# 1

# METALEPSIS AND THE CHRISTOLOGICAL REVISION OF PSALMODY IN PAUL

## 1.1 Introduction

### 1.1.1 The literary Paul and the "imaginative craft" of exegesis

The apostle Paul has always been a magnetic figure, inciting passionate engagement in his readers. Magnetism is a polarising force, to be sure: throughout the long centuries of his discursive afterlife, Paul is seen to attract some, repel others. But attraction and repulsion alike are forms of engagement. Not given to dilettantism, Paul's readers are in the main firmly engaged, closely invested – though not always consciously so – in the figuration of an author behind his literary output.

So invested, the engaged reader of Paul fashions from and for his letters an attractive or repulsive figure according to need. It is unsurprising, then, to find in the "Pauls" of current scholarly fashion a more than passing resemblance to contemporary scholars of the New Testament who read him. For the most part, such readers are those most likely to desire, and so constitute, an attractive Paul, whose attraction lies in part in imagined similarity to the reader, by which he crosses from a far historical horizon to the reader's own.[1] At least within Anglo-American scholarship of the last twenty years, the contemporary Paul is, like his students, an astute and creative reader of primarily scriptural texts, with which he is in extensive, if complex, sympathy. This is the Paul so elegantly characterised in the landmark study of Richard Hays – himself a reader astute, creative and sympathetic: *Echoes of scripture in the Letters of Paul*.[2]

It is with this Paul that we are likewise concerned. In the chapters that follow, we will grant some features of the Haysian portrait, while

[1] An imagined similarity embodied in Hays' "common sense" hermeneutics (Hays 1989:27–8).

[2] Hays 1989, henceforth *Echoes*. I am indebted to this work, as are many others, for stimulating my interest in intertextuality in Paul.

querying others. We will agree that Paul is a "hermeneutical theologian", who reads for his theology; that his reading of scriptural texts is both intensive and extensive; and that Paul's troping – in quotation, allusion and "echo" – is central to the study of Pauline hermeneutics, and thus to Pauline theology. But we will query the way in which the Haysian study of Pauline tropes predisposes us to figure Paul as a hermeneut of a very particular kind: as an integrative, associative reader, much given to witty play, but less to warfare; more invested in harmony than in counterpoint; bold but not aggressive.

As we shall see repeatedly, this prefigured Paul underwrites, and is reinforced by, some rather cavalier – not to say tendentious – treatments of intertextual happenings in the Pauline text. This might not be thought overly bothersome, except that the stakes are high; for the larger pay-off of such readings is in a powerfully heightened sense of continuity between gospel and scripture, and so between the Christ-event and the symbolic world in which it came to expression. Questions of continuity and disjunction lie at the heart of Pauline theological debate, and cannot be lightly decided. Accordingly, one of the key heuristic moves of this study is to restrain, so far as is possible, the prefiguration of Paul beyond a straightforward recognition of his hermeneutical competence, so that the close study of Pauline tropes can proceed without bias and with due care.

Due care, but not undue curtailment – if ever that were possible. Since *Echoes* was published in 1989, a considerable industry of "intertextual" scholarship has sprung up in Pauline studies.[3] To a large extent, this scholarship has been detached from the ideological roots of Kristeva's *intertextualité*,[4] serving instead the canonical agendas of historical criticism,[5] but with new-found freedom and the appearance, at least, of sophistication. Freedom and sophistication are certainly welcome, for historical criticism's desire to fix authorial intent, whatever its philosophical merits, is ill-served by the familiar tropes of intertextuality. These

[3] The literature is voluminous; many examples will be reviewed during our study. For early criticisms of Hays, of varying incisiveness, see the essays in Evans and Sanders 1993, and Hays' response in the same volume. Merz's sophisticated approach to intertextuality in the Pastorals includes a positive engagement with Hays (Merz 2004:102–4). More recent treatments that interact with Haysian methodology include Moyise 2008b and 2010, and the published work of SBL's Paul and Scripture Seminar (collected in Porter and Stanley 2008). The yield of various symposia on intertextuality and the NT is of mixed quality; cf. the essays in Hays et al. 2009 and Brodie et al. 2006.

[4] Drawing extensively on Bakhtin, Kristeva developed her ideas on intertextuality in *La révolution du langage poétique* (Kristeva 1974). Dissatisfied with its co-option to the study of sources, Kristeva (1984) finally abandoned the term *intertextualité* for *transposition*.

[5] Hays 2009:xiii.

vary in their formal claim to "pin down" what they evoke – allusion prefers imprecision and indirection, quotation does not – but none is entirely successful. It is of the essence of intertextual troping to complicate the rhetorical landscape, making intentions rather hard to discern.

Historically, the matter has been finessed by bringing reassuringly definite categories to bear. Thus one might focus on *classifying* intertextual moments in Paul, or *analysing* the types of allusion or quotation they enact; both approaches are familiar in the literature (cf. 1.1.3). They yield the impression of definition: however fuzzy an intertextual referent may be, it qualifies as *this kind* of referent in *that place*. But intertextual philately is a prosaic affair, and cannot hope to yield a desirably unified portrait of the authorial Paul. Where classification is an analytic, discriminating act, the hermeneutical strategies of Paul are (so we desire) synthetic, integrative. The hermeneutical Paul aligns his intertexts, discovering harmonies between them, constituting the unity of scriptural witness to the Christ. Coolly analytic, piecemeal approaches to his reading of scripture are not much in evidence post-*Echoes*; for indeed, they cannot serve.

They will not serve for Hays, at any rate, who has little interest in classifying forms of allusion,[6] and whose criteria for discerning the presence of echoes serve less to define and constrain the productivity of Paul's text than to guarantee it.[7] Indeed, Hays is concerned to distance exegesis from scientific pretension, reminding his readers that there can be no precision in judging allusion, "because exegesis is a modest imaginative craft, not an exact science".[8] As aids to imaginative craft, Hays' seven criteria for "testing" echoes serve to open the field, not narrow it: they nod to both authorial intention and readerly freedom; they profess an interest in historical plausibility but decline to be constrained by it. The criterion he thinks most important, *satisfaction*,[9] is of all the most intuitive, the least scientifically reducible.[10]

Interpreters with historical critical sympathies have found in the broad-mindedness of Hays' approach a warrant to read for allusion in a more relaxed, even playful, way. The quarry remains the same as before, more or less – authorially intended references to discrete texts – but the burden

[6] Hays 1989:29.

[7] In this connection, the failure of attempts to make Haysian methodology more "scientific" is salutary. Thompson, for example, adduces eleven criteria (1991:28–36) in his attempt to trace dominical tradition in Romans. Dunn commends Thompson for having "attempted a more scientific analysis" (1994:160); Porter (1997:87) deems it "virtually unworkable".

[8] Hays 1989:29.

[9] Hays 1989:31. Hays' seven criteria are introduced in pp. 29–33.

[10] On the methodological underpinnings and associated costs, see 1.2.

of proof has shifted. Instead of (spurious) attempts at scientific precision for individual references, cumulative claims are more often favoured, in which a range of allusively grounded references are taken together to confirm a desirable portrait of Paul as a literary aesthete, a synthetic reader with an investment in narrative. Hays himself thinks the sort of reading developed in *Echoes* "necessarily cumulative".[11]

We will cover this shift in more depth shortly (1.2), but we can register an early hesitation here. Unless pursued with great care, a cumulative approach to evidence runs the risk of circularity: cumulative cases for Pauline intertextuality depend for their likelihood on a notional Paul (the sophisticated reader described earlier) who depends in turn on a cumulative thickness of reference. Even in the subtlest hands, such an approach tends not towards a "modest imaginative craft", but to something much more powerful and much less beholden; in exchanging (rightly) the pretension to "science" for "imaginative craft", exegetical modesty is often lost.

The critical category in Hays, a powerful, immodest tool for opening up the text, is *metalepsis*, aka *echo*. Introduced in 1.1.2, analysed in some depth in 1.2, it will occupy us in various ways throughout our study.

### 1.1.2 The centrality of metaleptic echo to the Haysian project

An English lecturer enters a noisy undergraduate class at the beginning of her lecture. Marching to the podium, she declaims, "Friends! Romans! Countrymen!" The room quickly falls silent; a few students smile knowingly.

What has just taken place is a simple instance of what might be called metalepsis. Quoting a text well known to her audience, the lecturer invites that audience to supply the quotation's complement – "Lend me your ears!" It is that complement which is salient (a speaker's call for silent attention), rather than the quoted words; precisely because it makes little sense to be addressed as friends, Romans or countrymen, the given text fails to satisfy, and a complement must be sought which will. Finding the key, the audience is flattered at its skill, and smiles at the cleverness of the lecturer whose speech set the play in motion.

In its long-established but dubiously valued home in rhetoric, the figure *metalepsis* is conventionally taken to involve the metonymical substitution of one word by another which is itself a metonym;[12] more broadly,

[11] Hays 1989:32.

[12] For an early definition of metalepsis, in which the Latin term *transsumptio* is introduced, see Quintilian (*Inst. 8.6.37–9*). Where Quintilian finds the figure rare and unnecessary, Bloom

"as an extended trope with a missing or weakened middle".[13] The term has acquired a still broader definition in Pauline studies, and an unaccustomed cachet, via the work of Hays, where it denotes a figured correspondence between a text and its precursor which includes aspects of the latter not explicitly cited.[14] Hays gives expression to this wider, less precise usage with the term *echo*.

Whether as *echo* or *metalepsis*, the rhetorical figure illustrated above is at the heart of Hays' account of Pauline intertextuality, and is the key to its productivity. Indeed, to engage with it is to address what Hays himself considers to be critical in his project. Among early critics of *Echoes*, William Scott Green drew particular attention to its potential to obscure the disjunction represented by the Christ-event.[15] Invoking Thomas Greene's hermeneutical typology,[16] Hays responds by identifying Green's reading of Paul's hermeneutic as "heuristic": "Paul evokes the symbolic world of Scripture precisely to reconfigure it systematically into his own symbolic world".[17] Hays, by contrast, orients his project, and the category of metalepsis, to a "dialectical" hermeneutic. Hays' response to Green is worth quoting at length:

> About one point Green is certainly correct: the mere presence of scriptural citations, allusions, and echoes in Paul's discourse cannot settle the [hermeneutical] question. . . . In fact, however, my argument is far less simple than Green makes it sound. Everything rides on the *character* of the intertextual relation between Paul's writing and what was written in Israel's Scripture. If, as I have tried at some length [in *Echoes*] to show, the intertextual relation is genuinely *dialectical*, if Scripture really does retain its own voice and power to challenge and shape Paul's unfolding discourse, then indeed Paul's stance is not supersessionist, at least not as that term is ordinarily understood. But the determination of whether Scripture's voice[18] continues to be

(2003:102) thinks it pervasive. Hollander 1981:133–49 offers an extensive historical review, carefully distinguishing his own account from Bloom's (as represented particularly in Bloom 1973).

[13] Bloom 2003:139.

[14] Hays 1998:219 n. 37. Hays' account of metalepsis is grounded firmly in Hollander 1981; cf. Hays 2005:174–5.

[15] Green 1993.

[16] Drawn from Greene 1982; see Hays 1989:173–8.

[17] Hays 2005:175 (reprinting Hays 1993b).

[18] Notable here is the singularity – the univocity – conferred by the notion of "Scripture's voice", which enters as a term into Hays' argument. The metaphor and its singularity together beg the question of whether "Scripture" is capable of entering into a univocal "relation" with Paul's "unfolding discourse". See 1.2.3.

> heard rather than suppressed is, in significant measure, a literary judgment about how the text's tropes work.[19]

Hays is quite correct in asserting the hermeneutical significance of literary tropes, specifically in how they "work".[20] Accordingly, our study is not least an attempt to assess how the trope of metalepsis works, in general (1.2), in relation to psalmic discourse in particular (1.3) and at numerous points in Paul's text where psalmic discourse is represented in quotation. As such, it promises further insight into the character of Paul's hermeneutic, whether dialectical or heuristic, whether oriented to continuity or disjunction.

As an instrument in the service of such hermeneutical judgements, metalepsis is both extremely powerful and very difficult to constrain, because of its structural reliance on the unsaid. The figure is unusual among intertextual tropes in its formal dependence on context; as in the example with which we began, what is said does not constitute the figure alone, but also – if not primarily, or even only[21] – that which is unsaid, which a reader must supply. We may wonder, in light of this, whether the trope of metalepsis is structurally disposed to constitute a dialectical, rather than heuristic, relationship between discursive voices, insofar as the unsaid must be voiced by an agent other than Paul. More generally, we hardly need Derrida's warnings concerning the undecidability of contexts to recognise the risks attaching to any account, dependent on metaleptic claims, that wishes to establish a hermeneutical stance for an author such as Paul.[22]

A close examination of the dynamics of metalepsis is thus in order. Indeed, in its call for context and in its empowerment of the reader, metalepsis figures a more complex drama of reading than that offered by quotation. Quotation and allusion alike foreground authorial intent, though allusion requires a historical reader to confirm it; but metalepsis is formally contingent upon readerly activity, responding to (perceived) signals in the text left by a (constructed) author. We will shortly tease

[19] Hays 2005:176.

[20] Indeed, *Echoes* represents an eloquent apology for a literary-theological approach, whose basic legitimacy will not be further argued here. The methodologically sceptical reader is duly referred to that volume.

[21] See Quintilian (*Inst. 8.6.38*): "For the nature of metalepsis is that it is an intermediate step, as it were, to that which is metaphorically expressed, signifying nothing in itself, but affording a passage to something".

[22] Cf. Derrida's "Signature Event Context" and "Limited Inc a b c …", collected in Derrida 1988 with a helpful afterword; both are addressed to the strong intentionalism of Austinian speech-act theory. The problem of undecidability is not absolute, however: Derrida does allow that *some* determination may be made among possible interpretations; cf. Derrida 1988:142, 148–9. Rather, his point is the failure of appeals, whether to intending subjects or to contexts, to master the play of signification.

out its various threads (1.2), a task all too seldom attempted.[23] Yet we must do this, not only to keep our own and other metaleptic readings accountable, but equally to habilitate metalepsis to the study of psalmody in Pauline intertextuality. To the question of psalmody we turn next.

### 1.1.3 Towards the study of Christological psalmody

The grandest claims for Paul's intertextual engagement with scripture have had Second Isaiah in view, or Deuteronomy. Hays and those shaped by him have been intrigued with Second Isaiah in particular.[24] Among significant contributions since *Echoes*, Watson's *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* stands out as a full-scale attempt to position Paul as an exegete of the Pentateuch.[25]

Large-scale treatments of Isaiah or Deuteronomy in Paul have often been allied to the narrative school in Pauline studies, indebted – as is this mode of intertextual enquiry – to Hays.[26] Not infrequently, narrative elements within the Pentateuch – the exodus traditions and patriarchal stories especially – have been brought to the fore;[27] apt, perhaps, to yield a "narrative substructure"[28] for Pauline theology.

A focus on Second Isaiah or on Deuteronomy should not surprise us: these delimited texts rank first and second in undisputed citations in the agreed Paulines. More surprising, at first glance, is the relative lack of attention paid to the psalms, which rank a close third.[29] At least, little *systematic* attention has been paid to the psalms, such as might yield a composite portrait of Paul as a reader of "the psalms", taken as a literary or discursive whole. But it may be that the narrativist affiliations of the Haysian project tell against an interest in psalmody, whose relationship with narrative is typically thinner than other kinds of texts might claim to show.[30] Nor can "the psalms" designate

[23] See 1.1.3 n. 36 for attempts to reckon with Haysian methodology.

[24] Hays 1998. The standout engagement with Isaiah in the Haysian mould is Wagner 2002 (Wagner took his doctorate under Hays). Wilk 1998 is similarly rich; cf. Wilk 2009.

[25] Watson 2004. Watson acknowledges his debt to *Echoes* (2004:xii–xiii).

[26] Here the significant text is Hays 1983, 2nd edn. 2002.

[27] Watson 2004; cf. Keesmaat 1999.

[28] The quest for a "narrative substructure" is the declared project of Hays 1983, 2nd edn. 2002.

[29] For textual studies of undisputed citations, see Harrisville 1985; Silva 2001; Stanley 1992. Casting the net wider in search of "influence", cf. the lists in the revised *Corpus Paulinum* (Hübner 1997) or in NA[27].

[30] Endorsing Watson's *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, Hays observes (on its back cover), "Most provocatively, Watson seeks to demonstrate two interlocking theses: that Paul reads the Pentateuch as having a coherent narrative structure, and that Paul therefore has a

a bound literary work in quite the way of other texts in the eventual canon of scripture.[31]

A spate of recent studies has partially redressed the imbalance, though none, at time of writing, has attempted a full-scale reading of "the psalms", construed as a literary or discursive whole, in the writings of Paul; not post-*Echoes*, at least. Nonetheless, even many of these partial studies attempt to read the psalms for narrative, and so demonstrate their debt to Hays.[32]

The present study does not pretend to be comprehensive in its approach to the psalms in Paul. Our focus is rather on what we will term "Christological psalmody". At the core of our investigation are instances in Paul, largely in Romans, where Christ might be installed as speaker of a quotation from the psalms. Of preliminary interest, however, are quotations to which David is attached; for the domain of psalmody into which Christ enters is conventionally David's, particularly in late Second Temple Judaism.[33] Ancillary to these is the concatenation of Davidic psalmody in Rom 3:10–18, whose association with David is unmarked but potent, calling for reflection. Taken together, the subset of Pauline psalm quotations treated in our study represents a substantial proportion of the whole.[34]

comprehensive hermeneutical perspective that makes sense out of his various scriptural citations"; cf. Hays 2005:xvi n. 16. Watson takes Paul to have a coherent *reading* of the Pentateuch, certainly (Watson 2004:515), but the form of that reading is not necessarily narrative. Watson's Paul construes the Pentateuch as a whole by discerning a "pattern" from particular readings (cf. Kelsey 1975:102, cited with approval in Watson 2004:515 n. 1); and the question of whether such a "pattern" is best described in narrative terms may be debated (cf. Barclay 2002:154–6; Horrell 2002:166–8). In any event, it is telling to find a "coherent narrative structure" posed not simply as a *desideratum*, but as that which constitutes Paul as a reader with a "comprehensive hermeneutical perspective". The logic of such a claim is not self-evident; nor is it immediately clear how biblical psalmody could serve Paul in like manner.

[31] See 1.3.1.3 n. 99 on the fluidity of the psalter in late Second Temple Judaism.

[32] For broad-ranging surveys see, inter alia, Keesmaat 2004 on Romans; Williams 2004 on 1 and 2 Corinthians. The former reads for narrative, but better resembles Tom Wright than Hays in terms of methodology. Earlier general treatments of psalmody in Paul include Harmon 1969, which distils the results of his unpublished thesis (1968). In a different category is Kleinknecht 1984, whose portrait of Paul as "righteous sufferer" entails a claim of extensive discursive influence from psalmody. Studies of individual references to the psalms, or of subsets, are referred to in the course of our study.

[33] See Evans 1997, 2004; Mays 1986.

[34] Precision is neither necessary nor helpful. Nevertheless, were we to allow the catena in Rom 3 to represent a series of quotations, and based on a conservative estimate of the number of psalm quotations in Paul (e.g. Silva 2001), we could claim for our study a total of eleven examined in detail (including Deut 32:43 at Rom 15:10, which Silva does not factor), and various others in brief, out of twenty-three possible. More than half of Paul's psalm quotations receive attention.

Though we will be in critical dialogue with many aspects of the Haysian project, the current study is certainly indebted to it, and shares with it at least two significant historical assumptions and two methodological priorities. Like Hays, we will take Paul to be a competent and interested reader of his textual precursors; and we will allow his historical audiences a similar competence and interest, given a sufficiently rich account of reception.[35] As to method: we will locate metalepsis at the heart of our reading of Paul, while anchoring intertextual claims to explicit quotations. The last we share with Hays[36] rather than with many of his followers, who demonstrate somewhat less reserve (1.2.1).[37]

[35] In a series of articles (Stanley 1997a, 1997b, 1999) and a monograph (Stanley 2004), Chris Stanley has argued against the high standard of audience competence imagined by Hays and those who follow him; cf. Stanley 2008. Yet even in earlier work (1999:135f.), Stanley grants in principle a range of competencies in any given audience. This is of course a crucial concession, since it allows – on the reasonable assumption that a letter, when received, was read and heard many times and discussed at length – that the competence of even just one "expert" reader might come to facilitate the understanding of others. Stanley does not imagine this (1999:130); others press for it (Wagner 2002:37; cf. Tuckett 2000:410 n. 24). Just such competence might be associated with a duly empowered letter-bearer, as suggested by Doty (1973:76–7). Titus and Timothy are strong candidates in the Pauline case (see 1 Cor 4:16–17; 16:10–11; 2 Cor 8:16–24); cf. Mitchell's illuminating discussion of Titus and Timothy as emissaries (1992:651–62). On the competence of Roman audiences, see Fisk 2008; in response to Stanley, see Abasciano 2007.

[36] Hays explores the workings of metalepsis almost always in relation to a quotation or unequivocal allusion. The methodological focus is set out in Hays 1989:24. An "unequivocal allusion" is one whose intentionality is unequivocally marked in the text. Many other kinds of allusion might be distinguished; for an influential categorisation, see Perri 1978; cf. Perri 1984. Ben-Porat 1976 reflects seminally (and structurally) on allusive process; Pucci 1998 helpfully foregrounds the reader's role in construing allusion. For definitions of "quotation" intended to serve Pauline scholarship, see Koch 1986:11–23; Stanley 1992:37f. From among seven criteria adduced by Koch, Stanley adopts three for identifying a direct quotation: introduction by an explicit quotation formula, accompanying interpretive gloss and syntactical tension between quotation and Pauline context. As tools for identifying quotation, Stanley's influential criteria are indicative rather than exhaustive, as he (1992:37) and others recognise; see Porter 1997 for trenchant critique; cf. Porter 2006. Even in recent critique (Porter 2008a), Porter displays an impressive ability to miss the point in assessing Hays' methodology; cf. his insistence that, "for Hays and others, echo is tantamount to allusion" (Porter 2008a:36). Moyise's cursory review of perspectives on quotation (Moyise 2008a:15–28), in the same volume, is hampered by methodological compatibilism, a problem which equally limits the value of his more recent monograph on method (Moyise 2008b). "It is the conclusion of this study", he tells us, "that this complexity [of the business of "evoking Scripture"] is best served by combining a number of approaches rather than fastening on just one" (Moyise 2008b:141). What a synthetic approach would look like Moyise does not say, though he hints at possible rapprochements (2008b:48). Moyise appears not to recognise the incommensurability of the disparate hermeneutical approaches he surveys.

[37] That is, they build cumulative cases for a hermeneutical Paul, which depend substantially upon forms of allusion which are unmarked for intention. Rosner (1994:20) is typically cavalier: "Some of the connections between Paul and Scripture we shall propose are less

Appropriately enough, we will be in extensive dialogue with many whose treatment of Pauline quotation, and of Christological psalmody, involves a claim of metalepsis, and this not infrequently in narrative terms. Metaleptic claims are significant also in our account; so much so, in fact, that metalepsis emerges as a genuine subject, and not merely an instrument, of investigation. Our study differs from many others, however, in the way it characterises metaleptic process, and its realisation in the distinctive discourse of psalmody. Indeed, a failure to reckon adequately with the character of psalmic discourse, and with the methodological bias of Haysian metalepsis, has compromised the value and insight of earlier studies.

All this remains to be shown, mostly ad loc. But here we must do some ground-clearing. Section 1.2 considers the dramatic structure of metalepsis, and functions as a general critique of weaknesses in the Haysian project which we will amply illustrate in later chapters. Section 1.3 assesses the distinctive character of psalmody, particularly as this bears on metaleptic process. There too we will reflect on how psalmody fashions a subject for imitation; for the Christological quotations we are considering offer their subjects to just this end. Section 1.4 charts the path ahead.

## 1.2 The dramatic structure of metalepsis

Metalepsis is by no means the only intertextual trope which might be identified in Paul's text; nor, in the case of psalmody, do we need to depend on it, as though indirection were Paul's only approach to psalmic intertexts. In conventional thinking on the matter, quotations are the surest evidence of authorial interest in a textual precursor;[38] and the

certain than others. The argument of the study, it must be stressed, rests not upon individual items, but upon the cumulative weight of the evidence. Rather than 'one bad apple spoiling the whole barrel', when it comes to establishing Paul's dependence upon the scriptures for ethics, 'the more (connections between Paul's paraenesis and his Scriptural inheritance) the merrier'". Not always appreciated in such remarks is what is entailed in assessing the "cumulative weight" of unmarked intertextual references. The risk of circularity is high, in which one reference, tentatively claimed (being unmarked), serves to bolster another, which in turn underwrites the first. At its most undisciplined, to argue "the more the merrier" is to tailor for Paul's text an intertextual "suit of new clothes" with scarcely a dependable thread. Our own approach avoids circularity, arguing from clearly marked quotations in each case, and refusing to allow one metaleptic claim to underwrite, or to depend upon, another. The most we will claim for an identification that is not explicitly made – of Christ as a given quotation's speaker, for example in Rom 15:9 (4.3.1.2) – is that it makes *plausible* such identifications elsewhere (cf. 5.2.3.2). But plausibility is not probative, and does not constitute dependence.

[38] Such thinking is evident in the persistent focus on citations in studies prior to *Echoes*, where questions of influence or dependence were to the fore. Hays detaches his project, at least nominally (see 1.2.1 below), from authorial intention.