The motivation behind Paul’s collection from the Corinthian church for the *persona miseriae* (i.e. widow, orphan, and stranger) of the Jerusalem church has been interpreted in a variety of ways.¹ David J. Downs has conveniently outlined the major motivations proposed by scholars. The collection was: 1) an eschatological pilgrimage to Jerusalem in fulfillment of OT prophecy;² 2) an obligation to the Jerusalem Council to “remember the poor;”³ 3) a love-based act of Christian charity between fellow believers;⁴ 4) a means of equal distribution of goods and material relief for the Christians in Jerusalem;⁵ and/or 5) a religious or cultic offering.⁶

---

¹ Unless otherwise indicated all NT translations are from NASB and all LXX translations are from *NETS*.
Developed from part of Downs’ taxonomy, Yohannes Faye’s category of “The Collection as a Polemic Act” is most relevant to the present study and should perhaps be more appropriately labeled “The Collection as an Alternative to Ancient Systems of Reciprocity,” since that is the common theme of the major proponents of this view, namely, Sze-kar Wan and David Downs. Both Wan and Downs focus on the collection in the context of patronage and benefaction, and to a certain extent Downs could be seen as nuancing or expanding on Wan’s patronage-based analysis.7

Downs sees the cultic setting of the collection as a way of inserting God into the process of patronage and reciprocity as the ultimate benefactor and patron, stating “Paul metaphorically frames his readers’ responsive participation in the collection as an act of cultic worship, and in so doing he underscores the point that benefaction within the community of believers results in praise to God, the one from whom all benefactions ultimately come.”8 However, Downs does not nuance sacrificial reciprocity as a variation of an OT model. Although other scholarly models for the motivation of the Jerusalem collection should not be discounted or dismissed, the present study endeavors to expand on the work of Wan and Downs by showing that Paul’s collection for the personae miserae of the Jerusalem church as expressed in 2 Cor 8–9 should be read in light of OT sacrificial patronage. This will be demonstrated using a combination of sociological, lexical, and intertextual methodologies over three sections, followed by a fourth section on implications and further research. First, admonitions and descriptions of giving in the NT will be discussed in light of Greco-Roman conceptions of patronage and benefaction on the one hand, and OT conceptions of patronage on the other. Second, a NT theology of giving will be explored in Jesus’ ministry, the early church, and Paul. Third, alleged OT allusions in 2 Cor 8–9 will be

8 Downs, Offering, 28-29, 164.
evaluated to determine the extent to which their OT contexts might inform Paul’s argument and theology.

It must be acknowledged that the present thesis is nearly identical with David Downs’. However, there are two ways in which the present study expands on his thesis. First, whereas Downs only identifies Paul’s cultic description of the Jerusalem collection, the present study establishes Paul’s conception of giving as sacrificial reciprocity within the larger contexts of the early church, Jesus’ theology, and the original context of Deuteronomic sacrificial reciprocity. Second, whereas section II of the paper draws heavily from Downs’ research, the reasons and evidence of sections I, and especially III, are quite distinct from Downs’ approach.

I. Benefaction and Patronage in the Ancient World

A. Availability of Resources in the Ancient World

Whereas in the modern industrialized world resources are considered unlimited, Bruce Malina maintains that in the ancient world the opposite was true. This conception of limited resources was the ideological basis for the ancient economy. To improve one’s social status (i.e. gain more resources) required the sacrifice or expense of another person’s status (i.e. by losing resources); thus socio-economic mobility was a cause for alarm. To attenuate the problem of society-destroying socio-economic mobility, the Greco-Roman ideology of the “honorable man” was developed. This man was one who knew his place in society relative to others and sought to maintain that place through various personal, familial, and societal obligations. He was concerned with the right to maintain his level of subsistence, whatever that may be.

---

10 Ibid., 76.
11 Ibid., 77.
The OT economic ideology to which Paul appeals in 2 Corinthians differs slightly from the Greco-Roman ideology. Whereas resources in the Greco-Roman world may have been considered limited, the Deuteronomic notion that God will continually bless his people relative to their covenant faithfulness (Deut 28:1-2) suggests that resources were not necessarily limited; or at least they did not have to be. Unlike the patrons of the first century CE Greco-Roman world, the chief of whom was the Emperor (and even he had limited resources), YHWH the Patron of the Judeo-Christian world was the creator of resources.³ This nuance aside, the Deuteronomic and Greco-Roman economic systems utilized essentially the same models of economic exchange in the form of reciprocity and redistribution.³

B. Reciprocity

A central mechanism of the ancient economy was the concept of reciprocity between two parties.¹⁴ Halvor Moxnes identifies three primary types of reciprocity in the ancient world: generalized (i.e. altruistic giving), balanced (i.e. near-equivalence attempted in exchange of goods and services), and negative (i.e. stealing or fraud). The patron-client relationship was based on the generalized concept of reciprocity, by which a higher status patron would “altruistically” provide goods or services to a client.¹⁵ Although the patron-client relationship is often viewed as a sort of business relationship, in reality it encompassed nearly any conceivable

¹² In utilizing an OT model of patronage Paul likely wants the Corinthians to move away from the Greco-Roman model of limited resources into a Judeo-Christian model of covenant-faithfulness-based unlimited resources (9:8).

¹³ This should not be surprising, as Menahem Herman shows based on Marcel Mauss’ conception of prestation systems that economic systems of reciprocity permeate ancient and indigenous cultures (Tithe as Gift: The Institution in the Pentateuch and in Light of Mauss’s Prestation Theory, Distinguished Dissertation Series 20 [San Francisco, CA: Mellen Research University Press, 1991], 115–121).


¹⁵ “Altruistically” is in quotes, because although referred to in such terms, patron generosity was hardly altruistic in the sense of selfless giving. Moxnes, Economy, 35; Herman, Tithe, 107.
relationship between superior and subordinate. The primary characteristics of the patron-client relationship were fourfold. First, the interaction between the patron and client was based on a simultaneous exchange of different types of resources. The patron gave certain resources to the client, who was obliged to reciprocate in kind. However, this was not necessarily accomplished via material resources; rather, the client could reciprocate via social resources in the form of public displays of praise, honor, or loyalty. Second, the solidarity of the relationship is connected to concepts of personal honor and socio-religious obligation. Third, the relationship was ideally long-term, but could be abandoned voluntarily by either partner at risk of social ramifications. Fourth, the relationship was based on social inequality, differences in power, and access to resources between patron and client. Because of these features, charity to the poor was uncommon, which distinguishes Greco-Roman reciprocity from Judeo-Israelite reciprocity.

Stephen Joubert further distinguishes between the reciprocal systems of patronage and benefaction. While these are similar to the extent that they govern the exchange of goods and services via a social relationship, the goods themselves and the nature of the relationship are different. Whereas in Greek benefaction the reciprocation of gifts by beneficiaries subjugated the benefactor so that he was required to provide ongoing future benefaction, in Greco-Roman (and OT Deuteronomistic) patronage a client’s reciprocation did not subjugate the patron. Although

---

17 Moxnes, *Economy*, 42.
19 Ibid., 88.
a patron would likely continue to support a faithful client, he had not lost social status, nor was he obligated to engage in future patronage because of a perceived loss of status. This is perhaps best illustrated by Seneca’s idealized exhortation, “Let us give, even if many of our gifts have been given in vain; none the less, let us give to still others, nay, even to those at whose hands we have suffered loss.”

This process is significant to Joubert because he believes that Paul’s rhetoric about the Jerusalem collection appropriates Seneca’s conception of social exchange. However, neither benefaction nor Greco-Roman patronage is fully embraced by NT authors. Whereas Greco-Roman patronage fits well with the notion of God as the ultimate patron who gives of his unlimited resources to provide abundance to his worshipers, the notion of one Christian patronizing another or of one church patronizing another posed a significant threat to unity. By emphasizing the patron-client relationship between the Corinthians and God (2 Cor 9:8-15), and minimizing the patron-client relationship between the Corinthians and Jerusalem via a redistribution model, Paul gives the standard Greco-Roman conception of reciprocity a Judeo-Christian nuance that changes everything.

23 In other words, a patron’s future giving is contingent upon faithful reciprocation of the client, but is not an honor based response to reciprocation; Seneca, Ben. 7:31.4-32.1.
25 Ibid., 70.
C. Redistribution

Besides the mechanism of reciprocity, another hallmark of the ancient economy was the concept of redistribution of resources. This was the politically or religiously based movement of resources from the people to a centralized location to be redistributed elsewhere.\(^\text{26}\) Moxnes observes that a political or religious institution had to justify the highly institutionalized endeavor of redistribution based on four main factors of “generalized exchange.” First, members were made aware of group norms and goals.\(^\text{27}\) Notice Paul’s stated goal that the collection for Jerusalem be done, “not for the ease of others and for your affliction, but by way of equality [ἰσότης]” (8:13). Second, the criteria, privileges, and duties of membership were defined in order to distinguish members from non-members. Paul’s statement that the collection is considered a, “proof [ἔνδειξις] of your love and of our reason for boasting about you” (8:24) and, “the proof [δοκιμή] given by this ministry,” (9:13) plainly shows that the collection functioned as a proof of membership.\(^\text{28}\) Third, the principles of power distribution within the group were clarified. Whereas the Corinthians share parallel status with the Macedonian churches (8:1-5), Paul and Timothy’s status as money collectors and Paul’s status as Apostle elevate them above the churches in terms of power and authority. Additionally, God as the ultimate Patron shows that all power derives from him. Fourth, the structure of resources and group social relations implied a higher meaning or purpose behind the group and its financial decisions; hence Paul’s elevation of the Jerusalem church’s spiritual praise to God (9:12-15), which he identifies as the reciprocation of abundance back to the Corinthians (8:14). Since these factors of generalized exchange were

---


\(^\text{27}\) Moxnes, *Economy*, 37.

\(^\text{28}\) The words for proof in the passages cited here are different. This does not negate the function of the offering as a proof of faith or membership in the body. Further lexical research may be warranted to identify the significance of Paul using these different terms in 8:24 and 9:13.
implicitly established by the socially elite, and since God is framed as the ultimate Patron, the Corinthians would have understood Paul’s words as originating ultimately from God’s authority.\(^{29}\)

In the Jewish world from the beginning of the sacrificial system through the first century CE, the temple was the primary redistributive institution. However, its function was not merely economic, as Moxnes elaborates: “The social and economic exchange was embedded in a highly meaningful context of cult and ritual, linking the mundane to the transcendental.”\(^{30}\) A central role of the temple and a generally important role in the public sphere of redistribution was the broker.\(^{31}\) The broker functioned as the intermediary between patron and client.\(^{32}\) Within the cult the role of broker was fulfilled by a priest, who facilitated a worshiper’s client-based reciprocity to God or accepted the patronage of a worshiper and acted as an intermediary patron to the poor (clients) who would receive the beneficence of the original patron (at least in the triennial tithe of Deut 14:28-29). It is important to hold in tension the Greco-Roman socio-economic system and the slightly different Judeo-Christian ideologies of giving. We must not suppose that Paul employed Judeo-Christian ideology to overthrow the Greco-Roman system.\(^{33}\) Changes in social norms or society as a whole, especially in relation to the patron-client system, were not easily or often attempted.\(^{34}\) The patron-client system was inherently unstable because there was always a potentially higher or more powerful patron, or else limited resources. Thus, whereas Wan sees Paul as a sort of social revolutionary, it is more likely that Paul’s Judeo-Christian nuance of the

\(^{29}\) Ibid., 38.
\(^{30}\) Ibid., 38.
\(^{31}\) In the early empire the use of brokers was important to gain access to the patronage of the emperor. Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor*, 37.
\(^{32}\) Moxnes, *Economy*, 44.
\(^{33}\) Contra Wan, “Collection for the Saints as Anticolonial Act: Implications of Paul’s Ethnic Reconstruction.”
\(^{34}\) Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom*, 45.
patron-client system, by setting God as the highest Patron, alleviates the potential for instability and fear in giving.

It has been mentioned that the patron client relationship was meant to facilitate access to goods and services which a client could not acquire independently, and was capable of being dissolved by either party if the relationship was not appropriately reciprocal. This requires clarification, as Stephen Joubert observes,

The harsh realities of Roman life frequently led to exploitation of clients. Although clients could theoretically end a relationship in such instances, this was easier said than done. Competition among large groups of would-be clients for the benefactions of a relatively small group of Roman patrons was intense, making it difficult to find new patrons. Socio-economic realities, therefore, forced many clients to bear with public humiliation and failure to reciprocate on the part of their patrons, in the hope of receiving at least some material rewards along the way for their clientele services. This harsh reality of Greco-Roman reciprocity may be juxtaposed with the uniquely nuanced economic system of Judeo-Israelite reciprocity.

D. Diachrony of Judeo-Israelite Sacrificial Reciprocity

Israelite society throughout the biblical period into the first century CE utilized a system of reciprocity that was similar to and distinct from the Greco-Roman reciprocal system in many ways. First, the use of hospitality to establish relationships for political purposes is minor or absent from the OT. Second, the sort of public benefaction known to the Greek world was impermissible in the Jewish world, though equal exchange of benefits between individuals is

occasionally present in the OT. For example, Peter Leithart suggests that Melchizedek’s gifts of bread and wine to Abram, which he reciprocates with a tithe (Gen 14:17-24), evince an exchange of benefits. Additionally, Abram’s refusal of tribute from the King of Sodom shows awareness of the obligations and binding attributes of gift-giving and the ability of the recipient to choose to whom he should be bound. Third, whereas Greco-Roman benefaction was primarily concerned with exchange between individuals of equal status (i.e. in voluntary associations) and therefore showed little or no concern for the poor, benefaction in the OT was focused primarily on the poor and destitute, sometimes through reciprocal relationships. More often, however, the reciprocal patron-client relationship took place in the Israelite cultic sacrifices. In Israelite culture God was considered the Patron and Israelites were the clients, and just as in Greco-Roman culture this reciprocal relationship was paramount. OT sacrificial reciprocity also followed the same basic model of economic exchange as we find in Greco-Roman reciprocity, namely, it entailed two stages of exchange: benefaction and reciprocal gratitude. Although God could also provide protection or other intangible forms of benefaction, in sacrificial reciprocity the provision was typically agricultural or pastoral abundance. The necessary reciprocal gratitude which Israelite clients were expected to provide to their God in order to maintain covenant faithfulness (upon which future benefaction was contingent), was to sacrifice and tithe only a small portion of their annual yield during the three annual festivals.

---

39 Joubert cites Deut 15:8 to show that this exchange was part of OT benefaction in general. However, Deut 15:8 envisions a specific type of exchange, namely, a loan, but is not representative of all OT benefaction to the poor (Paul as Benefactor, 73-119, esp. 95–96); Leithart, *Gratitude*, 60–61; Moxnes, *Economy*, 115.
40 Leithart observes that although the OT exhorts generous gift giving it includes no instructions about how the recipient should give back to the benefactor. Though perhaps in light of Greco-Roman reciprocity the “glory” and “honor” in LXX Prov 22:9a are a method of client reciprocity (Gratitude, 62–64); Moxnes, *Economy*, 38; Malina, *NT World*, 142.
41 Herman notes that in the P source material the tithe is status-maintaining and in D the tithe enhances the relationship between God and the donor through feasting and rejoicing. *Tithe*, 139.
In particular they offered the firstborn of their pastoral yield (Deut 16:1-8; 26:1-11) and a tithe of their agricultural or pastoral yield (16:13-15). A central feature of this event was the patron-client sacrificial meal, in which God (Patron) participates by enjoying the fragrant burnt portion of the sacrifice, and the priest (broker), the worshiper (client), and his household participate by consuming the rest of the animal in cultic communion. Understood within the patron-client system, sacrifice recognizes God as the highest Patron who controls all things. Interestingly, this system of exchange was not limited to the standard annual sacrifices.

Deuteronomy observes another type of sacrifice, the triennial tithe, which was a cultically licit substitute for the annual sacrifices that was held every three years in the local city of the worshiper, and was intended to benefit the personae miserae (e.g. Levite, widow, orphan, and stranger) of that locale (Deut 14:28-29; 26:12-15). Like the annual sacrifices, at the triennial tithe worshipers presented food to a broker, probably a Levite at the gates of his city, and enjoyed a communal meal with the personae miserae. Based on the imitatio Dei of the Israelite client-turned-patron, the benefaction and implicit expression of gratitude directed toward God from the personae miserae allowed the triennial sacrifice to function as the Israelite client’s reciprocal gesture of gratitude to God, and thereby maintained covenant faithfulness and provided a

42 cf. Mal 3:8-10 as further evidence of the tithe as the miniscule exchange for God’s blessing and the dependence of future blessings upon tithe payment; Malina, NT World, 97–100 and 131; Peterman, Paul’s Gift, 24; Leithart, Gratitude, 61.

43 Othmar Keel suggests that in the sacrifice of thanksgiving material sacrifice is replaced with a song of thanksgiving, since God doesn’t actually need to consume sacrificial food. He points to Ps 16; 40:6-10; and 56-60 as psalms which might have been sung during the sacrificial events. Further, he suggests that through the communal meal the sacrifice was more likely intended to sate the desires of the attendees, especially the poor (Ps 22:26); rather than feeding God (The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997], 24-30, cf. n.40); cf. Lev 7:11-15 on the peace offering Leithart, Gratitude, 65.

44 Although Deut 14:28-29 and 26:12-15 are silent about the use of the Levite as a broker, the parallelism between the sacrificial event at the central cult site and in the locale of the worshiper, the practical necessity for a cultic recipient of the triennial offerings, and the necessity for a representative of God to attend the communal meal all suggest that the Levite was the natural choice to fulfill the role of priestly broker at the triennial tithe.
justification for God’s future benefaction.\textsuperscript{45} Whereas the Greco-Roman patron client system and the standard annual sacrificial reciprocity of the Israelite cult were essentially based on the same model of simple back and forth exchange in horizontal and vertical directions, respectively; the triennial gesture of sacrificial reciprocity was directed through the \textit{personae miserae} toward God in a triangular pattern.

As the Israelite cult evolved, charitable giving (i.e. almsgiving) rose to the fore and at certain times even overshadowed cultic sacrifice as a means of reciprocating for God’s benefaction, maintaining covenant faithfulness, and earning future benefaction in the forms of material or eschatological wealth (i.e. salvation).\textsuperscript{46} However, Philo and Josephus evince a greater degree of Greco-Roman influence, occasionally viewing benefaction to the poor as a loan – rather than a sacrifice to God – that could be repaid fully by the recipient.\textsuperscript{47} In the midst of this Jewish and Greco-Roman context of benefaction ideology, it is interesting that the NT writers generally and Paul in particular do not portray giving in light of the dominant Greco-Roman or first century CE Jewish conceptions of reciprocity, but instead return to a distinctly OT sacrificial conception.
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\textsuperscript{45} Herman, \textit{Tithe}, 140.
\textsuperscript{47} However, just as in Deut there is a distinction between giving to the poor without expecting repayment (14:28-29) and loaning to the poor expecting repayment (except when repayment was overridden by the Sabbath year of debt remission; cf. Deut 15:7-18), perhaps in the first century CE there was a similar distinction that Joubert has overlooked. Joubert, \textit{Paul as Benefactor}, 98; Peterman, \textit{Paul’s Gift}, 50; Leithart, \textit{Gratitude}, 65–68.
II. The Redefinition of Old Testament Sacrificial Patronage in the New Testament

A. Benefaction in Jesus’ Ministry

Within the context of his Jewish contemporaries Jesus’ conception of sacrificial reciprocity was not always distinct. Leithart observes, “by announcing the reign of God, Jesus aimed to detach giving and gratitude from the honor system in which it was embedded in Roman society and in Jewish life.”48 That is not to say that the reign of God was incompatible with first century CE Jewish reciprocal giving, but that the reign of God marked a return to a model of giving more familiar to the Exodus or Deuteronomic eras when YHWH originally reigned as king of Israel. Although Jesus often speaks about giving in an altruistic way that would have been familiar to his contemporary Jewish culture (Matt 6:3-4; Luke 6:35), his reinstitution of divine patronage was more familiar to the OT sacrificial model.49 Jesus also followed both the apocryphal (Sir 29:9-13) and late OT models of exchange, in which eschatological reward was expected for charity, and the Deuteronomic tradition, in which material rewards were expected. Jesus was therefore capable of motivating eschatological giving (i.e. spreading the gospel, Matt 10:5-15; or healing people, Matt 15:29-31) and material giving (i.e. feeding people, Matt 14:13-21; 15:32-38), based on the expectation that in either case God would continue to provide for his clients-turned-patrons in immaterial and material forms of benefaction.50

At least three significant affinities between OT sacrificial reciprocity and Jesus’ model of patronage are evident in the NT. First, in Matt 25:34-46 Jesus says “to the extent that you did it for [the advantage of] one of these brothers of mine, even the least of them, you did it [as

48 Ibid., 68.
49 Jesus even follows Sirach in suggesting that charity resulted in treasures in heaven (Matt 6:20; Sir 29:9-13). Ibid., Gratitude, 69–70.
50 Ibid., Gratitude, 71.
though] for me.”\textsuperscript{51} In other words, when you as a patron give charity to persons in need (i.e. \textit{personae miserae}) it is as though you are expressing your reciprocal generosity directly to me. This is the very principle that justifies the triennial tithe (Deut 14:28-29) as a legitimate mode of cultic sacrificial reciprocity, and it shows that the OT model of sacrificial reciprocity is a central tenet of Jesus’ theology of giving. Second, Jesus takes the model a step further in identifying his body as the temple of God (Matt 26:61; 27:40; Mark 14:58; 15:29; John 2:19-22; cf. 1 Cor 3:17); and third, in being identified as the Lamb of God (John 1:29-36; cf. Rev 5:6; 6:9; 7:17; 14:10; 15:3; 19:9; 21:23; 22:1, 3). These three developments in Jesus’ theology of giving assert that the Deuteronomistic model of patronage has been reinstated, that his body (later represented by followers of Jesus, namely, the church) is the new metaphorical location for sacrificial reciprocity, and that he functions as the animal of the sacrificial meal.\textsuperscript{52}
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B. Benefaction in the Early Church

Patronage in the early church, expressed in Acts 4:32–6:7, is a continuation of Jesus’ enhanced model of OT sacrificial reciprocity. In Acts 4:32–5:16 the apostles function as priestly brokers of the freewill offering of church members, accepting their sacrifices and distributing them to the \textit{personae miserae} of the fledgling Jerusalem church, except when they decide that it

\textsuperscript{51} I have added the bracketed phrases to the NASB translation in order to highlight the function of the dative as a “dative of advantage.” I am thankful to my colleague Kei Hiramatsu for highlighting this feature. Daniel B. Wallace, \textit{Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament} (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 142–44.

\textsuperscript{52} Because these observations have been made without recourse to secondary literature, further research is necessary to determine whether I am the first to have identified the depiction of Jesus as temple and lamb in economic terms.
is necessary to appoint specialists to oversee the διακονία (Acts 6:4). Their actions echo those of Moses in Exod 35:4–36:7, who acts as priestly broker in receiving the materials of the freewill offering that is used to construct the tabernacle and likewise appoints specialists to oversee the construction of the tabernacle.

Another indication that the early church drew from Jesus’ conception of sacrificial reciprocity is found outside of Acts in discussions of participation in the Eucharist, the analog of which was the festive meal of Passover and Unleavened Bread (Matt 26:20-29; 1 Cor 11:23-34; Jude 12). Interestingly, whereas attendees of Greco-Roman dinners were given different qualities of food based on their social status, those who attended the Eucharist (and OT festive meals, esp. the triennial sacrificial meal, Deut 14:28-29) would receive the same meal, regardless of social status. A final point of interest is that almsgiving in Acts is portrayed as a sign of the true worshiper of God, not unlike the function of the collection in 2 Cor 8–9 as a proof of faith.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triennial Sacrifice</th>
<th>Early Church Patronage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israelite</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personae</td>
<td>Personae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misere</td>
<td>Misere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

53 διακονία is used only once in the LXX (1 Macc 10:58) and although less common than in the NT (34x: Luke 10:40; Acts 1:17, 25; 6:1, 4; 11:29; 12:25; 20:24; 21:19; Rom 11:13; 12:7; 15:31; 1 Cor 12:5; 16:15; 2 Cor 3:7, 8, 9; 4:1; 5:18; 6:3; 8:4; 9:1, 12, 13; 11:8; Eph 4:12; Col 4:17; 1 Tim 1:12; 2 Tim 4:5, 11; Heb 1:14; Rev 2:19), it is used in 1 Macc in connection with cultic service.

54 Although the offerings of Acts 4 are not used to build a physical temple, they are used to build, via acts of charity and healing, the metaphorical temple of God which is understood as the body of Christ, or the church (1 Cor 12). In Acts 5:14–16 the addition of numbers as a result of acts of healing and charity is understood as building the church (i.e. adding more members to the body of Christ). It is interesting that the narrative of the inauguration of the church parallels the inauguration of the Israelite cultic system. I have observed several other notable parallels, even stronger than these, but this must be saved for a later project.

55 Leithart suggests that the peace offering of thanksgiving (todah) is the ritual precedent of the Eucharist. Meeks shows that the Eucharist commemorates the Passover meal, which was one of the festive meals of the OT calendar year (Gratitude, 71); Wayne A. Meeks, The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), 158.

56 cf. Martial Epigrams 10.49 in Shelton, As the Romans Did, 317; Meeks, First Urban Christians, 159.

Note the exact parallelism between the triennial sacrifice (Deut 14:28-29) and early church conceptions of sacrificial reciprocity (Acts 4:32–5:16; 6:1-7).

C. Benefaction in Paul

As an Apostle of the early church Paul evinces the same conception of patronage as Jesus (e.g. enhanced OT sacrificial reciprocity). Of particular interest are Phil 4:18 and Eph 5:2 in which Paul uses explicitly sacrificial language in reference to sacrificial benefaction. These texts are not directly related to the Jerusalem collection, but they inform Paul’s understanding of that collection as sacrificial benefaction.

1. Philippians 4:10-20

The gift which the Philippians provide to Paul in order to sustain his ministry efforts is referred to metaphorically as a ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας “fragrant aroma” (4:18), which Dieter Georgi recognizes as an echo of OT sacrificial imagery and suggests that the true substance of this gift is a sacrifice. Georgi helpfully adds, “I understand the theological argumentation on which Paul elaborates in 4:10-20 as an exegetical model for the further interpretation of all Pauline literature pertaining to the collection.” The basis of this offering in sacrificial reciprocity explains why Paul’s rhetoric, which some consider evasive and even offensive, does not show direct gratitude to the Philippians for their gift. Paul does not evade gratitude; he follows the OT triennial sacrificial model by accepting their benefaction as one of the personae miserae (namely, as a Levite) and

---

59 The terms ὀσμὴν and εὐωδίας occur 37 times together in a cultic sacrificial context (Gen 8:21, Exod 29:18, 25, 41; Lev 2:12; 4:31; 6:14; 8:21; 17:4, 6; 23:18; Num 15:3, 5, 7, 10, 13, 14, 24; 18:17; 28:2, 6, 8, 13, 24, 27; 29:2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 36; Jdt 16:16; Sir 50:15; Ezek 6:13; 16:19; 20:28; Dan 4:37a). Georgi, Remembering the Poor, 64–66; Faye, The Nature and Theological Import of Paul’s Collection for the Saints in Jerusalem, 106; Peterman, Paul’s Gift from Philippi, 153.
60 Georgi, Remembering, 66.
61 Leithart, Gratitude, 73.
giving gratitude to God directly. Alternatively, Paul may be viewed here like the other Apostles as a priestly broker who accepts the offering of the Philippians as a standard OT sacrifice. Whether it can be said that in 4:8 and elsewhere (e.g. 2 Cor 8–9) Paul is correcting what would have been the common Greco-Roman interpretation of the gift, as Peterman suggests, is a secondary issue. Paul is following the NT theology of sacrificial reciprocity.

---

### Early Church Patronage
(Acts 4:32—6:7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Personae Miseræ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Pauline Patronage
(Phil 4:18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Paul or Personae Miseræ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. **Ephesians 5:1-2**

Here Paul employs metaphors familiar from Phil 4:18 and the Jerusalem collection. He uses the metaphor of a ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας (5:2), this time applied to Jesus’ passion sacrifice, in a manner consistent with Jesus’ self-awareness and identification as the destroyed temple and sacrificial lamb in the Gospels. He takes a similar approach to the Jerusalem collection by exhorting the Corinthians to imitate the self-induced poverty of Jesus (2 Cor 8:9). Although the phrase “he became poor” may be misleading in 2 Cor 8:9, in light of Eph 5:2 and Phil 4:18 it is clear that Jesus’ death is viewed as a sacrifice that functions for Paul and the early church as the highest form of sacrificial reciprocity, upon which all other material and immaterial sacrifices should be based. Forgoing a

---

65 Interestingly, the sacrificial phrase of Eph 5:1 is preceded in 4:27-28 by an exhortation to labor for the purpose of charitable giving. Although it is much shorter of an exhortation, the theme (giving) and theology (sacrificial reciprocity) of Eph 4:27-28 and 5:1 are identical to the theme and theology of 2 Cor 8-9. I am thankful to Dr. Fredrick J. Long for identifying this potential parallel.
diagram, as the one who sacrifices himself (Eph 5:2), namely, the Lamb of God (John 1:29, 36). Jesus is both the patron and the gift given to the Chief Priests (Matt 27:1) who sacrifice him as an offering to God.

D. Jerusalem Collection Texts

In analyzing texts relating to the Jerusalem collection it is important to note that Paul’s theology of giving is no different here than in Phil 4:18, Eph 5:2, or the early church as a whole. The difficulty of the collection texts (Rom 15:22-29; 1 Cor 16:1-4; 2 Cor 8–9; Gal 2:10) is that they have not often been studied for their sacrificial language and themes, much less within a context of sacrificial reciprocity.66

1. Romans 15:15-29

Although there is some debate over the phrase ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἔθνων “the offering of the gentiles,” Downs suggests that the genitive is subjective, indicating that this is a euphemism for the Jerusalem collection. The fact that it is called a προσφορά in the first place is evidence enough of sacrificial language, however throughout the pericope Paul uses several other sacrificial terms for the collection: λειτουργός “ministry/service,” ἱερούργεω “to act as priest” (consistent with Paul’s role as priestly broker in sacrificial offerings), εὐπρόσδεκτος “acceptable” (sacrificially), and ἁγιάζω “to sanctify.”67 It is noteworthy that Paul lacks any emphasis on χάρις or the voluntary nature

66 Except Downs, Offering.
67 προσφορά occurs 15x in the LXX almost exclusively in cultic contexts (3 Kgdms 7:34; 1 Esd 5:51; Ps 39(40):7(6); Sir 14:11; 34:18, 19; 35:1, 5; 38:11; 46:16; 50:13, 14; Dan 3:38; 4:37b. Sir 31(34):15-16 (18-19) is not cultic). λειτουργός occurs 23x in the LXX exclusively in cultic contexts (Num 4:27; 7:7, 8; 8:25; 16:9; 18:4, 6, 7; 1 Chron 6:17, 33; 9:13, 19, 28; 23:24, 28; 28:13, 20; 2 Chron 8:14; 35:15; 2 Macc 3:3; 4:14; Wis 18:21; Ezek 29:20). The service of Nebuchadnezzar in Ezek 29:20 is depicted as cultic service for God. In Rom 12:1 Paul uses λειτουργός to describe the Christian act of offering one’s body as a “living and holy sacrifice, acceptable to God.” ἱερούργεω does not occur in the LXX, but its cognate noun ἱεροῦργία occurs 1x in the LXX, a cultic context (4 Macc 3:20). εὐπρόσδεκτος occurs in the LXX 3x (Prov 11:20; 16:15; Wis 9:12), though Prov 16:15 has no cultic connotations and Prov 11:20 and Wis 9:12 can only be seen as cultic through a wisdom lens. ἁγιάζω occurs 192x in the LXX, with the connotation of “to set apart as holy.” Downs, Offering, 154. H. Strathmann “λειτουργός,” TDNT
of the gift, except that the parallel use of διακονία here, in 2 Cor 8–9, and most importantly in Acts 6:4, suggests that the collection and the offerings of Acts 4:32–6:7 should be viewed equally as freewill offerings. That is not to say that the offerings of Acts 4:32–6:7 are the same as Paul’s Jerusalem collection, but that categorically they are both freewill offerings and are both collected for the Jerusalem church.

2. 1 Corinthians 16:1–4

Prior to this pericope the letter is filled with language associated with cultic sacrifice and worship (i.e. prophecy, prayer, singing, praise, thanksgiving, interpretation of tongues, and weighing of prophecies), many of which David deSilva identifies as appropriate responses to God’s grace (e.g. sacrificial reciprocity). However, the cultic terminology here is sparse. The term εὐοδόω “abundance” is not the same word used for the περισσεύω “abundance” of 2 Cor 9:8, 12, but it is a cognate, and was used in the LXX to connote God’s provision to his covenant people. David Downs suggests, contra Georgi, that λογεία should be interpreted as a sacrificial term in light of the context of the collection as a sacrificial offering. Also evident in this pericope is Paul’s apostolic role

69 deSilva, Honors, 142-47; Linss suggests that all giving is a thank offering to God (“The First World Hunger Appeal,” CTM 12 (1985): 218); Claire S. Smith, Pauline Communities as “Scholastic Communities”: A Study of the Vocabulary of “Teaching” in 1 Corinthians, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus, WUNT 335 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 269; Stephen Joubert, “Religious Reciprocity in 2 Corinthians 9:6–15: Generosity and Gratitude as Legitimate Responses to the Χάρις Τοῦ Θεοῦ,” Neot 33 (1999): 87.
71 λογεία is not extant in the LXX. Downs, Offering, 129; Gerhard Kittel “λογεία,” TDNT 4:282.
as priestly broker between the Corinthians and the Jerusalem church. Perhaps the best indication from this pericope that the collection functions sacrificially is Paul’s instruction for the Corinthians to collect the money on the first day of the week (i.e. Sunday), which was the day they met for worship and celebrated the Eucharist sacrificial communal meal.

3. 2 Corinthians 8–9

As the largest text on the Jerusalem collection and the one in which Paul makes his most impassioned exhortation, it is not surprising that sacrificial and religious language and themes would pervade these chapters. A central theme is *imitatio Dei/Christi* (8:9), which was also central to the triennial sacrifice (Deut 14:28-29) and Jesus’ sacrifice (Eph 5:2). In light of the NT conception of sacrificial offerings, this theme in the beginning of Paul’s discourse shows that the offering should be interpreted sacrificially. The goal of ἴσοτης “equality” may function as a double entendre here, referring to the concept of Greco-Roman friendship, to the distribution of food suggested by the allusion to Exod 16:18 (discussed below), and/or the basis for divine power leading to salvation. In the present context Paul probably intends the OT allusion to set his discussion about the collection in an OT context before he arrives at the allusion-laden pericope of 9:6-15. Another term used for God’s provision and the collection itself is χάρις “grace.” χάρις is commonly employed in Greco-Roman benefaction literature.

---

75 deSilva notes that *imitatio Dei* was featured in Seneca’s *Ben*. 1.10.5; 3.15.4; 7.31.2, 4; and 7.32; indicating that this theme pervaded ancient conceptions of benefaction. Paul’s use of the theme in specific reference to Christ, in light of the NT theology of giving, must be restricted to a non-Greco-Roman sense. deSilva, *Honor*, 107.
77 χάρις is used 160x in the LXX.
both as the favor shown by a benefactor toward the beneficiary, and as the beneficiary’s
gratitude. In the Christian context it refers to God’s divine patronage and to the grace which the Corinthian church, as recipients of his patronage and imitators of Christ, will also extend to Jerusalem.\(^{78}\)

Another term, the significance of which has already been discussed in the context of the freewill offering of Acts 4:32-6:7, is διακονία “service/ministry.”\(^{79}\) The term λειτουργία “service/ministry,” is more consistently part of the worship context than διακονία, even in Greco-Roman literature. When combined in 9:12 both terms set the offering in a cultic context.\(^{80}\) The term αὐτάρκεια “sufficiency,” is not necessarily a religious or cultic term, but in the context of 9:8 it connotes independence based on God’s material benefaction which enables the Corinthians to independently imitate Christ or God in their patronage of Jerusalem.\(^{81}\) The term ἐπιτελεῖσθαι “complete,” is used in the Greco-Roman sphere for the completion of cultic offerings, as it is used here (8:6, 11) in reference to the collection as a sacrificial offering.\(^{82}\) The term εὐχαριστία “thanksgiving,”

---

78 Harrison gives an exhaustive treatment of the usage of χαρίς throughout ancient literature (Paul’s Language, 63, 95, 165-66, 209-10, and 287); Leithart, Gratitude, 74; Joubert, Paul as Benefactor, 152–53; deSilva, Honor, 104–05; Faye, however, disagrees that χαρίς is a technical term for worship here (Nature, 104); Hans Conzelmann “χαρίς,” TDNT 9:393-96.
79 Joubert, Paul as Benefactor, 198–200 and 217.
80 Joubert, “Reciprocity,” 86; Downs, Offering, 144–45.
81 αὐτάρκεια is used 1x in the LXX (Pss. Sol. 5:16) to connote moderation of God’s provision, with the implication that abundance alone yields sin, but abundance with righteousness is a blessing from God. This sentiment parallels 2 Cor 9:8. As others have noted, this term is also used in Stoic philosophy to refer to autonomy. Bart B. Bruehler, “Proverbs, Persuasion, and People: A Three-Dimensional Investigation of 2 Cor 9:6–15,” NTS, Proverbs, Persuasion, and People 48 (2002): 216; Kittel “αὐτάρκεια,” TDNT 1:467.
in the early Christian context is a technical term connected to worship in the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{83} Finally, the term εὐλογία “blessing,” is typically used for the public praise of God.\textsuperscript{84} Taken together, the cultic terminology of 2 Cor 8–9 suggests that the Jerusalem collection was to be a freewill offering from God’s abundant patronage to the Corinthian church so that it could participate in imitatio Dei/Christi by becoming the patron of the personae miserae in the Jerusalem church, which allowed them to ultimately fulfill their gesture of reciprocal thanksgiving to God in accordance with NT standards of sacrificial reciprocity and Deut 14:28-29.

4. Galatians 2:10

Many scholars interpret “remember the poor” in Gal 2:10 as a command by the Jerusalem Council to remember the poor in Jerusalem by collecting money for them.\textsuperscript{85} This is corroborated by 1 Cor 16:1 where Paul mentions the churches of Galatia as those involved in the collection for Jerusalem. However, Bruce Longenecker has recently challenged the scholarly consensus by surveying the early history of interpretation of Gal 2:10. He discovered that prior to the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE the phrase was understood as applicable to the poor within local congregations throughout Judea and the Greco-Roman world.\textsuperscript{86} Evidently the passage was later applied to the poor in Jerusalem by Ephrem, Jerome, Chrysostom, and many scholars since.\textsuperscript{87} Whether the phrase refers to benefaction of the poor in Jerusalem explicitly, local churches generally, or both (i.e. locally and

\textsuperscript{83} εὐχαριστία occurs 4x in the LXX (Esth 8:12d; 2 Macc 2:27; Wis 16:28; Sir 37:11), and of these only Wis 16:28 seems to have a possible cultic context. Hans Conzelmann “εὐχαριστία,” TDNT 9:413.
\textsuperscript{84} εὐλογία occurs 95x in the LXX in reference to blessing or praise. Smith, Pauline Communities, 272; Beyer “εὐλογία,” TDNT 2:757-58 (in OT), 761-63 (in NT).
\textsuperscript{86} Bruce W. Longenecker, Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 161–70 and 181-82.
\textsuperscript{87} Lim, “Generosity,” 24.
globally) is not important here. This text merely substantiates the other major texts on the Jerusalem offering, and in light of these “remember” should have a sacrificial nuance.

Several texts have been sampled which show that 1) Jesus’ conception of patronage was based on a combination of eschatological benefaction and OT sacrificial reciprocity, 2) the early church continued to view patronage of the poor in a sacrificial light (Acts 4:32–6:7), and 3) Paul followed suit with explicit references to giving as a sacrifice (Phil 4:18 and Eph 5:2). Although not always described in such explicit terms, it can be reasonably inferred that the Jerusalem collection would have been understood by the early church as a form of sacrificial reciprocity akin to the triennial sacrifice of Deut 14:28-29. The final section of this paper will discuss the influence of allusions to the OT in 2 Cor 8–9, and the extent to which the OT contexts of these allusions inform Paul’s argument.

III. Intertextuality in 2 Cor 8–988

The goal of the present section is not to determine the legitimacy or scope of the intertextuality in 2 Cor 8–9 (e.g. using Hays’ or Beale’s methodology).89 Rather, the intent is for the first time to bring to bear on this passage the OT context of alleged allusions in order to show the extent to which they may enhance Paul’s argument. Additionally, the hope is that providing a

---

88 The NT texts used below are from the NA28 and all OT texts to which Paul alludes in 2 Cor 8-9 are from the Rahlfs LXX. Alfred Rahlfs, Septuaginta (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006); Eberhard Nestle et al., eds., Novum Testamentum Graece, 28th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 2012).

more substantial support for the full OT context of these allusions will contribute to the debate over Greco-Roman vs. OT priority of interpretation.\footnote{Betz’ commentary is notable for providing a balanced approach to the allusions in 2 Cor 8–9 to the extent that he considers possible allusions to both Greco-Roman and Jewish/OT texts (2 Corinthians 8 and 9: A Commentary on Two Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985], 106–07).}

A. 2 Corinthians 8:15 (Exodus 16:18 LXX)\footnote{Refer to the appendix for more detailed grammatical discussion of the intertextual elements in this section.}

Although in 2 Cor 8:15 he references just a portion of Exod 16:18, it is likely that Paul considers all of chapter 16 relevant to his argument in two ways.\footnote{Contra Balla, this quotation describes more than the mutual abundant support of needs within the church. Peter Balla “2 Corinthians,” Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 774.} First, it shows that if God provided meat and manna from the desert, his resources as patron to the Corinthians cannot be considered anything but infinite. Second, the story shows that equality (i.e. having one’s subjective needs met) is an important aspect of God’s patronage. The implication is that the Corinthians have deliberately been given too much (8:14) so that they can then imitate God by patronizing those in the Jerusalem church who do not have enough. Whereas the Corinthians may have felt entitled to their material wealth as inherent to their subsistence level, Paul reframes their wealth as abundance and presents them with the dilemma of keeping their wealth and violating social norms or distributing it so that equality might be restored.\footnote{Recall that the notion of any person having more than he should (i.e. abundance) was a cause for alarm because his surplus required another person’s deficit.}

B. 2 Corinthians 8:21 (Proverbs 3:4 LXX)

Proverbs 3:4 emphasizes charity and loyalty, which are both significant elements of reciprocity. Although Paul is probably concerned in 2 Cor 8:21 with validating his collection of money as honorable, in light of Prov 3:3–4 what is “honorable” (καλός) may also be interpreted as loyalty within the church through mutual acts of charity.
C. 2 Corinthians 9:6 (Proverbs 11:24 LXX and 22:8 LXX) and 9:7b (Proverbs 22:8a LXX)\textsuperscript{94}

The agrarian metaphor employed in Prov 22:8 LXX and 2 Cor 9:6 appeals to both Greco-Roman and OT contexts (cf. Job 4:8; Prov 11:26; Sir 7:3; 3 Bar 15.2; cf. Gal 6:7-9).\textsuperscript{95} What is noteworthy for the present discussion is that this allusion does not stand in isolation. Rather, the full context of Prov 22:8-9a seems to be influential for Paul’s argument in 2 Cor 9:6-14. Second Corinthians 9:7b alludes to Prov 22:8a LXX by mutual emphasis on the cheerful disposition and liberal patronage of the giver toward the poor.\textsuperscript{96} The rest of the context of Prov 22:8-9a LXX, namely 22:9-9a, also informs the remaining context of 2 Cor 9:8-14: 1) the theme of benefaction to the poor leading to future benefaction from God (Prov 22:9 paralleled with 2 Cor 9:8, 10, and 11) and 2) the theme of the poor reciprocating their gift through vocal glorification of God or the giver (Prov 22:9a paralleled with 2 Cor 9:11b, 12b, 13b, and 14).

D. 2 Corinthians 9:7a (Deuteronomy 15:10 LXX)

Although the lexical connections are sparse, the larger context of Deut 14:22–16:17 is relevant to Paul’s argument. The overall theme of giving to the poor is prevalent in 2 Cor 8–9 and Deut 14:28–15:18. Additionally, Paul’s theology of giving as sacrificial reciprocity matches the descriptions of the tithes in (Deut 14:22-29), loans to the poor (15:1-18), and the three annual festivals (16:1-17), which may suggest that Paul alludes to Deut 15:10 in order to draw upon its larger theological context.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{94} Although NA\textsuperscript{28} identifies Prov 11:24 LXX as a text to which 2 Cor 9:6 alludes, the stronger allusion based on word order and vocabulary is Prov 22:8 LXX.

\textsuperscript{95} Joubert, “Reciprocity,” 82.

\textsuperscript{96} Betz, 2 Corinthians, 106–07; Although Betz observes several additional parallels which suggest that Paul may be attempting to appeal to both Greco-Roman and Jewish conceptions of giving, in the context of Pauline and NT theology of giving it is more likely that Paul is either recasting the proverb in the light of NT sacrificial reciprocity or he is echoing the sacrificial reciprocity already evident in Prov 22:8-9a. cf. Lev. Rab. 34:8 or m.'Abot 5:13; Sir 4:1-10. Betz, 2 Corinthians, 106–07.

\textsuperscript{97} Bruehler suggests that the allusion is meant to emphasize the volitional quality of the collection (“Proverbs,” 214). Joubert highlights the importance of a gift made with the right attitude, based on Seneca Ben 2.1.1 (“Reciprocity,” 83).
E. 2 Corinthians 9:9 (Psalm 111:9 LXX)

Second Corinthians 9:9 is a quotation of Psalm 111:9, and despite the fact that Psalm 111 does not describe an act of sacrifice it has several compelling points of thematic continuity with OT cultic activity. First, God’s patronage is described early in the Psalm (111:5) and paralleled later (111:9) with the description of a righteous man’s *imitatio Dei* in the form of his patronage to the poor. Second, the agricultural metaphor (111:9) parallels those of 2 Cor 9:6 and Prov 22:8 LXX and the agricultural and pastoral produce offered during the annual festivals of Deut 14–16. Third, God’s portrayal as the first patron and the righteous man’s portrayal as a former client who through *imitatio Dei* has become patron to the poor, correlate with the form of sacrificial reciprocity in Deut 14:28-29. Fourth, the psalm was actually part of the cultic liturgy that would have been recited in an ancient Israelite cultic ceremony of praise and thanksgiving to YHWH and maybe even during the annual or triennial tithe. This suggests that Paul utilizes Ps 111:9 and arguably the entire context of 111 to strengthen his assertion in 2 Cor 9:8 that God provides benefaction to his clients so that they can imitate him as patrons of the poor in Jerusalem.

F. 2 Corinthians 9:10 (Isaiah 55:10 LXX)

Like the above OT texts alluded to throughout 2 Cor 8-9, Isaiah 55 LXX describes God’s abundant patronage. However, a significant difference here is that agricultural produce is a metaphor for spiritual concepts (e.g. righteousness), rather than material produce. This probably reflects the shift toward eschatological benefaction in the later OT and intertestamental period, which Jesus and the NT writers embrace and combine with material benefaction in their theology.

---

98 Joubert refers to the righteous man of Ps 111:9 as the “embodiment of the agrarian maxim” in 2 Cor 9:6 (“Reciprocity,” 84).
99 Leithart, *Gratitude*, 64; Balla "2 Corinthians," 776.
100 Downs, *Offering*, 142; Balla "2 Corinthians," 776.
of sacrificial reciprocity. Paul’s use of Isa 55:10 LXX seems to imagine at least the thematic context of the entire chapter. God initiates patronage with Israel in an everlasting covenant (Isa 55:3), which Isaiah relates via agrarian metaphor to God’s material patronage, and to which Israel and all of creation respond with reciprocal thanksgiving to God (55:12-13). While the allusion to Isa 55:10 LXX functions in 2 Cor 9:10 as a summary of 9:6-9, the appeal to a combination of eschatological and material benefaction and reciprocal thanksgiving to God also points forward to God’s material and eschatological benefaction of the Corinthians (9:10-11) and the thanksgiving of the Jerusalem church (9:12, 14).101

G. 2 Corinthians 9:10 (Hosea 10:12 LXX)

Admittedly Hos 10:12 LXX is the least cultic of all allusions in 2 Cor 8–9, though this does not detract from Paul’s use of the full context of Hos 10 in his argument. Hos 10:12 employs the familiar agrarian metaphor for God’s patronage and like Isa 55 LXX the benefaction is eschatological rather than material. By the phrase “sow for yourselves unto justice,” Hos 10:12 subtly relates to the theme of benefaction to the personae miserae, in response to which God will later provide eschatological benefaction.102 This combination of OT texts which discuss God’s eschatological produce is germane to Paul’s rhetoric in 2 Cor 9:10-15, in which he assures the Corinthians that their material gift will result in eschatological spiritual blessing. Another likely reason for Paul’s use of Hos 10 is the overwhelmingly negative language of Israel’s misdeeds and God’s judgment. Just like the Israelites, the Corinthians have a choice between living a just

---

101 It may also be reasonable to connect the word of God which accomplishes his will (Isa 55:11) with Jesus as the divine λόγος and who in the context of 2 Cor 8–9 accomplishes the will of God via self-sacrifice (Ibid., 776); Bruehler, “Proverbs,” 217; Joubert, “Reciprocity,” 85.

102 The sense is similar to that of Isa 55:10 LXX. Justice is a form of benefaction to the personae miserae throughout the OT (Ps 68:5; 146:7; Isa 1:17, 10:2; Jer 22:3; Ezek 22:29). Combined with sacrificial reciprocity, patronage for the poor forms a central theme of Deuteronomy (10:18; 24:17; 27:19).
life characterized by care for the poor, or not. If not, the Corinthians are subject to divine judgment.

IV. Implications and Further Research

Many scholarly views on the purpose of the Jerusalem collection are based on an assumption that it was influenced by a Jew/gentile conflict in the early church, which gentile Christians were obligated to rectify via their collection for Jewish Christians. The dominant scholarly positions proceed from this assumption and assert that the collection was motivated specifically by 1) Paul’s sense that the gentile clients were indebted to their Jewish patrons in Jerusalem, 2) Paul’s desire to see the gentile and Jewish churches united by this single act of reconciliation, unity, or solidarity, and/or 3) Paul’s conception of the collection as fulfilling the Isaianically anticipated eschatological event in which the gentiles, subordinate to the Jews, stream to Zion with gifts.

The only approach which does not necessarily give merit to the Jew/gentile distinction is the material relief position, which is capable of acknowledging different theological frameworks for the collection (i.e. eschatology, ecumenism, or cultic sacrifice), but is more concerned with its practical function. The setting of NT giving within Deuteronomic sacrificial reciprocity (Deut 14:22-29), esp. the triennial offering (Deut 14:28-29) which was intended to serve entirely pragmatically as material relief (albeit within a cultic theological framework), comports best with the material relief motive for the collection. This necessitates several questions worthy of further study: 1) If the basis of the Jerusalem collection in sacrificial reciprocity shows that it was motivated at least partially by pragmatic material relief, and this comports with the general NT conception of giving as sacrificial reciprocity which was also motivated by concerns for material relief, should support for the Jerusalem church be reckoned primarily as anything but
pragmatically motivated by material relief? 2) More to the point, is there any reason to see Paul’s collection or the mandate to “remember the poor” (Gal 2:10) as a benefaction or patronage-based obligation of the gentile churches to Jerusalem? 3) How might all NT texts which discuss giving be illumined by the concept of sacrificial reciprocity? Besides these questions, further research is needed to fully develop a Biblical theology sacrificial reciprocity throughout the entire canon.

Conclusion

Although in 2 Corinthians 8-9 Paul certainly appeals to conceptions of reciprocity and language germane to the wider Greco-Roman culture, the present study has endeavored to show based on 1) the NT theology of giving as sacrificial reciprocity, 2) Jesus’ redefinition of patronage to the poor as an enhanced OT sacrificial reciprocity which was adopted by the early church, and 3) deliberate allusions to OT texts which support his argument and theology, that Paul’s conception of patronage is thoroughly tied to the OT. In particular, Paul’s collection from the Corinthians for the *personae miserae* of the Jerusalem church may be profitably read in the light of OT sacrificial patronage and reciprocity.

\[103 \text{ Cf. Acts 4:32-6:7}\]
Appendix: Detailed Analysis of the Allusions in 2 Cor 8-9

A. 2 Corinthians 8:15 (Exodus 16:18 LXX)

  In 2 Cor 8:15 Paul writes “As it is written, ‘He who gathered much did not have too much, and he who gathered little had no lack.’” This quotes Exod 16:18b “And they measured by the gomor. The one with much did not have excess, and the one with less did not have too little. Each person collected for those appropriate at his own home.” In 16:1-35 God’s patronage in the form of manna and quail is the central theme. For the portion of Exod 16:18 which Paul quotes, the majority (bold) of the text is identical in vocabulary and word order. Only one word in Exodus (ἔλαττον) is exchanged with a cognate (ὀλίγον) and the particle>verb>subject NP word order of ὁ τὸ πολύ ἐπλεόνασεν ὁ τὸ ἔλαττον in Exodus is inverted to subject NP>particle>verb in 2 Cor, suggesting that this is a calque of Exod 16:

  Exod 16:18 – οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν ὁ τὸ πολύ, καὶ ὁ τὸ ἔλαττον οὐκ ἴλαττόνησεν.
  2 Cor 8:15 – ὁ τὸ πολύ οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν, καὶ ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐκ ἴλαττόνησεν.

B. 2 Corinthians 8:21 (Proverbs 3:4 LXX)

  In 2 Cor 8:21 Paul writes “for we have regard for what is honorable, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men.” This alludes to Prov 3:3-4 “Let acts of charity and loyalty not fail you; rather fasten them on your neck and you will find favor, and think of what is noble in the sight of the lord and of people.” In his allusion to Prov 3:4 Paul includes all of the original words (bold), but adds γὰρ, οὗ μόνον, ἀλλὰ, and ἐνώπιον (elided in Prov), and exchanges the imperative προνοοῦ for the indicative προνοοῦμεν:
C. 2 Corinthians 9:6 (Proverbs 11:24 LXX and 22:8 LXX)

In 2 Corinthians 9:6 Paul writes “Now this I say, he who sows sparingly will also reap sparingly, and he who sows bountifully will also reap bountifully.” This alludes to two texts in Prov. Proverbs 11:24 says “There are those who by distributing their livelihood increase it, and there are others who gather, yet have less.” The better allusion is Prov 22:8, “He who sows what is cheap will reap what is bad and will complete the impact of his deeds.” For the portion of Prov 22:8 to which Paul alludes, three words are identical (bold), and two (φαῦλα and κακά) are replaced with similar terms:

Prov 11:24 – εἰσίν οἱ τὰ ἱδίᾳ σπείροντες πλείονα ποιοῦσιν,

Prov 22:8 – ὁ σπείρων φαῦλα θερίσει κακά,

2 Cor 9:6 – Τοῦτο δὲ, ὁ σπείρων φειδομένως φειδομένως καὶ θερίσει,

καὶ ὁ σπείρων ἐπ’ εὐλογίαις ἐπ’ εὐλογίαις καὶ θερίσει.

D. 2 Corinthians 9:7a (Deuteronomy 15:10 LXX)

In 2 Cor 9:7a Paul writes “Each one must do just as he has purposed in his heart, not grudgingly or under compulsion.” This alludes to Deut 15:10 “Giving you shall give to him, and you shall lend him a loan whatever he needs, and you shall not be grieved in your heart when you give to him, because through this thing the Lord your God will bless you in all your works and in all to which you may put your hand.” For the portion of Deut 15:10 to which Paul alludes, only καρδία and λύπης are paralleled, though the negative is retained in each with οὐ (Deut) and
μὴ (2 Cor), and the indicative verb λυπηθῆσῃ is modified to the genitive noun λύπης. The word order is also inverted, suggesting that this is a calque of Deut 15:

Deut 15:10 –  οὖν λυπηθῆσῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ

2 Cor 9:7a – ἐκαστὸς καθός προήρηται τῇ καρδίᾳ, μὴ ἐκ λύπης ἢ ἐξ ἀνάγκης.

E. 2 Corinthians 9:7b (Proverbs 22:8a LXX)

In 2 Cor 9:7b Paul writes “for God loves a cheerful giver.” This alludes to Prov 22:8a

“God blesses a cheerful and generous man.” For the portion of Prov 22:8a to which Paul alludes, the majority (bold) of the text is identical, however, Paul makes a few changes. Whereas ἀνδρα is the subject of the verb εὐλογεῖ in Prov, the subject has changed to δότην, and the verb has been changed to ἀγαπᾷ: 104

Prov 22:8a – ἀνδρα ἰλαρὸν καὶ δότην εὐλογεῖ θεός

2 Cor 9:7b – ἰλαρὸν γὰρ δότην ἀγαπᾷ θεός

F. 2 Corinthians 9:9 (Psalm 111:9 LXX)

In 2 Cor 9:9 Paul writes “as it is written, ‘He scattered abroad, he gave to the poor, His righteousness endures forever.’” This is a quotation of Ps 111:9 “He scattered; he gave to the needy; his righteousness endures forever and ever.” The quoted portion of the psalm is reproduced in 2 Cor 9:9 exactly from the LXX:

Ps 111:9 – ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκεν τοῖς πένησιν, ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

2 Cor 9:9 – ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκεν τοῖς πένησιν, ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

G. 2 Corinthians 9:10 (Isaiah 55:10 LXX)

In 2 Cor 9:10a Paul writes “Now he who supplies seed to the sower and bread for food will supply and multiply your seed for sowing.” This alludes to Isa 55:10 “For as rain or snow

104 Bruehler suggests Paul changed εὐλογεῖ to ἀγαπᾷ in order to emphasize the blessing of the recipient rather than the giver. The change may also be attributed to the fact that εὐλογεῖαν has already been used in 9:5 and Paul is focusing the disposition, rather than the blessing of the giver (“Proverbs,” 215).
comes down from heaven and will not return until it has soaked the earth and brought forth and blossomed and given seed to the sower and bread for food...” For the portion of Isa 55:10 to which Paul alludes, the majority (bold) of the text is identical, and ἐπιχορηγῶν σπόρον (Isa) is exchanged for the cognate phrase δῶ σπέρμα (2 Cor):

Isa 55:10 – ἐπιχορηγῶν σπόρον τῷ σπείροντι καὶ ἁρτον εἰς βρῶσιν.

2 Cor 9:10 – δῶ σπέρμα τῷ σπείροντι καὶ ἁρτον εἰς βρῶσιν

H. 2 Corinthians 9:10 (Hosea 10:12 LXX)

Following the preceding allusion Paul also writes “…and increase the harvest of your righteousness.” This alludes to Hos 10:12 “Seek the Lord until the produce of justice comes to you.” For the portion of Hos 10:12 to which Paul alludes there are three parallel terms (bold), though “you” is declined differently:

Hos 10:12 – ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν γενήματα δικαιοσύνης ὑμῖν.

2 Cor 9:10 – αὐξήσει τὰ γενήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν.