possession upon a social group whose emic discourse is distinctly other than the modern concept. In other words, Davies' idea of spirit possession does not square with the Jesus movement's own self-understanding. The question of the historicity of the Gospel accounts aside, from the perspective of the Gospel writers, experience of the Holy Spirit of God is significantly different from experience of unclean, demonic spirits. The unclean spirits take over the individual's personality and cause physical harm to the person, convulsing them, driving them from society, or throwing them into fire or water. God's Spirit works in cooperation with the human personality. Thus, Jesus 'exults in the Holy Spirit' (Luke 10:21), and the Spirit is 'upon' Jesus, 'anointing' him to preach, sending him to do wonderful deeds (Luke 4:18-19). Luke depicts Jesus delivering the Nazareth sermon calmly and graciously (Luke 4:20-22). Luke does not depict Jesus as 'possessed'. We must respect the emic discourse of the early Christians. They did not think of themselves as 'possessed'. They were 'filled' and empowered to defeat those evil spirits 'possessing' hapless humans. Their perspective, while not to be uncritically accepted, nevertheless provides data which can be utilised – viz. our informants believed that there existed at least two distinct types of spirit experience.

Nevertheless, with Cohen's discussion as a control and guide, Davies can be viewed as having indeed made a contribution. He pointed out the importance of bringing the etic concept of spirit possession into our discussion of early Christianity. The way he did it needs procedural adjustment. However, the fact that he did it is significant. Jesus and his followers may now be

[23] 12-13.
[24] 13.
[25] 15.
[26] 14-15.

understood not merely in terms of what they believed and taught, but in terms of what they experienced and how they experienced it.

2.2.4 Gerd Theissen, *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion* (1999)

Theissen's focus is upon baptism and the eucharist, which he views as having defeated two other competing rites to become the principle Christian rites. The Eucharist took ascendency over footwashing and baptism supplanted glossolalia. Theissen observers: 'in Corinth there were efforts to make glossolalia the decisive ritual of initiation: in that case only those who spoke with tongues would be Christians in the real sense.'[27] Theissen here recognizes the early significance of glossolalia as a boundary marker, but he rejects the thesis of this dissertation, that glossolalia in fact did become the cardinal initiation rite. His rejection is understandable, as he only considers Corinth, he does not address the Lukan evidence.

Theissen also argues that the Christian rites of baptism and eucharist replaced the Jewish sacrificial system. He appeals to social anthropological understandings of sacrifice. He first laments that there is no definitive social theory of sacrifice, but then identifies three basic theoretical functions: gift, communion, aggression. In terms of gift, Theissen discusses baptism as the place of self-sacrifice and also of 'activation' of the Spirit. However, Theissen's elaboration consists of but a paragraph. Much more can be done here.

2.2.5 Richard E. DeMaris

2.2.5.1 *The New Testament in its Ritual World* (2008)

In his introduction, DeMaris, after having reviewed a broad array of literature on ritual, adopts a consensus position among ritual theorists that ritual must be studied on its own, apart from any symbolic system, myth, or dogma. Consequently, he sets out a 'twofold strategy' of the book to counter any idea that ritual is communication, that it is symbolic or that there is meaning 'behind' the rite. 'First, it avoids interpretive frameworks that assume the referential or symbolic nature of rites.'[28] The second strategy to prevent any attempt 'to look past rites to their "real" meaning is to foreground rites… and to assume their primacy.'[29] Instead of viewing rites as 'derivative and ancillary', DeMaris aims 'to regard rites as generative and creative'.[30]

One way this can be done is to recognize that rituals can influence the fashioning of New Testament narrative. DeMaris cites Frank Gorman:

> Ritual structures and ritual processes may serve as the basis for story and narrative. Ritual may serve as the background for narrative construction and development. Indeed, ritual may generate narrative and story in such a way that ritual dynamics will be reflected within a narrative.[31]

The idea that biblical texts have been written reflecting community ritual corroborates, from the perspective of ritual theory, a central narratological and discourse argument made by this

---

[27] Gerd Theissen, *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion* (London: SCM Press, 1999), 24.
[28] Richard E. DeMaris, *The New Testament in its Ritual World* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), 8.
[29] 8.
[30] 8.
[31] 9. Frank H. Gorman, Jr., 'Ritual Studies and Biblical Studies: Assessment of the Past, Prospects for the Future', *Sem*, 67 (1994), 13-36; 23.

dissertation, namely, that Luke crafted detailed, ecclesial stories specifying proper, and improper, ritual performance.

On the other hand, DeMaris' methodological presupposition, widely held among ritual theorists, that ritual does not signify anything outside of itself, i.e., ritual is not symbolic and is without any ideological or theological referent, stands opposed to the more broadly social-anthropological approach taken in this dissertation. Yet, DeMaris and the rite-focused methodology he employs, properly stress evaluation of the rite in and of itself apart from external symbolism. This point is essential for the dissertation's discussion of glossolalic spirit possession. The experience of possession has meaning in and of itself – one *is* joyful, one *is* bold, one *is* inebriated. These visceral emotions are not epiphenomena of an abstract, theoretical joy, or boldness, or inebriation that the initiate must strain his mind to comprehend.

A final comment of DeMaris' introduction relevant to the dissertation is that the experience of the ancient believer 'is practically irrecoverable'.[32] I demure. Firstly, modern glossolalia, as a product of the human brain, is unlikely to have evolved significantly in the past two thousand years. Secondly, the New Testament descriptions of ancient Christian tongues-speaking, both the Lukan idea of a 'known' language and the Pauline concern for 'unknown' utterance, compare roughly with what is observable among Charismatics or Pentecostals today where anecdotal stories of tongues as 'real' known languages abound.[33]

DeMaris divides the monograph into two sections, entry rites, dealing with baptismal initiation, and exit rites, dealing with excommunication. Only the first section will be reviewed. There he first addresses the question of New Testament sources for data about baptismal practice. He identifies the consensus regarding the utility of the Book of Acts: 'few scholars think Acts gives us a historically accurate picture of early church life' … Acts supplies Luke's imaginary conception of the early days, 'but not how it actually was.'[34] This is a relevant point of contact with the dissertation because the dissertation argues that questions of the historicity of Acts material are irrelevant to questions of how Acts functioned pedagogically for Luke and his audience. DeMaris could be justified in his scepticism of Acts as a source for the very earliest days, but he overlooks the potential of Acts as a source for understanding the Christian sect circa 70-130. Having eliminated Acts, he logically proceeds from the perspective that there is limited data on baptism in the New Testament. Paul mentions it in 1 Corinthians 12:13, but he also reveals his uneasiness with the practice in 1 Corinthians 1:14-16 where he seems to have forgotten who he baptised. Was it really all that important, then? Even in the Acts story of Cornelius, Peter the apostle does not baptise the Gentiles, but orders others to do it. DeMaris asks, 'Is there some reason why it was best for Peter not to have administered the water?'[35]

DeMaris challenges the ubiquitous notion that baptism can be understood in anthropological terms as an 'initiatory' rite. He points to 2 Corinthians 6:8-9, where Paul speaks of his existence in ministry 'as dying and behold we live'. If the metaphor of death can be used of the Christian life, then how is baptism an absolute threshold between death and life? The

[32] 9.
[33] Cf. Jordan Daniel May, *Global Witnesses to Pentecost: The Testimony of 'Other Tongues'* (Cleveland: Cherohala Press, 2013), which provides over a hundred pages of stories where someone believed they recognized tongues speech. Similarly, Ralph W. Harris, *Spoken by the Spirit: Documented Accounts of "Other Tongues" From Arabic to Zulu* (n.p.: Radiant Books, 1973).
[34] DeMaris, *Ritual World*, 15.
[35] 17.

dissertation would argue that this is not a substantial objection – itinerate preachers need not be systematic in their use of metaphors. DeMaris raises a more serious objection to baptism as 'initiation rite' when he points out that Victor Turner, who along with Arnold van Gennep, is the classic scholar of initiation rites, did not find Roman Catholic rites to be sufficiently interesting for study in terms of liminal initiation, so he chose to study Christian pilgrimage instead. Turner writes:

> When we first began to look for ritual analogues between "archaic," or "tribal," and "historical" religious liminality, beginning with the Catholic Christian tradition which we know best, we turned, naturally enough, to the ceremonies of the Roman rite. But in the liturgical ceremonies of the Mass, baptism, female purification, confirmation, nuptials, ordination, extreme unction, and funerary rituals, though it was possible to discern somewhat truncated liminal phases, we found nothing that replicated the scale and complexity of liminality in the major initiation rituals of the tribal societies with which we were familiar.[36]

In citing Turner, DeMaris has raised a critical issue pertinent to the dissertation, for, in Acts, initiates are never sequestered for lengths of time in a hut apart from village life as might occur in a tribal society initiation. How can anyone speak of 'liminality' in early Christian initiation when the time lapse between conversion, immersion, hand-laying and spirit possession is so brief, only a few hours, perhaps just minutes?

First, Turner does not deny the presence of liminality in Roman Catholic rites, it is simply minimal – 'truncated liminal phases'. So too, we have liminal phases in Acts, truncated perhaps, but nevertheless, liminal. That is, passing from outside the group to inside involved a period of time in which the initiate experienced being in process, being neither in nor out, being 'betwixt and between' as Turner himself put it.[37] Moreover, as the dissertation will show, Lukan initiates were expected to become possessed by the Holy Spirit, speak in tongues and dissociate for a period of time sufficient for ritual elders to establish (1) that the initiate was speaking in tongues properly, and (2) that the initiate was being ritually purified by the physical phenomena of Holy Spirit possession. Only then was the initiate permitted to join table fellowship. In other words, the initiate had to experience a period of testing during which their status was ambiguous. The initiate had to become possessed in the presence of onlookers and thereby experience a degree of humiliation. The initiate, as a *tabula rasa*, suddenly speaks a new language, the language of the community. The initiate experiences close emotional bonding with fellow initiates such that, in the ongoing life in the community, the initiate carries over this intense bond and is willing to sacrifice time, possession, money, and even risk life itself for the sake of Jesus and the 'saints'. Turner would call such a state of unity and comradeship, 'communitas'.[38] This is all classic Turnerian liminality theory.[39] Finally, though early Christian liminal experience is brief (though perduring sufficiently to generate communitas) relative to tribal societies, delineating the liminal phases of Christian initiation

[36] Victor Turner and Edith Turner, *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture* CCIR (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), 3-4. I have cited slightly more from Turner than DeMaris.
[37] Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 1969), 95.
[38] 96.
[39] 94-103.

allows Luke to explain how to repair it when it breaks down under the stress of expanding missionary evangelism (cf. the Samaria and Ephesian Disciples stories).

Ultimately, DeMaris does not reject initiation as a possible category for early Christian baptism. However, DeMaris is clear: 'classifying baptism in this way can no longer be made without strong supporting argument, which New Testament scholars have rarely offered.'[40] This dissertation's utilization of narratology, discourse analysis, and literary analysis provides the exegetical foundation that DeMaris calls for.

2.2.5.2 'Water Ritual' (2019)

DeMaris places early Christian baptism in the context of Graeco-Roman and Jewish bathing culture and finds it to be a 'rite of inversion', a practice which, 'mimics standard ritual behaviour but also alters it in some way.'[41] Thus, Romans bathed daily and Jews frequented the *mikveh*, but Christians were baptised only once (though, DeMaris avers, Christian baptism may not originally have been once-for-all, as Hebrews mentions plural baptisms).[42] DeMaris works within the anthropological framework of alternate states of consciousness, or ASCs. He understands baptism to have induced an ASC in initiates. Jesus experienced ASCs, and his 'receipt of spirit at baptism seems to have been the model for how a believer gained access to the spirit world'.[43] The dissertation is in hearty agreement with much of DeMaris' presentation at this point. However, in Luke's presentation of the event, Jesus does not receive the Spirit by means of the water, but through his prayer. Thus, in Lukan sectarian practice, it is the initiates' prayer – accompanying their immersion – that facilitates the ASC known in the narrative as receiving the Spirit, or 'Spirit baptism'.

Also of relevance for the dissertation is DeMaris' inquiry into precisely how 'concurrent' water baptism and Spirit reception were. He notes Acts accounts of hand-laying to impart the Spirit. Perhaps, he suggests, 'baptism was not foolproof, which is true of any ritual.'[44] Moreover, the Didache mentions another rite linked to baptism, fasting, which could have induced ASCs.[45] The dissertation, in its inclusion of spirit possession as a second, and primary element, along with water baptism, in a liminal ritual process, is virtually in unison with DeMaris when he writes:

> Baptism's ability to trigger an ASC echoed its function as a boundary-crossing rite in that both marked transition and transformation, enabling entry into a new social world or into the spirit world, where one had a different status.[46]

DeMaris further anticipates the dissertation when he notes that 'purification (elimination of sin)' is one of the three main emphases of baptism, along with 'boundary crossing' and 'spirit bestowal (ASC entry)'.[47] The dissertation will explore how ASCs paired with baptism were believed to 'purify' the Christian initiate. Finally, DeMaris notes how baptism structured relationships within the Christian community through the 'baptizer-baptizand bond'. 1

[40] DeMaris, *Ritual World*, 20.
[41] Richard E. DeMaris, 'Water Ritual', Risto Uro, Juliette J. Day, Richard E. DeMaris, Rikard Roitto, *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Ritual* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 391-408; 395.
[42] 395.
[43] 400.
[44] 400.
[45] 400.
[46] 400.
[47] 401.

Corinthians illustrates how this bond was so strong, and potentially dangerous, that DeMaris argues, 'Paul finally resorted to the disingenuous claim that he was sent to preach, not baptize (1:17), as though an apostle's duty could be subdivided'.[48] The dissertation acknowledges this point in the main, though it argues that an apostle's duty was to impart the Spirit (induce glossolalic ASCs) not to baptise. Anyone could baptise. It took a skilled practitioner to lead initiates into their first Christian ASC.

2.2.6 Risto Uro, *Ritual and Christian Beginnings: A Socio-Cognitive Analysis* (2016)

Uro outlines ritual theory and cognitive theory in relation to New Testament rituals. He emphasizes how ritual theories – and it is a plurality of theories that he encourages – provide a needed framework for historical data about baptism or the eucharist. Likewise, the Cognitive Science of Religion facilitates the interpretation of ritual data. He summarizes the Ritual Form Theory of Thomas Lawson and Robert McCauley, as well as the Modes of Religiosity Theory of Harvey Whitehouse, both of which provide competing avenues of approach to ritual and religious experience and will be utilized in the dissertation. Commitment Signalling Theory, the idea that extreme religious behaviour can function to 'signal' sincerity to the group, will play a particular role in the dissertation's discussion of the social functions of glossolalia.

In terms of the practical application of ritual theory to the New Testament, Uro questions,

> how ritual inventions, such as John's immersion, function as catalysts for new movements. How do ritual innovations contribute to the consolidation of religious ideas and to the social dynamics of an emergent group or movement?[49]

The dissertation will follow Uro in asking precisely these questions. Uro notes, 'For new rites, the challenge of course is to make them appear 'archetypal', so that participants can feel that they are replicating or achieving something pre-existing.'[50] As the dissertation will show, this is just what Luke does in re-framing glossolalia as 'prophecy' in line with the book of Joel, and cognitive dissociation as a 'purificatory' ritual à la Malachi. Uro, drawing upon Bell, points out that innovation requires proof of efficacy, and he finds this happening with baptism in Jesus' name – it communicated the Spirit whereas the old baptism of John did not.[51] The dissertation will simply shift Uro's observation to the totality of baptism – a rubric for the entire initiation ritual process – where, through the agency of powerful ritual elders the divine spirit is imparted.

Lawson and McCauley's Ritual Form Theory proposes three basic elements to religious ritual: an agent, an action/instrument, and a patient.[52] In any given religious ritual, one of these elements will be more closely associated with a higher power, or 'culturally postulated superhuman agents', i.e., gods, spirits, ancestors, than the other elements. That close association with the higher power renders that element 'special'. Thus, a ritual may be classified as a 'special agent ritual' or a 'special instrument/patient ritual'. These are the two fundamental categories of religious rituals. Lawson and McCauley hypothesize that special

---

[48] 404.
[49] Risto Uro, *Ritual and Christian Beginnings: A Socio-Cognitive Analysis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 72.
[50] 74.
[51] 75.
[52] Cf. Robert N. McCauley and E. Thomas Lawson, *Bringing Ritual to Mind: Psychological Foundations of Cultural Forms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). See also, E. Thomas Lawson and Robert N. McCauley, *Rethinking Religion: Connecting Cognition and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

agent rituals (1) are likely to exhibit higher pageantry and 'sensory arousal' than special instrument/patient rituals, (2) are not able to be repeated, but (3) can be reversed.[53] The Ritual Form Theory is further delineated in that it defines religious ritual as rites 'that bring about changes in the religious world'.[54] Uro notes that this definition 'excludes many religious activities that most people intuitively regard as rituals, such as singing, dancing, or kneeling in religious contexts.'[55]

Drawing upon Lawson and McCauley's theory, Uro argues that, 'John's special agent ritual would have intuitively been felt to be more powerful than a self-administered ritual purification.'[56] Again, the dissertation applies Uro's insight to the induction of spirit possession by ritual elders ('special agents' in the theory because they are closer to the divinity than the other actor in the ritual, namely the 'patient' who is being initiated). Purificatory spirit-possession induced by an apostle would be construed as more powerful than a ritual purificatory ablution in a Jewish *mikveh*, both because of the belief system that framed the ritual and because of the nature of the ritual itself – i.e., it was conceived of as coming from a ritual person who was especially close to God, and it was intrinsically more experiential, not only did one get wet, one got possessed.

Uro also builds upon Whitehouse's theory involving two distinct modes of the transmission of religious knowledge.[57] The imagistic mode transmits 'flashbulb', episodic memories of painful, frightening ritual experience that occurs only infrequently and relies upon the initiate's personal reflection on, and/or coming to grips with, the past experience. The doctrinal mode transmits religious knowledge frequently through teaching and preaching, that is, putting information into semantic memory.[58] However, Uro has elsewhere critiqued Whitehouse:

> It has become obvious by now that Whitehouse's idea does not work as a grand theory, and that in view of recent memory research the distinction between the two modes of codification is overly simplistic.[59]

Uro nuances Whitehouse's approach with the work of István Czachesz, picking up on Czachesz' emphasis upon memory and 'self-relatedness' – one actively participates in the ritual and one 'attributes personal significance to the actions involved'.[60]

Taking this discussion of knowledge transmission a step further, Uro draws upon Joseph Henrich's concept of 'belief-ritual packages' and the role of costly signalling in the spread of

---

[53] Uro, *Ritual*, 34.
[54] 35.
[55] 35.
[56] 88. Cf. István Czachesz, 'Long-term, Explicit Memory in Rituals', *JCC* Vol. 10 (2010), 321-333. István Czachesz, *Cognitive Science and the New Testament: A New Approach to Early Christian Research* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).
[57] Cf. Harvey Whitehouse, *Modes of Religiosity: A Cognitive Theory of Religious Transmission* (Lanham, MD: Altamira Press, 2004). Harvey Whitehouse, *Arguments and Icons: Divergent Modes of Religiosity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
[58] Uro, *Ritual*, 36-37, 90.
[59] Risto Uro, 'The Interface of Ritual and Writing in the Transmission of Early Christian Traditions', in István Czachesz and Risto Uro eds., *Mind, Morality and Magic: Cognitive Science Approaches in Biblical Studies* BW (Durham: Acumen Publishing Limited, 2013), 72.
[60] Uro, *Ritual*, 91.

successful beliefs.[61] The dissertation will apply all these theories to the role of glossolalic spirit-possession in the early Christian belief system. Uro's further discussion of 'charismatic signalling' which utilizes altered states of consciousness to coordinate group behaviour naturally lends itself to the dissertation.[62]

In discussing the healing practices of Jesus as they relate to ritual theory, Uro highlights a distinction that has been drawn in ritual studies and in anthropology between 'performance-centred' and 'liturgy-centred' ritual. Key to 'performance' ritual is 'improvisation and selection from a wide range of possible scenarios'[63] As it may be overly caricaturizing to starkly dichotomize the two forms of ritual, the dissertation will utilize a continuum approach, suggesting that ritual behaviour can be placed along a spectrum from open improvisation within a wide repertoire of ritual acts, to strict adherence to established, clearly defined forms.

Regarding spirit possession, Uro reflects that, 'It would be probably generalizing too much to argue that the whole of primitive Christianity was a possession cult… but it certainly hosted groups that can be called such.'[64] The dissertation will take Uro one step further and argue that all of Lukan Christianity was a 'possession cult'. Uro draws upon the anthropological scholarship of Cohen, who identified two basic forms of spirit possession, 'executive possession' where there is an alteration in identity, and 'pathogenic possession', where there is no change in personal identity, but a spirit is viewed as negatively affecting, or contaminating, the individual.[65] Uro applies this to the early Christian cultural context:

> the threat of being contaminated or occupied by hostile spirits was a real concern for a large part of the population…. A movement that offered effective therapeutic and protective rituals with regard to such threats, as well as ritual techniques to induce an experience of tutelary spirits, would certainly find a market and satisfy a need.[66]

Justin J. Meggitt critiques the idea that ancient Graeco-Romans lived in constant fear of magic/witchcraft/etc.[67] Yet, Meggitt, in his earlier work, discusses the ubiquitous presence of curse tablets especially among labourers: 'their world became one of curse and counter curse, a battlefield between defixiones and apotropaic devices'.[68] Bruce Longenecker provides evidence that concerns regarding sorcery existed and were prevalent. Ovid, concerned about an embarrassing case of impotence, states, 'Is it some spell or drug that has brought this misery upon me? Has some sorceress written my name on crimson wax, stuck a pin in my liver?' (*Amores* 3.7.27-30). A graffito in the area of Vesuvius states bluntly: 'I believe in incantations' (*CIL* 4.1635). Pliny the Elder wrote, 'There is indeed nobody who does not fear to be spell-bound by imprecations' (*Natural History* 28.19). The entry to a workshop in Pompei has the painted words, 'The son of Zeus, Herakles, dazzling in victory, lives here. Let no evil enter!'

---

[61] 91. Cf. Joseph Henrich, 'The evolution of costly displays, cooperation and religion: credibility enhancing displays and their implications for cultural evolution', *EHB* Vol. 30 Issue 4 (July 2009), 244-260.
[62] Uro, *Ritual*, 97.
[63] 108.
[64] 119.
[65] 116. Cf. Emma Cohen, *The Mind Possessed*. Emma Cohen, 'What is Spirit Possession? Defining, Comparing, and Explaining Two Possession Forms', *Eth* Vol. 73 Issue 1 (March 2008), 101-126.
[66] 120.
[67] Justin J. Meggitt, 'Did Magic Matter? The Saliency of Magic in the Early Roman Empire', *JAH* Vol. 1 Issue 2 (May 2013), 170-229.
[68] Justin J. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival* SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 33-34.

(*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 4.733). Phallic images were also thought to ward off evil and are found everywhere among the Vesuvian towns (cf. Pliny the Elder's discussion, *Natural History* 28.7.39).[69]

Considering both Meggitt and Longenecker, the dissertation will nuance Uro's argument, carefully suggesting that, like the ever-popular protective amulet, holy spirit possession and dissociative glossolalia *did* have a defensive purpose, functioning to ward off hostile possession and to provide an ongoing guardianship of the spirit of the famed and powerful Jewish God. The Lukan Jesus' teaching on the need for spirit experience to avoid 'repossession' by demons makes this clear (cf. Luke chapter 11). *However*, like the protective charm with its dual purpose of 'spirituality' and fashion, Christian spirit-possession was attractive not merely for apotropaic reasons, but also because it was fun – emotions of joy, power, and boldness are all associated with early Christian spirit experience. This duality contributed to the growth of Christianity vis-à-vis other spirit-oriented religious practices, such as the popular use of curse tablets.

Uro also discusses the role of religious ritual in signalling commitment to a group. An initiate may make a costly investment in a ritual and thereby signal to the group his sincerity, his commitment. Uro distinguishes between hard-to-fake rituals and impossible-to-fake rituals. The later are what Roy Rappaport identifies as indexical rituals. Uro cites Rappaport: 'the sign brings the state of affairs into being… and having brought it into being cannot help but indicate it'.[70] Uro finds difficult, but non-indexical rituals still very useful, as they can facilitate social cooperation. A ritual does not need to be indexical. This is how Uro understands the charismatic activity in Corinth: 'prophecy and glossolalia along with other emotional rituals in the Pauline assemblies, functioned as cooperative signals. [they] evoked synchronized arousal'.[71] Uro cautiously suggests that commitment signalling partly explains 'the social dynamic and survival of early Christian groups.'[72]

In discussing how ritual, and baptism especially, embodies knowledge and facilitates the sharing of knowledge, Uro draws again upon Ritual Form Theory: 'by making a special agent ritual a central rite of its cultic life, early Christianity placed particular emphasis on a knowledge of God's working mediated in and through ritual bodies.'[73] This idea of mediation of knowledge, or, as the dissertation emphasises, mediation of 'power', takes on even greater significance when the discussion moves from water immersion alone to immersion plus spirit possession.

2.2.7 David J. McCollough, *Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit: An Analysis of the Timing, Mechanism, and Manifestation of Spirit Reception in Luke-Acts* (2017)

In my earlier work I set out, as the title states, to understand the timing, mechanism, and manifestation of Spirit reception in Luke-Acts. This is exegetical, not social anthropological. It is included in this literature review because, though the methods it employs, namely narratology, discourse analysis, and literary analysis, are not new to New Testament studies nor even to questions of Christian initiation, it does uniquely *integrate* them together and apply

[69] Bruce W. Longenecker, *In Stone and Story: Early Christianity in the Roman World* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020), 227-237.
[70] Uro, *Ritual*, 138. Roy Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 108.
[71] Uro, *Ritual*, 152.
[72] 153.
[73] 164.

them in a united fashion to the Spirit-reception question, the specific concern of the present dissertation. The dissertation will not repeat the detailed methodological explanations, nor will the dissertation rehash the perhaps pedantic, exegetical engagement with all manner of German, French, and English scholarship. This review will highlight the key exegetical tools and the primary exegetical arguments found in *Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit*, and then identify those major areas where I critique my previous work. Being concerned with social anthropological interpretation of the early Christian ritual, I will necessarily engage with my earlier arguments about that ritual, but in the end, I will present a different ritual story.

First among the exegetical tools that I utilised is the literary and discourse principle of sequential reading.[74] Put simply, it is better to read from beginning to end than to skip back and forth in a story. Why? Because narratives are constructed linearly, they are designed to create a cognitive/emotional impact upon the reader who progresses through them scene by scene. Key to sequential reading is the readerly act of accumulation of knowledge. Accumulation involves the discourse theory of 'presupposition pools', i.e., how the reader's knowledge of the world derived both from pre-reading life and from the narrative, impacts the act of reading. One knows intuitively that dogs bark and trees grow, but one learns from a story that dragons belch fire. Accumulation also relates to 'cognitive frames', i.e., standard 'scripts' for life, such as how to behave in a classy restaurant, what a funeral is supposed to be like, and so on. These also are learned in life as well as built up and constructed sequentially through a narrative. The modern recognition that narrative accumulates is consistent with ancient rhetoric. Amplification (αὔξησις), the repetition of a basic idea in a variety of ways throughout a speech, was a standard practice. Whether Luke-Acts was ever actually read as a two-volume literary unit is irrelevant to its narrative analysis. I addressed questions of the re-reader, arguing from cognitive studies that the illusion of suspense affects re-readers only slightly less than first-time suspense affects first-time readers. To the question of who is the reader, namely, who is the 'implied reader' (a narratological construct of the text, not the actual historical reader), the answer is given that Luke's implied reader is a Christian in a leadership role (cf. Luke 12:41). This implied reader does not differ from the narratee, Theophilus.

When one reads sequentially one accumulates the knowledge and emotions that the implied author (narratological term: not the historical author, but the image of an author portrayed by clues in the text) expects the implied reader to acquire. A real historical reader may react emotionally in the exact opposite direction from what the text encourages (e.g., 'Darth Vader is my hero') but that same historical reader may also recognize the textual *tendenz* (you are supposed to loath and fear Darth Vader, not idolize him). At any particular point in the storyline, one has a set of data/emotions regarding the characters, the plot, and the setting as these elements have been revealed. For this concept I used a term coined by discourse analyst Catherine Emmott, 'entity representation' or 'ER'.[75] The dissertation instead uses the alternative phrase, 'implied mental construct'.

I employed a variety of other terms. 'Focalisation' is a narratological concept, the orienting of the reader, often via a character, towards some aspect of the story, 'the focalised'. I paired focalisation with a literary term, the 'narrative aside' ('my dear reader, you should know that…') to identify what the narrative authoritatively asserts about itself. This is then applied

[74] McCollough, *Ritual*, 45-62.
[75] 62-63.

to identify didactic aspects of Luke-Acts.[76] When a narrative repeatedly focalises something, perhaps from multiple angles, we are dealing with a literary concept termed 'functional redundancy'. Repetition, often with modification, serves a purpose in the story, advancing the plot, fleshing out the description of a character, etc. It does not automatically indicate the poor editing of sources.[77] An action-packed narrative episode, followed by a pause and a character or narrator making some declaration, is a sequence of 'action peak' and 'didactive-peak'.[78]

Finally, I drew upon type-scene theory, first used by Walter Arend in the field of Classics to study Homer and later applied to biblical studies by Robert Alter.[79] A type-scene is the literary equivalent of a cognitive frame. It is a script or schema that is standardised in a literary corpus, or in a culture generally. Its elements may be modified but it remains easily recognisable. So, for the script of 'boy meets girl at village well', one may vary the names of the characters – Jacob, Moses, Jesus – but it stays the same script, the same 'type-scene'. One may allude to a type-scene by referencing one of its elements. Thus, a type-scene need not always be repeated in all its detail. This requires the reader to be familiar with the type-scene or miss the significance of the allusion. Thus, baptism is understood as a Luke-Acts type-scene. The Christian implied reader is familiar with baptism via personal experience, and the type-scene is authoritatively constructed over the course of Luke's narrative. The modern analyst who, unlike the implied reader, is not personally familiar with early Christian baptism rituals, must build up, by progressing through the narrative, that mental picture of baptism which 'Luke' expects his reader to construct.[80]

It is this integrated use of a range of exegetical tools that I argued allows for the recovery of 'didactic intent'. That is, while wooden repetition is certainly one way that a narrative can communicate, contrary to the assumptions of many scholars, it is not the only way. We can know what Luke constructed as authoritative teaching for his implied reader by analysing the narratological, discourse, and literary features of his text. I supplied the example of Peter's housetop prayer. It is narrated, but that in itself does not make it authoritative for the reader. There is no apostolic preaching, 'repent, be baptised, and ascend the housetop to pray', nor is there a narrative aside informing the reader that God heard Peter because he was on the housetop.

The rest of the monograph consists of the application of these exegetical tools to the text of Luke-Acts. This review will outline the basic arguments. Jesus' baptism is the first instantiation of the baptism type-scene. It is not a full depiction of a 'Christian baptism' because it is only the first of a series in which the type-scene, or to use the related discourse concept, the entity representation, will be developed. Only by progressing through all the Lukan scenes will the full entity representation for baptism be developed. The Lukan text focalises, not the water, but the prayer and links Jesus' prayer to his reception of the Spirit. Next, Jesus' teaching on the Spirit emphasises personal, persistent prayer at the time of conversion as protection against repossession by evil spirits initially cast out. Spirit reception

[76] 63-64.
[77] 65-66.
[78] 66-67.
[79] 67-71.
[80] 70-71.

is thus juxtaposed with exorcism. The end of Luke's Gospel has Jesus creating anticipation of the arrival of the Spirit.

The Acts picks up on this forward-looking tension and resolves it in the moment of the disciples' tongues speech at the coming of the Spirit on Pentecost. The Pentecost narrative then focuses back on the tongues speech through a series of literary devices, namely, the questions and mockery of the crowd regarding tongues speech and the answer of Peter regarding tongues speech – this is what was spoken by the prophet Joel, what you see and hear is the Promise of the Spirit which Jesus has received from the Father. Having identified the tongues experience with the Spirit reception experience, Luke then promises the Spirit experience to all baptizands in perpetuity. I then strangely reversed course and argued that Luke has not explicitly required tongues speech of initiates, he has merely 'programmatically' suggested it.[81] That is, this is the typical way things are done, but not necessarily the only way.

My current work, this dissertation, uses my own narrative tools against my former presentation, and argues that Luke ineluctably equates tongues speech with Spirit reception, and requires it of all initiates. This produces a very different ritual picture of early Christian initiation and it is this glossolalic ritual that the present dissertation works with. Nevertheless, I properly observed that, according to the discourse principles discussed at length, the reader of the Pentecost story has not forgotten Jesus' baptismal prayer, nor his teaching on prayer, and will expect the Pentecost baptizands to pray at their baptisms and receive the promised Spirit in their prayers, not in the water.[82]

The Samaria story is given extensive treatment. The key argument is that Samaria must be understood as a progressive development of the idea (entity representation) of baptism, which already links the gift of the Spirit, not to the water, but to the prayer which follows the water. Despite extensive analysis of the focalisation of hand-laying, I was unwilling to make apostolic hand-laying normative. I stated: 'The text constructs neither normativity nor exceptionality.'[83] I recognised that a narrative gap was left in the Pentecost story, for Luke's camera does not show any of the converted crowd being baptised or receiving the Spirit. I recognised that a reader *might* fill in the gap with hand-laying. But I rejected any normativity.

The dissertation, however, employs a discourse principle that I previously did not use. That is the Graeco-Roman cultural expectation that historiography and biography had a fundamentally exemplaric function. From the perspective of Graeco-Roman exemplarity, Peter and John cannot be anything but role models. Luke's narrative gap-filling *is* integral to his exemplaric, narrative argument. Furthermore, the dissertation will provide a discourse/linguistic analysis of Simon the Sorcerer and his 'perception' of the apostolic hand-laying that substantiates a definitively exemplaric role for apostolic hand-laying. This standard role of apostolic hand-laying changes the picture of early Christian ritual significantly because it links the evocation of dissociative, glossolalic spirit-possession to the mediating hands of ritual elders.

The conversion of Saul is discussed, but surprisingly, the three iterations of the story are not interpreted progressively, as one would think with all the foregoing emphasis upon progressive reading, but synoptically. The key take-away is that Luke modifies the requirement of an

[81] 125.
[82] 136.
[83] 169.

apostle to impart the Spirit. Here a non-apostle, though admittedly one who has seen the resurrected Jesus, is perfectly able to transmit the Spirit to Saul.[84]

The Cornelius story further modifies the entity representation for baptism/spirit reception. Tongues speech, which is understood in the narrative to be genuine language, i.e., xenolalia, need not have witnesses who understand it, nevertheless, it should have an intelligible, God-magnifying component. Spirit impartation may be effected without hand-laying or immersion simply by the presence of a minister in whom there is 'resident power'.[85] This concept of resident power is already in the reader's mind because the Lukan Jesus exhibited just such spontaneously emanating power, and Peter is already known in the story as having a shadow thought to heal. The primary principle is that the Spirit is mediated by a gifted minister. I argued that Cornelius' house is 'programmatic' in that early leaders, whom Luke's reader cannot help but respect as authoritative (I here moved in the direction of exemplarity, though without the background discourse theory), identified Spirit reception from initiates' tongues-speech. However, again, I denied that Luke makes an unequivocal affirmation of tongues-speech as necessary for initiates.[86] The dissertation argues the opposite. Peter is the exemplar of a ritual elder who oversees the initiation of new converts.

In the final chapter, passages traditionally viewed as murky and impossible to exegete are explicated based on the principles of sequential reading. Though teaching accurately about Jesus, Apollos knows 'only the baptism of John'. John's baptism repeatedly functions as a demarcation line in the narrative prior to this point. Thus, Apollos must be unaware of Pentecost and the baptism in Jesus' name. He is a member of the people of God, but not a follower of Jesus. His teaching was proleptic. The Ephesian Twelve illustrate for Paul what had previously been emphasised for Peter – the ability to impart the Spirit after baptism through apostolic hand-laying.

I concluded regarding formal ritual structure, that 'Luke presented a standard framework within which there is a limited amount of variety.'[87] Regarding tongues-speech, I concluded: (1) 'there is a programmatic expectation of xenolalia upon Spirit- reception'; (2) Luke expected an intelligible aspect to tongues-speech, such as praise or prophecy; (3) 'though Luke never explicitly excluded the possibility that Spirit-reception could be signalled by another phenomenon, or by no manifestation, neither did he affirm such a possibility.'[88] The dissertation, however, argues that in the Lukan ritual process, glossolalia was not simply possible, or even 'programmatic', but actually *indexical* of Spirit reception.

2.2.8 Giovanni B. Bazzana, *Having the Spirit of Christ: Spirit Possession and Exorcism in the Early Christ Groups* (2020)

A key concept for Bazzana is the complexity of spirit possession. The phenomenon is not always a simplistic replacement of the host's agency with that of an alien personality, rather, control for possession of the human body may be negotiated, sometimes agonistically. Thus, Jesus must bring the spirit, Beelzebul, under his own control so that he can defeat the forces of his main adversary, Satan, and rescue the human 'vessels' held captive by that malevolent entity.

[84] 177.
[85] 183.
[86] 189.
[87] 216.
[88] 216.

This emphasis upon coming to terms with a possessing spirit so that the ritual practitioner may be able to function within society as a healer and exorcist is surely appropriate. Bazzana elaborates upon the psychological impact of possession and of the social dimension required for success:

> The "host" must undergo a complex and sophisticated process of reconstruction of his or her own subjectivity in order to become an efficient and effective conduit for the healing and divinatory powers of the "spirit." In practical terms, given the relative state of unconsciousness in which most possession experiences are expected to take place, this second aspect also requires a relevant involvement of the social group to which the host belongs.[89]

The principle of complexity in spirit possession and the concomitant idea of the subjective reconstruction of the original 'self' by a 'spirit' contribute much to this dissertation, especially as we will develop the topic of the 'dividual' in terms of identity fusion theory. Nuancing Bazzana, I suggest that the salient agonistic feature of early Christian spirit possession was the surrender of the self to the spirit. This psychosomatic struggle, manifested in glossolalia, dissociation, inebriation, and even shaking, was a battle to yield the self to the purificatory regime of the – holy – spirit who is conceived of as descending from Jesus and, going one step back, initially proceeds from the Father, Luke's ultimate sacred postulate.

Yet, Bazzana's assertion of unconscious possession must be used with caution. If the Jesus story above is at all representative of early Christian practice, then it is true that the subjects of Christian exorcism were hapless if not entirely unconscious (cf. also Mark 9:26). However, in the ritual initiation process, exorcism, when necessary, precedes and is to be distinguished from, positive spirit possession. The form of holy spirit possession portrayed in Acts and in Paul surely involves dissociation, yet the notion of total unconsciousness may not best represent what the communities of Luke and Paul were experiencing. The same spirit that moved the Pentecost disciples to 'utter' (ἀποφθέγγομαι) other languages, stimulated Peter to 'declare' (ἀποφθέγγομαι) his intelligible sermon to the assembled crowd and empowered the Lukan Paul to 'utter words of truth and mental soundness' (ἀλλ' ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ἀποφθέγγομαι).

Bazzana emphasises the *poiesis* effect – how spirit possession creates history. To be possessed by Jesus is to embody the cult's history. For all cult members to be possessed by the same spirit (which Bazzana points out is not unremarkable) thus creates a shared embodiment of group history. This is true whether we follow Bazzana in arguing for possession by a certain 'Christ spirit', or whether one follows the dissertation's argument of possession by a specific 'holy spirit' who mediates access to Christ and the 'spirit world' generally. The early Christians, through their spirit possession experiences, relived the great moments of their religious past and embodied the central deities of their religion. Embodiment, Bazzana argues, then produces another effect – that of a specific morality. If your body is actually Jesus' body, then how can you Corinthians unite it with a prostitute? Thus, spirit possession powerfully controlled the moral/ethical beliefs and behaviour of the sect.

---

[89] Giovanni B. Bazzana, *Having the Spirit of Christ: Spirit Possession and Exorcism in the Early Christ Groups* Synkrisis (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2020), 37.

Bazzana also addresses the relationship between spirit possession and performance as found in 1 Corinthians 12-14. He notes that Paul begins the discussion with the idea of 'speaking in a spirit of God'. No one, in this state, will curse Jesus. Bazzana observes that Paul 'clearly envisages a multiplicity of "spirits."'[90] The idea of a 'Holy Spirit' Bazzana argues is simply a later theological development. What we have in 1 Corinthians, Bazzana argues, is performance in triangular terms: the possessing 'spirit', the host, and the audience all work together to discern, as the possessing state is emerging, what kind of possession this is, whether positive or negative.[91] We should note that the dissertation emphasises this discernment process as presented by the Lukan narrative as the task of ritual elders. While Bazzana's triangular shape exists in Luke as well as Paul, for Luke the emphasis rests upon the ritual elders in their task of discerning any inappropriate manifestation – i.e., any uninvited spirit-guests. The default expectation is holy spirit. Submission to holy spirit and sanctification by holy spirit, along with the physical manifestations of submission and sanctification, are the norm. There is no Lukan expectation, as with Bazzana's construct, of uncertainty in terms of spirit possession. Initiates normally manifest the same possessing spirit as that experienced by the sectarian community. Yet, Bazzana's model is useful in that Luke demonstrates awareness that the normal expectation does not always play out and the community must be ever watchful.

Bazzana cites the linguistic research of Kristina Wirtz on Cuban Santería where unintelligible *Lucumí* speech is regularly employed. Its production differs according to the ritual situation, as does its function. Interestingly, *Lucumí* is translated by individuals with special ability. Bazzana rightly draws parallels to the Corinthian spirit-possession practices which likewise feature unintelligible speech paired with interpretation by especially gifted persons. He cites Wirtz at length:

> To say a text or an utterance is not intelligible is not to say it has no meaning, but instead that its meaning derives from functions other than denotation. That is, an unintelligible utterance can still fulfil other indexical functions of speech….[92]

This observation will be confirmed in the dissertation's analysis of glossolalia as an indexical sign of holy spirit possession in Luke-Acts.

But is Bazzana correct to correlate the spirit possession experiences of Jesus and of early Christ groups with Cuban Santería? In contrast to Bazzana, Tanya Luhrmann's recently completed interdisciplinary, multi-researcher study of religious experience, funded by Templeton and conducted in China, Ghana, Thailand, Vanuatu/Oceania, the United States, and the Ecuadorian Amazon, suggests that we cannot, without caution, impose modern religious phenomena upon our conception of ancient religion. The Mind and Spirit project, 'asks whether different understandings of 'mind', broadly construed, might be related to the ways that people experience what they take to be real.'[93] That is, does culture/worldview/cosmology influence religious experience? Luhrmann's researchers answered yes:

---

[90] 176.
[91] 177-178.
[92] 202. Kristina Wirtz, '"Where obscurity is a virtue": The mystique of unintelligibility in Santería ritual', *LC* Vol. 25 Issue 4 (October 2005), 351-375; 353.
[93] T.M. Luhrmann, 'Mind and Spirit: a comparative theory about representation of mind and the experience of spirit', in *Mind and Spirit: A Comparative Theory: Special Issue of the Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* Vol. 26, S1 (2020), 9-27; 9.

> the more a person imagines the mind-world boundary as porous (as permeable), the more they report vivid, near-sensory experiences of invisible others.
>
> We seem to see, in short, that ways of representing the mind (which we take to be cultural ideas) appear to be related to ways of experiencing spirits (which appear to reflect experience, and not just a culturally shaped way of talking).[94]

That is, one's cultural framework affects not only one's discourse about spirit experience, but it affects the sensory experience itself – to some degree, then, culture constructs qualia. While the Mind and Spirit project's immediate results would apply to any cosmology, ancient or modern, that includes spirit beings, Luhrmann's work suggests that we must ask whether African influenced spirit cults spring from the same cultural matrix as the various early Christianities, especially the variant(s) of Christianity which Paul and Luke represent. Might Africa's cultural smorgasbord differ from ancient Judaism in ways which might produce divergent spirit experiences? This dissertation will utilize the work of Bazzana, but with the recognition that to African-origin spirit cults must be added data from Pentecostalist/Charismatic practitioners, and, to this broader scope of comparative religion must be added the caveat that such work is fundamentally heuristic. Comparing contemporary spirit experiences with the religious behaviours of Paul and Luke may open doors of insight but cannot result in dogmatical impositions.

2.3 Precursors to the Conclusions

As already stated in the literature review, extensive surveys of the Spirit in the New Testament already exist. However, we will focus on three seminal figures who either introduced or championed concepts central to the dissertation.

2.3.1 Hermann Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit: The Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul* (1888)

We cannot avoid the name of Hermann Gunkel. Gunkel's little book remains a seminal scholarly work[95] and intersects with the dissertation at numerous crucial points. The social anthropological analysis of this dissertation could virtually be conducted on the conclusions of Gunkel alone, apart from appeal to any other researcher.

To begin with, there is the methodological question of sources. Gunkel seeks to understand the 'primitive Christian community' through, primarily, the book of Acts, while recognizing that Acts is not an unadulterated source. He is cautious of possible influence from Paul as well as the danger that 'it betrays the perspective of a later generation.'[96] The dissertation agrees with Gunkel on both the dangers and potentialities of using Acts to reach back to the era of the earliest Jesus followers. However, the dissertation diverges from Gunkel in that it seeks to understand Luke in his own terms as a voice of and to his own times. The dissertation does *not* seek to peel back the Lukan overlay to recover early sources.

---

[94] 23.

[95] As to Gunkel's enduring influence, see e.g., Levison's use of Gunkel as both a starting point and structuring device, John R. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009), xiv-xxvii; 3-13; 109-107; 225-235.

[96] Hermann Gunkel, translated by Roy A. Harrisville and Philip A. Quanbeck II, The Influence of the Holy Spirit: The Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1979 [Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprechts Verlag, 1888)]), 11.

With these caveats, Gunkel then argues that the early Christians, before Luke, that is, and with the exception of Paul, had not formulated a doctrine of the Holy Spirit. They nevertheless had common practices, obvious 'manifestations', that they attributed to the Spirit.[97] Chief among these practices was glossolalia. Gunkel understood it along the lines of possession:

> In glossolalia the individual is overwhelmed by a powerful force that has taken total possession of him. In such situations he is passive. He himself is no longer agent; instead, something alien has come over him and added to his independent, personal life.[98]

The dissertation recognizes Gunkel's early emphasis upon the experiential quality of the Spirit among the first Christians and will, crucially, utilise the anthropological category of 'possession'. But it will argue that, whatever may have been the experience of the very first Christians, total passivity is not Luke's understanding of glossolalia, rather the phenomenon is a cooperative one. For example, Peter, who has just been speaking in tongues as the Spirit was giving him to 'utter' (ἀποφθέγγομαι), stands and utters (ἀποφθέγγομαι) an intelligible sermon. Paul also utters (ἀποφθέγγομαι) 'words of truth and soundness'. Luke's depiction of the fiery effects of the Spirit is one of sober intoxication, even dissociation, but not raving madness, nor total loss of consciousness.

Gunkel also asserts that for the early Christian 'popular view', 'the Spirit is not, as it is for Paul, the principle of the Christian religious-moral life'.[99] As Gunkel writes:

> When J. E. Gloël supposes that in Acts the total 'religious and moral life of fellowship in the earliest community' is an effect of the Spirit' this can be proved neither from the Pentecost narrative, in which the Spirit directly works only glossolalia and prophecy, nor from Acts 2:42-47, in which there is not one syllable to indicate that the ideal state of the community described derives from the Spirit.[100]

Naturally, Gunkel writes apart from narratological analysis, which reads sequentially and recognises the description of the idyllic community as the result of the immediately preceding events in the narrative. The dissertation views the glossolalia that Gunkel so readily attributes to the Spirit as a spirit-possession phenomenon that facilitates identity fusion among the possessed. Thus, initiatory spirit-possession *did* influence the ongoing religious and moral life of the early Christians. Gloël was right.

For Gunkel, the distinguishing manifestation of the Spirit was glossolalia: 'it is not enough to say that glossolalia was the most conspicuous gift of the Spirit – it was at the same time the most characteristic.'[101] This view is virtually that of the dissertation which argues that glossolalia was indexical of Spirit reception.

As to the connection between faith and the Spirit, an important topic as it relates to the concept of liminality in the ritual process, Gunkel writes:

---

[97] 13-14.
[98] 31.
[99] 16.
[100] 16.
[101] 31.

> For Acts it is a commonplace that to be a believer and to be seized by the Spirit are separate events. Only the believer, of course, can receive the Spirit, but whoever has faith does not on that account already have the Spirit (see esp. Acts 8:12-17). Faith comes through preaching, and the Spirit descends usually by the laying on of hands following baptism (Acts 8:17; 19:6) or by the laying on of hands prior to (Acts 9:17) and during baptism (Acts 2:38). The reception of the Spirit is thus God's witness to the existence of faith (Acts 15:8ff.; 11:17). Faith, then, is not derived from the Spirit but is held to be the prerequisite for receiving the Spirit.[102]

Thus, he recognizes the temporal gap between a decision to join the Christian group and the experience of spirit possession – liminality, though usually brief, is nevertheless present.

Finally, with regards to the concept of the mediation of the Spirit, so important to this dissertation, Gunkel is once again ahead of the game, recognizing that, 'In Acts, of course, the view predominates that the Holy Spirit is normally given by the laying on of the apostles' hands (Acts 8:18).'[103] But that this is accompanied by prayer indicates that God, not hand-laying, is the source, the 'cause', of the Spirit. However, Gunkel denies that Luke's later view was the early Christian view. Presumably, Gunkel understood the early Christian experience to be more natural and spontaneous.[104] The dissertation is interested only in Luke's view. What Gunkel finds consistently in the Acts stories is, 'the Spirit is given only through some mediation in the community'.[105] The dissertation is in agreement here, noting that, while the Lukan Jesus encourages his followers to pray to their Father for the Spirit, that prayer is in the context of conversional deliverance where others, such as exorcists, will be present. Also, though the 120 prayed and received the Spirit in response, thus modelling for the community the idea of extended times of prayer for the Spirit (cf. Acts 4:31), Luke never tells a story of a convert receiving the Spirit apart from the established community.

Thus, the dissertation's anthropological analysis draws upon Gunkel for three key concepts: (1) the idea of the experiential Spirit (with 'characteristic' prominence given to glossolalia); (2) a time gap between faith and Spirit reception, thus opening the door to the idea of liminality; (3) mediation of the Spirit through community representatives. To Gunkel's interlocutor, J. E. Gloël, goes credit for a fourth valuable point, that Christian community life was due to the Spirit's effect.

2.3.2 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* (1970)

Dunn coins the phrase 'conversion-initiation' and in viewing Christian initiation explicitly as a complex process, he paves the way for the dissertation's discussion of liminality. Here he summarises the role of the Spirit in becoming a Christian:

> the baptism in or gift of the Spirit was part of the event (or process) of becoming a Christian, together with the effective proclamation of the Gospel, belief in (εἰς) Jesus as Lord, and water-baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus; that it was the chief element in conversion-initiation so that only those who had thus received the Spirit could be called Christians; that the reception of the Spirit was a very definite and

[102] 17.
[103] 41.
[104] 13-14.
[105] 42.

> often dramatic *experience*, the decisive and climactic experience in conversion-initiation….'[106]

While Dunn gives some place to the temporal/horizontal dimension of conversion-initiation, namely proclamation, belief, water baptism, and experiential Spirit reception, his primary emphasis is upon the conversion-initiation as a vertical complex describing the human/Divine encounter: the human repents and commits herself to God in the physical act of baptism; God responds by giving the Holy Spirit.[107] The dissertation, on the other hand, emphasises the horizontal, temporal dimension of the ritual process, though consideration is also given to the ideology of the early Christians regarding the vertical significance of Spirit reception.

Elsewhere, Dunn argues that Luke has a 'rather crude concept of Spirit as almost identical with glossolalic and prophetic inspiration'.[108] Dunn emphasized the physicality of early Christian Spirit experience. The 'coming of the Spirit was, in Luke's conception, something tangible and visible, most typically (but not solely) in inspired, prophetic speech'.[109] Moreover, 'the Spirit of the New Testament period was first and foremost an *experience* – an experience almost tangible in quality'.[110] Dunn writes that:

> the presence or absence of the Spirit in a person's (or community's) life was directly knowable and perceptible – not the Spirit as such, of course, but his presence; the Spirit's presence or absence could be ascertained not just indirectly as a deduction from some rite or formula, but immediately.[111]

As to hand-laying, Dunn recognizes that it can occur, but does not link it to the gift of the Spirit as he does baptism. First, he emphases singularity rather than complex unity. Speaking of the Ephesian story in Acts 19, Dunn states: 'The argument that vv. 5f. relate two quite separate procedures fails to recognize the fact that baptism and the laying on of hands here are the *one* ceremony.'[112] He argues that Paul did not inquire about their faith or whether they had had hands laid upon them. He inquired about their baptism. Thus, baptism is linked to the gift of the Spirit, not anything else. However, *pace* Dunn, all this indicates is that 'baptism' was the rubric for the whole of the process. He further argues that Paul baptised them. This too, is uncertain, even unlikely, for, as Bovon will observe, the text phrases the disciples' baptism impersonally in the passive, 'they were baptised', but their reception of the Spirit is personal and active – Paul laid hands upon them.

Dunn then becomes slightly unclear in his analysis:

> The laying on of hands in v. 6 must therefore be the climax of a single ceremony whose most important element is baptism, and whose object is the reception of the Spirit…. The laying on of hands is almost parenthetical; the sequence of events is

---

[106] 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* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970), 4, original italics.
[107] 37.
[108] 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 (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1975), 122.
[109] James D. G. Dunn, 'Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts', *The Christ and the Spirit: Volume 2, Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 222-242; 241.
[110] 'Rediscovering the Spirit (1)', *The Christ and the Spirit: Volume 2, Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 43-61; 45, original italics.
[111] 45.
[112] Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 87.

> 'baptism (resulting in) … Spirit'. Certainly the one action leads into and reaches its conclusion in the other with no discernible break.

If baptism is the most important, then why is it not the climactic act of the ceremony? How is hand-laying 'parenthetical' when the text states that, 'when Paul laid hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them' (καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ Παύλου ᵒ[τὰς] χεῖρας ⸢ἦλθεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτούς – note how the genitive absolute ἐπιθέντος …τοῦ Παύλου precisely identifies the circumstances of the coming of the Spirit). Moreover, though there may be 'no discernible break' in the Ephesian story, there certainly was a temporal break in the previous Samaritan story, which remains a part of the overall narrative. Yet in Dunn's reading of Luke, 'water-baptism can properly be described as the vehicle of faith; but *not* as the vehicle of the Spirit.'[113] In fact, for Dunn baptism is 'a necessary expression of faith, but God gives the Spirit directly to faith'.[114]

Thus, Dunn champions two ideas central to the dissertation: experiential Spirit reception and early Christian initiation as a horizontal and vertical complex. He will not say that glossolalia was always the marker of Spirit reception. Here is where the precision methods of this dissertation come into play. The dissertation will demonstrate that glossolalia was indexical of Spirit reception in Lukan teaching. Furthermore, Dunn downplays hand-laying and instead wants to locate the gift of the Spirit in God's response to human repentance/faith demonstrated via the act of baptism. This is a nuanced position, to be sure. For Dunn, the Spirit is neither mediated by the water or human hands nor is the Spirit given to faith apart from baptism. Baptism actualizes the faith to which God responds. This, however, is simply not Luke. The gift of the Spirit is a complex cluster of agents and acts, of individual faith – which can be successfully expressed apart from baptism but is always accompanied by baptism – and prayer, as well as submission to representatives of the community, as well as mediation through those representatives. Luke encompasses both Dunn's emphasis upon individual faith, and Gunkel's emphasis upon mediation.

2.3.3 François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1950-2005)* (2005)

Bovon outlines the basic structure of early Christian initiation:

> Normally, water baptism in the name of Jesus for the forgiveness of sins and the imposition of hands for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit form two moments of one ceremony. Acts 19:5-6 reflects the general rule....'[115]

Here Bovon considers the horizontal dimension of initiation and at the same time emphasises the unitary nature of initiation. The dissertation follows Bovon in his recognition of complex unity between baptism and hand-laying, rather than Dunn, who prefers the singularity of baptism.

Bovon notes also that prayer accompanies hand-laying, but it is this last act 'which triggers the outpouring of the Spirit.'[116] Furthermore, 'It is not impossible that the laying on of hands was

---

[113] 100.
[114] 100.
[115] François, Bovon. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1950-2005)* Second Revised Edition (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 269.
[116] 271; 272.

reserved for a leader of the community or an apostle….'[117] However, 'Luke does not say that the laying on of hands transmits the Holy Spirit ex opere operato.'[118] Yet, Bovon avers,

> the imposition of hands is more than a prayer or a symbol of the act of God in Zwingli's sense. Luke thinks – whether we call it naïve or *frühkatholisch* – that God has entrusted a power to God's people – that is, those who live as servants of the word and not in an autonomous manner. They know that this power can be transmitted to new converts when the latter have been baptized and received, after a payer, the imposition of hands.

Thus, Bovon captures the Lukan initiatory structure that the dissertation will interpret. Bovon, even more than Gunkel, expresses the Lukan idea of mediation by powerful ministers, rather than by powerful rites, that the dissertation will work with in terms of social anthropology and ritual performance.

With Gunkel, Dunn, and Bovon, we have almost the entire fundament necessary for the social anthropological interpretation of Lukan initiation ritual. What we have not done is trace the arguments of the multitude of other scholars who dissent in various fashions and degrees from these three. To do so would be more than a dissertation. We would then have no time for the social anthropological analysis of Pauline and Lukan ritual. What we will do, however, is to confirm the key conclusions of these three through employment of a constellation of narratological, discourse, and literary methods. We will also add a crucial component of the Lukan initiation ritual which has not been argued in the literature, and that is dissociative glossolalia indexical of spirit reception. Furthermore, we will situate initiation within the broader concept of Lukan soteriology.

3. Exegetical Methodology

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Similar Methods for Luke and Paul? Narrative Rhetoric and the Psychology of Reader Transportation

Can we use the same interpretive methods for Luke and Paul? That is, does Paul as an epistolary rhetorician require different exegetical approaches than Luke as a narrator? Michal Beth Dinkler argues that the arts of narrative persuasion and rhetorical persuasion are not as far apart as has been thought and that, 'scholars concerned with New Testament rhetoric should be considering narrative's poetic features.'[119] Citing the work of Douglas Hesse on Aristotle, she writes that 'we can read the *Poetics* as advancing "a fourth mode of persuasion – the mimetic or narrative – that complements and completes the logical, ethical, and pathetic forwarded in [Aristotle's] *Rhetoric*."'[120] Dinkler does not mean merely that narratives utilise rhetorical techniques to persuade. Rather, drawing upon literary theorists Michael Kerns and

[117] 271.
[118] Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 269.
[119] Michal Beth Dinkler, 'New Testament Rhetorical Narratology: An Invitation toward Integration', *BI* Vol. 24 (2016), 203-228; 210.
[120] 211. Douglas Hesse, 'Aristotle's Poetics and Rhetoric: Narrative as Rhetoric's Fourth Mode', in Richard Andrews, ed., *Rebirth of Rhetoric: Essays in Language, Culture, and Education*. London: Routledge, 1992, 19-38; 19–20.

James Phelan, she states: 'Telling a story is a rhetorical act; narratives create rhetorical effects *as narratives*.'[121]

But Dinkler does not leave us simply with literary theory, she cites psychological research to demonstrate that narratives *qua* absorbing stories, do in fact impact the reader.[122] In experiments involving over 600 participants, Melanie C. Green and Timothy C. Brock found that psychological absorption, or 'transportation', into a storyworld affects beliefs, both by making subjects less likely to identify 'false notes' in a story and by aligning subjects' beliefs with the story. What then is 'transportation'? First, in transportation, a reader (inclusive of hearers, i.e., any story recipient) becomes so immersed in the story that she loses touch with reality, not only in the sense of not noticing a new person walking into the room, but also in terms of 'real-world facts that contradict assertions made in the narrative'.[123] Second, in transportation, readers experience intensified 'emotions and motivations' despite awareness that a story is fictitious. Green and Brock explain how transportation impacts the narrative recipient:

> First, transportation may reduce negative cognitive responding. Transported readers may be less likely to disbelieve or counterargue story claims, and thus their beliefs may be influenced. Next, transportation may make narrative experience seem more like real experience. Direct experience can be a powerful means of forming attitudes (Fazio & Zanna, 1981), and to the extent that narratives enable mimicry of experience, they may have greater impact than nonnarrative modes. Finally, transportation is likely to create strong feelings toward story characters; the experiences or beliefs of those characters may then have an enhanced influence on readers' beliefs.[124]

Green and Brock paved the way for research on narrative transportation spanning the last two decades. Recently Tom van Laer, et al., in a multidisciplinary, meta-analysis of 76 published and unpublished articles, show that research has continued to focus on the transportation effect in terms of imagery, empathy, and suspended reality – the narrative 'consumer' engages in a vivid world of mental images so that she disengages physiologically from the real-world environment, and, in the narrative world, comes to emotionally identity with certain characters.[125] Transportation results in 'strong and long-lasting' 'affective and cognitive responses, beliefs, and attitude and intention changes'.[126] In separate paper, van Laer underscores the ethical ramifications of these effects in his research on marketing practices: 'We argue that the ethical relevance of stories should attract more attention from managers, policymakers and scholars, as storytelling drives suspension of disbelief, has enduring

---

[121] Dinkler, 'Rhetorical Narratology', 216, original emphasis. Michael Kearns, *Rhetorical Narratology* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1999). James Phelan, *Narrative as Rhetoric: Technique, Audiences, Ethics, Ideology* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1996). James Phelan, 'Rhetoric/ethics', in David Herman, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 203-216.
[122] Dinkler, 'Rhetorical Narratology', 218. Melanie C. Green and Timothy Brock, 'The Role of Transportation in the Persuasiveness of Public Narratives', *JPSP* 79 (2000), 701–721.
[123] 702.
[124] 702. R. H. Fazio and M. P. Zanna, 'Direct experience and attitude-behavior consistency', in L. Berkowitz, ed., *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* Vol. 14 (San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1981), 161-202.
[125] T. van Laer, de Ruyter, K., Visconti, L. M. and Wetzels, M., 'The Extended Transportation-Imagery Model: A Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents and Consequences of Consumers' Narrative Transportation', *JCRe* Vol. 40 Issue 5 (2014), 797-817; 799-800.
[126] 800.

persuasive effects, is unintentionally affective and may lead to actual behavior.'[127] Van Laer keenly observes: 'nothing is less innocent than a story'.[128]

Dinkler has encouraged Pauline scholars to recognise the innate rhetorical force of narrative. Luke is not just telling stories. But this works both ways. The force of narrative dynamics can also be brought to bear on Paul. Note the narrative/discourse principle of sequential reading. One reads Paul's letters from opening greeting to closing farewell. Paul unfolds his ideas line by line. One cannot interpret the last bit of a Pauline discourse apart from reading what he says at the beginning. For example, if Paul *initially* argues that baptismal practices within a particular local church have led to schism, then a reader, attune to both rhetorical and narratological concerns – following the Pauline logic and the Corinthian story – might reasonably question scholarship which claims that Paul *later* appeals to the water rite as a source of unity.

But what about the grand narrative of the Hebrew Scriptures – does not Paul weave his thoughts integrally into that sweeping Biblical story? As a matter of pragmatics, this dissertation will limit itself to engaging the story of Israel where it impinges upon the interpretation of specific texts, such as 1 Corinthians 10:1-4, related to the specific focus upon initiation.[129]

3.1.2 Similar Exegetical Cautions with Paul and Luke

As Richard B. Hays notes, 'There is no reason to think that Paul's Roman readers had read Galatians'.[130] A rhetorical/narratological approach is concerned to engage narrative/rhetorical wholes. To extract disparate scenes from the flow of a Lukan narrative, juxtapose them, and declare them inconsistent, is just as egregious as extracting a verse from one Pauline epistle and inserting it into the argument of another – both are interpolation. Case in point: to one audience Paul may emphasise water baptism as the great source of unity, nullifying categories of Jew and Greek, slave and free, male and female. But for another audience, water baptism may be such a source of disunity and schism that Paul appeals to charismatic Spirit baptism as the supreme unifier, the factor nullifying categories of Jew and Greek, slave and free. The similar discourse of Jew/Greek, slave/free belies fundamentally different argumentation and fundamentally different baptisms.

3.2 Acts: The Dual Problems of Historicity and Intelligibility

Stories are potent generators of religious thought and emotion. As Douglas Davies writes, 'Narratives, with paradigmatic scenes at their heart, implant core values in the mind and … may exert a deeply formative influence on the very structures of feeling of a tradition'.[131] But does

[127] T. van Laer, S. Feiereisen and L. M. Visconti, 'Ethical Implications of Story Domain, Teller and Receiver for the Narrative Transportation Effect', Paper presented at the 45th Annual European Marketing Academy Conference, 24 - 27 May, 2016, Oslo, Norway, page 1.
[128] Van Laer, 'Extended Transportation-Imagery Model', 798.
[129] For recent interaction with the literature on the Pauline thought world, cf. Heilig, *Paulus als Erzähler?*. See also Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* Second Edition (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016); Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective* Revised and Expanded Edition (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007).
[130] Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1989), 188.
[131] Douglas J. Davies, *Emotion, Identity, and Religion: Hope, Reciprocity, and Otherness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 49.

Davies' social anthropological observation have any relevance for ancient literature? Consider Judith M. Lieu:

> Few would dispute the paradigmatic role that 'remembering our story' has played in the Jewish and Christian traditions, in the maintenance of identity for the group and for those who claim membership of it….[132]

I argue that discourse and narratological analysis confirms Davies and Lieu, and demonstrates that Acts can be used as a source for social-anthropological research. That is, this chapter shows that Acts provides workable data about the early Christian sect ca. 70-130 CE. This runs contrary to two common perceptions. First, it opposes the notion that Luke, while cultivating a few theological *topoi* as he curated historical records, did not bother himself with the specifics of doctrine or praxis. Second, it promises a revision of the view that Acts is merely a literary work with vague theological tendencies which, while framed with historical facts, has limited value in terms of its ability to contribute to our knowledge of early Christianity.[133]

3.2.1 Acts and History

3.2.1.1 History or Biography? The Question of Genre and Its Relevance for the Interpretation of Acts

Richard A. Burridge writes, 'Genre is a system of communication of *meaning*. Before we can understand the meaning of a text, we must master its genre.'[134] Yet, as William Kurz observes, a wide swath of literature in the Graeco-Roman world, from novels, to histories, to biographies, was interested in providing examples to imitate, i.e., was pedagogically inclined.[135] Thus, we need not definitively resolve the question of genre to know that Luke-Acts aims to teach.

But could more specificity be helpful? Though views on the genre of Acts vary – epic, novel, history, biography – the latter two predominate.[136] For example, Jörg Frey recognises that Luke is not a modern historian seeking objective neutrality, yet he states: 'The fact that Luke is anything but 'impartial' in this respect, and that his 'fidelity to the facts' is questionable in many places, cannot keep him from being classified as a historian.'[137]

---

[132] Judith M. Lieu, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 63.

[133] Cf. the discussion of the use of Acts for social-historical purposes, in particular the divergence between English and German speaking scholarship, Alexander Weiß, 'Sozialgeschichtliche Aspeckte der Apostelgeschichte', in Stefan Alkier and Michael Rydryck, eds., *Paulus – Das Kapital eines Reisenden: Die Apostelgeschichte als sozialhistorische Quelle* SB 241 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 2017), 37-58; esp. 41-43. This chapter draws in part upon a previously published article: 'The Liminal Spirit: Ritual Experience, Ritual Initiation in Luke and Paul', *JYT* Vol. 45 (2018), 107-142. Permission for use has been granted.

[134] Richard A. Burridge, *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 52.

[135] William Kurz, 'Narrative Models for Imitation in Luke-Acts', David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks, eds., *Greeks, Romans and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1990), 171-189.

[136] For epic, cf. Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Gospels and Homer: Imitations of Greek Epic in Mark and Luke-Acts* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2014). As novel, see Richard I. Pervo, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987). For a recent genre informed argument that Luke-Acts is historiography, see Andrew W. Pitts, *History, Biography, and the Genre of Luke-Acts: An Exploration of Literary Divergence in Greek Narrative Discourse* BIS 177 (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2019).

[137] 'Die Tatsache, dass Lukas in dieser Hinsicht alles andere als ‚unparteiisch' ist und das seine ‚Tatsachentreue' an vielen Stellen fraglich ist, kann nicht davon abhalten, ihn als einen Historiker zu klassifizieren.' Jörg Frey, Clare K. Rothschild, and Jens Schröter, *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker und*

Scholars deal with 'Acts as history' in different ways. Some are not concerned with historiographical 'agendas' and simply interpret the contents of Luke's narrative directly in terms of the social anthropology of the primitive church (cf. Philip Esler or Bruce Malina and John Pilch).[138] Others attempt to dig out nuggets of realia from Luke's tendentious account (cf. Gerd Lüdemann, Seth Schwartz).[139] Still others, such as Martin Hengel, would grant that the theology presented in Acts, e.g., in Peter's speeches, is also Luke's 'Christologie und Ekklesiologie', but would caution that 'it would be completely misleading to project everything that Acts (and the somewhat earlier Gospel of Luke) tells us onto the author's own time and his supposed church'.[140] Rather, Hengel sees Luke, historian and theologian that he is, as idealising the early church for moralistic reasons, to strengthen the faith of the – for him contemporary – church and to emphasise unity among Jew and Gentile believers.[141] For Hengel, the research question remains how we can arrive at reliable information about the earliest church.[142]

Other scholars shift the focus more towards the time of Acts publication and the Lukan church, asking how Acts functioned in Luke's own community. David Paul Moessner writes that:

> authorial intent to impact an audience through a deliberately designed plot was a common poetic currency, and … Luke was fully versed in this culture. …if he proves persuasive, Luke's audience will perforce experience transformation in understanding, belief, and action.[143]

Similarly, Knut Backhaus suggests that in the story of Acts, Luke's contemporary church had a *verbindlichen Herkunfsmemoria* – a binding origins-memorial.[144] Jan David Basczok elaborates upon Backhaus, pointing out that in making his claim to having produced the authoritative remembrance of Christian beginnings, Luke actively excludes other 'false'

---

frühchristlicher Historiographie BZNW 162 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 11. Similarly, Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Introduction and 1:1-2:47* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 29.

[138] Philip Francis Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lukan Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987). Bruce J. Malina and John J. Pilch, *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008).

[139] Gerd Lüdemann, trans. John Bowden, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989 [1987]; London: SCM Press, 1989); Gerd Lüdemann and Tom Hall, *The Acts of the Apostles: What Really Happened in the Earliest Days of the Church* (Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 2005), 9. Similarly, Seth Schwartz, in addressing the 'nearly complete lack of contemporary information' regarding Christian origins, refers to scholarly examination of the Gospels and Acts in the attempt to 'recover reliable scraps of information', Seth Schwartz, 'Roman Historians and the Rise of Christianity: The School of Edward Gibbon', in W. V. Harris, ed., *The Spread of Christianity in the First Four Centuries: Essays in Explanation*, CSCT 27 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 145-160; 145.

[140] Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Die Urgemeinde und das Judenchristentum* GFC 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 5-6. Cf. Martin Hengel, *Studien zum Urchristentum: Kleine Schriften VI* WUNT 234 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 50, 299.

[141] 6.

[142] 10, 'Die Frage ist, ob und wieweit wir auf Grund dieses stark idealisierten und einlinigen, holzschnittartigen lukanischen Bildes einigermaßen zuverlässige Aussagen über die Entstehung der Urgemeinde in Jerusalem machen können.'

[143] David Paul Moessner, *Luke the Historian of Israel's Legacy, Theologian of Israel's 'Christ': A New Reading of the 'Gospel Acts' of Luke* BZNW 182 (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2018), 339.

[144] Knut Backhaus, 'Asphaleia: Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung im Rahmen des antiken Wahrheitsdiskurses', in Eva Ebel, Samuel Vollenweider, eds., *Wahrheit und Geschichte: Exegetische und hermeneutische Studien zu einer dialektischen Konstellation* ATANT 102 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2012), 79-108; 108.

memories. Thus, Acts asserts for itself, 'einen normativen Charakter'.[145] As such, Luke's *oeuvre* has an 'identity-supplying function', is 'a dramatic cultural repository', and provides a specific, concrete identity for the collective Christianity.[146] Similarly, Aaron Kuecker emphasises the function of Acts to form identity: 'Of the several interrelated purposes of Luke-Acts, one of Luke's clear aims is to tell its hearers *who* they are, *whose* they are and *how* they are to be within their contexts.'[147]

If historiography can have didactic, identity-forming, normative tendencies, what about biography? Sean A. Adams has, in several monographs and articles, made a sustained argument that Acts is a particular kind of biography popular in the first century CE, the collected biography.[148] Regarding 'authorial intention and purpose', Adams observes that novels seek to entertain, histories seek to educate, and biographies are 'encomiastic, exemplary, informative, entertainment, preservation of memory, didactic, and apologetic' in purpose.[149] Collected biographies follow biographies and particularly emphasise exemplarity and education. Adams acknowledges that scholars propose a variety of authorial purposes for Acts, including entertainment and apologetic, and affirms that these purposes have a place in Luke's writing. However, he notes that the theme of education is mostly overlooked.

> Rather, Luke teaches the reader through the use of characters. The focus on the disciples and their teachings and deeds shows a particular emphasis on delineating the members of the Christian community in comparison to outsiders (e.g., Judas, 1.16–17; Ananias and Sapphira, 5.1–10; Simon Magus, 8.4–24; and the sons of Sceva, 19.13–16). Through this delineation, Luke also educates his readers theologically and facilitates their growth as Christians.[150]

Adams notes that in-group / out-group delineation and its educational function is characteristic of collected biography. Of further direct relevance for this dissertation is Adams' focus on imitation in the collected biography genre:

> as the concept of imitation is a central concern of collected biography, the contrast between in-group and out-group members becomes even more important, since

---

[145] 'a normative character', Jan David Basczok, *Szenen, Inszenierungen und Bühnen in der Apostelgeschichte* WUNT2 538 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 155.

[146] 155. 'Die identitätsstiftende Funktion der Apostelgeschichte sehe ich, das sei wiederholend genannt, darin, das der Text eine Art ‚dramatischer Kulturspeicher' ist.' 'Da sich der Text gemäß dem Anspruch ihres Verfassers auf die Christenheit und damit das gesamte Kollektiv bezieht, ist die Apostelgeschichte identitätskonkret.'

[147] Aaron Kuecker, *The Spirit and the 'Other': Social Identity, Ethnicity and Intergroup Reconciliation in Luke-Acts* LNTS 444 (London: Bloomsbury, 2011), 24. So too, Nickolas A. Fox, *The Hermeneutics of Social Identity in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2021). Cf. Florian Wilk, ed., *Identität und Sprache: Prozesse jüdischer und christlicher Identitätsbildung im Rahmen der Antike* BTS 174 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018).

[148] Sean A. Adams, *Greek Genres and Jewish Authors: Negotiating Literary Culture in the Greco-Roman Era* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2020). Sean A. Adams, 'Luke and Progymnasmata: Rhetorical Handbooks, Rhetorical Sophistication, and Genre Selection,' eds., M.R. Hauge and A.W. Pitts, *Ancient Education and Early Christianity* LNTS 533 (London: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2016), 137-54. Sean A. Adams, 'The Characterization of Disciples in Acts: Genre, Method, and Quality', eds. F. Dicken and J. Snyder, *Characters and Characterization in Luke-Acts* LNTS 548 (London: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2016), 155-68. Sean A. Adams, *The Genre of Acts and Collected Biography* SNTSMS 156 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013). Sean A. Adams, 'The Genre of Luke and Acts: The State of the Question', ed., Sean A. Adams and Michael Pahl, *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2012), 97-120.

[149] Adams here acknowledges following Burridge, 167; see Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?* 145–147, 180–183.

[150] 168.

> both individual and collected biographies provide a template for readers to emulate in their appropriation of a philosophical teaching. This aspect was widely known in the ancient world. Reading (Luke–) Acts as a collected/succession biography assists us in understanding how Peter, Paul, and the other disciples presented a pattern for imitation for Theophilus and the early Christian community.[151]

Thus, while Graeco-Roman literature generally had some level of pedagogical intention, history was noted for its educational function and collected biography heightens that aspect. As we are here concerned with initiation rituals, Adams' research on the role of key characters to exemplify in-group / out-group delineation serves to corroborate the dissertation's narrative analysis. Adam's contributions would remain useful even if one viewed Acts as comprising elements from a variety of genres.

Given Acts' identity-forming function, my research focus is not upon questions of historical accuracy. The historicity of the characters – like Peter – or the stories – like Pentecost – while not unimportant, is secondary to the teaching which those characters and stories illustrate and embody. Luke could have used Aesop's fables to flesh out his instructions and inculcate his reader in proper Christian identity. It is the Lukan *teaching* which is the primary historical artefact and which calls for critical social-anthropological analysis. That Lukan body of instruction we locate historically circa 70-130 CE, the time of Acts publication.[152]

3.2.1.2 History and Theology: How Precise and Particular was Luke?

I. Howard Marshall's classic work, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, went far towards settling the strife over whether Luke teaches theology or simply acts as ancient 'historiographer',[153] though in light of Adams' research, perhaps Marshall's work should be retitled *Biographer and Theologian*. Hengel, too, as noted above, affirms Luke as doing both history and theology. The question of whether Luke teaches is not an issue. As Eve-Marie Becker writes, 'literary memory in early Christianity serves a didactic purpose'.[154] But a recent Asbury Ph.D.

---

[151] 245.

[152] Following Andrew Gregory, 'Acts and Christian Beginnings: A Review Essay', *JSNT* Vol. 39 No. 1 (September 2016), 97–115. Knut Backhaus puts forward 100-130, but his exclusion of a pre-100 date is not based upon external evidence, but on a feeling, certainly justified, that there is 'perspectival distance' between the narrated world and the world of the author. But could not such an impression have arisen after forty or fifty or sixty years, putting the publication of Acts in the 70s to 90s? 'Zur Datieung der Apostelgeschichte. Ein Ordnungsversuch im chronologischen Chaos', *ZNW* Vol. 108 No. 2 (2017), 212-258, 253, 258. Gregory helpfully distinguishes questions of date from questions of historical value. He observes that the theoretical possibility exists that Luke accessed material from Josephus' *Antiquities* via a private or public reading before it was published in 93/94. He notes that even if Luke used a collection of Paul's letters, that does not necessitate a second century date, cf. 2 Peter 3:15-16 and 1 Clement 47.1. He argues that, while Acts could have been written ca. 110-120 to rebut Marcion, it need not have been. Moreover, if it was a response to Marcion, why does it not address his use of Pauline letters? He concludes we simply do not have enough data to date Acts any more precisely than the range of 70-130. On Marcion as early, cf. Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 29, and John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942), 11-12. On Marcion and Paul's letters, cf. Judith M. Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 426. Cf. Dennis E. Smith and Joseph B. Tyson, eds., *Acts and Christian Beginnings: The Acts Seminar Report* (Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013); see also Christopher Mount, *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul* SNT 104 (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2002).

[153] I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970).

[154] Eve-Marie Becker, *The Birth of Christian History: Memory and Time from Mark to Luke-Acts* AYBRL (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2017), 32. For a summary of the history vs. theology debate, see Clare

dissertation argues that Luke was simply a curator of historical sources, perhaps interested in broad themes, but not a careful instructor of theology. Thomas Lyons cites Dunn's critique of McCollough as an illustration of this view:

> The question that kept coming to my mind was whether McCollough is right to assume that Luke was intent on pushing a particular thesis regarding reception of the Spirit. Or was he simply telling a series of stories that highlight the central importance of the Spirit and reception of the Spirit in earliest Christianity, without insisting on particular points about prayer, the laying on of hands, and so forth. Luke's focus is surely on the central role of the Spirit in the earliest Christian mission, from Pentecost onwards and in vital breakthroughs thereafter. There is no real indication that he was making specific points as to the right method to ensure reception of the Spirit, is there?[155]

Lyons follows with:

> the diversity of any particular practice or phenomenon in the accounts could merely be representative of the diversity of such elements found in Luke's sources. … Luke certainly had freedom in composition to tease out themes and even to make theological points, as would have been appropriate in ancient historiographic literature … but he was also constrained by his sources.[156]

Whether Luke was in fact 'constrained by his sources' is a matter of speculation. We simply do not know what liberties Luke may have taken with his Acts sources because we do not have his sources to compare.[157] But besides the issue of sources, both Dunn and Lyons highlight the issue of precision and particularity. Neither takes issue with the basic idea of Luke as interested in general theological themes, but both question whether Luke went beyond vague emphases to make specific points.

However, Lyons failed to quote Dunn's comments upon the methodology employed in *Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit*:

> I confess that I struggled with this chapter. The first and third of the tools make good sense, but I found myself struggling with the technical jargon of the second,

---

K. Rothschild, *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History: An Investigation of Early Christian Historiography* WUNT2 175 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 24-59. From a narratological perspective see, Ute E. Eisen, *Die Poetik der Apostelgeschichte: Eine Narratologische Studie*, NTOA 58 (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2006; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 13. Cf. Jörg Frey, *Apostelgeschichte im Kontext*, 20. Cf. William W. Klein, Craig L. Blomberg, Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*, Third Edition (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017), 532-533; Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*, Revised and Expanded (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006), 219.

[155] James D. G. Dunn, review of *Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit: An Analysis of the Timing, Mechanism, and Manifestation of Spirit-Reception in Luke-Acts*, McCollough, David J., Paternoster, 2017, *RRT* Vol. 26 Issue 1 (January 2019), 111-113; 113. Cited in Thomas Lyons, *Revisiting the Riddle in Samaria: A Social-Scientific Investigation of Spirit Reception in Luke-Acts in Historical Perspective* Ph.D. Dissertation, Asbury Theological Seminary (2020), 21-22.

[156] Lyons, Revisiting the Riddle in Samaria, 22.

[157] Cf. Brandon D. Crowe, 'The Sources for Luke and Acts: Where Did Luke Get His Material (and Why Does it Matter?)', in Sean A. Adams and Michael Pahl, eds., *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2012), 73-95.

> and in future references to 'ER', I usually had to look back to pp. 62–63 to remind me not just what ER meant but what 'entity representation' meant and referred to.[158]

Dunn struggled with Emmott's discourse analysis concept which she terms 'entity representations'.[159] But that concept (here rendered with the more perspicuous label of 'implied mental constructs') is fundamental to grasping narrative.[160] Had Dunn understood the methodology chapter he may have had the answer to his question: 'There is no real indication that he was making specific points as to the right method to ensure reception of the Spirit, is there?' Lyons too fails to engage with the narratological and discourse tools that provide precision in moving beyond vague generalities to concrete details with which a historian or a social anthropologist can work. This chapter on methodology will provide the tools whereby the dissertation will demonstrate that not only did Luke take up the topic of the Spirit and baptism, but he was precise and particular in his teaching. To borrow a line from Ben Witherington:

> One of the things Luke as a rhetorical historian is unlikely to do is offer interesting but rhetorically irrelevant or insignificant details in his narrative. Everything is included with the view to persuading the audience about various matters. In short, the material is purpose-driven and tendentious in shape.[161]

3.2.2 Acts and Intelligibility

But, if we are going to base social analysis upon Luke's tendentious rhetoric, i.e., upon his teaching, we are faced with the challenge that determining his teaching has been an intractable problem for Acts research. The question is *how* Luke does it and how we can know precisely what it is he teaches.[162] This chapter will consequently address two exegetical questions regarding the intelligibility of Luke-Acts: first, how can prescriptive elements in Lukan narrative be identified, particularly with regards to Christian initiation, and second, does Luke present a coherent picture of Christian initiation?

---

[158] Dunn, review of McCollough, *Ritual*, 112.

[159] Catherine Emmott, *Narrative Comprehension: A Discourse Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 198ff.

[160] We will discuss this concept further under section 3.4.3. Cf. the brief discussion of 'mental representations' in Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC, 2010), 186. In addition to Emmott, *Narrative Comprehension*, cf., Herre van Oostendorp and Susan R. Goldman, ed., *The Construction of Mental Representations During Reading* (Mahwah, New Jersey; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1999); Knut Lambrecht, *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), esp. 74-116; for discussion of presupposition pools, see Theo Vennemann, 'Topics, sentence accent, and ellipsis: a proposal for their formal treatment', in Edward L. Keenan, ed., *Formal Semantics of Natural Language: Papers from a colloquium sponsored by the King's College Research Centre, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 313-328; 314. Gillian Brown and George Yule, *Discourse Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 28-31.

[161] Ben Witherington, *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009), 78.

[162] Cf. Gordon D. Fee, *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, A Division of Baker Publishing Group, 1991), 91.

3.2.2.1 The Question of Coherence

We will take the second question first.[163] In terms of the coherence of notions regarding Christian initiation, Marshall's 1970 observation still reflects virtually all of current scholarship: 'it is a notorious problem that Luke's statements about the relation of the Spirit to baptism are incapable of being worked into one single pattern'.[164] It is not without reason that it is a cliché to assert that Luke knows no common ritual – he seems to vary the way the Spirit comes in his Spirit-reception scenes. In Acts 2, the Spirit comes suddenly from heaven, but then is apparently promised in baptism. In Acts 8, the Spirit comes after baptism in the laying on of hands. Then again in chapter 10, the Spirit comes apart from either baptism or hand-laying. Surely Luke is incoherent, or unconcerned, or poorly editing his sources.

However, the common assumption that, in order for Luke to be 'coherent' he must say the exact same thing in every scene, is not methodologically valid. By what rule of rhetoric or style must Luke woodenly repeat himself? He need not, and does not, say the same thing in every story. Instead, he tells diverse stories to teach diverse concepts. He emphasises various aspects of Christian initiation in a variety of narratives. In one passage he focuses upon post-baptismal prayer as fundamental to receiving the Spirit. In another case, he elaborates on the

---

[163] Cf. Alan J. Bale, *Genre and Narrative Coherence in the Acts of the Apostles* LNTS 514 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 47; Todd A. Sacewater, 'Introduction: Discourse Analysis: History, Topics, and Applications', in Todd A. Sacewater, ed., *Discourse Analysis of the New Testament Writings* (Dallas: Fontes Press, 2020), 16-17.

[164] Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, 198. Cf. Wilfried Eisele, 'Lukas schreibt Heilsgeschichte, keine Sakramentenordnung', 'Luke writes salvation history, not sacramental order,' 'Apostel auf Firmreise? Taufe, Handauflegung und Geistempfang in der Apostelgeschichte', in Michael Seewald, ed., *Ortskirche: Bausteine zu einer künftigen Ekklesiologie: Festschrift für Bischof Gebhard Fürst* (Ostfieldern: Matthias Grünewald Verlag, 2018), 495-524; 516. 'Since Gaventa's important study of conversion, we find little support for the view that the Lukan narrative has identified a technique or pattern of conversion', Joel B. Green, *Conversion in Luke-Acts: Divine Action, Human Cognition, and the People of God* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 16; Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament* OBT 20 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), esp. 97, where she argues that Acts 2:38 cannot have paradigmatic force, since, 'The problem with this approach is that it selects one small pattern in the garment and seeks to make the rest of the garment conform to that pattern.' However, she does not employ discourse or narratological methods. Cf., Mikeal C. Parsons, it is 'mistaken to suggest … that there is any clear sequence of baptism and reception of the Holy Spirit in Acts'. *Acts* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 50. Charles H. Talbert, 'There is in Acts no set procedure for receiving the Holy Spirit'. Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* Revised Edition (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, Inc., 2005), 72. Carl R. Holladay explains the diversity in terms of history, 'Luke's lack of consistency in reporting baptismal initiation, especially how and when people receive the Holy Spirit, probably reflects the diversity of baptismal experiences.' *Acts: A Commentary* NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016), 185. Kuecker, *Spirit and the 'Other'*, 17, 'Luke's concern is less with a dogmatic "order of salvation" and more with how and why a diverse collection of persons were incorporated into the Spirit-empowered Jesus community.' Friedrich Avemarie, addressing Luke's baptism stories and considering the, 'disparity of the Lukan narrative', hardly expects any simple, handy result. 'Angesichts der Disparatheit der lukanischen Erzählungen ist aber ein einfaches, griffiges Ergebnis kaum zu erwarten.' Friedrich Avemarie, *Die Tauferzählungen der Apostelgeschichte: Theologie und Geschichte*, WUNT 139 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 17. Similarly, Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* SP (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 57; Craig S. Keener, *Acts, An Exegetical Commentary* Volume 2 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 1524; Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2006), 214; William H. Shepherd, Jr., *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts*, SBLDS 147 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 22; D. A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14* BTCL (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster Press, 1995; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House Company, 1987), 143; Eduard Schweizer, trans. Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller, *The Holy Spirit* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980 [German, 1978]), 62. John Fleter Tipei, *The Laying on of Hands in the New Testament: Its Significance, Techniques, and Effects* (New York: University Press of America, Inc., 2009), 212.

experience of glossolalia as indexical to Spirit reception. In yet another story he teaches that apostles impart the Spirit at will through the laying on of their gifted hands. In still another story, meant to be read in the flow of all the other narratives, he emphasises that apostles are like Jesus, miraculous power emanates spontaneously from them and, therefore, they need not always lay hands upon initiates for initiates to receive the Spirit.

If one seeks coherence only by looking for 'consistent' statements, retold in identical form in every Lukan tale, then one will be disappointed.[165] Luke is not consistent in this sense. That is, he does not say the same thing in every story. While it is true that bland, identical repetition is one way to communicate, it is not the only way. An author can build up a composite picture by relating different aspects of the picture in different stories. No one story tells it all. Stories read cumulatively in sequence reveal the artist's masterwork. As Anja Cornils, in her narratological analysis of Acts states:

> If at the end of the Acts of the Apostles one has a concept of the way the Holy Spirit works, then this is based on the fact that as a reader one has gone through different narratives of the Spirit and has related them to each other as elements in such a way that they result in a coherent narrative or a coherent whole. One connects the individual narratives with each other, compares them and derives the meta-narrative regarding Pneuma, which is obtained through reflection and is able to integrate the various individual narratives regarding Pneuma.[166]

Building upon Cornils' affirmation of the potential for Lukan coherence, and utilising many of the same methods – while also expanding the methodological toolkit – I will show that Luke's narrative, with its sequential series of individual scenes/discourse segments, constructs its own meta-discourse, the formation of which is not left to the ingenuity of the reader but is definitively inscribed in the Lukan narrative structure and authoritatively prescribed for the Lukan reader.

3.2.2.2 The Question of Prescription

Regarding the first question of how to identify prescription in narrative, we have already addressed the role of psychological transportation. Vivid, sympathetic characters influence readers' beliefs and behaviour. I argue, moreover, that Luke's cultural/historical context was one in which characters and events were *expected* to serve as exemplars for the reading/listening audience. The dissertation will show that Luke teaches with exemplars and we can know what he teaches through analysis of them.

To begin with, some, such as Hans Conzelmann, Hans-Josef Klauck, and Markus Öhler, have noted Luke's use of ideal depictions of early Christianity yet assessed them as imagining a

---

[165] Bale defines 'configuration' vis-à-vis the coherent whole as 'the process whereby the reader fits each part into that whole' (*Genre and Narrative Coherence*, 47).

[166] 'Wenn man am Ende der Apostelgeschichte ein Konzept von der Art und Weise des Wirkens des heiligen Geistes hat, denn beruht dieses darauf, dass man als Leser verschiedene Geist-Erzählungen durchlaufen hat und diese als Elemente so miteinander in Beziehung gesetzt hat, dass sie eine kohärente Erzählung bzw. Ein kohärentes Ganzes ergeben. Man verbindet die einzelnen Erzählungen miteinander, vergleicht sie und leitet daraus die Meta-Erzählung zu Pneuma ab, die durch Reflexion gewonnen wird und in der Lage ist, die verschiedenen Einzelerzählungen zu Pneuma zu integrieren.' Anja Cornils, *Vom Geist Gottes erzählen: Analysen zur Apostelgeschichte* TANZ 44 (Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 2006), 206.

wonderful, though unattainable utopia.[167] Alan C. Mitchell has suggested that Luke's utopian descriptions were parenesis aimed at his Christian audience.[168] In response, I will argue firstly that the exemplaric character of Luke's narrative extends to much more than just the community life summaries. Exemplarity is part and parcel of the entirety of Luke-Acts. Of interest to this chapter, it undergirds his discussion of Christian initiation. Luke expects his reader to imitate his models. Secondly, I will argue that Luke's exemplars are finely crafted with a variety of literary devices and can be accurately understood by using the tools of discourse analysis, narratology, and literary analysis. Luke is intelligible and coherent about the models he expects to be imitated.

3.3 Methodological Problems

Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit devotes significant space to detailed theoretical explanations of narratological, discourse analysis, and literary analysis tools. Furthermore, Sönke Finnern, Jan Rüggemeier, and Christoph Heilig all provide extensive discussions of the application of cognitive and narratological theories to New Testament exegesis.[169] My aim in this chapter is more focused. I will address recent theoretical objections to using interpretive 'tools' and then I will briefly outline the tools themselves. Discussions of the transportation effect, of *exempla*, and of genre were not part of *Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit*, and result in significantly different outcomes.

3.3.1 Michal Beth Dinkler: The Problems of Subjectivity and Lack of Differentiation Among 'Tools'

In the use of various methodological approaches, Dinkler raises a word of caution. With reference to such methods such as Marxism, feminism, and deconstruction, Dinkler argues that many treat these as 'glasses' which one picks from an assortment of spectacles and wears to read a particular text, or they are 'tools, as though an interpreter, looking into a theoretical toolbox, simply chooses, uses, and replaces a particular criticism, just as one would a hammer.'[170] Dinkler objects that this is careless. Deconstruction, she argues, is not simply a

---

[167] Hans Conzelmann, 'Luke does not present this way of life as a norm for the organization of the church in his own time. It is meant as an illustration of the uniqueness of the ideal earliest days of the movement'. *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* HR (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987 [*Die Apostelgeschichte*, 2., verbesserte Auflage, 1972]), 24. Similarly, Conzelmann speaks of 'das idealisierte Bild der Urgemeinde', *Geschichte des Urchistentums* GNT 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 36. Cf., Hans-Josef Klauck on Luke's presentation of the early community: 'Diesen Idealzustand gab es nur in der goldenen Zeit des Anfangs, deren heroische Größe für die Gegenwart uneinholbar ist, aber Ansporn und Mahnung sein kann'. 'Gütergemeinschaft in der klassischen Antike, in Qumran und im Neuen Testament', *RQ* Vol. 11 No. 1 (41) (October 1982), 47-79; 73-74. Markus Öhler writes similarly: 'Es wäre daher wohl unzutreffend, davon zu sprechen, die Urgemeinde würde einen idealen Verein darstellen. Vielmehr präsentiert Lukas die ideale Gemeinde als Aufforderung an seine Leser und Leserinnen, dieser nachzueifern'. 'Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde im Spiegel des antiken Vereinswesens', *NTS* Vol. 51, Issue 3 (July 2005), 393-415; 415. Andy Chambers asserts that Luke's ideals, 'were and still today are unattainable in toto, in spite of the sincerest progressive intentions'. *Exemplary Life: A Theology of Church Life in Acts* (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2012), 53. Cf. Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, 'Die Gütergemeinschaft der Urgemeinde', *ET*, Vol. 58 Issue 5 (1998), 370-383.

[168] 'Was Luke only interested in using this ideal to describe the early Jerusalem community as a golden age, or did he have some expectation for a practical effect on the life of his community?', Alan C. Mitchell, 'The Social Function of Friendship in Acts 2:44-47 and 4:32-37', *JBL* Vol. 111 Issue 2 (1992), 255-272; 258.

[169] Sönnke Finnern, *Narratologie und biblische Exegese* WUNT2 285 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); Jan Rüggemeier, *Poetik der markinischen Christologie* WUNT2 458 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017); Christoph Heilig, *Paulus als Erzähler? Paul as Narrator? A Narratological Perspective on the Epistles of Paul: Eine narratologische Perspektive auf die Paulusbriefe* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2020).

[170] Michal Beth Dinkler, *Literary Theory and the New Testament* AYBRL (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2019), 34.

'method', but an actual theory about language and literary forms. We must differentiate among methodological 'tools'.

Worse still is the problem of subjectivity:

> the default assumption underlying these toolbox and glasses analogies is that an interpreter chooses a tool to use, or a pair of glasses to wear, from a place of neutrality, a *non*-position. However, the nature of human communication and comprehension means that everyone *already* reads from a particular *limited* vantage point. We can't always put on and take of critical glasses at will; certain lenses are welded to our faces.[171]

Dinkler is correct that no one is neutral, no reader possesses pure objectivity. She is also correct in her observation that a feminist reading, as a reading method, is fundamentally different from Derrida's theorising about the nature of texts and meaning.

Where, then, does Dinkler's critique leave the present undertaking, with its vantage point of social anthropology and its overt utilisation of narrative, discourse, and literary 'tools'? Perhaps we can begin with defining what we mean by 'tool'. To take Dinkler's analogy a little further, let me observe that one cannot hammer a nail with a feather – a feather is not suited for the purpose. One can attempt to drive a nail with a tree branch, and one might have limited success, but will probably end up with a bent and twisted nail, only partially driven into the wood. One needs a hammer to successfully drive a nail. So, the idea of a 'tool' implies appropriateness, useful function, suitability for a purpose. One may try to 'read' a text by flipping to the last page and working backwards from there. Surely there will be some cognitive effect from such an endeavour, but one is consciously operating against the mechanical design of a book. So, if reading a book from beginning to end, a key narrative principle employed in this dissertation, is to be designated a 'tool' it is at least a 'tool' suited to the mechanics of reading. In this it is to be distinguished from ideological 'tools' such as post-colonialism, feminism, etc. Reading from beginning to end is more in line with what Dinkler classifies as fundamental linguistic theory.

Furthermore, reading from beginning to end can be distinguished from narrative gimmicks or rhetorical techniques that Luke might employ. Yes, there is the ancient rhetorical technique of 'amplification', or αὔξησις, which taught orators to pile on words and repeat ideas again and again as they went along. Luke may indeed be seen to utilise amplification. However, Luke's reader works from the beginning of his story to the end regardless of whether Luke takes extra time to repeat ideas. It has to do with the mechanism of reading, not the art of reading. Luke's text gives no indication that its reader should do anything but start at the beginning and progress onwards. That a 'real' reader might be cheeky and begin in the middle is inconsequential for a narrative that envisages its reader – its ideal reader – working sequentially, scene by scene, one plot revelation after another. Reading from beginning to end is likewise different from the fact that Luke has several *leitmotifs*, such as the kingdom of God, the geographical progression of the logos, money, prayer, the Holy Spirit, etc. Luke need not have any recurrent themes for his reader to pick up the story from the start and read to the finish. Neither is it important whether any actual historical reader ever picked up a physical scroll and read Luke's entire story at one sitting. Luke could have finished writing, put his scroll away in a box and buried

[171] 34.

it, only to have it discovered, still unread, 2000 years later – he nevertheless had written a story that has a beginning and an end.

This takes us back to Dinkler's criticism that no one operates from objective neutrality, everyone exercises subjectivity in selecting reading 'tools'. If by tool one means ideological perspective, then yes. This dissertation does not adopt a theological approach that would view faith, God, or Holy Spirit as metaphysical realities in themselves. This dissertation adopts a social anthropological view that recognises the role religious ideology plays in a group – theology is not irrelevant – but understands theological convictions as social/psychological forces motivating and constraining religious movement. Again, if by tool one means linguistic analysis, then her point about the difference between Marxism as a method and deconstruction as a theory comes into play.

But how can *modern* tools be used on an *ancient* text? To see the wonders of the universe one needs specialized instruments. It matters not when the star was born, or how massive the galaxy, or how dense the black hole, the astronomer, with her radio-telescopes, x-ray telescopes, ultraviolet telescopes, and numerous other delicate instruments, is able to observe the various phenomena billions of light years away. It is irrelevant to the biologist with her microscope how old the item in the slide is, whether a piece of wood from a past millennium, or a new virus, the microscope can be used to examine it. So too, narrative instruments tell us about yesterday's newspaper, or a story written two millennia ago. It is irrelevant whether the ancients had read Gérard Genette and Mieke Bal on focalisation, or Wolfgang Iser on the implied reader. If focalisation occurred, then we, today, can identify it.

Thus, the use of methodological tools or instruments is not necessarily a mark of subjectivity, as if one simply selects the tool one wants to get the result one desires. One cannot build a house with a feather, nor can one see the farthest star without a telescope. Tools and instruments are required for specific purposes, they are not optional. They are marks of complexity. Misuse of tools, or misreading instruments, is always a possibility and thus the need for a community of users to provide checks and balances. But the miscalibration of a spectrometer does not mean we cease to use spectrometers. In this vein the dissertation employs tools or 'instruments' from narratology, discourse analysis, and literary analysis.

3.3.2 Problems with Literary and Historical Context

Discussing, as we have been, issues of author, text, and reader requires us to clarify what we are and are not attempting in this dissertation. First, we will work on two levels, the literary and the historical. There is an author within the text, the 'implied author' and there is also the historical person who composed the text. There is a reader, or readers, within the text, the 'implied reader', and there is the historical reader, or readers, who actually read the text, or heard it read. Reader-response approaches, which offer the third level of the modern reader, will not be employed. Neither will reception history beyond the first and second centuries be addressed. Our interest is (1) in engaging with the communication encoded in the text, specifically in the implied author's expectations of the implied reader, and (2) asking how the historical ancient reader, as a member of a charismatic sect, could have reacted to those implied authorial expectations. One might object, though, that 'ancient reader response' is not practical as we have no access to the first/second century historical audience. However, careful attention to the relationship between ancient cultural discourse and textual expectations forges a link between the historical dimension and the dimension of the text.

3.4 Methodological Solutions

3.4.1 Exempla: The Graeco-Roman Reading Context

3.4.1.1 Malherbe and Kurz – Exemplary Discourse in Ancient Cultures and Literary Genres

Abraham J. Malherbe, in his treatment of moral exhortation in the Graeco-Roman world, addresses the role of personal examples, an especially common literary/rhetorical device.[172] He cites Lucian's call to, 'copy that man', a philosopher named Demonax (Lucian, *Demonax* 1-2), Pliny the Younger's encouraging of a man to imitate his father (Pliny, Letter 8.13), and Plutarch's appeal to preserve both excellent and poor role models: 'So, I think, we also shall be more eager to observe and imitate the better lives if we are not left without narratives of the blameworthy and the bad' (Plutarch, *Demetrius* 1.4-6). The role model, the moral example, was standard educational fare among both Greeks and Romans. Malherbe also cites a variety of New Testament texts and church fathers employing exemplary discourse. Of interest to us is his citation of Acts 20:31-35, where Paul points to his own life as a leadership model.

In a *festschrift* for Malherbe, William S. Kurz examines the role of exemplary discourse in Luke-Acts.[173] Kurz observers that a variety of ancient genres, biographies, novels, histories, all contained instructional elements. The characters and events were paradigmatic, were meant to teach. Consequently, regardless of how one categorizes the genre of Luke-Acts, the potential exists for the pedagogical *tendenz* to be present. Jewish literature, too, employed the narrative role model. Kurz cites Josephus' moralizing in his preface, 'the main lesson to be learnt from this history by any who care to peruse it is….' (Josephus *Ant.* 1 proem 3 § 14 Loeb Classical Library), and Josephus' comments on the life of Ahab, 'And further, with the king's history before our eyes, it behooves us to reflect on the power of Fate' (Ant. 8.15.6 § 418-20 LCL). About the story of Antipater, we read, 'I shall relate the whole story of this in order that it may be an example and warning to mankind to practise virtue in all circumstances' (17.3.3 § 60 LCL). Kurz also points to 2 Maccabees as supplying the classic *exemplum* in Eleazar, who facing a martyr's death declares:

> 'Therefore, by bravely giving up my life now, I will show myself worthy of my old age and leave to the young a noble example of how to die a good death willingly and nobly for the revered and holy laws.' When he had said this, he went at once to the rack. (2 Macc. 6:27-28 *NETS*)

Kurz continues, citing, among others, Philo's representation of Moses as the ideal Hellenistic monarch and Sirach's praise of the fathers (Sirach 44:1-50:24). In Luke-Acts, Kurz finds classic cases of the paradigmatic model in the passion narrative, where Jesus is particularly a model of prayer to his disciples, and where, in contrast to Mark, the Lukan Jesus dies calmly: 'The Lukan redactional themes all go in the direction of portraying Jesus as a model of how to die, as Plato had presented Socrates.'[174] Kurz similarly views Stephen's death, the deaths of Ananias and Sapphira, the generosity of Barnabas, as well as Paul's farewell speech, as deliberately constructed moral models. Kurz concludes: 'A significant number of the

[172] Abraham J. Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation, A Greco-Roman Sourcebook* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), 135-138.
[173] Kurz, 'Narrative Models for Imitation in Luke-Acts', 171-189.
[174] 186.

narratives in Luke and Acts are specially shaped and redacted to provide clear models for imitation by implied readers.'[175]

Since the work of Kurz, the matter of Graeco-Roman exemplaric discourse and Luke-Acts has not been significantly addressed. For example, though Jean-François Landolt asks, 'If at times Paul presents himself in his letters as an example to imitate, could one say that the Lukan construction of Paul retains the same exemplary dimension?',[176] yet his discussion is strictly internal within the Pauline and Lukan writings. He makes no appeal to the cultural milieu that puts a premium upon mimesis. Likewise, Eric Clouston, in his recent monograph on narrative persuasion in Acts and the Graeco-Roman world, argues that Paul's Miletus speech is not didactic, since there are only six verses of instruction but twelve verses about Paul's ministry: 'The focus is much more on Paul and his ministry than on people following his example.'[177] Likewise, Peter, Stephen, and Paul 'echo Jesus at times' but 'this is not presented as planned imitation of Jesus but rather as spontaneous, through the inspiration the Holy Spirit'.[178] 'Paul cannot be seen as a deliberate follower of Peter's example, because contact between them is minimal' and thus, 'The emphasis in Acts is not on learning from example', and Paul and the other characters are presented as 'exceptional, not as models realistic for every believer (or even the community) to follow.'[179] However, this is a basic misunderstanding of exemplaric discourse. An author need not show one character deliberately imitating another to encourage mimesis among the readers/auditors. Imitation was simply how one read. Thus, there is a need to examine the ancient discourse of moral examples further.

3.4.1.2 Roller and Roman *Exempla* – Action, Evaluation, Commemoration, Norm Setting

Notable deeds that provided a model to imitate or eschew – these were the Roman *exempla*. Malherbe and Kurz have discussed the moral model in narrative, but it went beyond that. The pedagogical use of historical events and characters as *exempla*/παραδείγματα was ubiquitous in Roman culture. Matthew B. Roller writes, 'Exemplary discourse … encompasses all of Roman society, from the loftiest aristocrats to the humblest peasants, laborers, and slaves.'[180]

---

[175] 189.

[176] Jean-François Landolt, trans. Michael D. Thomas, Eric Gilchrest, and Timothy Brookins, ''Be Imitators of Me, Brothers and Sisters' (Philippians 3.17): Paul as an Exemplary Figure in the Pauline Corpus and the Acts of the Apostles', in David P. Moessner, Daniel Marguerat, Mikeal C. Parsons, Michael Wolter, eds., *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Paul and Israel's Legacy* LNTS 452 (New York: T&T Clark, 2012), 290-317.

[177] Eric Clouston, *How Ancient Narratives Persuade: Acts in is Literary Context* (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2020), 211.

[178] 211.

[179] 211.

[180] Matthew B. Roller, 'Exemplarity in Roman Culture: The Cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia', *CP* Vol. 99, No. 1 (January 2004), 1-56; 6. Cf., Matthew Roller, 'The Exemplary Past in Roman Historiography and Culture', in A. Feldherr, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 214-230. Rebecca Langlands, *Exemplary Ethics in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018). Kristoffel Demoen, 'A Paradigm for the Analysis of Paradigms: The Rhetorical *Exemplum* in Ancient and Imperial Greek Theory'. *RJHR* Vol. 15 No. 2 (Spring 1997) 125-158. John M. Lilley, *The Narrative Presentation of Ethical Paradigms in Dionysius's* Roman Antiquities *and* Luke-Acts, PhD Dissertation, Marquette University, 1994. Werner Jaeger: 'The whole of Greek paideia [education] is founded on two very old Greek ideas – paradeigma and mimesis, the model and its imitation.' Werner Jaeger, trans. Gilbert Highet, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture* Vol. 2, *In Search of the Divine Centre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1943), 259. For exemplars in Jewish writing see, Teresa Rash Brown, *Sinners, Idol-Worshippers and Fools*

What exactly, then, did an *exemplum* look like and how was it related to culture, specifically? Roller cites Polybius, a second century BCE historian, who attributes the military success of the Roman state, not merely to superior strength and courage, but to the cultural institutions which nurture that courage in the youth.[181] The particular institution which Polybius describes is the funeral of an important man. The deceased is carried into the forum, the plaza in the centre of a city, to the rostra, the platform for orators, where he is placed, more often than not, upright rather than reclined. Then one of his sons will discourse on his virtues and accomplishments until it seems the loss is not just the family's, but the whole community's. The man is then buried with appropriate ceremonies. A mask, which imitates both the 'features and complexion' characteristic of the man is placed prominently in the home in a wooden shrine. Families will display their masks at public sacrifices. When a prominent member of the extended family dies, the masks of the departed ancestors are worn by men who in some way resemble them. The masked men wear togas, trimmed in purple, or even all purple, or trimmed in gold, depending upon the rank and achievements of the ancestor. They ride to the forum in chariots before which go the fasces, axes, and various insignia. Then they sit in a row on the rostra on chairs of ivory. An orator recounts the great deeds, not only of the deceased, but of all the ancestors represented by masks.

> There could not easily be a more ennobling spectacle for a young man who aspires to fame and virtue. For who would not be inspired by the sight of the images of men renowned for their excellence, all together and as if alive and breathing? (*Histories of Polybius* 4.53.1-9).

Polybius had never read the psychological literature on narrative transportation. But he aptly describes its presence in Roman society. Having depicted the physical ceremony, Polybius then illustrates the nature of exemplaric oratory by recounting at length the legend of the Roman warrior, Horatius Cocles, who singlehandedly defended a bridge against an invading army, ordered the bridge destroyed behind him, and then, when the city of Rome was safe from attack, dived into the river and perished, counting 'the safety of his country' and the glory which would accrue to him more valuable than life. Polybius uses no flowery adjectives to describe Horatius, other than to indirectly state that the enemy was 'astonished' at his 'endurance and courage'. Polybius lets the deed speak for itself. 'Such, if I am not wrong, is the eager emulation of achieving noble deeds engendered in the Roman youth by their institutions' (Histories of Polybius 4.55.4)

Roller analyses the Roman cultural convention of exemplarity, illustrated in 'Horatius at the Bridge', in terms of four elements: action, evaluation, commemoration, and norm setting. First, 'action' is the deed, but it is the deed done, as with Horatius, Roller notes, before representatives of the Roman public. If non-Romans witness the deed, then they are portrayed as possessing traditional Roman values; Polybius used the Greek term *ethismoi* (ἐθισμός ὁ - accustoming, habituation, habits, usages, customary modes, Liddell-Scott-Jones) the Latin counterpart Roller identifies as 'customs of the ancestors' (*mos maiorum*).

---

among the Men of Hesed: Ben Sira's Pedagogy in Praise of the Fathers *(Sir 44-50)* PhD Dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1998.

[181] Matthew B. Roller, *Models from the Past in Roman Culture: A World of Exempla* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 3.

Second, the deed is evaluated by the witness according to Roman customs and given either positive or negative weight. 'These judges thereby imbue the selected action with social significance, converting it into a "deed" (*res gesta*) with implied or explicit normative force.'[182] Roller observes that Horatius' enemies testified to his valour and Horatius himself died knowing he would win glory, obviously and correctly, expecting a positive judgment from the Romans who witnessed his feat.

Third is commemoration, 'This deed – that is, the action, its performer, and the evaluation(s) it received – is commemorated via one or more monuments.'[183] Roller understands a monument to be anything that preserves the memory of the deed within the community, be that a written text, orations, statues, paintings, temples, tombs, or roads. Polybius' funeral masks and speeches are just such an institutional monument.[184] That Horatius was memorialised, Roller points out, is confirmed by Polybius who explains how the Romans recount his story.

Fourth there is what Roller terms, 'norm setting'. The audience to such commemoration, that is, the Roman community, is 'enjoined to accept the deed – now inscribed via monuments into the moral framework of the *mos maiorum* – as normative, i.e., as having a morally prescriptive or obligatory character.'[185] In continually retelling the story of Horatius at the Bridge, the Romans normativize his gallantry. Roller notes that the great deed of the past becomes a standard by which to evaluate moral questions of the present: 'the deed is taken to set or confirm a moral standard by which audience members should judge other actions they observe in their own time and place, or to provide a model that they themselves should imitate or avoid.'[186] Thus, the Roman *exemplum* sets up characters who are 'exceptional', but in the discourse of their exceptionality they function to inspire others to emulate or surpass them. These four exemplaric elements – action, evaluation, commemoration, and norm setting – the dissertation will show to be present in the Lukan narrative.

Thus, the *exemplum* belonged to the Graeco-Roman cultural discourse familiar to Gentile and Jew alike. Luke's readers would have had a tendency, ingrained upon them since childhood, through family rhythms of household shrines, funerals, speeches, and sacrifices, whether their own or their neighbours', through formal education where rhetoric was studied,[187] through participating in the communal reading meetings common to virtually every social class,[188] through breathing the air of cities filled with commemorative statutes, engravings, and memorials, to view the Lukan characters and events as exemplars.

Here we segue from the historical context with its cultural discourse, to the narrative context which is embedded in that same cultural discourse. The expectation of *exempla* belongs to the pool of presuppositions that an ancient reader could be expected by an ancient author to bring to the text and must be considered as part of the narrative structure, that is, as intrinsic to the implied author and implied reader. Luke need not overtly mark characters as exemplaric. By

[182] 6.
[183] 6.
[184] 6-7.
[185] 8.
[186] 8.
[187] Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), 221.
[188] See Brian J. Wright, *Communal Reading in the Time of Jesus: A Window into Early Christian Reading Practices* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017), esp. 40-41 and 111-115.

virtue of the cultural discourse, exemplaric reading is the default mode for Luke's implied reader.

3.4.2 Influencing the Implied Reader: Tools of the Literary Trade

When we speak of readers and audience, we must ask what readers and what audience do we mean? The 'audience' Luke influences is the 'implied reader'. This is the ideal reader constructed by the narrative who always responds appropriately to the ideology expressed by the implied author (also a narrative construct). As Wolf Schmid writes, the implied reader is, 'the author's image of the recipient that is fixed and objectified in the text by specific indexical signs'.[189] This is not the actual reader, ancient or modern. Nor is the implied reader someone like Luke's Theophilus. Narrator and narratee both exist within the narrative. Furthermore, when we speak of 'Luke', we are not speaking of the actual person, but of the implied author, a construct of the text. While the implied reader/author are constructs of the text, the text is, as we have just discussed, a construct of society with its language, cultural norms, and cognitive frames.

Manipulating characters and events to influence the implied reader is the function of literary devices. Such include: focalisation (orienting the reader's attention to the 'focalised'[190]), functional redundancy (purposeful repetition)[191], narrative asides (comments directed overtly to the reader)[192], narrative spokespersons (characters who represent the implied author's ideology, e.g., God, Jesus, and sometimes Peter), action peaks/didactic peaks (a high point in the action is often paired with a teaching moment[193]), type-scenes (a standard, recurring scenario; a cognitive 'frame' for which reference to a part can elicit awareness of the entire 'frame'),[194] exemplars, and amplification (αὔξησις, used in ancient rhetoric for expanding repeatedly upon a theme).[195] By these one identifies what is brought before the implied

---

[189] Wolf Schmid, 'Implied Reader', Paragraph 1, Peter Hühn, et al. (eds.), *The Living Handbook of Narratology* (Hamburg: Hamburg University Press, URL = hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/index.php?title=Implied_Reader&oldid=2015 [view date: 22 May 2018]). See also, Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983 [1961]), 137-138.

[190] Cf., Michael Toolan, *Narrative, A Critical Linguistic Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2001), 60. Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* Fourth Edition (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017), 132-153.

[191] On functional redundancy, cf.: Ronald D. Witherup, 'Functional Redundancy in the Acts of the Apostles: A Case Study', *JSNT* Vol. 48 (1992), 67-86; 84. Ronald D. Witherup, 'Cornelius over and over and over again: 'Functional Redundancy' in the Acts of the Apostles', *JSNT* Vol. 15 Issue 49 (January 1993), 45-66. William S. Kurz, 'Effects of Variant Narrators in Acts 10-11', *NTS* Vol. 43 (1997) 570-586. Gaventa's analysis does not employ the narrative methods of Witherup and Kurz, cf., *From Darkness to Light*, 52-95.

[192] Steven M. Sheeley, *Narrative Asides in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, JSOT Press, 1992), 36.

[193] R. E. Longacre, "Interpreting Biblical Stories" in Teun A. van Dijk, ed., *Discourse and Literature: New Approaches to the Analysis of Literary Genres* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1985), 169-185; 172-173, 176; Cf., Robert E. Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse* (New York: Plenum, 1996), 37.

[194] Cf., Walter Arend, *Die Typischen Scenen bei Homer* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1933); Robert Alter, 'Biblical Type-Scenes and the Uses of Convention', *CI* Vol. 5 No. 2 (Winter, 1978), 355-68; Robert Alter, *Art of Biblical Narrative* (n.pl.: Basic Books, 1981), 47-62. Mary Therese DesCamp, *Metaphor and Ideology: Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and Literary Methods Through a Cognitive Lens* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 81. Classically, see Charles J. Fillmore, 'Frame Semantics and the Nature of Language', *ANYAS* Vol. 280 Issue 1 (October 1976), 20-32. For a review of the field, cf. Bonnie Howe and Eve Sweetser, 'Cognitive Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation', in Steven L. McKenzie, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 121-131. For recent application of frames to narrative exegesis, see Rüggemeier, *Poetik*, 11-14; Finnern, *Narratologie*, 41.

[195] Malcolm Heath, 'Invention', in Stanley E. Porter, ed., *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. – A.D. 400* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 89-119, 95.

reader's attention, emphasised, commented upon, and marked for emulation; thus, answering Fee, resolving the perennial problem of disambiguating the merely incidental to the story from what is aligned with the implied author's ideology. That is, differentiating the described and the didactic, distinguishing the narrated from the normative.

For example, Simon has a mother-in-law. The Lukan text makes no derogatory remarks about mothers-in-law, nor does it deprecate Simon for having gotten married at some unknown point in the past. Neither does the Lukan story praise Simon in this regard. At the moment in the Lukan narrative[196] where the mother-in-law is mentioned, Simon is not yet even a disciple. Jesus deems him worthy enough to visit him in his home, but other than that, the narrative has not embued Simon with exemplaric qualities. Having a wife is therefore neither disparaged nor praised. It is unmarked.

On the other hand, selling one's property and laying the proceeds at the apostles' feet is encouraged in the narrative by the behaviour of characters whose status in the story renders them exemplaric for the implied reader: the fresh from Pentecost, Spirit-filled early believers, and Joseph the Levite, whom the apostles approvingly call 'Son of Encouragement' (Acts 2:44-45; 4:34-37). That the apostles especially represent the ideology of the implied author is signalled in the text by three factors: (1) Jesus 'opened their minds to understand the scriptures',[197] (2) their close association with Jesus from the time of John to Jesus' ascension, and (3) their recent theophanic reception of the Holy Spirit, the Promise from Father God, the ultimate ideological anchor-point. However, while donations are thereby encouraged, *they are not required*, as Peter explains to Ananias (Acts 5:4). Repentance and baptism in Jesus' name, however, are required – Peter, the Spirit enflamed apostle of the exalted Christ, stands among the apostles and delivers his command at a 'didactic peak', a pause occurring immediately after the intense action of Pentecost. Thus, we can see gradation in the level of narrative prescription.

Whoever produced the literary artefact that is Luke-Acts had some measure of Graeco-Roman education.[198] Our immediate narratological concern is not to uncover this historical personage, but rather to understand that the implied reader would read this literate text as a part of his cultural milieu, expecting the implied author to employ characters as role models. As modern readers of the ancient text, we have the critical tools to specify precisely what the implied author puts forward as an *exemplum* / παράδειγμα, and how he advances it, whether positively or negatively, and to what degree, either as normal, or as encouraged, or as fully normative.

3.4.3 Using the Tools to Craft a Prescriptive Narrative: Sequential Reading, Focalisation, Type-Scenes, Implied Mental Constructs, and Discourse Normality

How then, do we employ these narrative tools? Discourse analysis, narratology, and literary analysis would all be concerned with narrative progression – one reads Luke's scenes sequentially, observing the unfolding of the story, seeing how each scene addresses a different theme, noting how questions raised (or gaps left) in initial scenes are answered (filled in) in

[196] NB we are not here concerned with the 'actual' 'historical' life-story of Peter, but with Luke's telling of it, Luke's discourse; cf. Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978).

[197] τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς· (Luke 24:45).

[198] The concern here is not the historical Luke, but the implied author, whose construction is not unsophisticated. The historical Luke's precise educational level is debated. Cf. Sean A. Adams, 'Luke and progymnasmata: rhetorical handbooks, rhetorical sophistication and genre selection', in A.W. Pitts, and M.R. Hauge eds., *Ancient Education and Early Christianity* LNTS 533 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 137-154.

subsequent scenes.[199] In other words, how is narrative ambiguity disambiguated?[200] I do not mean to inquire how a modern reader might creatively imagine resolutions to apparent disjunctures. I mean to address the question of how the implied reader is expected, based upon explicit indices in the text, as well as cultural and behavioural frames/schemas and scripts, to construct from the sequentially presented, individual Lukan scenes/discourse segments, an overarching Lukan meta-discourse.

We note that, as with the need to distinguish between the historical author and the implied author, so too, sequential reading is a matter of implied reading practice, not actual historical reading practice. Thus, Luke and Acts need never have been read together[201] for Luke's implied reader to read them together. As C. Kavin Rowe states, he is interested in, 'the cumulative or total effect of the passages' with which he deals.[202]

Thus, we come to Peter M. Phillips, who argues, what is for Luke-Acts, a crucial issue. That is, while it is standard practice for commentaries to move through a biblical book one verse, or even one word, at a time, the interpretation of those verses and words is influenced by factors from the whole range of material available in the book, and even from material external to the book. Such intra, and extra-textual readings disrupt the reading process planned by the author for the reader.[203] How an author sequences information in a narrative is not irrelevant. As Aaron Kuecker writes, 'Reading Luke with respect to narrative order respects the author's use of the classical rhetorical devices of accumulation and amplification gradually to bring along the hearers…'. [204] Similarly, Jan Rüggemeier observes: 'Cognitive psychology research indicates that initial information is better retained in reading memory than information conveyed at a later point in the narrative.'[205] In other words, initial scenes such as Jesus' baptism, or the Day of Pentecost remain in the reader's mind and influence how she reads the

---

[199] On filling narrative 'gaps', see Meir Sternberg, The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985); Michal Beth Dinkler, *Silent Statements: Narrative Representations of Speech and Silence in the Gospel of Luke* (Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2013); Kathy Maxwell, *Hearing Between the Lines: The Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and its Literary Milieu* LNTS 425 (London: T&T Clark International, 2010). On narrative progression and corpus stylistics, see Michael Toolan, 'Narrative Progression in the Short Story: First Steps in a Corpus Stylistic Approach', *Nr* Vol. 16 No. 2 (May 2008), 105-120.

[200] On narrative ambiguity and disambiguation of textual gaps, see Wolfgang Iser, 'Interaction Between Text and Reader', Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman, ed., *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 106-119; 111-112. Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 116-118, 169.

[201] Cf., Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period Before Irenaeus*, WUNT2 169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); C. Kavin Rowe, 'History, Hermeneutics, and the Unity of Luke-Acts', Andrew F. Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe, ed., *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts* (Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 2010), 43-65. Cf. Andrew Gregory, 'The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts', *JSNT* Vol. 29 No.4 (2007), 459-472.

[202] C. Kavin Rowe, *Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 10-11. Cf. Rowe's sequential, cumulative reading of κύριος in his *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* BZNW 139 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), cf., 11-14.

[203] Peter M. Phillips, *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: A Sequential Reading* LNTS 294 (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 27; cf. 25-26. Whereas Phillips works phrase-by-phrase through John's prologue, Kari Syreeni sets a precedent for sequential scene analysis, 'Peter as Character and Symbol in the Gospel of Matthew', David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, ed., *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, JSNTS 184 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 106-152; 120-152.

[204] Kuecker, Spirit and the 'Other', 18.

[205] 'So weisen kognitionspsychologische Untersuchungen darauf hin, dass anfängliche Informationen besser im Lesegedächtnis verankert werden als solche Informationen, die zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt der Erzählung vermittelt werden.' (Rüggemeier, *Poetik*, 17).

remainder of the narrative. This psychological reading dynamic is not merely a matter of readers retaining cognitive 'facts'. In terms of emotional impact, if the author constructs the sequential revealing of details in the story in such a way as to foster suspense in the reader, flipping to the end of the book to discover the story's ultimate resolution completely spoils the suspense. It unravels the carefully constructed narrative fabric.

To analyse the story as if there were no implicit construction of readerly suspense is to egregiously misread it. A single phrase, a single word, spoken precisely when the tension is resolved, when the reader finally comprehends the sweep of the narrative, has infinitely more significance than if it were uttered somewhere along the meandering path leading up to that climactic point. The pieces of the puzzle, presented stepwise in scene after scene, may suddenly take shape and meaning in one final episode. To analyse the bits and pieces apart from the story's own final revelation is an exercise in futility. The oft repeated refrain of, 'there are only x number of occurrences of this word', epitomizes this fallacy. Even if one cobbled together an explanation, a theory that apparently made sense of it all, to do so apart from the actual revelatory moment inscribed in the narrative itself would be misleading. Thus, when Simon the Sorcerer perceives with greedy wonder, 'Ahh! Through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Spirit is given', the reader's mind flashes back to those previous events where thousands were baptised, but no mention was made of exactly *how* they were to receive the promised Spirit. The reader shares the revelatory moment with Simon. An unexplained phenomenon has been clarified. A narrative gap has been filled in. Thus, a sequential analysis of Luke-Acts eliminates the classic exegetical conundrum of isolating and juxtaposing Acts 2:38 with Acts 8:17.

Narratology is also interested in focalisation – the narrative camera. Focalisation is not mere emphasis. It is arrangement and orientation, camera angle, as it were. For example, we do not have the actual, fully detailed, perfectly chronological knowledge of Paul's life, but we do have the Pauline story as Luke focalises it for us in his discourse.[206] Thus focalisation is related to the concept of limitation – by focusing *through* a particular lens, the narrative camera necessarily limits our perspective. We may hear story through the narrator's voice, describing every detail. We may also hear the story through the voice of a character or see it through a character's eyes – this is a more limited perspective than that of the all-knowing narrator. One may also think of focalisation in terms of presence in the story-world. Your experience of the story may come to you from someone entirely external to the story, or it may be mediated by someone internal to the story – hence, external/internal focalisation. Yet another way of think of focalisation is in terms of the object to which your attention is drawn and the means by which your attention is directed – focalisation and the focalised.[207] For example, looking again at Simon the Sorcerer, the narrator speaks, recounting to us how the apostles laid hands on

[206] For technical discussion of fabula and sujet, see, Irene de Jong, *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 47; 76-77.

[207] For further reading, see Michael Toolan, *Narrative, A Critical Linguistic Introduction*, 2nd Ed. (London/New York: Routledge, 2001), esp. 60; Wolf Schmid, *Narratology: An Introduction* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010); Peter Hühn, Wolf Schmid, Jörg Schönert, eds, *Point of View, Perspective, and Focalization: Modeling Mediation in Narrative*, Nar 17 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009); Manfred Jahn, 'Focalization', in David Herman, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 94-108; one may also profitably consult *The Living Handbook of Narratology* at http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/focalization.

people, how they were receiving the Holy Spirit; but Simon perceives – and for a brief moment we perceive with him.

Thus, with focalisation, working in concert with literary tools such as narrative asides, functional redundancy, didactic peaks, type-scenes, exemplars, and amplification, one identifies prescriptive narrative structures and gauges their level of normativity. Put simply, the narrative focuses attention on some aspect of the story, then comments upon the focalised. This narrative combination becomes prescriptive when the implied author holds a position of authority vis-à-vis the implied audience. That is, the text constructs an expectation on the part of the implied author of obedience on the part of the implied reader.

In our text, the narrator, who is always narratologically distinct from, but in Luke-Acts is ideologically aligned with, the implied author, establishes himself in an authoritative teaching role for Theophilus, the narratee, with whom the implied reader identifies. For a slightly imperfect,[208] but otherwise helpful example, in C.S. Lewis' *The Screwtape Letters*, the advice that Screwtape the demon offers Wormwood his nephew is quite the opposite of what the implied author expects the implied reader will view as good and godly. Such a contrast between the implied author and the narrator in the story (Screwtape) is not the case in Luke-Acts. Consequently, then, when Luke's camera focalises, say, glossolalia, and Luke narrates the significance of the glossolalia, the implied reader receives the Lukan commentary on the focalised as authoritative.

Literary analysis also pays particular attention to type-scenes. Robert Alter is recognised for his pioneering work with biblical type-scenes, of which there are a variety:

> the annunciation … of the birth of the hero to his barren mother; the encounter with the future betrothed at a well; the epiphany in the field; the initiatory trial; danger in the desert and the discovery of a well or other source of sustenance; the testament of the dying hero.[209]

The classic biblical example is 'boy meets girl at village well' (e.g., Abraham's servant for Isaac meets Rebekah, Jacob meets Rachel, Moses meets Reuel's daughters). The basic elements of the story are repeated with different characters, but typically, someone draws water, they eat at the girl's family's home, they marry. The power of the type-scene is multifaceted: it allows for diversity within a basic structure and mention of just a part of the type-scene can evoke memory of the entire scene. That is, a story can swap out the names of the hero and heroine who meet at the well, and the story is still recognisable. The story can swap the village well for the town pub, and it is still recognizable. The story may in some way subvert the type-scene, as when Jesus meets a woman at a village well – he is single, but she… she is not the young, marriageable woman that one might expect. In Luke's case, the baptism/Spirit-reception/Christian initiation type-scene can exhibit diversity in various instantiations while remaining recognisable as the same basic scene. Luke need not always repeat his scenes

[208] Lewis does provide a preface, which explicitly clarifies the letters from Screwtape. C. S. Lewis, *The Screwtape Letters* (London: Geoffrey Bles: The Centenary Press, 1942) 9-10. However, the preface does not provide a reified implied author, but really another character in the book, e.g., 'I have no intention of explaining how the correspondence which I now offer to the public fell into my hands' (9).
[209] Alter, Art of Biblical Narrative, 51.

verbatim, nor elaborate the whole scene in each and every instantiation, because reference to one element, such as baptism, can evoke for the implied reader the entire type-scene.

Finally, with the concept of following the reader's implied mental constructs ('entity representations' as coined by Catherine Emmott)[210] which the narrative stipulates the reader should have, one monitors what the implied reader knows about any particular character, setting, aspect of the plot, theme, or ideological perspective of the story, at any particular point in the storyline. As the reader acquires new information, one gauges the impact of that information on the reader's developing cognitive – and emotional – engagement with the storyworld. Theo Vennemann explains the fundamental discourse concept underlying Emmott:

> I assume a model of semantic (or pragmato-semantic) representation in which presuppositions are not carried and characterized inside their matrix structures … but in a special 'presupposition pool' which does not belong to individual sentences only but to entire discourses or, at least, stretches of discourses. The information contained in this pool is constituted from general knowledge, from the situative context of the discourse, and from the completed part of the discourse itself.[211]

That is, a text is constructed with the expectation that a reader comes to it with basic understandings about the world and how it works, e.g., grass grows, flowers bloom, trees do not shrivel up overnight, leprous persons ought not be touched, prophets should keep their distance from sinful women, etc. A text may also add information to the reader's knowledge of the world – Jesus of Nazareth has power to shrivel trees, to touch lepers, and to forgive sinful women. The reader's discovery of storyworld-unique information takes place sequentially, via the unfolding of the story. Readers may not initially understand how strange new information fits into the overall plan, but readers expect the narrative universe to make sense, to have a fundamental realism. Teun A. van Dijk calls this 'assumed normality'.

> An important COGNITIVE condition of semantic coherence is the ASSUMED NORMALITY of the worlds involved. That is, our expectations about the semantic structures of discourse are determined by our KNOWLEDGE about the structure of worlds in general and of particular states of affairs or courses of events. For abnormal worlds, we need specific indicators….[212]

This means that, in reading Luke-Acts, as each of the various and divergent scenes of initiation is encountered, the implied reader will not expect Luke to have poorly redacted his sources, or to be confused about the way things actually were. The implied reader expects that the pieces will all fit together eventually. This does not require that implied readers be impossibly naïve. It simply means that the reader grants a certain measure of 'suspension of disbelief'. Unless that trust is violated by an unreliable implied author – as in a story where the reader comes to the conclusion that the writer is genuinely schizophrenic – readers expect stories to exhibit coherence. Contra-normal circumstances, as per van Dijk, must be specifically indicated, something Luke in fact does when he, for instance, informs us that the Spirit had not yet fallen

[210] Emmott, *Narrative Comprehension*.
[211] Vennemann, 'Topics, sentence accent, and ellipsis', 314.
[212] Teun A. van Dijk, *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse* LLL (London and New York: Longman, 1977), 99.

on any of the Samaritans, they were in the condition of only having been baptised (μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον – Acts 8:16).

Hence, in terms of our discourse/narratological analysis of Luke-Acts, we will expect narrative coherence. We will identify what Luke says about initiation in each individual initiation scene and accumulate a full picture as we progress through the narrative. I.e., we will sequentially develop our implied mental construct for initiation. Each story, with its own particular focus, will contribute distinctly to the whole. Luke will not necessarily repeat his initial statements in subsequent scenes, as he may have different purposes in each scene. Nevertheless, discourse analysis indicates that what Luke states in one narrative segment, i.e., what he focalises and comments upon, carries forward into subsequent segments, which are read in light of what has gone before.

But what of Luke's diversity? Accumulation does not mean a simplistic pasting together of contradictory statements. Implied readers make sense of variation, not by assuming the implied author is careless or irrational, but by interpreting new information in light of past precedent – that is, on the implied author's terms rather than readerly ingenuity. This is van Dijk's 'assumed normality'. Green has already applied this principle to Lukan narrative – the reader expects things to proceed according to the normal functioning of the narrative universe unless the text indicates differently.[213] For example, we will observe that Luke tells an initial story about baptism and prayer, and attaches the coming of the Spirit specifically to the act of prayer; he goes on to relate Jesus' teaching on the importance of persistence in prayer to receive the Spirit; in a further account, he tells how the fervently praying believers receive the Spirit direct from the exalted Jesus; and then, in more teaching, Luke predicates reception of the Spirit upon repentance and baptism in Jesus' name. With all the foregoing emphasis upon prayer, the reader does not now imagine that the Spirit is transmitted through the water of baptism, but understands that new converts, like Jesus, pray at their baptism and receive the Spirit through – persistent – prayer. The rest of the Lukan initiation scenes, likewise, each contribute one or several elements to the sequentially accumulated, composite-understanding of Christian initiation.

3.5 Acts and History Again: Which Historical Audience?

Given the didactic nature of Acts as our basis for historical work, we are faced with two questions. (1) Who is Luke claiming to teach? (2) Did anyone ever follow Luke's teaching? As to the first question, Loveday Alexander notes, ancient addressees were almost always real personages, and even when fictional, reflected historical circumstances.[214] Naturally, the expected readership is much broader than simply the addressee. Following Richard Bauckham, we can view Luke as writing in a Graeco-Roman context in which travel and inter-city communication were relatively common, in which Paul could link his readers in Corinth together trans-locally with Christians everywhere, in which Christian leaders, like Paul and

[213] See his discussion of 'presupposition pools' in Joel B. Green, 'From "John's Baptism" to "Baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus": The Significance of Baptism in Luke-Acts', in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, eds., *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White* JSNTS 171 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 157-172; 160. See also, Michael Toolan, 'Coherence' in Peter Hühn, et al., *Handbook of Narratology* Second Edition, Volume 1 (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2009), 44-62.

[214] Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1* SNTSMS 78 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 188. Cf. Sean A. Adams, 'Luke's Preface and Its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander', *JGRCJ* Vol. 3 (2006), 183.

Timothy, travelled widely, and in which churches sent messengers with letters to each other. Luke wrote, not merely for Theophilus, nor for an isolated local community, but for Christians generally.[215]

With respect to the second question, Andrew Gregory points out that Acts was regarded as scripture at least by ca. 185 since Irenaeus argues in *Against Heresies* (3.15.1) that if one accepts Luke's Gospel, one must also accept what he says in Acts.[216] That, in itself, is no guarantee that Luke's Acts teaching was adhered to ca. 70-130, but it provides the *terminus ad quem* of a trajectory that is suggestive of wide acceptance.[217] In terms of Luke's own assertions in his Gospel prologue, he claims to be a superbly authoritative Christian teacher whose compilation surpasses that of anyone before.[218] Whether this is truth or presumption, we cannot know.

4. Exegesis

The exegesis will engage with Paul (the authentic letters) and Luke-Acts. There is simply not sufficient space to deal with the Gospel of John or with later epistles. Our narrow focus will be upon the understanding of spirit experience in relation to Christian initiation and ritual, namely with notions of preaching of the gospel message, confession of Jesus as Lord, water baptism, prayer, laying on of hands, and holy spirit reception. Thus, we will not explore concepts such as 'justification' throughout the Pauline literature, but will limit ourselves to how 'justification' is viewed in a specific local text, viz., 1 Corinthians 6:11, that addresses Christian initiation.

4.1 Pauline Epistles

4.1.1 1 Thessalonians – The 'Experiential' Spirit

1 Thessalonians provided but a paucity of data regarding Christian initiation. Paul writes: 'for our gospel did not come to you in word only but also in power and in the Holy Spirit and in great certainty' (1:5a). Paul tells us also that the Thessalonians received 'the word in much tribulation with joy of the Holy Spirit' (1:6b). The Thessalonians were not passive converts but spread the 'word of the Lord' vigorously and expansively (1:7). Paul later argues for moral purity among the Thessalonians from the idea that it is God who gives the Holy Spirit to them

[215] Richard Bauckham, 'For Whom Were Gospels Written?' in Richard Bauckham, ed., *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 9-48. Backhaus comes to a related conclusion, though for different reasons. In arguing for a post 100 date, he uses internal narrative considerations, reasoning that there is distance between the world of the author and the world of the narrative drama. Luke's church is past the 'threshold phase' and has a history to look back upon. Luke's perspective is broad – hence, not tied to a specific church: 'So lässt Apg nicht auf eine konkrete Gemeinde mit typischen Zeitproblemen schließen, wohl aber auf einen wissenssozialen Horizont, der die Schwellenphase hinter sich gelassen hat', 'Zur Datieung der Apostelgeschichte', 256. For discussion concerning the implied reader as a Christian, cf. William S. Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts, Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 9-16.

[216] Cf. Gregory, *Reception of Luke and Acts*, 3, 38-39, 350-351.

[217] Cf. Backhaus regarding Irenaeus, 'Seine Kenntnis des zweiten Logos ist so breit, dass der Eindruck entsteht, dass das Geschichtswerk bereits etabliert ist'. 'Zur Datieung der Apostelgeschichte', 223.

[218] Cf. Francis Watson, *The Fourfold Gospel: A Theological Reading of the New Testament Portraits of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016), 61. Francis Watson, 'Luke Rewriting and Rewritten', in Mogens Müller and Jesper Tang Nielsen, eds., *Luke's Literary Creativity* LNTS 550 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 79-95; 80-81.

(4:8). Thus, conversion is associated with intense religious experience attributed to the Holy Spirit.[219]

4.1.2 Galatians – Baptism, Sonship, Spirit Experience, and the 'Abba Cry'

Troels Engberg-Pedersen, arguing with respect to the relationship between spirit, sonship, and baptism in Galatians 3:27-29 and 4:4-7 writes: 'Here again Paul's focus is on sonship. But here it is achieved through reception of the pneuma in baptism. …the proper sequence is in fact this: faith, baptism, reception of the pneuma, sonship….'[220] Yet this seems to run counter to Paul's text at 4:6, which Engberg-Pedersen cites at length: Ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ⸋ὁ θεὸς⸌ τὸ πνεῦμα....' (now because you are sons, God sent forth the spirit….).[221] Engberg-Pedersen recognises the standard reading sequence, yet, in a lengthy endnote he appeals to Romans 8:15-16 to suggest that perhaps 'sonship actually presupposes possession of the pneuma'.[222] He further appeals to Paul's 'overall view' to suggest (though with the caveat that Paul may not have had a clear opinion) that, 'it seems probable that sonship proper was achieved through reception of the pneuma (though evidently on the basis of faith and baptism).'[223]

Others are likewise unhappy with the idea of sequence or predication in Paul's Galatians text. Keener, like Engberg-Pedersen, appeals to Romans 8:14-15 asserting that there the 'logical sequence … might be reversed' and thus 'the components of the event are really too intertwined to separate theologically…'.[224] Yet, resorting to material outside of Galatians, interpolating one Pauline letter into the text of another, is precisely the exegetical fallacy that we are seeking here to avoid. Michael Lakey takes a different approach, reasoning that the ὅτι in 4:6 cannot be causal ('since' or 'because') because Paul has previously argued that, 'the reception of God's spirit is the evidence of, and is baptismally coterminous with, the Galatians becoming heirs of the blessing (cf. Gal 3:2, 14, 26), namely sons.'[225] Witherington also draws from the flow of Paul's argument, asserting that since Paul has not previously in Galatians made any temporal distinctions within the 'conversion experience' he is not likely doing so here.[226] So too, Martinus C. de Boer dismisses any notion of predication, arguing that, 'Paul has already

---

[219] On Pauline 'experience', cf. Troels Engberg-Pedersen, 'The Construction of Religious Experience in Paul', Frances Flannery, Colleen Shantz, and Rodney A. Werline, eds., *Experientia, Volume 1: Inquiry into Religious Experience in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 147-157. For in-depth analysis of the neurobiological dimension of Paul's religious experience, cf. Colleen Shantz, *Paul in Ecstasy: The Neurobiology of the Apostle's Life and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). For discussion of Paul as 'mystic' see, John Ashton, *The Religion of Paul the Apostle* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000). See also, Guy Williams, *The Spirit World in the Letters of Paul the Apostle: A Critical Examination of the Role of Spiritual Beings in the Authentic Pauline Epistles* FRLANT 231 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009); Clint Tibbs, *Religious Experience of the Pneuma: Communication with the Spirit World in 1 Corinthians 12 and 14* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock [Mohr Siebeck], 2007).

[220] Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology & Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 68-69.

[221] Ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ⸋ὁ θεὸς⸌ τὸ πνεῦμα ⸋1τοῦ υἱοῦ⸌ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ⸢ἡμῶν κρᾶζον· αββα ὁ πατήρ.

[222] Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology*, 230.

[223] 230.

[224] Craig S. Keener, *Galatians: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019), 345-346.

[225] Michael Lakey, The Ritual World of Paul the Apostle: Metaphysics, Community and Symbol in 1 Corinthians 10-11 LNTS 602 (London, New York: T&T Clark, 2018), 60.

[226] Ben Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (London, New York: T & T Clark International, 1998), 290.

said that the Galatians "began" with the Spirit.'[227] But Galatians 3, while indeed associating faith, the Spirit, justification, baptism, and sonship, nowhere discusses the precise timing of these elements. Could not Paul in 4:6 have been adding specificity to his argument?

In the same fashion as Engberg-Pedersen and Keener, viz., appealing to a text outside Galatians, and concluding similarly to Lakey, Jason N. Yuh assumes a direct causal link between water baptism and spirit experience in Galatians. He writes, 'it is likely that baptism is what produced the reception of the Spirit and the experience of miraculous activities (3.1-5) as Paul makes explicit elsewhere (1 Cor. 12.4-13).'[228] Yet Yuh commits the oft repeated exegetical error of interpolation. We must ask whether there are grounds for the various claims above in Galatians itself?

Though theologically rich, Galatians at first blush seems to contain little regarding ritual practices. Paul argues his doctrine of 'faith not works' from the fact that the Galatians have received the Spirit and are experiencing miracles: 'did you receive the Spirit from works of law or from hearing of faith?' (Galatians 3:2); 'So then, the one supplying to you the Spirit and working miracles among you, is it from works of law or from hearing of faith?' (3:5). This line of argumentation suggests the Galatians had had some form of memorable religious experience in the past and that it was presently ongoing.[229] The fact that Paul identifies the 'blessing of Abraham' with the gift of the Spirit is an index of the latter's importance. As Hays points out, Paul may be linking the promised Spirit to the narrative logic of the all-important 'Christ-story' – Jesus is Abraham's seed, Jesus gives the Spirit, therefore, the Spirit must be Abraham's blessing.[230] Thus, working forward from Hays, this Pauline 'story logic' requires that the acme of divine favour, even nationalistic favouritism, is equated with the Galatians' pneumatic experiences. They are now the favoured of God. They are now *the chosen people*.

Clearly pneumatic experience is linked to 'faith' and incorporation into the people of God, but is there a link to baptism? Paul later references their baptism in relation to notions of sonship: 'For all of you are sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptised into Christ, clothed yourselves with Christ' (3:26-27). Thus, identification with Christ is related to water baptism, but is it the actual liquid that cements the connection or is this a metaphor for some spiritual event that was conceived to happen apart from the water rite? Dunn advocating against the sacramental view, appeals to Acts 2:4; 8:2-16; and 10:44-48 to propose metaphor: 'a metaphor drawn from the ritual act, but not identical with it.'[231] This is possible. However, we suggest that while Acts may legitimately be employed in a heuristic fashion, to raise questions or open possibilities, it would be anachronistic to read Paul determinatively via Acts. The image of being 'clothed with Christ' may also be a metaphor, but, at the same time, it may be a literal reference to new clothes being put on after baptism, a

[227] Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 265.
[228] Jason N. Yuh, 'Analysing Paul's Reference to Baptism in Galatians 3.27 through Studies of Memory, Embodiment and Ritual', *JSNT* Vol 41 Issue 4 (2019), 478-500; 484.
[229] Similarly, Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 202; Gordon Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994), 383-384; John M. G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* SNTW (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Ltd, 1988), 84-85, 213.
[230] Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11* Second Edition BRS (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002 [Society of Biblical Literature, 1983]), 182-183. Hays also recognises likely allusions to Isaiah 44:3 as part of a cluster of Messianic seed passages, Genesis 3:15, 2 Samuel 7:12-14.
[231] James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* BNTC (London: A & C Black, 1993), 203.

logical conclusion when one thinks about the practicalities of an immersive baptism, or even a baptism involving pouring a more than token amount of water. It does not require that there existed among the Galatians a 'putting on Christ' ritual. Paul simply takes the necessary act of changing clothes and preaches from it.[232] Though Albert J. Harrill has addressed in depth Paul's discussion of leaving the pedagogue and coming of age in terms of the Roman *toga virilis* ceremony,[233] Paul's likely use of the cultural illustration does not necessarily require that he believed 'sonship' was only accomplished with the putting on of clothes after baptism.

When then, does Paul understand the spiritual 'action' to take place? There is a slight hint of timing in chapter four. As cited above, the sending of the Spirit is predicated upon sonship: Ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν 'Now because you are sons he sent forth…'(4:6a). Hans-Joachim Eckstein observes that this is a classic point of debate. Should the ὅτι be translated causally, 'because', or declaratively, 'that'? 'Because' would indicate that the gift of the Spirit is predicated upon sonship, 'that' would require sonship to be predicated upon, or at least proved by, the gift of the Spirit, i.e., 'that you are [as proof you are] sons God sent forth the Spirit'. Eckstein argues: 'From a purely linguistic point of view, the causal understanding is more likely because it is more obvious.'[234] He cites other cases of causal ὅτι that begin a sentence: 1 Corinthians 12:15; John 15:19; 20:29. He also states a further objection: 'in the declarative interpretation, namely, an elliptical formulation is presupposed, which would have to be completed in the sense of Gal 3:11a (ὅτι … δῆλον, ὅτι).'[235] Eckstein is not alone in reading ὅτι causally. J. B. Lightfoot reads 'because'.[236] Ernest de Witt Burton points out, there is 'no verb of saying or the like for it to depend upon as an object clause.'[237] Heinrich von Siebenthal cites Galatians 4:6 and reads 'because'.[238] David Mathewson and Elodie Emig, as well as Daniel Wallace, read it causally.[239]

However, Eckstein finds the causal reading problematic from a theological point of view. It would suggest a chronological or factual sequence and that goes against Paul's theology. Paul himself, or so Eckstein understands him, sets sonship and sending the Spirit in one event.[240] But *pace* Eckstein, that is the very thing to prove, not to assume. Fee also goes against the grammar, arguing that Paul (1) never elsewhere predicates the gift of the spirit upon sonship

---

[232] Dunn is right, in this sense it is a metaphor, though he identifies the referent as the gift of the Spirit, which Paul himself does not do. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 109-110; Dunn, *Galatians*, 204.

[233] Albert J. Harrill, 'Coming of age and putting on Christ: the toga virilis ceremony, its paraenesis, and Paul's interpretation of baptism in Galatians', *NT*, Vol. 44 No 3 (2002), 252-277.

[234] 'Rein sprachlich gesehen ist das kausale Verständnis wahrscheinlicher, weil naheliegender.' (240).

[235] 'bei der deklarativen Deutung wird nämlich eine elliptische Formulierung vorausgesetzt, die im Sinne von Gal 3,11 zu ergänzen wäre.' (240).

[236] J. B. Lightfoot, *St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations* Sixth Edition (London: MacMillan and Co., 1880), 169.

[237] Ernest de Witt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921), 221.

[238] Heinrich von Siebenthal, *Ancient Greek Grammar for the Study of the New Testament* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019), 421.

[239] David L. Mathewson and Elodie Ballantine Emig, *Intermediate Greek Grammar: Syntax for Students of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016), 280. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 461. So too, Rosario Pierri, 'Due Note Filologiche di Greco Biblico', SBFLA LVI (2006), 311-316; 316.

[240] 'Paulus selbst beide Ereigisse gerade in eins setzt.' (240). Cf. Udo Borse, who seems to undercut Paul's sequence: 'Zu Verwircklichung ihrer Sohnschaft setzt er einen weiteren Heilsakt: Er entsendet den Geist.' ('For the realization of their sonship he sets another act of salvation: he sends the Spirit.'). *Der Brief an die Galater* RNT (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1984), 144.

and that (2) 'the concerns which unite the two sentences are so obvious',[241] therefore (3) there is no predication here. Dunn, on the other hand, argues that this is a logical predication and not a temporal predication.[242] Paul's grammar excludes Fee's appeal to 'Pauline thought' and cannot resolve Dunn's claim.

Eckstein seeks to resolve the problem by appealing to the overall argument of Galatians of salvation by faith not law and concludes that ὅτι must represent a '*logische Schlußfolgerung*' (logical conclusion) that should persuade Paul's Galatian audience:

> How else can it be explained that God has sent the Spirit of his Son in our hearts and that through him allows us to address him as Father, except by the fact that we all – and thereby also you – are sons of God.[243]

Eckstein dismisses the idea that this address to God, the Abba Cry, is 'ecstatic speech' or glossolalia, as 'unlikely' and unable to be explained by the Greek term κράζειν.[244] Equally, Eckstein rejects the suggestion that the Abba Cry is a reference to the opening of the Lord's Prayer as being unsubstantiated by Paul's letters.[245] He concludes that it is the simple fact that the Galatians can address God in intimate terms, just as Jesus did, that provides them with a clear sign that they are God's children.[246] As to whether glossolalia is in view here, Eckstein is right to be sceptical and not go beyond the text. But we will return to this possibility in a moment. However, contra Eckstein, κράζειν, 'to cry out', does suggest an element of emotion. Eckstein removes too quickly the role of religious feeling as a factor in legitimating religious belief. Moreover, how can a mode of address, which must at some point have been taught to the Galatians by Paul, confirm anything? In 3:5, Paul does not remind the Galatians of his superior teaching on intimacy with God, but of God 'supplying the spirit and working miracles'.

Let us look more carefully at this contentious passage.

> Now because you are sons, God sent out the Spirit of his son into our hearts crying out 'Abba Father'. So then you are no longer slaves but sons. Now if sons, heirs through God.' (4:6-7)

Here the matter of timing gets a slight boost. Are we to understand that the very moment the Galatians believed Paul's preaching they cried out 'Abba'? Paul never writes, 'when you heard the gospel you cried Abba'. Yet, Paul's argument here in Galatians (Engberg-Pedersen's appeal to Romans notwithstanding) does tie the Spirit to sonship and sonship to faith. Perhaps then in Paul's ministry one could believe the gospel and receive the Spirit by 'faith' and utter the Abba Cry before one had been water baptised.[247]

---

[241] Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 407.
[242] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 114. Similarly, J. K. Parratt, 'The Witness of the Holy Spirit: Calvin, the Puritans, and St. Paul', *EQ* Vol. 41 Issue 3 (1969), 161-168; 165; Ronald Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988), 184.
[243] Hans-Joachim Eckstein, *Verheißung und Gesetz* WUNT 86 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996), 241.
[244] 243.
[245] So too, Jürgen Becker, 'Der Brief an die Galater', J. Becker/U. Luz, eds., *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, und Kolosser* NTD Band 8/1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 7-103; 64.
[246] 243.
[247] Similarly, David John Lull, *The Spirit in Galatia: Paul's Interpretation of Pneuma as Divine Power* SBLDS 49 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), 66; Lull notes Acts 10:44-45 and suggests that similarly, 'Paul's

However, Hays provides us with a cogent argument that the gift of the Spirit in 4:6 is paired with baptism in 3:27.[248] He observes that Paul maintains a sustained parallelism between 3:23-29 and 4:3-7. Here is my reconstruction of the Galatians counterpoints:

___

3:23-24a We were under the Law, which was our 'pedagogue'.

4:1-3 We were under guardians and managers, viz. the 'elements of the cosmos'.

___

3:24b Faith in Christ, and justification thereby, has become a possibility.

4:4-5 The incarnation of God's son, and possible redemption and adoption thereby, has happened.

___

3:25-26 We no longer minors but are now sons of God.

4:5 We are now adopted sons.

___

3:27 We were baptised into Christ and clothed with Christ.

4:6 God gives the Spirit to us, who cries 'Abba Father'.

___

3:28 Ethnic, socio-economic, and gender boundaries are removed in Christ.

4 – no counterpoint

___

3:29 We are Abraham's descendants and consequently heirs of the promise to Abraham.

4:7 We are heirs through God.

___

As is evident, baptism into Christ is paired with the gift of the Spirit and the Abba Cry. Naturally, this does not require that the Spirit is given by baptism mechanistically, nor that it occurs at precisely the moment of baptism, but it is a strong indication that in Paul's mind – in Paul's 'story logic' – water baptism and the gift of the Spirit were associated.

Let us then look further at that vocalization: αββα ὁ πατήρ. While this could be a phrase recited by the initiate after baptism, Paul identifies the source of the utterance as the Spirit, not the convert. Mere recitation does not capture the source, nor the spontaneity of the vocalization.

proclamation was accompanied by ecstatic experiences among his converts.' This use of Acts is not inappropriate, so long as it is applied heuristically, not dogmatically, and Lull seems to be in the former camp.

[248] Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11* SBLDS 56 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 229.

Moreover, Paul says the Spirit is 'crying out' (κρᾶζον – BDAG reads: 1 to make a vehement outcry, cry out, scream, shriek; 2 to communicate someth. in a loud voice, call, call out, cry) and while a baptizand could theoretically be asked to call out the required words over and over, such a ritualized cry would undermine Paul's argument that the Galatians received the Spirit by faith. If the Galatians know that all they did at their baptism was shout loudly, then Paul's appeal to religious experience becomes vacuous. If some sort of religious spirit-possession was transpiring, then Paul's argumentative logic makes sense.

Harkness' ethnographic work in South Korea provides information that can be useful. Here he explains what he learned from an informant:

> The evangelist insisted the phonetic and prosodic sound patterns of glossolalia could be very simple at first. And while many people did begin speaking in tongues in a very simple way – with "starter tongues" (*ch'obangŏn*) sometimes described as infantile babble, baby talk, or "la la la" glossolalia – it was possible for glossolalia to undergo ornate semiotic enregisterment.[249]

Harkness' ethnographic data can be corroborated with Randal Ackland's extensive review of early Pentecostal literature which reveals that a variety of pre-glossolalic phenomena were understood as part of a natural process reaching full consummation in fluent glossolalia:

> Numerous testified to pre-glossolalic experiences which they defined as 'stammering lips', a 'pre-Pentecostal fullness', 'whispering words', 'not fully satisfied', or 'gracious anointings'. While any pre-glossolalic state was an 'incomplete baptism' and somewhat 'abnormal', it was just a part of the process.[250]

Thus, what we know about contemporary Christian holy spirit possession would be consonant with initial dissociation and simplistic, stammering sounds that Paul and his contemporaries could easily hear as 'abba'.

Finally, returning to Engberg-Pedersen and Yuh, the work of Hays shows that they are correct in generally associating baptism with spirit experience, but a causal link is not supported by the text. Given these constraints, and utilising Hays' parallelism, a tentative reconstruction of the typical (not overly rigid) 'way things were done' could be as follows: (1) belief (faith) in Paul's message, (2) (which faith led to) water baptism, (3) change of clothes, (4) spirit experience vocalised with the 'Abba Cry'.

4.1.3 1 Corinthians – Paul on Christian Initiation

4.1.3.1 1 Corinthians 1-3 – Differentiating Spirit Experience from Baptism

In seeking to restore order to a schismatic situation, Paul argues that he has hardly baptised anyone. 'I thank God that I baptised no one among you except Crispus and Gaius, that none of you should say that you were baptised into my name' (1:15). Oh, and Paul forgot, he had baptised the household of Stephanus, but he cannot remember if he baptised anyone else. Paul then declares, 'Christ did not send me to baptise but to preach the gospel' (1:17). What can we conclude? Baptism was taking place – it seems as if everyone had been baptised by someone.

---

[249] Harkness, *Glossolalia*, 57. Cf. Steven G. Herbert's observation of dissociation and 'stammering lips', 'Speaking in tongues and other gifts of the Holy Spirit: A study in possession', MA Thesis at the University of Montana (1984), 38.

[250] Randal Ackland, *Toward a Pentecostal Theology of Glossolalia*, PhD dissertation, Bangor University (2020), 354.

Baptism was seen to link the baptizand and baptiser in some undefined way. Perhaps just bragging rights. Perhaps more. Also, baptism was clearly not an apostle's job. He could do it, but preferably the task was left to others. Preaching was the apostle's job. That is relevant for our study because, as we will see, Paul links the Spirit to his preaching.

Paul asserts that his initial coming to the Corinthians was accompanied, not by 'persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and power' (2:4). Then he argues from this initial religious experience, 'that your faith should not be in the wisdom of men but in the power of God' (2:5). He does not here link the Spirit to any particular religious rite. That in itself is significant. He does not remind them of their baptism. He reminds them of their encounter with the Spirit. He can speak of intense religious experience apart from any ritual – but of course, he has just emphasised that he was 'sent to preach not baptise'. Paul does say, 'I planted, Apollos watered' (3:6). As this is in the context of his original refutation of baptism-oriented schism, it could indeed be a reference to Paul preaching and Apollos baptising. It could as well allude to different ministry orientations – Paul towards evangelism and Apollos towards tasks of pastoral nurturing. In 3:16-17 he warns against schism by comparing the Spirit among the group of believers to God's Spirit dwelling in a holy temple. Destroy the temple and God will destroy you. But, Paul does not say *how* the Spirit came to be among the Christians.

4.1.3.2 1 Corinthians 5 – An Exit Experience

Paul provides a glimpse of an exit ritual, which provides a foil to our interest in 'entrance' rituals. Regarding the removal of an immoral member of the congregation, Paul writes:

> For I, being absent in body but being present in spirit, already judged, as being present, the one having so done this. In the name of our Lord Jesus, when you are gathered together along with my spirit and with the power of our Lord Jesus, hand over the one such as this to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit should be saved in the day of the Lord (5:3-5).

Whether Paul's being 'present in spirit' was a claim to actually being located among the Corinthians in spirit-form, or simply a figure of speech is not of concern to us. What is of concern is the contrast between Jesus, as common Lord of Paul and of the Corinthians, and Satan, the adversary and enemy of the Christians, as well as the emphasis upon acting in the 'name' or authority of the Lord Jesus and the emphasis upon 'power' being present among the gathered believers. If this is the exit, then it is reasonable to think that the 'entrance' into the Jesus community likewise was conceived of in terms of resident power and transference from one name, or realm of authority, to another.

A key point is that no physical rite is mentioned. There is no act reversing baptism. There is no solemn procession out of the church. The transaction is distinctly non-physical. There are likewise no formal words of excommunication that Paul instructs them to recite. Apparently, the Corinthian leaders already know how to perform this spiritual act. Since Paul has emphasised power not rhetoric, it seems unlikely that mere recitation would do the trick anyways. The power would not lie in saying the 'proper' words. Words will be used, but the power would lie in the spiritual performance. If the individual upon entrance to the community had once publicly professed Jesus as Lord, perhaps in the 'handing over to Satan', someone, maybe an officiant, publicly reverses this original profession with a simple declaration,

following Paul's instruction, 'In Jesus' name we hand you over to Satan'. Jesus is no longer the person's Lord; the individual now belongs to Satan.

This 'spiritual' transaction, this transfer of their erstwhile fellow from under the aegis of Jesus over into the clutches of their nemesis, is perceived and experienced as ontological reality. For Paul, who has in this letter been highlighting his spiritual power in contrast to mere words, this hand-over will have genuine physical and spiritual consequences. The immoral individual will suffer bodily, perhaps even die, as a result of this public act. Nevertheless, such severe measures are necessary for the individual's ultimate spiritual redemption. We dare not underestimate the effectiveness of religious ritual, or perhaps better put, performative religious declaration, among those who believe in it. The experiential dimension of Pauline religion was intense and central to excommunication, and concomitantly likely to initiation as well.

4.1.3.3 1 Corinthians 6 – Belief, Baptism, Spirit Experience – Now You're Justified!

In 6:11, after listing various categories of sinful people, Paul asserts of the Corinthians:

> And such as these some of you were. But you washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God.
>
> καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε· ἀλλ᾽ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλ᾽ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλ᾽ ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ⸀Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ⸁ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

The first item of ritual concern has to do with whether the 'washing' is related to water baptism. Dunn, while at first denying any link, 'Paul is not talking about baptism at all – he speaks rather of the great spiritual transformation of conversion',[251] quickly qualifies his bold statement; the verb ἀπελούσασθε 'does not have its first reference to baptism, although it may be implied that water-baptism was the occasion when this cleansing took place.'[252] Thus Dunn recognises the bi-level referencing – to the physical rite and to the belief system in which the rite is emmeshed.

The second question of ritual interest concerns the grammar of ἀπελούσασθε. Debate has circled as to whether the aorist middle has any significance, as in 'you got yourselves baptised',[253] or as in an indication of human volition, 'faith',[254] or whether the middle should just be read as a passive – especially a 'divine passive'. However, recently, Liana Tronci has conducted a corpus-based examination of approximately 1800 Greek verbal items. In terms of the changes from Classical to Hellenistic Greek, Tronci observes that, 'transitivity is expressed by both active and middle aorists, middle inflection being completely defunctionalised as a voice marker, with some rare exceptions'.[255] She gives several exceptions, including the aorist middle at issue in 1 Corinthians 6:11. The 'middle aorists ἀπελουσάμην, ἐβαπτισάμην are commonly interpreted as passives, though they cannot be passive, because sigmatic middles are never passive in Ancient Greek'.[256] Speaking directly of 6:11, Tronci writes:

---

[251] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 121.
[252] 121.
[253] Beasley-Murry, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 162-163.
[254] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 123.
[255] Liana Tronci, 'Aorist voice patterns in the diachrony of Greek: The New Testament as a sample of Koine', *JGL* 18 (2018), 241–280; 276.
[256] 262. She cites Wackernagel, 'Die Formen des I. Aorists, die dem Medium zugerechnet werden, sind allerdings im Attischen nie passivisch und umgekehrt kann ein passivischer Aorist ebenda nur durch die Formen auf -θην und -ην gegeben werden.' Jacob Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax: mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von*

> We consider that the difference in voice between the middle ἀπελούσασθε and the passives ἡγιάσθητε and ἐδικαιώθητε is meaningful. The middle aorist could be interpreted as a reflexive, thus implying an involvement of the subject in the event.

First, we note that Tronci's informed opinion about the 'exceptions' to her research findings is not without weight and would imply that any idea of a 'divine passive' is excluded.[257] The Corinthians were involved somehow in their washing. This linguistically reinforces Dunn's recognition of reference to a physical water rite. Second, we recognise that the middle voice is more complex than a simplistic 'reflexive' notion.[258] Thus, though a wooden translation may be, 'you washed yourselves', the simple intransitive idea, 'you washed', suffices. We know from the immediately preceding apologetic against baptism-related schisms that people were baptised by an officiant, whether Apollos, or even Paul.

Having addressed the grammar and briefly addressed the question of ritual and belief, we may move on.[259] There are several basic ritual questions at issue here. First, is the 'washing' related to water baptism or to a non-ritualized moment of faith? Second, are the three notions – washing, sanctification, and justification – equivalent or distinct? Third, if distinct, are they coincident with each other, either temporally or logically or both? Fourth, if not coincident, are they in some way sequential?

We will argue: (1) Washing is related to *both* water baptism and to a prior non-ritualised moment of 'faith', i.e., acceptance of the message preached by Paul. Washing evokes a complex of referents – the ritual immersion, the metaphysical 'washing' which that immersion symbolises, as well as the emotion of experiencing forgiveness, the religious sensation of being 'clean'. The moment of the metaphysical washing is *not* conceived as coincident with the water immersion which symbolises it, but with a prior moment of acceptance of the Pauline preaching, i.e., an initial instance of religious 'faith'. (2) They are not equivalent terms, they are distinct concepts, (3) They are neither logically nor temporally coincident with each other, (4) They are sequential: a. washing, b. sanctification, c. justification.

What then, have commentators made of this verse? Joseph Hanimann has argued, drawing upon the testimony of the Acts of the Apostles, especially chapters 8 and 19 where there is a sequence of immersion followed by handlaying to impart the Spirit, that Paul had the same practice as that depicted in Luke's writings and that this initiatory sequence is to be found throughout 1 Corinthians, including 6:11.[260] We argue, however, that it is methodologically inappropriate to anachronistically impose the later writings of Luke upon the earlier writings

---

Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009 [1920]), 137. So too, R. J. Allan, 'Sigmatic middle aorists with passive meaning do not exist in historical Greek.' Allan, R. J., *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek. A Study in Polysemy*, PhD Dissertation University of Amsterdam (2002).

[257] Contra Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* 4. Auflage HTA (Holzgerlingen: Brockhaus, 2018 [2006]), 'im hellenistischen Griechisch kommt das Verb jedoch fast immer in dieser Form vor und steht für die Passivform.' (322). Schnabel would put the emphasis upon God actively forgiving the sins of the individual.

[258] Cf. Rachel Aubrey, *Hellenistic Greek Middle Voice: Semantic Event Structure and Voice Typology* (MA Thesis, Trinity Western University, 2020). See also, regarding middle voice and intransitivity, Mathewson and Emig, *Intermediate Greek Grammar*, 150-151. For general cautions, cf., Siebenthal, *Ancient Greek Grammar*, 300-302.

[259] The translation of ἐν τῷ πνεύματι as instrumental 'by', i.e., 'by means of', seems uncontroversial. So too, Hanna Stettler, *Heiligung bei Paulus: Ein Beitrag aus biblisch-theologischer Sicht* WUNT2 368 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 326.

[260] Joseph Hanimann, '«Nous avons été abreuvés d'un seul esprit» Notes sur 1 Corinthien 12,13b', in *NRT*, Vol. 94 No 4 (1972), 400-405.

of Paul. Nevertheless, one may legitimately employ Luke-Acts heuristically, asking whether a phenomenon of the later Christian movement may also have been present earlier on. As Hanimann does not exegete 6:11, but simply applies his conclusions to it, we will not engage him at this juncture, but later in discussing 12:13.

We continue to Beasley-Murray who argues for the link to baptism. First, he appeals to Acts 22:16, where Paul is told:

> And now, why do you delay? Get up and get yourself baptised and wash away your sins calling upon his name.
>
> καὶ νῦν τί μέλλεις; ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου ⸀ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ

The similarities with 1 Corinthians 6:11 are striking, with both passages having the aorist middle of ἀπολούω and the Acts passage having the aorist middle for βαπτίζω. Yet, there is a methodological problem which Beasley-Murray did not consider, namely that Luke writes later than Paul. One could theoretically argue that in Paul's time 'washing' was a spiritual, non-ritual event, whereas by Luke's time spiritual 'washing' had been routinized and had come to refer to the ritual of water immersion.

Second, Beasely-Murray argues for the link to water baptism by noting that 6:11 is contrastive: 'you were sinners, but you washed…'. This is true, but one could argue that the point of contrast was a non-ritual decision to believe Paul's preaching with a concomitant 'spiritual washing'. Third, there is the apparent baptismal formula: ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ⸀Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ⸁. Given the contextual, schismatic issue of baptism in the Corinthian community, e.g., 'were you baptised into the name of Paul?', this time Beasely-Murray's argument holds. Fourth, the washing is associated with the Spirit, who, from Acts, is known to be associated with baptism. Again, this argument does not take into consideration that Acts may have developed a different theology than Paul. We cannot uncritically read Acts back into Paul. Fifth, Beasely-Murray cites Romans 6:1ff, Galatians 2.26ff and Colossians 2:11 in an appeal to broader Pauline theology: 'for him there is no opposition between sacramental act and spiritual experience of grace'.[261] But this is circular, assuming that all these passages speak of sacrament and are not figurative or symbolic.

Nevertheless, we concur with Beasely-Murray that 'washing' does refer to water baptism for several reasons. First, the imagery maps well onto the topic of water baptism that has already figured prominently in Paul's argument. Second is the 'in the name' formula. Fee objects that Paul earlier had used εἰς τὸ ὄνομα (1 Corinthians 1:13-15) rather than ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, so the latter cannot refer to a baptismal formula. However, Fee gives no basis for restricting Paul to just one preposition,[262] and there is no linguistic reason to limit Paul to only one, as in Hellenistic Greek the two prepositions had begun to be interchangeable.[263] Dunn objects that

[261] Beasely-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 163. Similarly, Frédéric Louis Godet writes of, 'the gift of the Spirit bestowed on him in baptism; comp. Acts ii. 38; 2 Cor. i. 21, 22; Eph. i. 13.' F. Godet, trans. A. Cusin, *Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians* Vol. 01 CFTLNS XXVII (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1889), 298.
[262] Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 131.
[263] 110. F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. Cf.

washing cannot refer to baptism because of the list of sins, '*these* are what have been washed away; and these are moral and spiritual matters. Whatever washes them away is a cleansing of the heart and conscience'.[264] But, then Dunn writes that our verb, 'does not have its first reference to baptism, although it may be implied that water-baptism was the occasion when this cleansing took place.'[265] Dunn therefore does not categorically reject any reference to baptism in 6:11, rather he nuances the discussion: there is a first reference and a second reference. We follow Dunn here in his dual reference. Washing references both the ritual immersion and the metaphysical 'washing from sin' which that immersion symbolises for Paul.

However, we part with Dunn over the timing of the metaphysical 'washing'. As cited above, Dunn would have us believe that Paul thought the metaphysical 'cleansing' overlapped with, and was temporally coincident with, the rite of water immersion. This is not merely Dunn's opinion on one isolated verse, nor is it taken out of the context of Dunn's overarching argument. Here is Dunn in his own words, summarizing his theory for all of the New Testament:

> Baptism properly performed is for the NT essentially the act of faith and repentance – the actualization of saving faith without which, usually, commitment to Jesus as Lord does not come to its necessary expression. As the Spirit is the vehicle of saving grace, so baptism is the vehicle of saving faith.[266]

However, contra Dunn, for Paul in 1 Corinthians, water baptism is never the 'occasion' for faith, nor the 'actualization' of faith, nor the 'vehicle' of faith. Paul explicitly separates his preaching from water baptism. The 'spiritual' is connected with Paul's ministry of supernatural wisdom where he demonstrates the Spirit and power; the 'natural' is connected with water baptism which, among the Corinthians, has given rise to schisms. Paul, in 1:21b leaves no room for Dunn's plan:

> it pleased God, through the foolishness of the proclamation, to save the ones who believe:
>
> εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος σῶσαι τοὺς πιστεύοντας·

The ritual symbol of the metaphysical washing/cleansing is, then for Paul, located temporally *after* the actual moment of belief in Paul's preaching, the desideratum to which Paul attaches metaphysical importance. Dunn has a sophisticated theory of the relationship between water and Spirit. But, carefully nuanced though Dunn is, his schema is nowhere to be found in Paul.

So far, we have asked whether the 'washing' is conceived of as related to water baptism or to a non-ritualized moment of faith. Our answer is both. We now ask whether the three notions – washing, sanctification, and justification – are equivalent or distinct. Steven J. Chester, in reviewing the theological arguments of E. P. Sanders and Rudolf Bultmann, notes that both equate the ideas of 'washing', 'sanctification', and 'justification' and both locate these three concepts in the waters of baptism. Sanders claims, without any argumentation or explanation: 'The point of all the verbs here, including 'justified', is that the Christians were *cleansed* of the

---

Lars Hartman, *'Into the Name of the Lord Jesus': Baptism in the Early Church* SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 37.

[264] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 121.

[265] 121.

[266] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 227.

sins just enumerated.'[267] Bultmann also assumes without argumentation that: 'All three verbs describe the sacramental bath of purification'.[268] John Barclay similarly assumes that they are, 'washed and purified through their baptism'.[269] Michael Bird also asserts, though without making any statement regarding water baptism, 'cleansing and sanctification are coordinate to justification and all three elements are said to be results of the Spirit's activity.'[270] Moreover, he states, 'Spirit and righteousness are part of the instantaneous experience of faith.'[271] Gordon Fee asserts coincidence apart from water baptism: 'The two prepositions and three verbs all go together'.[272] However, he, like Dunn, qualifies his non-ritual position, if but slightly:

> This is not to say that the verb for Paul may not have carried with it an indirect allusion to baptism; rather Paul is not here concerned with the Christian initiatory rite, but with the spiritual transformation made possible through Christ and effected by the Spirit.

In support of his case, Fee supplies the argument that the metaphors Paul uses here are parallel with 'the theological terms "regeneration, sanctification, and justification"; and for Paul these are the work of the Spirit in the believer's life, not the result of baptism.'[273] Yet, Fee does not actually exegete the passage but appeals to a systematic-theology framework.

Beasley-Murray alone makes an actual argument for his claim that all three events occurred 'at the same time', namely, at their 'cleansing', which he understands as baptism: 'The three aorists are to be regarded as denoting coincidental action and all three are qualified by 'in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God'.[274] However, we argue that 'coincidental action' does not require split-second simultaneity. Several closely related events, perhaps just minutes apart, could equally be reference by the coincident aorist. For example, I could write: 'Paul, having entered the city, bought himself some salted fish and lounged at the bookshop.' The sentence does not require Paul to have *instantly* bought himself the salted fish at the first fish shop at the gate. He could have wandered around the marketplace for a few minutes before he bought his fish. It certainly does not mean that he *simultaneously* bought the fish and lounged at the bookshop. Therefore, because the washing and the sanctifying are not required to be literally simultaneous, and because they consequently could be distinct events, the phrases 'in the name' and 'in the Spirit' do not necessarily qualify both events. Put simply, the grammar allows for the washing to be done in Jesus' name and the sanctifying to be done in/with/by the Spirit[275] and the justifying to reflect the accomplishment of the first two.

---

[267] E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM Press, 1977), 471 original italics.
[268] Rudolf Bultmann, trans. Kendrick Grobel, *Theology of the New Testament* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007 [Vol. 1 1951 and Vol. 2 1955]), 136.
[269] John M. G. Barclay, *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews* WUNT 275 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 190, similarly 96.
[270] Michael Bird, *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification, and the New Perspective* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers; Milton Keyes: Paternoster, 2007), 103.
[271] 103.
[272] Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 131.
[273] 131.
[274] G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (London: MacMillan & Co Ltd; New York: St Martin's Press, 1962), 164.
[275] Full discussion of location/instrumentality/agency and the preposition ἐν must await our analysis at 12:13.

Chester rightly laments, 'The three verbs ἀπολούω, ἁγιάζω and δικαιόω have become synonyms.'[276] This cannot be, he reasons, as the syntax contains, 'a triple ἀλλά, making each verb stand individually as well as collectively, in opposition to what has gone before.'[277] Chester's appeal to the 'triple ἀλλά' works against Beasley-Murray's argument from the coincident aorist. Yet, Chester does not wish,

> to commit the opposite error and so segregate the meaning of the verbs that they come to seem like chronological stages in a process. Paul does not mean that the Corinthians were first washed, then sanctified and finally justified.[278]

Instead, though he supplies no particular argumentation for his choice, Chester thinks of, 'the verbs as denoting different aspects of the same event of conversion.'[279] Thus we have logical distinction but temporal coincidence. But we must ask of Chester, if the 'triple ἀλλά' forces a logical distinction, whence then the temporal coincidence?

If Paul had not already proclaimed that God had not sent him to baptise, if Paul had not already emphasised the tangible 'Spirit power' in his preaching, we too might have associated the Corinthians' sanctification (ἡγιάσθητε) with the waters of their baptism. I.e., we might have thought that washing and sanctification were both symbolized by baptism. We might have followed Chester in identifying three distinct ideas – washing, sanctification, justification – as all present in the one event of baptismal conversion. This would make perfect sense if Paul believed that baptism into the Lord Jesus Christ conveyed the 'Spirit of our God'. The ritual event of baptismal conversion would then be the occasion of various kinds of 'spiritual' activity, including the convert's 'justification' by God, whatever that may mean.

However, we must ask more closely whether Paul himself equated baptism with the impartation of the Spirit. Clearly, he connected the Holy Spirit with converts' holiness. This is elaborated upon further just a few verses later: 'Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you, which you have from God, and you are not your own?' (6:19). So, the corporate group can be called a 'temple' of the Spirit, and individual members' bodies are also a 'temple' of the Spirit. Holiness is linked with the Spirit who is located within the believer. But this still leaves unanswered the questions of precisely *when* the convert receives the Spirit, of *when* the Spirit takes up residence in the human temple, and of *how* the Spirit comes to take up human residence.

The fact that in 1 Corinthians Paul associates his preaching with the power of the Spirit, and that he *disassociates* his preaching from baptism, is a clear indication that we cannot blithely combine water immersion with the Pauline gift of the Spirit. As soon as we decouple Spirit from water, we are presented with the very thing that Chester disapproves of, a temporal sequence of washing (in water, which may be symbolic of some earlier metaphysical 'washing'), sanctification (through experience of the Spirit), justification (which is then a reflection back over the prior two events – having been washed and sanctified one can be considered righteous in God's sight, accepted into God's holy people). Thus, the three verbs are distinct, but are not coincident with each other, either temporally or logically. Since they

---

[276] Stephen J. Chester, *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church* SNTW (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 139.
[277] 139.
[278] 140.
[279] 140.

are not coincident, they must be sequential. We note here that Hanimann's proposal is not as far-fetched as it might, at first blush, have appeared. We now turn to Paul's discussion of initiation in Chapter 10 and 12. We will then return to our evaluation of the ritual implications of 6:11.

4.1.3.4 1 Corinthians 10 – Baptism into Moses: Charismatic Experience and Immersion as Protective Rituals

Coming to 1 Corinthians 10 with the issue of the relationship between apostolic preaching, baptism, and Spirit reception in mind – and justifiable so for these are matters Paul has addressed in his epistle heretofore – raises interesting questions. Here Paul speaks of more than one baptism. He writes of the ancient Israelites:

> and all were baptised into Moses in the cloud and in the sea
>
> καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ⸀ἐβαπτίσθησαν ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ (10:2).

Matthew Brook O'Donnell proposes that 'cloud' may be a theophany and as such it, along with the 'sea', could be 'agents' baptising the Israelites into the sphere of Moses – all were baptised *by* the cloud and the sea into Moses.[280] However, though the cloud is certainly an Exodus theophany, the sea was not. O'Donnell's creative analogy breaks down. Rather, Paul gives his reader two elements, two baptisms, in cloud and in sea, but one effect – incorporation into Moses' authority/person/identity. They became 'Moses people'. They then 'ate' and 'drank' spiritual food and drink. Paul proceeds to discuss the Lord's Supper (10:16-17), thus supplying us with a tantalisingly brief picture of Pauline initiation into the Jesus movement.[281]

Not surprisingly, given his interpretation of 6:11 (and, as we shall see, 12:13), Hanimann writes:

> In the same epistle again, at the beginning of ch. 10, the mention of the cloud and the sea would allude, by way of typology, to the double rite, the mention of the cloud evoking the Spirit, that of the sea, baptism.[282]

Is Hanimann right? Does Paul here distinguish a Spirit baptism from a water baptism? Syntactically he does, but is this just an awkward figure for the one baptismal immersion? That is, should we take the grammar as it stands and understand that in Paul's ministry, converts first experience the Spirit and then undergo water baptism or should we understand this redundancy as a sort of 'Hebrew parallelism'? Cloud and sea are just two images for the same event – baptismal immersion. Or is this grammatical form actually a hendiadys, a 'one through two' figure of speech?

---

[280] Matthew Brook O'Donnell, 'Two Opposing Views on Baptism With/By the Holy Spirit and of 1 Corinthians 12.13: Can Grammatical Investigation Bring Clarity?', in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, eds., *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White* JSNTS 171 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 311-336; 334.

[281] See discussion in Roy E. Ciampa, 'The Function of 1 Cor 10:1-22 within Its Literary Context (1 Cor 8-11): Food for Thought', in Florian Wilk, ed., *Paul and Moses: The Exodus and Sinai Traditions in the Letters of Paul* SERAPHIM 11 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 83-99; 95; Matthias Konradt, ''Geschrieben zu unserer Ermahnung': Beobachtungen zu den Schriftrekursen in 1 Kor 10,1-11', in Florian Wilk, ed., *Paul and Moses: The Exodus and Sinai Traditions in the Letters of Paul* SERAPHIM 11 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 101-120; 107.

[282] Dans la même épître encore, au début du ch. 10, la mention de la nuée et de la mer ferait allusion, par mode de typologie, au double rite, la mention de la nuée évoquant l'Esprit, celle de la mer, le baptême. '«Nous avons été abreuvés d'un seul esprit» Notes sur 1 Corinthien 12,13b', 404.

As to the possibility of a hendiadys, a single 'baptism in cloud and sea', that is unlikely as the preposition ἐν is repeated. As George Benedict Winer writes:

> When two or more substantives dependent on the same preposition immediately follow one another joined together by a copula, the preposition is most naturally repeated, if the substantives in question denote things which are to be conceived as distinct and independent … but not repeated, if the substantives fall under a single category.[283]

We will take the question of Hebrew parallelism below. Now we note that Hanimann is not alone in his reading. B. J. Oropeza focuses particularly upon initiatory Spirit experience. He notes that Paul frequently utilises Isaiah in 1 Corinthians (e.g., 1 Corinthians 1:19 and Isaiah 29:14; 2:16//40:13; 14:21/28:11-12; 15:54//25:8) and he observes that in the Isaianic New Exodus tradition the cloud is reinterpreted as the Holy Spirit (Isaiah 63:7-14, esp. 10 and 14).[284] He further points to how Paul draws heavily upon the Numbers wilderness narrative: sinful 'craving' of Numbers 11:34 and wrongful 'craving' in 1 Corinthians 10:6; Israelites 'strewn in the wilderness' (Numbers 14:16 and 1 Corinthians 10:5; Baal of Peor (Numbers 25:1-9) and immorality (1 Corinthians 10:8); plague of serpents (Numbers 21:4-9 and 1 Corinthians 10:9); grumbling (Numbers 16 and 1 Corinthians 10:10). Numbers 11:25 has the LORD descend in a cloud and take of the Spirit upon Moses and put it upon the seventy elders. Oropeza thus argues it is likely that Paul associated Spirit and 'cloud'.[285] He reads the cloud metaphor as Paul's reference to the Corinthians' baptism in the Spirit which took place at their conversion and which Paul speaks of in 12:13. He notes how the Israelites experienced blessings, 'gifts (grace), miracles, deliverance, "baptism", God's Spirit presence, and sustenance from the Rock'[286] and writes of the Corinthians:

> They could easily associate these blessings with their own salvific experiences of divine grace, justification, water and Spirit baptism, miracles through charismatic gifts, and spiritual eating via the Lord's Supper….[287]

What then of the 'Hebrew Parallelism'? Andrew Wilson argues that the first three points of Paul's argument correspond directly to distinct aspects of Corinthian ritual experience – Israelite's spiritual food and drink correspond to the bread and wine of the Christian sacred meal, the Israelite's passing through the sea corresponds to baptism – *and that therefore*, the final element in Paul's argument must correspond to an actual element of Corinthian initiation – Spirit experience.

---

[283] George Benedict Winer, *Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament* Seventh Edition, Enlarged and Improved by Gottlieb Lünemann (Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1886), 419-420. For a more recent discussion of the concept, see Walter Bühlmann and Karl Schere, *Sprachliche Stilfiguren der Bibel: Von Assonanz bis Zahlenspruch ein Nachschlagewerk* 2., verbesserte Auflage (Giessen: Brunnen Verlag GmbH, 1994), 33-35; Siebenthal, *Ancient Greek Grammar*, 559.

[284] B. J. Oropeza, *Paul and Apostasy: Eschatology, Perseverance, and Falling Away in the Corinthian Congregation* WUNT2 115 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 92-97.

[285] B. J. Oropeza, '1 Corinthians 10:1-22 in Light of the Corinthians' Knowledge of Scripture', in Florian Wilk, ed., *Paul and Moses: The Exodus and Sinai Traditions in the Letters of Paul* SERAPHIM 11 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 121-137; 130-131. Watson extensively discusses the Exodus/Numbers story, as well as its connections with 1 Corinthians, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 326-378.

[286] Oropeza, '1 Corinthians 10:1-22', 132.

[287] 132.

Wilson makes his case in an unpublished paper presented to the Evangelical Theological Society (ETS).

> Paul is describing Israel as having undergone something akin to a prototypical 'baptism in the Spirit', which the Corinthians should see as analogous to their own, much-vaunted, initiatory spiritual experiences.[288]

Wilson notes that Paul is building on his previous argument (1 Corinthians 8) regarding eating idol food – one cannot eat at the Lord's table and the table of demons – and argues that Paul is warning the Corinthians that even though they have received the charismatic Spirit and been water baptised in Jesus' name and they eat and drink the 'spiritual food' and 'spiritual drink' of the Lord's sacred meal, none of these things will prevent them from being destroyed by God if they participate in idol worship. Wilson also argues that 'baptism into Moses' is Paul's play on the phrase 'baptism into Christ' which is found in Paul's letter to the Galatians (3:27 εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε).

Wilson is unaware of Oropeza's work, but he reviews the literature, citing Conzelmann who states, 'apparently the cloud is the sign of the divine presence, and to this the Spirit in baptism corresponds',[289] and Tom Wright who avers, 'No early Christian would have had much trouble decoding what Paul was saying. ...the cloud and the sea for the children of Israel are like the spirit and the baptism-water for Christians.'[290] To these could be added Richard B. Hays, 'the two elements correspond to Spirit and water in Christian baptism.'[291] This is not far from Thomas Aquinas, who writes, 'the cloud is the symbol of the Spirit, but the sea is the symbol of water', and Origen, 'What they regarded as a cloud is in reality, Paul claims, the Holy Spirit.'[292] Dunn writes of the cloud and the sea that they are, 'baptism in the Spirit into Christ'.[293] David E. Garland recognizes that some have linked the cloud to the Spirit but dismisses such an interpretation out of hand. It is simply part of their baptism into Moses.[294] A number of other commentators have failed entirely to draw a link between cloud and Spirit baptism.[295] Christian Wolff, however, points out that in Exodus 14:19 the cloud moves from

---

[288] Andrew Wilson, 'Were Israel Baptised in the Spirit?' Available online at: https://thinktheology.co.uk/blog/article/were_israel_baptised_in_the_spirit. Page numbers and date are not available.

[289] Hans Conzelmann, trans. James W. Leitch, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* HR (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975 [1969]), 166.

[290] Tom Wright, *Paul for Everyone: 1 Corinthians* (London: SPCK, 2003; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 122.

[291] Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians* Int (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997), 160.

[292] Thomas Aquinas, trans. F. R. Larcher, B. Mortensen, and D. Keating, *Commentary on the Letters of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* BC Vol. 38 (Lander, WY: The Aquinas Institute for the Study of Sacred Doctrine, 2012), 194. For Origin, see Judith L. Kovacs, *1 Corinthians Interpreted by Early Christian Commentators* CB (Grand Rapids/ Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005), 161.

[293] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 127, cf. Dunn's footnote 34.

[294] David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 449.

[295] Commentators who make no reference to the possibility of a 'Spirit baptism' allusion include: Chester, *Conversion at Corinth*, 337. A. J. M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology against its Graeco-Roman Background* WUNT 44 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 59. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* AYB (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 379-382. Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Corinthians; A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* RTNT (New York: Crossroad, 1987), 63. Ben Witherington III *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1995), 220. Craig S. Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*

before the Israelites to behind, thus suggesting that they passed under it. He observes: 'Perhaps the being under the cloud, which was the sign of the divine presence, is to be understood as analogy to the bestowal of the Spirit at baptism.'[296] Similarly, Wolfgang Schrage, noting Origen, as well as nineteenth century scholarship, that the cloud is a symbol of the Spirit, adds, 'especially since the clouds (= Spirit-baptism) would have to precede the sea (= water-baptism)' and concludes that it is possible that the cloud points to the Spirit.[297] But neither Origen, Aquinas, Conzelmann, Wright, Hays, Wolff, nor Schrage identify the 'cloud' as a charismatic Spirit experience temporally distinct from baptism, rather than something communicated through, or symbolised by, water baptism. Though, as noted above, Hanimann and Oropeza do just that.

Having surveyed the literature, Wilson launches into his own exegesis. The exodus narrative itself links cloud and Spirit. Wilson cites Numbers 11:16-17, though it is actually verse 25 that mentions the cloud. YHWH, who is in the cloud, takes some of the Spirit that is on Moses and puts it on the seventy elders of Israel. So, the text does not directly equate Spirit and cloud. But verse 29 clarifies that the Spirit being spoken of is the Spirit of YHWH and that YHWH puts his Spirit upon whomever he wishes. So, Wilson's point can be granted, there is a general association between the cloud where YHWH dwells and the Spirit of YHWH.

Wilson next cites Isaiah 63:7-14 LXX, a New Exodus recounting of how God led Israel out of Egypt by Moses, the key verses we list below:

10. αὐτοὶ δὲ ἠπείθησαν καὶ παρώξυναν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ· 'but they disobeyed and provoked his holy spirit'

11b. ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ θεὶς ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον; 'where is the one who put the holy spirit among them?'

14b. κατέβη πνεῦμα παρὰ κυρίου καὶ ὡδήγησεν αὐτούς· οὕτως ἤγαγες τὸν λαόν σου ποιῆσαι σεαυτῷ ὄνομα δόξης. 'spirit from the Lord came down and guided them. Thus you led your people to make for yourself a glorious name.'

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 84. Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* NIGTC (Carlisle: The Paternoster Press; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000), 724-725. Craig L. Blomberg, *The NIV Application Commentary: 1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 191. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *Keys to First Corinthians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 194. F. W. Grosheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* NICNT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), 220. David Prior, *The Message of 1 Corinthians: Life in the Local Church* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985), 167-168. Leon Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary* Revised Edition TNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985),139. Margaret E. Thrall, *I and II Corinthians* CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 73. John Hargreaves, *A Guide to 1 Corinthians* ISG 17 (London: SPCK, 1978), 127. Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* SP (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 368. C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968), 220-221. Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, trans. William Montgomery (London: A. & C. Black, LTD, 1931), 258-261. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 142.

[296] Christian Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther, Zweiter Teil: Auslegung der Kapitel 8-16* THNT 7 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1982), 40.

[297] 'zumal dann die Wolken (=Geistestauf) dem Meer (= Wassertaufe) vorangehen müßten'; 'Das genügt, um Wolke und Meer als Typos des Taufwassers erscheinen, möglicherweise aber auch die Wolke auf den Geist verweisen zu lassen.' Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1 Kor 6,12-11,16)* EKKNT (Solothurn und Düsseldorf: Benziger Verlag AG; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995), 389.

Wilson states, 'The association—verging on an equation—between the Spirit and the cloud in the Septuagint of 63:7-14 is therefore very significant'. Where the exodus story has a cloud, the LXX Isaiah has YHWH's Spirit. Furthermore, this is not an isolated incidence in Paul. Wilson notes three other Spirit-related Pauline usages of Isaiah: Isaiah 28:11-12 in 1 Corinthians 14:21; Isaiah 29:14 in 1 Corinthians 1:19; and Isaiah 40:13 in 1 Corinthians 2:16. 'Isaiah was clearly formative in his pneumatology'.[298]

How then does this apply to Paul's argument? Wilson argues from Pauline symmetry:

> Paul is matching four key boundary-marking elements of Israel's experience—the cloud, the sea, manna from heaven and water from the rock—with four key boundary-marking elements of the Corinthian Christians, with the explicit intention of showing that the boundary-marking elements do not protect you from falling.

We have two elements from the Lord's Supper, we have water baptism, but, Wilson argues, if we do not identify the 'cloud' we ruin the symmetry of Paul's argument. The Corinthians believe that these elements protect them from danger, even when associating themselves with idols and idol food. But, Wilson argues, Paul spends significant space correcting the Corinthians' incorrect views of Spirit experience. If anything would provide protection, surely the Corinthians would think their amazing Spirit experiences would do so:

> As such, far from being an incidental or even meaningless detail, Paul's reference to being 'baptised into Moses in the cloud' reinforces his polemic against the Corinthians' self-understanding as a 'spiritual' people, and substantially bolsters his argument.

Wilson, in arguing from the Corinthian's pride in their spirituality, rightly brings the broad scope of Pauline argument to bear on this passage. Suggesting that Paul cites the cloud to reference charismatic Spirit experience is reasonable. As Oropeza also argues, Spirit experience is front and centre for Paul and the Corinthians. Furthermore, in reasoning from Pauline symmetry, Wilson's argument does something Oropeza does not, it eliminates the 'Hebrew parallelism' possibility that we raised at the beginning of this section. Each point of Paul's argument corresponds to a distinct aspect of Corinthian ritual experience: the cup, the bread, the water, and necessarily, the Spirit. There is then no reason *not* to take the initial syntax at face value: 'into Moses they were baptised in the cloud and in the sea'.

Oropeza and Wilson make a compelling case that Paul juxtaposes Corinthian water baptism with Corinthian Spirit experience, suggesting that the Spirit baptism experience is distinct from, and not subsumed within, the water baptism experience. Their exegesis is corroborated by our sequential reading of 1 Corinthians in which we have noted that Paul emphatically distances himself from water baptism but, just as emphatically, associates himself and his ministry with demonstrable experience of the Spirit.

---

[298] For linking 1 Corinthians 10:1-11 with 2 Corinthians 3:7-18, in which the Spirit plays a prominent role, see C. J. A. Hickling, 'Paul's Use of Exodus in the Corinthian Correspondence', in R. Bieringer, ed., *The Corinthian Correspondence* BETL 125 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), 367-376. See also, Finny Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology: The Eschatological Bestowal of the Spirit upon Gentiles in Judaism and in the Early Development of Paul's Theology* WUNT2 194 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005). On the general significance of Isaiah for Paul, see Florian Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus* FRLANT 179 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998).

This raises another ritual question: was the sequence of 'cloud' and 'sea' taken from the Exodus story and not intended to precisely reflect the Pauline ritual order, especially since Paul could pen the sequence of 6:11? Or was Pauline praxis always Spirit baptism followed by water baptism? Or was there variety with sometimes Spirit baptism coming first, sometimes water baptism?

4.1.3.5 1 Corinthians 6:11 Again – Sequencing the Rituals of Justification

Paul wrote:

> And such as these some of you were. But you washed yourselves, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God.

In view of the sequence in 6:11 vis-à-vis the 10:1-5 sequence of baptism in the cloud and baptism in the sea, we must wrestle with the question of whether Paul, in his evangelistic ministry: (1) had a strict formal liturgy of initiation, or (2) whether Pauline initiation was completely ad hoc, or (3) whether there was a generally followed sequence with some exceptions.

In favour of options 1 and 3, 6:11 has a rhetorical flair to it, if not a formulaic tone. Against option 1 and in favour of option 2 would be the argument that Paul, disdainful of the lowly task of water baptism, went about preaching and getting converts baptised in the Holy Spirit. Sometimes those converts would have already been water baptised by Paul's team-mates and at other times they would not. Also working against option 1, Paul's emphasis upon his powerful ministry of the Spirit rather than of human wisdom suggests that he was not 'liturgical' if by that we mean a fixed arrangement of words and gestures in which are vested power/authority.

Paul's emphasis upon his Spirit-ministry and his, for the most part, decoupling of that ministry from the activity of baptism is clear. But it is the fact that Paul sometimes did baptise that introduces an element of variety. This moves us towards option 3 – a generally followed sequence with minor variation. The summary statement of 6:11 with its sequence of washing, sanctification, justification would then be taken as the standard protocol. The spontaneity of Paul's ministry may result in converts experiencing Spirit baptism before water baptism, but that would be the exception, not the rule. Paul's appeal to the Exodus story in 1 Corinthians 10 would account for the sequence of baptism in the cloud and baptism in the sea.

As discussed above in section 1.3, Paul's use of the idea of 'justification' in this passage has a clear ritual/experiential referent. The convert is 'justified' only after submitting to water immersion and then experiencing spirit possession. This is no claim to fully explain δικαίωσις in Pauline thought. It is, however, an indication that Paul could view justification as related to status in the people of God. That is, justification does not get one 'in', it is a reflection upon one's status as being 'in'. Thus, we must reckon with the fact that Paul's religion was highly experiential and cannot be understood apart from wrestling with the social anthropological issues of spirit possession and ritual.

4.1.3.6 1 Corinthians 12 – Spirit Experience and Christian Initiation

In 1 Corinthians 12 Paul assumes Spirit reception belongs to Christian initiation. Though he recognises a wide diversity of spiritual gifts distributed by the Spirit to various individuals

within the believing community, he, apparently, seems to oppose the idea that glossolalia is common to all.

4.1.3.6.1 1 Corinthians 12:13 – The Unifying Spirit Experience

4.1.3.6.1.1 What Kind of Baptism and What Kind of 'Drinking'?

In 12:13 Paul asserts that all initiates to the Jesus movement, at the time of their initiation, experienced/received the Spirit. In that Paul uses the concepts of being baptised in the Spirit, and being given the Spirit to drink, Paul's terminology is similar to that found earlier in 10:1-5.

> For even in/with one Spirit we all were baptised into one body, whether Jews or Greeks whether slaves or free, and we all were given one Spirit to drink.
>
> καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες ⸆ ἓν ⸂πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν⸃.

The notion that Paul believed the Spirit to be communicated to initiates via the water of baptism has been termed 'the *communis opinio* of critical scholarship',[299] and in this vein Eckhard J. Schnabel incisively observes: 'Nearly all commentators assume (without justification) a reference to Christian water baptism.'[300] The strategic significance of this passage is highlighted by David John Lull:

> If Paul attributes the initial gift of the Spirit to baptism, it would be here if anywhere; for this is the only place where Paul uses the verb βαπτίζω together with a reference to the possession of the Spirit.[301]

Schnabel critically points out that βαπτίζω can reference water baptism as well as Spirit baptism, though he does not argue for either one. He simply concludes that, 'What Paul wants to say is, in any case, clear: All confessors of Jesus have the one Spirit of God and belong to the one body of the church.'[302] Dunn demurs more definitively from the standard view – 'Paul is thinking of baptism in the Spirit; he is not speaking about water at all.'[303] He cites the varied

---

[299] Volker Rabens, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life* Second Revised Edition (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010]), 96-97. Cf. Dieter Zeller, who does not even consider any other possibility, 'Die Zugehörigkeit zu einen Leib ist durch die Taufe gewährleistet, in der das Urchristentum auch sonst (vgl. Joh 3,5; Apg 2,38; Tit 3,5) den Heiligen Geist am Werk sieht.' *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* KEK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 397. Similarly, Schrage, in a brief footnote, confidently dismisses any understanding of baptism as metaphorical, asserting: 'Paulus verwendet βαπτίζειν aber weder im 1 Kor (vgl. 1,13-17; 10,2; 15,29) noch sonst metaphorisch', *Der erste Brief on die Korinther (1Kor 11,17-14,40)*, 216. Fitzmyer is likewise certain that Paul refers to the water rite: 'Even though he adds the mention of the Spirit, it is highly unlikely that Paul is referring to anything different from the well-known early Christian tradition about baptism by water and its effects (see Rom 6:3-4; 1 Cor 1:13-17, and esp. 6:11, "you have been washed").' *First Corinthians*, 477. Christian Strecker makes no argument whatsoever, providing only a footnote with a few references, *Die liminale Theologie des Paulus: Zugänge zur paulinischen Theologie aus kulturanthropologischer Perspecktive* FRLANT 185 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 204.

[300] 'Fast alle Ausleger gehen (ohne Begründung) von einem Bezug auf die christliche Wassertaufe aus.' Schnabel, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 728.

[301] Lull, The Spirit in Galatia, 61.

[302] 'Was Paulus sagen will, ist jedenfalls deutlich: Alle Jesusbekenner haben den einen Geist Gottes and gehören zu dem einen Leib der Gemeinde.' (730).

[303] Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 129.

usage in the New Testament (Mark 10:38; Luke 12:50; Acts 1:5; 1 Corinthians 10:2; John 1:26, 31).[304]

Hanimann also departs from the 'standard', arguing that Paul is referring here to two rites, water baptism and handlaying for the gift of the Spirit. Hanimann argues firstly that Luke accurately knew the practices of the early church ('les usages eux-mêmes de l'Eglise primitive'.[305] Secondly, he argues,

> we know that Paul himself was very concerned, in the field of rites and customs, to do what the other churches did, to be faithful to the traditions. On several occasions, precisely in the first epistle to the Corinthians, he emphasizes it: 4, 17; 11, 16. 23; 14, 33b; 15, 1-3. 11.'[306]

Given points one and two above, Hanimann concludes that Paul, in 12:13, must be referencing the dual ritual of water baptism and handlaying to impart the Spirit: 13a is water baptism, 13b is the gift of the Spirit. Lull argues similarly, reviewing the Acts occasions of Spirit reception and finding that the idea of being given one Spirit to drink references neither baptism nor communion wine, but the gift of the Spirit itself: 'the gift of the Spirit that was operative in baptism was received in response to Christian proclamation prior to baptism.'[307] We shall review the exegesis and return to Hanimann and Lull's argumentation.

Anther scholar interpreting against the typical view is Max Turner, who, following James Alistair Brown, argues that the immersion is into the body of Christ, not into water or into Spirit, and that the agent doing the immersing is the Spirit. Turner acknowledges that the grammar permits the idea of baptism into the Spirit, but argues that the idea of immersion is, in the sentence, placed closer to the idea of the 'body' than to the 'Spirit'. He then states:

> Had Paul wished the sense 'we were immersed in Spirit "for the benefit of the one body"' (an idea that does not strictly belong here anyway) he would have needed a *different* preposition, such as *hyper* plus genitive, to make it clear.[308]

As for the typical perspective that baptism (imparting the Spirit) is in view, Oscar Cullmann argues, 'To determine the essence and meaning of Baptism, *both* these passages, Rom. 6.3ff and I Cor. 12.13, must be taken together.'[309] Such an approach runs contrary to basic narrative exegeses. Likewise, Friedrich Wilhelm Horn freely mixes disparate texts, appealing to what he identifies as the βαπτίζειν εἰς Χριστόν terminology of Galatians 3:24 and Romans 6:3, suggests we need only switch Χριστός with σῶμα and we can be assured that Paul in 1 Corinthians 12:13 is speaking of water baptism, especially since Paul identifies the 'body' as

---

[304] 129.
[305] Hanimann, 'Notes sur 1 Corinthien 12,13b', 403.
[306] 'Or, justement, nous savons que Paul lui-même est très soucieux, dans le domaine des rites et des usages, de faire ce que font les autres églises, d'être fidèle aux traditions ; à plusieurs reprises, précisément dans la première aux Corinthiens, il le souligne : 4, 17 ; Î J , 16. 23 ; 14, 33b ; 15, 1-3. 116.' Hanimann, 'Notes sur 1 Corinthien 12,13b', 403.
[307] Lull, *The Spirit in Galatia*, 62, cf. 59-61.
[308] Max Turner, 'Receiving Christ and Receiving the Spirit: In Dialogue with David Pawson', *JPT* 15 (1999), 3-31; 14-15. James Alistair Brown, *Metaphorical Language in Relation to Baptism in the Pauline Literature*, PhD Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, (1982), 305-306.
[309] Oscar Cullmann, trans. J. K. S. Reid, *Baptism in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1950 [German 1948]), 30.

'Christ's body' (12:27).[310] But these are two different metaphors. They are conceptually related to one another, surely, but are nevertheless distinct. The one is a metaphysical idea of union with Christ, upon which Paul hangs various bits of theology. The other is a physical group of people related by their common belief in Christ, an idea to which Paul attaches more theology. But besides this logical misstep, Horn mixes arguments from different epistles. How does he know that Paul in Romans is talking about the same thing as Paul in Corinthians? Baptism is a flexible metaphor – ships sink in the sea, men sink into sleep, or into intoxication, etc. Can we be confident that every time Paul uses the imagery of immersion he is speaking of the water bath?

Similarly, Beasley-Murray opines that Paul in his argument to the Galatians (3:2-28) points to water baptism as a unifying event, even using similar phraseology – 'Jew/Greek slave/free'.[311] But this cannot be inserted, cut and paste, into the flow of his argument to the Corinthians. Even recent scholarship exhibits the same error. Bruce Hansen, in his study of Galatians 3:28, 1 Corinthians 12:13, and Colossians 3:11, simply assumes at the outset, without any attempt to justify his position, that 'the formula' (Jew/Greek slave/free) references water baptism in all three epistles.[312] That is exactly the kind of fallacy which this dissertation argues that exegetes must avoid. Do we know for certain that Paul only employed phraseology in praise of unity at baptisms? Paul, preacher that he was, could have waxed eloquent about his pet topic, Christian unity, on many occasions – weddings, funerals, births of babies, coming of age ceremonies, fundraising events, etc. Rhetorical catchphrases like 'there is neither Jew nor Greek' etc. tell us something about Paul's priorities and about his typical discourse, but nothing about the occasion for that discourse.

To the argument from similar rhetoric, Stephen Richard Turley adds,

> More generally, baptism was understood as a death to one's old life and the beginning of a new life, and was thus associated with the gift of the Spirit, the power of this new life (1 Cor. 6.11; cf. Acts 2:38; cf Jn 3.5; Acts 10:47; 19:2-6; *Barn* 11.11).[313]

With a dizzying array of disparate scripture verses all telling us how 'baptism was understood', this approach would run contrary to any attempt to read Paul's epistles individually apart from interpolation. But let us assume for the sake of argument, that the 'new life' in Pauline thought is associated with both water baptism and with Spirit baptism. That association, however, does not logically require that water baptism and Spirit baptism are directly linked. That is, phenomenon A associates with phenomenon B and C. But that does not mean B and C are

---

[310] Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, *Das Angeld des Geistes: Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie* FRLANT 154 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 173, 'Im Hintergrund dieser ersten Aussage ist unschwer das aus pl Tauftraditionen bekannte βαπτίζειν εἰς Χριστόν (Gal 3,24; Rö 6,3) zu erkennen. Hier ist Χριστός durch σῶμα ersetzt, was angesichts der Gleichsetzung in 12,27 nicht schwer wiegt, so aber im Bild bleiben läßt (Leib-Glieder).'
[311] Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 169.
[312] Bruce Hansen, *All of You Are One: The Social Vision of Galatians 3.28, 1 Corinthians 12:13 and Colossians 3.11* LNTS 409 (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 6. Similarly, Stephen Richard Turley, *The Ritualized Revelation of the Messianic Age: Washings and Meals in Galatians and 1 Corinthians* LNTS 544 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 76. So too, J. Brian Tucker, 'Paul's Particular Problem – The Continuation of Existing Identities in Philemon', in Brian J. Tucker and Coleman A. Baker, eds., *T&T Clark Handbook to Social Identity in the New Testament* (London: Bloomsbury: 2014), 407-424; 407.
[313] Turley, *Ritualized Revelation*, 76.

directly related to each other. They may be considered to be in association with each other simply because of their mutual connection to A.

The alternate explanation to Turley's argument is logically just as possible. Namely, that initiates encounter, during the process of their being integrated into the group (A), an experience of water immersion (B) and also an experience of immersion in the Spirit (C), and that once they have had the two experiences (B+C) they are considered members of the community (A). In this case, Spirit experience (C) would not be causally related to water immersion (B). Rather, initiation would be contingent upon both water baptism and Spirit baptism.

Turley then argues against Dunn and Fee who exemplify the 'symbolic interpretations' of 12:13. Turley draws upon anthropology, specifically the work of James Fernandez, to argue that religious metaphors give rise to multiple 'ritualized acts and utterances' or in Fernandez's words, 'ceremonial scenes'.[314] This changes the metaphor into a metonymy.[315] This, then, provides Turley with the solution to the tension between sacramental and symbolic views of 12:13:

> We may see now how ritual logic renders obsolete the choice between baptism as a metaphor versus a rite. In order for one to be identified with the metaphor "baptism in the Spirit," one would need to participate in associated "ceremonial scenes" such as water baptism that are related contiguously to the metaphor, thus rendering the metaphor a metonymy.[316]

Turley is right, one needs to somehow connect with the metaphor, but he errs in assuming that the connection would necessarily be water baptism. That is the point to prove. Paul claimed that his preaching was with demonstration of the Spirit and of power, he even threatened the Corinthians with his supernatural power. Would not an immersive encounter with the overwhelming power of the Apostle suffice as a 'ceremonial scene' with which to link a 'baptism in the Spirit'? An altered state of consciousness would then serve as the source of the 'immersion' metaphor. Naturally, we could with Dunn appeal to the Gospel traditions of John the Baptist's prophecy contrasting his own water immersion with the baptising work of the Coming One, but we do not have concrete evidence that Paul was familiar with that particular tradition. Perhaps the Baptist's saying blended well in practice with the religious experiences that Paul's converts were having so that the origins of the Spirit-baptism imagery which Paul employs are twofold. Perhaps. What we do know from Paul's first letter to the Corinthians is that his possession of the Spirit, as well as theirs, was experiential – demonstration of the Spirit, power, tongues, handing over to Satan, prophecy, miracles, healing, etc.

Rather than Turley et al.'s mixing of diverse texts, the argument of each epistle, Galatians, 1 Corinthians, Colossians, must be examined independently of the other arguments and then, having arrived at an understanding of each epistle, comparisons among the various texts may

---

[314] James Fernandez, 'The Mission of Metaphor in Expressive Culture', *CA* Vol. 15 No. 2 (June 1974), 119-145; 125.
[315] 79.
[316] 79. Anthony R. Cross appeals the notion of synecdoche. The present response to Turley would cover all sorts of subcategories of metaphor. Cross, 'Spirit – and Water – Baptism in 1 Corinthians 12:13', Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, ed., *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies* (London/New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 120-148.

be made. With this approach in mind, we note that Paul has, in his argument to the Corinthians heretofore, distanced his Spirit-ministry from schism-causing water baptism, discussed the multiple elements of washing, cleansing, and justification, and gone on to speak of two distinct baptisms, one in the 'cloud' and one in the 'sea'. Then here he speaks of baptism in/with the Spirit. That is, he begins his epistle discussing one rite, he then elaborates repeatedly upon two rites, finally he focuses again upon one rite. He starts with a rite that brings dissention; he finishes with an experience that brings unity. He begins with immersion in water. He ends with the common experience of the charismatic, gift-giving Spirit – the immersion in/with one Spirit into one body, which unites Paul and his Corinthian audience, and which initiates the Corinthians' ongoing charismatic, Spirit-oriented communal life. Thus, Hanimann's proposal of baptism plus handlaying is not wrong to emphasis the gift of the Spirit but errs in assuming that water baptism is at all in view. Turner and Brown, arguing that the element of immersion is the 'body', fail to read chapter 10 – one can be baptised into one or several element(s) with reference to entrance into a social group. Concomitantly, if Paul does not have the water rite in mind in 12:13a but instead the initial religious experience of the Corinthians, then it is unlikely that he has the communion wine in mind when he writes that 'we were all given one Spirit to drink'.

4.1.3.6.1.2 Who Baptises?

If this, then, is a Spirit-oriented baptism, *who* does the baptising? This is a grammatical question hinging on the interpretation of ἐν, a common preposition that takes the dative case. Yet, this is not a trivial question for ritual studies, as Turner and Brown demonstrate.[317] Did Paul conceive of the situation as the Spirit being the baptismal officiant, immersing people into the body of Christ? We have already argued that the narrative context works against this view, but what about the grammar itself? The experiential dimension would then be more figurative – an initiate is immersed into the friendly fellowship, the relational bonds, of the Christian community. Or perhaps Paul understood this as a non-experiential, purely metaphysical 'baptism', spiritual legalese, as it were – the Spirit effecting an invisible transition in the divine record-books from outside the people of God to inside. All of these ideas would be reading ἐν as denoting agency.

Or did Paul think of God as being the officiant, immersing initiates in his Spirit so that they then become a part of the one body? Or perhaps Paul viewed himself as the officiant, bring the Corinthians in touch with the Holy Spirit? Given Paul's earlier argumentation that his ministry among the Corinthians has been one of demonstration of 'Spirit and power', this immersion in/with the Spirit we would expect to be a tangible religious experience, the start of the ongoing charismatic life which Paul is about to discuss at length. In this case, ἐν would denote instrument and/or location. For help in distinguishing between the concept of agent and that of instrument, we turn to Silvia Luraghi:

> Another semantic role that has affinities with Agent is Instrument. The two roles are crucially different, in that Instrument exerts no control on the state of affairs,

[317] So Ben Witherington III, *Troubled Waters: Rethinking the Theology of Baptism* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 81.

> and it usually implies the co-occurrence of an Agent; however, both Agent and Instrument are necessary to the accomplishment of an action.[318]

O'Donnell argues that in 1 Corinthians 12:13, the Spirit is the Agent. He makes two arguments. First, he lists every New Testament occurrence of ἐν πνεύματι as well as the occurrences of the passive forms of βαπτίζω. He concludes:

> The study of prepositional phrases consisting of ἐν πνεύματι above indicated that the preposition ἐν may sometimes be used to express the (personal) agency of the Holy Spirit. It is therefore possible that ἐν modifying a passive form of βαπτίζω may function like the more common ὑπό.[319]

Second, he argues that Greek word order prefers the subject first.

> Further research would need to be done concerning in what position the agent of the action of a passive verb usually appears, but, if a writer was wishing to indicate the agent of the action, it is not difficult to see that they might place the word in the position which the subject (of an active) verb would usually occupy – that is before the verb.[320]

Hence, in 1 Corinthians 12:13a, καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, we should see 'one Spirit' as the agent of the passive verb 'we were baptised'.

Regarding the admittedly speculative argument (2), what if Paul wished to forefront the idea of element? Why is 'agent' the only thing that Paul could forefront? The flexibility of Greek word order allows an author to front a variety of concepts. Regarding argument (1), he has not utilised a linguistic approach. Just because ἐν πνεύματι may, on its own, indicate agency (he cites as definitely agency: Luke 4:1, Romans 15:16, 1 Corinthians 2:13, 6:11, 12:9, 12:13, Ephesians 2:18, 3:5, 2 Thessalonians 2:13, 1 Peter 1:2)[321] does not mean that ἐν πνεύματι in association with another word, such as βαπτίζω, indicates agency. We will discuss this point – the effects of collocation – at length below. Moreover, many of the examples he lists as certainly representative of 'agency' are questionable. Luke 4:1 could be read as Jesus being led 'in the Spirit'. 1 Corinthians 2:13a reads: ἃ καὶ λαλοῦμεν οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος[T]. In the prepositional phrase ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος, the idea of agency is expressed by the genitive πνεύματος, not by the ἐν: 'which also we speak, not in words taught by human wisdom, but in [words] taught by the Spirit. In 1 Corinthians 12:9, God is the agent, working through/by means of the Spirit. He cites 1 Corinthians 12:13 as definitely agency, but that is the very passage that is at issue.

For Anthony Thistleton, however, there is no clear resolution to the grammatical question. After reviewing numerous commentators on both sides, he writes, 'the probability that ἐν with the dative denotes agency carries no less force' than the idea of ἐν plus the dative denoting instrumentality.[322] Why is there such uncertainty? On one hand, we might look to the

---

[318] Silvia Luraghi, 'Spatial metaphors and agenthood in Ancient Greek', in Michaela Ofitsch and Christian Zinko, eds., *Sonderdruck aus 125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz: Arbeiten aus der Abteilung „Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft" Graz* (Graz: Leykam, 2000), 275-290; 277.
[319] O'Donnell, 'Two Opposing Views', 334.
[320] 335.
[321] 330-332.
[322] Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 997. Garland seems equally uncertain, *1 Corinthians*, 591, as does Fitzmyer, 477.

'immediate context' of chapter 12. There we read that spiritual gifts are given: διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος (12:8a), κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα (12:8b), ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι (12:9a), ἐν τῷ ⸀ἑνὶ πνεύματι (12:9b). At first blush it seems the Spirit is doing all the giving and thus, by virtue of being in close proximity to two cases where ἐν with the dative has the force of agency, it seems the ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι in 12:13 must mean, 'baptised *by* one Spirit'. Yet verse six makes clear that God is 'the one working all things in all' – God gives through the Spirit, and according to the Spirit, and ἐν the Spirit. 12:9ab is the idea of God giving 'by means of' his Spirit, not a giving by the Spirit *simpliciter*. This is the instrumental use of the dative. Thus, the immediate context of 12:13 does *not* have ἐν as a dative of agency.

But context aside, could 12:13 nevertheless be read as agency – the Spirit-Agent baptising converts into the body-element? We will argue the classic grammars suggest that it is not, and, moreover, a modern linguistic approach flatly excludes it. We will make a linguistic case that the dative, or ἐν plus the dative, with βαπτίζω, indicates location and instrument – where something is immersed and with what something is immersed, and that this is the same as with other verbs of washing. The differentiation between location and instrument would only come through context, for example, the text might say someone was 'immersed in a pool' – location is then clear.[323]

But, before getting to the linguistic argument, what do the Greek grammarians say?[324] Robertson does not speak to ἐν as found in 1 Corinthians 12:13, but discusses the instrumental use of ἐν generally; he does not speak of ἐν being used for direct agency as conceived of by Turner and Brown.[325] Heinrich von Siebenthal, while not addressing 1 Corinthians 12:13, states of ἐν plus the dative that it can (1) 'indicate space (position) *in*, *within*, *at*, *by*, *on*; *among* (a group)' and (2) ' in KG [Koine Greek] also indicating instrument or cause… *with*, *by means of*, *through*, *by*, *because /on account of*'.[326] 'Cause' could be understood as ἐν functioning to indicate direct agency in the sense argued by Turner and Brown. Blass, Debrunner, Funk do not address the ἐν in 1 Corinthians 12:13, neither do they list direct agency as a meaning of ἐν.[327] Daniel Wallace, in 1 Corinthians 12:13, sees only dative of means – Christ, by means of his Spirit, baptises the convert. Wallace cites Mark 1:8 as support: αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ⸀ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Here it is clear that 'he', Jesus, is the agent.[328] Similarly, Dunn observes:

> In the NT ἐν with βαπτίζιεν never designates the one who performs the baptism; on the contrary, it always indicates the element in which the baptizand is immersed…. in each of the six other passages which speak of Spirit-baptism (Matt. 3.11; Mark

[323] Cf. Rachel Aubrey and Michael Aubrey, *Greek Prepositions in the New Testament: A Cognitive-Functional Description* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press). See their discussion under the entry 'ἐν'. No page numbers available.
[324] We are here concerned with the function of the preposition ἐν. However, on the matter of agency and the dative case generally, see K. W. Krüger, translated and expanded by Guy L. Cooper, III, *Attic Greek Prose Syntax* Revised and Expanded in English, Volume 1 (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998), 322, 580. Smyth, H. W. *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* (New York; Cincinnati; Chicago; Boston; Atlanta: American Book Company, 1920), 343–344. A. T. Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, Third Edition (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919), 542. F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 102. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 374.
[325] Robertson, *Grammar*, 589-591.
[326] Siebenthal, *Ancient Greek Grammar*, 271-272.
[327] F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar*, 117-118.
[328] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 374.

> 1.8; Luke 3.16; John 1.33; Acts 1.5; 11:16) the Spirit is the element used in the Messiah's baptism in contrast to the water used in John's baptism.[329]

Murray Harris cites several passages where ἐν can be construed as 'agency' (Luke 4:1; Acts 17:30-31; 1 Corinthians 6:2). However, Harris makes an extended argument that in 1 Corinthians 12:13, ἐν does not denote agency, but is locative. He argues as follows:[330]

(1) Another preposition, ὑπό, is used with βαπτίζεσθαι for personal agency.
(2) In the synoptic cases of John the Baptist prophesying a baptism ἐν πνεύματι, the concomitant notion of ἐν ὕδατι requires the locative or element idea and excludes agency.
(3) Jesus is the baptiser in John's prophecy, so Jesus must be the baptiser in 1 Corinthians 12:13.
(4) Paul's singular use of ἐν plus βαπτίζω in 1 Corinthians 10:2 is clearly local.
(5) 1 Corinthians 12:13c, which indicates 'inward participation in the Spirit', would be logically more suited to immersion in the Spirit than to immersion by the Spirit.
(6) Ephesians 2:18 has the identical phrase, ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, but this is not instrumental because we read at the beginning of the verse, δι' αὐτοῦ, viz. through Christ. 1 Corinthians 12:9, ἐν τῷ ἑνὶ πνεύματι, is instrumental though.

Point 3 is an appeal to theology and point 6 is another epistolary context, nevertheless, Harris' main arguments are significant. Both Harris and Dunn move us in the direction of a linguistic approach.

Looking at the problem from a broader perspective of language, we want to know if there was a particular Greek idiom for speaking of dipping someone or something in liquid. For example, although it is technically true that doors rotate on their hinges, we do not, in English, say 'Please rotate the door so I can enter'. English has a fixed idiom – 'open the door'. The word 'open' collocates with 'door'. 'Rotate' does not primarily collocate with 'door', it collocates with 'hinges'.[331] Michael Hoey explains collocation:

> the property of language whereby two or more words seem to appear frequently in each other's company (e.g. *inevitable* + *consequence*).[332]
>
> it is a psychological association between words (rather than lemmas) up to four words apart and is evidenced by their occurrence together in a corpora more often than is explicable in terms of random distribution.[333]

Hoey observes that collocation includes conceptual frameworks as well as specific lexical items. For example, the world 'hour' collocates with 'quarter' and with 'half', as well as with

[329] Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 128.
[330] Murray J. Harris, *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 231.
[331] Collocation is distinguishable from, yet overlaps with, the concept of idiom. 'Idioms are collocations where the meaning of the combination is not predictable from the separate meanings of the parts.' Michael Hoey, 'What's in a Word?', *ETP* Issue 27 (April 2003), 5-8; 6.
[332] Michael Hoey, *Lexical Priming: A New Theory of Words and Language* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), 2, original emphasis.
[333] 5. Four words because, 'a wider span than that tends to become too "noisy", in that enormous numbers of unrelated words are thrown up by computer Key Word in Context (KWIC) concordance', see Michael R. Scott, 'The Right Word in the Right Place: Key Word Associates in Two Languages', *AAA* Vol. 22 No. 2 (1997), 235-248; 236. Scott also highlights the role of narrative context, 'the story so far', in collocation (236).

a variety of numbers – 'a two-hour walk', 'a five-hour flight', etc. But these constructions can be thought of in terms of broader categories/frameworks – the semantic categories of NUMBER and JOURNEY.[334]

Collocation impacts how we read. Even though a given word may have several meanings in a lexicon, when that word appears in a specific linguistic context – a particular collocation – its range of meaning will be much more limited. If it is used in a witty pun, it may have two meanings, but otherwise, it will have only one. For example, the adjective 'red' in the phrase, 'the red revolutionary' does not have the same meaning as in the phrase 'the red sunburn'. Different collocations, different significations. Particular words also 'prime' hearers for other specific words:

> a listener, previously given the word *body*, will recognise the word *heart* more quickly than if they had previously been given an unrelated word such as *trick*; in this sense, *body* primes the listener for *heart*.[335]

Words are also associated with particular grammatical functions. 'It is a matter of consequence' is not the same as, 'It is a consequence of the matter.[336] Different colligations, different significations.

Collocations and colligations are related to cultural-cognitive 'frames' – commonly recognised situations, standard 'scripts' for proper behavior. Todd L. Price illustrates the interpretive impact of cognitive framing nicely with the 'restaurant' script: in a restaurant, to give a tip does not mean to give the waitress advice, nor does 'menu' mean the same in a restaurant script as it does in a laptop script.[337] Thus, we must ask whether the Greek words ἐν and βαπτίζω participated in typical 'washing' scripts or collocated together with a fixed meaning. Put another way, what semantic categories typically collocate with ideas of washing/immersion? E.g., we might expect 'washing' to associate with ideas of AGENT, OBJECT, ELEMENT, TRANSFORMATION – as in 'the man washed the garment clean in the river'.

We will start with the Synoptic Gospel stories of John the Baptist's baptising and preaching. For example:

Mark 1:8 reads: ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ᵀ ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ᵒἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

Mark 1:9b tells us what then happened to Jesus: καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου.

But one could argue that the Gospel accounts are all dependent on a single traditional saying, and Acts is dependent upon the Gospel traditions, so this is not widely dispersed evidence. It really amounts to but one example. Nevertheless, in this linguistic sample of speaking about the activity of immersion, agency is expressed using ὑπὸ with the genitive and the element of the immersion is expressed by the dative, and also by ἐν with the dative. But again, is this an

---

[334] Hoey, *Lexical Priming*, 16.
[335] 8.
[336] Cf. Hoey's corpus linguistics analysis of 'consequence' (44); see also, Hoey, 'What's in a Word?'.
[337] Todd L. Price, *Structural Lexicology and the Greek New Testament: Applying Corpus Linguistics for Word Sense Possibility Delimitation Using Collocational Indicators* PLAL 6 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2020 [2015]), 67. Cf. Richard A. Hoyle, *Scenarios, Discourse, and Translation: The scenario theory of Cognitive Linguistics, its relevance for analysing New Testament Greek and modern Parkari texts, and its implications for translation theory* (n.p.: SIL International, 2008), 67-68. See also, Matthew Brook O'Donnell, *Corpus Linguistics & the Greek of the New Testament* NTM 6 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005).

isolated instance? No, for Paul has, just prior in his argument to the Corinthians, written: καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ⌜ἐβαπτίσθησαν ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ ‘and all were baptised into Moses in the cloud and in the sea’ (1 Corinthians 10:2). The Israelites were not immersed in Moses’ body, they were immersed in the cloud and sea and thereby came into special association with Moses. In terms of semantic categories, we have OBJECT, RESULT, ACTION, ELEMENTS (with God understood as the AGENT). This collocation of semantic categories in the Corinthian corpus creates a cognitive frame, a schema, regarding ritual initiation which informs the reading of 12:13 – one is immersed in/with an element(s) into a special relationship (with a leader and the leader’s group).

The collocation of ἐν plus βαπτίζω is also seen in other passages outside the New Testament:

Josephus BJ 1.435

πέμπεται μὲν οὖν ὁ παῖς διὰ νυκτὸς εἰς Ἰεριχοῦντα, ἐκεῖ δὲ κατ’ ἐντολὴν ὑπὸ τῶν Γαλατῶν βαπτιζόμενος ἐν κολυμβήθρᾳ τελευτᾷ.

‘he sent then the child through the night to Jericho, and there, according to [Herod’s] command, he was immersed in a pool by the Galatians and died.’

2 Kings 5:14a LXX

καὶ κατέβη Ναιμαν καὶ ἐβαπτίσατο ἐν τῷ Ιορδάνῃ ἑπτάκι

‘and Naiman went down and immersed himself in the Jordan seven times’

POLYBIUS, Historiae 5.47.2

οἳ καὶ συνεγγίσαντες τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ξενοίταν διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τῶν τόπων οὐ προσεδέοντο τῶν πολεμίων, αὐτοὶ δ’ ὑφ’ αὑτῶν βαπτιζόμενοι καὶ καταδύνοντες ἐν τοῖς τέλμασιν ἄχρηστοι μὲν ἦσαν ἅπαντες,

‘and they, having drawn near to the forces of Xenoetas, through ignorance of the ground, without needing help from the enemy, they by their own weight were immersed and sinking down in the swamp they were all useless’

Thus, with βαπτίζω, the ideas of location ‘in’ or instrumentality ‘with’ are expressed using the dative case or ἐν with the dative. This is true of other verbs of washing.

With νίπτω we have:

Exodus 30:20 LXX: ὅταν εἰσπορεύωνται εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου, νίψονται ὕδατι καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνωσιν· ‘whenever they enter into the tent of witness, they will wash with water and they will not die.’

Exodus 30:21 LXX: νίψονται τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας ὕδατι· ‘they will wash the hands and the feet with water’

With πλύνω we read:

Revelation 7:14: οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης καὶ ⌜ἔπλυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν ^{o1}αὐτὰς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἀρνίου. ‘these are the ones coming out of the great tribulation and who washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the lamb.’

With λούω we find:

PLUTARCHUS Biogr. et Phil. Aetia physica Stephanus page 911 section D line 10: καὶ τὰ σώματα τῶν λουσαμένων ἐν θαλάττῃ ξηρὰν εὐθὺς ἴσχει καὶ τραχεῖαν τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν. 'and the bodies of the ones washing in the sea dry immediately and have a rough appearance'.

With ἀπολούω we read:

LUCIANUS, Lexiphanes 4 line 5: καὶ δέος μὴ ἐν λουτρίῳ ἀπολουσώμεθα κατόπιν τῶν Καριμάντων μετὰ τοῦ σύρφακος βύζην ὠστιζόμενοι 'and fear lest in used wash-water we should wash off after the Carimants, with the rubbish pressed and jostled'.

The significance of our review of the usage of βαπτίζω and other verbs of washing and of our analysis of the semantic categories that form a cognitive frame regarding ritual initiation in 1 Corinthians 10 is that, contra Thistleton's claim that either reading of ἐν – agency or instrumentality – is equally possible, the natural reading of the expression in 1 Corinthians 12:13 is 'in/with one Spirit we were all baptised into one body'. That is, Paul works with the semantic categories of ELEMENT, OBJECT, ACTION, RESULT. The category of AGENT is not specified – it could be God, Jesus, or even Paul himself. The idea of 12:13 as agency – baptised by the Spirit-as-Agent – is not a possibility.

4.1.3.6.2 1 Corinthians and Paul's Ritual Process – A Review

We are now in a better position to evaluate Wilson's identification of being 'baptised in the cloud' with a charismatic experience of being 'baptised in the Spirit'. The topic of chapter twelve, and on through chapter fourteen, is spiritual gifts. Here we have Paul saying that everyone has already been given this Holy Spirit who distributes gifts and who enables every Christian to confess Κύριος Ἰησοῦς. As Colleen Shantz notes, this is done when the believer is 'in the Spirit of God' (ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ), that is, in an altered state of consciousness.[338] No one who is 'in the Spirit' will say anything negative about Jesus Christ. It seems that being 'in the Spirit' was the standard experience of Paul's congregants.

Viewing the trajectory of discussion so far in Corinthians, it becomes difficult to believe that Paul understands water baptism to symbolise the Spirit. Let us review Paul's thought regarding initiation in 1 Corinthians. In chapter 1 he praises the Corinthians on their charismatic giftedness, but immediately addresses problems attached to water baptism and makes clear that water baptism was not his business. Rather, we find in chapter 2 that preaching the gospel in the demonstration of the Spirit and power is Paul's forte. This drives a hard, conceptual wedge between water baptism and Spirit experience. The latter is tied to Paul's person and preaching, the former to the person of Apollos, and his pastoral 'watering' (chapter 3). Also, in chapter 3 we find that it is the Spirit, dwelling among them as in a sacred Temple, that is dangerous to schismatics, not their baptism. Chapter 5 illustrates just how dangerous is the spiritual power at work among them – 'the power of our Lord Jesus'. Moreover, in the excommunication procedure there is no physical ritual reversing baptism. Instead there is a 'spiritual' handing over to Satan suggesting that a metaphysical act reverses an earlier metaphysical act. Chapter six juxtaposes the work of water and the work of Spirit: 'But you washed yourself, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God.' When one submits to the Lord Jesus Christ in baptism and then is sanctified by the experience of the Spirit, one is declared righteous. Moving on, in chapter 10 Paul specifies

[338] Shantz, *Paul in Ecstasy*, 159.

two baptisms: cloud and sea. It is reading against the grain, even kicking against the pricks, to squeeze together into one what Paul has so repeatedly separated into two. Finally, in chapter 12, Paul points to an initial baptism in the Spirit from which ongoing 'drinking' of the Spirit proceeds. If the Corinthians' ongoing experience of the Spirit, which abounds with charismatic gifts, had its beginning in Spirit baptism, how then could that baptism be anything but charismatic?

Paul's picture of Christian initiation is thus a multipart ritual process: preaching with demonstration of Spirit and power, water baptism, charismatic baptism in the Holy Spirit, partaking of the bread and wine of the Lord's supper. Along the way there is confession – by the enabling power of the Spirit – of Jesus as Lord. As discussed earlier (section 4.1.4.5) the order of the two baptisms is relatively interchangeable, with 6:11 representing the common sequence of water and Spirit and 10:2 being influenced by the Exodus story, and with 12:13 representing the baptism which Paul associated with his ministry – that of the Spirit – around which Paul established the unity of the Corinthian believers.

4.1.3.6.3 1 Corinthians and Pauline Spirit Reception / 'Spirit Baptism' – Evaluating 12:30 on Glossolalia

But what did Paul mean by being 'baptised in the Spirit'? We have argued above that since the ongoing charismatic experience of the Corinthians – viz. the enthusiastic Corinthian 'drinking' of the Spirit – is traced back to their initial Spirit baptism, that Spirit baptism must itself have been experiential/charismatic. But what did it look like? Did all initiates at this time receive some charismatic 'gift' or ability? As 12:7 reads, 'But to each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good.' This is a possibility, though the phrase ἑκάστῳ δὲ δίδοται could simply reference each who has received, not that each and every convert receives a spiritual gift. Ongoing improvement in 'gifting' was believed to be possible, as verse 31 makes clear, 'but zealously desire the greater gifts.'

With the Corinthians placing such great value on glossolalia, we must ask whether Paul thought tongues were part of the Spirit-baptism package. That Pauline 'Spirit baptism' was experiential should no longer be in question. But was it a glossolalic Spirit baptism? The objection to this possibility stems from Paul's rhetorical question in 12:30b μὴ πάντες γλώσσαις λαλοῦσιν; 'Not all speak with tongues, do they?' Since clearly not all Corinthians spoke in tongues then tongues could not have been a required element of initiation for Paul. However, before we rush to conclusions, we should cite the rest of the verse, 12:30c: μὴ πάντες διερμηνεύουσιν; 'Not all interpret, do they?' C. K. Barrett rightly observes that 30b and 30c are paired: 'Do all interpret (that is, interpret the tongues which others speak)?'[339] This pairing of tongues and interpretation is found again in 14:5:

> Now I wish all of you to speak with tongues, but rather that you should prophesy; and the one who prophesies is greater than the one who speaks with tongues except if he should interpret, that the church might receive edification.

[339] C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* Second Edition BNTC (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968 & 1971), 296. Cf. F. W. Grosheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London, Edinburgh: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1953, 2nd edition 1954), 300.

> θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε· μείζων δὲ ὁ προφητεύων ἢ ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσαις ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ⌜διερμηνεύῃ, ἵνα ἡ ἐκκλησία οἰκοδομὴν λάβῃ.

Paul links the speaking in tongues with interpretation and the building up of the church, indicating that the activity under consideration with the 'do all speak with tongues?' phrase is not a private activity, but a public activity, something done in the local assembly. Surprisingly, major interpreters have overlooked this point. Turner, for example, does not even mention 12:30c in his article devoted to the very question of whether Corinthian glossolalia was universal.[340] Neither does Fee address this issue.[341] Paul asserts that not all have the gift of uttering in/before the congregation a tongues speech message which is then interpreted by someone else with the interpretation gift. Paul's rhetorical statement, 'do all speak with tongues?' says nothing about members' initiatory experiences.

Paul himself boasted that he practiced glossolalia more than all the Corinthians (Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ⌝, πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον ⌜γλώσσαις ⌞λαλῶ· 14:18). He had also twice challenged the Corinthians to imitate him. He does this first in 4:16, where he argues that they may have many teachers, but only one father – himself. As their father he writes: Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε⌝ 'I exhort you then, be imitators of me'. He therefore sends Timothy who will remind them, not simply of Paul's doctrine, but of his practice, 'my ways in Christ' (τὰς ὁδούς μου τὰς ἐν ⌜Χριστῷ [Ἰησοῦ]⌟ (4:17). He again calls upon the Corinthians to copy him in 11:1 μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε καθὼς κἀγὼ Χριστοῦ. That exhortation is in the context of the foregoing practical teaching on when it is appropriate to eat food offered to idols and when it is not. In 11:2 he praises them for holding to the traditions (τὰς παραδόσεις) which he handed on to them. In other words, Paul expected his churches to follow both his practical example and his doctrine. In light of Paul's discipleship practice of mimesis, his exclamation that he speaks in tongues more than all the Corinthians cannot be simply dismissed as an idiosyncrasy of the Apostle. Paul's circle imitated their teacher. They in turn taught 'his ways' to the churches.

As the Corinthians seemed enthusiastic about glossolalia, so much so that Paul needed to write the love chapter to bring perspective and to pen in chapter 14 specific instructions about the proper exercise of glossolalia in the community, we have to ask again where were the Corinthians getting their glossolalia? Here the circumstantial nature of Paul's letter comes into play. He did not write a church manual on every aspect of charismatic community life. He assumes his Corinthian audience already knows the story. He just highlights points of interest for their edification and correction. Thus, while the Corinthians' initial Spirit baptism is a likely suspect for the origins of Corinthian glossolalia, and Paul's exhortations to personal imitation are suggestive that churches imitated his prayer practices, he does not provide enough data for us, so far removed from the narrative he shared with the Corinthians, to precisely identify the origins of the ubiquitous behaviour.

4.1.4 2 Corinthians – Spirit Experience as 'Anointing', 'Sealing', 'Down Payment'

In our reading of 2 Corinthians, we will first establish what can be known from the immediate discussion, not assuming that the first epistle has the same argument as the second. Once the discussion is understood, we will bring the two Corinthian correspondences together. 1 Corinthians has two brief mentions of the Spirit in relation to initiation. First, 1:21-22 reads:

---

[340] Max Turner, 'Tongues: An Experience for All in the Pauline Churches?', *AJPS* Vol. 1 No. 2 (July 1998), 231-253.

[341] Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 194-195; 220-221.

> Now the one having established us with you in Christ and having anointed us is God, the one also having sealed us and having given the down payment of the Spirit in our hearts.
>
> ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν ⸀ἡμᾶς σὺν ὑμῖν⸁ εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας ἡμᾶς θεός, ⸀ὁ καὶ⸁ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν.

The εἰς Χριστὸν could be a reference to Paul himself having been water baptised 'into Christ', which is then paired with his being anointed by God. But there is no necessity that Paul has water immersion in view. Horn, however, argues that the context must be that of water baptism because of the use of σφραγίζω and because of the connection with the gift of the Spirit.[342] But he assumes the very point he needs to prove, that baptism gives the Spirit. Regarding σφραγίζω, Udo Schnelle, whom Horn cites, does not help his case for Schnelle recognises that, 'For Paul, σφραγίζειν is, indeed, not yet a synonym for baptism, but it prepares for this development'[343] Yet, neither Schnelle nor Horn envisage any possibility other than that, 'Baptism and Spirit belong inseparably together. The Spirit is bestowed in baptism, the baptismal effect is above all the effect of the Spirit.'[344]

With χρίσας 'having anointed', Paul is playing upon the meaning of 'Christ' – Paul identifies with the Anointed One and receives from the Christ an anointing for his own ministry. Paul further elaborates upon 'anointing' with the idea of having been sealed (σφραγίζω) and having been given the 'down-payment of the Spirit' τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος – common commercial terms that in Paul's usage make possession ('in our hearts') of the Spirit fundamental to belonging to God. Paul's initiates share in the Spirit who anointed Jesus, they are marked as belonging to Jesus, they are given the first instalment of a larger purchase.

The second reference to Spirit experience is 5:5, where, after discussing death and the hope of immortality in heaven, Paul writes: 'Now the one having prepared us for this same is God, the one having given to us the down payment of the Spirit.' Once more, in an eschatological context, Paul speaks τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος. However, Paul here reveals no details of how or when the Spirit is given.

4.1.5 Bringing 1 and 2 Corinthians Together

In our previous sequential reading of Paul's discussion of water baptism and Spirit baptism in 1 Corinthians, baptism and Spirit are in association with each other because of their mutual association with joining the Jesus movement. Baptism, which is distinctly not Paul's task, is the purview of other men – mere talkers. Paul – a man of action – administers the Spirit. If Paul in 2 Corinthians argues from Spirit reception at Christian initiation to future eschatological

---

[342] Horn, *Angeld des Geistes*, 391.

[343] 'Für Paulus ist zwar σφραγίζειν noch nicht Synonym für die Taufe, aber er bereitet diese Entwicklung vor.' Udo Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit und Christusgegenwart: Vorpaulinische und paulinische Tauftheologie* Zweite, durchgesehene Auflage GTA 24 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 125. Schmeller also recognises this, Thomas Schmeller, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther (2Kor 1,1-7,4)* EKKNT (Ostfildern: Neukirchener Theologie Patmos-Verlag, 2010), 113. So too, Frank J. Matera, *II Corinthians: A Commentary* NTL (Louisville, London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 56-57. So too, Margaret E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* Vol. 1 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 156-158. Oropeza favourably entertains the idea of baptism but moves on, B. J. Oropeza, *Exploring Second Corinthians: Death and Life, Hardship and Rivalry* RRA 3 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 113.

[344] Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit und Christusgegenwart*, 125. 'Taufe und Geist gehören untrennbar zusammen. Der Geist wird bei der Taufe verliehen, die Taufwirkung ist vor allem Wirkung des Geistes.'

glory, then that initial Spirit reception must be experiential. Such a conclusion is consonant with Paul's ongoing emphasis upon power and demonstration rather than mere eloquence.

4.1.6 Romans – All Christians have the Spirit, All Vocalise the 'Abba Cry'

Despite numerous references to the Spirit in Romans, Paul says very little regarding the Spirit in relation to rituals of Christian initiation. In 2:29a he writes:

> but he is a Jew who is one in secret, and circumcision is of the heart by means of the Spirit, not the letter
>
> ἀλλ᾽ ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι,

Does Paul mean by this that he had a developed theology that an initiatory Spirit experience had replaced Jewish circumcision as an entry rite? Possibly so. However, our text is simply too brief to be certain. Paul could simply be referring to the Spirit's work in a person generally, and not specifically to an initiatory event.[345]

In 5:5 it is the Spirit through whom God pours out his love in the hearts of believers and who Paul asserts was given to believers. In 7:6 he repeats the 2:29 contrast – believers serve God 'in newness of the Spirit and not in oldness of the letter'. In chapter eight he resolves the problem his epistle-long argument has been dealing with – the struggle against sin and the inability of the law to give victory:

> For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus freed you from the law of sin and of death (8:2)
>
> ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠλευθέρωσέν ⸀σε ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου.

The life in and of the Spirit is essential for Paul's conception of Christian living – one cannot please God living in ἐν σαρκὶ, 'in the flesh'. It is an either/or situation for Paul:

> But you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God dwells in you. But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, this one is not his. (8:9)
>
> Ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ᾽ ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. εἰ δέ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ.

Therefore, it might be argued, since one is either 'in Christ' or not, Paul must have believed that the convert receives the Spirit at the instant, the very moment, of saving faith. For example, Dunn writes, 'it is by coming into 'possession' of the Spirit that one becomes a Christian (8.9, 15)'.[346] However, Paul has also, earlier in his epistle, argued, 'as many of us as were baptised into Christ Jesus, were baptised into his death' (6:3). He assumes that all Christians have been baptised and makes baptism synonymous with identification with, union with, Christ. Paul's either/or dichotomy does not address the status of an initiate who stands in the queue to be immersed. Paul also writes that one must confess with one's mouth Jesus is Lord. But Paul

[345] Cf. Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* Second Edition BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018), 151; Douglas Moo, *The Letter to the Romans* Second Edition NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2018), 184.

[346] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 149. Cf. Moo, *Romans*, 512; Schreiner, *Romans*, 407-408.

does not address the question of what happens to a person who has believed in her heart, but then dies before she has a chance to publicly confess Jesus as Lord. That is, Paul assumes everyone is water baptised, everyone has publicly declared Jesus as Lord, and everyone has received the Spirit. The issue of ritual process, e.g., the person standing in the queue to be baptised, the in-between state in which an initiate exists for a brief liminal period, does not concern Paul.

One possible reference to ritual behaviour is in Paul's statement (8:15) that believers cry out 'Abba Father' – ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· αββα ὁ πατήρ. David Wenham notes the use of αββα in Jesus' Gethsemane intercession (Mark 14:36) and suggests this might background Paul's use of the term.[347] We have already discussed stammering, 'buh-buh-buh' type utterances that are normal in Pentecostal dissociation and can be considered precursors to fluent glossolalia (4.1.2). This initiatory utterance may have perdured within early Christian circles precisely because it sounded like the Aramaic word for 'father'. It may have functioned similarly to the 'hosanna' shouted at Sukkot, or like modern Charismatics or Pentecostals might cry out 'glory!' and 'hallelujah!'. When then do the Pauline believers utter this cry? Is it at various times in the community worship?[348] Is it in particular moments of intense private prayer? Is this a reference to the moment of the Spirit indwells the believer and they, by the Spirit, verbalise their new status as 'son'? Here in Romans Paul simply does not supply enough details to make a clear determination. What is certain is that verbal utterance, tinged with emotion, is connected with the ongoing experience of the Spirit. As Paul writes: 'for we do not know what is necessary that we should pray, but the Spirit himself intercedes with inexpressible groanings' (8:26).

4.1.7 Summary of Spirit Experience and Ritual in the Pauline Literature

A sequential reading of Paul's letters has shown that, for the Apostle, Spirit reception is highly experiential. It is distinct from water baptism, but nevertheless is closely associated with the water rite – even to the point of being set in parallel with baptism in Paul's thought – in that both Spirit baptism and water baptism are elements in Christian initiation admitting the convert to the Christian sacred meal. Justification, then, at least in 1 Corinthians, reflects back upon the initiate's new status as having gotten 'in' to God's holy people. Paul links Spirit reception with verbal cries of 'Abba Father', he associates Spirit-prayer with inarticulate groanings, and he finds in Spirit baptism the inception of charismatic community life, that is, the diversity of gifts of the Spirit; but he does not state that Spirit reception is linked to tongues speech. However, neither does Paul deny that the tongues speech so pervasive among his readership, at least among his Corinthian audience, begins with Spirit baptism.

4.2 Luke-Acts

4.2.1 Situating Christian Initiation within Lukan Salvation – An Overview of Current Research and a Response

To analyse Luke's conceptions of initiation apart from situating those conceptions within the larger Lukan story of salvation would excise the rituals of water and Spirit from their theological framework and thus lead to potential misconstrual. Recent and thoroughgoing

[347] David Wenham, *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), 276-277.

[348] Cf. John A. Bertone, *"The Law of the Spirit": Experience of the Spirit and Displacement of the Law in Romans 8:1-16* SBL 86 (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 201-202. Bertone notes the contrast between the aorist ἐλάβετε and the present κράζομεν. Mark Wreford observers that this must have been a familiar occurrence. Mark Wreford, 'Diagnosing Religious Experience in Romans 8', *TB* Vol. 68 Issue 2 (2017) 203-222; 208.

Forschungsberichte are extant and will not be replicated here; e.g., Timothy W. Reardon has traced challenges to and evolution from Conzelmann's redaction-critical claims that for Luke, Jesus' death is not linked to salvation or forgiveness of sins.[349] Reardon sums up the problem as:

> Luke appears to display the *what* of salvation without sufficient attention to the *how*, missing, and even intentionally omitting, any substantial reference to Christ's atoning death.[350]

That is, Luke speaks of results without providing means, at least, without providing means recognizable by Protestant conceptions of substitutionary atonement, propitiation, expiation, etc.[351] Key themes under debate have been the degree to which the Lukan Jesus' death is expiatory or exemplaric (is he substitute or role model?), and to what degree Lukan salvation is present or future, practical or spiritual, restricted or holistic. In terms of methodology, Reardon observes that the primary tool is redaction criticism, resulting in attempts to capture the theology of the historical 'Luke' rather than the theology of the text.[352] Reardon has sought to remedy these lacunae in his recent monograph, arguing that, while the criticism that Luke does not develop traditional Protestant atonement themes is accurate, Luke is in no way soteriologically deficient, but presents a holistic, cosmic, *Christus Victor* model of redemption.[353]

The recent work of Torsten Jantsch seeks to address issues highlighted by Reardon's *Forschungsbericht*.[354] Jantsch's own extensive literature review observes that, though commentators are united in asserting 'salvation' as central to Lukan thought, there is no consensus on the meaning of Lukan salvation nor on how it is established. Jantsch opens his *Jesus, der Retter* citing Haenchen's criticism: 'Luke had not succeeded in "bringing the earthly life of Jesus [...] into an inner connection with the forgiveness of sins and salvation".'[355] Jantsch sets out, in opposition to Haenchen, to argue that 'one of Luke's central concerns [is] to bring Jesus' earthly ministry and his position as exalted to God into a meaningful, coherent, and comprehensible context.'[356] Yet, Jantsch concludes that Luke gives no soteriological weight to Jesus' death, arguing that the key phrase in Luke 22:19ff. ('the new covenant in my blood poured out on your behalf'), while text-critically of sound Alexandrian provenance,[357] is not Lukan theology but merely '*traditionelles Gut*' (traditional material).[358] Moreover, it

---

[349] Timothy W. Reardon, 'Recent Trajectories and Themes in Lukan Soteriology', *CBR* Vol. 12 Issue 1 (2013), 77-95. Timothy W. Reardon, *The Politics of Salvation: Lukan Soteriology, Atonement, and the Victory of Christ* LNTS (London, New York: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2021), 13-27. Cf. Torsten Jantsch, *Jesus, der Retter: Die Soteriologie des lukanischen Doppelwerks* WUNT 381 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 9-36; Benjamin R. Wilson, *The Saving Cross of the Suffering Christ: The Death of Jesus in Lukan Soteriology* BZNW 223 (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2016), 1-37; John Kimbell, *The Atonement in Lukan Theology* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), 4-17; Hermie C. van Zyl, 'The soteriological meaning of Jesus' death in Luke-Acts. A survey of possibilities', *VE* Vol. 23 No. 2 (2002), 533-557.
[350] Reardon, 'Recent Trajectories', 77, original italics.
[351] 90.
[352] 88.
[353] Reardon, *Politics of Salvation*, 31-32.
[354] Jantsch, *Jesus, der Retter*, 3. Jantsch cites Reardon's notion of 'what vs. how'.
[355] 1.
[356] 1.
[357] 110.
[358] 113, 345.

occurs just once.[359] Jantsch acknowledges the seeming import of the 'new covenant' motif; however, he looks in vain for Luke to develop it. Luke does not cite Jeremiah 38:31-34, and though he uses the term διαθήκη, he does so only in reference to covenant with the Hebrew patriarchs. Moreover, Luke fails to repeat the theme, or give any sacramental weight to it, in his Acts stories of community bread-breaking. Thus, Jantsch concludes, 'Luke has here taken up a piece of tradition without integrating it into his theology.'[360]

However, there are three significant issues that are overlooked, not just in Jantsch's arguments, but in the discussion generally. The first is over-dependence upon redaction criticism to explicate Lukan theology. Geir Otto Holmås, in his study of Lukan prayer, sagely observes:

> Without discounting the value of redaction-criticism in principle, and even making occasional remarks on Luke's editorial procedure, this study will attach minimal hermeneutical importance to the text's diachronic development, seeing firmer ground for assessing the Lukan prayer notices by tracing patterns of structure and plot development in the final form of the text.[361]

One may glean inklings of an author's thought comparing her finished piece to her sources. But modification of sources tells but part of the tale. The work itself must be examined. That is, the Lukan *oeuvre* must be interpreted on its own terms. For example, if five artists each paint a picture of a cross, one artist may include nails, one may feature dripping blood, one may place a flower at the base, and so on. The five paintings will differ and a critic may stand back and compare their details. However, if one stands before any individual painting, one sees a cross. One is impacted emotionally and intellectually by the painting itself, alone, not in comparison to the other paintings. One does not say, 'ah, this is a flower painting' or, 'here we have a depiction of rusty nails', unless, of course, the artist so enlarged the flower or the blood or the nails as to overpower the image of the cross. But that would be an interaction of elements *within a single painting*, and not an inter-painting phenomenon. The cross may be 'traditional material' but that does not mitigate or diminish its role in any single artwork. Jantsch's first premise is misplaced.

Let us examine this distinction between redaction critical and narratological approaches further. The mere fact that Luke omits Mark's reference to Jesus giving his life as 'ransom for many' (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν Mark 10:41-45 and Matthew 20:28; cf. Luke 22:24-27) does not in one fell swoop excise redemption from Lukan theology. Luke already featured λύτρωσις in the Benedictus – i.e., 'redemption' is a Lukan frame. But here, instead of the λύτρον idea, Luke emphasises the 'numbered with transgressors' citation of Isaiah 53:12 MT (Luke 22:37) in which the suffering servant 'poured out his soul unto death' and 'bore the sin of many' and 'interceded for transgressors' – Jesus, after all, will soon be interceding in the garden.[362] Luke later *does* use a verb cognate with λύτρον: the pair on the road to Emmaus had hoped that Jesus

[359] 101.
[360] 111, 'Lukas hier ein Traditionsstück aufgenommen hat, ohne es in seine Theologie zu integrieren.'
[361] Geir Otto Holmås, *Prayer and Vindication in Luke-Acts: The Theme of Prayer within the Context of the Legitimating and Edifying Objective of the Lukan Narrative* LNTS 433 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2011), 85.
[362] For comparison of MT and LXX, see Cilliers Breytenbach, 'The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 53 and the Early Christian Formula 'He Was Delivered for Our Trespasses'', *NT* Vol. 51 (2009), 339-351. For application of Isaiah 53 to Luke, see William J. Larkin, 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament as a Key to His Soteriology', *JETS* Vol. 20 No. 4 (December 1977), 325-335.

was the one destined *λυτροῦσθαι* τὸν Ἰσραήλ (Luke 24:21). But Jesus berates them for not believing the prophets: ⌜οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ⌜δόξαν αὐτοῦ? The disciples got it all wrong. Jesus *did* redeem Israel. Zacharias *was* right. The things Jesus suffered *were* necessary to accomplish the redemption. In other words, redaction criticism can helpfully inform us that Luke does not use a particular word that other synoptic writers use. But only narrative analysis can tell us that Luke has framed the idea of redemption in terms of Isaiah 53, not only in his gospel, but also in his Acts, viz. in the elaborate focalisation of Isaiah 53 in the Ethiopian Eunuch story (Acts 8:26-40).

Jantsch, however, critiques the scholarship that relies on Isaiah 53. While Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, building upon Sam K. Williams,[363] asserts that early Christianity understood Isaiah 53 in terms of substitutionary and redemptive death, and then works interpretively from that assumption,[364] Jantsch objects to this manoeuvre. 'Mittmann-Richert presupposes a uniform original Christian understanding of the fourth servant-of-God song. However, she has not demonstrated this at any point.'[365] Jantsch also takes issue with Rouven Genz, who asserts that Acts 8 is the key to the entire Lukan narrative. Genz argues that not only is 'the notion of substitutionary atonement' established by the story centring on Isaiah 53, but the reader will reflect this understanding back over the other narrative references to Isaiah such as Luke 22:37, 'numbered with the transgressors'.[366] Jantsch applies the same critique of Mittmann-Richert to Genz – they both proceed from the unfounded assumption that early Christians, or Luke, understood Isaiah 53 as substitutionary atonement. For Jantsch, Luke's Acts 8 citation of Isaiah 53 is about 'humiliation and eventual elevation' – if there is perchance any underlying Lukan narrative structure, this is conceivably it.[367] However: 'The death of the servant of God from Isa 53 is just not evaluated soteriologically in Acts 8,32f. and it must also not be read into it!'[368] Instead, the 'theological valence' of Isaiah 53 is unclear.[369]

Jantsch's critique must be acknowledged. One cannot assume *a priori* that Luke read the servant song with vicarious atonement in mind. Even less can we make generalisations about early Christianity's latent understandings. We can, however, read Isaiah 53 and find repeated, overt imagery of substitution, suffering, and death (53:4, 5, 8, 11, 12 LXX; also 6, 10 MT) – this vicarious 'valence' is not unclear. It is in the identification of the suffering servant that there is ambiguity. But Second Temple Jewish interpretations or even assumed early Christian interpretations are secondary to the question of how Luke himself reworked the material.

Luke's use of Isaiah has been examined in several monographs. Peter Mallen reviews literature covering the Isaianic Servant and the Isaianic New Exodus motifs in Lukan thought and then proceeds to explore Luke holistically in terms of Isaiah. Observing that Luke cites or alludes

---

[363] Sam K. Williams, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event the Background and Origin of a Concept* HDR 2 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972).
[364] Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, *Der Sühnetod des Gottesknechts: Jesaja 53 im Lukasevangelium* WUNT 220 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 80.
[365] 'Mittmann-Richert setzt eineinheitliches urchristliches Verständnis des Vierten Gottesknechtsliedes voraus. Sie hat dieses aber an keiner Stelle nachgewiesen.' Jantsch, *Jesus der Retter*, 101.
[366] 'der Vorstellung von stellvertretender Sühne', Rouven Genz, *Jesaja 53 als theologische Mitte der Apostelgeschichte: Studien zu ihrer Christologie und Ekklesiologie im Anschluss an Apg 8,26–40* WUNT2 398 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 311-312.
[367] 101.
[368] 'Der Tod des Gottesknechts aus Jes 53 wird in Apg 8,32f. gerade nicht soteriologisch ausgewertet und darf auch nicht hineingelesen werden!' 101-102.
[369] 'Die soteriologische Valenz des Vierten Gottesknechtsliedes bleibt vielmehr unklar.' 102.

to Isaiah at key narrative junctures (e.g., Luke 3 and 4: John the Baptist and Jesus; Luke 24 and Acts 26: the post-resurrection disciples and Paul; Luke 2 and Acts 1: prophecies of Simeon and of Jesus), Mallen argues that Isaiah supplies 'an interpretive framework for Luke's reader.'[370] Luke employs Isaiah, 'to develop the nature, scope and response to God's salvation' and all this is in accordance with the divine scriptural (Isaianic) plan.[371] Yet Mallen, utilising redaction criticism, asserts that Luke does not 'explain his [Jesus'] death in terms of vicarious atonement.'[372] However, Holly Beers, in her recent monograph, suggests that Luke's omission of the explicit reference to atonement found in Mark 10:45 and Matthew 26:28 is not because Luke is unaware of an 'atonement' role for Jesus (since, she points out, Luke has the sayings about his body and blood in Luke 22:19-20 and Acts 20:28), but because it is 'only a small part' of Isaianic salvation,[373] and because Luke wishes (1) to extend the concept of salvation beyond the bounds of '*vicarious suffering*' to include issues of 'communal peace and social justice' and (2) to extend the concept of The Servant beyond Jesus to include his disciples.[374] Beer's work points the way for this dissertation in that she argues Luke keeps an atonement concept and expands the salvation concept. However, I will question whether Luke has at all minimised atonement and I will observe that the Servant's role as 'sacrifice' is not limited to Jesus but also carries over to his disciples.

Let us look again at the text. Luke employs Isaiah 53 (Luke 22:37) against the backdrop of Passover. What aspects then of the Passover sacrifice vis-à-vis the Servant Song interest Luke? To begin with, Luke uses comedic irony to focalise Jesus as the Passover lamb (22:1-2). As the great feast nears, the chief priests and scribes busy themselves, not with preparations to slaughter vast numbers of sacrificial lambs (Josephus reports 256,500 on a single Passover, *Jewish Wars* 6.9.3), but to kill one man – Jesus. Furthermore, Luke speaks of Jesus' body given for his followers (20:19; cf. Mark 14:22 and Matthew 26:26 which omit τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον). He speaks of a new covenant in Jesus' blood poured out for his followers (22:20; cf. 1 Corinthians 11:25). Yes, this is mostly 'traditional material' – even Paul knew it – but Luke chose to place it in his story. Its function within that story is not minimized by the fact that other storytellers have also used it. That is what Jantsch, Mallen, Beers, et al. have gotten wrong. Regardless of how Matthew or Mark or Paul read, *Luke portrays* Jesus' body and blood offered on behalf of his followers. Moreover, in other notable scenes Luke reiterates and builds upon this point. In Jesus' final appearances, national redemption is tied to his necessary suffering (24:21). At Paul's farewell speech, we hear that Jesus purchased the church with his own blood (Acts 20:28).

This brings us to Jantsch's second objection, that the 'new covenant blood poured out on behalf of Jesus' disciples' statement occurs only once. From a literary, narratological perspective, counting occurrences of a word is no guarantee of that word's importance. A word set within a climactic scene may be the hinge for an entire plot. 'The knife', 'the kiss', 'the hope' – an idea is imbued with significance by its narrative location. There may be *many* knives, *many* kisses, *many* hopes, but at the turning point there is only *one*. When Jesus, at the last supper –

[370] Peter Mallen, *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts* LNTS 367 (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 198-199.
[371] 158.
[372] 131.
[373] Holly Beers, *The Followers of Jesus as the 'Servant': Luke's Model from Isaiah for the Disciples in Luke-Acts* LNTS 535 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 115.
[374] Beers, *Followers of Jesus*, 120-121, original italics.

it is the *last*, after all – speaks of the new covenant in his blood poured out for 'you', this is hardly extraneous material. He prays over the cup that is poured out while just verses later his blood falls to the ground mingled with his self-sacrificing prayers – 'remove this cup, yet not my will…'. The narrative value of a word is determined, not primarily by its frequency, but by its *location*. Narratively speaking, Luke's Jesus is the Isaianic intercessor. 'Numbered with transgressors', Jesus is Isaiah's sin bearer.

Yet, Luke's appeal to 'covenant' has not be entirely side-lined within scholarship. Hans Jörg Sellner argues that Luke, in speaking of the blood of the 'new covenant' is not thinking of 'atonement' but is linking to the Exodus story:

> The idea of atonement, which is often seen behind the motif of blood in the cup-saying, cannot be proved for Lk 22,20. The connection of "blood" and "covenant" taken from Ex 24,8 has already in the context of Ex 24 nothing to do with atonement: The blood here serves solely to seal the covenant agreement. What Luke wants to take from Ex 24,8 is nothing more than the motif "sealing the covenant by blood".[375]

Sellner is surely correct. But the blood of the covenant, sprinkled over the people, sealing the covenant agreement in Exodus 24:8 is not the end of the story, but the beginning. Chapters 25 through 31 recount the instructions to build the tent of witness (ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου) with its altar and furnishings, and to establish the priesthood that would perpetually offer sacrifices. The construction of the tent is interrupted by Israel's sin in which dedicatory sacrifices (ἀνεβίβασεν ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ προσήνεγκεν θυσίαν σωτηρίου 32:6 LXX) are offered, not for the tent, but for the golden calf. The remaining chapters discuss the building and the eventual dedication of the tent of witness and its priests. Leviticus tells the story of how the sin offering, the whole burnt offering, and the sacrifice of salvation were, properly, offered by Aaron in dedication of the tent (ποιήσας τὸ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τὰ ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ τὰ τοῦ σωτηρίου 9:22 LXX), who then raises his hands over the people and blesses them. Likewise, at the dedication of the tent in Numbers, whole burnt offerings (ὁλοκαύτωμα), offerings for sin (περὶ ἁμαρτίας), and the sacrifice of salvation (θυσία σωτηρίου) are presented (7:15-88). Thus, when Luke speaks of Jesus' blood of the new covenant, he does so, as Sellner correctly observes, against the background of Exodus-story covenant. But if one recognises a link to Exodus covenant, then one must also consider the three-fold telling of the story in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. The focus is upon the tent of witness with its sacrifices of sin and salvation, and, as we will see below, its manifestations of fire and glory.

The third crucial but overlooked point is the Temple. The Temple looms behind Luke's Gospel narrative from the nativity stories to the temptation, to Jesus' cleansing of it, to his daily teaching in its precincts, to the tearing of the veil, to the final scene with the disciples 'continually in the temple praising God'. Luke's Acts – from Peter to Paul – continues to host

[375] 'Der Sühnegedanke, der vielfach hinter dem Motiv des Blutes im Becherwort gesehen wird, läßt sich für Lk 22,20 nicht nachweisen. Die Ex 24,8 entnommene Verbindung von „Blut" und „Bund" hat bereits im Rahmen von Ex 24 nichts mit Sühne zu tun: Das Blut dient hier einzig und allein der Besiegelung des Bundesschlusses. Was Lukas aus Ex 24,8 übernehmen will, ist nichts weiter als das Motiv „Bundesbesiegelung durch Blut".' Hans Jörg Sellner, *Das Heil Gottes: Studien zur Soteriologie des lukanischen Doppelwerks* BZNW 152 (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2012), 497. Scott McKnight recognises 'covenant' as a possibility but then rejects it, distinguishing the Pesach from the Exodus 24:8-11 blood-covenant and meal. *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005), 288-289.

the ubiquitous structure. As Gregory R. Lanier notes in his detailed study, commentators recognise a structural/literary function for the Temple in Luke's narrative, but relatively little is made of it theologically.[376] Lanier argues that Luke foregrounds the Temple to show the re-visitation of YHWH in the person of Jesus, and the Jewish rejection of Jesus heralds God's rejection of 'their' house. As noted above in reference to Josephus, I observe a different, soteriological focus – the Temple was not simply a municipal building, but an animal slaughterhouse. Jesus' Pesach speech is framed, both by the saga of Exodus deliverance, already focalised at the transfiguration (τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, ἣν ⸀ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ⸀ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ 9:31), and by the Temple cult. *Pace* Haenchen, Luke *does* bring Jesus' earthly life into connection with the atoning sacrifices of Judaism.

But does not Luke emphasise a new, bloodless temple? The Spirit working in the fresh-formed Christian community? For example, Richard Bauckham draws upon a range of Second Temple literature to argue that Luke 'understood the σκηνή Δαυειδ to be the Temple of the messianic age' (cf. James' Acts 15:16 citation of Amos 9:11).[377] D. H. Jung appeals to Jesus' baptism and Stephen's speech to argue that Luke has replaced the physical Jewish Temple initially with Jesus' Spirit-indwelt body, and finally with the bodies of Jesus' followers likewise indwelt by the Holy Spirit.[378] N. H. Taylor, after analysing Luke's use of various terms for 'temple', argues that God's presence in Jesus began to replace the Temple, but the structure was not fully supplanted until the tearing of the veil. After Pentecost, the expanding church then became the earthly locus of divine presence.[379] Steve Walton suggests that for Luke, Jesus fulfils the functions of the Jewish Temple and now 'the whole of creation' is his temple.[380] G. K. Beale, employing, perhaps a more popular level 'biblical theology' approach, argues for Pentecost as a 'new temple'.[381] This dissertation will, below, further supplement this recognition of a central Lukan motif.

But, if Luke has fashioned a *new* temple, what then are the implications for the much-debated Lukan soteriology? What sacrifices does Luke depict as being offered therein? Of particular import for understanding Luke's conception of Jesus' death, how is this new temple dedicated? Does Luke, perchance, draw upon imagery from the dedication of Moses' tent of witness or

---

[376] Gregory R. Lanier, 'Luke's Distinctive Use of the Temple: Portraying the Divine Visitation', *JTS* Vol. 65 Pt. 2 (October 2014), 433-462. For discussion of Lukan narrative geography, cf. Ronald C. Fay, 'The Narrative Function of the Temple in Luke-Acts', *TJ* Vol. 27 No. 2 (Fall 2006), 255-270. For general discussion see, Peter Head, 'The Temple in Luke's Gospel', in T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole, eds., *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 101-119; and Steve Walton, 'A Tale of Two Perspectives? The Place of the Temple in Acts', in T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole, eds., *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 135-149.

[377] Richard Bauckham, 'James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)', in Ben Witherington III ed., *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 154-184; 158.

[378] D. H. Jung, 'Fluid Sacredness from a Newly Built Temple in Luke-Acts', *ET*, Vol. 128 Issue 11 (2017), 529-537.

[379] N. H. Taylor, 'The Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts', *HTS* Vol. 60 Issue 1&2 (2004), 459-485. For the new Temple as Jesus, see Steve Smith, *The Fate of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts: An Intertextual Approach to Jesus' Laments Over Jerusalem and Stephen's Speech* LNTS 553 (London, New York: T&T Clark, 2017), 187.

[380] Walton, 'Tale of Two Perspectives?', 149.

[381] G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity Press, 2004; Leicester: Apollos, 2004), 201-216; for extensive research on Pentecost and temple imagery, see G. K. Beale, 'The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 1: The Clearest Evidence', *TB* Vol. 56 Issue 1 (2005), 73-102. G. K. Beale, 'The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 2: Corroborating Evidence', *TB* Vol. 56 Issue 2 (2005), 63-90.

Solomon's temple? As will be further developed below, Luke situates Jesus' death, not merely within the context of Herod's magnificent edifice, but within an intertextual schema of temple dedication which Luke explicitly references, notably in his images of theophanic fire and glory. As with previous Hebrew sanctuaries, whose dedication entailed sacrifices for sin and salvation as well as the making or renewing of the nation's covenant with God, Luke portrays Jesus' death as the θυσία σωτηρίου dedicating a new Temple of the Spirit and establishing a new covenant with Israel's God. Luke *does* develop the new covenant motif, though not in the places Jantsch had expected.

Having addressed the wider topic of Lukan soteriology, which will be important in our future anthropological discussion of the interconnection between sacrifice and spirit possession, I will now turn to the Lukan rituals of initiation. The argument I lay out here generally follows my previous argumentation as discussed in the literature review. However, when the exegesis moves from broad strokes to specific arguments and conclusions, I will challenge my old argumentation, reject my previous conclusions, and argue in a completely new direction. It is these fresh and original arguments and conclusions which provide the key data for social anthropological discussion.

4.2.2 Jerusalem, Nazareth, Judea, and the Jordan

How then does a narrative-critical approach flesh out Luke's initiation structure? A sequential reading begins where the story does, in the Jerusalem Temple, with incense burning on the altar, 'all the multitude of the people' praying outside, and a priest who does not believe the angel sent directly from God's presence.[382] Luke pans out towards Nazareth of Galilee, and then the hill country of Judea, with the angelic encounters and Spirit experiences of Mary, John, Elizabeth, and Zacharias, but then returns to the Temple and two especially Spirit-led individuals, Simeon and Anna. Thus, Luke lays out his cosmology in his opening scenes: the realm of God's throne, angelic mediation, the Temple cult, the prayerful Jewish nation, the priesthood. Luke extends the locus of divine encounter from Temple to countryside in Holy Spirit experiences encompassing power, miraculous conception, loud prophecy, physical movement, and divine guidance. Here, particularly righteous, or exceptional individuals, the faithful people of God, experience the Spirit. Here is salvation come to God's suffering people. Here is revelation enlightening the Gentiles. Here is salvation for 'all peoples'. Lukan salvation comes in terms of mediation – the sacred touching the profane. Yet Luke will supply not simply an either/or dichotomy of holy/common, but a spectrum of mediatorial activity and personages extending from the sacred ultimate – heaven's throne – to angels, priests, incense, Temple, prayerful people, Elijianic forerunner, shepherds, young mother, Holy Spirit, infant son of God, apostles, evangelists, ordinary believers, to finally the Gentile nations.

[382] Luke 1:21-22 indicate the people were 'waiting' for Zacharias, and expecting to hear him say something, perhaps a blessing? Unfortunately, as David Instone-Brewer writes, 'we know almost nothing about prayer in the Temple.' David Instone-Brewer, *Prayer and Agriculture* TRENT 1 (Grand Rapids, MI / Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004), 61, 53-54. Similarly, Jeremy Penner cautions that we have no evidence for set liturgical prayers associated with the morning and afternoon sacrifices. Instead, the 'correlation between prayer and sacrifice' was 'a practice of personal piety' which considered the times of sacrifice 'auspicious', Jeremy Penner, *Patterns of Daily Prayer in Second Temple Period* STDJ 104 (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2012), 69-70. Philo reports that incense was offered before the morning sacrifice, and after the evening sacrifice (*De Spec. Leg.* I. 171), C. T. R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), 120.

Mediation, viz., proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom, continues as a ῥῆμα θεοῦ comes to John the Baptist. Wearing not the priestly garb of his father but the hairy mantle of Elijah, he preaches a baptism of repentance, preparing the way of the Lord, preparing for 'all flesh' to see the salvation of God. In this context of divine inbreaking, Jesus' Spirit reception (Luke 3:21-22) is associated with baptism – the first iteration of an oft to be repeated type-scene. Luke presents heaven opening, the Spirit descending, and the divine voice speaking, all after Jesus' immersion and during his prayer ('having been baptised and while praying'[383]), thus making prayer integral to the baptism event[384] yet linking the coming of the Spirit to the prayer immediately following immersion, not to the water per se. As Wilhelm Wilkens precisely observed:

> The baptism and the reception of the spirit during the prayer of Jesus are assigned to each other. This is shown by the genitive construction enclosing both acts. At the same time, however, both acts are sharply distinguished and set off from each other by the different tenses. The baptism in water is strangely relegated to the margins. All weight rests on the reception of the spirit during the prayer.[385]

Likewise, Dunn notes, 'the baptism of Jesus and the descent of the Spirit are two distinct events – closely related, but distinct.'[386] Bovon similarly writes, 'The account of Jesus' baptism therefore distinguishes the baptism of water from the outpouring of the Spirit'.[387]

Caution is in order however, for Jesus' baptism is *not* a stand-alone model of Christian initiation. A sequential reading approach avoids any argumentation over whether Jesus' baptism directly represents Christian baptism by understanding it as an initial building block

---

[383] Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν… (Luke 3:21)

[384] On prayer as typically Lukan and here uniquely Lukan, see Holmås, *Prayer and Vindication*, 85-86; Amy-Jill Levine and Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 91; Michael Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium* HNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 170.

[385] Wilhelm Wilkens, 'Wassertaufe und Geistesempfang bei Lukas', *TZ* Vol. 23 Issue 1 (1967), 26-47; 29, 'Wohl sind Taufe und Geistempfang während des Gebets Jesu einander zugeordnet. Das zeigt die beide Akte umschließende Genetivkonstruktion. Durch die verschiedenen Tempi werden beide Akte aber zugleich scharf unterschieden und voneinander abgesetzt. Die Wassertaufe rückt merkwürdig an den Rand. Alles Gewicht ruht auf dem Geistempfang während des Gebets.'

[386] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 35.

[387] Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 268. So too, Martin Dibelius, *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer* FRLANT 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911), 60, 'Die Erwähnung des Gebetes Jesu zerreißt den Zusammenhang zwischen Taufe und Geistesbegabung'; Arthur James Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism* (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1891), 16, 'But whatever the act of Baptism itself was or was not to our Lord, it was by a distinct, though connected, movement, that He received the abiding unction of the Holy Ghost.'; Dom Gregory Dix, *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism: A Public Lecture in the University of Oxford delivered on January 22nd 1946* (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1946), 30, 'It is *after* our Lord's own Baptism in the Jordan … it is immediately after, but after this that the Messianic Spirit descends upon Him.' G. W. H. Lampe, while emphasising that it is solely through the sacrament of baptism that the Spirit is given to the faithful, nevertheless recognises the Lukan link to prayer. G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers* (London: Longmans, Green and Co Ltd, 1951), 44. Cf. McCollough, *Ritual*, 88-91. Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague acknowledge the Lukan emphasis on Jesus' prayer, and even the similarity with Tertullian's baptismal rite, but they are uncomfortable with separating the Spirit from Christian baptism. Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries* Second, Revised Edition (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 24-25.

of the reader's implied mental construct for Christian initiation.[388] That mental construct must be allowed to fully develop. It is not until the entire Luke-Acts narrative is traversed that the reader has a full grasp of what it means to be initiated into the early Christian community. Luke's implied reader sees in Jesus' baptism, not a perfect correspondence with every aspect of his own baptism, but the precursor to what would later become the full Christian initiation process. Jesus' baptism is, however, a situating of the baptism ritual within the Lukan cosmology of mediation.

4.2.3 Jordan – Malachi's Fire: The Messiah Fashions a Nation of Priests

Luke prefigures Pentecost in the Jordan River prophecy of John the Baptist:[389] 'I baptize you with water, but one is coming who is stronger than I… he will baptise you with Holy Spirit and fire' (Luke 3:16). Luke presents John as exhorting the converted, baptised multitudes whom he initially addresses with caustic injunctions, but, upon their contrition, whom he instructs in practical deeds of repentance. It is then, when the people, now thoroughly converted, are in expectation and 'wondering in their hearts' whether John was Messiah, that John makes his prophecy. Thus, in Luke's presentation, John promises that Messiah will baptise, not the wicked, but the repentant in Spirit and fire. Dunn argues the same point from the 'you' of John's preaching, 'I baptise you… he will baptise you'.[390] More fire, of a non-baptismal sort, awaits those who are considered 'chaff'.

If the people of God are to be baptised in fire, we should examine what Luke might mean by this. Fortunately, this ground has been covered by a number of scholars. Dunn argues that Malachi 3-4, with its fires of refining and destruction, backgrounds John the Baptist: 'John himself understood the baptism in … fire as both refining and destructive'.[391] Turner highlights Luke's portrayal of John in terms of Elijah in Luke 1:17.[392] Andrew Perry argues, contra Dunn above, that, 'The refining figure in Malachi describes a *beneficial* effect on a single group of people (Levites), and this is different from the destructive unquenchable fire of Luke's purging metaphor (Luke 3:17).'[393]

Dunn, Turner, and Perry are right to argue that Luke draws upon Malachi. The relevant texts are: Malachi 3:1-4; 22-23 (LXX; cf. 3:1-4, 4:5-6 MT); Luke 1:17, 76; 7:27.

1. Luke 1:17 'he will go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just'.
    a. Malachi 3:1, 'Behold I send my messenger, and he will look upon the way before my face, and suddenly the LORD comes into his temple, whom you seek, even the messenger of the covenant, whom you desire: behold, he comes, says the LORD almighty.' (LXX).
    b. Malachi 3:22 (LXX, cf. 4:5 MT) 'And behold I send to you Elijah the Tishbite before the coming of the great and glorious day of the Lord.'

---

[388] Cf. Marshall, nothing in the Lukan story, 'characterises Christian baptism'. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1978), 150. Cf. McCollough, *Ritual*, 88.

[389] Cf. Teresa L. Reeve, *Luke 3:1-4:15 and the Rite of Passage in Ancient Literature: Liminality and Transformation*, PhD Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2007.

[390] Dunn, *Baptism*, 11.

[391] 12.

[392] Turner, *Power*, 151-152.

[393] For extensive discussion of the Malachi/Luke-Acts relationship, see Andrew Perry, *Eschatological Deliverance: The Spirit in Luke-Acts,* PhD Dissertation, Durham University (2008); 254-278; 266, original italics.

c. Malachi 3:23 (LXX, cf. 4:6 MT) 'who will restore the heart of father to son and the heart of a man to his neighbour'.

2. Luke 1:76 'And you, child, will be called prophet of the Most High, for you will go before, before the Lord to prepare his ways' (cf. Malachi 3:1).
3. Luke 7:27 'Behold, I send my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way before you' (cf. Malachi 3:1).
4. Malachi 3:2-4 (LXX) 'And who will endure the day of his coming? Or who will withstand in his divine appearance? Because he will enter as fire of a smelting furnace, and as cleaning lye. And he will sit smelting and purifying as with silver and as with gold: and he will purify the sons of Levi and he will pour them out as gold and as silver: and they will be bringing to the LORD sacrifices in righteousness. And the sacrifices of Judah and Jerusalem will please the LORD just as in the days immemorial and just as in the years before.

Luke overtly draws upon Malachi's priestly purification imagery, explicitly likening John to a forerunner figure going before the Lord. Richard M. Blaylock has recently summarised argumentation surrounding the Malachi passage, which is heavily debated at several levels: activity of a redactor, allusions, identity of the *dramatis personae*.[394] Blaylock observes that there is no manuscript evidence for redaction, allusions are made to Exodus 23:20 and Isaiah 40:3, and that, rather than one or three, there are only two characters, the messenger of YHWH and YHWH Himself. Blaylock concludes: 'Malachi 3:1 predicts the coming of a human prophetic priest who will prepare the way for the divine royal priest.'[395] Blaylock notes that, as the Synoptics all present John the Baptist as Elijah, they concomitantly present Jesus as Malachi's 'Lord', and thus Jesus is identified with YHWH.[396] It is this last observation of Blaylock that is crucial, because, from a narratological perspective, the meaning of Malachi in its historical context is secondary. The primary narratological concern – the dissertation's only concern – is how *Luke* interpreted Malachi, how *he* employed it in his narrative.

Lotta Valve addresses this narratological issue. She proposes that Luke did not follow the traditional (i.e., Matthean and Markan) perspective: 'Luke presents Jesus as a new, messianic *Elijah regressus* who suddenly comes to his temple [as an infant and as an adolescent]'.[397] Moreover, 'Luke lets both notions, John as Elijah and Jesus as Elijah, be present in his infancy narrative.'[398] However, she does not grapple with the redundancy and emphasis with which Luke identifies John as Elijah vis-à-vis Jesus as Messiah. As Perry observes, in 7:27 Luke changes Malachi's first person pronoun (πρὸ προσώπου μου) to second person (πρὸ προσώπου σου), effectively putting Jesus in place of YHWH.[399] Nor does she engage the idea that Luke could reserve the Elijah title for John, and the title of LORD for Jesus, while still painting Jesus in prophetic colours. Following Blaylock and Perry, Luke reads Malachi as presenting an Elijah figure preparing the way for Jesus *qua* YHWH to sit and purify the priests of Israel to

[394] Richard M. Blaylock, 'My Messenger, the LORD, and the Messenger of the Covenant: Malachi 3:1 Revisited' *SBJT* Vol. 20 No. 3 (2016), 69-95.
[395] 84.
[396] 85.
[397] Lotta Valve, 'The Lord Elijah in the Temple as in Malachi 3.1: "Overkilling" Elijah Traditions in Luke 2', *Luke's Literary Creativity* LNTS 550, ed. Jesper Tang Nielsen and Mogens Müller (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 155, 156.
[398] 158.
[399] Perry, *Eschatological Deliverance*, 259.

offer proper worship. Engaging Perry, Blaylock, and Valve, we see that in Luke's multivalent portrait, Jesus is at once prophet, priest, Messiah, Κύριος.

Therefore, in light of Malachi, while Luke's John the Baptist certainly preaches fires of judgement for the wicked, he also propounds purificatory Spirit and fire for the baptised repentant. John the Baptist, the son of a priest, is preparing the repentant people of God to be a nation of priests. Luke is careful to note that John's baptism was a national affair, as 'all the people … and the tax collectors' were baptised by John, only the pharisees and lawyers rejected τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ (7:29-30). The idea of all Israel as a priestly kingdom, harking back to Exodus 19:6, and especially the idea of restoration to a previous state of national fidelity to the cult, is not out of place in Luke's storyline. Sinai and Horeb allusions are overt in the transfiguration narrative of Luke 9, viz., Jesus' face changed, clothes like 'flashing white lightning', Moses and Elijah on a mountaintop, glory, a frightening, overshadowing cloud, the audible voice of God. It is, in fact, a classic paradigmatic scene. In the Lukan plot, John the Baptist, a new Elijah, is restoring Israel to its original, founding cultic purpose from which it fell by transgression with the golden calf. The Lukan Messiah will make Israel a nation of priests.

4.2.4 On the Road to Jerusalem: Jesus Teaches on Persistent Prayer for the Protective Spirit

David Crump declares regarding Jesus' teaching on prayer (Luke 11): 'All suggestions of "persistence" in the interpretation are totally unwarranted.'[400] But, his conclusion derives from a restricted focus upon the meaning of ἀναίδεια, which BDAG renders as, 'lack of sensitivity to what is proper, carelessness about the good opinion of others, shamelessness, impertinence, impudence, ignoring of convention'. The focus in the story of the impertinent man who knocks on his friend's door at midnight is not the retention of honour by the sleepy friend. There is no mention of ἡ τιμή αὐτοῦ. Instead, the text explicitly states the issues is shamelessness – τὴν ἀναίδειαν αὐτοῦ. The only shameless person is the one knocking at midnight.

Thus, teaching on shamelessly persistent prayer, on asking, seeking, and knocking, Jesus encourages his followers to ask their Father for the Spirit, and then relates the story of a demoniac initially delivered from his demon but later repossessed.[401] Edward J. Woods has

---

[400] David Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1992), 131.

[401] The variant reading of the Lord's Prayer in Luke 11:2, 'Let your kingdom come, let your Holy Spirit come on us and cleanse us' (ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς.), attested in Gregory of Nyssa (4th century), is tantalizing (James A. Brooks, *The New Testament Text of Gregory of Nyssa* (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1991). Tertullian, circa 208, in *Against Marcion* 4.26, where he goes point by point through Marcion's version of the Lord's Prayer, also makes reference to the Holy Spirit, 'Whom shall I ask for the Holy Spirit?' (A quo spiritum sanctum postulem?) at Luke 11:2 (text and translation, Ernest Evans, *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 83. Tertullian does not criticise the reading, and thus it likely represents a reading common to both Tertullian and Marcion. Marcion could have ministered as early as 210-212 (on Marcion as early, cf. Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 29, and John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942), 11-12). This puts the variant rather early. The variant is also attested in minuscule 700, a codex available in the British library, and in minuscule 162 at the Vatican library. Codex Zacynthius seems to suggest that the Lukan reading is different from Matthew's, but frustratingly, the page of commentary discussing Luke 11:2b is missing. The extant text reads 'Next, while Matthew follows the "Our Father" with "who is in heaven", since he is speaking about the kingdom of heaven and relating that, after the Beatitudes, the Saviour also taught all of those present his word

argued this story encourages not simply prayer for the Spirit, but *persistent* prayer,[402] and Holmås has noted persistent prayer as a Lukan *leitmotif* (e.g., Luke 18:1-8 the persistent widow, Luke 21:36 vigilant prayer and the eschaton, Acts 1:14 the apostles 'continually devoting themselves to prayer').[403] McCollough, then, rightly situates the call for persistent prayer in the initiatory context: the implied reader asks herself what the demoniac should have done to prevent repossession and the foregoing narrative about persistent prayer to the Father for the Spirit provides the answer.[404] His house was clean, but empty and thus vulnerable. In this way, Luke encourages initiates, that is, all who experience the delivering power of the finger of God acting through Jesus, to persist in prayer for the Spirit at the time of their deliverance from bondage. Luke thus adds a small but important detail to his initiation type-scene: persistent prayer for Spirit experience. The implied reader adds this detail to her mental construct for initiation.

4.2.5 Jerusalem Pentecost

4.2.5.1 The Father's Promise Promised

Luke, in the final chapter of his gospel anticipates the gift of the Spirit. In Luke 24 we learn that Jesus' followers, not just the eleven, but others with them (cf. 24:33) have their minds 'opened to understand the scriptures' (24:45). In narrative terms that makes them authoritative spokespersons for Jesus. They learn of the scriptural necessity of Christ's suffering and resurrection, and of the resulting task that falls upon them to proclaim forgiveness from sins to all nations. They are witnesses.

> And behold, I am sending the promise of my father upon you; and you must remain in the city until you are clothed with power from on high.
>
> ⸢καὶ [ἰδοὺ] ἐγὼ⸣ ⸢ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ⸤τοῦ πατρός⸣ μου ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς· ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ⸣ ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ⸢ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν⸣. (24:49)

Turner keenly observes the reference to Isaiah 32:15 LXX (ἕως ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἀφ᾽ ὑψηλοῦ) noting that this passage concerns, 'the New Exodus restoration of Israel and transformation of her 'wilderness' estate'.[405]

Then they journey out to Bethany, Jesus lifts up his hands and blesses them, he ascends into heaven, they worship him, they return to Jerusalem and are continually in the Temple praising God. Notice that worship to Jesus is juxtaposed with praise to God. The astute reader, knowing that Jesus has successfully made a new covenant in his blood, has offered the θυσία σωτηρίου establishing a new sanctuary, recognises the gesture – Jesus is the high priest who, like Aaron at the dedication of the tent of witness, blesses the people (Leviticus 9:22). Given what follows in Leviticus 9:23-24, the reader should anticipate soon-coming scenes of glory and fire.

---

about prayer, Luke, on the other hand...' (https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-10062-UNDERTEXT/172). However, as the variant is not in the main text of Nestle-Aland 28, it will not be included in the narrative analysis. Were it included, it would introduce, early in the story line, the idea of purification by the Holy Spirit and tie it to initiation.

[402] Edward J. Woods, *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts* JSNTS 205 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 184.

[403] Holmås, *Prayer and Vindication*, 137-142, 146, 167.

[404] McCollough, *Ritual*, 92-93.

[405] Turner, *Power from on High*, 300.

But Luke holds his audience in suspense, for in volume two, chapter one, Jesus again teaches on the coming of the Spirit. He cites John the Baptist's prophecy, but does not mention 'fire', an omission which the alert, ideal reader notes, creating even more suspense. Instead, Jesus speaks of power and being his witness ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς – an allusion to Isaiah 49:6 LXX[406]:

> And he said to me, 'It is great to you for you to be called my servant, to establish the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the diaspora of Israel.
>
> Behold, I have appointed you as a covenant for a race, for a light of nations, for you to be salvation unto the end of the earth.
>
> καὶ εἶπέν μοι Μέγα σοί ἐστιν τοῦ κληθῆναί σε παῖδά μου τοῦ στῆσαι τὰς φυλὰς Ιακωβ καὶ τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ Ισραηλ ἐπιστρέψαι·
>
> ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

Then Jesus is taken up into heaven in a cloud – a classic Exodus motif.

4.2.5.2 Purified Priests and Whole Burnt Sacrifices in the Pentecostal Temple

Luke's next Spirit reception scene is the house of Pentecost, with its wind and fire and tongues. Suspense resolved. According to the narrative (Acts 1:13-15), the 120 disciples are in the city of Jerusalem, living together and fervently praying in a certain 'upper-room' (τὸ ὑπερῷον). When the sound of the 'rushing mighty wind' fills ὅλον τὸν οἶκον οὗ ἦσαν ⸀καθήμενοι – the whole house where they were staying/sitting – the text gives no narrative indication that they have moved away from their original location. In fact, it seems that they are in a similar place to where they had celebrated the final Passover with Jesus. That was an 'upper-room' as well, large and furnished (ἀνάγαιον ⸀μέγα ἐστρωμένον – Luke 22:12).

Naturally, τὸν οἶκον can be used for the Jewish Temple, and, up to this point in the narrative, Luke has done this on several occasions. In Luke 6:4, David enters τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ and takes the consecrated bread. In Luke 19:6, Jesus, having entered into the Temple (τὸ ἱερὸν) and kicked out the merchants, declares that it was written: ἔσται ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς – 'my house will be a house of prayer'. Later in the narrative Stephen will refer to the Temple as an οἶκον (Acts 7:47, 49).[407] What then is Luke doing with his wordplay?

John H. Elliott, in his social-scientific study, traces throughout Luke-Acts a social transition from Temple to household, a movement from the base of Jewish purity, politics, and finance, to the Christian locale of sanctification, heavenly kingdom, and economic reciprocity.[408] His argument can be augmented by observing how Luke bookends two volumes, opening with Zacharias in the Jerusalem Temple, closing with Paul in his own rented house in Rome. Elliott is right. Luke declares that God has created a new *axis mundi*. The divine glory that should

---

[406] 301.

[407] For discussion of ἱερόν, ναός, οἶκος, and ὁ τόπος ὁ ἅγιος, see Head, 'Temple in Luke's Gospel', 106-109.

[408] John H. Elliott, 'Temple Versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions', in Jerome H. Neyrey, ed., *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 211-240; 230. Andries G. van Aarde seeks to nuance Elliott by merely extending the metaphor of temple as God's house to include the 'everyday life' of the Jesus movement. But, Aarde has not closely followed the Lukan depiction of glory departed and glory resettled. Van Aarde, ''The Most High God Does Live in Houses, But Not Houses Build by Men…': The Relativity of the Metaphor 'Temple' in Luke-Acts', *Neo* Vol. 25 No. 1 (1991), 51-64.

have been in Herod's magnificent structure has now settled on a non-descript building somewhere in Jerusalem.

What then of the wind and fire? The reader knows that the Pentecostal phenomena are not just any theophany because of the ongoing leitmotif of Moses, Elijah, and the Exodus in Luke's Gospel (Elijah in Luke 4:5-26; 'the finger of God' in Luke 11:20, cf. Exodus 8:19; Moses and Elijah and Jesus' coming 'exodus' (τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ) in Luke 9:30-31; Moses and the Prophets in Luke 24:27, 44).[409] Having experienced the wind and fire, a reader familiar with the Sinai/Horeb paradigmatic scene will be looking for a voice, a φωνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Exodus 19:19 and 1 Kings 19:13). Indeed, the voice bursts forth, not thundering from the heights of the mountain, nor gently whispering at the opening of a cave, but as utterance from the mouths of God's people. They are all filled with the Holy Spirit and begin to speak with other tongues as the Spirit is giving them ἀποφθέγγεσθαι (2:4).

But Luke has also previously alluded to the covenant of the Exodus story. Given this narrative frame of covenant, would not the Pentecost fire evoke images of the dedication of Moses' Tent of Witness? The standard New Testament Greek lexicon, BDAG, defines ἀποφθέγγομαι as 'to express oneself orally, w. focus on sound rather than content, *speak out, declare* boldly or loudly (of the speech of a wise man … but also of an oracle-giver, diviner, prophet, exorcist, and other inspired persons)'.[410] Interestingly, ἀποφθέγγομαι occurs six times in the LXX, five of which refer to some kind of negative, evil speech activity.[411] The only time the word is used in reference to a positive utterance is in 1 Chronicles 25:1, where it translates the Hebrew (Ketiv הַנִּבְּיאִים Qere הַנִּבְּאִים) and refers to the chief Levitical musicians, Asaph, Heman and Jeduthun, 'prophesying' with lyres, harps and cymbals at the Tent of David in Jerusalem (cf. 23:4-5; 15:1, 16; 16:7, 37). The Tent musicians, who total 4,000, are grouped by family going back to Levi and his sons, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari (23:5-6). This is the chronicler who spent his first eight chapters giving genealogies back to Adam. For Luke, whose genealogy of Jesus also goes back to Adam and who is clearly familiar with the Chronicles, the Levites backdrop his story of glossolalic worship at Pentecost.[412] As Perry writes: 'By using ἀποφθέγγομαι, Luke is therefore invoking a liturgical framework for understanding the speech acts engendered by the Spirit at Pentecost'.[413] Now the reader understands the second element of the Baptist's prophecy – Messiah will baptize with Holy Spirit and *fire*. All the foregoing allusions to Malachi and YHWH's refining fire as well as the prophetic Levitical worship at the Tent of

[409] Menzies, while arguing that the Pentecost theophany is not specific to Sinai, but generic, fails to engage with the sequential flow of the narrative. *Empowered for Witness*, 189ff.
[410] Walter Bauer, rev. and ed. Frederick William Danker, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 125. H. G. Liddell and Robert Scott read 'to speak one's opinion plainly', *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1889).
[411] 1 Chronicles 25:1; Psalms 58:8; Micah 5:11; Zechariah 10:2; Ezekiel 13:9; 19.
[412] On Luke's use of 1 Chronicle's genealogy, see William Kurz, *Luke-Acts and Historiography in the Greek Bible*, PhD Dissertation, Marquette University (1980), 290-291. See also, Eben Scheffler, 'The assaulted (man) on the Jerusalem – Jericho road: Luke's creative interpretation of 2 Chronicles 28:15', *HTS* Vol. 69 No. 1, Art. #2010, 8 pages. Cf. H. G. L. Peels, 'The Blood »from Abel to Zechariah« (Matthew 23,35; Luke ll,50f.) and the Canon of the Old Testament', Vol. 113 No. 4 (2001), 583-601. Joseph Verheyden, 'Some Comments on the Earliest Evidence for the Reception of the Book of Chronicles in Christian Tradition', *RRJ* 16 (2013), 58-65.
[413] Perry, *Eschatological Deliverance*, 251.

David come to bear upon the apostles in this moment.[414] The disciples are purified to worship the Lord – Jesus – who has come suddenly to his 'Temple'.

But there is one more aspect of the Lukan Pentecostal fire. When Moses dedicated the Tent of Witness, the sacrifice was consumed by fire from before the LORD (Leviticus 9:22-24 LXX). Aaron initially offers sacrifices on the altar. He offers sacrifice for sin, the whole burnt offering, and the sacrifices for 'salvation' (τὰ τοῦ σωτηρίου). He then lifts up his hands and blesses the people (τὸν λαὸν). Then Aaron and Moses enter the tent of witness (τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου) and come out again to bless πάντα τὸν λαόν. Then the glory of the LORD appears to 'all the people' and fire comes out from before the LORD and consumes everything on the altar. 'All the people' see it and are 'amazed' (ἐξίστημι) and fall on their faces. This language is classically Lukan: cf. Luke 1:8 πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ; Luke 2:10; 3:15; 3:21; 7:29; Acts 2:47; 4:10; et al. Similarly, ἐξίστημι occurs eleven times in Luke-Acts, notably characterising the crowd at Pentecost (Acts 2:7, 12).

Moreover, when Solomon dedicates the Temple with innumerable sacrifices (2 Chronicles 5-7), the Levitical musicians join with 120 priests trumpeting with trumpets (5:12). When they make one voice (μία φωνὴ) of trumpeting and harping and speaking out confession and praise to the LORD, the cloud of the glory of the LORD fills the temple so that the priests cannot stand to minister (5:13-14). Then Solomon blesses τὴν πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν Ισραηλ (6:3). Next, he makes a lengthy prayer in which he appeals to the national covenant with YHWH, specifically citing the ark containing its 'covenant of the LORD which he covenanted with Israel' (διαθήκη κυρίου, ἣν διέθετο τῷ Ισραηλ 6:11) and citing Deuteronomy 7:9 as to the nature of the LORD God of Israel, 'keeping covenant and mercy' (φυλάσσων τὴν διαθήκην καὶ τὸ ἔλεος 6:14). Then fire descends from heaven, consumes the sacrifice, and the glory of the LORD fills the 'house' (καὶ δόξα κυρίου ἔπλησεν τὸν οἶκον 7:1). The priests cannot enter the house. All the sons of Israel see the fire and glory, fall on the pavement, and worship and praise the LORD.

What is Luke doing here with his images of Tent and Temple, sacrifice and fire? The Pentecostal fire not only purifies the 120 'priests' to offer worship, but it burns upon their heads, 'consuming' the priests themselves as though they were sacrifices at Moses's Tent or Solomon's Temple. And after the sacrifice, who then blesses the congregation? Peter stands with the eleven to declare that Jesus the Nazarene, crucified, resurrected, exalted to God's throne, has poured out the Spirit spoken of by the prophet Joel, the 'promise of the Father' foretold by Jesus himself. The new Temple of the Holy Spirit was not dedicated without sacrifice – Jesus was 'numbered with transgressors', he mingled his prayers with blood in the garden, his crucifixion tears the veil of the holy of holies (Luke 22:37, 44; 23:45). But, like Solomon's Temple, there are innumerable sacrifices and the 120 upon whom the fire falls are just the beginning.

But if God's glory is now with the Jesus followers, is it still also at the Jewish Temple? Is the torn Temple curtain a sign? Wilson sees the torn veil as an opening to the presence of God.[415] Green argues, 'The popular view that the torn veil signifies the destruction of the temple is

[414] McDonnell and Montague rightly declare: 'The "fire" of Luke 3:16 becomes the fire of Acts 2:3.' *Christian Initiation*, 23.
[415] Wilson, *Saving Cross*, 124.

difficult to square with the continuing, positive function of the temple in Luke 24 and Acts.'[416] Eyal Regev writes:

> Luke, in contrast, [to Mark] dates the tearing of the veil earlier than Jesus's last cry and breath, suggesting that it is not torn because he cries or dies. Distancing the veil from Jesus's death attests to a more remote connection.[417]

Regev's first point is – almost – correct,[418] but his second does not follow. In Luke's arrangement, the rending of the curtain precipitates Jesus' loud cry and death. Luke suggests that, after the glory departs from the Temple, Jesus' spirit leaves his body. This would not be the first departure of glory, for Ezekiel 10 recounts just such an event prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. But does Luke ever consult Ezekiel? Dale C. Allison has examined the parallels between Ezekiel's vision (Ezekiel 2:1) and Paul's encounter with the exalted Christ (Acts 9, 22, 26) and shown that, beyond the verbatim citation in Acts 26:16 (στῆθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου) of Ezekiel 2:1, there are a series of allusions throughout the three versions of Paul's vision.[419] Indeed, the Lukan Jesus, hinting at his future death in the city, has already lamented over Jerusalem and declared, ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν$^{\intercal}$ (Luke 13:35). One need not have the alternate reading of ἔρημος to recognise the motif of rejection of God's prophet resulting in abandonment – their house is left to them. The Lukan cosmology is reiterated in Stephen's speech before the Sanhedrin. After speaking of Moses and the σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου and then the οἶκος built by Solomon, Stephen declares: 'but the Most High does not dwell in handmade houses (ʿἀλλ' οὐχ $^{\intercal}$ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ$^{\intercal}$ 7:48).[420]

Moreover, Wilson and Green do not consider the issue of the appearance of the theophany among the 120 disciples. The disciples do not have access to the physical ναός, but the presence once located therein has now settled among them. All this is suggestive of a relocation of the glory. Jewish disciples indeed still gather in the Jewish Temple, but Gentile converts to the Way are excluded. The reflective reader will remember that Jesus, when he cleansed the Temple and quoted Isaiah 56:7, left off the last line, πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. For Luke, the Jewish Temple is a house of prayer for Jews only. Gentile believers cannot enter there (cf. Acts 21:28-29), yet as the narrative will reveal, they can enter into and participate in the worship at τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ (Acts 15:16). Since, from Luke's perspective, the Temple is destroyed, the only remaining sanctuary is the inter-racial fellowship of believers.

Thus, just as Jesus 'poured out' his blood on behalf of his disciples (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον Luke 22:20), now, having received from the Father, he 'pours out' the promise of the Holy Spirit (τήν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, ἐξέχεεν Acts 2:33). Like Solomon and the διαθήκη κυρίου, Jesus instantiates ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη in the New Temple – a temple in which pure sacrifices will continually be offered. That is, in the

---

[416] Joel B. Green, 'The Demise of the Temple as "Cultural Center" in Luke-Acts: An Exploration of the Rending of the Temple Veil (Luke 23:44-49)', in Joel B. Green, ed., *Luke as Narrative Theologian: Texts and Topics* WUNT 446 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 97-113; 113.

[417] Eyal Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred* AYBRL (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2019), 172. Cf. Isaac W. Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts* WUNT2 355 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 28.

[418] Regev himself notes the synchronization of Jesus' death with the Tamid sacrifice: 'Thus Jesus's death is coordinated with the Temple cult!', *Temple*, 172.

[419] Dale C. Allison Jr., 'Acts 9:1-9, 22:6-11, 26:12-18: Paul and Ezekiel', *JBL* Vol. 135 No. 4 (2016), 807-826.

[420] Cf. Christoph Schaefer, *Die Zukunft Israels bei Lukas: Biblisch-Frühjüdische Zukunftsvorstellungen im lukanischen Doppelwerk im Vergleich zu Röm 9-11* BZNW 190 (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2012), 296-306.

Lukan cosmology, sacrifice and experience of the Spirit are correlated. Standing within this New Temple, Peter declares the accomplishment of God to 'all the house of Israel' – Jesus is exalted Lord and Christ.

4.2.5.3 Liminality, the Gift of the Spirit, and a Narrative Gap

> Repent, he says, and let each of you be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ for forgiveness of your sins and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For to you is the promise and to your children and to all those who are far away, as many as the Lord our God should call. (Acts 2:38-39)

At this momentous juncture in Luke's salvation history, at the climax of Peter's Pentecost sermon, Max Turner writes:

> Only on the assumption that 2.38-39 provides something of a 'norm' adequately explains why Luke does not feel obliged to record the reception of the Spirit by the converts who are baptized in 2.41; that is, he could assume the reader would interpret references to people being baptized … as occasions when they received the Spirit unless (as in 8.16) it is explicitly stated otherwise.[421]

Sequential, cumulative reading confirms Turner and adds a key element to his interpretation, namely liminality. Wilkens anticipates a narratological reading when he points out that 'separation' is the result of Acts 2:38 being linked to Luke 3:16:

> For the formulation [Acts 2:38] ties in with the baptiser proclamation Luk 3:3.16. There, however, the separation of water baptism and reception of the Spirit is fundamentally pronounced. If Luke follows this baptiser proclamation, this means that water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ and the reception of the Spirit participate in the separation fundamentally formulated in the baptiser proclamation.[422]

Wilkens' approach is substantiated by Green, who, drawing upon the discourse theorists Brown and Yule, utilises discourse analysis principles to argue the case for 2:38 as 'pattern setting':

> According to discourse analysis, the process of meaning-making depends on the recognition of 'intertextual frames': we make sense of the Lukan portrait of baptism in Acts on the basis of what we have seen and heard before.[423]

McCollough, drawing upon Green's discourse approach, concludes similarly to Wilkens – when the reader comes to Peter's 2:38 promise that if the crowd will repent and be baptised, they will receive the very same gift of the Spirit that they saw the 120 had received, the implied

---

[421] Turner, *Power from on High*, 359. Similarly, Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 182, 100; so too, Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 150; similarly, Matthias Wenk, *Community Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts* (London, New York: T&T Clark International, 2004 [Sheffield Academic Press, 2000]), 276.

[422] Wilkens, 'Wassertaufe und Geistempfang', 30, 'Denn die Formulierung knüpft ja an die Täuferverkündigung Luk 3, 3.16 an. Dort aber ist die Diastase von Wassertaufe und Geistempfang grundlegend ausgesprochen. Schließt Lukas an diese Täuferverkündigung an, so bedeutet das: Wassertaufe auf den Namen Jesu Christi und Geistempfang nehmen an der in der Täuferverkündigung grundlegend formulierten Diastase teil.' Similarly, Rudolf Pesch states that Luke, 'nie von der Taufe als dem Akt der Geistmitteilung spricht'; baptism is instead the 'Voraussetzung' for the gift of the Spirit. *Die Apostelgeschichte* EKKNT Studienausgabe 2. Auflage (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft mbH; Ostfildern: Patmos Verlag, 2014 [1986]), 278.

[423] Green, 'Baptism in Luke-Acts', 161.

reader, having previously witnessed Jesus' baptism and prayer, and having received Jesus' teaching on persistent prayer to receive the Spirit, already has an expectation that prayer for the Spirit will follow immersion. Having progressed sequentially through the story, the implied reader will *not* now expect the Spirit to come in the water, but rather in the prayer that immediately follows the water.[424]

Both the water and the prayer for the Spirit are one liminal initiation process. There is no separation of Spirit reception from Christian initiation here. Spirit experience belongs integrally to the Christian ritual process. Yet, neither is there instantaneous reception of the Spirit at the moment of belief, for each of the 3,000, having believed Peter's preaching, and having made the decision to repent and be baptised, must wait their turn in the queue before they can actually be immersed and then receive the Spirit. Liminality is present – that ambiguous state of being betwixt and between, of being neither in nor out, of being in process.[425]

Neither was this a corporate experience, as with the 120, but a series of individual ritual experiences.[426] Luke does not show his reader the moment of Spirit reception for each of the 3,000. Luke's narrative camera fails to capture those thousands of individual events. All Luke says is that 3,000 were baptised. The implied reader knows, however, because Peter, the Spirit-baptised apostle, who stands with the eleven, promised it, that upon their repentance and baptism they would each receive the Spirit. Turner is right.

But, by what mechanism did the 3,000 receive the Spirit? The reader expects, based upon the previous story of Jesus' immersion, prayer, and Spirit experience, and upon Jesus' teaching on persistent prayer, that the 3,000 will pray persistently at their baptisms and receive the Spirit in association with the prayer – not the water. However, in not explicitly showing the Spirit reception experiences of the 3,000, Luke left a narrative gap. Will the lacuna will be filled in later?

What then, does the implied reader now have in his mental construct for initiation and Spirit reception? The process as presented by Luke up to and including Acts 2 is: (1) Encounter with a gospel messenger and possible exorcism (Luke 11); (2) Conviction of the truth of the message (Acts 2:37); (3) Appeal for help (Acts 2:37); (4) Instructions to repent and be baptised (Luke 3:16-17; Acts 2:38); (5) Repentance and baptismal immersion which, when numerous converts are present, implies a queue and thus a liminal waiting period (Luke 3:21; Acts 2:41); (6) Persistent post-baptismal prayer by the initiate for the Spirit, hence more liminality (Luke 3:21-22; Luke 11:1-13); (7) Spirit reception (Acts 2:38). Luke will later explain that Spirit reception and baptism can occur in reverse order, but here Luke uses multiple narrative devices to define the standard initiation sequence. New believers now fill the role which Jesus had occupied in the first initiatory type-scene.

4.2.5.4 The Tongues of Pentecost: Luke's Precise Focus on the Language Experience of Every New Initiate

In addition to the matter of liminality, the Pentecost story calls for further examination with respect to the nature of the Spirit reception experience – in particular, the strange 'language

[424] McCollough, *Ritual*, 96.
[425] On liminality, see Turner, *Ritual Process*, 95.
[426] That is, from Luke's emic perspective, from the perspective of his 'narrative camera', these were individual not corporate experiences.

speaking'. The epochal nature of the language event is highlighted by Luke's linguistic nod to the 'Babel' story. The Pentecost crowd are 'confused' (συνεχύθη) because they hear the disciples speaking in their own international dialects and this reminds the well-read reader of the Genesis story where God proposes to go down so that: συγχέωμεν ἐκεῖ αὐτῶν τὴν γλῶσσαν – 'we shall there confuse their tongue' (11:7). In fact, Genesis LXX labels the abandoned tower Σύγχυσις because there God 'confused' the 'lips of all the earth' (11:9).[427]

McCollough argues that Luke focalises 'xenolalic experience', that is the experience of uttering languages unknown to the speaker.[428] Our argument here will not refute that. It is McCollough's final twist to which we object. In a nutshell, his case is that, in the Pentecost story, Luke repeatedly focalises from multiple angles (an example of amplification), not wind or fire, which occur only once, but dissociative language-speaking. The narrator states initially that tongues speaking, that is, speaking in other languages, occurred.[429] Then the crowd moves toward this collective voice (τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης) of the disciples' language-speaking. Then the crowd asks three times about the language-speaking (Acts 2:7, 8, 12). No one asks about the wind or fire. Then some of the crowd mock the tongues – 'they are drunk'. After this flurry of action, Luke has Peter rise to answer the questions and mockery of the crowd – in discourse terms, the reader arrives at a didactic peak.

The verb for Peter's declarative response is ἀπεφθέγξατο. As discussed above, Luke uses this same verb of the initial Spirit-inspired language-speaking,[430] thus explicitly linking Peter's sermon to the authority of the Spirit.[431] Peter's fresh Spirit experience, his stance 'with the eleven',[432] and his oracular declaration by the Spirit, unequivocally present him, in this moment, as a narrative spokesperson delivering the ideological viewpoint of the implied author. In terms of Graeco-Roman educational discourse, Peter is a positive exemplar.

Peter informs the crowd that, 'this is what was spoken through the prophet Joel' (Acts 2:16). The crowd asks and Peter answers. The referent of discourse between Peter and the crowd is neither wind nor fire, rather it is the inebriated language-speaking. In psychological terms, they were dissociating. In good 'this is that' style,[433] Peter identifies the inebriated

---

[427] Cf. Joel B. Green, '"In Our Own Languages": Pentecost, Babel, and the Shaping of Christian Community in Acts 2:1-13', Joel B. Green, ed., *Luke as Narrative Theologian: Texts and Topics* WUNT 446 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 133-146; 134.

[428] McCollough, *Ritual*, 97-136.

[429] We cannot here engage the debate on whether the miracle was oral or aural, but simply note, following Craig Keener, that the language speaking is said to have occurred (2:4) before any crowd was present to understand the languages. I argue at length that Luke presents the 'tongues speaking' as an oral miracle and as genuine languages, McCollough, *Ritual*, 111-112. Cf. Keener, *Acts* Volume 1, 823.

[430] καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ⸀πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐδίδου ἀποφθέγγεσθαι αὐτοῖς.

[431] ἀποφθέγγεσθαι is employed only once more in the New Testament when Paul declares 'true and rational words' before Festus and Agrippa (Acts 26:25). But φθέγγεσθαι occurs in 4:18 when the Peter and John are forbidden to 'speak or teach in the name of Jesus'. Cf. Green, '"In Our Own Languages"', 137-138.

[432] Σταθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος σὺν τοῖς ⸀ἕνδεκα ἐπῆρεν ⸂τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ⸀ἀπεφθέγξατο αὐτοῖς⸃ (Acts 2:14a). Kuecker rightly sees 'Peter acting as a representative of his group' (*Spirit and the 'Other'*, 119).

[433] This is not a claim that Luke knew anything about pesher or Qumran. It is simply the observation that Luke's interpretive practice of identifying a current event with a biblical prophetic text was not unusual for his time. As Markus Bockmuehl proposes, albeit tentatively, the Qumran community may have been influenced by the interpretive practices of Alexandrian Hellenistic Jewry ('The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of Biblical Commentary' in Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, eds., *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* STDJ 84 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 3-29; 25). Pieter B. Hartog expands upon Bockmuehl's article

(dissociative) language-speaking as the prophetic outpouring of the Spirit promised in the Scriptures of Israel. McCollough hesitantly speaks of 'identification' rather than 'equation'.[434] Luke's logic is precise, however, and 'equation' is more accurate. Having equated the inebriated language-speaking experience with the foretold experience of the Spirit, Luke then presents the converse. Peter announces that Jesus has received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit and 'poured out this which you even see and hear' (Acts 2:33b).[435]

What then did they see and hear? Luke has presented the crowd as inquisitive, yet the crowd never asks about the wind or fire that had been narrated previously. All the crowd asks about is the language-speaking. The implied reader knows that what they saw and heard was what they had been asking about – seemingly inebriated language-speech – the discourse referent. Hence Luke's second equation: The experience of the promised Spirit is inebriated language-speaking.

Luke, again using amplification (and functional redundancy), has constructed two narrative equations and moves on to a third. In response to the crowd's appeal to Peter and the rest of the apostles[436] for help – 'What should we do?' – Peter instructs them:

> Repent, he says, and let each of you be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ for forgiveness of your sins and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For to you is the promise and to your children and to all those who are far away, as many as the Lord our God should call. (Acts 2:38-39)

If Turner is right that Peter's instructions function normatively, and the narratological analysis employed heretofore confirms that Turner is correct, then the experiential nature of the Spirit reception promised by Peter is also normative. Here I previously failed to grapple with the implications of Luke's argument, and I did not engage with the Graeco-Roman discourse of exemplarity. I denied that it was normatively prescriptive. However, in this third equation, the gift of the Spirit, already defined as inebriated language-speaking, is rendered as the promise in perpetuity. Luke locks dissociative language-speaking into his initiation ritual.

That is, Peter has argued:

1. The dissociative language-speaking experience is the Scripture foretold prophetic Spirit experience (2:16)

---

at monograph length, arguing that we should, 'conceive of the Pesharim as syncretistic entities bringing together elements from a wide range of other interpretative traditions', including Alexandria and Mesopotamia, *Pesher and Hypomnema: A Comparison of Two Commentary Traditions from the Hellenistic-Roman Period* STDJ 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 16. In light of Bockmuehl and Hartog, Luke's 'this is that' formulation reflects the interpretive milieu of his time.

[434] McCollough, *Ritual*, 113.

[435] Cf. Reicke, 'So benutzt Petrus die wunderbare Ausgiessung des Geistes als ein Argument in seiner Bekehrungspredigt.' (Thus Peter uses the wonderful outpouring of the Spirit as an argument in his repentance-sermon.). Bo Reicke, *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde: Bemerkungen zu Apg. 1-7* ATANT 32 (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1957), 49.

[436] Several commentators have observed the narratively significant point that, since the crowd asks all the apostles, and Peter responds, therefore Peter's response is representative of all the apostles and thus authoritative. So, Richard F. Zehnle, *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3*, SBLMS 15 (New York: Abingdon Press, 1971), 36. Otto Glombitza, 'Der Schluss der Petrusrede Acta 2:36-40: Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Predigten in Acta', *ZNW* 52, 1-2 (January 1, 1961), 115-118; 117. Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 183.

2. The experience of promise of the Holy Spirit, spoken of by Jesus, given by the Father, is the dissociative language-speaking experience (2:33)

3. The experience of the gift of the Spirit/the Promise is for all who repent and are baptised, both now and in the future, in Jerusalem and far away, for all whom God should call (2:38-39).

Therefore, as Hans Windisch stated in 1908:

> When Peter at Pentecost promises all the repentant the gift of the Holy Spirit, they should, then, all themselves experience what they just now had heard and seen from the disciples: glossolalia and witness-speaking 2:33, 38 cf. 4:31.[437]

However, I previously argued that:

> Luke has not explicitly excluded other possible manifestations (or non-manifestations) of the Spirit. This leaves the narrative door open for Luke to later suggest that the Spirit could manifest his arrival some other way, or even in no visible manner at all'.[438]

I further argued that just as Luke later modified the ritual sequence of Acts 2:38, so too, he could modify 'the expectations generated by Acts 2:16, 33, 38-39.'[439]

First, from a cultural discourse perspective, I did not reckon with Peter as an exemplar. This is a fundamental error. What Peter the Apostle does and says has weight for Luke's implied readers/auditors imbued with Graeco-Roman concepts of exemplarity. In terms of Roller's four elements of Roman exemplaric discourse, the great deed, or *action*, is accomplished by God. God sends the Spirit in wonderous fashion, and the 120 receive and experience and witness it. Of course, they had been obedient to Jesus' command to wait in Jerusalem and they had also been fervently praying. So, they, through their cooperative actions, had modelled the proper behaviour needed to experience God's promise.

The *evaluation* of God's great deed is made by several parties. First, representatives of the Jewish nation from all over the known world declare that they hear the apostles speaking in their various native languages τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ - 'the great deeds of God' (Acts 2:11). Sadly, some of the Jewish nation reject God's great deed – 'others, sneering, were saying 'they are filled with new wine'' (Acts 2:13). But Peter, standing up for all the disciples whose minds Jesus had 'opened' and whom Jesus had previously designated his 'witnesses' (Luke 24:33-49), declares that the wonderous event is the fulfilment of the Jewish scriptures. Peter, Luke's narrative spokesman, gives the final authoritative evaluation.

The *commemoration* of God's deed is present in the very fact of Luke's telling the story. But Luke also weaves it into the narrative – the promise of the Spirit is given to all who are afar off, as many as God calls – and in weaving it into the narrative he threads it into the warp and woof of his living community. In the individual experience of the Spirit that every new convert,

---

[437] 'Wenn Petrus zu Pfingsten allen Bußfertigen die Gabe des heiligen Geistes verheißt, so sollen sie alle an sich erfahren, was sie soeben von den Jüngern gehört und gesehen haben: Glossolalie und Zeugenreden 2 33.38 vgl. 4 31', Hans Windisch, *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum bis auf Origenes: Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Dogmengeschichte* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, Paul Siebeck, 1908), 93.
[438] McCollough, *Ritual*, 125.
[439] 122.

upon repentance and baptism in water will receive, is the memorial to that first Pentecostal outpouring. Luke's story sacralises the Spirit-experience for all future generations, and those future generations, in their experience of the Spirit, will memorialize the story.

Thus, Luke establishes what Roller termed, '*norm setting*'. Peter declares that it will always be this way. This is the norm for those who, in the community of the faithful, hear his scroll read. In terms of genre considerations, collected biography places emphasis upon delineation of in-group and out-group members. Here is norm setting for in-group membership. Moreover, the delineation of the in-group is linked to a major disciple, viz., Peter. This is also consonant with collected biography.

Second, from a narratological perspective, I did not consider that there is no narrative device which requires the Acts 2:38 sequence of repentance, baptism, and Spirit reception to always occur in that specific, precise order. So, while Luke does emphasise the sequence, i.e., it is uttered by a normative spokesperson at a critical point in the storyline and is consequently a programmatic statement, he does not require that the sequence will forever be the same. As discussed in the methodology section, normativity in Luke is finely graded. Here, with regard to sequence, we have emphasis on 'the way things are done' without exclusion of other possible sequences. The later narrative will demonstrate that this standard structure is flexible.

Yet, Luke's argument that the promised Spirit experience is the dissociative language experience, and that the promised Spirit experience is for all, everywhere and in perpetuity, whomever God should call, is more than broadly programmatic. It has a locking mechanism built into it. All receive the Promise. The experience of the Promise is the language experience. All, therefore, receive the language experience. Luke explicitly fixed languages into his conception of Spirit reception. He need not, therefore, explicitly include or exclude other possibilities, of which there could be an infinite number. No narrative door is left open.

Going forward in the narrative, to receive 'the Promise', the gift of the Spirit, is to dissociate and speak in languages. There is no discourse need for Luke to repeat this extensive, exemplaric definition of the Spirit reception experience. In subsequent scenes, Luke will address other concerns. Thus, the foundational type-scene of Jesus' immersion, prayer, Spirit experience, and divine voice has been elaborated upon, but not significantly altered. The divine voice is now speaking, not from above the initiates, but from within them.

4.2.6 Jerusalem Prayer: Shaking the House

Peter and John, released from the Sanhedrin, return to their own and report all the threats that have been made against them. In response, 'with one heart they raised voice to God and said' – an extended prayer of which Luke gives the gist. Were they all repeating in unison after a prayer-leader? It would be surprising if, seemingly just days after the outpouring of charismatic fervour at Pentecost, the disciples had routinized their drunken, glossolalic prayers into formal liturgy. What Luke does give is the impression of a group of believers, despite being under emotional/psychological pressure, calling out with one heart and mind, not just for deliverance from oppression, but also for God to support their evangelistic efforts by backing up their preaching with miraculous signs. They were on the offensive. As at Pentecost, everyone together was praying passionately, out loud, to God. Cacophony? To an outsider, probably. But, in Luke's story, it was a highly successful *exemplum* of corporate intercession. This is how we do it.

God responds immediately: 'it was shaken, the place in which they were gathered (ἐσαλεύθη ὁ τόπος), and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and were speaking the word of God with boldness' (Acts 4:31). Luke does not say there was an 'earthquake'(σεισμός) as when he tells how the foundations of a Philippian jail were 'shaken' (same verb σαλεύω). Luke will later use σαλεύω to describe how enemies of Paul were 'shaking up' and agitating the crowds against him. Adolf von Harnack is likely correct in suggesting that here in chapter four the 'shaking' pertains more to the band of believers themselves than to any building they may have been in.[440] The Spirit arrives and they begin to tremble. They are under the influence, again.

Thus, in terms of the reader's implied mental construct for Spirit experience generally, Luke reiterates ideas of prayer and of inebriation. Intense Spirit experience can be repeated, especially in a corporate setting, especially through prayer. Boldness and, presumably, miraculous signs, result from such prayer. The entire episode (Acts 3:1-4:37) encompasses Peter and John healing the lame man, Peter preaching in Solomon's Portico, 5,000 men believing, Peter and John appearing before the Sanhedrin, their return to the church, the church's intercession, the renewed manifestation of the Spirit among them, and finally the resulting miraculous power, unity, and sharing of goods among them.

It is reasonable to view the story as overlaying the fresh coming of the Spirit with the initiation of the new influx of converts and thus impacting the reader's implied mental construct, not just for Spirit experience generally, but for initiation. Luke depicts individual converts caught up in a growing movement of corporate intercessory prayer, mass physical manifestations of the Spirit, miracle power, and concomitant evangelistic boldness coming to all, with exceptional individuals, apostles, leading the way (i.e., there is hierarchy in religious experience – all Christians experience the powerful Spirit, but some Christians experience more power than others).

Thus, when read sequentially in terms of an accumulating implied mental construct, this story adds the expectation that all converts will integrate into the group prayer-life. The reader further comes to expect that all converts, having spent time praying fervently with the group, will experience boldness and miracle healing power (some more, some less). Thus, the new religious movement has much more to offer than 'just' glossolalia.

4.2.7 Samaria: Focusing on the 'Narrator Opinion'

As to the aforementioned matter of narrative gap-filling, the next Lukan story in which initiates receive the Spirit is Samaria (Acts 8). Here we arrive at the *locus classicus* of debate over Christian initiation. Laying on of hands is prominent here – McCollough duly notes its redundant focalisation[441] – and there are several responses among interpreters. Windisch observes that the apostles, through handlaying, transmit the Spirit with ecstatic manifestations. He denies that this necessarily gave any prerogative to the apostles. However, he does assert:

[440] 'The trembling of the ecstasy is transferred also to the place where they were assembled.' Adolf von Harnack, trans. John Richard Wilkinson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1909), 154. Cf. Reicke, *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde*, 82.
[441] McCollough, *Ritual*, 139-148.

> If anything is historical about the story, it is that originally water baptism and the communication of the Spirit were separate things in Christian circles in terms of content and time.[442]

Johannes Behm, analysing Acts 8 with Acts 19, concludes: 'that neophytes, through baptism and laying on of hands (in closest connection with each other) were received into the church.'[443]

Joseph Coppens concludes:

> 1º from the apostolic age the Church adopted a rite distinct from baptism to confer the gift of the Spirit on the baptized; 2º this rite followed the recitation of a prayer and consisted of the laying on of hands; 3º the effect of this rite was the communication of the Holy Spirit, a necessary complement to baptismal initiation; 4º finally, the administration of the sacrament was taken away from the deacons and reserved to the apostolic ministry.[444]

Gonzalo Haya-Prats writes that, not baptism, but handlaying is the ordinary means of 'gifting' the Spirit.[445] Bovon argues that baptism is a sign of forgiveness and calling upon Jesus' name, hand-laying a sign of giving the Spirit. He states, 'Luke affirms that the gift of the Spirit is related to prayer and the imposition of hands' and cites Acts 8:15; 17; 18-20; 19:6.[446] But this linkage troubles Avemarie and he cannot decide:

> Is the Spirit-mediating hand-laying thus for him [Luke] a rite sui generis, which only then comes up when the mediation of the Spirit does not come about through other ways, or is it a natural component of the Christian initiation ritual?[447]

C. K. Barrett is adamant that, despite appearances, hand-laying is not normative:

> Luke's fundamental conviction, which is that the Spirit does not respond to certain stimuli, such as the laying on of hands, more or less in the manner of Pavlov's dog,

---

[442] Windisch, *Taufe und Sünde*, 91, 'Erst die Apostel, die aus Jerusalem geholt werden müssen, vermitteln ihren durch Handauflegung den in ekstatischen Erscheinungen sich äußernden Geist. Lukas will von einer Ausnahme berichten (vgl. μόνον 8 16). Aber die Annahme, daß die Geistesmitteilung eine Prärogative der Apostel sei, ist dogmatisch tendenziös. Wenn etwas an der Geschichte historisch ist, so ist es dies, daß ursprünglich Wassertaufe und Geistesmitteilung in christlichen Kreisen inhaltlich und zeitlich voneinander geschiedene Dinge waren.' Similarly, Otto Bauernfeind, *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* WUNT 22 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, Paul Siebeck, 1980), 126.

[443] Johannes Behm, *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum: Nach Verwendung, Herkunft und Bedeutung in religionsgeschichtlichem Zusammenhang untersucht* (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1911), 'daß Neophyten durch Taufe und Handauflegung (in engster Verbindung miteinander) in die Gemeinde aufgenommen wurden.' (35, cf. 28, 40).

[444] Joseph Coppens, *L'imposition des Mains et les Rites Connexes dans le Nouveau Testament et dans L'Eglise Ancienne Étude de Théologie Positive* UCL2 15 (Paris: J. Gabalda, Éditeur, 1925), 188. 'D'où se dégagent les faits suivants : 1º dès l'âge apostolique l'Église adopta un rite distinct du baptême pour conférer aux baptisés le don l'Esprit ; 2º ce rite suivait la récitation d'une prière et consistait dans l'imposition des mains ; 3º l'effet de ce rite était la communication du Saint-Esprit, complément nécessaire de l'initiation baptismale ; 4º enfin, l'administration du sacrement était soustraite aux diacres et réservée au ministère apostolique.'

[445] Gonzalo Haya-Prats, trans. Scott A. Ellington, ed. Paul Elbert, *Empowered Believers: The Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2011 [*El Espiritu Santo en los Hechos de los Apostoles*, Pontifical Gregorian University of Rome, dissertation, 1967]), 52, 150-151.

[446] Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 268-269.

[447] 'Ist die geistvermittelnde Handauflegung also für ihn ein Ritus sui generis, der nur dann zur Taufe hinzutritt, wenn die Geistvermittlung nicht auf anderem Wege zustande kommt, order ist sie ein selbstverständlich Bestandteil des christlichen Initiationsrituals?' *Die Tauferzählungen der Apostelgeschichte*, 166-167.

> but is given solely *ubi et quando visum est Deo*. It is God, not magicians or even apostles, who gives his own Spirit.[448]

More recently, Laurence Decousu, similarly to Barrett, has proposed:

> The communication of the Spirit is indeed the fruit of a divine initiative that takes place without mediation. This fundamental component of ancient pneumatology explains the multiple discrepancies observed in the book of Acts between the outpourings of the Spirit and the baptismal rite. The laying on of hands in some accounts is not a post-baptismal custom of Christian initiation, but an occasional practice to remedy an unforeseen anomaly, and prefigures the praxis of Christian communities in matters of penance.[449]

However, Jacob Jervell writes:

> The laying on of hands is more than a symbolic rite because the Spirit is actually given through it. ... It is possible that for Luke the laying on of hands is part of the baptismal liturgy, but it is also connected with other circumstances.[450]

Similarly, Jürgen Roloff:

> The execution of the impartation of the Holy Spirit seemed to follow the baptismal practice familiar to Luke: The baptiser lays hands on the baptised with prayer. The coming of the Spirit is conceived of in the sense of an enthusiastic experience of the Spirit, which manifested itself especially through tongues speaking (cf. 2:12f.; 10:46).[451]

Notwithstanding Windisch's discomfort with apostles having a special prerogative, Avemarie's uncertainty about the standard ritual, and Barrett and Decousu's rejection of human mediation, Luke's resolute focalisation of hand-laying points us towards Behm, Coppens,

---

[448] C. K. Barrett, 'Light on the Holy Spirit From Simon Magus (Acts 8,4-25)', J. Kremer, ed., *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979), 281-295. Similarly, Ben Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1998), 288; Daniel Marguerat, trans. Ken McKinney, et al., *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'* SNTSMS 121 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 127.

[449] Laurence Decousu, 'Liturgie baptismale et don de l'esprit aux origines chrétiennes : une pneumatologie oubliée', *RSR* Vol. 89 No. 1 (2015), 47-66. 'La communication de l'Esprit est bien le fruit d'une initiative divine qui s'opère sans médiation. Cette composante fondamentale de la pneumatologie ancienne explique les multiples décalages observés dans le livre des Actes entre les effusions de l'Esprit et le rite baptismal. L'imposition des mains effectuée dans certains récits ne relève pas d'une coutume postbaptismale de l'initiation chrétienne, mais d'une pratique occasionnelle destinée à remédier à une anomalie imprévue, et préfigure la praxis des communautés chrétiennes en matière de pénitence.' (section 47).

[450] 'Die Handauflegung is mehr als ein symbolischer Ritus, denn der Geist wird tatsächlich dadurch gegeben. … Möglicherweise gehört die Handauflegung für Lukas zur Taufliturgie, ist aber auch mit anderen Gegebenheiten verbunden.' *Apostelgeschichte*, 264. Jervell also notes that Tertullian had a dual initiation rite of water and handlaying, citing *On Baptism* 8.

[451] 'Der Vollzug der Geistverheihung sheint der Lukas vertrauten Taufpraxis zu folgen: Der Täufer legt dem Täufling unter Gebet die Hände auf. Das Kommen des Geistes ist im Sinne einer enthusiastischen Geisterfahrung gedacht, die sich vor allem durch Zungenreden manifesterierte (vgl. 2,12f.; 10,46).' Jürgen Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte* NTD 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 135. Gerhard Barth simply states that Philip's baptism was made valid by the apostles' handlaying. *Die Taufe in frühchristlicher Zeit* BTS 4 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), 67.

Haya-Prats, Bovon, Jervell, and Roloff – three times he orients the reader towards human hands as a means of imparting the Spirt.[452]

> 15 οἵτινες καταβάντες προσηύξαντο περὶ αὐτῶν ὅπως λάβωσιν πνεῦμα ἅγιον· 16 οὐδέπω γὰρ ἦν ⸂ἐπ᾽ οὐδενὶ⸃ αὐτῶν ἐπιπεπτωκός, μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ⸂κυρίου Ἰησοῦ⸃. 17 τότε ⸂ἐπετίθεσαν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐλάμβανον πνεῦμα ἅγιον.

First, he narrates that the apostles prayed for the Samaritans to receive the Spirit (8:15). This was necessary because the Spirit had not fallen on any of them, they were, rather, in the condition of having only (μόνον δὲ) been baptised. Then, the apostles were laying hands upon them and that they were receiving the Spirit (8:17).

Craig Blomberg, following Dunn in denying the authenticity of the Samaritans' belief, argues that, 'the word order of verse 16…suggests that the contrast is between being baptized into the name of Jesus and some other action directed toward Jesus (such as belief).'[453] The text, however, does not say that the apostles prayed for them that they might believe in Jesus, but that they might receive the Spirit. In other words, the *desideratum* obtained is not Jesus, but the Spirit. The necessary action to acquire the Spirit is not belief, but a combination of prayer and handlaying on the part of apostles, and submission to these acts on the part of the Samaritans.

Second and third, Luke presents the procedure from the perspective of a character:

> but Simon, having perceived that through the laying on of the hands of the apostles the Spirit was given, offered them money saying, 'give also to me this authority that upon whomever I should lay hands he might receive the Holy Spirit' (8:18-19).
>
> Ἰδὼν δὲ ºὁ Σίμων ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων δίδοται τὸ πνεῦμαᵀ, προσήνεγκεν αὐτοῖς χρήματα ᵀλέγων· δότε κἀμοὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ᾧ ἐὰν ἐπιθῶ ᵀ τὰς χεῖρας λαμβάνῃ πνεῦμα ἅγιον.

But focalisation, important though it is, does not tell the whole story. We must look more carefully at the syntax. Normally, the present passive δίδοται, 'is given', would take the time of its matrix verb, Ἰδὼν (which in turn is subordinate to προσήνεγκεν), and be rendered, 'was given'. However, Stephen H. Levinsohn notes:

> When ὅτι occurs as a *complementizer*, this indicates that the propositional content of the complement is not the author's description of a state of affairs, but rather the

[452] Windisch will, in his discussion of Ephesus, plainly link the gift of the Spirit to a liturgical act of handlaying (92).

[453] Craig Blomberg, *From Pentecost to Patmos: An Introduction to Acts through Revelation* (Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group, 2006), 39. Behm, *Handauflegung im Urchristentum* (29), replies to August Neander's assertion that the Samaritans' initial belief was defective (the view later taken up by Dunn), Behm simply points to 8:14 which is similar to 11:1 and 17:11. Cf. August Neander, *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel* (Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1842), 85. Cf. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 63-68. Avemarie responds to Dunn point by point, e.g., 8:12 where Philip preaches explicitly concerning τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *Tauferzählungen*, 169. Turner similarly rebuts Dunn, *Power*, 362-367. See Dunn's careful retraction, 'Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts', in James D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit Volume 2 Pneumatology* (Grand Rapids, MI / Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 222-242; 240, 228.

> representation of a character's thought or inference about that state of affairs. One of the reasons for choosing ὅτι is when what is perceived relates back to and interprets a previous utterance.[454]

By 'representation', Levinsohn means that it is not a direct quote. He observes regarding the function of ὅτι:

> Certain languages have 'an explicit linguistic indicator of interpretive use' whose function is to signal that the utterance concerned is not a simple report of what was said on a particular occasion, but rather is an interpretation or representation of an utterance or thought which it resembles.[455]

Following Levinsohn, the ὅτι clause presents the event, not as a direct quote from Simon, but as a representation of what Simon thought/saw and, in doing so, links his perception back to, and reinforces, Luke's immediately previous statements that the apostles were laying hands on people and they were receiving the Spirit. This is redundant focalisation of hand-laying.

Drawing upon Levinsohn, an alternative translation would recognise ὅτι as signalling the representation of Simon's thinking. Consequently, δίδοται, being the main verb of an independent thought, would be rendered 'is given'.

> But Simon, having perceived – through the laying on of the hands of the apostles the Spirit is given – offered money…

Under this reading, Simon recognises what the narrator just narrated. Simon's perception is aligned with the narrator's presentation.

However, under a reading not influenced by Levinsohn, we then have an authorial side comment. Simon sees, but the narrator speaks, informing the reader of the state of affairs which Simon came to recognise.[456] In this case, too, the narrative aside aligns with what was previously narrated.

Ute Eisen, though, makes a narratological case that Simon's perception is *not* aligned with the narrator's opinion by contrasting what is called 'free indirect discourse' with direct speech. Independent of Levinsohn's work, Eisen identifies the ὅτι clause as free indirect style or '*erlebte Rede*'.[457] Free indirect style/speech/discourse is a widely discussed phenomenon in modern literature. Michael Toolan explains that it is 'free' because it lacks an introductory 'framing' clause which tells who is thinking or speaking (he thought/said). It is 'indirect'

---

[454] Stephen H. Levinsohn, 'Is ὅτι an Interpretive Use Marker?' in Stanley E. Porter and Matthew Brook O'Donnell, eds., *The Linguist as Pedagogue: Trends in the Teaching and Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament* NTM 11 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), 161-180; 179-180. Similarly, Margaret G. Sim, *Marking Thought and Talk in New Testament Greek: New Light from Linguistics on the Particles ἵνα and ὅτι* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2010), 156-163. NB, a 'complementizer' introduces a complement clause. Typical complementizers include 'that', 'if', 'to', among others. Cf. Michael Noonan, 'Complementation', in Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 52-150; 55. 'By complementation, we mean the syntactic situation that arises when a notional sentence or predication is an argument of a predicate. For our purposes, a predication can be viewed as an argument of a predicate if it functions as the subject or object of that predicate.' (Noonan, 52). An example would be, 'I thought that I was finished.'

[455] Levinsohn, 'Is ὅτι an Interpretive Use Marker?', 163.

[456] On authorial side comments, see Steven M. Sheeley, *Narrative Asides in Luke-Acts*, JSNTS 72 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1992), 36.

[457] Eisen, Die Poetik der Apostelgeschichte 115-117.

because it is a combination of a character's speech or thought with the perspective of the narrator. But it always uses the tense of the narrator.[458] Eisen understands it similarly, though she emphasises, not the lack of identification of the speaker, but the lack of *verbum decindi*, or words of speaking. She points out it is a combination of direct and indirect speech, an 'in-between form'.[459] So, for example (to borrow a turn of phrase from Käte Hamburger[460]):

- I said, 'Tomorrow is Christmas!' (direct speech)
- He said tomorrow was Christmas! (indirect speech)
- He had been so busy. Tomorrow was Christmas! (Free Indirect Discourse)

Eisen's identification of the ὅτι clause as *erlebte Rede* could be challenged by noting first that there is a framing clause, 'Simon, having perceived' (Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Σίμων). Though, as under Eisen's paradigm, there is no verb of speaking. Moreover, Luke uses δίδοται, which is present passive, not imperfect like the tense of the narrator in the previous verse (τότε ⸀ἐπετίθεσαν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐλάμβανον πνεῦμα ἅγιον).

However, Levinsohn's discourse analysis makes clear that we are *not* dealing with what Toolan calls 'Direct Thought' – 'the exact words a character has formulated in thought, their precise mental utterance'.[461] The ὅτι indicates resemblance, interpretation, representation. Rather, we have some form of Toolan's Indirect Speech or Indirect Thought, which 'offers the sense but not the precise grammar or wording of a character's thought'.[462] We have a combination of narrator involvement and character utterance – as Eisen puts it, 'eine Zwischenform'.

Whether it is precisely free indirect discourse, or simply indirect discourse, Eisen's argument must be considered. For her, the implication of understanding the ὅτι clause as free indirect speech is that it makes the clause represent the perspective of the character, not of the narrator. In this, she is in agreement with Levinsohn. However, she objects to viewing Simon's perspective presented in the ὅτι clause as authoritative because of Simon's direct speech (λέγων· δότε κἀμοὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην):

> In the scene of Peter and John's encounter with Simon Magus, Simon's observation is not narrator opinion (Acts 8:15-24). Rather, the direct speech of Simon betrays his magical misunderstanding (Acts 8:19).[463]

---

[458] Michael J. Toolan, *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction* Second Edition (London and New York: Routledge, 2001), 120-121. Cf. Monika Fludernik: 'Free indirect discourse is called 'free' because the introductory verbs of saying (He claimed that…) are dispensed with; 'indirect' because the utterances represented are referentially aligned and tenses shifted in accordance with the surrounding narrative discourse.' Monika Fludernik, trans., Patricia Häusler-Greenfield and Monika Fludernik, *An Introducton to Narratology* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), 67

[459] ‚eine Zwischenform zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede'. Eisen, *Die Poetik der Apostelgeschichte* 115.

[460] Käte Hamburger, *Die Logik der Dichtung* (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag, 1957), 33-34.

[461] Toolan, *Narrative*, 120.

[462] Toolan, *Narrative*, 120.

[463] 'In der Szene der Begegnung von Petrus und Johannes mit Simon Magus ist Simons Beobachtung … nicht Erzählermeinung (Act 8,15-24). Vielmehr verrät die direkte Rede des Simon sein magisches Missverständnis (Act 8,19)'. Eisen, *Die Poetik der Apostelgeschichte*, 116-117. Similarly, K. Haacker, 'Einige Fälle von ‚Erlebter rede' im Neuen Testament' *NT* Vol. 12, Fasc. 1 (Jan., 1970), 70-77; 74; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts, A Literary Interpretation*, Vol. 2, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990), 106; Ju Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (London: T & T Clark, 2004; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSNTS 211, 2001), 136.

However, *pace* Eisen, an imperfect character is perfectly capable of expressing the implied author's ideology. For example, at Jesus' trial, Pilate declares, 'I found no reason for death in him' (Luke 23:22). Pilate is no hero, but his words encapsulate the ideology of the implied author. This ability of a villainous character to represent the mind of the author means that even if an author renders a character's perspective, either with indirect discourse, or, with a ὅτι clause, or with both, that does not automatically mean the character's thoughts are 'wrong'. This is especially so when one considers Levinsohn's point that the ὅτι clause refers back to the immediately preceding narration.

Moreover, even if we were to reject both Eisen's understanding of Acts 8:18 as containing free indirect discourse, and hence, the thoughts of the character, and Levinsohn's discourse analysis that the ὅτι clause represents the thoughts of the character, we would still be left with a case of an authorial aside about what Simon perceived (viz. that the Spirit was given in a certain way). That narrative aside would align with the immediately previous narration about hands being laid upon people and the people receiving the Spirit. Nevertheless, we find no reason to reject either Eisen's point about indirect discourse or Levinsohn's discourse analysis conclusion that we are dealing with a representation of a character's thoughts.

However, we concur with McCollough's argument that Simon's observation is not qualified[464] with some statement as, 'Simon, *having supposed* – the Spirit is given by the laying on of apostolic hands', or 'Simon, *having incorrectly assumed* – the Spirit is given by the laying on of apostolic hands'. Furthermore, as McCollough observes, Luke is very willing to supply such a qualification if needed:

(1) '[the sailors], having presumed (δόξαντες) they had achieved their purpose' (Acts 27:13)
(2) '[the jailor], supposing (νομίζων) the prisoners had escaped' (16:27)
(3) [Paul and his companions go to the river where] 'we were supposing (ἐνομίζομεν) prayer to be' (16:13).[465]
(4) 'and having stoned Paul, they were dragging him out of the city, supposing (νομίζοντες) him to have died' (Acts 14:19)
(5) 'but having supposed (νομίσαντες) him to be in the caravan, they went a day's journey' (Luke 2:44)

No, Luke presents Simon having perceived (Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Σίμων) that the procedure in use by the apostles was hand-laying. In an unqualified manner, Luke states that Simon saw how the apostles transferred the Spirit. Simon's follow-on request in verse 19 for τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην that he might impart the Spirit with *his* hands, represents further focalisation of hand-laying, not as a rite with magic power in itself, but as a means of expressing tangible authority, an authority which Simon is eager to purchase. Peter's rebuke (8:20-21) does not correct a misunderstanding about the efficacy of apostolic authority, but about the ability of Simon to crassly buy it. Bovon is correct.

Furthermore, Luke does not provide a caveat such as, 'on this unique occasion' or 'uniquely here in Samaria'. On the contrary, Luke combines redundant focalisation of the hand-laying rite with normative, exemplar characters. Peter and John, representing the authority and praxis

[464] McCollough, *Ritual*, 143.
[465] 143.

of Jerusalem, demonstrate for the implied reader the impartation method in use – the ritual practice sanctioned by the implied author, the *Erzählermeinung*.

McCollough recognises that the Pentecost story did not show converts receiving the Spirit and consequently left a gap, partially filled in by Jesus' prayer at his baptism, but a gap nonetheless. Yet McCollough is unwilling to assert anything definite about Samaria's role in filling in this gap: 'The reader of Acts 8 is faced with the possibility that prayer and hand-laying fills in that gap…. However, this can *only* be a possibility, as it is not confirmed directly by Luke'.[466]

Once again, the role of Graeco-Roman exemplaric discourse comes into play. Peter and John are already known to the reader as miracle-working members of Jesus' apostolic band. Peter is the preacher of Pentecost. If *anyone* represents the proclamation and practice of the apostles, it is Peter. In terms of Roller's four elements of exemplaric discourse, we have apostolic *action* and we have *evaluation* by a sorcerer well-qualified to recognise power when he saw it. Luke himself, in recounting the event, provides the *commemoration*, but he includes, as well, characters in the story 'commemorating' the event – the apostles, before they return to Jerusalem, 'solemnly warn/charge and speak the word of the Lord'. This solemn warning to the Samaritans is all the more *apropos* in light of Simon's corruption over spiritual power. The gift of the Spirit, imparted through apostolic hands, must not be taken lightly. Finally, as Luke's story is not simply a tale told once, but a scroll to be read aloud again and again, we have *norm setting*. In terms of collected biography, we have in-group and out-group delineation associated with a major disciple.

Contra McCollough, in the Samaria story, Luke definitively fills in the narrative gap from Acts 2. Now the reader knows how the 3,000 received the Spirit. They heard the gospel message, they repented, were immersed, prayed persistently, received prayer from apostles, and had apostolic hands laid upon them. Thus, Luke has added yet more detail to the now familiar type-scene, and the implied reader has added new information to his composite picture of early Christian initiation. In addition to personally praying for the Spirit, the initiate must allow the community leaders to pray and lay hands upon him to receive the Spirit. Thus, the implied mental construct for initiation so far is: (1) encounter with a gospel messenger (possibly with exorcism); (2) Conviction of the truth of the message; (3) Appeal for help; (4) Instructions to repent and be baptised; (5) Repentance and baptismal immersion; (6) Persistent post-baptismal prayer by initiates; (7) Prayer and hand-laying by apostles to impart the Spirit; (8) Inebriated language-speaking understood as Spirit reception.

Luke presents baptism as a fixed ritual which lower-level leaders, like Philip, may administer, but portrays Spirit impartation as a flexible, performative ritual which high level leaders dispense as they, prayerfully, see fit. However, Daniel Marguerat argues that the prayer which accompanied the hand-laying necessarily denies 'resident power' to the apostles:

> The prayer prior to the laying-on-of-hands is important because it shows that Peter and John do not have permanent power. Praying places them in dependence on the

[466] 170, original italics.

> power of God, whom they ask to act, while maintaining the inviolable freedom of his Spirit.[467]

McCollough's response is narratively fitting: Marguerat has not considered the entire Luke-Acts story, where Jesus and Peter both demonstrate resident power, e.g., when a woman touches Jesus' garment virtue flows out (Luke 8:46); power is present for Jesus to heal (Luke 5:17); power goes out from Jesus (Luke 6:19); Peter's shadow is thought to heal (Acts 5:15-16).[468] The question is not either/or. The narrative allows the apostles to be in prayerful harmony with God, yet remain powerful human agents mediating the Spirit with their own hands. This Lukan mixture of performative ritual and 'liturgical' ritual will play a significant role in our coming social anthropological analysis.

4.2.8 On the Road Between Jerusalem and Gaza

Our concern is with the Spirit experience in relation to initiation ritual, and this story in Acts 8:26-40 does not mention any giving of the Spirit. Philip still has no power to impart the Spirit. However, there is a textual variant in which the Spirit falls upon the Ethiopian Eunuch and an angel of the Lord catches Philip away, but it is not in the Nestle-Aland text.[469] Were we to consider it, this alternate reading would narratively reinforce the idea of mediation of the Spirit through the presence of a human minister. That Philip laid hands upon the eunuch is implied in his baptism of him, 'and both of them went down into the water, Philip and the eunuch, and he baptised him.' (8:38).

4.2.9 Damascus – First Account: Liminality and a Caveat

Next is the story of Saul's 'conversion'. In the first iteration of the story (9:1-19),[470] after three days of Saul, blinded and fasting, Jesus assures Ananias that the erstwhile persecutor is now safe to initiate, 'for behold, he is praying' (9:11c). The precise moment of repentance is not identified, but it has happened. Luke then focalises the healing of Saul's eyes at Ananias' hands, rather than Saul's Spirit reception, though the latter is not omitted. It is mediated by Ananias, according to his own assertion, 'Jesus sent me so that you … may be filled with the Holy Spirit' (9:17c). Saul is then baptised, indicating that Saul's Spirit reception preceded his baptism, and finally partakes of food. Thus, there is process in Saul's conversion, there is an intermediate period – liminality.

Moreover, Luke adds a caveat to the reader's mental construct for initiation – a non-apostle appropriately empowered by Jesus may administer the Spirit *ad hoc*, in the moment, even before baptism. Yet the elements of the familiar type-scene remain in Luke's story. Thus, while the hand-laying gesture and immersion continue to be employed, Luke emphasises power from Jesus within the ritual administrator, rather than power in a rite. Luke's redundant telling of the story, and further explication of Christian initiation, will be addressed in due course after the Ephesus story.

---

[467] 'La prière préliminaire à l'imposition des mains est importante, car elle montre que Pierre et Jean ne jouissent pas d'un pouvoir à demeure. Prier les place en dépendance du pouvoir de Dieu, qu'ils sollicitent d'agir, tout en maintenant l'inviolable liberté de son Esprit', Daniel Marguerat, *Les Actes des Apôtres (1-12)*, CNTDS (Genève: Labor et Fides, 2007), 296.

[468] McCollough, *Ritual*, 152.

[469] ᵀ αγιον επεπεσεν επι τον ευνουχον, αγγελος δε Ac 323 . 453 . 945 . 1739 . 1891 . 2818 l (p w syh**) mae. Cf. *Ritual,* 164-166 for extensive discussion.

[470] The seminal discussion of the three stories of Saul's conversion is by Ronald D. Witherup, 'Functional Redundancy in the Acts of the Apostles: A Case Study', *JSNT* 48 (1992), 67-86.

4.2.10 Caesarea: Power in the Person and Performance per Pentecost

But where, then, is the liminality in the Cornelius story? The Spirit comes (Acts 10:43-44) precisely at the moment of belief. This is true, but what follows? Water baptism. Luke does not neglect the necessary water ritual. The type-scene is still there. However, the mode of the Spirit's coming sheds light upon initiation and ritual experience in Luke's presentation of the early Christian movement.

McCollough rightly notes four aspects of the story. First, the disciplined Roman soldiers who initially honoured Peter as their guest interrupted his speech with outbursts of language-speaking. That is not normal behaviour, it is dissociative. Second, Luke gives no list of persons who understood the languages – we have unrecognised language-speaking. Third, through a narrative aside the reader learns that the leaders of his community knew that initiates had received the Spirit because the leaders heard them speaking with languages and magnifying God (Acts 10:45-46). Thus, for Luke, when no one present recognises the languages spoken, the Spirit reception experience has to have an intelligible component (verbal or non-verbal, the text does not specify) that verifies the language-speaking as directed Godward.[471] Gunkel recognized this link early on:

> When Acts 10:46 recognizes that Cornelius and his house possess the Spirit by the fact that they speak in tongues and extol God, then a μεγαλύνειν τὸν θεόν, which is pneumatic in character, is not the usual praise that any Christian may give at any time but an ecstatic praise connected with glossolalia.[472]

Fourth, the main community leader in the story so far, Peter, validates the new initiates as having received the Spirit by comparing their Spirit experience to the Spirit experience of the apostolic leadership on the Day of Pentecost. Four times Peter equates the initiates' experience with that of the believers on Pentecost (Acts 10:47; 11:15, 17; 15:8). This redundancy is not otiose, it functions to establish the initial Spirit experience of the group's founders as the archetype of all new initiatory Spirit experiences and instructs those conducting initiation to initiate according to the template of Pentecost. McCollough, though, is reluctant to follow through on the implications of the Petrine equations. He writes: 'Luke did not explicitly deny that other manifestations could not equally attest Spirit-reception.'[473]

Once again, we must reckon with Roller's elements of Roman exemplaric discourse. The *action* is God's in sending the Spirit upon the Gentiles, but it is also Peter's, in his obedient and powerful preaching of the gospel. The *evaluation* is done by members of the Jewish people (οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοὶ) who are amazed that the gift of the Spirit had been poured out on Gentiles (Acts 10:45). The concrete basis of this evaluation is tongues speaking and Godward praise – ἤκουον γὰρ αὐτῶν λαλούντων γλώσσαις καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν θεόν – that Peter equates with Pentecost. Here, in good Roman style, Peter evaluates a new situation based upon an existing *exemplum*. The validity of the Gentile's experience is determined by its qualitative sameness vis-à-vis the original language experience of the 120 on Pentecost. Luke has *commemorated* the event through his written narrative and in so doing has also *set the norm*. He need not provide a list of all the other possible manifestations that might or might not accompany genuine Spirit experience. He has provided an *exemplum* of Spirit experience –

---

[471] McCollough, *Ritual*, 178.
[472] Gunkel, *Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 18.
[473] McCollough, *Ritual*, 189.

Pentecost – and then provided a second *exemplum* of a hero – Peter – using Pentecost as an *exemplum*.

But, in terms of the communication of the Spirit, is there not a conflict with the foregoing model of baptism and hand-laying? Here McCollough rightly argues that the implied reader, having previously encountered Peter's Acts 2:38 sequence of baptism and Spirit reception along with the Samaria story of prayer and hand-laying to impart the Spirit, as well as the Saul and Ananias episode, far from concluding that Luke poorly edited his sources, integrates the Cornelius sequence into the initiatory structure previously stipulated by Luke. Drawing upon the extensive emphasis on hand-laying power in the immediately previous Samaritan and Saul stories, and the leitmotif of emanating power, viz. the power/aura associated with Jesus in Luke 5:17 ('power of the Lord was present for him to heal'[474]); 6:19 ('power from him was going out and healing all'[475]); 8:46 ('I perceived power having gone out from me'[476]); and with Peter in Acts 5:15 (viz. his powerful shadow), the implied reader understands that the power upon an apostle may be so great that people receive the Spirit through his mere presence and word even without baptism or hand-laying. At the same time, this spontaneous outbreak of the Spirit can be viewed in the text (Acts 11:17) as God sovereignly acting, interrupting Peter.[477]

That a variant initiatory possibility exists, viz., 'spontaneous impartation' from an apostle's inner power, does not negate the format already established by Luke as standard through multiple literary devices in the earlier Pentecost story. For Luke, there is a 'way we do things'. Significantly, the liminal transition from Gentile Godfearers to full-fledged members of God's people was sealed with table fellowship (Acts 10:48; 11:3). In the final shared meal vis-à-vis the initial proclamation of the kerygma, Luke provides bookends to his initiation ritual.

4.2.11 Jerusalem (Caesarea Remembered) – Pure Gentiles in David's Tent

Gunkel observes: 'In Acts 15:8 the occurrence of glossolalic speech at Cornelius's conversion is cited as proof that in giving the Spirit God makes no distinction between Gentile and Jewish Christian.' Gunkel references Peter's statement in 15:8-9:

> And God, the knower of the heart, bore witness to them, giving the Holy Spirit just as also to us, and making no distinction between us and them, by faith cleansing their hearts.

That is, Luke narrates how the Holy Spirit that had come upon the Jews at Pentecost, purifying them to offer pure worship to God in accordance with Malachi 3, had equally come upon the Gentiles in the moment that they, believing the preaching of Peter about forgiveness of sins through Jesus' name, received the Spirit and began speaking in tongues and magnifying God. In Luke's precise narrative, the Gentiles exercise faith/believe, receive forgiveness of sins, and then immediately receive the Spirit who purifies them during a time of dissociative glossolalic prayer and worship. In Luke's presentation, God by his Spirit began purifying the Jews at Pentecost and began purifying the Gentiles at Cornelius' House.

---

[474] ⸢¹⸣καὶ δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ⸣ ἰᾶσθαι ⸢αὐτόν.

[475] καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐζήτουν ἅπτεσθαι αὐτοῦ, ὅτι δύναμις παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο καὶ ἰᾶτο πάντας.

[476] ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἥψατό μού τις, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνων δύναμιν ⸢ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ.

[477] McCollough, *Ritual*, 183. On the 'interruption', see Daniel Lynwood Smith, *The Rhetoric of Interruption: Speech-Making, Turn-Taking, and Rule-Breaking in Luke-Acts and Ancient Greek Narrative* BZNW 193 (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2012), 227-229.

Because Gentiles are now purified, offering glossolalic worship just as the Jews, James declares the restoration of David's Tent:

> Simon has related how at first God visited to take from the Gentiles a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets just as it is written: 'After these things I will return and will rebuild the tent of David which has collapsed and her ruins I will rebuild and I will restore her so that the rest of mankind might seek the Lord, even all the Gentiles who have been called by my name,' says the Lord who does these things. (Acts 15:14-17).

James quotes Amos 9:11, which in the Masoretic Text refers to the סֻכַּת דָּוִיד (David's hut). This has been understood by commentators as signifying, in its Amos context, the royal house/dynasty of David, and in its Acts context as the gathering of Gentiles to the Messianic community and/or the Messiah and/or his resurrection and exaltation.[478] While there may be overtones of all these notions in James' speech, I suggest that, from the very beginning of his Luke-Acts narrative, where John is depicted as the messenger going before the Lord to prepare the people and Jesus is given the role of the Coming One, the Refiner of Malachi, who baptises with the Holy Spirit and fire, Luke has been arguing that God is refining a people to offer pure cultic worship. Luke drew upon the Malachi imagery in the fire of Pentecost, and he highlighted the prophetic tabernacle worship as the disciples 'utter' (ἀποφθέγγομαι cf. 1 Chronicles 25:1 LXX) new languages by the Spirit.

Gentiles were not allowed in the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem, and, at the time of Luke's writing, it is destroyed anyway. But, from Luke's perspective, there is another house of God, even more ancient, to which Jew and Gentile alike still have access – David's Worship Tent. The ark of the covenant had then represented the presence of YHWH, but now the Holy Spirit dwells among his worshiping people. The 288 singers and the 4000 musicians that daily offered prophetic praise have become a multitude of ethnic voices prophesying, speaking in supernatural languages, and magnifying God.

4.2.12 Ephesus: Paul too is an Apostle

Finally, then, the reader comes to the last Spirit reception type-scene in Luke-Acts, the story of the Ephesian disciples. Regardless of how one defines them,[479] liminality is present in the ritual process. They believe Paul's instructions about Jesus, then they are baptised, then Paul lays hands upon them, and then they receive the Spirit. All of this takes time. The baptism of twelve men takes time (the text does not even indicate who baptised them). Paul did not lay hands upon them all at once, he had to do each ritual act separately for each individual. That took time. To make the point clear, Luke does not here present a non-individuated corporate experience of the Spirit, rather, he presents individual reception experiences in a liminal ritual

[478] Cf. J. Paul Tanner, 'James's Quotation of Amos 9 to Settle the Jerusalem Council Debate in Acts 15', *JETS* Vol. 55 No. 1 (2012), 65-85; 67; Holladay, *Acts*, 302; C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles* Vol. II ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 725. C. K. Barrett, 'Luke-Acts', in John Barclay and John Sweet, eds., *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 84-95; 94. Schaefer, *Zukunft Israels bei Lukas*, 252-256.

[479] Behm makes the same point that the nature of their being μαθηταί is irrelevant to the procedure of their incorporation into the church. *Handauflegung im Urchristentum*, 19.
They were disciples of John, members of what Luke viewed as the people of God, but not yet members of the Christian community.

process. Corporate Spirit reception is, of course, completely possible in Luke's conception, as Acts 2:1-4 and Acts 10:44-46 demonstrate.

The 'contact-point' for Spirit reception is not the water, but the handlaying. As Windisch writes: 'the reception of the Spirit does not tie itself to the water bath, but to a second liturgical act, the laying on of hands.'[480] Roloff states:

> The transmission of the Spirit by the laying on of hands following baptism seems to have corresponded to the liturgical custom of the Lukan church (see on 10:44ff.).[481]

Similarly, Bovon avers:

> Normally, water baptism in the name of Jesus for the forgiveness of sins and the imposition of hands for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit form two moments of one ceremony. Acts 19:5-6 reflects the general rule.... [482]

Indeed, Paul embodies the ecclesial ideology of the implied author.[483] Paul demonstrates the standard ritual process. Every detail of the full type-scene for initiation is not repeated, for the reader already knows that apostles and initiates pray. The implied reader maintains all the data in his progressively accumulated mental construct for initiation. As Behm wrote presciently: 'Does not 19, 5f. give the impression of a practical example to the rule established in 2, 38?'.[484] Thus, in the Ephesus story, Luke delimited the ritual structure: repentance (already accomplished with John's baptism) belief in Jesus as Messiah, baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus, hand-laying, Spirit reception manifested in language-speech with a control element (i.e., something intelligible), in this case, prophecy.

4.2.13 Damascus – Second and Third Accounts

In Saul's second recounting of his experience (22:10), Saul explains that Jesus identified himself to him, and then he responds by asking, 'what should I do, Lord?' McCollough rightly argues that in this statement, Saul is submitting himself to obey the one he formerly had persecuted.[485] He knows Jesus is raised from the dead and he calls him Lord (τί ποιήσω, κύριε;). According to the story logic, Saul has repented and become of follower of Jesus. Thus, Luke ultimately pinpoints the moment of 'conversion'. Of course, Ananias still goes through the initiatory rituals (22:16), water baptism and calling upon the name of the Lord. Nevertheless,

---

[480] 'der Geistesempfang knüpft sich nicht an das Wasserbad an, sondern an einen zweiten litugischen Akt, die Handauflegung.' Windisch, *Taufe und Sünde*, 92.

[481] 'Die Geistübertragung durch Handauflegung im Anschluß an die Taufe scheint dem liturgischen Brauch der lukanischen Kirche entsprochen zu haben (s. zu 10,44ff.).' Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 282.

[482] Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 269.

[483] Cf. William Kurz on Paul's Miletus speech in 20:17-38, 'Narrative Models for Imitation in Luke-Acts', 171-189; 175. Similarly, Jacob Kremer, *Pfingstbericht und Pfingstgeschehen: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Apg 2,1-13* SB 63/64 (Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1973), 200; Kremer is interested in 'die lukanische Interpretation des Pfingstberichts und Geistempfangs'; Kremer concludes regarding Spirit reception that it: (1) is 'zwar eng mit der Taufe verknüpft, aber nicht unlöslich damit verbunden.' (2) is 'für da Christsein konstitutiv.' (3) 'steht in enger Beziehung zur Kirche.' Viz. it is administered through 'berufener Männer'. (4) is a 'wahrnehmbare Erfahrung' – a 'perceptible experience'.

[484] Behm, *Handauflegung im Urchristentum*, 20, 'Macht nicht 19, 5f. den Eindruck eines praktischen Beispiels zu der 2, 38 aufgestellten Regel?'

[485] McCollough, *Ritual*, 174

the reader knows that Saul has already submitted to Jesus as Lord and has already received the Spirit through Ananias' initial hand-laying.

Thus, there exists a liminal period in Saul's conversion – repentance on the road to Damascus, but Spirit and baptismal initiation three days later in the city. Here Luke deftly identifies what is essential: not the ritual form, but the experiential reality. Yet, the ritual form is not to be dispensed with, it too is necessary for acceptance into the community of Jesus' followers.

4.2.14 Summary of the Implied Mental Construct for Spirit Reception and Christian Initiation

Luke prescribes over the course of the narrative and in extensive detail, the process of moving from outside the Christian group to inside. This liminal ritual process can be adumbrated as follows: (1) Encounter with the gospel message via a gospel messenger – whether office-holding apostle or evangelist, or non-office holding, ordinary Christian – sometimes with exorcism; (2) 'Conviction' of the truth of the message, that is, a visceral, emotional realization with alteration of internal discourse, and/or exorcism; (3) An appeal for help; (4) Further instructions, e.g. repent, believe on Jesus, be baptised; (5) Belief/repentance; (6a) Immersion in water officiated by a believer, but not necessarily by an apostle, or (6b) Spontaneous impartation of the Spirit from the resident power within a gifted minister and manifestation of dissociative glossolalia with an intelligible control element indexical of Holy Spirt reception; (7) Post-baptismal period of persistent supplicatory prayer to be given the Spirit; (8) Prayer by gifted minister(s) for the Spirit to be given; (9) Hand-laying by gifted minister(s) to impart the Spirit; (10) Dissociative glossolalia with an intelligible control element indexical of Holy Spirt reception; (11) Period of ongoing dissociation/glossolalia with possible other physical manifestations, such as appearing drunk and/or bodily shaking, which are understood by the officiants as experiences necessary for the spiritual purification and empowerment of initiates; (12) Table fellowship and participation in corporate prayer marking full acceptance into the believing community. This initiation purifies and equips the convert to access the 'new Temple', the inter-racial Tent of David where pure worship in the form of charismatic glossolalia is offered to God and the exalted Jesus. In depicting believers experiencing physical manifestations of the Spirit, Luke, in polyvalent fashion, presents them, not only as priests, but as sacrifices as well.

The single variant element in Lukan initiation has to do, not with a procedural modification of a liturgical rite, but with the spontaneity of 'performance' that exists due to Luke's concept of resident spiritual power. For Luke, power lies within the apostle or other similarly empowered representative of Jesus. Power flows from a person in whom Christ has placed power, not from a ritual in which Christ has placed power. That δύναμις is partially under the control of the apostle, but, as with Jesus from whom power spontaneously proceeded, even apart from his volition (cf. 'someone touched me for I perceived power (δύναμις) having gone out from me', Luke 8:46), the power acts on its own, often in response to the 'faith' of others.

In other words, in the early Christian sect, the ritual practitioner possesses a barely controllable spiritual force which other members of the community may make demands upon and experience, even apart from the direct action of the ritual practitioner. The initiatory 'rituals' of the sect include the fixed ritual of water baptism, as well as the typical gesture of hand-laying. The gesture has no power in itself but is simply a natural expression of the empowered ritual practitioner who operates towards the performative end of the liturgical/performative

spectrum. Thus, the dissertation confirms Bovon who, as cited earlier, argues that hand-laying does not function *ex opere operato*, nor as a Zwinglian symbol, 'Luke thinks – whether we call it naïve or *frühkatholisch* – that God has entrusted a power to God's people'.[486]

Furthermore, the dissertation has shown that the narrative addresses not just initiates. Luke enjoins his ritual practitioners to carefully judge the Spirit experience of new initiates. They are to evaluate by the *exemplum* of Pentecost, that is, by the Spirit experience of the 120. In the Cornelius story, Luke provides an *exemplum* of how to use the Pentecost *exemplum*.

5. Interpretation

5.1 Introduction

Risto Uro writes, 'It would be probably generalizing too much to argue that the whole of primitive Christianity was a possession cult… but it certainly hosted groups that can be called such'.[487] However, *pace* Uro, the foregoing narratological exegesis of Luke-Acts demonstrates that, at least with respect to Christian initiation, spirit possession, with accompanying altered states of consciousness (ASCs), was indeed a standard characteristic of the Lukan stream of Christianity, in the late first, early second century. How then is initiatory spirit-possession/ASC glossolalia to be understood in terms of a socio-cognitive ritual analysis such as Uro employs? Situating the analysis more broadly within the anthropology of religion, how did dissociative glossolalia, as an initiatory experience, contribute to the meaning making, identity and destiny of the sect? This chapter will explore these questions, integrating four elements of religion utilised, notably by Czachesz, in the cognitive study of religion: experience, rituals, beliefs, and texts.[488]

5.2 What's So Special About Initiation? Ritual Form Theory and Lukan Baptism(s)

Currently, ritual scholars view water baptism as the central primitive Christian initiatory rite. István Czachesz writes of baptism as, 'the initiation ritual par excellence of the movement'.[489] Uro states that in water baptism, early Christianity made, 'a special agent ritual a central rite of its cultic life'.[490] Richard E. DeMaris writes that Christian baptism was distinct from the Jewish *mikveh* and the Roman bath, not only because it was a 'boundary-crossing rite,' but because of 'its ability to mediate the Holy Spirit, or, in social-scientific terms, to induce an altered state of consciousness'.[491]

However, I have shown that Luke emphasises Spirit baptism over water baptism. For Luke, post-baptismal prayer and hand-laying, employed to impart/induce the Spirit reception/possession/ASC glossolalia cluster, is, in terms of Ritual Form Theory (see 2.2.6), the cardinal special agent ritual (in a performative, not liturgical, sense) and water baptism,

---

[486] Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 269-270.
[487] Uro, *Ritual*, 119.
[488] István Czachesz, 'The Emergence of Early Christian Religion: A Naturalistic Approach', in Petri Luomanen, Ilkka Pyysiäinen, and Risto Uro, eds., *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science* BIS 89 (Leiden: Brill; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2007), 73-94; 76-77.
[489] István Czachesz, 'Ritual and Transmission' in Risto Uro, et. al, *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Ritual* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 122.
[490] Uro, 164. For discussion of 'special agent' rituals and Lawson and McCauley's ritual taxonomy, see 2.2.6.
[491] Richard E. DeMaris, 'Water Ritual' in Risto Uro, et. al, *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Ritual* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 391-408; 398-399.

while still capable of being viewed as a special agent ritual, is not the *primary* special agent ritual in early Christian sect initiation.[492]

What then of water baptism? Baptism in Jesus' name was not conceived of as literally 'washing away' sins. Luke is careful to distinguish between Saul's moment of surrender to Jesus' lordship and his water baptism (cf. 4.2.13). Rather, baptism had a polyvalent ritual significance. It ritually symbolised forgiveness. It ritualised submission to, and identification with, Jesus as Lord. It enacted submission to the representatives of the community, and it prepared the initiate to receive the Spirit. Baptism with water led to a time of prayer, both by the initiate and by a ritual elder(s) who performatively employed prayer and hand-laying to bring about the climactic initiatory experience, the moment of the 'reception' of the Holy Spirit when the initiate would become possessed by the Spirit and utter unlearned speech in an altered state of consciousness. While lower-level leaders such as Philip could administer baptism, only specially gifted leaders, apostles, or 'called' individuals such as Ananias, could administer the Spirit, or in social anthropological terms, could evoke spirit possession.

What, then, is the ritual relationship between immersion and prayer/hand-laying for Spirit impartation? Uro states, 'Drawing on Lawson and McCauley, I formulated a hypothesis that special agent rituals are intuitively sensed as more powerful than rituals with other structural profiles…'.[493] So, is baptism still a special agent ritual in Acts since there it is not as powerful as prayer/hand-laying/Spirit impartation? Yes, it remains a special agent ritual. While prayer/hand-laying/Spirit impartation requires a 'more special' special agent than water baptism, some representative of the exalted Jesus, be it Philip or Ananias or some other disciple (there is no Lukan record of an apostle immersing anyone), still does the baptising. Luke's perspective is corroborated by Paul himself who famously protests that he hardly baptised any of the Corinthians (1 Corinthians 1:14-17). Baptism does not require the same level of performative δύναμις as Spirit impartation, but it remains a special agent ritual in that it maintains the same structural profile of a human agent (the baptiser) acting in the name/authority of a Culturally Postulated Superhuman (CPS) agent (Jesus/the heavenly Christ).

But, if baptism is 'only' symbolic and does not effect the gift of the Spirit, then, according to Lawson and McCauley's restriction of ritual to those acts which 'bring about changes in the religious world',[494] how can it be a special agent ritual? It can be viewed as a special agent ritual in that it effects a change relative both to the group and to the group's deity. It does not complete the transition from outsider to insider, but it is a significant steppingstone. Without a compliant attitude, the initiate cannot experience possession and accompanying ASC glossolalia.

5.3 Spirit Impartation as Performative Ritual

Uro utilises a distinction drawn between the fixed, routinized rituals conducted by someone like a priest in a temple, and those 'rituals' conducted by a shaman. The latter are 'performance-centred', while the former are 'liturgy-centred'.[495] In contrast to liturgy-centred

[492] For discussion of Ritual Form Theory and its special agent, patient, and instrument rituals, see 2.2.6.
[493] Uro, 164.
[494] Robert N. McCauley and E. Thomas Lawson, *Bringing Ritual to Mind: Psychological Foundations of Cultural Forms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 14.
[495] Uro, 108. The discussion of whether Jesus was a 'shaman', while interesting, is tangential to our focus. Cf. Pieter F. Craffert, *The Life of a Galilean Shaman: Jesus of Nazareth in Anthropological-Historical Perspective*

ritual, performance-centred ritual displays 'more improvisation and selection from a wide range of possible scenarios'.[496] Uro cites Jane Atkinson's description of the Wana shamen's performance:

> As a performance-centred ritual, a *mabolong* cannot be described or analysed as a preordained progression of delineated steps to which ritual practitioners and congregants collectively conform. It is rather a repertoire of ritual actions available to performers acting independently in the ritual arena'.[497]

Atkinson emphasises that the performance-centred ritual is 'governed less by liturgy and more by the actions and inclinations of individual practitioners'.[498] This performance vs. liturgy dichotomy 'parallels a distinction between shamanistic and priestly ritual, or between charismatic and routinized religious practice'.[499]

Caroline Humphrey and James Laidlaw elaborate upon Atkinson's performance/liturgy distinction, looking at the matter of efficacy and suggesting that the question, 'Has it worked?' is asked of performance-centred ritual, while the question, 'Have we got it right?' is asked of liturgical ritual.[500] One might think that they mean the ritual audience will know whether a performative ritual worked because the troublesome demon will be exorcised, or the invalid cured. Whereas an audience will believe a liturgical ritual 'worked' if it was performed properly – evidence-based performance vs. 'take it on faith' liturgy.

However, Humphrey and Laidlaw, still drawing upon Atkinson's work, qualify their concept of ritual efficacy in that the idea of shamanic power is created in the interaction between performer and audience. The shamanic performer may select from a variety of apparently supernatural actions, such as fire-eating or self-mutilation with instantaneous healing, which help convince both the performer and the audience of the presence of the supernatural and create the image of the powerful ritualist. However, 'shamanic success is not really defined by control over disease or other afflictions. An excuse or an alternative diagnosis can always be found if a patient dies'.[501] Perhaps Humphrey and Laidlaw's question 'Has it worked?' refers to whether the shamanic séance was duly impressive and not whether it was genuinely efficacious in resolving the problems it purported to set out to solve.

However, Humphrey and Laidlaw may be slightly off the mark. Do they mean to suggest that devotees come to their shamen simply for a good show and not because they believe the shamen are able to effect cures? I suspect not. Rather, the latter is the case. The 'Has it worked?' question should be understood in two senses: genuineness of belief in efficacy and

---

(Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2008); on 'shaman' as a cross-cultural category, see Jeffrey Vadala, 'Cross-Culturally Exploring the Concept of Shamanism', *Human Relations Area Files* (New Haven: Yale University, 2019), 1-12; for arguments opposing Craffert and Vadala, see, Reed Carlson, *Possession and Other Spirit Phenomena in Biblical Literature*, Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard Divinity School (2019), 169. On the continuing utility of social-type analysis see, Oz Almog, 'The Problem of Social Type: A Review', in *Electronic Journal of Sociology* (1998), n.p.

[496] 108.

[497] Uro 108, Jane Monnig Atkinson, *The Art and Politics of Wana Shamanship* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press, 1989), 15.

[498] Atkinson, 14.

[499] 15.

[500] Caroline Humphrey and James Laidlaw, *The Archetypal Actions of Ritual: A Theory of Ritual Illustrated by the Jain Rite of Worship* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 11.

[501] 10.

scientifically measurable efficacy. Devotees genuinely believe their ritualists are effective. Shamen unable to generate belief will gather no following. While it may be true that ritualists will try to explain away their failures, if they do not have sufficient successes, their followers' 'suspension of disbelief' will evaporate.

The definition of 'success' thus becomes relevant. Do devotees believe because of measurable efficacy, that is, in a Western scientific sense? Uro's conclusion is insightful: 'we concede that ritual healings sometimes work, by means of the placebo effect or hypnosis, by focusing on 'illness' instead of 'disease', by using the functional effects of the ASC, by catharsis, 'group therapy' and so forth'.[502] Consequently, actual, measurable success cannot be ignored as a factor in attracting and keeping a following.

Thus, the idea of performance-centred ritual can be applied to the Gospel stories, but with a caveat: the Gospels emphasise the genuine efficacy of Jesus' 'performance'. That is, they present a successful exorcist and a healer who is only hindered when his audience fails to believe. Crowds gathered because they thought that Jesus did in fact exercise 'control over disease or other afflictions'. Following Uro, they doubtless had reason to believe. Jesus is not presented as doing amazing tricks, firewalking and the like, to work up belief in his audience. The walking-on-water is presented as his inner circle glimpsing the secret power of their master, not as a sign for the crowds. As to Humphrey and Laidlaw's question of efficacy, we conclude that Jesus of Nazareth practiced performance-centred ritual in that he was able to persuade large numbers of people, including his political opponents, that he was effective at exorcising demons and curing invalids.

Finally, Uro views Jesus' healing behaviour in terms of 'performative ritual', not because Jesus meets all the criteria associated with 'shamanism', but because Jesus employs a repertoire of healing techniques allowing him a wide variety of performative actions from spiting, to touching, to commanding, etc. In other words, Jesus has no single 'healing ritual'. He has power/mana/authority which he dispenses at will. He has creative variety in performance and he has efficacy. For Jesus' audience, his performance 'works'.

So too, while the early Christian sect had a typical means of imparting the Spirit, namely an apostle would pray and lay hands upon a freshly baptised, and now also persistently praying, initiate, Spirit impartation was fundamentally a performative ritual, not a liturgical ritual. We see five aspects to this performative praxis: location, agency, importunity, efficacy, and variety. As to location, the power resided in the performer, not in the ritual act. Simon the Sorcerer has seen and been persuaded that power is located in the apostles (Acts 8:18). As to agency, the performer dispenses the Spirit as and when he wills (cf. Atkinson's 'inclination'). Simon wants the power to impart the Spirit on whomever he might lay *his* hands (Acts 8:19 τὰς χεῖρας is evidently Simon's hands). Yet, the ritual elder is not the only performing agent. In the cluster of prayer and hand-laying, *both* the initiate and the initiator pray. Early in the sequential development of the Lukan concept of Christian initiation, Jesus teaches on the need for shameless persistence in petitioning for the Spirit. The initiate to the early Christian sect is expected to pray persistently, even importunely, for the Spirit. Thus, the performance of prayer is cooperative. Both initiate and initiator pray. Persistent prayer indicates an expectation of a time element – the initiator may have to do more than simply lay hands upon someone and then move on quickly to the next candidate. He may have to integrate his own prayer and action

[502] Uro, 114.

with the prayer of the supplicant as the two work in tandem to induce possession/ASC glossolalia. Importunity also emphasises the element of desire in the face of delay and difficulty. The candidate must want to become possessed and persist in the initiation ritual despite lack of immediate results.

As to efficacy, Simon, a competent magician himself, has seen and been persuaded that his fellow Samaritans were actually receiving the Holy Spirit.[503] He is rejected, not because he erroneously assumed the apostles had power to impart the Spirit, but because that power to impart the Spirit was 'the gift of God' (τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ), possessed by the apostles Peter and John. Not even Philip the evangelist's hands can impart the Spirit, and Simon's hands are certainly incapable of it.[504]

As to the fifth aspect of early Christian sect performative ritual, variety, hand-laying is constructed as the typical, but not the sole, method of imparting the Spirit. In one example, the power in Peter is so great that his mere presence/preaching is able to bring about spontaneous Spirit reception at Cornelius' house (Acts 10:44). This is consonant with the depiction of Jesus having so much resident power that someone, say a woman with an issue of blood, is able to be healed simply by coming into contact with him without Jesus even exercising his volition (Luke 8:43-48, especially 46, 'I perceive power having gone out from me'; cf. 5:17 'power was present for him to heal', and 6:19, 'power from him was going out and was healing all'). Jesus is a man of mana and so are his apostles men of resident power. Thus, for the early Christian sect, Spirit impartation is performative 'ritual', performative praxis, more shamanistic than priestly, more charismatic than routinised.

5.4 Commitment Signalling Theory: Costly and Charismatic

5.4.1 Religion as a Signal of Commitment: Irons, Sosis and Bressler

In 2001, William Irons argued that religion is 'a hard-to-fake sign of commitment'.[505] Thus, strange and otherwise deleterious religious behaviours can be explained by their evolutionary ability signal a genuine social compact thereby increasing the survivability of the group. For example, impeccable honesty may not always serve the immediate best interests of an individual, however, a reputation for such honesty builds trust upon which a cohesive society can be established. So too, Irons cites the regular five-times-a-day public prayers, as practiced by the Yomut Turkmen of northern Iran among whom he lived, as a reliable signal that practitioners are trustworthy members of the in-group.

Others have built upon Irons' thought. Richard Sosis and Eric R. Bressler sought to test it with empirical data by analysing eighty-three 19th century American communes, comparing the level of costly requirements within the commune with the rate of commune survival.[506] Sosis and Bressler's work did not confirm that costly signalling *simpliciter* automatically improves

[503] The implied reader, reading sequentially through the narrative, knows that Simon saw recipients of the Spirit dissociating and speaking in tongues – ASC glossolalia.

[504] So too, Ananias tells Saul that Jesus sent him that he, Saul, might receive the Spirit; viz., the Spirit did not come automatically in response to Saul's faith, but was mediated through Ananias (Acts 8:17).

[505] William Irons, 'Religion as a Hard-to-Fake Sign of Commitment' in Randolph M. Nesse, ed., *Evolution and the Capacity for Commitment* (New York: The Russell Sage Foundation, 2001), 292-309.

[506] Richard Sosis and Eric R. Bressler, 'Cooperation and Commune Longevity: A Test of the Costly Signaling Theory of Religion', *CCR* Vol. 37 No. 2 (May 2003), 211-239. Cf. Richard Sosis' earlier article, 'Religion and Intragroup Cooperation: Preliminary Results of a Comparative Analysis of Utopian Communities', *CCR* Vol. 3 No. 1 (February 2000), 70-87.

commune longevity. Rather they found that costly signalling, when combined with religious belief, increases longevity. In drawing conclusions, they integrated Roy Rappaport's work on ritual and Ultimate Sacred Postulates (e.g. 'Jesus is the Son of God' or 'The Buddha has achieved enlightenment'), noting that Rappaport distinguishes between secular and religious rituals, that he links religious ritual with numinous religious experience, and that convincing religious emotional experience is linked with the verification/sanctification of non-falsifiable religious postulates.[507]

5.4.2 Rappaport on Religion, Ritual, Truth, and Emotion

Let us look more closely at what Rappaport states. As Sosis and Bressler observe, he first distinguishes secular and religious ritual, the latter being demarcated by the quality of 'sacredness'. What does he mean by 'sacred'? 'I take the term *sacred* to refer to the quality of unquestionable truthfulness imputed by the faithful to unverifiable propositions'.[508] Rappaport goes on to note the implication of sacred discourse for society: 'human organization could not have come into existence, or persisted, in the absence of ultimate sacred propositions and the sanctification of discourse'.[509] Sanctified discourse, 'in turn is rooted in ritual',[510] and ritual is linked to emotion. Rappaport emphasises the link between emotional religious experience and a religious symbol:

> sacred propositions, which are unfalsifiable because their terms are nonmaterial, are supported by emotions, which are material (they reflect actual psychological-physiological states) but, because nondiscursive, also unfalsifiable.[511]

Rappaport's discussion can be applied directly to dissociative glossolalia in early Christian sect initiation. The initiate can be certain of the reality of his God and the unquestionable sacredness of the teachings of his God because he experiences possession by his God – an event charged with emotion and non-discursive utterance. The utterances are nondiscursive from the initiate's perspective, as he has not learned them and cannot consciously employ them in conversation. Yet, the sacrality of the utterances is confirmed to him by other individuals who claim to know what he is saying, to recognise his 'language', or who are able to confirm that he is uttering 'language' in the same sacred fashion as the group.

What social mechanisms are involved in this second phenomenon of 'recognition' of the sacred language? On one level, this is a ritualised acceptance of the initiate by the group – we can confirm he is one of us because we recognise him speaking in our idiolect, or speaking after our fashion, and this must then be a sacred, divine act. There is a need to recognise the initiate in some way, and recognition of the 'language' meets this need. On another level, this is the group, which may, at that moment, *not* be experiencing possession – they are watching the initiate become possessed – but they are sacralising their beliefs vicariously through the possession experience of the initiate.

---

[507] They cite: Roy Rappaport, 'The Sacred in Human Evolution', *ARES* (1971), 2, 23-44, esp. 29, 31; Roy Rappaport, 'The Obvious Aspects of Ritual', Roy Rappaport, ed., *Ecology, Meaning, and Religion* (Richmond, CA: North Atlantic Books, 1979), 173-221; Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*.
[508] Rappaport, 'The Sacred', 29.
[509] Rappaport, 'The Sacred', 29.
[510] Rappaport, 'The Sacred', 31.
[511] Rappaport, 'The Sacred', 31.

5.4.3 'Supernatural' Values and the Cost of Cohesiveness: Lukan Finances and Israeli Kibbutzim

We return now to Sosis and Bressler. While non-religious communes may level costly requirements upon their members, those requirements are not linked with a sacred, divine concept and thus tend to be viewed as arbitrary. Even treasured Marxist maxims such as 'from each according to his ability to each according to his need', because they are not anchored in the non-falsifiable supernatural realm, can be brought into question through disastrous economic events, as has happened with the Israeli kibbutzim.[512] Religious requirements, though onerous, make sense to participants and are linked to immutable, eternal verities. Moreover, communication with religious ritual is unlike that with secular ritual: 'Trust emerges because participants direct their ritual efforts toward the same deity or spirit'.[513]

Sosis and Bressler argue that, if Rappaport is correct in linking ritual to the sanctification of religious postulates, and if they are correct in identifying sanctified ritual requirements as uniquely able to facilitate cooperation among religionists, then, 'we are likely to see a correlation between the cohesiveness of a religion's adherents and theological reliance on the supernatural', and thus, 'rationalistic' Liberal Protestantism is less likely to facilitate in-group 'trust and cooperation' than 'otherworldly' Pentecostals.[514]

This is relevant for understanding early Christian sect growth. By employing a highly experiential, possession-type initiation ritual, primitive Christianity was able to establish the trust and cooperation needed to allow for the easy exchange of finances among group members. Naturally, breach of trust was punished by the same Spirit that enabled it (cf. Ananias and Sapphira). Here, John Barclay has emphasised the role of Church networks for financial exchange.[515] However, it is religious emotion which formed the basis of trust and cooperation among early Christians allowing for the flow of finances which Barclay describes. Thus, with trust, cooperation, and financial vitality, the Jesus followers were able to swiftly propagate themselves across the Roman Empire.

In a later article, Sosis further substantiates his earlier work, pointing out that, as of 2004, while the more than two hundred and seventy secular kibbutzim in Israel are more than four billion dollars in debt, the less than twenty religious kibbutzim, possessed of numerous practices which to the secular mind appear useless, have remained financially stable. Employing a game-style test that measured cooperation, Sosis found that synagogue attendance positively correlated with cooperation for male kibbutz members,[516] thus suggesting that the religious kibbutzim survived precisely because they were religious. Concomitantly, Sosis has elsewhere argued that belief reduces the 'cost' of costly signalling. Thus, a vow of silence seems awful to an unbeliever, but to the believer this is a happy opportunity to fulfil spiritual obligations.[517]

---

[512] Sosis and Bressler, 229.
[513] 230.
[514] 231.
[515] John Barclay, 'Benefit Networks in Pauline Churches: Practice and Theology', British New Testament Conference Plenary Paper, 2019.
[516] Richard Sosis, 'The Adaptive Value of Religious Ritual' *AS* 92 (March-April 2004), 166-172; 170-171. The Kibbutz financial crisis, which began in the 1980s, is well studied. Cf. Joe Brinkley, 'Debts Make Israelis Rethink an Ideal: The Kibbutz', *The New York Times*, March 5, 1989; Ashkenazi, Maayan Hess, and Yossi Katz, 'From Cooperative to Renewed Kibbutz: The Case of Kibbutz 'Galil', Israel', *MES* Vol. 45 No. 4 (2009), 571-92.
[517] Richard Sosis, 'Why Aren't We all Hutterites? Costly Signally Theory and Religious Behavior', *HN* Vol. 14 Issue 2 (June 2003), 91-127; 108.

Belief then, is crucial. People engage in religious behaviours because they believe, not because they think that it will facilitate social cooperation, even though it accomplishes the latter.

5.4.4 Charismatic Signalling and CREDs – T'ongsong Kido, Repressed Han, and Worship in 'David's Tent'

Others have built on the basic theory of commitment signalling. Joseph Bulbulia notes that emotions can be a signal of religious/altruistic commitment.[518] He argues that religionists synchronise activity on a large scale by giving off, not necessarily costly signals, but nevertheless diverse and strong, i.e. 'charismatic', signals through music, architecture, bodily replication of external rhythms (entrainment), and altered states of consciousness.[519] Thus, Charismatic Signalling is to be distinguished from Costly Signalling – it costs something to get in, but once you are in, the charismatic vibe synchronises you with the group. A further 'signalling' behaviour is identified by Joseph Henrich who argues that credibility enhancing displays (CREDs) evolved to persuade learners that religious teachers were genuine. Thus, if a religious teacher were celibate, or a martyr, his teaching has more credibility because it seems less likely that he is teaching the religion for personal benefit.[520] Thus, once you pay to get in and you are synchronised with your fellows, you are then oriented towards a leader.

Contemporary cases of 'glossolalic signalling' may serve, not as anachronistic impositions upon our conception of ancient Christian worship, but as *heuristic* tools for exploring possibilities. For example, might not the congregational 'singing in the Spirit' at a Catholic charismatic prayer meeting[521] illumine the ancient practice of Paul who himself would 'sing' in the spirit? Luhrmann, in her study of the Vineyard Church, briefly mentions tongues speech. Among the Vineyardists, Luhrmann found glossolalia to be a learned behaviour: 'It is a skill – people talk about learning to speak in tongues and teaching others to speak in tongues – but it also has an uncontrolled, dissociative quality.'[522] This Vineyard practice of teaching tongues speech is distinct from the Lukan presentation of glossolalia as sudden, invasive, and unlearned. The two practices need not be viewed as conflicting data, but simply as different combinations of the social and biological aspects of glossolalia. Luhrmann's subjects can be situated more towards the socially constructed end of the continuum, while the Lukan experience maps onto a raw, biologically rooted phenomenon.

We will draw upon the fresh, extensive research of Harkness on glossolalia within the South Korean Protestant context. Harness understands glossolalia anthropologically as: 'cultural semiosis that is said to contain, and can therefore be justified by, and ideological core of language, but that in fact is produced at the ideological limits of language.'[523] This necessary ideological core is the practitioners' belief that glossolalia is 'real language'. The social reality is that practitioners recognise and attempt to process the fact that sometimes glossolalia does not appear to be genuine. In other words, Harkness is dealing with a problem, known in literary terms as 'the suspension of disbelief'.[524] Glossolalic speakers exist in tension between

[518] Joseph Bulbulia, 'Religious Costs as Adaptations that Signal Altruistic Intention', *EC* Vol. 10, No. 1 (2004), 19-42; 27.
[519] Joseph Bulbulia, 'Charismatic Signalling', *JSRNC* Vol. 3 No. 4 (December 2009), 518-551; 545.
[520] Henrich, 'The evolution of costly displays, cooperation and religion', 244-260.
[521] Cf., Csordas, *Language, Charisma, and Creativity*, 113.
[522] Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back*, 24.
[523] Harkness, *Glossolalia*, 43. Cf. Douglas Davies' emphasis upon a 'social context' interpretation of charismatic glossolalia, in Douglas Davies, 'Social Groups, Liturgy and Glossolalia', *Ch* Vol. 90 No. 3 (1976), 193-205; 203.
[524] Cf. Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back*, 321.

believing in the supernatural origin of their utterances and doubting that sacralising framework. In a population where glossolalia is ubiquitous, Harkness found a variety of resolutions to this tension, with some whole-heartedly committing themselves to the practice and others acknowledging its presence but remaining sceptical. Luke, too, emphasises both the genuineness of glossolalia – his Pentecost story includes a list of nations that 'understood' the tongues-speaking – and the familiar alterity of glossolalia – the Cornelius episode allows glossolalia to go uninterpreted and unrecognised other than in its character as a God-magnifying phenomenon.

Harkness also notes the role of glossolalia as a contact point, a mediating element, between devotees and deity – even a source of what he terms as 'fusion' – all the while creating fear and suspicion for some Koreans, reminding them of similar experiences in shamanism.[525] Yet, Harkness argues, socially engaged glossolalic prayer generates sacred space.

> The cacophony produced by groups of people praying together suppresses the audibility of individual speech sounds, opening up private communicative spaces for individuals to engage in focused, intimate, even secret communication with the deity.[526]

At the same time, Harkness observes that in intercessory prayer, group members are actively signalling to each other.

> Cacophonous glossolalia allows the prayerful to disconnect from others denotationally while connecting with others through a broader, covert set of pragmatic processes ritually organized into poetic form.[527]

Where, one might ask, is the 'poetry' in Korean prayer? Harkness suggests glossolalia may 'allow the prayerful to tune in intersubjectively with others quasi-musically, through pitch, rhythm, and tempo, below the level of awareness.'[528] In typical Korean-style prayer (*t'ongsong kido*), believers gather in groups and all cry out loudly together. This can be a small prayer meeting of 10 to 15, or a congregation of 12,000.[529] The intense exertion of intercessory energy has a coordinating group-effect so that what may sound like utter chaos to an outsider is earnest, sincere 'flow' to an insider. If someone gets 'out of the flow' – praying too loudly, or otherwise incorrectly – the others are alert to that and may take corrective action.[530]

Not only does corporate glossolalia create a sacred social space, it generates a sense of presence in and through that space – the transcendent becomes immanent. Harkness writes of:

> how the compounded unintelligibility of glossolalia and cacophony could be ritually transformed into an experience of contact with the divine. The process of producing this contact is so thickly mediated by social action that the mediation

[525] Harkness, *Glossolalia*, 43.
[526] 46.
[527] 63.
[528] 63.
[529] As in the Yoido Full Gospel Church main sanctuary on any given Sunday morning, a phenomenon which I have personally witnessed.
[530] Harkness, *Glossolalia*, 57.

itself could seem to disappear, generating an impression of unmediated, absolute spiritual presence.[531]

Harkness' examination of the mediating function of group glossolalia will be taken up further in our discussion of mediation below in section 5.8.5. At this point we will simply ask, whether Korean *t'ongsong kido*, the cacophonic yet harmonious blend of personal intercession and group unity, might tell us something about Luke's concept of the gathered believers, passionately lifting up their voices to God?[532] This is not to require that Luke's community were proto-Koreans. It is to suggest that when Luke emphasises glossolalia, and then goes on to describe the unifying power of group prayer, we may have encountered a similar phenomenon. In terms of emotional habitus, the Korean experience of successive foreign invasion, oppression, and lamentation, emotionally conceptualised in the term *han* and expressed in *t'ongsong kido*, maps well onto the Lukan *leitmotif* of persecution and martyrdom.[533] The social fact of group glossolalia, its power to coordinate and inspire, even to transport, participants beyond suffering and persecution into successful religious ventures, suggests that we ought not underestimate its focalised presence in the Lukan narrative.

Moreover, the phenomenon of intense, charismatic group prayer has been noted in other cultures. Yen-zen Tsai discusses the identity structuring function, both of 'the symphonic effect of glossolalia' and of physical bodily manifestations such as shaking, among Chinese adherents to the True Jesus Church.[534] As Csordas points out with respect to 'loud vocalization and hand clapping' among Catholic charismatics, 'Charismatics have rediscovered a virtually universal connection between sound and spirituality first formulated by Rodney Needham'.[535] Needham writes, 'why is noise that is produced by striking or shaking so widely used in order to communicate with the other world?'[536] He addresses all sorts of percussion instruments and specifically includes hand clapping.[537] Csordas draws carefully upon Needham to interpret the use of sound in worship generally, 'loud praise effects a transition from a collectivity of selves to a single people'.[538]

All of these aspects of corporate glossolalia can be applied to early Christian sect initiation ritual and to the ongoing prayer sessions which Luke envisions as uniting Jew and Gentile in a renewed 'David's Worship Tent'. Becoming inebriated and uttering nonsense syllables in public is initially a 'costly signal', but, when everyone is doing it, glossolalic ASCs are a synchronising charismatic signal. When your leader can induce ASCs in group members at will, that functions as a credibility enhancing display. Yet, belief that these are divine experiences helps to alleviate the aspects of humiliation and embarrassment during initiation. Cacophonic glossolalia's ability to generate within a specific social space a palpable sense of divine presence maps onto the Lukan claim that the tent of David – an ancestral locus of the

---

[531] 65.
[532] See also Nicholas Harkness, 'Glossolalia and Cacophony in South Korea: Cultural Semiosis at the Limits of Language', *AE* Vol. 44 No. 3 (2017), 476–489.
[533] Cf. MyungSil Kim, Female Images of God in Christian Worship in the Spirituality of TongSungGiDo of the Korean Church (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2014), 1.
[534] Yen-zen Tsai, 'Glossolalia and Church Identity: The Role of Sound in the Making of a Chinese Pentecostal-Charismatic Church', in Fenggang Yang, Joy K. C. Tong, and Allan H. Anderson, eds., *Global Chinese Pentecostal and Charismatic Christianity* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2017), 137-157; 152, 145.
[535] Csordas, Language, Charisma, and Creativity, 109.
[536] Rodney Needham, 'Percussion and Transition', *MNS* Vol. 2 No. 4 (December 1967), 606-614; 606.
[537] 607.
[538] Csordas, *Language, Charisma, and Creativity*, 109.

sacred – is restored in the interracial mix of Jew and Gentile united in glossolalic worship. When Christians pray in tongues together they synchronise their intercessory activity, they express the deepest emotions of oppression, and they generate social/psychological power to persevere through persecution and to propagate their beliefs. Above all, they fuse together diverse ethnic groups into a single, worshipping body.[539]

5.4.5 'Impossible to Fake' – Dissociative Glossolalia and Indexicality

5.4.5.1 Defining Terms: Rappaport, Uro, and Luke

In terms of Charismatic Signalling, it is not hard to understand initiatory glossolalia as a cooperative signal marking out that the initiate has become one of the group. But, what of Commitment Signalling Theory (CST)? According to CST, costly rituals may be employed by a group to signal the commitment, particularly the genuineness of the commitment, of the individual to the group. High-cost rituals are difficult to fake. But what if a signal was impossible to fake? Uro draws upon Roy Rappaport's discussion of indexical signals: 'the sign brings the state of affairs into being…and having brought it into being cannot help but indicate it'.[540] Uro points out that indexicality equates to being '*impossible-to-fake*'.[541]

In Luke's emic understanding, tongues-speech is indexical of Spirit reception. To receive the Holy Spirit is to dissociate and speak in tongues. But though Luke qualifies proper tongues speaking as something which must magnify God (Acts 10:46), thus indicating that there might be counterfeits, he never directly discusses someone trying to 'fake' baptism in the Holy Spirit. However, he does recount an attempt by non-believers to exorcise a demon by invoking Jesus' name. There (Acts 19:14-17), the demon does not recognise the non-Christian exorcists and proceeds to attack them. The basic emic idea is that in the spirit world, realities are transparent, and genuineness is readily determined (cf. Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5). But what of an etic perspective? Could someone, an actor perhaps, impersonate a tongues-speaker? Is tongues-speech really indexical?

5.4.5.2 The Spirit-Possession Factor – A Sliding Scale of Control

Spirit possession manifesting in ASC glossolalia can indeed be viewed as a high-cost signal of commitment, even as an indexical sign that the individual in question is genuinely committed to the group. Why would that be? How could something so simple (and apparently imitable) as babbling in language-like speech be a 'high cost, indexical signal of commitment'? First, it involves not just 'babbling', but dissociation and spirit possession, an altered state of consciousness in which an alternate personality/agency assumes some degree of control of an individual. Certainly not all tongues speech, ancient or modern, would fall under Emma Cohen's category of 'executive possession'.[542] Paul, in fact, instructs devotees to control their

---

[539] The corporate fusion which Luke presents is part of the ongoing prayer life of the community and is distinct from the initiation process, which can be either individual, as with the Samaritans, Saul, and the Ephesian Twelve, or corporate, as at Pentecost and Cornelius' house.

[540] Roy A. Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 108.

[541] 132, original italics.

[542] Cf. Cohen, 'What is Spirit Possession?'. Cohen advances the discussion from Erika Bourguignon's categories of 'possession trance' and 'possession', proposing two categories of 'executive possession' and 'pathogenic possession' and arguing that possession is fundamentally a cognitive phenomenon of the human brain, hence, it has cross-cultural elements. Cf. Erika Bourguignon, *Possession* (Prospect Heights: IL: Waveland Press, Inc., 1991 [1976]).

congregational tongues speaking with the admonition that if there is no interpreter they must remain silent in the church and simply speak to themselves and to God (1 Corinthians 14:28). Paul also states that when he prays in a tongue, his spirit prays (τὸ πνεῦμά μου προσεύχεται 1 Corinthians 14:14a). He immediately contrasts this with his mind which remains 'unfruitful' (ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου ἄκαρπός ἐστιν 14:14b), indicating by the parallel that he is not speaking of 'his spirit' in terms of a familiar spirit that possesses him, but simply of his own self, his own *pneuma*. Luke, in contrast to Paul, seems more liberal, depicting his tongues speakers as publicly flaunting their drunken glossolalia. Yet Luke also reins in that initial exuberance with sober speeches from his main characters.

Thus, within the concept of executive possession, the phenomenon can occur as a cooperative event in which both the original personality and the new personality work together. Luke emphasises the invasive 'taking control' at both Pentecost and Cornelius' house, where devotees begin, uncoached, to utter glossolalia and to do so with disregard for their surroundings – i.e., they have dissociated, they are in an ASC. This is more on the 'executive control' side of the spectrum. Yet he also emphasises his apostles and preachers speaking as oracles of God. We see this in his use of ἀποφθέγγομαι, a word having connotations of oracular speech, which is used not only for the 120 speaking in tongues, Acts 2:4, but also for both Peter and Paul's non-glossolalic speaking: Acts 2:14 and 26:25. Here the hosts' conscious agency is not obliterated, nor side-lined entirely, but experiences cooperative affiliation with the other spirit agency. That is, Luke depicts an initial 'excited' glossolalia shifting into a calm, Spirit imbued 'flow' in known language. This suggests that Lukan initiates learned to harness the glossolalia, a process of socialisation. This would be in line with Luhrmann's research discussed above (5.4.4).

While ongoing experience may be more cooperative, the initiatory experience in Luke's presentation is viewed as more executive. Initiates experience possession and begin, untaught by human interlocutors, to utter tongues speech. This executive possession experience is, in Luke's ritual world, what had transpired among the apostles, and new initiates can only be validated if their experience matches that of the apostles. At Pentecost, the element that Luke taught his implied reader that converts would receive upon baptism was not audible wind or visible fire, but tongues speech whose content was τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ ('the great things of God', Acts 2:11) and whose speakers appeared inebriated (2:13). Then later at Cornelius' House, Luke focalises tongues speech and magnification of God as the common denominator between Cornelius' House and Pentecost (Acts 10:46). As at Pentecost, with its 'drunken' tongues-speakers, Cornelius and friends interrupt an honoured guest with outbursts of tongues (Acts 10:44-46). That is not normal behaviour; that is dissociative behaviour. Luke prescribes dissociative tongues with a God magnifying element as what a ritual elder looks for to validate an initiate's entry into the community. The initiate must have the same essential experience as the apostles had, and as the initiating ritual elder has. This is Whitehouse's imagistic mode at work (cf. 2.2.6). Vivid spirit-possession/ASC experiences are passed down from generation to generation of initiates.

We return to the idea of spirit possession and ASC glossolalia as a hard to fake commitment signalling ritual. Luke expected a ritual elder to be able to identify genuine Spirit reception by dissociative glossolalia that magnified God (Acts 10:46). That last part, magnifying God, is open to interpretation as to its mode, for, at Cornelius' house, there is no list of nations (as on

Pentecost) who understood the tongues of the Gentiles. So, whether it is by facial expression, tone of voice, body posture, words spoken in a known language, or some combination of signals, the initiator is expected to recognise that the initiate speaking in tongues is, in fact, magnifying YHWH. So, in order to 'fake' Spirit reception, an initiate would have to self-induce an ASC and then behave and/or speak in such a way as to convince a seasoned ASC practitioner/glossolalist that they were speaking in tongues in the traditional fashion of the sect and that they were magnifying God.

This is not to say that a trained actor could not, after carefully observing sectarian glossolalia, mimic that verbal expression and even utter the occasional 'praise the Lord!'. However, it is to say that such an actor would need to do more than produce free vocalisation. He would have to replicate the sectarian emotional 'tone', as well as imitate the characteristic bodily manifestations of the specific local variant of spirit possession (e.g., the typical 'head flick' that one might see at a folk Pentecostal meeting). The actor would need to do all this under the watchful eyes of experienced ritual elders (i.e., the 'oldtimers') who are concerned to maintain undisturbed the 'flow of the Spirit' (i.e., the proper religious mood). Anyone who gets 'out of the Spirit' is considered to be disturbing the meeting and thereby constitutes a direct challenge to the elders' spiritual authority. Those same elders are, through long experience, alert to 'demonic' manifestations. If an actor does not get everything right, he might find himself the object of a deliverance session.[543]

Perhaps a talented actor could mimic the sectarian tone and successfully deceive the initiators, but most people do not have such skills. Moreover, this begs the questions of how an ancient impersonator could get close enough to a Pauline Christ-group or to a Lukan assembly to study their behaviour long enough to successfully copy it. Paul gives instructions about not speaking in tongues in front of 'outsiders' (ἰδιῶται ἢ ἄπιστοι – 1 Corinthians 14:23, though, apparently a controlled manifestation of tongues and interpretation was permitted, cf. 14:27-28), and Luke warns readers not to fake spiritual power (Acts 19:13-17). Thus, the spirit possession/ASC glossolalia cluster *pragmatically* functions, within the ancient context, to demonstrate the genuineness of conversion. It is an 'honest' signal in that it is indexical.[544]

For someone not trying to 'fake it', ASC glossolalia is moderately costly in that it involves an element of humiliation – one must utter strings of unknown words and phrases. One must become 'inebriated' in the Spirit. Naturally, the cost of humiliation is offset by the benefit of acceptance into the group. Furthermore, and relative to a higher level of cost, it involves trust, submission, acceptance, and cooperation. The initiate must trust the ritual elder who induces the ASC glossolalia, submit to the elder's ministrations, accept spirit possession and cooperate with the spirit. This involves trust that the 'Spirit' will not do the initiate harm, an issue that concerns Luke and which he addresses in Luke 11:11, where serpents and scorpions stand for evil spirits as per 10:19-20.[545] In trusting, submitting, accepting, and cooperating, an initiate is demonstrating characteristics valuable to group cohesion and survival. The initiate is also acquiring the skill set, namely, the ability to cooperate with the Spirit to produce ASC glossolalia, that will be useful in the corporate worship/prayer activities of the group. Uro recognises this in his discussion of high-arousal rituals in Corinth. The evidence from Paul

[543] Cf. the incident witnessed by Lynn, 'Wrong Holy Ghost', 231.
[544] For discussion of 'honest signalling' in biology, see C.D. FitzGibbon and J.H. Fanshawe, 'Stotting in Thomson's gazelles: an honest signal of condition', *BES* 23 (1988), 68-74.
[545] Cf. Turner, *Power from on High*, 339.

seems 'to support the view that prophecy and glossolalia, along with other emotional rituals in the Pauline assemblies, functioned as cooperative signals'.[546] Furthermore, 'Glossolalia … is a particularly striking example of a ritual that evokes synchronized arousal'.[547]

5.5 Identity Fusion in the Early Christian Sect: Understanding Social Bonds Among the Early Christians

Identity fusion is a social theory which is used to understand extreme pro-group behaviour, for instance, in Libyan revolutionaries, among English and Brazilian football fans, and with Moroccan volunteer fighters for the Islamic State.[548] According to Luke, the early Christians sacrificed their property, their comforts, and sometimes their lives to follow the Way.[549] Exemplarity indicates that Luke expected his audience to model themselves after his heroes. Could Luke have been propagating identity fusion in the early Christian sect?

5.5.1 Defining Identity Fusion: Mingling the Personal and Social Selves

Social theorists have long observed, not just in Western, individualistic societies, but in a variety of geographically diverse, communally oriented societies, that humans are bipartite – the personal self has an identity, a name, a body, an expressive will; the social self is entangled in relationships with surrounding society, belonging to country x, to political party y, to religious association z. We are, as it were, 'dividual'.[550] The two selves are often opposed and antagonistic, with one 'self' dominating the other. In a process termed 'identification', the

[546] Uro, 152.
[547] 152.
[548] Harvey Whitehouse, Brian McQuinn, Michael Buhrmester, and William B. Swann Jr., 'Brothers in Arms: Libyan Revolutionaries Bond Like Family', *PNAS* Vol. 111 No. 50 (December 2014), 17783-17785. Scott Atran, Hammad Sheikh, and Angel Gomez, 'Devoted Actors Sacrifice for Close Comrades and Sacred Cause', *PNAS* Vol. 111 No. 50 (December 2014), 17702-17703. Harvey Whitehouse, 'Dying for the Group: Towards a General Theory of Extreme Self-Sacrifice', *BBS* 41, e192 (2018), 1–62. Martha Newson, 'Football, Fan Violence, and Identity Fusion', *IRSS* Vol. 54 Issue 4 (2019), 431-444. Scott Atran, Hammad Sheikh, Ángel Gómez, 'For Cause and Comrade: Devoted Actors and Willingness to Fight', *CJQHCE* Vol. 5 Issue 1 (2014), 41-57.
[549] The term, 'the Way' was also used by the sectarian Essene community. Cf., Simon J. Joseph, *Jesus, the Essenes, and Christian Origins: New Light on Ancient Texts and Communities* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 164-165.
[550] Referencing Luke-Acts specifically, see Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, 'First-Century Personality: Dyadic, Not Individual', in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 67-96. Reaching further back, cf. William James, *The Principles of Psychology* Vol. I (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1890), 292-296; 400-401. James discusses two basic divisions of the self: the 'empirical me' and the 'pure ego'. The former is composed of three parts: the material self, the social self, and the spiritual self; the latter, the 'I', is the stream of conscious thought, an epiphenomenon of the functioning brain. James toys with the idea that the epiphenomenal thought is also the 'thinker'. If so, then for James, the limits of psychology's ability have been reached. Cf. Émile Durkheim, 'The Dualism of Human Nature and its Social Conditions', in Kurt H Wolff, ed., *Emile Durkheim, 1858-1917: A Collection of Essays, with Translations and a Bibliography* (Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press, 1960), 325-340; 328. More recently, McKim Marriott, 'Hindu Transactions: Diversity Without Dualism', in Bruce Kapferer, ed., *Transaction and Meaning: Directions in the Anthropology of Exchange and Symbolic Behavior* (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1976), 109-142. Marilyn Strathern, *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988). Sabine Hess, 'Strathern's Melanesian 'Dividual' and the Christian 'Individual': A Perspective from Vanua Lava, Vanuatu', *Oc* Vol. 76 No. 3 (November 2006), 285-296. Benjamin R. Smith, 'Sorcery and the Dividual in Australia', *JRAI* Vol. 22 Issue 3 (September 2016), 670-687.

personal self may, to varying degrees, be overshadowed, or even completely obliterated, by the group to which it has affinity.[551] But identification is not identity fusion.

What then is identity fusion? In their seminal article, Swann et al. write:

> Identity fusion occurs when people experience a visceral feeling of oneness with a group. The union with the group is so strong among highly fused persons that the boundaries that ordinarily demarcate the personal and social self become highly permeable. In fact, these boundaries become so permeable that aspects of both the personal and social self can readily flow into the other.[552]

Fused individuals are thus willing to personally sacrifice for the group and for other individual group members. Fused persons understand both that the group is an integral part of who they are, and that they are equally integral to the group.[553]

5.5.2 Distinguishing Characteristics of Identity Fusion: Principles and Emotions

Swann, et al. identify four principles that distinguish identity fusion from mere identification:

1) First is the 'agentic-personal-self principle'. This emphasises that in fusion, unlike identification, the personal self is not side-lined, or depersonalised, but works synergistically with the social self.
2) Second is the 'identity synergy principle' that pro-group activity is pushed synergistically by both the personal and the social self.
3) Third is the 'relational ties principle' which notes that in identity fusion, individuals bond with other individuals not just because they belong to the same group, but also because of the unique individual characteristics of the others. Thus, the relational ties are doubly strong.
4) Fourth is the 'irrevocability principle' that fused persons remain fused regardless of social context and usually remain fused for the long-term.[554]

Four more principles can be added that characterise identity fusion generally:

5) Fifth is invulnerability. Fused individuals project their fusion onto other group members, assuming that the others are just as committed to the group as they are. This 'will foster the perception of reciprocal strength, wherein highly fused individuals will perceive that the group is not only extremely powerful, but invulnerable due to the combined effect of personal and group agency'.[555]

---

[551] Henri Tajfel and John Turner, 'An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict', in William G. Austin and Stephen Worchel, ed., *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1979), 33-47; 34-35. For the 'Social Identity Perspective', cf. Tom Postmes and Nyla R. Brandscombe, *Rediscovering Social Identity* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 357. For application of identity theory to Biblical studies, cf., J. Brian Tucker and Coleman A. Baker, eds., *T&T Clark Handbook to Social Identity in the New Testament* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014); Fox, *Hermeneutics of Social Identity*.

[552] William B. Swann Jr., Ángel Gómez, Jolanda Jetten, Harvey Whitehouse, and Brock Bastian, 'When Group Membership Gets Personal: A Theory of Identity Fusion', *PR* Vol. 119 No. 3 (2012), 441-456; 442.

[553] 442.

[554] 442-444.

[555] 443.

6) Sixth is destiny. Fused persons possess 'a collective sense of invincibility and special destiny, especially when the collective is conceived as a small tight-knit group of fictive kin'.[556]
7) Seventh is spatial diversity. Fusion can take place locally, as in a sports team, a military unit, or a small tribe. It can also take place by extension, when a person experiences fusion based upon some common feature of a large entity, such as an ethnic group comprised of millions, or an ideology. When both local fusion and extended fusion combine it encourages pro-group behaviour sometimes resulting in, 'unusually bold and potentially dangerous actions on behalf of the group'.[557]
8) Eighth is emotion, an aspect of several of the features listed above. In addition to the flagship emotion of feeling viscerally one with the group, Swann et al. note that fused persons exhibit feelings of certainty vs. uncertainty, agency vs. anxiety, and invulnerability vs. fear of death.[558] To this can be added, as per Atran in point six above, feelings of destiny.

5.5.3 Determining the Presence of Identity Fusion: Emotions and Associated Behaviours

Can we know whether identity fusion was occurring in the early Christian sect? Obviously, we are unable to directly observe sectarian behaviour, or conduct qualitative measurements of early Christian emotions. However, as emotions are essential to identity fusion, we can evaluate Luke's teaching on emotions for signs that he was encouraging fusion. As it turns out, five emotions which characterise fused individuals – visceral oneness with the group, invulnerability, certainty, agency, and destiny – are all salient in Luke's teaching along with associated pro-group behaviour.

5.5.3.1 A Visceral Sense of Oneness with the Group

The primary emotion for identity fusion is the feeling of visceral oneness with a group. Luke presents this in his community life summaries and in his use of the term ὁμοθυμαδὸν.

5.5.3.1.1 The Function of Luke's Narrative Summaries

At four key narrative junctures, Luke provides summaries of community life.[559] The first case, Acts 1:13-14, depicts preparation for the coming of the Spirit. In the second two cases, Acts 2:42-47; 4:32-37, the summaries follow corporate outpourings of the Holy Spirit. The last summary (5:11-16) follows a powerful disciplinary action of the Holy Spirit preserving the integrity of the assembly.

Ernst Haenchen, noting Luke's use of πάντα κοινά (cf. 2:42, 4:32 – NA 28 reads ἅπαντα κοινά) and observing its similarity to a phrase employed by Plato and Aristotle, κοινὰ τὰ τῶν φίλων, writes: 'In short, Luke is here suggesting that the primitive Church also realized the Greek communal ideal!'[560] Eckhard Plümacher argues that Luke sought, 'to show, that something which, among the Greeks counted as a characteristic of the golden age or of a philosophical

[556] Atran, 'Devoted Actors Sacrifice', 17702.
[557] Swann et al., 'When Group Membership Gets Personal', 443.
[558] 451.
[559] Cf. Henry J. Cadbury, 'The Summaries in Acts', in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, The Acts of the Apostles* (London: Macmillan, 1920-1933), 392-402; 402. Maria Anicia Co, 'The Major Summaries in Acts: Acts 2,42-47; 4,32-35; 5,12-16, Linguistic and Literary Relationship', *ETL* Vol. 68 Issue 1 (April 1992), 49-85. Other depictions of community life are found elsewhere in Acts, e.g., 13:1-3 and 13:52.
[560] Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971 [German 14th edition, 1965], 233.

utopia, had also characterised the primitive times of the Christian Church'.[561] David L. Mealand finds Luke using slogans of Greek utopian literature, such as 'to consider nothing ἴδιον', as well as an Acts 4:34 allusion to Deuteronomy 15:4 LXX – there are no ἐνδεής among the believers.[562]

Mitchell challenges this utopian approach, arguing that Luke writes, not about replicating the Greek golden age, but about friendship. While drawing upon classic phrases like, ἅπαντα κοινά and ψυχὴ μία, Luke does not link himself to any particular Greek philosophical school. Rather, he subverts the Graeco-Roman reciprocity ethic by requiring Christians to exhibit friendship between social classes and on this basis to share their goods.[563] Gregory E. Sterling promotes a third view that Luke modelled his summaries after summaries of religious/philosophical groups in the Hellenistic world in order to equip Christians with an apologetic, viz., that Christianity, like other religions, had exceptionally virtuous individuals – ἀθληταὶ ἀρετῆς.[564]

However, these approaches need not be mutually exclusive, but may be complementary when viewed in terms of exemplaric discourse: Christians are to live in the golden age of Greece and Israel, where there are no needy and where 'common are the things of friends' because all are of the same spiritual class, all are called to be Spirit-empowered athletes of virtue.

5.5.3.1.2 ὁμοθυμαδὸν and Visceral Oneness

Luke employs descriptions and terminology that epitomise the idea, not simply of identification with the group, but of visceral oneness with the group. Acts 1:14 describes the band of believers as they waited for the Spirit to come: 'persistently devoting themselves with one mind/passion to prayer' προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν τῇ προσευχῇ. While persistent devotion (προσκαρτερέω) to prayer reflects agency, it is its combination with the following adverb that is especially suggestive. BDAG renders ὁμοθυμαδόν as 'with one mind/purpose/impulse'.[565] It is a favourite of Luke's, occurring 10 times in Acts and only once more in the whole New Testament (Romans 15:6).

Steve Walton, in his thoroughgoing article on ὁμοθυμαδὸν, after reviewing the etymology, explores the debate as to whether the word in the LXX and New Testament simply means 'together' with no special emphasis upon emotion or purpose, or whether New Testament usage retains the classical notions of united purpose and oneness of mind/emotions. He argues, based upon his review of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, that contra BDAG, Luke nuances the word in not one, but three basic ways. First, it may simply reference co-location, they were 'together'. Second, it may indicate shared action or decision, they acted/decided 'unanimously'. Third, it may reflect 'shared passion or commitment, *with one heart/mind/purpose*'.[566]

---

[561] 'zu zeigen, daß etwas, was bei den Griechen als ein Charakteristikum des goldenen Zeitalters oder philosophischer Utopie galt, die Urzeit auch der christlichen Kirche gekennzeichnet hatte'. Eckhard Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* SUNT 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 18.

[562] David L. Mealand, 'Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts II – IV', *JTS* Vol. 28 No. 1 (April 1977), 96-99.

[563] Mitchell, 'The Social Function of Friendship', 259.

[564] Gregory E. Sterling, '"Athletes of Virtue": An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41-47; 4:32-35; 5:12-16)', *JBL* Vol. 113, No. 4 (Winter 1994), pp. 679-696.

[565] Bauer, Danker, et al., *Greek-English Lexicon*.

[566] Steve Walton, 'ὁμοθυμαδὸν in Acts: Co-location, Common Action or 'Of One heart and Mind'?' in P. J. Williams, et al. ed., The New Testament in Its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background in Honour of B. W. Winter on His 65th Birthday (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004), 89-105; 104-105.

The first three occurrences of ὁμοθυμαδὸν are related to the coming of the Spirit. While the term ὁμοῦ is used of the gathering at Pentecost by Nestle Aland and by the *Editio Critica Maior*, the ECM has a number of alternate readings which include ὁμοθυμαδὸν.[567] In either case, for Luke, togetherness was an important aspect of Pentecost. Our first definitive occurrence of ὁμοθυμαδὸν is Acts 1:14. Walton notes that in Acts 1:13-15, Luke uses several expressions to physically locate the apostles in the upper room, and that therefore it is unlikely that ὁμοθυμαδὸν in 1:14 is simply more information about location, it must add something else to the story. Thus, he cites 1:14 as representative of the third nuance: 'a shared commitment of heart and mind to prayer'.[568] The second occurrence of ὁμοθυμαδὸν is to be found in the depiction of community life (2:42-47) immediately after the coming of the Spirit. Verse 46a reads, 'And daily they were persistently devoting themselves ὁμοθυμαδὸν in the temple…'. Walton reads this as co-location, 'together in the temple', in contrast to the following description of breaking bread from house to house. I note, however, that the same collocation of προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν as is found in 1:14, where Walton recognises it as referencing shared passion or commitment, occurs here in 2:46. This suggests that we are dealing with a similar nuance. The adverb tells us how they were devoting themselves.[569]

Nevertheless, there is no need to rest the argument for visceral emotion upon a single word. The 'continual devotion' of the early disciples to the apostles' teaching, to fellowship, to common meals, to prayers; the universal sense of awe, the togetherness, the holding of all things in common, the selling of properties and giving to those among them who had need – all of these contextual features suggest that Luke idealises feelings of strong, even 'visceral' unity. Concomitantly, these sacrifices of time and property epitomise strong pro-group behaviour.

The idea of unity of mind and heart continues in Luke's third employment of ὁμοθυμαδὸν. In 4:24 the apostles return from the Sanhedrin after being threatened. The believers, having heard the apostles' report, ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἦραν φωνὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν and launch into a fervent corporate prayer for divine assistance and vindication. Walton rightly highlights the 'shared passion' of the prayer with which the believers 'lifted up voice to God'. In the ensuing summary of community life (4:32-37), Luke's classic turn of phrase captures the mood: 'the multitude of believers was καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία (4:32). In the fourth summary of community life (5:11-16), the context is one of great fear (φόβος μέγας) due to the recent divine execution of Ananias and Sapphira. The apostles are doing signs and wonders and the believers 'were all ὁμοθυμαδὸν in Solomon's portico' (5:12). Here we have co-location – more like a huddling together. Luke idealises a – fearfully – visceral oneness. The remaining six occurrences of

[567] 2:1 is the sole Lukan occurrence. *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior, III Die Apostelgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 25, indicates:
a ομου
b ομοθυμαδον ομου
c ομοθυαδον
d οι αποστολοι ομου
e οι αποστολοι ομοθυμαδον
f ομοθυμαδον οι αποστολοι
g omit
[568] Walton, 'ὁμοθυμαδὸν in Acts', 101.
[569] A proximity search of the TLG shows that Luke and the commentators following him are the only ones to use this phrase.

ὁμοθυμαδὸν express unanimity and common passion in a variety of actors, juxtaposing the united mind and passion of the believers with that of their opponents.[570]

5.5.3.2 A Sense of Invulnerability

The next key emotion for identity fusion is a sense of invulnerability. The early Christians exhibited this trait in their behaviour – preaching vis-à-vis persecution. Luke instructs us that one of the primary effects of Spirit reception is boldness to speak. When the Spirit comes in Acts 2 and 4, disciples receive παρρησία (Acts 2:29; 4:13; 4:29; 4:31; 28:31). Paul, Barnabas, and Apollos speak boldly (παρρησιάζομαι Acts 9:27, 28; 13:46; 14:3; 18:26; 19:8; 26:26). Sanctioned by the Spirit of their God, the Jesus followers believe they have the authority to speak freely. Emboldened by the Spirit, they do so. Moving beyond the particular words for bold speaking, Luke's story as whole emphasises the Christians' courage. Throughout Acts, believers proclaimed their new faith in the face of persecution and personal humiliation. Luke's heroes face down sorcery, are beaten but continue on, are stoned but get up again to preach the gospel. For those who do not get up, Luke propagates the ideology that their martyred spirits would be received victoriously by their resurrected and exalted Lord.

5.5.3.3 A Sense of Certainty

Certainty also accompanied the sectarians of Luke-Acts. Luke wants Theophilus to have it regarding the Christian teaching (ἀσφάλεια Luke 1:4).[571] Peter wants all the house of Israel to have it regarding the identity of Jesus as Lord and Christ (ἀσφαλῶς Acts 2:36). Luke glorifies the martyr Stephen's death and in so doing he provides assurance regarding the destiny of the faithful. Luke's exemplaric believers know Jesus is resurrected. They know Jesus is coming back. They know the gospel of the kingdom progressively triumphs all the way to Rome. They know evildoers get punished – just look at Herod, eaten by worms.

5.5.3.4 A Sense of Agency

Agency plays a key role for Luke, closely entwining emotion with behaviour. Luke's model Christians do not feel helpless. In his Gospel, Lukan actors freely choose both good and evil. Zacharias disbelieves the angel but Mary believes (1:18, 45). In Luke 7:29-30, 'all the people and the tax collectors vindicated God, having been baptised with the baptism of John, but the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected the council of God'. In Acts 2:40, Peter exhorts the crowd to be saved from 'this crooked generation'. The apostles declare to their opponents that God gives his Spirit 'to those who obey him' (Acts 5:32). Peter excoriates Ananias: while he had the property, was it not his? Having been sold, was it not under his control? (Acts 5:4). Christians have free agency – giving is not compulsory. For Luke, the personal self is not obliterated by the social self. Contra Barnabas, Paul insistently refuses to take along John Mark

---

[570] In Acts 7:57 the Sanhedrin, 'cry out with a loud voice, cover their ears and rush ὁμοθυμαδὸν upon him'. In Acts 8:6, 'The crowds were paying attention to the things being spoken by Philip, ὁμοθυμαδὸν hearing and seeing the signs which he was doing'. Acts 12:20 reflects the unison with which the people of Tyre and Sidon come to Herod. In Acts 15:25 the assembly writes: 'It seemed good us, having become ὁμοθυμαδὸν, to send…'. Acts 18:12 tells of the Jews rising up ὁμοθυμαδὸν against Paul. Finally, in Acts 19:28-29, the Ephesians, filled with rage (θυμός) at the perceived insult to their goddess, cry out, 'great is Artemis of the Ephesians!' 'And the city was filled with tumult, and they rushed ὁμοθυμαδὸν into the theatre…'.

[571] On ἀσφάλεια in Luke's preface cf. Henry J. Cadbury, 'Commentary on the Preface of Luke', F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, ed., *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, The Acts of the Apostles* Vol. II (London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1922), 489-510; 509. Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 140. Sean A. Adams, 'Luke's Preface and Its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander', *JGRCJ* Vol. 3 (2006), 177-191, 185. Rick Strelan, 'A note on ασφάλεια (Luke 1:4)', *JSNT* Vol. 30 No 2 (December 2007), 163-171.

since he had abandoned them in Pamphylia (Acts 15:38-39). The strong wills of the two apostles, who sharply disagree and go their separate ways, yet again bring personal agency to the fore. In Luke's final scene he underscores individual choice: some of the Roman Jews accept his message, and some do not – they 'close their eyes' (Acts 28:24, 27).

5.5.3.5 A Sense of Destiny

From the time that Gabriel tells Mary her son will reign over an eternal kingdom, Luke's readers are caught up in a magnificent destiny. The Magnificat, the Benedictus, and the Nunc dimittis, all declare the awesome and portentous nature of the Lukan story. Throughout Luke's Gospel, the already-but-not-yet kingdom is preached. Jesus and his disciples heal the sick and proclaim the nearness of the kingdom. Jesus sees Satan fall like lightning from heaven and gives his followers power over demonic serpents and scorpions. Jesus promises that his faithful followers will ultimately be given cities to rule over according to their industriousness. Jesus promises his apostles a kingdom – they will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Luke 22:30). Jesus assures the apostles that the restoration of the kingdom to Israel will happen, but not yet. In lieu of an immediate Israelite kingdom, Jesus promises the Holy Spirit and commissions his followers to be his witnesses unto the end of the earth. They preach 'the kingdom' (Acts 8:12, 14:22, 19:8, 28:23). Ultimately, Jesus returns at 'the times of restoration of all things' (Acts 3:19; cf. 1:11).

5.5.4 Developing Identity Fusion: The Powerful Synergy of Text and Emotion

We have now demonstrated at length that a constellation of five key emotions is embedded in Luke's story. What impact could that have had on the Lukan audience? As Rafael Rodríguez writes:

> While any text that gains a wider cultural currency can become a locus of social identity, *sacred texts* can impact an individual's and a group's sense of identity on an especially deep and fundamental level. Sacred written texts function as reference points – even as boundary markers – in the social construction of identity.[572]

Whether Luke's text reached the social acceptance level of 'sacred' during the first century is obviously unknown. However, in publishing a text strewn with exemplaric characters and events which demonstrate emotions and behaviours characteristic of identity fusion, Luke uses the standard media of his day, namely, dramatic public readings by a *lector*,[573] to promote a social phenomenon capable of enabling his audience to enact the kind of radical pro-group behaviour he idealises. Drawing again upon van Laer's summative research on narrative transportation, Luke's emotion laden heroes, engaged in vivid action scenes, can only serve to facilitate audience detachment from everyday reality (e.g., mild ASCs), audience attachment to and identification with protagonists, and audience belief and behavioural modification.

Luhrmann, in studying Christians within the Vineyard Church, used a concept similar to transportation, 'absorption'. She evaluated her subjects using a standardised psychological test, the Tellegen Absorption Scale.

---

[572] Rafael Rodríguez, 'Textual Orientations: Jesus, Written Texts, and the Social Construction of Identity in the Gospel of Luke', in J. Brian Tucker and Coleman A. Baker, eds., *T&T Clark Handbook to Social Identity in the New Testament* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 191-210; 192.

[573] Cf., William David Shiell, *Reading Acts: The Lector and the Early Christian Audience* BIS 70 (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, Inc., 2004), 33. See also, Larry W. Hurtado, *Texts and Artefacts: Selected Essays on Textual Criticism and Early Christian Manuscripts* LNTS 584 (London, New York: T&T Clark, 2018), 102-103.

> Absorption, as measured by the scale, is related to reading and the imagination. The more highly you score, the more likely you are to be a reader, and the more likely you are to immerse yourself in rich, imaginative worlds; the more likely you are to be the kind of person who can lose him- or herself in movies and literature, the kind of person for whom the story can feel more real than the everyday.[574]

This ability to be 'absorbed' in a story, though it varies among individuals, Luhrmann considers to be 'central to spirituality'.[575] In other words, a good imagination actually alters what is perceived as real, enabling the vivid experience of non-material 'others', i.e., God, Holy Spirit, Jesus, even demons. Moreover, Luhrmann's research, involving psychological tests in which participants practiced either apophatic prayer, kataphatic prayer, or study, indicates that skill in absorption can be trained.[576] This suggests that the regular hearing of the Lukan adventure stories could have heightened absorption among Lukan sectarians and thus created susceptibility to charismatic experiences.

Yet, I do not claim that the communal reading of narratives, even good ones, is alone sufficient to generate identity fusion. The Book of Acts was not read in a vacuum. If any of the charismatic Christianity known to us through 1 Corinthians 12-14, 2 Corinthians 12:1-7, Galatians 3:1-5, and Romans 8:26-27, survived until the time of Luke's publication, then we have the potential for synergy between emotional, experiential religion and a highly evocative text. If Irenaeus can refer to prophecy and tongues speaking as still present in the Church ca. 185, then surely it was part of Luke's lived religion.[577] Indeed, Luke attributes the visceral oneness of his ideal community, the boldness, and the certainty (cf. Acts 2:33-36 – because the Spirit is visibly outpoured, Jesus must truly be exalted at God's right hand), to the coming of the Spirit. Though Luke does not present agency as caused by the Spirit, it most certainly is empowered by the Spirit.

5.5.5 Done: The Lukan Text Effectively Promoted Identity Fusion in the Early Christian Sect

In its emphasis upon emotion, Acts has value as a source for social anthropological research. Here we have a religious text, one of Czachesz' four aspects of religion, in which proper, sanctioned emotions are expressed in exemplaric events and characters. Because exemplarity was a normal part of ancient reading culture, we can expect ancient readers to have understood the author of Acts to be seeking to influence them though his paradigmatic scenes and protagonists. The psychology of reading tells us that open, malleable story recipients who accepted Luke's authority would be influenced and religiously formed through his intellectually and emotionally potent story. Luke taught specific emotions known to characterise identity fusion. Because we know that identity fusion is capable of producing extreme pro-group behaviour, there is no need to view Luke's social ideal merely as a utopian fantasy. There is every reason to believe that Luke's text was effective, especially as it worked in synergy with a believing charismatic community, to transport readers into ASC experiences,

---

[574] Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back*, 199; 195-202.
[575] 201.
[576] 202-209.
[577] *Against Heresies*, 5.6.1: 'In like manner we do also hear many brethren in the Church, who possess prophetic gifts, and who through the Spirit speak all kinds of languages, and bring to light for the general benefit the hidden things of men, and declare the mysteries of God, whom also the apostle terms 'spiritual,' they being spiritual because they partake of the Spirit, and not because their flesh has been stripped off and taken away, and because they have become purely spiritual.'

to modify their beliefs and behaviour in line with Lukan values, and, in short, to evoke key fusion-type emotions cementing identity fusion among group members.

5.5.6 Developing in Detail: The Creation of Identity Fusion

In discussing the causes of identity fusion, Swann et al. identify ideologies that facilitate fusion, such as nationalism based upon common ancestry/blood, and honour-based societies, where the honour of the individual and the honour of the group overlap. Whitehouse, following Swann et el., notes that blood ties can be simulated by establishing cultural norms that mimic actual kinship obligations, e.g., requiring group members to render mutual assistance that normally only family would give, calling group members 'brother' or 'sister'.[578] But, more potent for fusion than the objective blood and/or honour-based criteria, is subjective experience. This may be a soldier passing through danger with his comrades, or an adolescent being initiated into his tribe through tortuous rites of passage. The memories of the painful rites are burned into the mind of the initiand, and reflection upon the meaning of those initially strange rites is essential: 'reflection produces enduring and vivid episodic memories for the ordeals and the other group members who uniquely shared in the ritual'.[579]

Whitehouse emphasises the element of the unknown, 'causally opaque events', in generating reflection.[580] Initiands do not understand initially why all this suffering has occurred, it is only over time that they contemplate it, thereby, 'producing rich representations that form part of the core narrative self. When such representations are perceived to be shared with a group, this produces feelings of shared essence, in turn giving rise to fusion'.[581] However, though negative experiences have predominated in the literature, it is not just dysphoria that produces fusion, euphoric 'highs' may do so as well, as Christopher M. Kavanagh found in his study of Brazilian Jiu Jitsu participants.[582] Whitehouse cautions: 'it is not yet clear whether negative valence or merely overall emotional intensity is the key factor'.[583]

How then might spirit experience/altered states of consciousness – inspired and evoked in part by the Lukan narrative – have generated fusion among the early Christians? The emotional intensity of the experience is clearly expressed in Luke's presentation. Initiates are to become as if inebriated, they are to have a 'baptism' of the Spirit. It is not unreasonable to suggest that this early Christian emotional peak would contribute to identity fusion, particularly among the cohort that experienced that emotional intensity together. But does Luke suggest that the key behaviour of reflecting upon the experience was an expected part of life after incorporation into the sect? Surprisingly, Luke's Peter character models just such introspection. In retelling the story of how, as he began to speak to them, the Gentiles had received the Spirit in the identical way as the Jews, Peter states, 'Then I remembered the word of the Lord as he said, "John baptised with water, but you will be baptised with Holy Spirit".' Luke gives us a

---

[578] Whitehouse, 'Dying for the Group', 2. Cf., W. B. Swann Jr., M. D. Buhrmester, A. Gómez, J. Jetten, B. Bastian, A. Vázquez, A. Ariyanto, T. Besta, O. Christ, L. Cui, G. Finchilescu, R. González, N. Goto, M. Homsey, S. Sharma, H. Susianto and A. Zhang, 'What Makes a Group Worth Dying For? Identity Fusion Fosters Perception of Familial Ties, Promoting Self-Sacrifice, *JPSP* Vol. 106 No. 6 (2014), 912–26.

[579] Swann, et al., 'When Group Membership Gets Personal', 449. Harvey Whitehouse, 'Rites of Terror: Emotion, Metaphor, and Memory in Melanesian Initiation Cults', in John Corrigan, ed., *Religion and Emotion: Approaches and Interpretations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 133-148.

[580] Whitehouse, 'Dying for the Group', 2.

[581] 2.

[582] Christopher M. Kavanagh, Jonathan Jong, Ryan McKay, Harvey Whitehouse, 'Positive Experiences of High Arousal Martial Arts Rituals are Linked to Identity Fusion and Costly Pro-Group Actions', *EJSP* Vol. 49 (2019), 461–481; 472, 474.

[583] Whitehouse, 'Dying for the Group', 5.

protagonist who had a moment of epiphany as he watched someone else's initiation. He recognised in the other the intensity of his own initiation – this Spirit experience that we all share is, indeed, a baptism-like experience just as Jesus had said. Here Luke weaves emotional intensity into the fabric of the grand Christian narrative: 'John the Baptist foretold it, Jesus promised it, we have got it, and, if you join us, you will get it too.' Elsewhere as well, Luke links the practice of interpretation to intense experience. As early in the narrative as Pentecost, Peter, spontaneously preaching, answers the crowd's questions about the meaning of the strange languages. Clearly, sectarians like Luke had been faced with the problem of understanding and explaining to outsiders, and concomitantly to themselves, their own radical religious experiences.

How else might Spirit possession and ASC glossolalia facilitate identity fusion? This phenomenal cluster might be thought of as a sudden insertion of the sectarian social self. By becoming Spirit possessed, the initiate takes on the group identity, that is, becomes animated by the very Spirit that animates all the other members of the group. Early Christian sect possession experiences map well onto identity fusion theory for we do not see obliteration of the personal self. Yes, Luke teaches an intense, initially dissociative experience of the Spirit, but individuals come out of this to preach sermons, to get baptised, to have table fellowship, to proclaim the good news. Mindless followers are in Luke's story, but they are the pagan crowds enraged at Paul, shouting for hours in the theatre, disrupting the Roman peace. These are foils to the thoughtful, intelligent (like Sergius Paulus) Christian converts. Personal agency remains very much a part of Spirit-embued life in the sect.

Thus, painful initiation rituals are not needed. Nor does the sect rest upon ties of blood or of honour. Ideology is not unimportant, but it is the possession event which validates the sectarian belief system – the kerygmatic proclamation that Jesus is Lord is based upon the outpouring of the promised eschatological Spirit. Jesus is Lord precisely because he is Lord of the Spirit.[584] He is Lord of the individual sectarian because the sectarian received the Spirit from him, not as an abstract, ethereal doctrine, but as visceral possession. Thus, the ties that bind all members of the group to the exalted Christ are the ties of possession by the Spirit of the Christ.

Swann et al. observe that, 'activating the perception of shared core characteristics increased endorsement of fighting and dying for the group among fused persons'.[585] Given that Luke, through his many Spirit reception and empowerment stories (Luke 3, 11, Acts 2, 4, 8, 9, 10-11, 19) teaches possession of and by the Holy Spirit as a core characteristic of the Christian community, it is not surprising that he would explain/promote mutual acceptance between Jew and Gentile believers based upon the common experience of the Spirit. Luke depicts the founding Jewish apostles as persuaded to accept Gentiles into their midst once they learn the Gentiles have received the Spirit in the same way as they had. This illustrates just how 'core' Holy Spirit possession was for Luke and his audience. To possess/be possessed by the Spirit was such a central characteristic of their identity that it could explain the dissolution of the ingrained Jewish taboos against contact with Gentiles. This theme will be developed further in our discussion of sacred values theory.

[584] Cf. Turner, *Power from on High*, 278.
[585] Swann, et al., 'What Makes a Group Worth Dying For?', 923.

5.6 Sacred Values and the Early Christian Sect

5.6.1 Devoted Commitment to Jesus and his Saints – Sacred Values as a Motivating Factor Among the Early Christian Sect

While intense emotions and ASC experiences could be viewed as promoting unity, even identity fusion, among the early Christians, surely that was not all? Was not their kerygmatic belief system important too? Sacred values theory, utilised in conflict zones such as Israel, Palestine, Indonesia, and Guatemala, suggests that, indeed, ideology, functioning hand-in-glove with identity fusion, drives extreme commitment and behaviour among fused groups. Moreover, this extremism bears no correlation with utilitarian cost/benefit analysis, but is rigidly mandated by non-negotiable, 'sacred' principles. Embued with sacred values, individuals become 'devoted actors' rather than 'rational actors' – and their devotion will lead them to extreme actions which rational thought would never even entertain. Applied to the early Christian sect, sacred values theory indicates that axiomatic sectarian beliefs, such as Jesus' resurrection and gift of the Divine Spirit, were, alongside identity fusion, crucial in enabling the Christians to survive persecution, to thrive, and to promulgate their doctrine across an empire and beyond.

5.6.2 Defining Sacred Values: The Work of Davies, Tetlock, and Atran

5.6.2.1 Douglas J. Davies: A Brief Review of the Social Anthropological Background

The discussion of sacred values is not new to social anthropology. Davies traces that theme from Robertson Smith (the holy and the common) to Emile Durkheim (the sacred and the profane) to Franz Steiner (values, attitudes, taboo, and danger) to Mary Douglas (purity and danger) to Roy Rappaport (Ultimate Sacred Postulates) and Hans Mol (sacralization of identity).[586] Davies weaves these thinkers together with concepts of reciprocity and the Spirit: purity relates, as does taboo, an attitude to a social value; vital values become sacred to society and those values become embodied in 'persons, objects or actions … places and times'.[587] Ultimately, 'we adopt attitudes of respect towards these very things that confer meaning upon us and upon which, in the last resort, we depend for our very identity'.[588] In honouring our identity-bestowing values, we experience joy, we accrue merit. But when we, though externally conforming to them, privately disengage from these values, we experience what Davies calls 'embodiment dissonance' – we become polluted, we become dangerous to ourselves and to society. Thus, purity, 'the preservation of prime values', reaches to the core of what it means to be human, and has to do with survival itself.[589]

---

[586] Douglas J. Davies, 'Purity, Spirit and Reciprocity in the Acts of the Apostles', Louise Lawrence and Mario Aguilar, eds., *Anthropology and Biblical Studies: Avenues of Approach* (Leiden: Deo Publishing, 2004), 259-280, 260-265.

[587] 261.

[588] 261.

[589] 263-264. The vast research field of ritual/moral purity in Second Temple Judaism will not be dealt with here. Key sources for further reading include: Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Hyam Maccoby, *Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and its Place in Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson and Eileen Schuller, *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber* WUNT 305 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013); Susan Haber, ed. Adele Reinhartz, *"They Shall Purify Themselves": Essays on Purity in Early Judaism* EJIL (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008); Christine E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Matthew Thiessen, *Jesus and the Forces of Death: The Gospels' Portrayal of Ritual Impurity within First-Century Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020).

In the Book of Acts, then, to act contrary to the Holy Spirit, the gift which cannot simply be given back, that prime symbol, that sacred value, is to endanger both the Church and the blasphemer. As pollution is a matter of survival, both cannot continue to co-exist. One must go. Davies' social anthropological reading of Acts will be elaborated upon more fully below. Here our concern has been to lay out the foundational anthropological principles upon which contemporary sacred values theory draws.

5.6.2.2 Philip E. Tetlock: Psychology and the Sacred Values Protection Model

Philip E. Tetlock, et al., addressed the psychological question of decision making and conflict between 'sacred values' and 'secular values' as early as 1996.[590] In 2003, explicitly placing his anthropological roots in Durkheim and Radcliffe-Brown, he formulated for 'social-cognitive research' a definition of sacred values as 'values that a moral community treats as possessing transcendental significance that precludes comparisons, trade-offs, or indeed any mingling with secular values'.[591]

Tetlock argues for a Sacred Values Protection Model (SVPM), 'when sacred values come under secular assault, people struggle to protect their private selves and public identities from moral contamination by the impure thoughts and deeds implied in the taboo proposals'.[592] The SVPM puts forward, first, that when sacred values are violated, this results in 'an aversive arousal state', i.e., 'moral outrage'.[593] This outrage occurs even when violations are only contemplated. The level of outrage varies according to the length of time the 'indecent proposal' is contemplated, even though the 'right' decision is made in the end: 'Even to contemplate attaching a finite monetary value to one's friendships, children, or loyalty to one's country is to disqualify oneself from membership in the associated moral community'.[594] Thus we have Davies' 'embodiment dissonance' – sacred values exerting control over the very core of human cognition, the self fearful that it has, but momentarily, entertained indecency.

This issue of contemplation plays out classically in Luke's Simon the Sorcerer story. Morally outraged Peter rebukes Simon for supposing that holy power could be crassly purchased. It is not just the indecent admixture of profane and sacred, but the thought of it – Simon supposed (ἐνόμισας) the evil, his heart (ἡ καρδία) was not 'straight' (εὐθεῖα) before God, he needed forgiveness for the 'intention' of his heart (ἡ ἐπίνοια τῆς καρδίας). For Peter, participation in physical power required non-physical purity. Simon's violation is so severe that Peter does not know whether it can be forgiven since he perceives Simon's true internal condition – bitterness and iniquity. Simon, apparently worried, appeals to the apostles to entreat the Lord on his behalf.

Secondly, the SVPM advances the proposition that, when feelings of moral contamination arise through contemplation of sacred value violations, individuals 'engage in symbolic acts of moral cleansing' to realign themselves within their moral universe. The above-mentioned Simon evinces no concrete act of penitence, not even a prayer, and consequently leaves the reader,

---

[590] Philip E. *Tetlock*, Randall S. Peterson, Jennifer S. Lerner, 'Revising the Value Pluralism Model: Incorporating Social Content and Context Postulates', in Clive Seligman, et al. ed., *The Psychology of Values: The Ontario Symposium Vol. 8* (Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1996), 25-51. Philip E. Tetlock, 'Coping with Trade-Offs: Psychological Constraints and Political Implications', in S. Lupia, M. McCubbins, & S. Popkin eds., *Political Reasoning and Choice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

[591] Philip E. Tetlock, 'Thinking the Unthinkable: Sacred Values and Taboo Cognitions', *TCS* Vol. 7, No. 7 (July 2003), 320-324; 320.

[592] 320. Cf., Philip E. Tetlock, et al., 'The Psychology of the Unthinkable: Taboo Trade-Offs, Forbidden Base Rates, and Heretical Counterfactuals', *JPSP* Vol. 78, No. 5 (June 2000), 853-870.

[593] Tetlock, 'Thinking the Unthinkable', 321.

[594] 321.

along with Peter, uncertain of his fate. Saul, however, upon realizing his own violation of sacred values, namely that he had been opposing his nation's true Messiah, and that he had been doing so against something (conscience/Holy Spirit?) internal to himself – he had, with difficulty, been 'kicking against the goads' (σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν) – fasts for three days and then undergoes ritual purification: immersion, washing away his sin, calling upon the name of Jesus. The astute reader knows that Saul has already submitted to Jesus as Lord, because, when the heavenly voice reveals itself to be Jesus the Nazarene, he asks: τί ποιήσω κύριε? Nevertheless, the ritual act of water immersion is not negated by the Lukan pen but is reinforced through the exhortation of Ananias.

Thirdly, the SVPM hypothesizes 'reality constraint'. That is, despite sincere beliefs that sacred values are inviolable, people, when faced with difficult choices, i.e., conflicting moral absolutes, will resort to utilitarian calculus. They will seek to avoid acknowledging the shift from sacred values to secular values, and if that is not possible, 'will welcome rhetorical redefinitions of situations that transform taboo trade-offs into more acceptable routine trade-offs'. This manifests in two ways, either through reconceptualizing the situation as secular value vs. secular value, or treating the conflict as what Tetlock terms, with reference to ancient Greek plays, a 'tragic trade-off', pitting 'one sacred value against another', veracity vs. saving a life, etc.

The Jesus movement's tectonic shift from reliance upon Jewish circumcision and dietary laws as the fundamental community boundary markers to relying upon possession by the Holy Spirit as the new community boundary marker involved just such a conflict of absolute values. The Jewish covenant relationship with YHWH was instantiated and maintained through circumcision and the Mosaic Law. To grant access to the λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ *sans* circumcision would be an abomination, to transgress the Jewish food laws the height of pollution. Yet the sectarian leadership was confronted with the fact that uncircumcised, pork-eating Gentiles had entered into possession of and by the Spirit of YHWH. Luke thus juxtaposes sacred value with sacred value. The outcome, however, is not viewed tragically, but triumphally. For Luke, this exchange of sacred values was crucial to the sect's grand destiny, fully in accordance with the plan and will of the Ultimate Sacred Postulate in his narrative – Father God.

Interestingly, Tetlock's empirical research found that, while individuals who spent extra time contemplating a taboo trade-off (say, exchanging money for honour) were viewed negatively and even evoked moral outrage, individuals who took more time to make a tragic trade-off decision (e.g., decide whether to save the life of a youth, or save five elderly people), were viewed positively – their deliberations embodied the gravity of the moral conflict. Here again, Luke's threefold telling of the story (Acts 10, 11, 15) and the drawn-out struggle finally resolved in the great council of Acts 15, illustrate the enormity of the matter for Christians everywhere. Though Tetlock's research examines the verbal casuistry by which 'ordinary citizens'[595] may be persuaded to segue from unalterable sacred positions to secular, more flexible, positions, he recognizes that some values appear to be genuinely inviolable. He cites 'abortion rights, racism, or the sacred soil of Jerusalem or Kashmir'.[596]

5.6.2.3 Scott Atran: Anthropology and Sacred Values Theory

It is this point which Scott Atran has built upon in developing sacred values theory as it stands today, focusing upon that dimension of sacred values where Tetlock found people to be

[595] Viz., 'the masses' as opposed to 'political elites', 322.
[596] 323.

genuinely intransigent, and addressing the power of sacred values to motivate individuals towards extreme behaviour. Atran defines sacred values as 'nonnegotiable preferences whose defense compels actions beyond evident reason; that is, regardless of calculable costs and consequences'.[597] These are not necessarily 'religious' in the sense of related to gods or spirits, but are:

> any preferences regarding objects, beliefs, or practices that people treat as both incompatible or nonfungible with profane or economic goods, as when land becomes "sacred land," and which are part of our conception of "self" and of "who we are".

Jeremy Ginges and Atran argue that this is not simply about 'moral convictions'. While they recognise overlap between sacred values and concepts of morality, they differentiate them in that the 'sacred' may relate to inanimate objects such as amulets, rocks and lakes, whereas 'morality' seems to relate to humans, whether they are harmed or protected. This distinction is perhaps over-subtle, as surely one could argue that humans find in their sacred items moral imperatives, 'Thou shalt not touch the mountain, or thou shalt be stoned', etc. Is not the very idea of 'morality' a sacred, rather than a profane, concept, having to do with the inviolable nature of society itself? Nevertheless, the argument of the dissertation does not hinge upon Ginges and Atran at this point. For our purposes here, a non-negotiable 'moral' conviction will be considered a Sacred Value tout court.

Persons operating according to sacred values, termed 'devoted actors', show four notable traits:[598]

1) Deontological vs. teleological logic. They make decisions based upon their sacred values, even to their detriment, rather than act based upon utilitarian calculations. This has practical results. Atran and Ginges point to dedicated revolutionary forces arrayed against superior armies who, time and again, win against the odds.[599] They also cite extensive research on the intractable nature of conflicts such as the Israeli/Palestinian situation where both sides hold resolutely to their sacred values.[600]
2) The 'backfire effect'. They react negatively to material offers to surrender their sacred values. For example, the suggestion of 'land for peace' might evoke strong offence. So too, they cite research showing that Iranians become more supportive of their 'sacred value' of nuclear power when offered financial incentives to compromise.
3) No surrender. They resist solicitous offers compromising their sacred values, preferring to fight to the death.
4) Discounting of space and time. Their sacred values are held regardless of how distant their origin, e.g., the ancestors established them and we must keep them, the gods established them and we must keep them, etc. Many global conflicts, e.g. Israel/Palestine, are rooted in sacred books or traditions which are millennia old.[601]

---

[597] Scott Atran, 'The Role of the Devoted Actor in War, Revolution, and Terrorism', in James R. Lewis, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Religion and Terrorism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 69-88; 69.
[598] Scott Atran and Jeremy Ginges, 'Devoted Actors and the Moral Foundations of Intractable Intergroup Conflict', in J. Decety & T. Wheatley, eds., *The Moral Brain: A Multidisciplinary Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015), 69-85; 70-71.
[599] 72.
[600] 72.
[601] They also cite research for a fifth point: 'brain-imaging patterns consistent with processing SVs as rules rather than as calculations of costs and consequences and with processing perceived violations of SVs as emotionally agitating and resistant to social influence or discounting.' (71)

Thus, for example, Atran and Ginges found that, in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, actors on both sides reject proposals of 'land for peace' as violations of their fundamental principles, of their 'sacred values'. Financial incentives to compromise said values only provoke hostile, emotional reactions. The conflict seems intractable, with neither side contemplating surrender. Both sides anchor their claims in ancient history. However, when one group offers to compromise its own sacred values, even in something as simple and apparently unsubstantial as an apology, the other party demonstrates a surprising willingness to make a corresponding compromise of its own sacred values (echoes of Tetlock's 'trade-off' concept, though in a positive, not tragic sense). Atran and Ginges suggest that sacred values theory could represent a way forward in otherwise unresolvable conflicts.[602]

Atran and Ginges argue that, 'sacralizing parochial preferences and prioritizing those sacred values are necessary factors in producing actors willing to sacrifice for a cause', but that these are not typically sufficient factors.[603] Fusion with a group in combination with fusion with sacred values provides the generative combination that results in extreme self-sacrifice. In a study of 1600 pro and anti-abortion activists in Spain in 2014, Atran and Ginges found that levels of fusion with abortion-related beliefs corresponded to levels of willingness to sacrifice jobs, to go to jail, and to risk one's life. Only willingness to risk the physical safety of their own children was not significantly affected by the activists' values fusion.[604]

This kind of extreme action, driven by the four dimensions of devoted actors can also be seen in that ancient promulgator of new religious beliefs – Paul. In 2 Corinthians 11:23-29 he catalogues the sufferings he endured to proclaim the Christ-gospel:

> in prisons frequently, in beatings above measure, in deaths often… thirty-nine lashes… three times beaten with rods, once stoned, three times shipwrecked… constant journeys, in dangers of rivers…bandits…countrymen…pagans…

Paul epitomises the devoted actor. Deontologically, Christ was raised and hence Paul was compelled to preach. He preached 'the cross' to his own detriment; with utilitarian calculations of an easy path Paul had no truck. Typical of guerrilla fighters devoted to a sacred cause, his revolutionary agenda prevailed against all odds. Pleas for Paul to avoid danger only provoked the apostle to greater resolve. For Paul there was no surrender, he would serve Christ to the death. Finally, Paul rooted his radical *Weltanschauung* in the present mystical revelation of an ancient promise to his Jewish people – Messiah will come – Jesus is Messiah – the Graeco-Roman world, indeed the cosmos, must bow.

5.6.3 Sacred Values and the Sacred Text

Of texts in a living religious context, Davies writes:

> Sacred stories, especially when they become part of a ritual in which people participate today in 'real time', have great potential for prompting and schooling appropriate emotions and allowing individuals their own nuanced appropriation of them.[605]

---

[602] Atran and Ginges, 'Moral Foundations', 73-74.
[603] 74.
[604] 77-78.
[605] Davies, *Emotion, Identity, and Religion*, 48.

Averil Cameron's work would suggest this is applicable to the development of Christianity:

> if there was ever a case of the construction of reality through text, such a case is provided by early Christianity. …Christians built themselves a new world. They did so partly through practice – the evolution of a mode of living and a communal discipline that carefully distinguished them from their pagan and Jewish neighbours – and partly through a discourse that was itself constantly brought under control and disciplined.[606]

In the introduction to this chapter, we stated that, following Czachesz, we would develop our discussion in terms of four aspects of religion: experience, ritual, belief, text. So far, we have primarily addressed the first three elements, though we have already engaged with many texts in extensive exegesis, and we have discussed the psychological power of narrative to transport and transform its recipients, especially – even synergistically – in interaction with a sympathetic audience (5.5.5). Now, in line with Cameron, we wish to reiterate that religious texts – the very Pauline and Lukan texts which we have been exegeting – not only preserve, *ad hoc*, for posterity portions of early Christian beliefs, but they were integral to the religious discourse and dynamic of their own day.[607]

As Roller has highlighted for us, texts (or any 'monument') functioned to maintain cultural values through retelling the great actions/deeds of the past, through evaluating them, through commemorating them, and through establishing cultural norms by them. Though the earliest reception history of Luke-Acts is not known,[608] Luke's narration exemplifies this sequence of action, evaluation, commemoration, and norm setting. Paul too, in his letters, not infrequently views himself, as one who has received direct revelation from God, as performing the great deeds, making evaluations of them (only the spiritual are qualified to do so), commemorating them (sometimes in this he feels compelled against his will), and setting the norm (imitate me!). As Lieu observes:

> Christianity is characterized, at least from our perspective, by the vibrancy and creativity of its literary productivity. From the earliest evidences of this, among which must be Paul's letter to the church at Thessalonica, its authors saw their activity not as peripheral nor as transitory but as indispensable; I Thess. 5.27 is remarkably solemn: 'I bind you by oath by the Lord that the letter be read to all the brethren.'[609]

Beyond the contents of the written texts, commentators have noted the sociological function of the material written object – whether scroll or codex – within the early Christian communities. Chris Keith draws upon William A. Johnson's argument that the public reading and discussion of a bookroll gave a community a sense of identity as 'educated' while at the same time affirmed the importance of the scroll which they were privileged to possess.[610] As Johnson

---

[606] Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* SCL 55 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 21, cf. 32.
[607] Cf. Uro, 'Interface of Ritual and Writing', 74, 76.
[608] Cf. Andrew F. Gregory, 'The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts', in Andrew F. Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe, eds., *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2010), 82-93.
[609] Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 48.
[610] Chris Keith, 'The Gospel Read, Sliced, and Burned: The Material Gospel and the Construction of Christian Identity', *EC* Vol. 12 Issue 1 (2021), 7-27; 9-10.

puts it, this 'symbiotic' relationship 'revalidates the text as worthy and recommends the community as suitable gatekeepers.'[611] Keith writes:

> Similar to the elite Roman reading cultures that Johnson analyzed, the scroll or codex of the gospels sat at the core of this distinctly Christ-oriented reading culture and the process of reading it provided a means of identity articulation.[612]

What I suggest is that the symbiosis entails not only the two-way affirmation of text and community, but also the mutual legitimation of text and religious experience. There is a dynamic interplay between sacred religious beliefs – materially represented in expensive books, socially enacted through public reading – and the religious experiences which the book reading instructs, models, and inspires. When the prescribed religious experiences are successfully enacted by the congregation, whether via prophecies, or miracle cures, or outbursts of tongues speech, or visions, or altered states of consciousness, they in turn confirm the power and sacrality of the scroll and of the community that reads the scroll.

5.6.4 Douglas J. Davies: Purity, Spirit, and Reciprocity – Luke's Sacred Values

Do we see Luke promulgating sacred values or acting in accordance with sacred values Theory? Yes. For Luke, Jesus' cleansing of the Temple was in defence of its sacred role as a house of prayer (Luke 19:46) and prayer is a Lukan leitmotif. As noted above, Peter's rebuke ('may your money go with you into destruction') of Simon's proffer of cash for Spirit power is a prime example of offence evoked by enticements to yield up sacred values. The Spirit, and accompanying endowments of God, are sacrosanct, one dare not cheapen them through monetary transactions. Peter's reaction is an exemplar to all sect leaders – those who deal in the Spirit are not to degrade themselves with filthy lucre.

Davies addresses in depth the issue of attitudes towards sacred values in his seminal article, 'Purity, Spirit and Reciprocity in the Acts of the Apostles' which we began to examine above. 'Purity concerns the preservation of prime values,' he writes.[613] Moreover, in Acts the prime value is the Holy Spirit.[614] The former sacred value of blood, as covenantal in circumcision and as polluting in menstruation, Davies observes has been exchanged for the Spirit. The new 'Christian' community, an 'artificial society' into which one is admitted, not a 'natural society' into which one is physically born, solved the problem of expansion beyond Judaism and preservation of identity by turning to the Spirit as the 'foundation', 'focus', and 'locus' of their meaning-making.[615] The Spirit is a 'condensed symbol of Jesus' and of the 'new covenant' and therefore, Christian life revolves around attitudes towards this prime value that bestows sectarian identity. To violate this Spirit value is to blaspheme, to be the ultimate in ritual impurity, to betray to such an extent that there is no restoration.

Here Davies analyses the Ananias and Sapphira episode. The interpretive key is not merely the tried and true cultural analysis of honour and shame, nor even Mauss' tripartite reciprocity theory. Rather, that aspect of Mauss entertained by Maurice Godelier, the 'fourth obligation', opens the social anthropological door into what really is transpiring in the lies and deaths of

---

[611] William A. Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 202.
[612] Keith, 'Gospel Read', 18.
[613] Davies, 'Purity, Spirit and Reciprocity', 264.
[614] 264-265.
[615] 266.

Acts 5.[616] Gifts from the gods cannot be simplistically reciprocated, that is, if the transcendent realm has bestowed upon you life, health, land, marriage, property, happiness, what is left to give back? Worship, yes. Perhaps a token sacrifice. But essentially the divine gifts are inalienable. There is no price tag that can be placed upon them. They are not to be sold or traded. As Naboth replied in refusing Ahab's money: 'The LORD forbid it me, that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee.'[617] While fourth obligation goods be imparted to new initiates, to the next generation, they cannot, or at least, ought not, be sold or otherwise alienated from the original recipient. One is obligated in ways – such as honour, duty – not delineated by reciprocal giving, receiving, and giving in return. This is the Fourth Obligation and, Davies argues, it is the lens through which the Spirit in Acts, and the early Christian sect, can be understood.

It is, moreover, the social anthropological grounding for the deontological thought process that Atran has identified as fundamental to sacred values theory and that characterises the Lukan narrative. Jesus, in light of the ending of his earthly mission and his coming ascension to heaven, 'resolutely set his face to go to Jerusalem' (τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν Luke 9:51). Teleological joys are real, but to reach them Jesus must do his duty. Deontologically, he goes to the cross. Likewise, Paul, despite genuine prophetic warnings of chains and imprisonment, must do what he believes the will of the Lord to be. He too must go to Jerusalem.

Having established the Fourth Obligation character of that prime sectarian value, the Holy Spirit, Davies observes that Christianity was about 'supernatural multiplication, not for babies but converts.'[618] Since the Holy Spirit is the force behind successful proselytizing, church growth is 'associated with ritual purity just as the reproductive elements of "natural" societies are so associated.'[619] Money, being necessary to the sustenance and growth of the Jesus movement, thus becomes an element of potential purity and danger with respect to the Spirit. Having once become a vessel of the Spirit's indwelling, does the sectarian live in accordance with the obligations having received the ineffable gift demands? As one under the Fourth Obligation, the Christian must behave, vis-à-vis the Spirit, with all honour, rectitude, and purity.

Davies, in a thoroughgoing manner, demonstrates that Luke has selected money as the purity litmus test among Spirit-filled Christians. Prototypically, in the Gospel Zacchaeus gives away half his goods and makes restitution for any ill-gotten gains, but Judas betrays Jesus for thirty pieces of silver. In the Acts, the faithful sell their possessions and share all. Peter has no silver or gold, but he has the Name of Jesus and the freshly-received miracle power of the Spirit. Joseph the encouraging Levite, who sells his land and genuinely gives the money to the apostles, serves as a foil to the scheming Ananias and Sapphira. The danger of improper distribution of

---

[616] Cf. Marcel Mauss, trans. Ian Cunnison, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies* (Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Publishing, 2011 [Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1954]), 12-16; Maurice Godelier, trans. Nora Scott, *The Enigma of the Gift* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999 [*L'Énigme du don* (Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1996)]), 29-31; 43-45; 179-198. Rachel Coleman notes that with Ananias and Sapphira's sin in Acts 5:2 (ἐνοσφίσατο ⸀ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς) Luke alludes to a primal trespass of Israel which occurs in the Achan story of the Book of Joshua (7:1 LXX). There the children of Israel sin a great sin and ἐνοσφίσαντο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναθέματος – they steal some of the dedicated things. For the Christian pair to have received the generous gift of the Spirit and then to have violated that gift by stealing what was God's, was for them, as it was for Achan, a death sentence. Rachel L. Coleman, *The Lukan Lens on Wealth and Possessions: A Perspective Shaped by the Themes of Reversal and Right Response* BIS 180 (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2019), 125.

[617] As the King James so poetically renders it (1 Kings 21:3).

[618] Davies, 'Purity, Spirit and Reciprocity', 268.

[619] 268.

the common wealth motivates structural change in the sect, with 'deacons' appointed to oversee business affairs, while the Apostles devote themselves wholly to 'spiritual' matters. Stephen recounts the treacherous sale of the patriarch Joseph, as well as his financial/material vindication by God. Simon, in a classic example of what Atran calls the 'backfire effect', is rebuked by Peter for trying to purchase an inalienable, God-given spiritual power. Dorcas is praised for her charity and Cornelius is known by God for giving to the poor. In response to a Spirit inspired prophetic warning, financial help is sent from Antioch to Judea. A slave girl with a 'python spirit', exorcised by Paul, lost her ability to divine and turn a profit for her masters. Converted magicians burn 50,000 silver-pieces worth of books. Paul testifies that he has honourably worked for his money and had never been covetous of others' 'silver or gold'. Luke has Paul cite the hapax Jesus saying, 'it is more blessed to give than to receive.' Felix looked for a bribe from Paul, who never gave it (Atran's point three: 'no surrender') Finally, self-sufficient Paul lived in Rome, 'in his own rented lodgings' (ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι).[620] Davies concludes his discussion of the leitmotif with the phrase, 'the holy money of Acts'. Indeed, it is 'holy money', for the hearts of those who handle it have been cleansed by the Spirit received through faith (Acts 15:8-9) and the cash itself is purposed for the holy mission of world evangelism in the power of the – Holy – Spirit.

Davies' argument is intriguingly corroborated by the Lukan intertext. As discussed above in section 4.2.3, Luke's Gospel draws heavily upon Malachi 3 to depict John the Baptist as the forerunner of the Lord, and Jesus as the Lord who comes 'suddenly to his Temple'. Malachi emphasises the theme of purity as precious metals – the Lord 'will sit smelting and cleansing as silver and as gold, and he will cleanse the sons of Levi and pour them as gold and as silver' (Malachi 3:3 LXX). Given Luke's placement of Jesus as the Lord who purifies by his fiery Spirit, it is noteworthy to find Luke's textual source using gold and silver as the symbol of inner purity. This anchors Davies' argument deep in Luke's narrative structure.

Next, Davies, drawing upon Godelier, notes that the Spirit links the Christians 'with their origin … Jesus and his resurrection.'[621] This corresponds to Atran's fourth point – the discounting of space and time – for the Spirit links the new sect, not only with Jesus, who resides 'extra-dimensionally' at the right hand of God, but also with 'the ancestors', the ancient people of God which had always possessed the Spirit among its prophets, priests, and kings. The Christians, Luke argues, simply made Spirit experience universal. Now all can and must be Spirit-possessed, Spirit-sanctified, Spirit-guided, and Spirit-empowered.

So too, Davies, referencing Leviticus 17:11 that 'the life is in the blood' observes that the setting aside of regulations concerning food, circumcision, bodily fluids, etc., 'does not mean that a system of purity-impurity ceases to be operative. Prime values always exist'. Now, as Davies aptly notes, the life is in the Spirit 'and it is that life which is the power that engenders the identity of Christians.' It is the Spirit that subsumes the previous role of circumcision as the *sine qua non* of membership in God's people. Entrenched cultural norms, Davies argues, do not suddenly dissipate into thin air: 'such a shift in practice, in embodiment … would only be possible under the most powerful of motivations. It is here that the sensed power of the spirit seems to predominate.'[622]

---

[620] 268-270.
[621] 270.
[622] 271.

Indeed, it is here that the phenomenological cluster of spirit possession with ASCs and glossolalia has explanatory power. Would yet another water ritual, immersion in Jesus name, for instance, be emotionally potent enough to accomplish the 'shift in practice, in embodiment' that Davies has outlined? *Mikva'ot* were ubiquitous in ancient Israel, ritual ablutions commonplace. Yes, there was the ideology of Jesus' resurrection associated with baptism, but would the kerygma, even combined with an especially symbolic water rite, have shoved the ancient cultic practices off the ritual table and allowed sectarian expansion into dangerous Gentile territory?

In actuality, Luke tells us that for some time the Jesus sect baptised its Jewish converts without any desire to shelve the 'old' Mosaic rituals or to evangelize their uncircumcised neighbours. Luke justifies the acceptance of Gentiles strictly because of the common experience of Holy Spirit possession. Only after the Gentiles are observed in a glossolalic ASC are the Jews, viz., Peter and his associates, willing to immerse them. Once that is accomplished, then table fellowship naturally follows and a whole new habitus, the habitus of the Spirit, begins to supplant the habitus of Moses.

This transition entails Davies' term, 'embodiment dissonance', which was introduced above.[623] With similar meaning he employs Ernest De Martino's concept, 'crisis of presence'. Peter, for instance, in coming to terms with God's acceptance of the Gentiles, experienced a 'crises of presence' and 'embodiment dissonance' (at the vision of un-halakhic food, Peter protests, μηδαμῶς, κύριε and afterward he is ἐν ἑαυτῷ διηπόρει). These concepts, anguished protestations, internal perplexity, in contrast to the familiar 'cognitive dissonance', are emotive, are bodily, and not purely rational. Conversion to the Jesus sect, even the sect's own move to include Gentiles, all tend to involve a period of disorientation, where the old habitus drops off and the individual is aligned with the new sectarian habitus. Peter and Paul, as leading, exemplary characters, both illustrate this.

Lydia the prayerful seller of purple, convert of Paul, as well as Cornelius the devout centurion, convert of Peter, seem to bely this dissociative trend. However, both are portrayed as being already especially inclined towards spirituality – Cornelius with his fasting, prayers, and almsgiving can 'clearly see' an angelic visitation; Lydia, discovered at the riverside prayer meeting, already a 'worshiper of God', has her heart 'opened' by the Lord to listen to Paul (διήνοιξεν, cf. Luke 24:45, where Jesus 'opens', διήνοιξεν, the minds of the disciples). Clearly Luke is aware of diversity in the psychological process of conversion.

However, the problematic cases have to do with change of habitus. Some converts possess, before their conversion, the proper attitude towards prime sectarian values that allows them to rapidly be integrated into sectarian life. Luke thus points his reader towards one of the finer points of proselytising, namely, finding persons naturally inclined towards the 'spirituality' characteristic of the sect. That is, the particular religious mood distinctive of the early Christians.

In contrast to such good converts as Cornelius and Lydia, Luke presents us with Judas, with Ananias and Sapphira. These, Davies argues, highlight the Lukan theme of betrayal. He writes: 'it is a power for evil that is released if persons pretend to symbols of self-sacrifice in a community where such sacrifice is normative'. Davies lists Luke's evildoers, betrayers to one

[623] 263.

degree or another: the ones who turn back from Jesus' call that they may live more comfortably, that they may bury their dead or say goodbye; the rich young ruler; Judas; Peter; Ananias and Sapphira. Davies argues that Paul could be viewed as a betrayer, because he understood himself as one who had persecuted the church, as standing in the ignominious line of betrayers with Peter and with the apostles who fled at Jesus' arrest. Betrayal, Davies argues, seemed to go hand in hand with apostleship, and 'was at least one constituent element … in the experience of the earliest disciples and was related to the medium of money in Acts.'[624] But, while there was redemption for Peter and Paul, for those who betrayed the Spirit there was no mercy, as per Luke 12:10. That is violation of the fourth level obligations entailed through receiving the inalienable Spirit.[625]

Davies finishes his article on the hopeful note of 'pardon'. To join the sect, one must be pardoned. The Apostles were all pardoned, Paul experienced pardon. Borrowing Robert Hertz's phrase, the 'mystery of pardon', Davies roots this mystery in the transformative encounter with the transcendent that Maurice Bloch understood as 'rebounding conquest'. Bloch's contribution will be engaged with at greater length later in this dissertation. However, Davies writes, 'the Resurrection of Jesus rebounds in the conquest of the Spirit marked in the rise of the new community.' Ritual purity adheres to this transcendence, but ritual impurity lurks in the shadows of its denial. Death nears for those who, having once been transformed by the transcendent encounter, dare betray it.

But for those who are transformed, who, through numinous encounter themselves are transfigured, there is pardon. In fact, this transformation *is* pardon. The transformed are the community of the pardoned. 'The mystery of pardon is the key to this new society. Pardon has to do with social regeneration: it is the frame of repentance and baptism as a rite of passage into a new order ….'[626] To this I would only add that the pardon is sealed in the intense experience of the Holy Spirit. Thus, in Davies' discussion of purity, reciprocity, and the Spirit, we have, in social anthropological terms, addressed the heart of Lukan sacred values.

5.7 Emotion and the Early Christian Sect

5.7.1 Fundamental Issues

The question of emotion raises definitional issues. For example, John Corrigan reviews the current debate and describes it as marked by, 'on the one hand, claims for the universality of emotion across cultures and historical settings, and, on the other, arguments supporting the cultural construction of emotion….'[627] The elephant in the room, however, is the problem of consciousness. Regardless of whether emotions should be understood as clustering more tightly around the biological pole (and thus universal constants), or around the cultural pole (and thus fundamentally diverse), it is the conscious brain that experiences emotional qualia,

[624] 273-276.
[625] 277.
[626] 279.
[627] John Corrigan, 'Introduction: Emotions Research and the Academic Study of Religion', in John Corrigan, ed., *Religion and Emotion: Approaches and Interpretations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 3-31; 7. Cf. John Corrigan, Eric Crump, and John Kloos, *Emotion and Religion: A Critical Assessment and Annotated Bibliography* (London: Greenwood Press, 2000). For an extensive review of theories of emotion, consciousness, and ritual, see Ilkka Pyysiäinen, *How Religion Works: Towards a New Cognitive Science of Religion* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2003), 77-142.

even when elements of those emotions may be subconscious.[628] Despite a myriad of proposals, neuroscience has not yet solved the 'hard problem', has no Theory of Consciousness, no accepted explanation for what consciousness is, or how it is generated. Until we have a clear understanding of the basic phenomenon of self-awareness, caution is in order. This impacts any attempt to define emotion. If we do not know what consciousness is, or how its biological processes are related to language and culture, then how can we know what it means for a conscious self to emote?[629] We may, and truly we must, continue to gather data from ethnographies and fMRI scans, but the final resolution of whether emotions are more cultural or biological, or just how these two dimensions are woven together, or what, ultimately, emotion is, lies in the future of ongoing, progressive research.

5.7.2 Religious Moods, Emotional Regimes, and The Favoured Emotional Habitus: Davies, Riis and Woodhead, Corrigan

How then to proceed? Davies understands emotions as 'focused feeling states of limited yet intense duration'.[630] From a cognitive perspective, this relates well with the idea of emotional qualia emphasised here. We recognise that individuals can possess 'focused feeling states'. At the same time, there is value in the work of Ole Riis and Linda Woodhead, who propose a conceptual framework of 'emotion as constructed in the interplay between social agents *and* structures … emotion is 'both-and' rather than 'either/or': both personal and relational; private and social; biological and cultural; active and passive.'[631] They point out that emotions pertain, not merely to 'self and society', but also to 'culture, material objects, memories, places, and symbols' as well as with things and persons and beings deemed sacred.[632] They propose a threefold dialectic where, 'emotion is generated in the interactions between self and society, self and symbol, and symbol and society.'[633] They caution us, in employing this dialectic, to examine both the presence of emotion, and the lack thereof. This we will do. Continuing to use Davies' 'focused feeling states' as our baseline concept, we will understand terms like love, fear, joy, warmth, or betrayal in a heuristic fashion, especially within a particular social group, working with the threefold dialectic of self, society and symbol, while recognising the caveat that we may have no absolute, cross-cultural definitions for such terms.

Riis and Woodhead also warn that in the study of emotion and religion, we cannot seek, as do Rudolf Otto and more recently, Karen Armstrong, distinctively 'religious' emotions, whether

---

[628] Alfred W. Kaszniak, 'Emotion and Consciousness: Current Research and Controversies', in Alfred Kaszniak ed., Emotions, Qualia, and Consciousness: Proceedings of the International School of Biocybernetics Casamicciola, Napoli, Italy, 19-24 October 1998 (Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., 2001), 3-21; 4-5. Cf. Robert C. Roberts, 'Emotions Research and Religious Experience', in John Corrigan ed., The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Emotion (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 490-506; 494-495.

[629] Thomas J. Csordas has built upon the phenomenological theories of Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Pierre Bourdieu to describe the 'sacred self'. Csordas understands the self to be 'indeterminate capacity for orientation and engagement' and he explains: 'The notion of indeterminacy accounts precisely for why we cannot grasp it – "it" being the self itself – because there is in fact no "entity" as such to be grasped.' (Thomas J. Csordas, *The Sacred Self: A Cultural Phenomenology of Charismatic Healing* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 13-14. Cf. Csordas, *Language, Charisma, and Creativity*. I would understand the self as a genuinely present emergent phenomenon of the functioning brain. But, as noted above, there is as yet no accepted theory of how the self emerges from the mass of neurons in our head.

[630] Douglas J. Davies, *Emotion, Identity, and Religion: Hope Reciprocity, and Otherness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 4.

[631] Ole Riis and Linda Woodhead, *A Sociology of Religious Emotion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 5.

[632] 7.

[633] 7.

numinous or joyful and serene, since, firstly, religious significance can be bestowed upon any emotion, and, secondly, religious emotions derive from the threefold interaction of individuals, a religious community, and symbols particular to that community.[634] An emotion that may hold great religious significance for one group may be deprecated by another (e.g., compare the tension between Charismatic and Reformed versions of Christianity). Riis and Woodhead also argue that emotion becomes 'religious', not because of something intrinsic to itself, but because of the religious framework, or regime, within which the emotion is situated.[635] For example, the launch of a spaceship atop a giant rocket may elicit feelings of awe, wonder, and fascination. The identical emotions may occur while touring a magnificent cathedral. Otto is certainly right to have identified and isolated the particular emotion humans feel when contemplating something greater than themselves,[636] but, unless we wish to categorise NASA scientists as especially religious, Riis and Woodhead righty argue that emotion is religious because of its context. Moreover, they correctly reason that it is within an ideological context that emotion is deployed to structure society and order the world in which we live.[637]

In tandem with Riis and Woodhead, Corrigan may be utilised, for he encourages researchers to study, within a particular group, both officially sanctioned emotions and privately experienced emotions. We must, 'illuminate the complex relationship between what individuals feel and what religions expect them to feel.'[638] Unfortunately for this present dissertation, we do not have access to private diaries of the early Jesus followers. We have sacred texts. How much those texts reflect the interests and controlling influence of the new religious movement and how much they reflect the actual lives of individual sectarians is an open question and one not to be resolved here. Even Paul, frank and transparent as he seems to be at times, was a religious leader writing for his followers. Do we really have his private thoughts?

Nevertheless, Davies' observation of religious moods is helpful: 'The capacity of any religious group to prefer certain emotions and foster their affinity with particular doctrinal clusters of ideas … remains an area ripe for extensive research….'[639] Riis and Woodhead term this same concept 'emotional regimes', illustrating the idea from the familiar 'spirit' of Christmas – a holiday where celebratory feelings and expressions are officially enjoined, and non-participation is sanctioned – anyone unwilling to celebrate is labelled a 'Scrooge', a 'Grinch'.[640] In other words, emotional regimes 'structure a system of power relations.'[641] In pursuit of such a program dealing with the early Christian sect, we can study the second half of what Corrigan has advised, namely the emotional habitus officially expected of Luke's sectarians, particularly that engendered during initiation. We will thus explore the initiatory formation of religious mood/emotional regime within the early Christian sect.

---

[634] 54-57.
[635] 93.
[636] Rudolf Otto, trans. John Wilfred Harvey, *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry Into the Non-rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and Its Relation to the Rational* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924 [1917]).
[637] 93-94.
[638] 19.
[639] Douglas J. Davies, 'Introduction: Emotion, Identity and Group Communication', in Douglas J. Davies and Nathaniel A. Warne, eds., *Emotions and Religious Dynamics* (Farnham, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013), 1-8; 2.
[640] Riis and Woodhead, *Religious Emotion*, 10-12; 47-51; 69-73.
[641] 72.

5.7.3 Elliot: 'Biblical' Emotions and Cognition?

Some work on emotions in the New Testament has already been done. Matthew A. Elliot evaluates two competing psychological theories of emotion, the non-cognitive and the cognitive (he does not engage with social anthropological notions of emotion as cultural artefact, nor does he address the problem of emotional qualia and consciousness). He sides definitively with the idea that emotion belongs to the realm of reason, of cognition rather than the body. How one intellectually evaluates or judges a particular object determines the emotion linked to that object. For example, he explains, 'An emotion can be illogical or unjustifiable because it is based on wrong judgements.'[642] In fact, Elliot further argues that emotion and cognition are not 'two separate systems', one physiological and one cognitive, but are an integrated whole, reciprocally influencing each other.[643] With this I can agree. Yet, in the end, he leans towards prioritizing the 'rational' dimension: 'irrational emotions reflect our own irrational judgements and beliefs.'[644] For Elliot, New Testament emotion is clearly cognitive.[645] In fact, believing the apostolic teaching, the *kerygma*, 'forms the foundation for Christian emotions.'[646] He entitles his book, *Faithful Feelings*, because 'Emotions are a faithful reflection of what we believe and value.'[647]

While being mindful of the premise that without a full understanding of consciousness we cannot definitively understand emotional qualia, I would question whether a strict relegation of the totality of emotion to 'reason' is justified. I would especially question, in light of Paul's argument to the Galatians, whether the early Christians predicated their emotions upon their doctrine. For Paul it was the converse.

5.7.4 Emotional Mood: Inselmann, Wenkel, Story – Joy in Luke-Acts

We have already discussed in detail, as they relate to identity fusion, five of the key Lukan emotions: feelings of visceral oneness with the group, feelings of invulnerability, of certainty, of agency, and of destiny. To these must be added two more significant emotions – joy and fear. The presence of joy as a leading theme is not in doubt. Anke Inselmann writes:

> In contrast to the findings in Mark and Matthew's Gospels, the concept of joy (χαρά) is so strongly developed across texts in Luke's Gospel that it structures the narrative as a central *leitmotif*.[648]

In Luke, baby John leaps in Elizabeth's womb for joy, there is joy at John's birth, Mary rejoices in God her Saviour, the angel announces joy to the shepherds, there is joy in persecution and joy in heaven over the sinner who repents, the Seventy return with joy, Jesus himself rejoices in the Holy Spirit, there is joy at the resurrection and joy associated with worshipping the ascended Jesus and with praising God. In Acts, Peter quotes David that his heart celebrated and his tongue was filled with joy, the apostles rejoice that they are counted worthy to suffer

---

[642] Matthew A. Elliott, *Faithful Feelings: Rethinking Emotion in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2006), 35.
[643] 46-47.
[644] 48.
[645] 238.
[646] 254.
[647] 264.
[648] 'Im Gegensatz zum Befund im Markus- und Matthäusevengelium ist das Konzept der Freude (χαρά) im Lukasevangelium textübergreifend so stark ausgestaltet, dass es die Narration als ein zentrales Leitmotiv strukturiert.' Anke Inselmann, *Die Freude im Lukasevangelium: Ein Beitrag zur psychologischen Exegese* WUNT2 322 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 394.

shame, Philip's miracle ministry produces much joy in Samaria, the Ethiopian Eunuch goes on his way rejoicing, Rhoda has joy at the appearance of Peter, the Gentiles in Pisidian Antioch were rejoicing, the disciples at Pisidian Antioch were filled with joy and the Holy Spirit, the news of Gentile conversions brought great joy to all the brothers.

Three authors have devoted monographs to joy in Luke-Acts. Inselmann (limiting herself to Luke's Gospel), emphasises the rationality of Lukan joy:

> Because cognitive and affective processes are so closely intertwined, a long-term, stable, religious joy must, from a Lukan perspective, be rationally reflected upon and worked through.[649]

For Inselmann, it is this rational quality (exemplified, for example, when Jesus logically explains the Christ event from Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms – Luke 24:27, 44-47) which enables Lukan joy to overcome sadness and doubt, to mature past initial excitement, and to produce 'fruit'.[650] The Lukan narrative is at pains, 'to avoid esoteric and mystical representational tendencies.'[651] In this Inselmann corroborates the dissertation's emphasis upon Lukan spirit possession as 'sober intoxication' (cf. Introduction and section 2.3.1).

David H. Wenkel also provides us with several key insights.

> Joy works subjectively upon the reader by providing an accessible emotional gateway into the narrative world that Luke wants the reader to accept as corresponding to the experiential world.'[652]

In other words, the reader is also to enter into joy. Wenkel finds that joy functions ideologically as part of Lukan rhetoric – namely, feelings of joy are intended to persuade the reader that God has reversed the fortunes of his people and is inaugurating a new age.[653] Joy also evokes intertextual connections with Isaiah, where joy marks, 'the restoration of Israel, anti-idol polemic, the power of the word of God, and a universal concern for the salvation of the nations.'[654] Joy is an 'identity marker' distinguishing the true people of God.[655] In Acts, joy attends each point of Luke's famous geographical outline in Acts 1:8.[656] Joy is proof that God fulfils his promises to his people. Joy is employed 'to further the ecclesiological interest in forming identity' – which becomes evident at the grand council of Acts 15, where rejoicing precedes and follows it (Acts 15:3 and 31). Moreover, Wenkel keenly observes that 'joy is part of a matrix of requirements for the implied reader to enter into the upside-down world that Acts portrays.'[657] That is, in terms of emotional regimes, the early Christian sect expected joy.

J. Lyle Story, working meticulously through the Lukan stories and terminology for joy and 'great joy', emphasises the association of joyful emotion with charismatic experience.

---

[649] 'Weil kognitive und affektive Prozesse so eng miteinander verwoben sind, muss eine langfristig stabile Glaubensfreude aus lukanischer Sicht rational reflektiert und aufgearbeitet sein.' (405).
[650] 405.
[651] 'esoterische und mystische Darstellungstendenzen zu vermeiden.' (405).
[652] David H. Wenkel, *Joy in Luke-Acts: The Intersection of Rhetoric, Narrative, and Emotion* PBM (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2015), 173.
[653] 44-45.
[654] 174.
[655] 175.
[656] 176.
[657] 177.

Accurately reflecting the Lukan social hierarchy, Story begins with God who is a God of joy who desires his people to be joyful. Jesus, too, is a man of joy, exulting in the Spirit and praising his Father. As Wenkel, Story understands that Luke expects his readers to imitate his role models. Inclusion in the believing community is a matter of and for joy. Joy is tied to eschatological hope. Story helpfully observes that Luke contrasts the joyful people of God with the dour, joyless opponents of the faith, so that joy forms an 'identity marker'. Joy draws in converts. Joy is the natural and proper response to persecution. Joy is linked to the glorification of God.[658]

5.7.5 More Emotional Mood: Fear, and Security in Luke-Acts

But was this joy a superficial, happy-clappy sentimentality that the sectarians were supposed to don? Or was it, perhaps, a wild, uncontrolled emotional frenzy? Luke is careful to temper joy with fear. Zacharias feared. Mary asserts that the Lord's mercy is for those who fear him. Fear comes on the people after Zacharias' tongue is loosed. After the miracle of the great catch of fish, Jesus must tell Simon Peter not to fear. The people fear after Jesus raises a widow's son from death. Jesus teaches that God, not people, is the one to be feared. After Pentecost, when the believers were fellowshipping closely together and the apostles were working wonders and signs, there was fear with every soul. At the death of Ananias and Sapphira, all who hear of it fear, including the church. After the conversion of Saul, the church continues in both the fear of the Lord and the comfort of the Holy Spirit. The early Christian sect, at least as far as can be known from Luke's teaching, combined effervescence with sobriety. That is, the sectarians were not to celebrate entirely uncontrolled. Their joy was bounded by fear.[659]

5.7.6 Durkheim, Mellor: Effervescence and Revival of Religion Phenomena

We must now ask about the nature of Luke's communally validated and regulated religious experience. Was it simply Durkheimian effervescence with a little awe thrown in? Did the early Christians sing, dance, and drum themselves into an emotional frenzy and call it Spirit baptism? Luke does not mention such musical accoutrements. He only speaks of fervent, united prayer. Then could not such fervent prayer have led to highly emotional experiences? Clearly Luke wants us to think that it did. In Acts 4, after the persecuted, gathered community lifted up their voice in prayer, 'the place was shaken' (ἐσαλεύθη ὁ τόπος). Luke elsewhere employs the verb, σαλεύω, to speak of a literal earthquake that physically shakes open doors and looses chains (Acts 16:26), as well as to describe evildoers agitating a crowd (Acts 17:13). In Luke's worldview there would be no conceptual issue with the Almighty sending an earthquake in response to prayers. Nevertheless, when Luke says that after prayer 'the place in which they were gathered was shaken … and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit' (Acts 4:31), he could just as well have been speaking of a physical shaking of the believers themselves. In other words, we are likely looking at behaviour typical of revivals of religion – the convulsions, heavy physical gyrations, and shaking well known to modern sociologists of religion from the 'Toronto Blessing', and to students of the history of religion from such

---

[658] J. Lyle Story, *Joyous Encounters: Discovering the Happy Affections in Luke-Acts* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2018), 325-331.

[659] This is no claim that the average denizen of the Mediterranean world lived in constant fear. As discussed in section 2.2.6, Meggitt has sufficiently critiqued that trope (cf. Meggitt, 'Did Magic Matter?'). An isolated sect, however, could very well have utilised fear as a means of control. Cf., Ilkka Pyysiäinen, 'Religious Conversion and Modes of Religiosity', in Harvey Whitehouse and Robert N. McCauley, eds., *Mind and Religion: Psychological and Cognitive Foundations of Religiosity* (Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2005), 149-166; 152-153.

revivals as the First Great Awakening in colonial America with Jonathan Edwards, John Wesley, and George Whitefield, as well as Wesley and Whitefield's preaching in England.[660]

Philip A. Mellor argues that contemporary charismatic religion, with its 'highly *personalist* character' leans, in terms of emotion, toward the individualist perspective of William James and diverges from Durkheim's collectivist vision.[661] Yet Mellor brings us back to the group-oriented religious experience painted by Durkheim in that:

> Not only do these highly personal experiences offer the inductive basis for the affirmation of a community life, however, but the range of extreme physical and emotional symptoms individuals experience as they encounter the power of the Holy Spirit are *collectively nurtured*.[662]

Mellor's observations fit well the ancient Christian sect, with its introductory requirement of possession and glossolalia combined with its ordered cultivation of charismatic spirituality. Though Luke's Christians may experience possession *en masse*, the phenomenon is a complex interaction between individual and group dynamics – much more complex than simply heightened group emotions.

5.7.7 Davies' Challenge: Linking Emotions, Doctrine, and Praxis

We now return to Davies' challenge to study the link between a sect's preferred emotions and its doctrine. We do so with reference to the role of initiation in 'priming the pump' as it were, for life in the sect. Initiatory emotion impacts sectarian lives in three dimensions: the affective, the psychomotor, and the cognitive. Affectively, new sectarians experience the elation of having 'got in'. They have been accepted, not merely by the sect, but by the God of the sect. The Divine imprimatur has been stamped upon them. Now they also 'fit in' because they have submitted to the same emotional regime as the other sect members. Feelings of belonging, comfort, and purpose replace feelings of guilt and conviction (cf. the crowd in Acts 2:37; Saul in Acts 26:14). In psychomotor terms, they have gained new bodily skills – glossolalia and ASCs. The affective and psychomotor relate to the traditional praxis of the sect. In terms of cognition, the intense emotion of Spirit reception confirms the Apostolic teaching which the new initiate has received.[663]

This emotional melding, not only with the doctrine, praxis, and emotional regime of the sect, but also with the other sect members, is facilitated by the impact of sacred values and identity fusion. The initiatory possession/ASC/glossolalia cluster not only instils within the converted the sectarian emotional regime – feelings of visceral oneness, of invulnerability, of certainty, of agency, of destiny, of joy, and of fear – it also validates the sectarian worldview with its hierarchy of divine and human actors, its aspirations of world conquest, and its claims to ritual purity and spiritual power. Being thus fused to other sect members and imprinted with the

---

[660] Cf. Margaret M. Poloma, *Main Street Mystics: The Toronto Blessing and Reviving Pentecostalism* (Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2003). R. A. Knox, Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion with Special Reference to the XVII and XVIII Centuries (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950), 520-534.

[661] Philip A. Mellor, 'Embodiment, Emotion and Religious Experience: Religion, Culture and the Charismatic Body', James A. Beckford and N. J. Demerath III, eds., *The SAGE Handbook of the Sociology of Religion* (Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, 2007), 587-607; 591; original italics.

[662] 591; original italics.

[663] Cf. Luhrmann's discussion of the effects of a perceived experience of God upon religious doubt: 248, 148, 146.

sectarian value system, Luke's new converts are willing to aggressively proselytize, to uphold sectarian mores, and to endure hardship, persecution, and even martyrdom.

5.8 Mediation in the Early Christian Sect

5.8.1 Mediation as a Current Issue in Anthropology

Matthew Engelke poses the 'problem of presence', a quandary which he suggests particularly vexes Christian thought, namely, how can God be distant and yet present?[664] This difficulty can be construed in terms of:

> how a religious subject defines and claims to construct a relationship with the divine through the investment of authority and meaning in certain words, actions, and objects.[665]

The Friday Masowe Church, a Zimbabwean Christian sect which Engelke studied, solved the problem of presence by rejecting the use of physical Bibles or other religious objects and emphasising the 'live and direct' immediacy of God's Spirit, especially as the Spirit, and various angelic personages, manifest in and through human prophets. This solution, as Engelke explains, has its own attendant contradictions, for prophets still prescribe sacred medicines which are physical, and problems, as prophets may have personality clashes or even moral failures.

Joel Robbins, taking up Engelke's 'problem', asks an even more fundament question, why do religions pose distant deities in the first place? In seeking an answer, Robbins draws upon Henri Hubert and Marcel Mauss' essay on sacrifice to illuminate the role of spirit possession as a form of mediation between sacred and profane realms within a charismatic Christian, Papua New Guinea tribe. Hubert and Mauss propose that sacrifices allow individuals to temporarily bridge the gap between sacred and profane worlds. The two realms touch, the sacrifice is consumed, the human concerned benefits, and the sacred and profane return again to their normal, distant and differentiated positions. Matters of individual and society interpenetrate without either destroying the other – 'fusion' of the two realms is avoided.[666]

In the Urapmin tribe among which Robbins spent more than two years, sacrifice of animals has – almost – been replaced by spirit possession.[667] The possessing spirit, in this case, is the Christian Holy Spirit, who 'guides' the hearts of Urapmin Christians, who completely, though temporarily, possesses representative individuals at 'spirit-discos', and who possesses on a more permanent basis a few female Urapmin termed 'Spirit women'. Whereas before Christianity, the Urapmin sacrificed animals to maintain contact with, but a healthy distance between, themselves and their ancestors, and to severe unwanted ties with harmful spirits, now they no longer sacrifice to the ancestors and only rarely, and then only upon the instructions of

---

[664] Cf. Webb Keane's use of the phrase 'the problem of presence' in discussing sacred language addressed to distant deities/ancestors/spirits, 'Religious Language', *ARA* Vol 26 (1997), 47-71; 51. See also, Birgit Meyer's observation of religion, 'as a practice of mediation between people and the divine (or more broadly: the realm beyond the empirically perceivable reality)', in 'Religious revelation, secrecy and the limits of visual representation', *AT* Vol. 6 Issue 4 (2006), 431-453; 434.

[665] Matthew Engelke, *A Problem of Presence: Beyond Scripture in an African Church* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 9, 12.

[666] Henri Hubert and Marcel Mauss, trans. W. D. Halls, *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function* (London: Cohen & West, 1964 [*Essai sur la Nature et la Fonction du Sacrifice* (L'Année sociologique, 1898)]), 95-103.

[667] Cf. Joel Robbins, *Becoming Sinners: Christianity and Moral Torment in a Papua New Guinea Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).

the Spirit women, sacrifice to spirits. Whereas before they used deceptive initiation rituals to maintain secrecy and distance among themselves, now they preach a radically absolutizing sincerity and honesty in all social interactions. The issue that Robbins focalises is *preserving* distance, both between deity and devotee, and between individual and society. He suggests that the struggle of Urapmin Christians to find a functional balance might also be a driving factor among religions and religionists generally as they seek to interact with the sacred without dissolving the profane. Or, put another way, how to navigate between individuals benefiting society without becoming subsumed by it, and individuals benefiting themselves without being careless of the needs of society.

Douglas Davies has addressed the issue of bridging the sacred/profane gap from a different angle. While not utilising the terminology of 'mediation', he has drawn upon two other anthropologists – Maurice Bloch and Stanley Tambiah – to elucidate the processes and effects of sacred/profane encounter. In turning now to Davies' work, we suggest that he may have provided a solution to Robbins' question.

5.8.2 Maurice Bloch, Rebounding Conquest

Maurice Bloch attempted to provide a universal, underlying narrative for ritual in his theory of rebounding violence.[668] Bloch argued that through ritual, individuals, and societies collectively, experience being violently conquered by the transcendent realm. Their natural, human nature is ritually killed so that they can, in essence, belong to what their society conceives of as transcendent. This, of course, is inconvenient for ongoing societal/political structures. To remain in the terrestrial here and now, the ritual patient must consume the vitality of mortal beings (whether animal or human) and do so in the power of, and from the victorious vantage point of, the transcendent world of which he/she has become a part. Having experienced the violence of being conquered, the energized ritual patient now exerts violence to conquer and consume, hence the concept, 'rebounding violence'. The individual passing through such a ritual of rebounding conquest does not simply enter and exit without incident. He/she is transformed by contact with the transcendent – the numinous remains with the patient, who is now a powerful bifurcated inhabitant of both realms, the natural and the transcendent. In summary:

(1) Ritual Death & Sacrifice = killing of the earthly human nature by the transcendent realm
(2) Ritual Transformation & Metamorphosis = the ritual patient becomes transcendent
(3) Ritual Violence & Consumption = eating the vitality of the earthly realm (in form of animals or other humans, either literally or figuratively) enables continued existence in the terrestrial
(4) Ritual Outcome & Result = the bifurcated life: the ritual patient now exists both as a natural human, consuming earthly vitality, and as a transcendent being, drawing upon the transcendent world for victory in this world below.

In terms of mediation and the problem of presence, Bloch's work informs us that (1) mediation does not occur apart from transformation; (2) the locus of mediation can shift from the 'other' to the 'self' – the sacrificer becomes the sacrificed; (3) the duration of mediation can extend indefinitely in the 'living sacrifice'; (4) the danger of mediation can

[668] Bloch, *Prey into Hunter*.

be lessened in that the fusion between sacred and profane, which Hubert and Mauss feared, takes on a positive valence both for the individual and for society.

5.8.3 Stanley Jeyaraja Tambiah, Ethical Vitality

To Bloch's concept of rebounding conquest, Davies adds the work of S. J. Tambiah, who spoke of 'ethical vitality' – that primal energy to do ethical, social, and religious things. For Tambiah this is merit, transferable merit, produced by the 'sacrifice of… human energy'.[669] In the Buddhist, north-east Thai village studied by Tambiah, the community sponsors its young men to become monks. The young monks, in turn, earn merit for the parents, elders, et al. who sponsored them. Tambiah writes,

> The reciprocity may be elucidated as follows: village youth become temporary monks before marriage to make merit for their elders and community members. In effect, then, the older generation persuades its youth temporarily to renounce its vitality and sexual potency and undergo an ascetic regimen. In a sense it is the sacrifice of this human energy that produces ethical vitality which can counter karma and suffering.'[670]

We can summarise the process as: sacrifice of virility → ethical vitality = merit > negative karma.

5.8.4 Douglas J. Davies, Rebounding Vitality

Davies combines the notions of Bloch and Tambiah into the concept of 'rebounding vitality' – 'the merit generated through ethical vitality that becomes the power operating in the process of rebounding violence: merit drives the process of rebounding conquest.'[671] He states his thesis crisply:

> The life of Christ generated that ethical vitality which, symbolized in the resurrection and conceptualized as merit, provided the energy for rebounding violence, symbolized in the coming of the Holy Spirit, which both empowered the new Christian community to evangelize and validated its emergent soteriology.[672]

Thus, the self, its old nature sacrificed, yet now transformed by contact with the transcendent, full of and empowered by ethical vitality, seeks to conquer others with the vision of spiritual transformation. We can summarise the process as: sacrifice of virility → ethical vitality = merit → energy for social conquest / validation of sectarian belief system.

5.8.5 Mediation, Presence, Sacrifice, and Transformation in Early Christianity

Robbins raised the question of why religions so often posit a distant deity. I have suggested Davies, in integrating Bloch's emphasis upon sacrifice as transformation and Tambiah's focus on sacrifice – especially sacrifice of youth – as generating merit, points us towards the answer. Distant gods function evolutionarily to enable societal change. In opening a crevasse between the holy and the profane, society creates a form of potential energy. Gazing across the gap, society envisions itself as transcending its present state, sacrifices its present vital, but

---

[669] S. J. Tambiah, 'The Ideology of Merit and the Social Correlates of Buddhism in a Thai Village', in E. R. Leach, ed., *Dialectic in Practical Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 41-121; 105.
[670] 105.
[671] Davies, 'Rebounding Vitality', 211.
[672] 212.

immature self, and thereby transforms into the condition it perceives as its sacred destiny. To posit a distant deity is to posit societal potential. Imagining distance is a mechanism for change, for societal evolution. To borrow a line from Paul, society, 'beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, is transformed into the same image, from glory to glory'.

For Luke, distance between God and God's people exists, mostly because of sin, but also because of the complications involved in being occupied by foreign powers (e.g., Luke 1:67-79). Jesus has come, filled with the Holy Spirit – hence a mediator of divine presence – in accordance with the covenant of God with the ancestors, to redeem his people through his blood sacrifice, to establish a new covenant with them, and to purify them with the fiery Spirit that they may, once more, offer pure worship to God. The Lukan Messiah restores Israel to its original destiny as a nation of priests.

Though Jesus establishes ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου (Luke 22:20), Luke does not entirely dismiss the sacrificial Temple cult – Paul himself participates in a purification ritual that would require sacrifice (Acts 21:26). Luke transfers the primary sacrificial/mediatory work to Jesus while asserting the cultural importance of the Temple sacrifices and the entirety of the Mosaic law for Jewish members of his sect. Since, from Luke's post-70 perspective, the Temple and its sacrifices are no more, the only blood sacrifice that remains is the sacrifice of Jesus. Repentance and forgiveness, now offered in Jesus' name, moves beyond the boundaries of ethnic Israel to all nations (Luke 24:47). But this is not the end of the story of mediation in the Lukan community. Sacrifice continues, transmuted into holy spirit possession. Luke's Pentecost picture of theophanic fire upon the 120 disciples points the reader towards an ongoing form of sacrifice. Holy Spirit possession both purifies and consumes. The disciples are purified to offer worship yet themselves are sacrificially dedicated to God.

6. Conclusion

This dissertation has employed narratological, discourse analysis, and literary exegesis of texts in Paul and Luke-Acts relevant to the question of Spirit experience and Christian initiation and followed that by interpretation of the resultant data with social anthropological methods. It has eschewed etic theological issues (e.g., systematic theology concerns), though it values the emic ideology/theology. It has taken a fundamentally etic scientific approach, while utilizing the emic discourse of its informants as data to be understood with modern tools. It has been a social anthropological analysis of a historically significant new religious movement through literature of that movement. The salient results of the critical-exegetical and social anthropological analysis are several.

First, regarding the exegesis of Pauline writings and methodology, the dissertation has proceeded chronologically and evaluated each epistle independently of the others, carefully seeking to avoid any *prima facie* assumption that similar discourse equates to similar subject. That is, the presence of typical Pauline phraseology such as 'neither Jew nor Greek' etc., in two separate epistles does not indicate identical subject matter. Paul could have waxed eloquent about his pet topic, 'Christian unity', on any number of disparate occasions – funerals, baptisms, fundraisers, imprisonments, etc. Case in point: Paul's discussion of water baptism in Galatians 3:27-28 cannot define our reading of Paul's appeal to Spirit experience in 1 Corinthians 12:13. Rather, the dissertation has shown that the latter passage refers to Spirit baptism as the unifying force among the Corinthians in deliberate contra-distinction to water baptism which, in Corinth, had become source of schism.

Second, in terms of Pauline exegesis, the dissertation has shown that, contrary to prevailing scholarly opinion, Paul sharply differentiated between Spirit experience, which he associated with his ministry, and water baptism, which he could perform, but preferred to relegate to lesser men. Nevertheless, he closely associated the two baptisms, setting them in parallel in Galatians 3 and 4, as well as in 1 Corinthians 6 and 10. For Paul, at least the Paul in 1 Corinthians, both the water rite and the Spirit reception experience are necessary for a convert to be considered as having gained admittance to the people of God and as possessing right standing before God – as having been 'justified'. This construction of the key elements of initiation as being distinct yet integrally linked suggests that, after Paul's ministry associates had done their baptismal work, Paul himself imparted the Spirit.

Ritually speaking, while spatially and temporally distinct from water baptism, Holy Spirit reception is for Paul, nevertheless, united with immersion in that both Spirit baptism and water baptism are initiatory elements granting the initiate a place at the Christian sacred meal. Furthermore, as Dunn argued, for the Apostle, Spirit reception is highly experiential. Paul associates Spirit reception with verbal cries of 'Abba Father', he associates Spirit-prayer with inarticulate groanings, and he finds in Spirit baptism the inception of charismatic community life, that is, the diversity of gifts of the Spirit, as well as the primary unifying experience for the Corinthian Christians. A linguistic analysis has shown that Spirit baptism in 1 Corinthians 12:13 is a matter of immersion in/with the Spirit-element, not an action by the 'Spirit-as-Agent'. Though he does not overtly state that Spirit reception is linked to tongues speech, neither does Paul exclude that possibility, as Paul's rhetorical pairing of interpretation with tongues demonstrates. Both are public activities conducted in the assembly and as such are unrelated to matters of initiation or private prayer. In terms of Paul's notion(s) of 'justification', the dissertation has made no attempt to wade into those deep and troubled academic waters surrounding the grand story of Pauline hermeneutics, Second Temple Judaism, and the Hebrew Scriptures. The dissertation has instead made the humbler claim that social anthropological approaches to ritual and spirit possession can contribute to our understanding of justification, if only in the context of 1 Corinthians.

Third, regarding the *Sitz im Leben* of Luke's Acts, the dissertation demonstrated that the book has historical value, not in its etiological stories, but in its preservation of Christian teaching extant at the time of publication, circa 70-130 CE. This body of instruction, with its various moral, kerygmatic, and ecclesial dimensions, was targeted at the Lukan audience – the 'proto-orthodox' stream laying claim to the Pauline heritage.

Fourth, concerning the methodological approach to Luke-Acts, the dissertation has shown that we can access the Lukan teaching via employment of a constellation of exegetical tools: narratology, discourse analysis, literary analysis. Using such approaches to understand the narrative construction of sympathetic characters, vivid environment, and suspense is crucial, as we have noted the rhetorical power of these very elements to evoke transportation – a psychological phenomenon in which readers become immersed in a story, lose touch with real-world contexts, emotionally bond with narrative protagonists, and consequently experience belief and behavioural modification. Of particular interpretive import are sequential reading, focalisation combined with narrative asides, and the accumulation of an implied mental construct during sequential reading. This process is not a simplistic pasting together of disparate ideas, but a careful tracing of the unfolding narrative, observing how early information impacts and colours later disclosures.

In relation to the ancient cultural discourse within which Luke-Acts stood, the dissertation has utilised genre analysis and Graeco-Roman exemplarity. In terms of exemplarity, the dissertation found that the discourse framework studied by Roller resonates with Acts. Luke highlights for his implied reader the *action* (the great deed), Luke presents the *evaluation*, Luke, by virtue of his *magnum opus*, gives us the *commemoration*, and concomitantly Luke exercises *norm setting*. In terms of genre analysis, the dissertation noted the work of Adams, who argues that Luke-Acts should be understood as collected biography, an ancient literary form which (1) places value upon differentiating in-group members from out-group members and (2) aims to teach through its characters, to instruct regarding right belief and behaviour via reflection upon its lives. Nevertheless, the dissertation has considered the implications of taking alternate approaches to the genre question. If one rejects the location of Lukan writings within *bios*, preferring instead to label Luke's works strictly historiography, then the principles of Graeco-Roman exemplarity still are in play – ancient readers understood heroic deeds to have normative value. If one understands Luke-Acts to be a mixture of elements from both βίος and ἱστορία, then our narrative is coloured by the pedagogical hues of multiple genres. Thus, the dissertation has argued that we cannot escape the Lukan discourse expectations of normativity, instruction, and delineation of genuine disciples.

Fifth, regarding the exegesis of Luke-Acts, we have not isolated initiation but considered it within the broader framework of Lukan soteriology. With respect to the question of Lukan salvation, we have observed that, while redaction criticism produces a definitive result that Luke is not concerned with piacular matters, redaction criticism is insufficient to analyse a narrative. Likewise, lexical frequency statistics are unable to accurately represent the significance of a word when analysed apart from narrative flow. We have shown, narratively, that Luke utilises the substitutionary valence of Isaiah's Servant Songs. Luke identifies the Servant as Jesus, who atones for sin and establishes a new covenant through the wilful, prayerful spiling of his own blood. But not only that, Jesus' death dedicates a new sanctuary. With his final sacrifice, the glory of God departs from the magnificent Jewish Temple to relocate among prayerful disciples gathered in humble homes. Luke draws upon imagery from the Exodus narrative, Chronicles, Amos, and Malachi to portray a restored Tent of David in which pure glossolalic worship takes place, offered by a new, inter-racial priesthood of Jews and Gentiles, to Jesus and to Father God. Concurrently, the worshippers possessed by the Holy Spirit are themselves depicted as sacrifices. The divine fire that consumes the Aaronic and Solomonic dedicatory offerings also burns upon them. They are thereby consecrated to divine, anointed, service.

Sixth, regarding early Christian initiation, the dissertation has shown, contrary to the *communis opinio* that Luke has no overarching initiation sequence, Cornils is correct that Lukan initiation can be understood coherently. In response to Dunn and Lyons' scepticism regarding Lukan theological specificity, I have shown that he crafts his narrative with particular, detailed concern, parsing concepts of ritual praxis, of resident power, and of divine interaction, and prescribing specific initiatory elements. Lukan converts join 'the Way' through a clearly delineated ritual process that, like any ritual behaviour, exhibits limited variability.

Seventh, in terms of social anthropological analysis, the single variant element in Lukan initiation has to do, not with a procedural modification of a liturgical rite, but with the spontaneity of 'performance' that exists due to Luke's concept of resident spiritual power. For Luke, power lies within the apostle or other similarly empowered representative of Jesus.

Power flows from a person in whom Christ has placed power, not from a ritual in which Christ has placed power. In the early Christian sect, the ritual practitioner possesses a barely controllable spiritual force which other members of the community may make demands upon and experience, even apart from the direct action of the ritual practitioner. The initiatory 'rituals' of the sect include the fixed ritual of water baptism, as well as the typical gesture of hand-laying. The gesture has no power in itself but is simply a natural expression of the empowered ritual practitioner who operates towards the performative end of the liturgical/performative spectrum. Furthermore, the dissertation has shown that the narrative addresses not just initiates. Luke enjoins his ritual practitioners to carefully judge the Spirit experience of new initiates. They are to evaluate by the *exemplum* of Pentecost, that is, by the Spirit experience of the 120. In the Cornelius story, Luke provides an *exemplum* of how to use the Pentecost *exemplum*.

Eighth, further in terms of social anthropological analysis, the dissertation shows the Lukan variant of early Christianity to be a glossolalic spirit-possession cult. In doing so the dissertation has confirmed aspects of the theories of Davies and Bazzana, who argue for spirit possession as being fundamental to early Christianity. The dissertation has reasoned that it is possible that Luke is the first to make the charismatic experience of glossolalia, already ubiquitous within Pauline churches, normative at baptism. If that was the case, then it might be a distinct development from Paul, if we assumed Pauline initiation was non-charismatic or even if it was ambivalent regarding tongues. However, caution must be exercised as Paul's conception of holy spirit reception is distinctly vocal/experiential. Furthermore, Paul's letters are circumstantial, not comprehensive, and we do not have a detailed exposition of Paul's initiatory practices – glossolalia may well have accompanied initiation in the Pauline Christ-groups. Paul's discussion of the 'Abba Cry' indicates that some Spirit-inspired vocalization was indeed anticipated at baptism. Nevertheless, as for Luke, he asserts that every initiate to Christianity is expected, after immersion in water and via the laying-on-of-hands by powerful community representatives, to become possessed by the Holy Spirit, to psychologically dissociate, and to 'speak in tongues'.

Ninth, the dissertation has argued that spirit possession, understood in terms of cooperation/surrender/purification/sacrifice/empowerment and conceived of as a cluster of interrelated phenomena – dissociation, glossolalia, alterity – was indeed central to early Christianity, at least to the Christianity exemplified in Paul's letters and Luke's writings. The dissertation has shown that this possession experience was the cardinal rite in early Christian ritual and can be conceived of – vis-à-vis the more liturgical water immersion rite – in terms of performative ritual, that is, more 'shamanic' than priestly. Furthermore, it served a multiplicity of purposes.

Among these purposes, firstly, glossolalic spirit possession functioned to signal commitment to the group. It was a costly signal in that it involved humiliation – the initiate must become possessed and utter strange words in the presence of observers. It was a charismatic signal in that it synchronised group behaviour during prayer and worship as well as establishing the credibility of those charismatic leaders who could 'impart' the spirit experience. The dissertation, drawing upon the insights of Needham, Csordas, and Harkness, suggested that contemporary models can be *heuristically* employed in facilitating our understanding early Christian worship. The congregational 'singing in the Spirit' at a Catholic charismatic prayer meeting as well as the loud corporate cacophony of Korean *t'ongsong kido* prayer, both

illustrate the power of glossolalia to synchronize disparate individuals and to bind them together socially.

Secondly, the dissertation has argued that glossolalic commitment signalling involved partial surrender of control of the self and that there was thus an element of danger, of risk, to the individual's psyche. This surrender required significant trust on the part of initiates, both in the possessing 'holy' spirit and in the community leaders who impart the spirit experience. Drawing upon Rappaport, the dissertation has shown that this risky commitment signalling is related to the idea of sacrality, for in making the leap of faith to signal his commitment with glossolalic spirit possession, the initiate himself becomes certain of the reality of the sacred/unquestionable postulates of his new religion since, in the signalling process, he viscerally experiences inexplicable speech and incontrovertible emotions. Again, utilising Rappaport's concept of indexical rituals, the dissertation has argued that glossolalia succeeded as a signalling mechanism precisely because it is not simply 'hard to fake' but, in the minds of sectarians, was actually 'impossible to fake'. That is, it functioned as an indexical sign of Christian spirit possession.

Thirdly, the social benefits of costly and charismatic commitment signalling were not insignificant. The trust and cooperation engendered by such a highly experiential, possession-type initiation ritual allowed for the easy exchange of finances among group members. That is, social network theory as an explanation for early Christian expansion must be supplemented by understanding the intense emotional 'glue' that held new members in place. Friendship and kinship networks surely facilitated the movement of potential converts to the Christ groups, but it was the power of spirit possession that made those networks 'sticky'. Moreover, we cannot underestimate the advertising potential of dramatic scenes of exorcism from evil spirits and possession by the great spirit of the Jewish god. If Paul and Luke are to be believed, early Christian social networks were built on more than simply collegial fellowship.

Fourthly, in addition to commitment signalling, glossolalic spirit possession bound the individual group members together through a process of 'identity fusion' so that sect members became willing to radically sacrifice for the group and its ideology. The dissertation demonstrated that Luke-Acts profiles the constellation of emotions characteristic of identity fusion – visceral oneness with the group, invulnerability, certainty, agency, and destiny. Luke expected these to be imitated by his Christian audience. Because we know that identity fusion is capable of producing extreme pro-group behaviour, there is no need to view Luke's portrayal of the ideal 'early church' as mere utopian fantasy. There is every reason to believe that Luke's text was effective at facilitating identity fusion, especially as it worked in synergy with a charismatic community. The spirit possession/glossolalia/ASC phenomenal cluster characteristic of the Lukan community might be thought of as a sudden insertion of the sectarian social self. By becoming Holy Spirit possessed, the initiate takes on the group identity and becomes animated by the very Spirit that fills all the other members of the group.

Fifthly, the dissertation has argued that glossolalic spirit possession did not occur apart from a structuring ideology, which it in turn legitimated. The belief framework legitimated by spirit possession can be understood in terms of sacred values theory. Axiomatic sectarian beliefs, such as Jesus' resurrection and gift of the Divine Spirit, were, alongside identity fusion, crucial in enabling the Christians to survive persecution, to thrive, and to promulgate their doctrine across an empire. Imbued with sacred values and convinced by spirit possession, individuals become 'devoted actors' rather than 'rational actors' – and their devotion led them to extreme

actions which rational thought would never even entertain. Paul's own writings demonstrate that he was the epitome of the devoted actor, enduing endless beatings, torments, and trials to proclaim the Christ-message of which he had, though direct revelatory encounter, become utterly convinced. Luke, too, presents his Peter and Paul heroes as devoted actors whose courageous deeds should inspire imitation in the reader.

Sixthly, the dissertation has argued that glossolalic spirit-possession functioned to establish the sectarian emotional regime – namely the emotional habitus officially expected of Luke's Christians, particularly that engendered during initiation. The dissertation took up Davies' challenge to study the link between a sect's preferred emotions and its doctrine, arguing that Christian initiatory spirit possession 'primed the pump' for life in the sect and viscerally confirmed to new converts the sectarian dogma. The dissertation explored emotions in the New Testament and gave special attention to Davies' model of 'ethical vitality' which freshly integrates and builds upon the work of Bloch and Tambiah. The emotional intensity of Christian spirit possession produced an element of trauma which functioned in terms of the 'sacrifice' of the initiate. To belong the Christian movement was to be anointed as a consecrated sacrifice to God.

(98,790 words)

Bibliography

Ackland, Randal. *Toward a Pentecostal Theology of Glossolalia*. PhD dissertation, Bangor University (2020).

Adams, Sean A. 'Luke and Progymnasmata: Rhetorical Handbooks, Rhetorical Sophistication, and Genre Selection,' in M.R. Hauge and A.W. Pitts eds., *Ancient Education and Early Christianity*. LNTS 533. London: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2016, 137-154.

_____. 'Luke's Preface and Its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander', *JGRCJ* Vol. 3 (2006), 177-191.

_____. 'The Characterization of Disciples in Acts: Genre, Method, and Quality', in F. Dicken and J. Snyder, eds. *Characters and Characterization in Luke-Acts*. LNTS 548. London: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2016, 155-68.

_____. 'The Genre of Luke and Acts: The State of the Question', in Sean A. Adams and Michael Pahl, eds. *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2012, 97-120.

_____. *Greek Genres and Jewish Authors: Negotiating Literary Culture in the Greco-Roman Era*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2020.

_____. *The Genre of Acts and Collected Biography*. SNTSMS 156. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Alexander, Loveday. T*he Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1*. SNTSMS 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Allan, R. J. *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek. A study in Polysemy*. PhD Dissertation University of Amsterdam, 2002.

Allison Jr., Dale C. 'Acts 9:1-9, 22:6-11, 26:12-18: Paul and Ezekiel', *JBL* Vol. 135 No. 4 (2016), 807-826.

Almog, Oz. 'The Problem of Social Type: A Review', *EJS* (1998), n.p.

Alter, Robert. 'Biblical Type-Scenes and the Uses of Convention', *CI* Vol. 5 No. 2 (Winter, 1978), 355-68.

_____. *Art of Biblical Narrative*. N.pl.: Basic Books, 1981.

Aquinas, Thomas, trans. F. R. Larcher, B. Mortensen, and D. Keating, *Commentary on the Letters of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* BC Vol. 38. Lander, WY: The Aquinas Institute for the Study of Sacred Doctrine, 2012.

Arend, Walter. *Die Typischen Scenen bei Homer*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1933.

Ashkenazi, Maayan Hess, and Yossi Katz. 'From Cooperative to Renewed Kibbutz: The Case of Kibbutz 'Galil', Israel', *MES* 45 No. 4 (2009), 571-92.

Ashton, John. *The Religion of Paul the Apostle*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000.

Atkinson, Jane Monnig. *The Art and Politics of Wana Shamanship*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press, 1989.

Atkinson, William P. *Baptism in the Spirit: Luke-Acts and the Dunn Debate*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011.

Atran, Scott, and Jeremy Ginges. 'Devoted Actors and the Moral Foundations of Intractable Intergroup Conflict', in J. Decety and T. Wheatley, eds. *The Moral Brain: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015, 69-85.

Atran, Scott, Hammad Sheikh, and Angel Gomez. 'Devoted Actors Sacrifice for Close Comrades and Sacred Cause', *PNAS* Vol. 111 No. 50 (December 2014), 17702-17703.

Atran, Scott, Hammad Sheikh, Ángel Gómez. 'For Cause and Comrade: Devoted Actors and Willingness to Fight', *CJQHCE* Vol. 5 Issue 1 (2014), 41-57.

Atran, Scott. 'The Role of the Devoted Actor in War, Revolution, and Terrorism', in James R. Lewis, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Religion and Terrorism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017, 69-88.

Aubrey, Rachel. *Hellenistic Greek Middle Voice: Semantic Event Structure and Voice Typology*. MA Thesis, Trinity Western University, 2020.

Aubrey, Rachel, and Michael Aubrey. *Greek Prepositions in the New Testament: A Cognitive-Functional Description*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press.

Avemarie, Friedrich. *Die Tauferzählungen der Apostelgeschichte: Theologie und Geschichte*. WUNT 139. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Backhaus, Knut. 'Asphaleia: Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung im Rahmen des antiken Wahrheitsdiskurses', in Eva Ebel, Samuel Vollenweider, eds. *Wahrheit und Geschichte: Exegetische und hermeneutische Studien zu einer dialektischen Konstellation*. ATANT 102. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2012, 79-108.

_____. 'Zur Datieung der Apostelgeschichte. Ein Ordnungsversuch im chronologischen Chaos', *ZNW* Vol. 108 No. 2 (2017), 212-258.

Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* Fourth Edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017.

Bale, Alan J. *Genre and Narrative Coherence in the Acts of the Apostles*. LNTS 514. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.

Barclay, John M. G. 'Benefit Networks in Pauline Churches: Practice and Theology', British New Testament Conference Plenary Paper, 2019.

_____. *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* SNTW. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Ltd, 1988.

_____. *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews*. WUNT 275. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Barth, Gerhard. *Die Taufe in frühchristlicher Zeit*. BTS 4. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981.

Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968.

_____. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Second Edition. BNTC. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968 & 1971.

_____. 'Light on the Holy Spirit From Simon Magus (Acts 8,4-25)', in J. Kremer, ed., *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979, 281-295.

_____. 'Luke-Acts', in John Barclay and John Sweet, eds. *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 84-95.

_____. *The Acts of the Apostles* Vol. II. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Basczok, Jan David. *Szenen, Inszenierungen und Bühnen in der Apostelgeschichte*. WUNT2 538. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

Bauckham, Richard. 'For Whom Were Gospels Written?', in Richard Bauckham, ed., *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998, 9-48.

_____. 'James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)', in Ben Witherington III ed. *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 154-184.

Bauer, Walter, rev. and ed. Frederick William Danker, et al. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Bauernfeind, Otto. *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*. WUNT 22. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, Paul Siebeck, 1980.

Bazzana, Giovanni B. *Having the Spirit of Christ: Spirit Possession and Exorcism in the Early Christ Groups*. Synkrisis. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2020.

Beale, G. K. 'The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 1: The Clearest Evidence', *TB* Vol. 56 Issue 1 (2005), 73-102.

_____. 'The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 2: Corroborating Evidence', *TB* Vol. 56 Issue 2 (2005), 63-90.

_____. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity Press, 2004; Leicester: Apollos, 2004.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. *Baptism in the New Testament*. London: MacMillan & Co Ltd; New York: St Martin's Press, 1962.

Becker, Eve-Marie. *The Birth of Christian History: Memory and Time from Mark to Luke-Acts*. AYBRL. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2017, 32.

Becker, Jürgen. 'Der Brief an die Galater', J. Becker/U. Luz, eds. *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, und Kolosser*. NTD Band 8/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998, 7-103.

Beers, Holly. *The Followers of Jesus as the 'Servant': Luke's Model from Isaiah for the Disciples in Luke-Acts*. LNTS 535. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.

Behm, Johannes. *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum: Nach Verwendung, Herkunft und Bedeutung in religionsgeschichtlichem Zusammenhang untersucht*. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1911.

Bell, Catherine. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Oxford University Press, 1992.

Bertone, John A. *"The Law of the Spirit": Experience of the Spirit and Displacement of the Law in Romans 8:1-16*. SBL 86. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.

Bird, Michael. *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification, and the New Perspective*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers; Milton Keyes: Paternoster, 2007.

Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blaylock, Richard M. 'My Messenger, the LORD, and the Messenger of the Covenant: Malachi 3:1 Revisited', *SBJT* Vol. 20 No. 3 (2016), 69-95.

Bloch, Maurice. *Prey into Hunter: The Politics of Religious Experience.* Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Blomberg, Craig L. *From Pentecost to Patmos: An Introduction to Acts Through Revelation*. Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group, 2006.

_____. *The NIV Application Commentary: 1 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.

Bockmuehl, Markus. 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of Biblical Commentary', in Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, eds., *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity*. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009, 3-29.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983 [1961].

Borse, Udo. *Der Brief an die Galater* RNT. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1984.

Bourguignon, Erika. *Possession*. Prospect Heights: IL: Waveland Press, Inc., 1991 [1976].

Bovon, François. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1950-2005)* Second Revised Edition. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Breytenbach, Cilliers. 'The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 53 and the Early Christian Formula 'He Was Delivered for Our Trespasses'', *NT* Vol. 51 (2009), 339-351.

Brinkley, Joe. 'Debts Make Israelis Rethink an Ideal: The Kibbutz', *The New York Times*, March 5, 1989.

Brooks, James A. *The New Testament Text of Gregory of Nyssa*. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1991.

Brown, Teresa Rash. *Sinners, Idol-Worshippers and Fools among the Men of Hesed: Ben Sira's Pedagogy in Praise of the Fathers (Sir 44-50)*. PhD Dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1998.

Bühlmann, Walter, and Karl Schere, *Sprachliche Stilfiguren der Bibel: Von Assonanz bis Zahlenspruch ein Nachschlagewerk* 2., verbesserte Auflage. Giessen: Brunnen Verlag GmbH, 1994.

Bulbulia, Joseph. 'Charismatic Signalling', *JSRNC* Vol. 3 No. 4 (December 2009), 518-551.

_____. 'Religious Costs as Adaptations that Signal Altruistic Intention', *EC* Vol. 10 No. 1 (2004), 19-42.

Bultmann, Rudolf, trans. Kendrick Grobel, *Theology of the New Testament*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007 [Vol. 1 1951 and Vol. 2 1955].

Burridge, Richard A. *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Burton, Ernest de Witt. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921.

Cadbury, Henry J. 'Commentary on the Preface of Luke', in F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds. *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, The Acts of the Apostles* Vol. II. London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1922, 489-510.

_____. 'The Summaries in Acts', in in F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds. *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, The Acts of the Apostles*. London: Macmillan, 1920-1933, 392-402.

Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* SCL 55. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Carlson, Reed. *Possession and Other Spirit Phenomena in Biblical Literature*, Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard Divinity School (2019).

Carson, D. A. *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14*. BTCL. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster Press, 1995; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House Company, 1987.

Chambers, Andy. *Exemplary Life: A Theology of Church Life in Acts*. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2012.

Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.

Chester, Stephen J. *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church*. SNTW. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003.

Ciampa, Roy E. 'The Function of 1 Cor 10:1-22 within Its Literary Context (1 Cor 8-11): Food for Thought', in Florian Wilk, ed. *Paul and Moses: The Exodus and Sinai Traditions in the Letters of Paul*. SERAPHIM 11. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020, 83-99.

Clouston, Eric. *How Ancient Narratives Persuade: Acts in is Literary Context*. London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2020.

Co, Maria Anicia. 'The Major Summaries in Acts: Acts 2,42-47; 4,32-35; 5,12-16, Linguistic and Literary Relationship', *ETL* Vol. 68 Issue 1 (April 1992), 49-85.

Cohen, Emma. *The Mind Possessed: The Cognition of Spirit Possession in an Afro-Brazilian Religious Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

_____. 'What is Spirit Possession? Defining, Comparing, and Explaining Two Possession Forms', in *Eth* Vol 73 Issue 1 (March 2008), 101-126.

Coleman, Rachel L. *The Lukan Lens on Wealth and Possessions: A Perspective Shaped by the Themes of Reversal and Right Response* BIS 180. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2019.

Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. SP. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999.

Conzelmann, Hans, Trans. James W. Leitch. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. HR. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975 [1969].

Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. HR. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987 [Die Apostelgeschichte, 2., verbesserte Auflage, 1972].

_____. *Geschichte des Urchistentums* GNT 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.

Coppens, Joseph. *L'imposition des Mains et les Rites Connexes dans le Nouveau Testament et dans L'Eglise Ancienne Étude de Théologie Positive*. UCL2 15. Paris: J. Gabalda, Éditeur, 1925.

Cornils, Anja. *Vom Geist Gottes erzählen: Analysen zur Apostelgeschichte*. TANZ 44. Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 2006.

Corrigan, John, Eric Crump, and John Kloos. *Emotion and Religion: A Critical Assessment and Annotated Bibliography*. London: Greenwood Press, 2000.

Corrigan, John. 'Introduction: Emotions Research and the Academic Study of Religion', in John Corrigan, ed. *Religion and Emotion: Approaches and Interpretations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, 3-31.

Craffert, Pieter F. *The Life of a Galilean Shaman: Jesus of Nazareth in Anthropological-Historical Perspective*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2008.

Cribiore, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Cross, Anthony R. 'Spirit – and Water – Baptism in 1 Corinthians 12:13', in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, eds. *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*. London/New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, 120-148.

Crowe, Brandon D. 'The Sources for Luke and Acts: Where Did Luke Get His Material (and Why Does it Matter?)', in Sean A. Adams and Michael Pahl, eds. *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2012, 73-95.

Csordas, Thomas J. *Language, Charisma, and Creativity: The Ritual Life of a Religious Movement*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

_____. *The Sacred Self: A Cultural Phenomenology of Charismatic Healing*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Cullmann, Oscar, trans. J. K. S. Reid. *Baptism in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1950 [German 1948]).

Czachesz, István. *Cognitive Science and the New Testament: A New Approach to Early Christian Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

_____. 'Long-term, Explicit Memory in Rituals', *JCC* Vol. 10 (2010), 321-333.

_____. 'Ritual and Transmission', in Risto Uro, et al. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Ritual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019, 115-133.

_____. 'The Emergence of Early Christian Religion: A Naturalistic Approach', in Petri Luomanen, Ilkka Pyysiäinen, and Risto Uro, eds., *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science* BIS 89 (Leiden: Brill; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2007), 73-94.

Davies, Douglas J. *Emotion, Identity, and Religion: Hope Reciprocity, and Otherness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

_____. 'Introduction: Emotion, Identity and Group Communication', in Douglas J. Davies and Nathaniel A. Warne, eds. *Emotions and Religious Dynamics*. Farnham, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013, 1-8.

_____. 'Purity, Spirit and Reciprocity in the Acts of the Apostles', in Louise Lawrence and Mario Aguilar, eds. *Anthropology and Biblical Studies: Avenues of Approach*. Leiden: Deo Publishing, 2004, 259-280.

_____. 'Rebounding Vitality: Resurrection and Spirit in Luke-Acts', in M. Daniel Carroll, et al., *The Bible in Human Society: Essays in Honour of John Rogerson*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, 205-224.

_____. 'Social Groups, Liturgy and Glossolalia', *Ch* Vol. 90 No. 3 (1976), 193-205.

Davies, Stevan L. *Jesus the Healer: Possession, Trance, and the Origins of Christianity*. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1995.

_____. *Spirit Possession and the Origins of Christianity*. Dublin: Bardic Press, 2014.

Decousu, Laurence. 'Liturgie baptismale et don de l'esprit aux origines chrétiennes : une pneumatologie oubliée', *RSR* Vol. 89 No. 1 (2015), 47-66.

De Boer, Martinus C. *Galatians: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011.

De Jong, Irene. *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

DeMaris, Richard E. 'Backing Away from Baptism: Early Christian Ambivalence about Its Ritual', *JRS* Vol. 27 Issue 1 (2013), 11-19.

_____. 'The Baptism of Jesus: A Ritual-Critical Approach', in Wolfgang Stegemann, Bruce J. Malina, and Gerd Theissen, eds. *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

_____. *The New Testament in its Ritual World*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2008.

_____. 'Water Ritual', in Risto Uro, et al. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Ritual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019, 391-408.

Demoen, Kristoffel. 'A Paradigm for the Analysis of Paradigms: The Rhetorical Exemplum in Ancient and Imperial Greek Theory', *RJHR* Vol. 15 No. 2 (Spring 1997), 125-158.

DesCamp, Mary Therese. *Metaphor and Ideology: Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and Literary Methods Through a Cognitive Lens*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Dibelius, Martin. *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer*. FRLANT 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911.

Dinkler, Michal Beth. *Literary Theory and the New Testament*. AYBRL. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2019.

_____. 'New Testament Rhetorical Narratology: An Invitation toward Integration', *BI* Vol. 24 (2016), 203-228.

_____. *Silent Statements: Narrative Representations of Speech and Silence in the Gospel of Luke*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2013.

Dix, Dom Gregory. *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism: A Public Lecture in the University of Oxford delivered on January 22nd 1946*. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1946.

Douglas, Mary. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003 [1970].

_____. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002 [1966].

Dunn, James D. G. 'Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts', in *The Christ and the Spirit: Volume 2, Pneumatology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998, 222-242.

_____. 'Rediscovering the Spirit (1)', in *The Christ and the Spirit: Volume 2, Pneumatology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998, 43-61.

_____. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970.

_____. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1975, 122.

_____. 'Review of Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit: An Analysis of the Timing, Mechanism, and Manifestation of Spirit-Reception in Luke-Acts, McCollough, David J., Paternoster, 2017', in *RRT* Vol. 26 Issue 1 (January 2019), 111-113.

_____. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. BNTC. London: A & C Black, 1993.

Durkheim, Émile. 'The Dualism of Human Nature and its Social Conditions', in Kurt H Wolff, ed., *Emile Durkheim, 1858-1917: A Collection of Essays, with Translations and a Bibliography*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press, 1960, 325-340.

Eckstein, Hans-Joachim. *Verheißung und Gesetz*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996.

Ehrlich, Carl S., Anders Runesson and Eileen Schuller, *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber*. WUNT 305. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Eisele, Wilfried. 'Apostel auf Firmreise? Taufe, Handauflegung und Geistempfang in der Apostelgeschichte', Michael Seewald, ed., *Ortskirche: Bausteine zu einer künftigen Ekklesiologie: Festschrift für Bischof Gebhard Fürst*. Ostfieldern: Matthias Grünewald Verlag, 2018, 495-524.

Eisen, Ute E. *Die Poetik der Apostelgeschichte: Eine Narratologische Studie*. NTOA 58. Fribourg: Academic Press, 2006; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).

Elliott, John H. 'Temple Versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions', in Jerome H. Neyrey, ed. *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991, 211-240.

Elliott, Matthew A. *Faithful Feelings: Rethinking Emotion in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2006.

Emmott, Catherine. *Narrative Comprehension: A Discourse Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. *Cosmology & Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

_____. 'The Construction of Religious experience in Paul', Frances Flannery, Colleen Shantz, and Rodney A. Werline, eds., *Experientia, Volume 1: Inquiry into Religious Experience in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008, 147-157.

Engelke, Matthew. *A Problem of Presence: Beyond Scripture in an African Church*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Esler, Philip Francis. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lukan Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

_____. *The First Christians in their Social Worlds: Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Evans, Ernest. *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Fay, Ronald C. 'The Narrative Function of the Temple in Luke-Acts', *TJ* Vol. 27 No. 2 (Fall 2006), 255-270.

Fazio, R. H., and M. P. Zanna, 'Direct experience and attitude-behavior consistency', in L. Berkowitz, ed. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* Vol. 14. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1981, 161-202.

Fee, Gordon. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994.

_____. *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, A Division of Baker Publishing Group, 1991.

Fernandez, James. 'The Mission of Metaphor in Expressive Culture', *CA* Vol. 15 No. 2 (June 1974), 119-145.

Fillmore, Charles J. 'Frame Semantics and the Nature of Language', *ANYAS* Vol. 280 Issue 1 (October 1976), 20-32.

FitzGibbon, C.D., and J.H. Fanshawe, 'Stotting in Thomson's gazelles: an honest signal of condition', *BES* Vol 23 Issue 2 (August 1988), 68-74.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYB. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008.

Fludernik, Monika, trans., Patricia Häusler-Greenfield and Monika Fludernik, *An Introducton to Narratology*. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

Forbes, Christopher. *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment* WUNT2 75. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, Paul Siebeck, 1995.

Fox, Nickolas A. *The Hermeneutics of Social Identity in Luke-Acts*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2021.

Frey, Jörg, Clare K. Rothschild, and Jens Schröter, *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker und frühchristlicher Historiographie*. BZNW 162. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Fung, Ronald Y. K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988.

Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament*. OBT 20. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. London: Fontana Press, 1993 [Basic Books, 1973].

Genz, Rouven. *Jesaja 53 als theologische Mitte der Apostelgeschichte: Studien zu ihrer Christologie und Ekklesiologie im Anschluss an Apg 8,26–40*. WUNT2 398. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

Glombitza, Otto. 'Der Schluss der Petrusrede Acta 2:36-40: Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Predigten in Acta', *ZNW* Vol. 52 Issue 1-2 (January 1961), 115-118.

Gluckman, Max. *The Judicial Process Among the Barotse of Northern Rhodesia (Zambia)*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1955.

Godet, F., trans. A. Cusin. *Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1889.

Goodman, Felicitas. *Speaking in Tongues: A Cross-cultural Study of Glossolalia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Gorman, Frank H. Jr. 'Ritual Studies and Biblical Studies: Assessment of the Past, Prospects for the Future', *Sem* Vol. 67 (1994), 13-36.

Grady, Brian, and Kate Miriam Loewenthal, 'Features Associated with Speaking in Tongues (Glossolalia)', *BJMP* Vol. 70 Pt. 2 (1997), 185-191.

Green, Joel B. *Conversion in Luke-Acts: Divine Action, Human Cognition, and the People of God*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

_____. 'From "John's Baptism" to "Baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus": The Significance of Baptism in Luke-Acts', in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, eds. *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White*. JSNTS 171. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999, 157-172.

_____. '"In Our Own Languages": Pentecost, Babel, and the Shaping of Christian Community in Acts 2:1-13', in Joel B. Green, ed., *Luke as Narrative Theologian: Texts and Topics*. WUNT 446. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020, 133-146.

_____. 'The Demise of the Temple as "Cultural Center" in Luke-Acts: An Exploration of the Rending of the Temple Veil (Luke 23:44-49)', in Joel B. Green, ed., *Luke as Narrative Theologian: Texts and Topics* WUNT 446 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 97-113.

Green, Melanie C., and Timothy Brock. 'The Role of Transportation in the Persuasiveness of Public Narratives', *JPSP* 79 (2000), 701–721.

Gregory, Andrew. 'Acts and Christian Beginnings: A Review Essay', *JSNT* Vol. 39 No. 1 (September 2016), 97–115.

_____. 'The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts', *JSNT* Vol 29 No. 4 (2007), 459-472.

_____. 'The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts', in Andrew F. Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe, eds., *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2010, 82-93.

_____. *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period Before Irenaeus*. WUNT2 169. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Grosheide, F. W. *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.

_____. *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* Second Edition (London, Edinburgh: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1953, 2nd edition 1954.

Gunkel, Hermann, trans. Roy A. Harrisville and Philip A. Quanbeck II, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit: The Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1979 [*Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprechts Verlag, 1888].

Haacker, K. 'Einige Fälle von „Erlebter rede" im Neuen Testament' *NT* Vol. 12, Fasc. 1 (January 1970), 70-77.

Haber, Susan, ed. Adele Reinhartz, *"They Shall Purify Themselves": Essays on Purity in Early Judaism*. EJIL. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971 [German 14th edition, 1965].

Hamburger, Käte. *Die Logik der Dichtung*. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag, 1957.

Hanimann, Joseph. '«Nous avons été abreuvés d'un seul esprit» Notes sur 1 Corinthien 12,13b', *NRT* Vol. 94 No 4 (1972), 400-405.

Hansen, Bruce. *All of You Are One: The Social Vision of Galatians 3.28, 1 Corinthians 12:13 and Colossians 3.11*. LNTS 409. New York: T&T Clark, 2010.

Hargreaves, John. *A Guide to 1 Corinthians*. ISG 17. London: SPCK, 1978.

Harkness, Nicholas. 'Glossolalia and Cacophony in South Korea: Cultural Semiosis at the Limits of Language', *AE* Vol. 44 No. 3 (2017), 476–489.

Harnack, Adolf von, trans. John Richard Wilkinson. *The Acts of the Apostles*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1909.

Harrill, Albert J. 'Coming of age and putting on Christ: the toga virilis ceremony, its paraenesis, and Paul's interpretation of baptism in Galatians', *NT* Vol. 44 No 3 (2002), 252-277.

Harrington, Hannah K. 'Accessing Holiness via Ritual Ablutions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature', in Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart, eds. *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity: Constituents and Critique*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017, 77-95.

Harris, Murray J. *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Harris, Ralph W. *Spoken by the Spirit: Documented Accounts of "Other Tongues" From Arabic to Zulu* (n.p.: Radiant Books, 1973).

Hartman, Lars. *'Into the Name of the Lord Jesus': Baptism in the Early Church*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.

Hartog, Pieter B. *Pesher and Hypomnema: A Comparison of Two Commentary Traditions from the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. STDJ 121. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Haya-Prats, Gonzalo, trans. Scott A. Ellington, ed. Paul Elbert. *Empowered Believers: The Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2011 [*El Espiritu Santo en los Hechos de los Apostoles*, Pontifical Gregorian University of Rome, dissertation, 1967].

Hayes, Christine E. *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1989.

_____. *First Corinthians*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997.

_____. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11* SBLDS 56. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

_____. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11* Second Edition BRS (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002 [Society of Biblical Literature, 1983]).

Hayward, C. T. R. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

Head, Peter. 'The Temple in Luke's Gospel', in T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole, eds., *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 101-119.

Heath, Malcolm. 'Invention', in Stanley E. Porter, ed. *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. – A.D. 400*. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 89-119.

Heilig, Christoph. *Paulus als Erzähler? Paul as Narrator? A Narratological Perspective on the Epistles of Paul: Eine narratologische Perspektive auf die Paulusbriefe*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2020.

Hengel, Martin. *Studien zum Urchristentum: Kleine Schriften VI*. WUNT 234. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Hengel, Martin, and Anna Maria Schwemer. *Die Urgemeinde und das Judenchristentum* GFC 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

Henrich, Joseph. 'The evolution of costly displays, cooperation and religion: credibility enhancing displays and their implications for cultural evolution', *EHB* Vol. 30 Issue 4 (July 2009), 244-260.

Herbert, Steven G. 'Speaking in tongues and other gifts of the Holy Spirit: A study in possession', MA Thesis at the University of Montana (1984).

Hess, Sabine. 'Strathern's Melanesian 'Dividual' and the Christian 'Individual': A Perspective from Vanua Lava, Vanuatu', *Oc* Vol. 76 No. 3 (November 2006), 285-296.

Hesse, Douglas. 'Aristotle's Poetics and Rhetoric: Narrative as Rhetoric's Fourth Mode', in Richard Andrews, ed. *Rebirth of Rhetoric: Essays in Language, Culture, and Education*. London: Routledge, 1992, 19-38.

Hickling, C. J. A. 'Paul's Use of Exodus in the Corinthian Correspondence', in R. Bieringer, ed. *The Corinthian Correspondence*. BETL 125. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996, 367-376.

Hoey, Michael. *Lexical Priming: A New Theory of Words and Language*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.

_____. 'What's in a Word?', *ETP* Issue 27 (April 2003), 5-8.

Holladay, Carl R. *Acts: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016.

Holmås, Geir Otto. *Prayer and Vindication in Luke-Acts: The Theme of Prayer within the Context of the Legitimating and Edifying Objective of the Lukan Narrative*. LNTS 433. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2011.

Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Das Angeld des Geistes: Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie*. FRLANT 154. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.

_____. 'Die Gütergemeinschaft der Urgemeinde', *EvT* Vol. 58 Issue 5 (1998), 370-383.

Howe, Bonnie, and Eve Sweetser, 'Cognitive Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation', in Steven L. McKenzie, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, 121-131.

Hoyle, Richard A. *Scenarios, Discourse, and Translation: The scenario theory of Cognitive Linguistics, its relevance for analysing New Testament Greek and modern Parkari texts, and its implications for translation theory*. N.p.: SIL International, 2008.

Hubert, Henri, and Marcel Mauss, trans. W. D. Halls. *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function*. London: Cohen & West, 1964 [*Essai sur la Nature et la Fonction du Sacrifice* (L'Année sociologique, 1898)].

Hühn, Peter, Wolf Schmid, Jörg Schönert, eds. *Point of View, Perspective, and Focalization: Modeling Mediation in Narrative*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Humphrey, Caroline, and James Laidlaw, *The Archetypal Actions of Ritual: A Theory of Ritual Illustrated by the Jain Rite of Worship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Hur, Ju. *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. London: T & T Clark, 2004; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Hurtado, Larry W. *Texts and Artefacts: Selected Essays on Textual Criticism and Early Christian Manuscripts*. LNTS 584. London, New York: T&T Clark, 2018.

Inselmann, Anke. *Die Freude im Lukasevangelium: Ein Beitrag zur psychologischen Exegese* WUNT2 322. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Instone-Brewer, David. *Prayer and Agriculture*. TRENT 1. Grand Rapids, MI / Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004.

Irenaeus, trans. Roberts, Alexander and William Rambaut. *Against Heresies*. Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 1. edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885. Revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight.

Irons, William. 'Religion as a Hard-to-Fake Sign of Commitment' in Randolph M. Nesse, ed. *Evolution and the Capacity for Commitment*. New York: The Russell Sage Foundation, 2001, 292-309.

Iser, Wolfgang. 'Interaction Between Text and Reader', in Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman, eds. *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980, 106-119.

_____. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Jaeger, Werner, trans. Gilbert Highet. *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture Vol. 2, In Search of the Divine Centre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1943.

Jahn, Manfred. 'Focalization', in David Herman, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, 94-108.

James N. Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden Calf Incident*. WUNT2 188. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

James, William. *The Principles of Psychology* Vol. I. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1890.

Jantsch, Torsten. *Jesus, der Retter: Die Soteriologie des lukanischen Doppelwerks*. WUNT 381. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Jervell, Jacob. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Acts of the Apostles*. SP. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992.

Johnson, William A. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Joseph, Simon J. *Jesus, the Essenes, and Christian Origins: New Light on Ancient Texts and Communities*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018.

Jung, D. H. 'Fluid Sacredness from a Newly Built Temple in Luke-Acts', *ET* Vol. 128 Issue 11 (2017), 529-537.

Kaszniak, Alfred W. 'Emotion and Consciousness: Current Research and Controversies', in Alfred Kaszniak ed., *Emotions, Qualia, and Consciousness: Proceedings of the International School of Biocybernetics Casamicciola, Napoli, Italy, 19-24 October 1998*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., 2001, 3-21.

Kavanagh, Christopher M., Jonathan Jong, Ryan McKay, Harvey Whitehouse, 'Positive Experiences of High Arousal Martial Arts Rituals are Linked to Identity Fusion and Costly Pro-Group Actions', *EJSP* Vol. 49 (2019), 461–481.

Keane, Webb. 'Religious Language', *ARA* Vol 26 (1997), 47-71.

Kearns, Michael. *Rhetorical Narratology*. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.

Keener, Craig S. *1-2 Corinthians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

_____. *Acts, An Exegetical Commentary* Volume 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

_____. *Acts, An Exegetical Commentary* Volume 2. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.

_____. *Galatians: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019.

Keith, Chris. 'The Gospel Read, Sliced, and Burned: The Material Gospel and the Construction of Christian Identity', *EC* Vol. 12 Issue 1 (2021), 7-27.

Kim, MyungSil. *Female Images of God in Christian Worship in the Spirituality of TongSungGiDo of the Korean Church*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2014.

Kimbell, John. *The Atonement in Lukan Theology*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.

Klauck, Hans-Josef. 'Gütergemeinschaft in der klassischen Antike, in Qumran und im Neuen Testament', *RQ* Vol. 11 No. 1 (41) (October 1982), 47-79.

Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

_____. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Klein, William W., Craig L. Blomberg, Robert L. Hubbard, Jr. *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* Third Edition. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017, 532-533.

Knox, John. *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Knox, R. A. *Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion with Special Reference to the XVII and XVIII Centuries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Konradt, Matthias. ''Geschrieben zu unserer Ermahnung': Beobachtungen zu den Schriftrekursen in 1 Kor 10,1-11', in Florian Wilk, ed., *Paul and Moses: The Exodus and Sinai Traditions in the Letters of Paul*. SERAPHIM 11. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020, 101-120.

Kovacs, Judith L. *1 Corinthians Interpreted by Early Christian Commentators*. CB. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.

Kremer, Jacob. *Pfingstbericht und Pfingstgeschehen: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Apg 2,1-13*. SBS 63/64. Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1973.

Krüger, K. W. trans. and expanded by Guy L. Cooper, III, *Attic Greek Prose Syntax* Revised and Expanded in English, Volume 1. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998.

Kuecker, Aaron. *The Spirit and the 'Other': Social Identity, Ethnicity and Intergroup Reconciliation in Luke-Acts*. LNTS 444. London: Bloomsbury, 2011.

Kurz, William S. 'Effects of Variant Narrators in Acts 10-11', *NTS* Vol. 43 (1997) 570-586.

_____. *Luke-Acts and Historiography in the Greek Bible*. PhD Dissertation, Marquette University, 1980.

_____. 'Narrative Models for Imitation in Luke-Acts', in David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks, eds. *Greeks, Romans and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1990, 171-189.

_____. *Reading Luke-Acts, Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.

Lakey, Michael. *The Ritual World of Paul the Apostle: Metaphysics, Community and Symbol in 1 Corinthians 10-11*. London, New York: T&T Clark, 2018.

Lambrecht, Knut. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Lampe, G. W. H. *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers*. London: Longmans, Green and Co Ltd, 1951.

Landolt, Jean-François, trans. Michael D. Thomas, Eric Gilchrest, and Timothy Brookins, ''Be Imitators of Me, Brothers and Sisters' (Philippians 3.17): Paul as an Exemplary Figure in the Pauline Corpus and the Acts of the Apostles', in David P. Moessner, Daniel Marguerat, Mikeal C. Parsons, Michael Wolter, eds. *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Paul and Israel's Legacy*. LNTS 452. New York: T&T Clark, 2012, 290-317.

Langlands, Rebecca. *Exemplary Ethics in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Lanier, Gregory R. 'Luke's Distinctive Use of the Temple: Portraying the Divine Visitation', *JTS* Vol. 65 Pt. 2 (October 2014), 433-462.

Larkin, William J. 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament as a Key to His Soteriology'. *JETS* Vol. 20 No. 4 (December 1977), 325-335.

Lawson, E. Thomas and Robert N. McCauley, *Rethinking Religion: Connecting Cognition and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Lederle, H. I. *Treasures New and Old: Interpretations of "Spirit-Baptism" in the Charismatic Renewal Movement*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Inc., 1988.

Levine, Amy-Jill, and Ben Witherington III. *The Gospel of Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. 'Is ὅτι an Interpretive Use Marker?' in Stanley E. Porter and Matthew Brook O'Donnell, eds. *The Linguist as Pedagogue: Trends in the Teaching and Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. NTM 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009, 161-180.

Levison, John R. *Filled with the Spirit*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009.

Lewis, C. S. *The Screwtape Letters*. London: Geoffrey Bles; The Centenary Press, 1942.

Liddell, H. G., and Robert Scott. *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889.

Lieu, Judith M. *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

_____. *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Lightfoot, J. B. *St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations* Sixth Edition. London: MacMillan and Co., 1880.

Lilley, John M. *The Narrative Presentation of Ethical Paradigms in Dionysius's Roman Antiquities and Luke-Acts*. PhD Dissertation, Marquette University, 1994.

Longacre, Robert. E. 'Interpreting Biblical Stories', in Teun A. van Dijk, ed. *Discourse and Literature: New Approaches to the Analysis of Literary Genres*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1985, 169-185.

_____. *The Grammar of Discourse*. New York: Plenum, 1996.

Lüdemann, Gerd, trans. John Bowden. *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989 [1987]; London: SCM Press, 1989.

Lüdemann, Gerd, and Tom Hall. *The Acts of the Apostles: What Really Happened in the Earliest Days of the Church*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 2005.

Ludwig, Arnold M. 'Altered States of Consciousness', in Raymond Prince, ed. *Trance and Possession States*. Montreal: Burke Memorial Society, 69-95.

Luhrmann, T.M. 'Mind and Spirit: a comparative theory about representation of mind and the experience of spirit', in *Mind and Spirit: A Comparative Theory: Special Issue of the Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* Vol. 26 S1 (2020), 9-27.

_____. *When God Talks Back: Understanding the American Evangelical Relationship with God*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012.

Lull, David John. *The Spirit in Galatia: Paul's Interpretation of Pneuma as Divine Power* SBLDS 49. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.

Luraghi, Silvia. 'Spatial metaphors and agenthood in Ancient Greek', in Michaela Ofitsch and Christian Zinko, eds. *Sonderdruck aus 125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz: Arbeiten*

aus der Abteilung „Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft“ Graz. Graz: Leykam, 2000, 275-290.

Lynn, Christopher Dana. ‘“The Wrong Holy Ghost”: Discerning the Apostolic Gift of Discernment Using a Signaling and Systems Theoretical Approach’, *Ethos* Vol. 41 Issue 2 (2013), 223-247.

Lyons, Thomas. *Revisiting the Riddle in Samaria: A Social-Scientific Investigation of Spirit Reception in Luke-Acts in Historical Perspective*. PhD Dissertation, Asbury Theological Seminary, 2020.

Maccoby, Hyam. *Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and its Place in Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

MacDonald, Dennis R. *The Gospels and Homer: Imitations of Greek Epic in Mark and Luke-Acts*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2014.

Magness, Jodi. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002.

Malherbe, Abraham J. *Moral Exhortation, A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986.

Malina, Bruce J., and Jerome H. Neyrey. ‘First-Century Personality: Dyadic, Not Individual’, in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991, 67-96.

Malina, Bruce J., and John J. Pilch. *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

Mallen, Peter. *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts*. LNTS 367. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.

Marguerat, Daniel, trans. Ken McKinney, et al. *The First Christian Historian: Writing the ‘Acts of the Apostles’*. SNTSMS 121. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Marguerat, Daniel. *Les Actes des Apôtres (1-12)*. CNTDS. Genève: Labor et Fides, 2007.

Marriott, McKim. ‘Hindu Transactions: Diversity Without Dualism’, in Bruce Kapferer, ed. *Transaction and Meaning: Directions in the Anthropology of Exchange and Symbolic Behavior*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1976, 109-142.

Marshall, I. Howard. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970.

_____. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1978.

Mason, Arthur James. *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1891.

Matera, Frank J. *II Corinthians: A Commentary*. Louisville, London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.

Mathewson, David L. and Elodie Ballantine Emig, *Intermediate Greek Grammar: Syntax for Students of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016.

Maxwell, Kathy. *Hearing Between the Lines: The Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and its Literary Milieu*. LNTS 425. London: T&T Clark International, 2010.

May, Jordan Daniel. *Global Witnesses to Pentecost: The Testimony of 'Other Tongues'*. Cleveland: Cherohala Press, 2013.

May, L. Carlyle. 'A Survey of Glossolalia and Related Phenomena in Non-Christian Religions', *AANS* Vol. 58 No. 1 (Feb. 1956), 75-96.

McCauley, Robert N. and E. Thomas Lawson. *Bringing Ritual to Mind: Psychological Foundations of Cultural Forms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

McCollough, David J. *Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit: An Analysis of the Timing, Mechanism, and Manifestation of Spirit Reception in Luke-Acts* PBM. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2017.

_____. 'The Liminal Spirit: Ritual Experience, Ritual Initiation in Luke and Paul', *JYT* Vol. 45 (2018), 107-142.

McDonnell, Kilian, OSB, and George Montague SM. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries* Second Revised Edition. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1994.

McKnight, Scot. *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005.

Mealand, David L. 'Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts II – IV', *JTS* Vol. 28 No. 1 (April 1977), 96-99.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* Second Edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003 [1983].

Meggitt, Justin J. 'Did Magic Matter? The Saliency of Magic in the Early Roman Empire', *JAH* Vol. 1 Issue 2 (May 2013), 170-229.

_____. *Paul, Poverty and Survival*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Mellor, Philip A. 'Embodiment, Emotion and Religious Experience: Religion, Culture and the Charismatic Body', in James A. Beckford and N. J. Demerath III, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, 2007, 587-607.

Menzies, Robert P. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004 [1991].

Meyer, Birgit. 'Religious revelation, secrecy and the limits of visual representation', *AT* Vol. 6 Issue 4 (2006), 431-453.

Mitchell, Alan C. 'The Social Function of Friendship in Acts 2:44-47 and 4:32-37', *JBL* Vol. 111 Issue 2 (1992), 255-272.

Mittmann-Richert, Ulrike. *Der Sühnetod des Gottesknechts : Jesaja 53 im Lukasevangelium*. WUNT 220. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Moessner, David Paul. *Luke the Historian of Israel's Legacy, Theologian of Israel's 'Christ': A New Reading of the 'Gospel Acts' of Luke*. BZNW 182. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2018.

Moo, Douglas. *The Letter to the Romans* Second Edition. NICNT. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2018.

Morris, Leon. *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary* Revised Edition. TNTC. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985.

Mount, Christopher. *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul*. SNT 104. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2002.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *Keys to First Corinthians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Neander, August. *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel*. Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1842.

Needham, Rodney. 'Percussion and Transition', *MNS* Vol. 2 No. 4 (December 1967), 606-614.

Newson, Martha. 'Football, Fan Violence, and Identity Fusion', *IRSS* Vol. 54 Issue 4 (2019), 431-444.

Noonan, Michael. 'Complementation', in Timothy Shopen, ed. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, 52-150.

O'Donnell, Matthew Brook. *Corpus Linguistics & the Greek of the New Testament*. NTM 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005.

_____. 'Two Opposing Views on Baptism With/By the Holy Spirit and of 1 Corinthians 12.13: Can Grammatical Investigation Bring Clarity?', in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, eds., *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White*. JSNTS 171. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, 311-336.

Öhler, Markus. 'Die Jerusalemer Urgemeinde im Spiegel des antiken Vereinswesens', *NTS* Vol. 51, Issue 3 (July 2005), 393-415.

Oliver, Isaac W. *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts*. WUNT2 355. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Oropeza, B. J. *Exploring Second Corinthians: Death and Life, Hardship and Rivalry*. RRA 3. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

_____. *Paul and Apostasy: Eschatology, Perseverance, and Falling Away in the Corinthian Congregation*. WUNT2 115. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Osborne, Grant R. *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*, Revised and Expanded. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006.

Otto, Rudolf, trans. John Wilfred Harvey. *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry Into the Non-rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and Its Relation to the Rational*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924 [1917]).

Overman, Andrew. 'The Destruction of the Temple and the Conformation of Judaism and Christianity', in Peter J. Tomson and Joshua Schwartz, eds. *Jews and Christians in the First and Second Centuries: How to Write their History*. Leiden: Brill, 2014, 253-277.

Parratt, J. K. 'The Witness of the Holy Spirit: Calvin, the Puritans, and St. Paul', *The Evangelical Quarterly* Vol. 41 Issue 3 (1969), 161-168.

Parsons, Mikeal C. *Acts*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Peels, H. G. L. 'The Blood »from Abel to Zechariah« (Matthew 23,35; Luke ll,50f.) and the Canon of the Old Testament', *ZAW* Vol. 113 No. 4 (2001), 583-601.

Penner, Jeremy. *Patterns of Daily Prayer in Second Temple Period*. STDJ 104. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2012.

Perry, Andrew. *Eschatological Deliverance: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. PhD Dissertation, Durham University, 2008.

Pervo, Richard I. *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2006.

_____. *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

Pesch, Rudolf. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. EKKNT Studienausgabe 2. Auflage. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft mbH; Ostfildern: Patmos Verlag, 2014 [1986].

Phelan, James. *Narrative as Rhetoric: Technique, Audiences, Ethics, Ideology*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1996.

_____. 'Rhetoric/ethics', in David Herman, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, 203-216.

Philip, Finny. *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology: The Eschatological Bestowal of the Spirit upon Gentiles in Judaism and in the Early Development of Paul's Theology*. WUNT2 194. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Phillips, Peter M. *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: A Sequential Reading*. LNTS 294. London: T & T Clark, 2006.

Pierri, Rosario. 'Due Note Filologiche di Greco Biblico', *SBFLA* LVI (2006), 311-316.

Pitts, Andrew W. *History, Biography, and the Genre of Luke-Acts: An Exploration of literary Divergence in Greek Narrative Discourse*. BIS 177. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2019.

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

Poloma, Margaret M. *Main Street Mystics: The Toronto Blessing and Reviving Pentecostalism*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2003.

Postmes, Tom, and Nyla R. Brandscombe, *Rediscovering Social Identity*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Price, Todd L. *Structural Lexicology and the Greek New Testament: Applying Corpus Linguistics for Word Sense Possibility Delimitation Using Collocational Indicators*. PLAL 6. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2020 [2015].

Prior, David. *The Message of 1 Corinthians: Life in the Local Church*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985.

Pyysiäinen, Ilkka. *How Religion Works: Towards a New Cognitive Science of Religion*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2003.

_____. 'Religious Conversion and Modes of Religiosity', in Harvey Whitehouse and Robert N. McCauley, eds. *Mind and Religion: Psychological and Cognitive Foundations of Religiosity*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2005, 149-166.

Rabens, Volker. *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life* Second Revised Edition. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010].

Rappaport, Roy A. *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

_____. 'The Obvious Aspects of Ritual', in Roy Rappaport, ed. *Ecology, Meaning, and Religion*. Richmond, CA: North Atlantic Books, 1979, 173-221.

_____. 'The Sacred in Human Evolution', *ARES* (1971), 23-44.

Reardon, Timothy W. 'Recent Trajectories and Themes in Lukan Soteriology', *CBR* Vol. 12 Issue 1 (2013), 77-95.

Reed, Jonathan L. *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Reeve, Teresa L. *Luke 3:1-4:15 and the Rite of Passage in Ancient Literature: Liminality and Transformation*. PhD Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2007.

Regev, Eyal. *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred*. AYBRL. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2019.

Reicke, Bo. *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde: Bemerkungen zu Apg. 1-7* ATANT 32. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1957.

Riis, Ole, and Linda Woodhead, *A Sociology of Religious Emotion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Rodríguez, Rafael. 'Textual Orientations: Jesus, Written Texts, and the Social Construction of Identity in the Gospel of Luke', J. Brian Tucker and Coleman A. Baker, eds. *T&T Clark Handbook to Social Identity in the New Testament*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014, 191-210.

Robbins, Joel. *Becoming Sinners: Christianity and Moral Torment in a Papua New Guinea Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

_____. ‘Keeping God’s distance: Sacrifice, possession, and the problem of religious mediation’, *AE* Vol. 44 Issue 3 (August 2017), 464-475.

Roberts, Robert C. ‘Emotions Research and Religious Experience’, in John Corrigan ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Emotion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008, 490-506.

Robertson, A. T. *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* Third Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919.

Roloff, Jürgen. *Die Apostelgeschichte* NTD 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.

Roller, Matthew B. ‘Exemplarity in Roman Culture: The Cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia’, *CP* Vol. 99 No. 1 (January 2004), 1-56.

_____. *Models from the Past in Roman Culture: A World of Exempla*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

_____. ‘The Exemplary Past in Roman Historiography and Culture’, in A. Feldherr, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, 214-230.

Rothschild, Clare K. *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History: An Investigation of Early Christian Historiography*. WUNT2 175. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Rowe, C. Kavin. *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke*. BZNW 139. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.

_____. ‘History, Hermeneutics, and the Unity of Luke-Acts’, in Andrew F. Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe, eds. *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*. Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 2010, 43-65.

_____. *Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Rüggemeier, Jan. *Poetik der markinischen Christologie*. WUNT2 458. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Runge, Steven E. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC, 2010.

Sacewater, Todd A., ‘Introduction: Discourse Analysis: History, Topics, and Applications’, in Todd A. Sacewater, ed. *Discourse Analysis of the New Testament Writings*. Dallas: Fontes Press, 2020.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM Press, 1977.

Schaefer, Christoph. *Die Zukunft Israels bei Lukas: Biblisch-Frühjüdische Zukunftsvorstellungen im lukanischen Doppelwerk im Vergleich zu Röm 9-11* BZNW 190. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2012.

Scheffler, Eben. ‘The assaulted (man) on the Jerusalem – Jericho road: Luke’s creative interpretation of 2 Chronicles 28:15’, *HTS* 69(1), Art. #2010, 8 pages.

Schmeller, Thomas. *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther* (2Kor 1,1-7,4). EKKNT. Ostfildern: Neukirchener Theologie Patmos-Verlag, 2010.

Schmemann, Alexander. *Of Water and the Spirit: A Liturgical Study of Baptism*. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974.

Schmid, Wolf. 'Implied Reader', Paragraph 1, Peter Hühn, et al., eds. *The Living Handbook of Narratology*. Hamburg: Hamburg University Press, URL = hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/index.php?title=Implied Reader&oldid=2015 [view date: 22 May 2018].

_____. *Narratology: An Introduction*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.

Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* 4. Auflage HTA (Holzgerlingen: Brockhaus, 2018 [2006]).

Schnelle, Udo. *Gerechtigkeit und Christusgegenwart: Vorpaulinische und paulinische Tauftheologie* Zweite, durchgesehene Auflage. GTA 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1 Kor 6,12-11,16)*. EKKNT. Solothurn und Düsseldorf: Benziger Verlag AG; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995.

Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans* Second Edition. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018.

Schweitzer, Albert, trans. William Montgomery. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. London: A. & C. Black, LTD, 1931.

Schweizer, Eduard, trans. Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller. *The Holy Spirit*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980 [German, 1978].

Sellner, Hans Jörg. *Das Heil Gottes: Studien zur Soteriologie des lukanischen Doppelwerks*. BZNW 152. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2012.

Shantz, Colleen. *Paul in Ecstasy: The Neurobiology of the Apostle's Life and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Sheeley, Steven M. *Narrative Asides in Luke-Acts*. JSNTS 72. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Shepherd, William H. Jr. *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts*. SBLDS 147. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.

Shiell, William David. *Reading Acts: The Lector and the Early Christian Audience*. BIS 70. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, Inc., 2004.

Siebenthal, Heinrich von. *Ancient Greek Grammar for the Study of the New Testament*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019.

Sim, Margaret G. *Marking Thought and Talk in New Testament Greek: New Light from Linguistics on the Particles ἵνα and ὅτι*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2010.

Smith, Benjamin R. 'Sorcery and the Dividual in Australia', *JRAI* Vol. 22 Issue 3 (September 2016), 670-687.

Smith, Daniel Lynwood. *The Rhetoric of Interruption: Speech-Making, Turn-Taking, and Rule-Breaking in Luke-Acts and Ancient Greek Narrative*. BZNW 193. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2012.

Smith, Dennis E., and Joseph B. Tyson, eds. *Acts and Christian Beginnings: The Acts Seminar Report*. Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013.

Smith, Morton. *Jesus the Magician*. Harper & Row, 1978.

Smith, Steve. *The Fate of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts: An Intertextual Approach to Jesus' Laments Over Jerusalem and Stephen's Speech*. LNTS 553. London, New York: T&T Clark, 2017.

Smyth, H. W. *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*. New York; Cincinnati; Chicago; Boston; Atlanta: American Book Company, 1920.

Sosis, Richard, and Eric R. Bressler, 'Cooperation and Commune Longevity: A Test of the Costly Signaling Theory of Religion', *Cross-Cultural Research* Vol. 37 No. 2 (May 2003), 211-239.

Sosis, Richard. 'Religion and Intragroup Cooperation: Preliminary Results of a Comparative Analysis of Utopian Communities', *CCR* Vol. 3 No. 1 (February 2000), 70-87.

_____. 'The Adaptive Value of Religious Ritual' *AS* Vol. 92 (March-April 2004), 166-172.

_____. 'Why Aren't We all Hutterites? Costly Signally Theory and Religious Behavior', *HN* Vol. 14, Issue 2 (June 2003), 91-127.

Sterling, Gregory E. '"Athletes of Virtue": An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41-47; 4:32-35; 5:12-16)', *JBL* Vol. 113 No. 4 (Winter 1994), 679-696.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Stettler, Hanna. *Heiligung bei Paulus: Ein Beitrag aus biblisch-theologischer Sicht* WUNT2 368. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Story, J. Lyle. *Joyous Encounters: Discovering the Happy Affections in Luke-Acts*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2018.

Strathern, Marilyn. *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Strecker, Christian. *Die liminale Theologie des Paulus: Zugänge zur paulinischen Theologie aus kulturanthropologischer Perspecktive*. FRLANT 185. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.

Strelan, Rick. 'A note on ασφάλεια (Luke 1:4)', *JSNT* Vol. 30 No 2 (December 2007), 163-171.

Strutwolf, Holger, et al. *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior, III Die Apostelgeschichte*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017.

Swann Jr., W. B., M. D. Buhrmester, A. Gómez, et al. 'What Makes a Group Worth Dying For? Identity Fusion Fosters Perception of Familial Ties, Promoting Self-Sacrifice', *JPSP* Vol. 106 No. 6 (2014), 912–26.

Swann Jr., William B., Ángel Gómez, Jolanda Jetten, Harvey Whitehouse, and Brock Bastian, 'When Group Membership Gets Personal: A Theory of Identity Fusion', *PR* Vol. 119 No. 3 (2012), 441-456.

Swartz, Marc J. *The Way the World Is: Cultural Processes and Social Relations Among the Mombasa Swahili*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Syreeni, Kari. 'Peter as Character and Symbol in the Gospel of Matthew', in David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, eds. *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. JSNTS 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, 106-152.

Tajfel, Henri, and John Turner. 'An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict', in William G. Austin and Stephen Worchel, eds. *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1979, 33-47.

Talbert, Charles H. *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* Revised Edition. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, Inc., 2005.

_____. *Reading Corinthians; A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. RTNT. New York: Crossroad, 1987.

Tambiah, S. J. 'The Ideology of Merit and the Social Correlates of Buddhism in a Thai Village', in E. R. Leach, ed. *Dialectic in Practical Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968, 41-121.

Tannehill, Robert C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts, A Literary Interpretation, Vol. 2, The Acts of the Apostles*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990.

Tannen, Deborah. 'What's in a Frame?: Surface Evidence for Underlying Expectations', in Deborah Tannen, ed. *Framing in Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993, 14-56.

Tanner, J. Paul. 'James's Quotation of Amos 9 to Settle the Jerusalem Council Debate in Acts 15', *JETS* Vol. 55 No. 1 (2012), 65-85.

Taylor, N. H. 'The Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts', *HTS* Vol. 60 Issue 1&2 (2004), 459-485.

Tetlock, Philip E. 'Coping with Trade-Offs: Psychological Constraints and Political Implications', in S. Lupia, M. McCubbins, and S. Popkin eds. *Political Reasoning and Choice*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

_____. 'Thinking the Unthinkable: Sacred Values and Taboo Cognitions', *TCS* Vol. 7, No. 7 (July 2003), 320-324.

Tetlock, Philip E., et al. 'The Psychology of the Unthinkable: Taboo Trade-Offs, Forbidden Base Rates, and Heretical Counterfactuals', *JPSP* Vol. 78 No. 5 (June 2000), 853-870.

Tetlock, Philip E., Randall S. Peterson, Jennifer S. Lerner. 'Revising the Value Pluralism Model: Incorporating Social Content and Context Postulates', in Clive Seligman, et al.

eds. *The Psychology of Values: The Ontario Symposium Vol. 8*. Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1996, 25-51.

Theissen, Gerd. *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion*. London: SCM Press, 1999.

Thrall, Margaret E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* Vol. 1. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

_____. *I and II Corinthians*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Thiessen, Matthew. *Jesus and the Forces of Death: The Gospels' Portrayal of Ritual Impurity within First-Century Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Carlisle: The Paternoster Press; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.

Tibbs, Clint. *Religious Experience of the Pneuma: Communication with the Spirit World in 1 Corinthians 12 and 14*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock [Mohr Siebeck], 2007.

Tipei, John Fleter. *The Laying on of Hands in the New Testament: Its Significance, Techniques, and Effects*. New York: University Press of America, Inc., 2009.

Toolan, Michael. 'Coherence', in Peter Hühn, et al. eds. *Handbook of Narratology* Second Edition, Volume 1. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2009, 44-62.

_____. *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction* Second Edition. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

_____. 'Narrative Progression in the Short Story: First Steps in a Corpus Stylistic Approach', *Nr* Vol. 16 No. 2 (May 2008), 105-120.

Tronci, Liana. 'Aorist voice patterns in the diachrony of Greek: The New Testament as a sample of Koine', *JGL* Vol. 18 (2018), 241–280.

Tsai, Yen-zen. 'Glossolalia and Church Identity: The Role of Sound in the Making of a Chinese Pentecostal-Charismatic Church', in Fenggang Yang, Joy K. C. Tong, and Allan H. Anderson, eds. *Global Chinese Pentecostal and Charismatic Christianity*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2017, 137-157.

Tucker, J. Brian and Coleman A. Baker, eds. *T&T Clark Handbook to Social Identity in the New Testament*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Tucker, J. Brian. 'Paul's Particular Problem – The Continuation of Existing Identities in Philemon', in Brian J. Tucker and Coleman A. Baker, eds. *T&T Clark Handbook to Social Identity in the New Testament*. London: Bloomsbury: 2014, 407-424.

Turley, Stephen Richard. *The Ritualized Revelation of the Messianic Age: Washings and Meals in Galatians and 1 Corinthians*. LNTS 544. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.

Turner, Max. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000 [1996].

_____. ‘Receiving Christ and Receiving the Spirit: In Dialogue with David Pawson’, *JPT* Vol. 15 (1999), 3-31.

_____. ‘Tongues: An Experience for All in the Pauline Churches?’, *AJPS* Vol. 1 No. 2 (July 1998), 231-253.

Turner, Victor, and Edith Turner. *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture*. CCIR. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 1969.

Tyson, Joseph B. *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.

Uro, Risto. ‘The Interface of Ritual and Writing in the Transmission of Early Christian Traditions’, in István Czachesz and Risto Uro eds., *Mind, Morality and Magic: Cognitive Science Approaches in Biblical Studies*. BW. Durham: Acumen Publishing Limited, 2013.

_____. *Ritual and Christian Beginnings: A Socio-Cognitive Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Vadala, Jeffrey. ‘Cross-Culturally Exploring the Concept of Shamanism’, *Human Relations Area Files*. Yale University (2019), 1-12.

Valve, Lotta. ‘The Lord Elijah in the Temple as in Malachi 3.1: “Overkilling” Elijah Traditions in Luke 2’, in Jesper Tang Nielsen and Mogens Müller, eds. *Luke’s Literary Creativity*. LNTS 550. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016, 144-159.

Van Aarde, Andries G. ‘‘The Most High God Does Live in Houses, But Not Houses Build by Men…’: The Relativity of the Metaphor ‘Temple’ in Luke-Acts’, *Neo* Vol. 25 No. 1 (1991), 51-64.

Van Dijk, Teun A. *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. LLL. London and New York: Longman, 1977.

Van Laer, T., S. Feiereisen and L. M. Visconti, ‘Ethical Implications of Story Domain, Teller and Receiver for the Narrative Transportation Effect’. Paper presented at the 45th Annual European Marketing Academy Conference, 24 - 27 May, 2016, Oslo, Norway.

Van Laer, T., de Ruyter, K., Visconti, L. M. and Wetzels, M. ‘The Extended Transportation-Imagery Model: A Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents and Consequences of Consumers’ Narrative Transportation’, *JCRe* Vol. 40 Issue 5 (2014), 797-817.

Van Oostendorp, Herre, and Susan R. Goldman, eds. *The Construction of Mental Representations During Reading*. Mahwah, New Jersey; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1999.

Van Zyl, Hermie C. ‘The soteriological meaning of Jesus’ death in Luke-Acts. A survey of possibilities’, *VE* Vol. 23 No. 2 (2002), 533-557.

Verheyden, Joseph. 'Some Comments on the Earliest Evidence for the Reception of the Book of Chronicles in Christian Tradition', *RRJ* Vol. 16 (2013), 58-65.

Wackernagel, Jacob. *Vorlesungen über Syntax: mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009 [1920].

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Walton, Steve. 'A Tale of Two Perspectives? The Place of the Temple in Acts', in T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole, eds., *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004, 135-149.

_____. 'ὁμοθυμαδὸν in Acts: Co-location, Common Action or 'Of One heart and Mind'?' in P. J. Williams, et al. eds. *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background in Honour of B. W. Winter on His 65th Birthday*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004, 89-105.

Watson, Francis, 'Luke Rewriting and Rewritten', in Mogens Müller and Jesper Tang Nielsen, eds. *Luke's Literary Creativity*. LNTS 550. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016, 79-95.

_____. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* Second Edition. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.

_____. *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective* Revised and Expanded Edition. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007.

_____. *The Fourfold Gospel: A Theological Reading of the New Testament Portraits of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016.

Webb, Robert. *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Wedderburn, A. J. M. *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology against its Graeco-Roman Background*. WUNT 44. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.

Weiß, Alexander. 'Sozialgeschichtliche Aspeckte der Apostelgeschichte', Stefan Alkier and Michael Rydryck, eds. *Paulus – Das Kapital eines Reisenden: Die Apostelgeschichte als sozialhistorische Quelle* SB 241. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 2017, 37-58.

Wenk, Matthias. *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*. London: T&T Clark International, 2004 [Sheffield Academic Press, 2000].

Wenkel, David H. *Joy in Luke-Acts: The Intersection of Rhetoric, Narrative, and Emotion*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2015.

Whitehouse, Harvey. *Arguments and Icons: Divergent Modes of Religiosity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

_____. 'Dying for the Group: Towards a General Theory of Extreme Self-Sacrifice', *BBS* Vol. 41, e192 (2018), 1–62.

_____. *Modes of Religiosity: A Cognitive Theory of Religious Transmission*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press, 2004.

_____. 'Rites of Terror: Emotion, Metaphor, and Memory in Melanesian Initiation Cults', in John Corrigan, ed., *Religion and Emotion: Approaches and Interpretations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, 133-148.

Whitehouse, Harvey, Brian McQuinn, Michael Buhrmester, and William B. Swann Jr., 'Brothers in Arms: Libyan Revolutionaries Bond Like Family', *PNAS* Vol. 111 No. 50 (December 2014), 17783-17785.

Wilk, Florian. *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus*. FRLANT 179. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

_____, Ed. *Identität und Sprache: Prozesse jüdischer und christlicher Identitätsbildung im Rahmen der Antike*. BTS 174. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018.

Wilkens, Wilhelm. 'Wassertaufe und Geistesempfang bei Lukas', *TZ* Vol. 23 Issue 1 (1967), 26-47.

Williams, Guy. *The Spirit World in the Letters of Paul the Apostle: A Critical Examination of the Role of Spiritual Beings in the Authentic Pauline Epistles*. FRLANT 231. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.

Williams, Sam K. *Jesus' Death as Saving Event the Background and Origin of a Concept*. HDR 2. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972.

Wilson, Andrew. 'Were Israel Baptised in the Spirit?' Available online at: https://thinktheology.co.uk/blog/article/were_israel_baptised_in_the_spirit.

Windisch, Hans. *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum bis auf Origenes: Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Dogmengeschichte*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, Paul Siebeck, 1908.

Winer, George Benedict. *Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament* Seventh Edition, Enlarged and Improved by Gottlieb Lünemann. Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1886.

Wirtz, Kristina. '"Where obscurity is a virtue": The mystique of unintelligibility in Santería ritual', *LC* Vol. 25 Issue 4 (October 2005), 351-375.

Witherington III, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1995.

_____. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. London, New York: T & T Clark International, 1998.

_____. *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009.

_____. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1998.

_____. *Troubled Waters: Rethinking the Theology of Baptism*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Witherup, Ronald D. 'Cornelius over and over and over again: 'Functional Redundancy' in the Acts of the Apostles', *JSNT* Vol. 15 Issue 49 (January 1993), 45-66.

_____. 'Functional Redundancy in the Acts of the Apostles: A Case Study', *JSNT* Vol. 8 (1992), 67-86.

Wolff, Christian. *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther, Zweiter Teil: Auslegung der Kapitel 8-16*. THNT 7. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1982.

Wolter, Michael. *Das Lukasevangelium*. HNT 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Woods, Edward J. *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*. JSNTS 205. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Wreford, Mark. 'Diagnosing Religious Experience in Romans 8'. *TB* Vol. 68 Issue 2 (2017), 203-222.

Wright, Brian J. *Communal Reading in the Time of Jesus: A Window into Early Christian Reading Practices*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017.

Wright, Tom. *Paul for Everyone: 1 Corinthians*. London: SPCK, 2003; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

Zehnle, Richard F. *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3*. SBLMS 15. New York: Abingdon Press, 1971.

Zeller, Dieter. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.